IMMPACT XVIII - Initiative on Methods, Measurement, and Pain Assessment in Clinical Trials
June 5, 2015
A Matter of Record (301) 890-4188
Min-U-Script® with Word Index

IMMPACT XVIII - Initiative on Methods, Measurement, and Pain Assessment in Clinical Trials

Pain A	ssessment in Clinical Trials	ciit, uiiu		June 5, 2015
L*4343'	۲L*	Page 1		Page 3
1	INITIATIVE ON METHODS, MEASUREMENT, AND	•	1	PROCEEDINGS
2	PAIN ASSESSMENT IN CLINICAL TRIALS		2	MALE SPEAKER: Good morning to everyone.
3			3	Just a couple reminders to you before we start
4	IMMPACT XVIII		4	formally, the housekeeping things to keep in mind.
5			5	Please remember to speak into the microphone when
6			6	you want to be asking a question for those in the
7	Ensuring Data Quality in		7	audience. Make sure your cell phones are, in fact,
8	Clinical Trials of Pain Treatments		8	silenced.
9	Considerations for Study and Conduct		9	Checkout time from your room, just so you
10			10	know it, is 12:00 o'clock. If you haven't checked
11			11	out, you can do it at the coffee break or at
12			12	lunchtime. We will try and end the meeting within
13	Friday, June 5, 2015		13	a reasonable time.
14			14	Remember what your mission is for the rest
15			15	of this session, rest of today, which is at the end
16			16	of the day before we let you out the door, we are
17	Willard Hotel		17	going to begin talking about hopefully putting some
18	Washington, DC		18	information together that Bob is going to summarize
19			19	for you, and then start working towards having this
20			20	recommendation paper, considerations for improving
21			21	data quality based on the conversations that we've
22			22	had here.
		Page 2		Page 4
1	CONTENTS		1	MALE SPEAKER: And we submit it to the
2 AG	SENDA ITEM	PAGE	2	iournal.

1	CONTENTS		1 MALE SPEAKER: And we submit it to the
2	AGENDA ITEM	PAGE	
3	Data Quality Issues in the Design and		2 Journal. 3 MALE SDEAKED: To be submitted to a
4	Analysis of Clinical Trials, and FDA		4 reputable journel upprecified at this particular
5	Perspective		4 reputable journal unspecified at this particular
6	Paul Schuette, PhD	5	5 moment.
-	ora and Devel Discussion	24	6 (Laughter.)
	Q&A and Panel Discussion	24	7 MALE SPEAKER: Although she's not in the
8	Discussant I: An Academic Perspective on		8 room, I want to also remind you about taxis because
9	Clinical Trial Quality		9 it's Friday afternoon and they want to make sure
10	John Markman, MD	99	10 there's enough taxis, to check at the if you
11	Discussant II: Industry and CRO		11 haven't already done so, what time you're going to
12	Perspectives on Clinical Trial Quality		12 be needing a taxi so that, in fact, can be taken
13	David Hewitt, MD	139	13 care of by and Valorie is doing that.
14	Q&A and Panel Discussion	174	14 She's not in here, and I want to just thank
15	Consensus Discussion: Recommended		15 Valorie Thompson and Andrea Speckin, who were the
16	Considerations for Ensuring Study Data		16 two people who coordinated this meeting, did all
17	Quality in Clinical Trials of		17 the correspondence with you, got you the
18	Pain Treatments	261	18 information, took care of all the logistics
19	Adjournment	323	19 I think from our experience, they've been
20			20 extremely helpful, very effective in doing that.
21			21 Hopefully, you've all had a reasonable experience
22			22 in getting here.

IMMPACT XVIII - Initiative on Methods, Measurement, and Pain Assessment in Clinical Trials

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 5		Page 7
1	(Applause.)	1	quality by design paradigm. It was mentioned by
2	MALE SPEAKER: If you have any questions or	2	Nat that this occurs typically in the manufacturing
3	comments regarding your trip back or checking out	3	side of the house, and there's actually an FDA
4	or what have you, definitely check with them.	4	guidance that spells that out. I would also argue
5	They'll be able to help you.	5	that what we're attempting to do with the good XP
6	So let me turn it over to Mike, who's going	6	guidances, the GXP acronyms that we have all over
7	to finish off the session that we had begun, and we	7	the place, are partially an attempt to correspond
8	were slightly off target.	8	to this as well.
9	I want to thank Paul for being willing to be	9	GCP most people know, good clinical
10	flexible on the timing.	10	practice. GMP is good manufacturing practice. How
11	DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. It's my pleasure to	11	about GPVP? Good pharmacovigilance practice. And
12	introduce Paul Schuette, who is a mathematical	12	does anyone want to take a stab at GLP?
13	statistician and the scientific computing	13	MALE SPEAKER: [Inaudible].
14	coordinator at the FDA Center for Drug Evaluation	14	DR. SCHUETTE: Yeah. Government tends to
15	and Research. He's going to give the FDA	15	specialize in TLAs, three-letter acronyms.
16	perspective on, as you can see, contents data,	16	(Laughter.)
17	quality issues in the design and analysis of	17	DR. SCHUETTE: So there will be a test.
18	trials.	18	CDISC. Let's see. CDISC stands for Clinical Data
19	Presentation – Paul Schuette	19	Interchange Standards Consortium. So FDA, some of
20	DR. SCHUETTE: The standard disclaimer, if	20	our other regulatory agencies, and representatives
21	you don't like what I say, blame me, not the people	21	from both academe and sponsors have worked to try
22	I work for. A little bit of an outline. We'll	22	to develop data standards.
	Page 6		Page 8
-	talk about data quality, and analysis quality to	-	The data standards are not perfect. They
T		T	den't ensuer every retential issue, but they
2	some extent, reviewer experiences, some monitoring	2	don't answer every potential issue, but they le at
3	and some conclusions.	3	heast a step in the right direction. And I think
4	so data quality. I timink it's pretty much a	4	let more abvious when we all have to report the
5	given, it's been accepted, that we cannot inspect	5	data the same way. So these are out there
0	"Eliminate the need for inspection on a mass basis	0	CDISC has published a therapoutis area
/	Eliminate the need for inspection on a mass basis	/	conscience a interapeutic area
0	place " So Doming is portage the quality guru from	0	soving it's perfect again, but it's at least an
9 10	the 50s '60s '70s and '80s	10	attempt in the right direction. And I would also
11	This is one of his 14 points. This is	11	argue that the very fact that we have a
12	actually reflected in one of our guidance	12	prespecified statistical analysis plan is in some
13	documents. "Monitoring or oversight alone cannot	13	sense related to data quality and analysis quality
14	ensure quality. Rather, quality is an overarching	14	Statistical quality concerns Missing data
15	objective that must be built into the clinical	15	This is perhaps one of the big ones nowadays
16	trial enterprise. EDA recommends a quality risk	16	There's a National Academy of Sciences report that
17	management approach to clinical trials "	17	is certainly something to look at. There is an FMA
18	Let me tell you where that came from because	18	report. There is an FDA guidance in development
19	that's an important document, which is "Oversight	19	am told, and all dealing with that
20	of Clinical Investigations: A Risk-Based Approach	20	The basic approach that I think we're saving
21	to Monitoring."	21	to missing data is don't. Avoid missing data, and
22	I would say that FDA has embraced the	22	part of that is looking at how things are designed.
	•	1	

	Page 9		Page 11
1	Do the study design and study conduct minimize	1	fileable. This comes fairly early on. But
2	missing data? How do the protocol and the	2	unfortunately, this is a fairly rudimentary
3	statistical analysis plan propose dealing with	3	process. It's basically are the appropriate
4	analysis of missing data? So we would like to have	4	domains populated, is there a demographics domain,
5	that more specified as we go along.	5	is there this other domain?
6	By the way, last observation carried forward	6	It doesn't say anything about how great the
7	is not considered a good way to handle missing	7	data is once it's in there. It just says is it
8	data. So there's more there.	8	there. So that's why I call it rudimentary checks.
9	Another thing that has come out, and this is	9	We're trying to put in place incrementally some
10	a little bit older now, are the patient-reported	10	better methods.
11	outcomes guidance. One of the things that we do	11	Within the CDER I'm located in the Office
12	see as an issue, and it's sometimes a problem, is	12	of Translational Sciences. A companion
13	specifying the choice of instrument. There should	13	organization within the Office of Translational
14	be some background as to why a particular	14	Sciences is the Office of Computational Sciences.
15	instrument has been chosen. And along with that,	15	And they actually have worked with CDISC to provide
16	there needs to be sort of a complete document	16	something they're calling a jump start service.
17	trail, audit trail that is available, that	17	And this actually provides some rudimentary checks
18	specifies the version number, scoring algorithm,	18	of SDTM data.
19	and so forth.	19	So as I use these acronyms, I assume people
20	Sometimes it can be very difficult to	20	kind of know what I'm talking about here, but this
21	replicate results or know what's going on. And	21	is basically, the "raw data" that come out of the
22	unfortunately, the choice of instrument even if you	22	CDISC model. And what this does is it checks for
	Page 10		Page 12
1	savit's there, there is some concern as to whether	1	things like is the advorse event start date before
1 1	or not the version is changing over the course of a	2	the adverse event and date these types of things
2		2	very basic types of checks that are necessary but
4	So I've used a term from the modeling and	4	can be missing
5	simulation world at the very last hullet is for	5	We have Office of Scientific Investigation
6	lack of a better term, verification, validation	6	inspections OSL But this is usually a very small
7	and uncertainty quantification. Basically, this is	7	proportion of sites We're talking about 1 to
, 8	called content validation and other things in the	, 8	2 percent in many cases so not a huge amount And
9	guidance, but the overall idea is does the	9	data quality issues can emerge throughout the
10	instrument does it do what it says it's supposed	10	review process. So we'll follow this with some
11	to do, and are the results reliable? And there's	11	anecdotes.
12	been some allusion to some of those types of	12	This should look vaguely familiar because I
13	issues.	13	think this is the exact same instance that Sharon
14	So data quality and the FDA submission	14	alluded to vesterday as her first example.
15	process, let's go through some of this. So suppose	15	Reviewer reported an incident in which several
16	a sponsor finishes their study. This is kind of	16	members of the same family were all enrolled in a
17	what actually happens on our end. They submit an	17	pain medication trial on a Friday evening. My
18	application to the electronic documents staff. It	18	understanding is the dog did it.
19	goes into our systems, and then we start looking at	19	This raised some red flags. There were
20	it.	20	found to be some other questionable practices at
21	The review teams must determine whether or	21	this site. Turns out this was also the largest
22	not the submission is actually what we call	22	site in the trial. OSI is concerned with the
1		1	

	Page 13		Page	15
1	validity of data from the site. The entire trial	1	speakers yesterday, variability of individual	
2	was excluded, and if the sponsor wants to pursue	2	outcomes. Some of this is perhaps related to	
3	this, they have to submit new studies. So this is	3	subject training. From our perspective, we don't	
4	a fairly serious problem for the actual sponsor.	4	know if it's a subject training, an instrument	
5	Another experience, misclassification.	5	reliability issue. It's all sort of conflated. We	
6	Rescue medications were misclassified as	6	just know that we don't think things are changing,	
7	concomitant medications, affecting some domains,	7	and the responses are changing quite a bit. So we	
8	and really changed the efficacy evaluation of the	8	saw some challenges being addressed along those	
9	product because we're looking at a combination	9	lines.	
10	product, in essence, rather than the actual product	10	Missing values. One of the standard	
11	itself.	11	problems, of course, in all this area is what	
12	So just because someone says that they're	12	happens if we have a missing value. Some of that	
13	employing standards doesn't mean that they are	13	could be related to the choice of the instrument.	
14	actually doing so correctly, and we need to have	14	Sharon was saying, for example, that if we don't	
15	the standards employed in the right manner in order	15	have the option to respond in the right way, what	
16	to be effective.	16	do most of us do, is we just stop the survey at	
17	PRO. One of my division directors says that	17	that point. So there may be multiple reasons why	
18	we should always have a cartoon in a presentation.	18	there's missing values, and we think that needs to	
19	But there is a serious aspect there. I would say	19	be explored further.	
20	that the circumstances in who is administering the	20	Rescue medication. We're looking at	
21	test can matter, and the context is also important.	21	analyzing the efficacy and safety of medications,	
22	I've realized I've gone into government	22	and, if you will, it's necessary to prevent more	
	Dava 44		Dama	40
	Page 14		Page	16
1	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of	1	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating	16
1 2	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course,	1 2	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for	16
1 2 3	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of	1 2 3	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain	16
1 2 3 4	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some	1 2 3 4	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses.	16
1 2 3 4 5	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular	1 2 3 4 5	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out.	16
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been seen is the use of pediatric and adult scales	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this type of analysis.	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been seen is the use of pediatric and adult scales without making a distinction. They're both on a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this type of analysis. The other thing that we've already seen a	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been seen is the use of pediatric and adult scales without making a distinction. They're both on a zero to 10 scale, gamish them together, and we're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this type of analysis. The other thing that we've already seen a problem with are opioids misclassified as	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been seen is the use of pediatric and adult scales without making a distinction. They're both on a zero to 10 scale, gamish them together, and we're good to go, right? No. We need to look at	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this type of analysis. The other thing that we've already seen a problem with are opioids misclassified as concomitant meds rather than rescue medications.	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been seen is the use of pediatric and adult scales without making a distinction. They're both on a zero to 10 scale, gamish them together, and we're good to go, right? No. We need to look at pediatric being very different from an adult PRO	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this type of analysis. The other thing that we've already seen a problem with are opioids misclassified as concomitant meds rather than rescue medications. And one of the problems is that when we're looking	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been seen is the use of pediatric and adult scales without making a distinction. They're both on a zero to 10 scale, gamish them together, and we're good to go, right? No. We need to look at pediatric being very different from an adult PRO potentially, or if they're going to say they're the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this type of analysis. The other thing that we've already seen a problem with are opioids misclassified as concomitant meds rather than rescue medications. And one of the problems is that when we're looking at these rescue medications and looking at	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been seen is the use of pediatric and adult scales without making a distinction. They're both on a zero to 10 scale, gamish them together, and we're good to go, right? No. We need to look at pediatric being very different from an adult PRO potentially, or if they're going to say they're the same, there needs to be some justification.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this type of analysis. The other thing that we've already seen a problem with are opioids misclassified as concomitant meds rather than rescue medications. And one of the problems is that when we're looking at these rescue medications and looking at different rates and different trials, and we're	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been seen is the use of pediatric and adult scales without making a distinction. They're both on a zero to 10 scale, gamish them together, and we're good to go, right? No. We need to look at pediatric being very different from an adult PRO potentially, or if they're going to say they're the same, there needs to be some justification. Observer-reported outcomes. It may not be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page of missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this type of analysis. The other thing that we've already seen a problem with are opioids misclassified as concomitant meds rather than rescue medications. And one of the problems is that when we're looking at these rescue medications and looking at different rates and different trials, and we're looking at an overall submission, how do we deal	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been seen is the use of pediatric and adult scales without making a distinction. They're both on a zero to 10 scale, gamish them together, and we're good to go, right? No. We need to look at pediatric being very different from an adult PRO potentially, or if they're going to say they're the same, there needs to be some justification. Observer-reported outcomes. It may not be the case that a patient can actually report their	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this type of analysis. The other thing that we've already seen a problem with are opioids misclassified as concomitant meds rather than rescue medications. And one of the problems is that when we're looking at these rescue medications and looking at different rates and different trials, and we're looking at an overall submission, how do we deal with integrating these results across all the	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been seen is the use of pediatric and adult scales without making a distinction. They're both on a zero to 10 scale, gamish them together, and we're good to go, right? No. We need to look at pediatric being very different from an adult PRO potentially, or if they're going to say they're the same, there needs to be some justification. Observer-reported outcomes. It may not be the case that a patient can actually report their pain. How do we handle this and how should that be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this type of analysis. The other thing that we've already seen a problem with are opioids misclassified as concomitant meds rather than rescue medications. And one of the problems is that when we're looking at these rescue medications and looking at different rates and different trials, and we're looking at an overall submission, how do we deal with integrating these results across all the trials in a submission is one of the issues that	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been seen is the use of pediatric and adult scales without making a distinction. They're both on a zero to 10 scale, gamish them together, and we're good to go, right? No. We need to look at pediatric being very different from an adult PRO potentially, or if they're going to say they're the same, there needs to be some justification. Observer-reported outcomes. It may not be the case that a patient can actually report their pain. How do we handle this and how should that be incorporated with the other information is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this type of analysis. The other thing that we've already seen a problem with are opioids misclassified as concomitant meds rather than rescue medications. And one of the problems is that when we're looking at these rescue medications and looking at different rates and different trials, and we're looking at an overall submission, how do we deal with integrating these results across all the trials in a submission is one of the issues that our reviewers are mentioning.	16
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 14 speak. PRO is patient-reported outcomes, of course. One of the challenges is, of course, instrument validation. Perfect validation, of course, doesn't really exist, but we want some literature and background as to why a particular instrument was used, is it fit for a purpose. And some of that is also spelled out in the PRO guidance. One of the problems that has sometimes been seen is the use of pediatric and adult scales without making a distinction. They're both on a zero to 10 scale, gamish them together, and we're good to go, right? No. We need to look at pediatric being very different from an adult PRO potentially, or if they're going to say they're the same, there needs to be some justification. Observer-reported outcomes. It may not be the case that a patient can actually report their pain. How do we handle this and how should that be incorporated with the other information is something to consider.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page of missing data, but it can also be a complicating factor. So the use of rescue medications for breakthrough pain in both acute and chronic pain trial poses a challenge for efficacy analyses. There is a draft guidance that has come out. It's listed in the references, but it just came out last year. And they do allude to some of these types of issues, that it is a little bit more complicated when we're actually looking at this type of analysis. The other thing that we've already seen a problem with are opioids misclassified as concomitant meds rather than rescue medications. And one of the problems is that when we're looking at these rescue medications and looking at different rates and different trials, and we're looking at an overall submission, how do we deal with integrating these results across all the trials in a submission is one of the issues that our reviewers are mentioning. Some other issues, incorrectly coded AEs.	16

	Page 17		Page 19
1	problems with. In some sense, that's also a	1	that may not be necessarily quite as relevant for
2	quality control issue.	2	the scientific question under concern.
3	Correctly ascertaining the recorded reason	3	Centralized monitoring can be an important
4	for withdrawal. For most of us who do work with	4	component of a risk-based monitoring plan, so we're
5	reviews, this is one of our pet peeves. Lost to	5	focusing on sort of this risk-based idea. The
6	follow-up is not a good reason. We need to have	6	guidance has some details, but let me outline, the
7	better follow-up as to why someone withdrew from a	7	key steps are to identify the critical data and
8	trial. Did they move away? Did they die? Did	8	processes; do a risk assessment of those, keeping
9	they experience an adverse event? Was it for lack	9	in mind who will be actually entering the data and
10	of efficacy?	10	those processes; considering risk factors; and
11	Those type of things need to be included as	11	also, developing a plan.
12	part of the protocol and actually more effort to	12	Even with the best centralized monitoring,
13	ascertain what's going on for those purposes.	13	remote evaluation, we still think there will be
14	Follow-up with phone calls, reaching out more.	14	need for onsite monitoring, at least in some cases.
15	Lab values. This is also a quality control	15	So it's sort of an entire approach, but we think
16	issue. In some cases, we were calling this	16	onsite monitoring can be reduced in some cases and
17	investigator error. In some cases, we don't know	17	targeted more specifically.
18	if it's incompetence, ineptitude, not the proper	18	Statistics and central monitoring. This
19	training with the instrumentation. But it does	19	will look vaguely familiar from Amy's talk.
20	create some problems and issues. And again,	20	Distribution of data is one of the things we're
21	missing values, something to harp on is the missing	21	looking at. Too much variation, too little
22	value issue, but pain is one of the areas that	22	variation, outlier, inlier detection.
	Page 18		Page 20
1	there's a higher proportion than some of the	1	The general trend that we want to look for
2	others. And one thing that one of our reviewers	2	in some sense are results that are too good to be
3	mentioned was the need for better tools to discover	3	true, or conversely, they're way, way off scale
4	misconduct in errors.	4	from everyone else. One of the issues people who
5	This gets us to monitoring, and we have two	5	fudge data seem to not know how to look at a
6	basic types, the onsite monitoring, source data	6	calendar.
7	validation was something that Amy was talking	7	(Laughter.)
8	about yesterday and centralized monitoring where	8	DR. SCHUETTE: Maybe that's part of the
9	we're doing a remote evaluation.	9	numeracy training that we were alluding to.
10	We do have a FDA guidance on the topic, and	10	But we want to examine the differences
11	there is a recognition that onsite monitoring is	11	between and within sites, and we're also looking at
12	time consuming, expensive, and not always	12	some ideas from data anomaly detection. The word
13	necessary. And we can even add another point is	13	"fraud" has certain legal connotations, so we'll
14	that it doesn't always catch the problem.	14	refer to things like misconduct or data anomaly.
15	So centralized monitoring. Let me quote	15	And we also need to make the results coherent to
16	straight from the guidance. "FDA encourages	16	non-statisticians or data scientists. So those are
17	greater use of centralized monitoring practices	17	some of the issues that are involved.
18	where appropriate than has been the case	18	Here are some of the initiatives that we're
19	historically with corresponding less emphasis on	19	starting, and we're not there yet. We're working
20	onsite monitoring." And this might even get into	20	with companies to bring commercial software into
21	some of the issues that Nat was pointing out	21	FDA for evaluation, research, and development.
		21	

A Matter of Record (301) 890-4188

	Page 21		Page 23
1	Amy alluded to the fact that some of these	1	really want it to be.
2	programs require hundreds if not thousands of	2	One of the items that we've talked about
3	individual tests. Many of these are actually going	3	perhaps overall, and I've labeled this, is can we
4	to be simulated. This is a very high for lack	4	better articulate what we mean by good clinical
5	of a better term, high performance computing	5	trial practices, good data practices?
6	environment is needed to actually carry this out	6	What I mean by that is that if we look at
7	for the requisite level that we would like. So	7	sort of the areas by themselves, clinical practice,
8	we're looking at using our FDA high performance	8	manufacturing, other aspects, they're all sort of
9	computing environment to actually be able to carry	9	individual discrete domains. But the clinical
10	out some of that.	10	trial itself starts with a plan, a design, coming
11	We're also looking to improve the	11	up with endpoints, how are we going to measure it,
12	statistical methods to determine some ways we can	12	recruitment, setting up the sites. That entire
13	filter out some of the false positives and false	13	process is something that I think we can improve.
14	negatives.	14	I will say onsite and centralized monitoring
15	We're also looking at improving our existing	15	are complementary and not mutually exclusive
16	office of scientific investigation site selection	16	approaches. We're looking at a blended approach
17	tool. We just brought in I'm actually the	17	for future. And we do need to develop and
18	person that's working on that. We just brought in	18	implement some better tools for what we're calling
19	a graduate student who will be working with us this	19	data anomaly detection.
20	summer to do a little bit of data mining in terms	20	Let me phrase it this way. Here are the
21	of looking at the data.	21	four guidances I referenced. Basically, if you
22	There is a potential for our Janus clinical	22	enter these titles into Google, they'll pop up.
	Page 22		Page 24
	Page 22		Page 24
1	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals	1	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report.
1 2	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially	1 2	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II,
1 2 3	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse	1 2 3	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee,
1 2 3 4	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on	1 2 3 4	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my
1 2 3 4 5	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky	1 2 3 4 5	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues.
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Motro, kind of how it lurghes and store	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward that's kind of how lanus has	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.)
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR_MCDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our ability to put that in place	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR. McDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the speakers and panelists to please come up. So we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our ability to put that in place.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR. McDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the speakers and panelists to please come up. So we had three terrific presentations, and I think to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our ability to put that in place. So we're still trying to get all that involved, and one of the ideas that's been mooted	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR. McDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the speakers and panelists to please come up. So we had three terrific presentations, and I think to start things. I'll just maybe summarize quickly
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our ability to put that in place. So we're still trying to get all that involved, and one of the ideas that's been mooted about is to actually include some of these data	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR. McDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the speakers and panelists to please come up. So we had three terrific presentations, and I think to start things, I'll just maybe summarize quickly some of the questions that either came up directly
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our ability to put that in place. So we're still trying to get all that involved, and one of the ideas that's been mooted about is to actually include some of these data checks as part of putting the trial data into the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR. McDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the speakers and panelists to please come up. So we had three terrific presentations, and I think to start things, I'll just maybe summarize quickly some of the questions that either came up directly in the presentations or in my own mind.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our ability to put that in place. So we're still trying to get all that involved, and one of the ideas that's been mooted about is to actually include some of these data checks as part of putting the trial data into the repository. So there's potential. We can't say	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR. McDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the speakers and panelists to please come up. So we had three terrific presentations, and I think to start things, I'll just maybe summarize quickly some of the questions that either came up directly in the presentations or in my own mind. In terms of central statistical monitoring.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our ability to put that in place. So we're still trying to get all that involved, and one of the ideas that's been mooted about is to actually include some of these data checks as part of putting the trial data into the repository. So there's potential. We can't say we're there yet. So this is more aspirational than	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR. McDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the speakers and panelists to please come up. So we had three terrific presentations, and I think to start things, I'll just maybe summarize quickly some of the questions that either came up directly in the presentations or in my own mind. In terms of central statistical monitoring, a number of issues related to I guess one could
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our ability to put that in place. So we're still trying to get all that involved, and one of the ideas that's been mooted about is to actually include some of these data checks as part of putting the trial data into the repository. So there's potential. We can't say we're there yet. So this is more aspirational than operational.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR. McDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the speakers and panelists to please come up. So we had three terrific presentations, and I think to start things, I'll just maybe summarize quickly some of the questions that either came up directly in the presentations or in my own mind. In terms of central statistical monitoring, a number of issues related to I guess one could put it as cost effectiveness of traditional
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our ability to put that in place. So we're still trying to get all that involved, and one of the ideas that's been mooted about is to actually include some of these data checks as part of putting the trial data into the repository. So there's potential. We can't say we're there yet. So this is more aspirational than operational. Do have some conclusions. I think we're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR. McDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the speakers and panelists to please come up. So we had three terrific presentations, and I think to start things, I'll just maybe summarize quickly some of the questions that either came up directly in the presentations or in my own mind. In terms of central statistical monitoring, a number of issues related to I guess one could put it as cost effectiveness of traditional monitoring versus central statistical monitoring.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our ability to put that in place. So we're still trying to get all that involved, and one of the ideas that's been mooted about is to actually include some of these data checks as part of putting the trial data into the repository. So there's potential. We can't say we're there yet. So this is more aspirational than operational. Do have some conclusions. I think we're making progress, but there is definitely room for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR. McDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the speakers and panelists to please come up. So we had three terrific presentations, and I think to start things, I'll just maybe summarize quickly some of the questions that either came up directly in the presentations or in my own mind. In terms of central statistical monitoring, a number of issues related to I guess one could put it as cost effectiveness of traditional monitoring versus central statistical monitoring. I think that can use some investigation.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our ability to put that in place. So we're still trying to get all that involved, and one of the ideas that's been mooted about is to actually include some of these data checks as part of putting the trial data into the repository. So there's potential. We can't say we're there yet. So this is more aspirational than operational. Do have some conclusions. I think we're making progress, but there is definitely room for improvement. On a lot of things, we're at	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR. McDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the speakers and panelists to please come up. So we had three terrific presentations, and I think to start things, I'll just maybe summarize quickly some of the questions that either came up directly in the presentations or in my own mind. In terms of central statistical monitoring, a number of issues related to I guess one could put it as cost effectiveness of traditional monitoring versus central statistical monitoring. I think that can use some investigation. The issues of what does one check in an
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 22 trials repository. So one of the long-term goals is basically we're trying to develop, essentially what it boils down to, a long-term data warehouse for at least the SDTM data. And depending on funding that's kind of gone on a herky-jerky type of fashion. If you're familiar with sometimes riding the Metro, kind of how it lurches and stops and moves forward, that's kind of how Janus has actually proceeded. Sequester did a number on our ability to put that in place. So we're still trying to get all that involved, and one of the ideas that's been mooted about is to actually include some of these data checks as part of putting the trial data into the repository. So there's potential. We can't say we're there yet. So this is more aspirational than operational. Do have some conclusions. I think we're making progress, but there is definitely room for improvement. On a lot of things, we're at version 1. And as you know, for any software	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 24 This is the National Academy of Sciences' report. And I'd like to thank my colleagues in the DB II, analgesics review team, Freda Cooner, Feng Lee, Kate Meaker, James Travis, Yan Zhou, and also to my colleague Scott Como for his input on PRO issues. And I finished on time. (Applause.) Q&A and Panel Discussion DR. McDERMOTT: I'd like to invite the speakers and panelists to please come up. So we had three terrific presentations, and I think to start things, I'll just maybe summarize quickly some of the questions that either came up directly in the presentations or in my own mind. In terms of central statistical monitoring, a number of issues related to I guess one could put it as cost effectiveness of traditional monitoring versus central statistical monitoring. I think that can use some investigation. The issues of what does one check in an individual study, when, how often do we have to

	Page 25		Page 27
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	triggers. There are certain actions that might be taken, but what should precipitate these actions and how strange do these anomalies have to be before we take action? What actions should be taken in any particular case? Paul raised some issues at the very end about potential standards for clinical trial practice, which I thought was sort of interesting. And Rick in his presentation raised a lot of questions actually about site monitoring, things about selecting dealing with other countries, for example, that one has to worry about the feasibility of recruitment versus quality issues, of course; having investigator meetings face to face versus having webinars, the sort of training issues that are associated with that; delegation of responsibilities from investigators to coordinators, who's overseeing, is there adequate supervision of the people to whom a lot of the trial tasks are being delegated; issues concerning informed consent training; and a bunch of other	1 t 2 t 3 t 4 t 5 t 6 t 7 t 8 9 i 10 t 11 t 13 t 14 15 16 t 17 t 18 t 19 t 20 t 21 t	talk whether there might be some guidances or evidence that could be put forward, or studies that could be conducted to say, all right, you need to comply with these, but the best way to do that is use a pocket data entry system and to make sure the data gets entered and checked, et cetera, et cetera. I'm wondering whether there's a way to carry it that next step, something that Nat's been working on, which is to try and make all of this work in a better way, both from the perspective of keeping track of it obviously, but also from the perspective of actually getting it done. DR. McDERMOTT: Paul, do you want to? DR. SCHUETTE: I am not aware of anything that says where the dividing lines are for onsite versus these others. I think it's still fairly early days to actually determine which method is best. And I think over time, we'll see that methods evolve as to how we approach the best way of collecting the data and inputting it.
22	things that were raised.	22	We saw, for example, that bring your own
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	So I want to open it up to first the floor for any questions. John, you're always first. JOHN: I guess that's what I get for sitting up front. There have been some great talks, and I think the move towards trying to make things more efficient with central monitoring and not worrying. And being willing to say that site monitoring actually might not always serve the right purpose I think is a real step forward because, obviously, it's a lot of effort involved and so on. The thing that I haven't heard as much is that in trying to implement all of these, there are a couple of considerations that I think we ought to take into account. And that is, is there a way to	1 (2 (3 t 4 5 (6 a 7 (8 l 9 (10 k 11 s 12 13 (14 i 15 l	device type of things to clinical trials has upsides and downsides. Provision of various things, devices to the subjects has its own issues. So as far as I know, we don't have any real guidance for that, and I think that's probably an area where the folks in the field can really help out. And if they can I'll lapse into FDA-speak. If they can work collaboratively together to develop best trial practices, that would certainly be something I think the agency would tend to support. DR. WASAN: It's Ajay Wasan. So quick question. A lot of us who do investigator- initiated trials use REDcap, and REDcap on many levels kind of addressed a lot of the concerns that
16 17 18 19 20	ao it more efficiently and more effectively? And when we come to a fork in the road, could we perhaps, if they're equal in terms of the benefits to monitoring, could we choose the one that's more efficient or is likely to work more effectively?	16 a 17 r 18 f 19 20 \ 21 a	an or you nave raised. And it's being used even more for bigger trials the NIH or PCORI are funding. So I just want to get what's your sense to what extent, when REDcap is used well, that it actually is a pretty good data platform for

- I wondered -- to the panelists in general, 21
- 22 but specifically with regards to Paul's

Min-U-Script®

22 capturing a lot of high quality type of data, as

	Page 29		Page 31
1	you-all outlined.	1	we're typically used to.
2	DR. SCHUETTE: We do not endorse any	2	One thing that sort of strikes me as
3	commercial product.	3	interesting is that in a lot of ways, these ideas
4	DR. WASAN: That's not a commercial product.	4	aren't new. I mean, Nat talked about quality
5	This is funded by Vanderbilt. It's an NIH effort.	5	control way back when for industry. But a lot of
6	I just want to get a sense of in general	6	the I think the first publication of this that
7	DR. SCHUETTE: We do not let me phrase it	7	was really noticed by people was in the late 1990s,
8	this way. We do not support any commercial or	8	and then it was about 10 years of not a whole lot.
9	specific product by itself. If it's fit for use	9	And all of a sudden, there were a lot of papers
10	and for other things, we do not stand in the way,	10	coming out now about this.
11	but we don't necessarily, for example, support SAS.	11	I suspect this has to do with cutting costs
12	We don't necessarily say you have to use R. So we	12	and so forth and trying to move away from
13	try to stay away from particular platforms'	13	traditional monitoring, but I'm sort of curious as
14	endorsements.	14	to why the sudden interest and why there was this
15	DR. WASAN: And I'm sorry to be difficult.	15	sort of long dead period. I don't know if anyone
16	Let me just rephrase. I just want to get a general	16	here has a comment about that.
17	sense of the process that REDcap uses, that's	17	If not, go ahead.
18	all throughout NIH. In general, what's the sense	18	MALE SPEAKER: Yes, I have a separate
19	of good and bad of that platform? That's all.	19	question. It's kind of just a practical question.
20	DR. SCHUETTE: That's again, one of those	20	I'm a clinician and have been doing clinical trials
21	areas where, unfortunately and I'm not trying to	21	forever. I don't know if the FDA one of the
22	be smart-alecky or anything else, but I can't	22	things we get all the time in the new electronic
	Page 30		Page 32
1	Page 30 comment.	1	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or
1	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks.	1	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs.
1 2 3	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap	1 2 3	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a
1 2 3 4	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel?	1 2 3 4	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously,
1 2 3 4 5	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it	1 2 3 4 5	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like range checks and so forth.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks, print those out.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like range checks and so forth. But I think a lot of what and in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks, print those out. But obviously, it would be an enormous
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like range checks and so forth. But I think a lot of what and in particular Amy talked about yesterday was the very	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks, print those out. But obviously, it would be an enormous effort on our part if we let a monitor sit in front
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like range checks and so forth. But I think a lot of what and in particular Amy talked about yesterday was the very many logic checks, for example, or other kinds of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks, print those out. But obviously, it would be an enormous effort on our part if we let a monitor sit in front of the EMR, not to even get into whether I think
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like range checks and so forth. But I think a lot of what and in particular Amy talked about yesterday was the very many logic checks, for example, or other kinds of checks that wouldn't be automatically produced by	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks, print those out. But obviously, it would be an enormous effort on our part if we let a monitor sit in front of the EMR, not to even get into whether I think it's ethical or not for them to have complete
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like range checks and so forth. But I think a lot of what and in particular Amy talked about yesterday was the very many logic checks, for example, or other kinds of checks that wouldn't be automatically produced by something like REDcap. And so a lot of people have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks, print those out. But obviously, it would be an enormous effort on our part if we let a monitor sit in front of the EMR, not to even get into whether I think it's ethical or not for them to have complete access to a patient's file, and then access to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like range checks and so forth. But I think a lot of what and in particular Amy talked about yesterday was the very many logic checks, for example, or other kinds of checks that wouldn't be automatically produced by something like REDcap. And so a lot of people have moved toward electronic data capture with REDcap	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks, print those out. But obviously, it would be an enormous effort on our part if we let a monitor sit in front of the EMR, not to even get into whether I think it's ethical or not for them to have complete access to a patient's file, and then access to every other file in that Epic system and so forth.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like range checks and so forth. But I think a lot of what and in particular Amy talked about yesterday was the very many logic checks, for example, or other kinds of checks that wouldn't be automatically produced by something like REDcap. And so a lot of people have moved toward electronic data capture with REDcap and other systems, but there's, I think, a fair	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks, print those out. But obviously, it would be an enormous effort on our part if we let a monitor sit in front of the EMR, not to even get into whether I think it's ethical or not for them to have complete access to a patient's file, and then access to every other file in that Epic system and so forth. So I don't know. Has the FDA dealt with
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like range checks and so forth. But I think a lot of what and in particular Amy talked about yesterday was the very many logic checks, for example, or other kinds of checks that wouldn't be automatically produced by something like REDcap. And so a lot of people have moved toward electronic data capture with REDcap and other systems, but there's, I think, a fair amount of effort that needs to go into programming.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks, print those out. But obviously, it would be an enormous effort on our part if we let a monitor sit in front of the EMR, not to even get into whether I think it's ethical or not for them to have complete access to a patient's file, and then access to every other file in that Epic system and so forth. So I don't know. Has the FDA dealt with that at all, or do you guys have any position on
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like range checks and so forth. But I think a lot of what and in particular Amy talked about yesterday was the very many logic checks, for example, or other kinds of checks that wouldn't be automatically produced by something like REDcap. And so a lot of people have moved toward electronic data capture with REDcap and other systems, but there's, I think, a fair amount of effort that needs to go into programming. And I don't know how specific that needs to be for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks, print those out. But obviously, it would be an enormous effort on our part if we let a monitor sit in front of the EMR, not to even get into whether I think it's ethical or not for them to have complete access to a patient's file, and then access to every other file in that Epic system and so forth. So I don't know. Has the FDA dealt with that at all, or do you guys have any position on monitoring coming in? I mean, we want them to have
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like range checks and so forth. But I think a lot of what and in particular Amy talked about yesterday was the very many logic checks, for example, or other kinds of checks that wouldn't be automatically produced by something like REDcap. And so a lot of people have moved toward electronic data capture with REDcap and other systems, but there's, I think, a fair amount of effort that needs to go into programming. And I don't know how specific that needs to be for each trial, how portable some of these methods are.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks, print those out. But obviously, it would be an enormous effort on our part if we let a monitor sit in front of the EMR, not to even get into whether I think it's ethical or not for them to have complete access to a patient's file, and then access to every other file in that Epic system and so forth. So I don't know. Has the FDA dealt with that at all, or do you guys have any position on monitoring coming in? I mean, we want them to have access and quality data. That really has been a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 30 comment. DR. WASAN: Okay. Thanks. DR. McDERMOTT: Have others here used REDcap on the panel? So the one thing I haven't used it either, but some of my colleagues have. But one thing about REDcap or any other platform, I guess, is there are things you can build into the system to prevent certain kinds of errors, of course, like range checks and so forth. But I think a lot of what and in particular Amy talked about yesterday was the very many logic checks, for example, or other kinds of checks that wouldn't be automatically produced by something like REDcap. And so a lot of people have moved toward electronic data capture with REDcap and other systems, but there's, I think, a fair amount of effort that needs to go into programming. And I don't know how specific that needs to be for each trial, how portable some of these methods are. I suspect that to a large extent, they are. But	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 32 medical age is how to let monitors have access or not to EMRs. So I have a clinical practice, and I have a research practice. We keep a firewall, obviously, between the two companies for HIPAA reasons. But the monitors increasingly beat us up when they come and they want to have access to our EMRs. So we take what we think are pertinent records from the practice and send those over to the research folks, print those out. But obviously, it would be an enormous effort on our part if we let a monitor sit in front of the EMR, not to even get into whether I think it's ethical or not for them to have complete access to a patient's file, and then access to every other file in that Epic system and so forth. So I don't know. Has the FDA dealt with that at all, or do you guys have any position on monitoring coming in? I mean, we want them to have access and quality data. That really has been a practical problem, has been an issue for us.

	Page 33		Page 35
1	with that level of approach since I'm in the Office	1	what you said is the Teva policy, is you want to
2	of Biostatistics as opposed to Office of	2	see the medical records.
3	Compliance. But generally speaking, I would	3	DR. MALAMUT: No, I mean, I didn't say it
4	encourage you to reach out to your contacts in the	4	was always successful because you're right. The
5	Office of Compliance and actually say here are our	5	study subjects who come through advertising, it is
6	concerns and to actually say, okay, how can we	6	a challenge. But I think it's more of an increase
7	address these needs.	7	in effort on the part of us to get those records,
8	In some case, one can do extraction from a	8	find out from the patient who their primary care
9	database and then make that available. That's just	9	physician is, get them to sign a release and get
10	one possible approach, but the short answer is I	10	the records.
11	don't know. But I would certainly encourage you to	11	DR. DWORKIN: So to me, it seems almost
12	reach out to your appropriate contacts.	12	essential if you're recruiting a patient for a low
13	MALE SPEAKER: Great. Thanks. That is what	13	back pain study and you get the patient through
14	we do. We do extraction out, and then let them	14	advertising, and you then succeed in getting the
15	have access to that, but that never seems to	15	patient's medical records, and it seems that
16	satisfy them. I don't know.	16	they've never mentioned to their clinician in the
17	(Laughter.)	17	past three years having back pain, that seems like
18	DR. SCHUETTE: Well, no, but that's good.	18	a red flag.
19	I'm glad they're not satisfied because I mean, I	19	DR. MALAMUT: Well, not only is a red flag,
20	was trying to raise the question as to whether we	20	it's an exclusion. So again, I would argue that
21	should try to collect more, not less, from the	21	those patients are precisely the patients we need
22	source documents to be distinguished from source	22	to get the records on. And I agree with you. We
	Page 34		Page 36
1	data. But I agree, compliance, HIPAA, privacy, we	-	strive for 100 percent. Do we achieve 100 percent?
		1	Surve for fou percent. Do we achieve fou percent?
2	get it.	1 2	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for
2 3	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob?	1 2 3	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the
2 3 4	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question	1 2 3 4	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the
2 3 4 5	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new	1 2 3 4 5	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study.
2 3 4 5 6	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were	1 2 3 4 5 6	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back?
2 3 4 5 6 7	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for example, from their primary care clinician.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or academia and a patient is transferred to you, their
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for example, from their primary care clinician. Now, I've been at meetings with other	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or academia and a patient is transferred to you, their medical records come with them, almost always,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for example, from their primary care clinician. Now, I've been at meetings with other sponsors and CROs, where what we hear is that when	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or academia and a patient is transferred to you, their medical records come with them, almost always, invariably. And if they don't come with them,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for example, from their primary care clinician. Now, I've been at meetings with other sponsors and CROs, where what we hear is that when patients are identified through, for example,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or academia and a patient is transferred to you, their medical records come with them, almost always, invariably. And if they don't come with them, there's a problem, and somebody's going to have to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for example, from their primary care clinician. Now, I've been at meetings with other sponsors and CROs, where what we hear is that when patients are identified through, for example, advertising on TV, that it's kind of impossibly	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or academia and a patient is transferred to you, their medical records come with them, almost always, invariably. And if they don't come with them, there's a problem, and somebody's going to have to fix it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for example, from their primary care clinician. Now, I've been at meetings with other sponsors and CROs, where what we hear is that when patients are identified through, for example, advertising on TV, that it's kind of impossibly difficult to get the physicians or nurse	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or academia and a patient is transferred to you, their medical records come with them, almost always, invariably. And if they don't come with them, there's a problem, and somebody's going to have to fix it. I mean, you just don't take on a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for example, from their primary care clinician. Now, I've been at meetings with other sponsors and CROs, where what we hear is that when patients are identified through, for example, advertising on TV, that it's kind of impossibly difficult to get the physicians or nurse practitioners, what have you, in the community to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or academia and a patient is transferred to you, their medical records come with them, almost always, invariably. And if they don't come with them, there's a problem, and somebody's going to have to fix it. I mean, you just don't take on a patient if you have a pain patient that I've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for example, from their primary care clinician. Now, I've been at meetings with other sponsors and CROs, where what we hear is that when patients are identified through, for example, advertising on TV, that it's kind of impossibly difficult to get the physicians or nurse practitioners, what have you, in the community to fax medical records, and that if that's required by	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or academia and a patient is transferred to you, their medical records come with them, almost always, invariably. And if they don't come with them, there's a problem, and somebody's going to have to fix it. I mean, you just don't take on a patient if you have a pain patient that I've inherited I don't do that anymore, but when I
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for example, from their primary care clinician. Now, I've been at meetings with other sponsors and CROs, where what we hear is that when patients are identified through, for example, advertising on TV, that it's kind of impossibly difficult to get the physicians or nurse practitioners, what have you, in the community to fax medical records, and that if that's required by the protocol, the CRO, whatever, aren't going to be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or academia and a patient is transferred to you, their medical records come with them, almost always, invariably. And if they don't come with them, there's a problem, and somebody's going to have to fix it. I mean, you just don't take on a patient if you have a pain patient that I've inherited I don't do that anymore, but when I was at Emory, you always get the medical record.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for example, from their primary care clinician. Now, I've been at meetings with other sponsors and CROs, where what we hear is that when patients are identified through, for example, advertising on TV, that it's kind of impossibly difficult to get the physicians or nurse practitioners, what have you, in the community to fax medical records, and that if that's required by the protocol, the CRO, whatever, aren't going to be able to get any patients through advertising.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or academia and a patient is transferred to you, their medical records come with them, almost always, invariably. And if they don't come with them, there's a problem, and somebody's going to have to fix it. I mean, you just don't take on a patient if you have a pain patient that I've inherited I don't do that anymore, but when I was at Emory, you always get the medical record. So I think this idea of not being able to get the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for example, from their primary care clinician. Now, I've been at meetings with other sponsors and CROs, where what we hear is that when patients are identified through, for example, advertising on TV, that it's kind of impossibly difficult to get the physicians or nurse practitioners, what have you, in the community to fax medical records, and that if that's required by the protocol, the CRO, whatever, aren't going to be able to get any patients through advertising. So when I was listening to you talk, there	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or academia and a patient is transferred to you, their medical records come with them, almost always, invariably. And if they don't come with them, there's a problem, and somebody's going to have to fix it. I mean, you just don't take on a patient if you have a pain patient that I've inherited I don't do that anymore, but when I was at Emory, you always get the medical record. So I think this idea of not being able to get the medical record is a little bit suspect. It sounds
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	get it. DR. McDERMOTT: Bob? DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Rick, I had a question about what you were describing as Teva's new policy. If I understood you correctly, you were saying that you would go to a site and you want to see source documents on the patients, and it sounded like you really mean medical records, for example, from their primary care clinician. Now, I've been at meetings with other sponsors and CROs, where what we hear is that when patients are identified through, for example, advertising on TV, that it's kind of impossibly difficult to get the physicians or nurse practitioners, what have you, in the community to fax medical records, and that if that's required by the protocol, the CRO, whatever, aren't going to be able to get any patients through advertising. So when I was listening to you talk, there was a real disconnect between what I've heard about	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Of course not. But I think if we don't try for 100 percent, we won't even get close. And for the reasons we've talked about, you won't have the right patient in your study. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. In the back? MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow up on this because it's really an interesting subject. If you're a clinician in private practice or academia and a patient is transferred to you, their medical records come with them, almost always, invariably. And if they don't come with them, there's a problem, and somebody's going to have to fix it. I mean, you just don't take on a patient if you have a pain patient that I've inherited I don't do that anymore, but when I was at Emory, you always get the medical record. So I think this idea of not being able to get the medical record is a little bit suspect. It sounds to the non-clinician like, wow, that's a big deal,

	Page 37		Page 39
1	But one point I do want to make is this, is	1	an outline for the type of difference that you
2	that in terms of the amount of data we're	2	might be looking for.
3	collecting, it's huge. And when everything is	3	DR. SINGLA: So just to get back on this
4	important, to my mind, nothing is important. And	4	source I mean medical records issue, as an
5	so I do think you need to have focus in this world,	5	investigator who has done this for a long time and
6	and I think one of the things that remote	6	recruits a lot of patients through advertising and
7	monitoring and some of the things you're	7	different types of patients, I just wanted to
8	recommending to try to get actually kind of	8	provide some insight, which is that first of all,
9	addresses that issue.	9	it is very difficult to get medical records from
10	But one of the things that comes up a lot is	10	recruited patients. It's not like clinic patients
11	100 percent SDV. I might have missed that talk.	11	because clinic patients are inside the healthcare
12	But that's part of what I'm very curious about what	12	system, and as such, there's an expectation that
13	everybody's opinion is on that, where you go to the	13	they will come with records.
14	site. The primary endpoint is what it is.	14	So it is hard. It's also hard because the
15	Obviously, you need to for the data that you're	15	screening period is typically like 28 days. You
16	really focusing on in terms of your submission.	16	got to get the patient randomized, and by the time
17	obviously, that's important. There are a lot of	17	you get their medical records, you're right at the
18	ancillary endpoints people collect, and measures	18	end of that, and then you can't rescreen them. So
19	they collect, how well that needs to be done.	19	those are the difficulties.
20	Obviously, safety needs to be done well.	20	It is possible, however, like you said,
21	But I wonder if people can talk about the	21	Rick. We've had studies where it was mandated, and
22	SDV issue because I find like a lot of people are	22	then we found a way to do it sometimes. But then
	Page 38		Page 40
1	Page 38 really focused on getting everything.	1	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort,
1	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our	1	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it?
1 2 3	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an	1 2 3	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the
1 2 3 4	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that.	1 2 3 4	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the
1 2 3 4 5	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as	1 2 3 4 5	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything, and that it's much more important to make sure that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction, 19-year-old patient probably doesn't have any
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything, and that it's much more important to make sure that your primary outcome measures are all there and all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction, 19-year-old patient probably doesn't have any medical records. You're going to bang your head
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything, and that it's much more important to make sure that your primary outcome measures are all there and all correct than it is all of these blood measurements	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction, 19-year-old patient probably doesn't have any medical records. You're going to bang your head against the wall trying to find the medical records
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything, and that it's much more important to make sure that your primary outcome measures are all there and all correct than it is all of these blood measurements that you take at every cycle of chemotherapy that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction, 19-year-old patient probably doesn't have any medical records. You're going to bang your head against the wall trying to find the medical records from the time they were like 11 and went to see
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything, and that it's much more important to make sure that your primary outcome measures are all there and all correct than it is all of these blood measurements that you take at every cycle of chemotherapy that no one's ever going to use, and especially if we,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction, 19-year-old patient probably doesn't have any medical records. You're going to bang your head against the wall trying to find the medical records from the time they were like 11 and went to see their pediatrician. And you know that they have
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything, and that it's much more important to make sure that your primary outcome measures are all there and all correct than it is all of these blood measurements that you take at every cycle of chemotherapy that no one's ever going to use, and especially if we, on top of that, also collected safety data about	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction, 19-year-old patient probably doesn't have any medical records. You're going to bang your head against the wall trying to find the medical records from the time they were like 11 and went to see their pediatrician. And you know that they have third molars. You can see them on X-ray, and you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything, and that it's much more important to make sure that your primary outcome measures are all there and all correct than it is all of these blood measurements that you take at every cycle of chemotherapy that no one's ever going to use, and especially if we, on top of that, also collected safety data about those sorts of things.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction, 19-year-old patient probably doesn't have any medical records. You're going to bang your head against the wall trying to find the medical records from the time they were like 11 and went to see their pediatrician. And you know that they have third molars. You can see them on X-ray, and you basically know they're healthy. Do you really need
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything, and that it's much more important to make sure that your primary outcome measures are all there and all correct than it is all of these blood measurements that you take at every cycle of chemotherapy that no one's ever going to use, and especially if we, on top of that, also collected safety data about those sorts of things. I think some studies that have been done,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction, 19-year-old patient probably doesn't have any medical records. You're going to bang your head against the wall trying to find the medical records from the time they were like 11 and went to see their pediatrician. And you know that they have third molars. You can see them on X-ray, and you basically know they're healthy. Do you really need them in that situation? Probably not. It's a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything, and that it's much more important to make sure that your primary outcome measures are all there and all correct than it is all of these blood measurements that you take at every cycle of chemotherapy that no one's ever going to use, and especially if we, on top of that, also collected safety data about those sorts of things. I think some studies that have been done, there doesn't seem to be any proof that 100 percent	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction, 19-year-old patient probably doesn't have any medical records. You're going to bang your head against the wall trying to find the medical records from the time they were like 11 and went to see their pediatrician. And you know that they have third molars. You can see them on X-ray, and you basically know they're healthy. Do you really need them in that situation? Probably not. It's a six-hour study. They're going to have the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything, and that it's much more important to make sure that your primary outcome measures are all there and all correct than it is all of these blood measurements that you take at every cycle of chemotherapy that no one's ever going to use, and especially if we, on top of that, also collected safety data about those sorts of things. I think some studies that have been done, there doesn't seem to be any proof that 100 percent SDV is necessary and adds anything.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction, 19-year-old patient probably doesn't have any medical records. You're going to bang your head against the wall trying to find the medical records from the time they were like 11 and went to see their pediatrician. And you know that they have third molars. You can see them on X-ray, and you basically know they're healthy. Do you really need them in that situation? Probably not. It's a six-hour study. They're going to have the indicated surgery.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything, and that it's much more important to make sure that your primary outcome measures are all there and all correct than it is all of these blood measurements that you take at every cycle of chemotherapy that no one's ever going to use, and especially if we, on top of that, also collected safety data about those sorts of things. I think some studies that have been done, there doesn't seem to be any proof that 100 percent SDV is necessary and adds anything. DR. SCHUETTE: And I would actually go with	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction, 19-year-old patient probably doesn't have any medical records. You're going to bang your head against the wall trying to find the medical records from the time they were like 11 and went to see their pediatrician. And you know that they have third molars. You can see them on X-ray, and you basically know they're healthy. Do you really need them in that situation? Probably not. It's a six-hour study. They're going to have the indicated surgery. So I think that when the sponsor
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 38 really focused on getting everything. MS. KIRKWOOD: I agree. I think for our center, we don't do 100 percent SDV. We're an academic center. We can't afford to do that. I agree that not all data is as important as some of the data and that I mean, we are sort of looking at lots of data in the kind of methods that I described, but it was more to look at patterns rather than actually to try and correct everything, and that it's much more important to make sure that your primary outcome measures are all there and all correct than it is all of these blood measurements that you take at every cycle of chemotherapy that no one's ever going to use, and especially if we, on top of that, also collected safety data about those sorts of things. I think some studies that have been done, there doesn't seem to be any proof that 100 percent SDV is necessary and adds anything. DR. SCHUETTE: And I would actually go with the guidance on the topic for risk-based. So	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 40 we lost patients as well. It was a lot of effort, and then it's a question of is it worth it? So I think it requires a decision on the sponsor's part to decide a priori, what is the disease being studied and do we need medical records. For example, low back pain, yes, you probably do, and patients who are on opioids, it's a serious issue. Surgical third molar extraction, 19-year-old patient probably doesn't have any medical records. You're going to bang your head against the wall trying to find the medical records from the time they were like 11 and went to see their pediatrician. And you know that they have third molars. You can see them on X-ray, and you basically know they're healthy. Do you really need them in that situation? Probably not. It's a six-hour study. They're going to have the indicated surgery. So I think that when the sponsor says like, puts a half approach towards the

	Page 41		Page 43
1	just causes a lot of confusion. Nobody does it.	1	for the study kingpins.
2	And by the time the trial is 50 percent over, you	2	DR. MALAMUT: You could make the argument
3	just stop trying because the sponsor has given up	3	that the patients you can't get records on and
4	as well.	4	disappear, maybe they weren't the ones you wanted.
5	So that's just a practicality of what I've	5	I mean, maybe you're losing out on some very good
6	seen happen over the years. So I think that you	6	study patients, but the tradeoff.
7	have to consider the disease and then make a choice	7	DR. McDERMOTT: Michael, did you have a
8	as a sponsor. Yes, you must have them, and then	8	DR. ROWBOTHAM: I just wanted to go a little
9	increase the screening period if you're going to	9	further with some of the discussion this morning
10	force that.	10	and then yesterday about data that's too good to be
11	DR. MALAMUT: So it's a pragmatic approach	11	true. So one of the possibilities also is that you
12	is what you're suggesting	12	could have a positive trial and it comes out
13	DR. SINGLA: Yeah.	13	negative because of fraud or fabrication on study
14	DR. MALAMUT: not a mandated thou shalt	14	sites just trying to increase their numbers.
15	provide source records, but a little more	15	So could I hear a little bit more from both
16	pragmatic. You're right. Bunionectomy study with	16	the FDA and the industry perspective as to what
17	younger people or maybe not as important. But I'm	17	kind of data checking is likely to be done
18	really going to argue strongly about certain I'm	18	routinely to make sure that the data that was sent
19	still leaning towards the idea of this 100 percent	19	in a file to the FDA actually is legitimate data?
20	idea even though I know we can be pragmatic. But	20	DR. SCHUETTE: Right now, it's more on a
21	we have to study the right patients.	21	trial-by-trial basis. There really isn't an entire
22	DR. SINGLA: And I'm just saying, for low	22	across the submission look at data quality on each
	Page 42		Page 44
1	back pain, maybe you do want 100 percent.	1	and every aspect. So what we have right now is
2	DR. MALAMUT: Yes, I think so.	2	fairly rudimentary checks, sort of things like
3	DR. SINGLA: They're on opioids. It's a	3	calendar dates and some of the other types of
4	serious condition, multiple medications. You can't	4	items.
5	verify they have the condition whereas in a	5	The example that Sharon gave was noteworthy
6	bunionectomy, you can verify it, those kind of	6	in the sense that there was actually a comparison
7	things.	7	between one site one trial and another trial,
8	DR. DWORKIN: So I would push and say that	8	trials that were conducted in the U.S. and outside.
9	clearly, there are exceptions, and I think, Neil,	9	And they said an unbelievable response rate over
10	you did a great job of giving us an example of an	10	here and a middling response rate over here. So
11	exception.	11	that was a case where we could just say, just by
12	But if we're talking about chronic pain in	12	looking at it, this is way too good to be true.
13	adults, whether it's low back pain or	13	That's actually where we are right now.
14	osteoarthritis or diabetic peripheral neuropathy,	14	What we'd like to do with some of these other
15	and assuming it is correct that there are study	15	aspects is to look at it in a more coherent
16	kingpins not only in Boston but elsewhere who are	16	fashion, and that's still a matter of development
17	going to clinicaltrials.gov and finding out the	17	from our perspective.
18	inclusion/exclusion criteria of trials, and feeding	18	DR. MALAMUT: I think, as I said, we do our
19	patients into those trials, then don't we really	19	best is that the right word? to verify
20	want to see the clinician's record on 100 percent	20	everything that the study sites tell us, what they
21	of these adults with symptomatic chronic pain?	21	write down, what's documented. A lot of the
22	Otherwise, I mean, we're just making it real easy	22	efforts go towards making sure data is entered.

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 45		Page 47
1	We're a little limited in being able at the	1	area I work in. You don't get professional
2	time of monitoring, at the time after last patient	2	subjects in cancer trials. But it's definitely
3	out, to be able to verify that a pain score is	3	something that I think would be interesting to look
4	actually an accurate pain score. So a lot of the	4	at.
5	too good to be true may have to come later during	5	I think it might be hard to do without
6	the all too short time to look at the data and then	6	examples of it. So what you would really need is a
7	in analyses later. And of course, we'd like it to	7	trial where you've got a data set with patients
8	be good, so there's a bias.	8	that you have identified as professional subjects,
9	When we see something that's successful, we	9	and if you could get that, then it would definitely
10	say aha, we were right, but then we do try to be	10	be something that would be very interesting to look
11	critical and look for those patterns, and do take	11	at, whether they could be picked out. But it's not
12	it to individual sites, individual regions, and try	12	something I've looked at because it's not something
13	to see not only why a study may not have succeeded	13	I'd imagined before this meeting really.
14	but why did a study succeed, where did the positive	14	DR. SCHUETTE: And I will say that we don't
15	data come from.	15	have we'd be interested in the exact same thing
16	DR. McDERMOTT: I think	16	with actual examples, and we're working with
17	DR. DEVINE: Eric.	17	commercial developers in some ways to try to do
18	DR. McDERMOTT: Eric, sorry.	18	research and development.
19	DR. DEVINE: I've come to this meeting to	19	I've already mentioned after reading your
20	beat a single drum. Everyone knows what I'm going	20	paper, Eric, this idea to one person one
21	to say. But we want people to exclude professional	21	developer suggested that this was a product niche
22	subjects from their study before they get in.	22	that if they were willing to, they could actually
	Page 46		Page 48
1	But assuming the potential that not all		
<u> </u>		1	pursue.
1 2	sites will make the efforts to get the medical	1 2	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back.
2 3	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really	1 2 3	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for
1 2 3 4	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional	1 2 3 4	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive
2 3 4 5	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of	1 2 3 4 5	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things.
2 3 4 5 6	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll	1 2 3 4 5 6	DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more
2 3 4 5 6 7	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site but of a fraudulent subject?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver supervisory group.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site but of a fraudulent subject? Over a lot of observations of what a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver supervisory group. People 20 years ago, when I was a trialist,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site but of a fraudulent subject? Over a lot of observations of what a particular disease looks like and the way the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver supervisory group. People 20 years ago, when I was a trialist, 25 years ago, were hesitant to become proactive
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site but of a fraudulent subject? Over a lot of observations of what a particular disease looks like and the way the subject answers questions in the trial, would you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver supervisory group. People 20 years ago, when I was a trialist, 25 years ago, were hesitant to become proactive with the CRO or the company doing the study because
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site but of a fraudulent subject? Over a lot of observations of what a particular disease looks like and the way the subject answers questions in the trial, would you see a pattern that you could pick up on that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver supervisory group. People 20 years ago, when I was a trialist, 25 years ago, were hesitant to become proactive with the CRO or the company doing the study because they felt that that was their purview. But the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site but of a fraudulent subject? Over a lot of observations of what a particular disease looks like and the way the subject answers questions in the trial, would you see a pattern that you could pick up on that professional subject because their answers are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver supervisory group. People 20 years ago, when I was a trialist, 25 years ago, were hesitant to become proactive with the CRO or the company doing the study because they felt that that was their purview. But the events that I'm referring to are so egregious and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site but of a fraudulent subject? Over a lot of observations of what a particular disease looks like and the way the subject answers questions in the trial, would you see a pattern that you could pick up on that professional subject because their answers are similar to someone that's malingering with a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver supervisory group. People 20 years ago, when I was a trialist, 25 years ago, were hesitant to become proactive with the CRO or the company doing the study because they felt that that was their purview. But the events that I'm referring to are so egregious and so extraordinary that, in fact, if we do not exert
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site but of a fraudulent subject? Over a lot of observations of what a particular disease looks like and the way the subject answers questions in the trial, would you see a pattern that you could pick up on that professional subject because their answers are similar to someone that's malingering with a learning disorder because they need services, or	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver supervisory group. People 20 years ago, when I was a trialist, 25 years ago, were hesitant to become proactive with the CRO or the company doing the study because they felt that that was their purview. But the events that I'm referring to are so egregious and so extraordinary that, in fact, if we do not exert some responsibility, we cannot allow or expect only
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site but of a fraudulent subject? Over a lot of observations of what a particular disease looks like and the way the subject answers questions in the trial, would you see a pattern that you could pick up on that professional subject because their answers are similar to someone that's malingering with a learning disorder because they need services, or someone who is malingering with pain because they	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver supervisory group. People 20 years ago, when I was a trialist, 25 years ago, were hesitant to become proactive with the CRO or the company doing the study because they felt that that was their purview. But the events that I'm referring to are so egregious and so extraordinary that, in fact, if we do not exert some responsibility, we cannot allow or expect only the regulatory group to pick this up because some
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site but of a fraudulent subject? Over a lot of observations of what a particular disease looks like and the way the subject answers questions in the trial, would you see a pattern that you could pick up on that professional subject because their answers are similar to someone that's malingering with a learning disorder because they need services, or someone who is malingering with pain because they want the drug?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver supervisory group. People 20 years ago, when I was a trialist, 25 years ago, were hesitant to become proactive with the CRO or the company doing the study because they felt that that was their purview. But the events that I'm referring to are so egregious and so extraordinary that, in fact, if we do not exert some responsibility, we cannot allow or expect only the regulatory group to pick this up because some of this stuff is extraordinarily buried in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site but of a fraudulent subject? Over a lot of observations of what a particular disease looks like and the way the subject answers questions in the trial, would you see a pattern that you could pick up on that professional subject because their answers are similar to someone that's malingering with a learning disorder because they need services, or someone who is malingering with pain because they want the drug? MS. KIRKWOOD: To be honest, it's not	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver supervisory group. People 20 years ago, when I was a trialist, 25 years ago, were hesitant to become proactive with the CRO or the company doing the study because they felt that that was their purview. But the events that I'm referring to are so egregious and so extraordinary that, in fact, if we do not exert some responsibility, we cannot allow or expect only the regulatory group to pick this up because some of this stuff is extraordinarily buried in the database and it may not become evident. And yet
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	sites will make the efforts to get the medical records or design the study so it isn't really vulnerable to being gamed by the professional subject, and maybe there's collusion on the part of the investigator who really wants to enroll quickly, do you think that it's possible, from a monitoring perspective, to pick up on patterns of data that are indicative not of a fraudulent site but of a fraudulent subject? Over a lot of observations of what a particular disease looks like and the way the subject answers questions in the trial, would you see a pattern that you could pick up on that professional subject because their answers are similar to someone that's malingering with a learning disorder because they need services, or someone who is malingering with pain because they want the drug? MS. KIRKWOOD: To be honest, it's not something I ever considered until this meeting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	pursue. DR. McDERMOTT: Way in the back. DR. SIMON: So slight note of caution for those of us who actually serve on executive committees or DSMBs or DMCs or any of these things. In the last 10 years, it's actually been more common than not that we've seen inappropriate or inadequate or mismanaged oversight by hired CROs that require buy-in from the physician or caregiver supervisory group. People 20 years ago, when I was a trialist, 25 years ago, were hesitant to become proactive with the CRO or the company doing the study because they felt that that was their purview. But the events that I'm referring to are so egregious and so extraordinary that, in fact, if we do not exert some responsibility, we cannot allow or expect only the regulatory group to pick this up because some of this stuff is extraordinarily buried in the database and it may not become evident. And yet theoretically, a DMC chair and his team should be

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 49		Page 51
1	So the caution that I'm trying to suggest is	1	the patient record, we just assume that you're
2	that we keep asking questions that are asking the	2	taking the history and finding out the allergies
3	FDA to have an answer for how these things get	3	and the con meds, and of course, the presumed study
4	controlled, but it's going to have to require	4	patient may have incentives to not tell you the
5	cooperation between the external groups that are	5	whole truth, but we have to at least make sure
6	supposedly overseeing the studies and the internal	6	we're doing that.
7	groups.	7	The same on the vendors. I tried to make
8	Just for example, most recently I am serving	8	the point yesterday that we all have to monitor
9	as a kind of monitor of a trial, and I was asked to	9	each other. Otherwise, the data we get will maybe
10	review the SOPs of the CRO regarding the history of	10	not reflect the true nature of the compound we're
11	the patient. And the concerns were for a chronic	11	testing or be misleading. And I fully agree, Lee.
12	pain trial that the history was only going to be	12	DR. SCHUETTE: If I can jump in, I'll echo
13	taken for the previous year.	13	what Richard has indicated and say we completely
14	Well, the problem was, is that a lot of the	14	agree with Lee, particularly when we're talking
15	potential history for allergies and other issues	15	about multi-regional trials and things that are
16	would either have to be extracted from the chart	16	done outside of this country where, as was pointed
17	or, God forbid, the PI on the trial at the site	17	out by Sharon yesterday, we can't always, as
18	would actually have to take a history from the	18	regulatory agencies from the U.S., get access to
19	patient that is actually being recruited into his	19	the types of data in other countries. And it
20	site, and he's getting paid for this.	20	becomes particularly important that the CRO or the
21	So the reality is we have to take some	21	sponsor ensure that the data is good, that there is
22	responsibility for this, too, and be mature enough	22	not misconduct at the site because some cases,
	Page 50		Page 52
1	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to	1	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than
1	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody	1 2	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection.
1 2 3	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this.	1 2 3	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay.
1 2 3 4	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any	1 2 3 4	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up
1 2 3 4 5	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's	1 2 3 4 5	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15,
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution. DR. McDERMOTT: Yes, I think, Rick, you said	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is incredibly important. So all these centralized and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution. DR. McDERMOTT: Yes, I think, Rick, you said something about vendor oversight yesterday.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is incredibly important. So all these centralized and statistical monitoring approaches are very
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution. DR. McDERMOTT: Yes, I think, Rick, you said something about vendor oversight yesterday. DR. MALAMUT: Yes. I mean, again, I was	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is incredibly important. So all these centralized and statistical monitoring approaches are very important, but you really do need to get to the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution. DR. McDERMOTT: Yes, I think, Rick, you said something about vendor oversight yesterday. DR. MALAMUT: Yes. I mean, again, I was trying to be veiled yesterday because I didn't want	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is incredibly important. So all these centralized and statistical monitoring approaches are very important, but you really do need to get to the sites.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution. DR. McDERMOTT: Yes, I think, Rick, you said something about vendor oversight yesterday. DR. MALAMUT: Yes. I mean, again, I was trying to be veiled yesterday because I didn't want to actually give strong opinions, although somebody	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is incredibly important. So all these centralized and statistical monitoring approaches are very important, but you really do need to get to the sites. As we go up the food chain in industry, we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution. DR. McDERMOTT: Yes, I think, Rick, you said something about vendor oversight yesterday. DR. MALAMUT: Yes. I mean, again, I was trying to be veiled yesterday because I didn't want to actually give strong opinions, although somebody last night told me they could tell everything I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is incredibly important. So all these centralized and statistical monitoring approaches are very important, but you really do need to get to the sites. As we go up the food chain in industry, we get further and further away from the sites. In
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution. DR. McDERMOTT: Yes, I think, Rick, you said something about vendor oversight yesterday. DR. MALAMUT: Yes. I mean, again, I was trying to be veiled yesterday because I didn't want to actually give strong opinions, although somebody last night told me they could tell everything I thought. So maybe that's good. Thanks, John.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is incredibly important. So all these centralized and statistical monitoring approaches are very important, but you really do need to get to the sites. As we go up the food chain in industry, we get further and further away from the sites. In this meeting here today, I've heard us talk about
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution. DR. McDERMOTT: Yes, I think, Rick, you said something about vendor oversight yesterday. DR. MALAMUT: Yes. I mean, again, I was trying to be veiled yesterday because I didn't want to actually give strong opinions, although somebody last night told me they could tell everything I thought. So maybe that's good. Thanks, John. But I really do want to hear from others	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is incredibly important. So all these centralized and statistical monitoring approaches are very important, but you really do need to get to the sites. As we go up the food chain in industry, we get further and further away from the sites. In this meeting here today, I've heard us talk about some of the most important people are the CRAs.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution. DR. McDERMOTT: Yes, I think, Rick, you said something about vendor oversight yesterday. DR. MALAMUT: Yes. I mean, again, I was trying to be veiled yesterday because I didn't want to actually give strong opinions, although somebody last night told me they could tell everything I thought. So maybe that's good. Thanks, John. But I really do want to hear from others about this. I think I may have made the case	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is incredibly important. So all these centralized and statistical monitoring approaches are very important, but you really do need to get to the sites. As we go up the food chain in industry, we get further and further away from the sites. In this meeting here today, I've heard us talk about some of the most important people are the CRAs. They're the most inexperienced people in the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution. DR. McDERMOTT: Yes, I think, Rick, you said something about vendor oversight yesterday. DR. MALAMUT: Yes. I mean, again, I was trying to be veiled yesterday because I didn't want to actually give strong opinions, although somebody last night told me they could tell everything I thought. So maybe that's good. Thanks, John. But I really do want to hear from others about this. I think I may have made the case yesterday that exactly what Lee is saying, that we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is incredibly important. So all these centralized and statistical monitoring approaches are very important, but you really do need to get to the sites. As we go up the food chain in industry, we get further and further away from the sites. In this meeting here today, I've heard us talk about some of the most important people are the CRAs. They're the most inexperienced people in the system, and we overtax them. We expect them to do
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution. DR. McDERMOTT: Yes, I think, Rick, you said something about vendor oversight yesterday. DR. MALAMUT: Yes. I mean, again, I was trying to be veiled yesterday because I didn't want to actually give strong opinions, although somebody last night told me they could tell everything I thought. So maybe that's good. Thanks, John. But I really do want to hear from others about this. I think I may have made the case yesterday that exactly what Lee is saying, that we do need to take responsibility as sponsors, as	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is incredibly important. So all these centralized and statistical monitoring approaches are very important, but you really do need to get to the sites. As we go up the food chain in industry, we get further and further away from the sites. In this meeting here today, I've heard us talk about some of the most important people are the CRAs. They're the most inexperienced people in the system, and we overtax them. We expect them to do monitoring. If we really want to have onsite eyes,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 50 to actually do the work that we're being paid to do. And I'm not actually hearing anybody acknowledging that particular aspect of this. Of course, nobody in this room has any belief to be malfeasant or not to do what he's supposed to do, but in fact, it's become de rigueur that the superficial nature of the supervision of the trials on our side is actually quite bad, so note of caution. DR. McDERMOTT: Yes, I think, Rick, you said something about vendor oversight yesterday. DR. MALAMUT: Yes. I mean, again, I was trying to be veiled yesterday because I didn't want to actually give strong opinions, although somebody last night told me they could tell everything I thought. So maybe that's good. Thanks, John. But I really do want to hear from others about this. I think I may have made the case yesterday that exactly what Lee is saying, that we do need to take responsibility as sponsors, as CROs, as investigators to take a proper history.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 52 we're blocked from going very much further than just an overall look and inspection. DR. McDERMOTT: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: Just an obvious follow-up observation, again, the way we did things 15, 20 years ago, just following up on some of Lee's comments, was much more personal. So there are so many more layers now in study conduct. To your point, Rick, getting to the site is incredibly important. So all these centralized and statistical monitoring approaches are very important, but you really do need to get to the sites. As we go up the food chain in industry, we get further and further away from the sites. In this meeting here today, I've heard us talk about some of the most important people are the CRAs. They're the most inexperienced people in the system, and we overtax them. We expect them to do monitoring. If we really want to have onsite eyes, we either have to do a better job with the CRAs or

	Page 53		Page 55
1	So in small companies and I don't know if	1	technical devices that's been invented recently is
2	others have even been to sites. I don't know.	2	the phone. And picking it up and just calling
3	Rick, if you've been out to visit a site	3	people, you'd be surprised how much valuable
4	recently	4	information you get just by talking to an
5	DR. MALAMUT: Not in a few years.	5	investigator because they have phones, too. It's
6	MALE SPEAKER: but, yeah, it's really	6	pretty cool.
7	eye-opening. And there are a lot of intangibles	7	(Laughter.)
8	that you pick up. And obviously, you can put in	8	MALE SPEAKER: Now, but the point I do want
9	statistical and other central monitoring schemes.	9	to make is a serious one, picking up from Lee's
10	but until you get to meet the investigator, the	10	comment, is I was amazed. The way we do things in
11	coordinator I mean, there isn't probably even a	11	the United States, we think the whole world does it
12	coordinator here at the meeting. I'm not sure if	12	that way. And I've been used to a system where we
13	that's true or not.	13	have highly trained study coordinators who really
14	But they're the guarterbacks for these	14	know what they're doing better than, at one point,
15	studies, and maybe just as we think about this, Bob	15	I did when I first got into it. These study
16	and Dennis, going forward, probably we need to get	16	coordinators are sometimes amazing.
17	some feedback from coordinators and monitors about	17	Then we go to these sites, and we open them
18	this guidance if we're going to be creating this	18	up for the first time. And in Europe what really
19	paper that people will be reading.	19	surprised me is that study coordinators are not
20	But again, very impersonal, lots of layers.	20	these really anal retentive nurses who've been,
21	I think CROs are probably I mean, I've worked	21	we're on the floors for years and now we're working
22	for CROs. I've worked with CROs. It's a problem.	22	clinical trials. They're young physicians, who are
	Page 54		Page 56
1	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or	1	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator.
1	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from	1	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on
1 2 3	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through	1 2 3	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in
1 2 3 4	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the	1 2 3 4	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but
1 2 3 4 5	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm	1 2 3 4 5	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of.
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree because you made the points I made yesterday. But	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David? DAVID: Yes, sort of in all this discussion,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree because you made the points I made yesterday. But no, I'm envisioning a diagram with circles of all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David? DAVID: Yes, sort of in all this discussion, I think we're looking a lot at downstream events.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree because you made the points I made yesterday. But no, I'm envisioning a diagram with circles of all the people involved in the study with everyone	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David? DAVID: Yes, sort of in all this discussion, I think we're looking a lot at downstream events. And when you talk about drug or the kingpin, the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree because you made the points I made yesterday. But no, I'm envisioning a diagram with circles of all the people involved in the study with everyone connecting to everyone else because we're all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David? DAVID: Yes, sort of in all this discussion, I think we're looking a lot at downstream events. And when you talk about drug or the kingpin, the study kingpin, that also could be a study
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree because you made the points I made yesterday. But no, I'm envisioning a diagram with circles of all the people involved in the study with everyone connecting to everyone else because we're all monitoring each other, and we all have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David? DAVID: Yes, sort of in all this discussion, I think we're looking a lot at downstream events. And when you talk about drug or the kingpin, the study kingpin, that also could be a study coordinator. And I'm wondering, has anybody ever
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree because you made the points I made yesterday. But no, I'm envisioning a diagram with circles of all the people involved in the study with everyone connecting to everyone else because we're all monitoring each other, and we all have responsibilities, so yes.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David? DAVID: Yes, sort of in all this discussion, I think we're looking a lot at downstream events. And when you talk about drug or the kingpin, the study kingpin, that also could be a study coordinator. And I'm wondering, has anybody ever looked at sort of the study equivalent of a secret
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree because you made the points I made yesterday. But no, I'm envisioning a diagram with circles of all the people involved in the study with everyone connecting to everyone else because we're all monitoring each other, and we all have responsibilities, so yes. DR. McDERMOTT: I guess way in the back and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David? DAVID: Yes, sort of in all this discussion, I think we're looking a lot at downstream events. And when you talk about drug or the kingpin, the study kingpin, that also could be a study coordinator. And I'm wondering, has anybody ever looked at sort of the study equivalent of a secret shopper where you put a sham patient in and sort of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree because you made the points I made yesterday. But no, I'm envisioning a diagram with circles of all the people involved in the study with everyone connecting to everyone else because we're all monitoring each other, and we all have responsibilities, so yes. DR. McDERMOTT: I guess way in the back and then	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David? DAVID: Yes, sort of in all this discussion, I think we're looking a lot at downstream events. And when you talk about drug or the kingpin, the study kingpin, that also could be a study coordinator. And I'm wondering, has anybody ever looked at sort of the study equivalent of a secret shopper where you put a sham patient in and sort of see what happens at that interface? Because I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree because you made the points I made yesterday. But no, I'm envisioning a diagram with circles of all the people involved in the study with everyone connecting to everyone else because we're all monitoring each other, and we all have responsibilities, so yes. DR. McDERMOTT: I guess way in the back and then MALE SPEAKER: All these comments are really	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David? DAVID: Yes, sort of in all this discussion, I think we're looking a lot at downstream events. And when you talk about drug or the kingpin, the study kingpin, that also could be a study coordinator. And I'm wondering, has anybody ever looked at sort of the study equivalent of a secret shopper where you put a sham patient in and sort of see what happens at that interface? Because I think that could be very interesting. I've never
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree because you made the points I made yesterday. But no, I'm envisioning a diagram with circles of all the people involved in the study with everyone connecting to everyone else because we're all monitoring each other, and we all have responsibilities, so yes. DR. McDERMOTT: I guess way in the back and then MALE SPEAKER: All these comments are really good, and as somebody who as even like a year ago	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David? DAVID: Yes, sort of in all this discussion, I think we're looking a lot at downstream events. And when you talk about drug or the kingpin, the study kingpin, that also could be a study coordinator. And I'm wondering, has anybody ever looked at sort of the study equivalent of a secret shopper where you put a sham patient in and sort of see what happens at that interface? Because I think that could be very interesting. I've never done it myself, but I'm very curious if anybody
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree because you made the points I made yesterday. But no, I'm envisioning a diagram with circles of all the people involved in the study with everyone connecting to everyone else because we're all monitoring each other, and we all have responsibilities, so yes. DR. MCDERMOTT: I guess way in the back and then MALE SPEAKER: All these comments are really good, and as somebody who as even like a year ago when I was at Merck was doing site visits, I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David? DAVID: Yes, sort of in all this discussion, I think we're looking a lot at downstream events. And when you talk about drug or the kingpin, the study kingpin, that also could be a study coordinator. And I'm wondering, has anybody ever looked at sort of the study equivalent of a secret shopper where you put a sham patient in and sort of see what happens at that interface? Because I think that could be very interesting. I've never done it myself, but I'm very curious if anybody has.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 54 There's just too many layers from an issue or problem getting to the source. It has to go from the coordinator to the CRA, up the chain through the CRO, through the project manager, back to the sponsor. And as a CMO in a small company, I'm eight layers removed from an issue, and it gets filtered. Basically, we have to do a much better jobs. Your thoughts, Rick? DR. MALAMUT: Again, obviously, I agree because you made the points I made yesterday. But no, I'm envisioning a diagram with circles of all the people involved in the study with everyone connecting to everyone else because we're all monitoring each other, and we all have responsibilities, so yes. DR. MCDERMOTT: I guess way in the back and then MALE SPEAKER: All these comments are really good, and as somebody who as even like a year ago when I was at Merck was doing site visits, I totally endorse that. But one of the greatest	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 56 really both sub-PI and study coordinator. I've expressed concerns about that on multiple occasions during multiple site visits in Europe. People have allayed my fears somewhat, but it is something that everybody should be aware of. I think doctors are pretty good, but not all of us are trained to be that focused on the minutiae, which I think a really good study coordinator needs to be. DR. McDERMOTT: David? DAVID: Yes, sort of in all this discussion, I think we're looking a lot at downstream events. And when you talk about drug or the kingpin, the study kingpin, that also could be a study coordinator. And I'm wondering, has anybody ever looked at sort of the study equivalent of a secret shopper where you put a sham patient in and sort of see what happens at that interface? Because I think that could be very interesting. I've never done it myself, but I'm very curious if anybody has. DR. McDERMOTT: No takers.

IMMPACT XVIII - Initiative on Methods, Measurement, and Pain Assessment in Clinical Trials

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 57		Page 59
1	(Laughter.)	1	professional patients in laboratory analog trials
2	DR. MALAMUT: I don't think I want to reply	2	that are clean of any drugs, they're free of health
3	to that. Secret shopper. Wow.	3	problems and so forth, to keep them coming back for
4	(Laughter.)	4	more and more trials.
5	MALE SPEAKER: No, there have been. There	5	I think it's important that we, I quess as a
6	have been secret research subjects, and they'll	6	group, appreciate that maybe in our same community,
7	publish it. And it's a big splash article in a	7	this is being thought about in quite different ways
8	local paper about how they pretended to be a	8	That's one point.
9	patient and how easy it was to get into a study and	9	l guess I heard really yesterday it's
10	get drugs. It happens every once in a while.	10	maybe shifting the gears a little bit here. But at
11	DR. MALAMUT: So what was the outcome?	11	the point of making decisions about a person's
12	MALE SPEAKER: Oh, no, it always makes some	12	meeting inclusion and exclusion criteria for
13	great expose article. I don't know when the last	13	participation in a study, which I think is really
14	one was published, but I don't think it's been done	14	central to the integrity of the study, I heard both
15	on a systemic basis.	15	in presentations and, then importantly for me, in
16	MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I was thinking more of	16	sidebar conversations with a number of people over
17	the quality aspect, not the journalistic aspect.	17	the last day and a half a sense of, yeah, there are
18	MALE SPEAKER: I was thinking about	18	those. But if I really have a bad feeling about a
19	actually Rob and I were talking last night about	19	person, I don't include them in the study.
20	the undercover diner. It goes into to see who's	20	I have a very serious concern about whether
21	stealing from the cash register.	21	we really have additional inclusion and exclusion
22	(Crosstalk.)	22	criteria that we're talking about here, which is we
	Page 58		Page 60
1	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real	1	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting
1	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper,	1 2	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some
1 2 3	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is	1 2 3	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that
1 2 3 4	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks	1 2 3 4	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with
1 2 3 4 5	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track	1 2 3 4 5	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case.
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it.	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do you consider such a because it has been used and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do you consider such a because it has been used and validated throughout healthcare, and we use it.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch or gut, we exclude them. I'm very concerned about
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do you consider such a because it has been used and validated throughout healthcare, and we use it. And I'm always interested in getting the secret	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch or gut, we exclude them. I'm very concerned about that slippery slope.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do you consider such a because it has been used and validated throughout healthcare, and we use it. And I'm always interested in getting the secret shopper reports on my service. It's fascinating.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch or gut, we exclude them. I'm very concerned about that slippery slope. DR. MALAMUT: I won't speak for all my
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do you consider such a because it has been used and validated throughout healthcare, and we use it. And I'm always interested in getting the secret shopper reports on my service. It's fascinating. DR. McDERMOTT: Over here, and then Lee	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch or gut, we exclude them. I'm very concerned about that slippery slope. DR. MALAMUT: I won't speak for all my fellow sponsors, but in most studies, there is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 58 MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do you consider such a because it has been used and validated throughout healthcare, and we use it. And I'm always interested in getting the secret shopper reports on my service. It's fascinating. DR. McDERMOTT: Over here, and then Lee afterwards.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch or gut, we exclude them. I'm very concerned about that slippery slope. DR. MALAMUT: I won't speak for all my fellow sponsors, but in most studies, there is somewhere down at the bottom of the exclusion list
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do you consider such a because it has been used and validated throughout healthcare, and we use it. And I'm always interested in getting the secret shopper reports on my service. It's fascinating. DR. McDERMOTT: Over here, and then Lee afterwards. MALE SPEAKER: So I apologize again if this	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch or gut, we exclude them. I'm very concerned about that slippery slope. DR. MALAMUT: I won't speak for all my fellow sponsors, but in most studies, there is somewhere down at the bottom of the exclusion list a exclusion for any other reason the investigator
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do you consider such a because it has been used and validated throughout healthcare, and we use it. And I'm always interested in getting the secret shopper reports on my service. It's fascinating. DR. McDERMOTT: Over here, and then Lee afterwards. MALE SPEAKER: So I apologize again if this has been said. I think we talk out of both sides	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch or gut, we exclude them. I'm very concerned about that slippery slope. DR. MALAMUT: I won't speak for all my fellow sponsors, but in most studies, there is somewhere down at the bottom of the exclusion list a exclusion for any other reason the investigator feels the patient is not appropriate. And there's
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do you consider such a because it has been used and validated throughout healthcare, and we use it. And I'm always interested in getting the secret shopper reports on my service. It's fascinating. DR. McDERMOTT: Over here, and then Lee afterwards. MALE SPEAKER: So I apologize again if this has been said. I think we talk out of both sides of our mouths. Maybe in the clinical trials area,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch or gut, we exclude them. I'm very concerned about that slippery slope. DR. MALAMUT: I won't speak for all my fellow sponsors, but in most studies, there is somewhere down at the bottom of the exclusion list a exclusion for any other reason the investigator feels the patient is not appropriate. And there's no rule that says just because a patient meets all
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do you consider such a because it has been used and validated throughout healthcare, and we use it. And I'm always interested in getting the secret shopper reports on my service. It's fascinating. DR. McDERMOTT: Over here, and then Lee afterwards. MALE SPEAKER: So I apologize again if this has been said. I think we talk out of both sides of our mouths. Maybe in the clinical trials area, this is a major concern, and I understand that and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch or gut, we exclude them. I'm very concerned about that slippery slope. DR. MALAMUT: I won't speak for all my fellow sponsors, but in most studies, there is somewhere down at the bottom of the exclusion list a exclusion for any other reason the investigator feels the patient is not appropriate. And there's no rule that says just because a patient meets all the criteria, they have to be enrolled. I mean, it
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do you consider such a because it has been used and validated throughout healthcare, and we use it. And I'm always interested in getting the secret shopper reports on my service. It's fascinating. DR. McDERMOTT: Over here, and then Lee afterwards. MALE SPEAKER: So I apologize again if this has been said. I think we talk out of both sides of our mouths. Maybe in the clinical trials area, this is a major concern, and I understand that and I appreciate that we're spending the time talking	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch or gut, we exclude them. I'm very concerned about that slippery slope. DR. MALAMUT: I won't speak for all my fellow sponsors, but in most studies, there is somewhere down at the bottom of the exclusion list a exclusion for any other reason the investigator feels the patient is not appropriate. And there's no rule that says just because a patient meets all the criteria, they have to be enrolled. I mean, it really is discretionary.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in real quick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper, people may know, in most healthcare systems is actually used as a validated way of quality checks and auditing. So there actually is a nice track record in clinical care for using it. So it's certainly a reasonable thing to maybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Do you consider such a because it has been used and validated throughout healthcare, and we use it. And I'm always interested in getting the secret shopper reports on my service. It's fascinating. DR. McDERMOTT: Over here, and then Lee afterwards. MALE SPEAKER: So I apologize again if this has been said. I think we talk out of both sides of our mouths. Maybe in the clinical trials area, this is a major concern, and I understand that and I appreciate that we're spending the time talking about that.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch or gut, we exclude them. I'm very concerned about that slippery slope. DR. MALAMUT: I won't speak for all my fellow sponsors, but in most studies, there is somewhere down at the bottom of the exclusion list a exclusion for any other reason the investigator feels the patient is not appropriate. And there's no rule that says just because a patient meets all the criteria, they have to be enrolled. I mean, it really is discretionary. But I think there's a risk, and I think
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 58MALE SPEAKER: Just to chime in realquick sorry. Actually, the secret shopper,people may know, in most healthcare systems isactually used as a validated way of quality checksand auditing. So there actually is a nice trackrecord in clinical care for using it.So it's certainly a reasonable thing tomaybe consider as a bullet point in the paper. Doyou consider such a because it has been used andvalidated throughout healthcare, and we use it.And I'm always interested in getting the secretshopper reports on my service. It's fascinating.DR. McDERMOTT: Over here, and then Leeafterwards.MALE SPEAKER: So I apologize again if thishas been said. I think we talk out of both sidesof our mouths. Maybe in the clinical trials area,this is a major concern, and I understand that andI appreciate that we're spending the time talkingabout that.In other research enterprises in the same	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 60 include people if they maybe are close to meeting the criteria in terms of, for example, age or some other criteria. Then we should be clear that there's some wiggle room there. I don't agree with that, but I imagine that that's the case. Exclusion criteria, which is we have all these things, if the person meets those criteria, but we still don't feel we think maybe they're a fraudulent or professional patient, we have a hunch or gut, we exclude them. I'm very concerned about that slippery slope. DR. MALAMUT: I won't speak for all my fellow sponsors, but in most studies, there is somewhere down at the bottom of the exclusion list a exclusion for any other reason the investigator feels the patient is not appropriate. And there's no rule that says just because a patient meets all the criteria, they have to be enrolled. I mean, it really is discretionary. But I think there's a risk, and I think everyone in this room either is, or has been, or

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 61		Page 63
1	think we're doing our internal system is	1	where they get paid for recruitment, not paid for
2	checking to see is this really what they say they	2	completion. And therefore, that leads to
3	are.	3	missingness, which is like a nightmare. And
4	My concern is more with the less expert	4	furthermore, it also leads to inadequate patients
5	enroller, some of the research sites who don't have	5	being recruited because the pressure, as you just
6	that inner and they're checking the box.	6	mentioned, is to recruit so that you can actually
7	They're saying, well, they met all these criteria,	7	remain within the trial, because otherwise, you'll
8	therefore, they must qualify. They're not really	8	be dropped out if you only have two or three people
9	thinking beyond that. And I don't mean to	9	compared to somebody else that already has 45.
10	generalize.	10	So I think that we in this community who
11	MALE SPEAKER: I've encouraged journal	11	believe in this process should, in fact, create an
12	editors to ask that that disclaimer, if you will,	12	infrastructure to allow people to learn how to do
13	be added to every	13	these things and become certified or at least
14	DR. McDERMOTT: Well, sometimes other	14	knowledgeable.
15	pressures enter into this, too. I mean, pressure	15	To think that this all happens at an
16	to recruit or to be kicked out of the trial as a	16	investigator meeting that may take eight hours, and
17	site. All sorts of things come into play.	17	everybody is asleep and on their computer anyway
18	Lee, you've been waiting.	18	during the time, is ridiculous. Let's be honest.
19	DR. SIMON: It's really interesting. This	19	This is a complicated process that requires real
20	raises the problem that we've assumed that the	20	knowledge, and we should be teaching it.
21	people that are out there serving as principal	21	DR. McDERMOTT: Laurie?
22	investigators at the individual sites are actually	22	MS. BURKE: I completely agree from my
	Page 62		Page 64
1	capable of doing that because they've actually been	1	limited knowledge post ex-FDA, from what I've seen.
2	able to recruit before or for any other criteria	2	And I think that this isn't just one curriculum to
3	that are there.	3	quality people to be clinical trialists, but it's
4	We are all experienced people, and we all	4	multiple. It starts with there's the multiple
5	think we know what we're doing. And we've taught	5	disciplines' worth of qualification of degree
6	ourselves since there is no academic process of	6	programs, or whatever you want to call them, that
7	learning how to become a clinical trialist, it is	7	need to be thought about. And of course, my thing
8	catch as catch can. And basically, in the end,	8	is the measurement area. There's really no place
9	we've abrogated our responsibilities for these	9	that people can go to get a degree in clinical
10	clinical trials unless we create a methodology to	10	trial measurement, and that, I think, is one in and
11	allow people to become clinical trialists and make	11	
12	It be a actual learned endeavor.	12	MALE SPEAKER: Just one comment on the
13	I o complain that people use their own	13	compensation, which I think to piggyback on Lee's
14	intuitive nature of deciding if somebody will get	14	comment, which is really important. Clinical trial
15	into a trial or not, which is absolutely what	15	sites don't get paid to screen in general. There
16	nappens all the time, and why that last comment	16	are screening rees. Yes, or course, there is, but
17	exists in the exclusion criteria, we have an	17	you get paid to randomize subjects. And it's
18	opportunity nere to identify within this manuscript	18	completely skewed, the amount of money you get when
19	what we believe should be the right way to do	19	
20	umiys.	20	i think it's because sponsors want
21		0-	rendersized subjects which makes same. They also
	It even goes down to how we recompense	21	randomized subjects, which makes sense. They also

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 65		Page 67
1	screened because it's easy to inflate the number of	1	later and say, hey, we want you to really think
2	patients you screen, so it's kind of just a	2	harder about patient recruitment or think harder
3	necessary evil.	3	about how you're coaching your patients training
4	But I think this economic lopsidedness about	4	your patients to measure pain, or get your
5	randomization leads to a pressure to randomize and	5	queries resolved more quickly or whatever the
6	to not get because you're not getting	6	quality metric is, you can't get anywhere because
7	compensated essentially for screening. It's almost	7	you don't have any financial leverage over those
8	like you're paying for screening, and then you get	8	sites unless you are in a network where you own the
9	paid when you randomize subjects. That's how it is	9	sites.
10	as an investigative site, which is the genesis of a	10	I wonder whether it's almost worth a
11	lot of these problems.	11	paragraph in this paper or at least some discussion
12	To talk just one more point about what Bob	12	of how we fall short of trying to influence quality
13	Dworkin said yesterday regarding blinding clinical	13	because we fail to account for it in our
14	trial sites to when the subjects can be screened	14	contracting processes.
15	and randomized, I think that's a good idea.	15	DR. MALAMUT: It's almost for the next
16	When that does not occur, in other words,	16	study. You're right, in the middle of a study,
17	the decision has not been made to blind. When	17	it's very difficult, without seeing the data, to
18	there's subjective criteria or like a baseline	18	know what the quality of the data actually is. But
19	entry criteria, let's say, for OIC, patients have	19	I think the act should be on the next study, so
20	to have less than this many bowel movements, or for	20	that if I look at site X and they've recruited
21	a OA study, they have to have a flare of X, Y or Z,	21	30 patients, and did a great job recruiting but, in
22	you can see in the data someone's talking	22	fact, most of the data had to be thrown out and
	Page 66		Page 68
	Page 66		Page 68
1	Page 66 about we're all talking about central	1	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be
1 2	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have	1 2	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site
1 2 3	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it	1 2 3	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do.
1 2 3 4	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely	1 2 3 4	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that
1 2 3 4 5	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential,	1 2 3 4 5	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working,
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect because it's financially driven and it affects the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the quality of the site at the end of the study,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect because it's financially driven and it affects the randomization.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the quality of the site at the end of the study, they'll all say yes. And then when you ask them to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect because it's financially driven and it affects the randomization. DR. McDERMOTT: Matt?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the quality of the site at the end of the study, they'll all say yes. And then when you ask them to show you exactly how they do that, no one can ever
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect because it's financially driven and it affects the randomization. DR. McDERMOTT: Matt? MALE SPEAKER: I think it's I want to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the quality of the site at the end of the study, they'll all say yes. And then when you ask them to show you exactly how they do that, no one can ever come up with anything. They can't find it. That
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect because it's financially driven and it affects the randomization. DR. McDERMOTT: Matt? MALE SPEAKER: I think it's I want to pick up on comments made earlier about contracting.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the quality of the site at the end of the study, they'll all say yes. And then when you ask them to show you exactly how they do that, no one can ever come up with anything. They can't find it. That was the other CRO. Well, what we really know is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect because it's financially driven and it affects the randomization. DR. McDERMOTT: Matt? MALE SPEAKER: I think it's I want to pick up on comments made earlier about contracting. Now that we're contracting with sites to do	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the quality of the site at the end of the study, they'll all say yes. And then when you ask them to show you exactly how they do that, no one can ever come up with anything. They can't find it. That was the other CRO. Well, what we really know is whether there were any major audit findings or how
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect because it's financially driven and it affects the randomization. DR. McDERMOTT: Matt? MALE SPEAKER: I think it's I want to pick up on comments made earlier about contracting. Now that we're contracting with sites to do clinical trials, it's kind of shocking how much	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the quality of the site at the end of the study, they'll all say yes. And then when you ask them to show you exactly how they do that, no one can ever come up with anything. They can't find it. That was the other CRO. Well, what we really know is whether there were any major audit findings or how many patients they recruited.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect because it's financially driven and it affects the randomization. DR. McDERMOTT: Matt? MALE SPEAKER: I think it's I want to pick up on comments made earlier about contracting. Now that we're contracting with sites to do clinical trials, it's kind of shocking how much contracting influences quality in the sense that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the quality of the site at the end of the study, they'll all say yes. And then when you ask them to show you exactly how they do that, no one can ever come up with anything. They can't find it. That was the other CRO. Well, what we really know is whether there were any major audit findings or how many patients they recruited. So there's a huge disconnect between what
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect because it's financially driven and it affects the randomization. DR. McDERMOTT: Matt? MALE SPEAKER: I think it's I want to pick up on comments made earlier about contracting. Now that we're contracting with sites to do clinical trials, it's kind of shocking how much contracting influences quality in the sense that investigators are never, ever, ever contracted for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the quality of the site at the end of the study, they'll all say yes. And then when you ask them to show you exactly how they do that, no one can ever come up with anything. They can't find it. That was the other CRO. Well, what we really know is whether there were any major audit findings or how many patients they recruited. So there's a huge disconnect between what people claim they evaluate in terms of study
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect because it's financially driven and it affects the randomization. DR. McDERMOTT: Matt? MALE SPEAKER: I think it's I want to pick up on comments made earlier about contracting. Now that we're contracting with sites to do clinical trials, it's kind of shocking how much contracting influences quality in the sense that investigators are never, ever, ever contracted for quality. They're only contracted for procedures,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the quality of the site at the end of the study, they'll all say yes. And then when you ask them to show you exactly how they do that, no one can ever come up with anything. They can't find it. That was the other CRO. Well, what we really know is whether there were any major audit findings or how many patients they recruited. So there's a huge disconnect between what people claim they evaluate in terms of study quality and how they utilize that information for
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect because it's financially driven and it affects the randomization. DR. McDERMOTT: Matt? MALE SPEAKER: I think it's I want to pick up on comments made earlier about contracting. Now that we're contracting with sites to do clinical trials, it's kind of shocking how much contracting influences quality in the sense that investigators are never, ever, ever contracted for quality. They're only contracted for procedures, whether those are visits or EKGs or visits or	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the quality of the site at the end of the study, they'll all say yes. And then when you ask them to show you exactly how they do that, no one can ever come up with anything. They can't find it. That was the other CRO. Well, what we really know is whether there were any major audit findings or how many patients they recruited. So there's a huge disconnect between what people claim they evaluate in terms of study quality and how they utilize that information for the next study and what's actually being done. So
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 66 about we're all talking about central monitoring that different sites have differential rates of patients that will make it through that baseline period and sometimes widely differential. And when it is widely differential, that's a problem because it's all based on competition. So I think when you look at central statistical monitoring, this is the key aspect because it's financially driven and it affects the randomization. DR. McDERMOTT: Matt? MALE SPEAKER: I think it's I want to pick up on comments made earlier about contracting. Now that we're contracting with sites to do clinical trials, it's kind of shocking how much contracting influences quality in the sense that investigators are never, ever, ever contracted for quality. They're only contracted for procedures, whether those are visits or EKGs or visits or histories and physicals or what have you.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 68 other patients then that site is not going to be selected for the next study. Now, maybe that site doesn't care. But we would hope they do. MALE SPEAKER: The facts, I think, show that if that's the current system, it's not working, because otherwise, we wouldn't be having this meetings. I also think that as much ask any CRO or any sponsor, do they monitor do they measure the quality of the site at the end of the study, they'll all say yes. And then when you ask them to show you exactly how they do that, no one can ever come up with anything. They can't find it. That was the other CRO. Well, what we really know is whether there were any major audit findings or how many patients they recruited. So there's a huge disconnect between what people claim they evaluate in terms of study quality and how they utilize that information for the next study and what's actually being done. So I think there are opportunities within the

	Page 69		Page 71
1	that financial leverage	1	it the number of study coordinators that came up
2	DR McDERMOTT: Way in the back and then	2	to me I don't know about Bob and said. "I've
3	DR HEWITT: So what I'd say is I do believe	3	never really thought of that before " And it was
4	in relationships with sites and there are sites	4	so interesting to bear that
5	that I've used we've all used probably in	5	So picking up on Lee Simon university for
6	clinical trials that go back to the late '90s. So	6	clinical trialists, university for study
7	we all know a lot of people who do a lot of	7	coordinators kind of concept, obviously, really
8	clinical trials and are good sites.	8	difficult to operationalize. But what I do think
9	And I think when you just to pick on	9	is a really good idea, and perhaps this could go
10	Nat's point, a high-guality site. I think for those	10	into the document as well, is at each investigator
11	of us who have really been in the trenches, has to	11	meeting, there should be a clinical trial 101 type
12	do with their queries. If the data is really	12	meeting in which the protocol is not just discussed
13	dirty, no study coordinator I mean, no CRA is	13	and how to do an EKG, but actually the nature of a
14	going to want to pick a site again that's just	14	clinical trial and what we are doing in it. This
15	given them hell for three months as they're trying	15	is an experiment in clinical equipoise, and all of
16	to clean up the queries.	16	the things that we kind of take for granted, but
17	So although you could use a lot of metrics,	17	they actually don't understand, and they really
18	I'll tell you, the number of queries and getting	18	don't.
19	them rectified in a timely fashion is what will	19	DR. McDERMOTT: Scott?
20	either get you on to the next study at work at	20	DR. EVANS: So in statistics, we have a
21	inVentive or not because for those of us who follow	21	saying that there are lies, damn lies, and
22	these things, those are important metrics.	22	neurologists.
	Page 70		Page 72
1	DR. McDERMOTT: Roy?	1	(Laughter.)
2	DR. FREEMAN: So I want to pick up on a	2	DR. EVANS: You guys may have heard a
3	point made by I think it was Lee behind me and the	3	different version.
4	invention of the cell phone guy, which I think was	4	I'd like to pick up on that point because
5	David Hewitt, but I'm not sure.	5	much of the discussion is sort of focused on
6	Bob Dworkin and I found ourselves at an	6	detection of fraud and malfeasance and outliers in
7	investigator meeting a week or so ago, and we had a	7	a sense. But when I think about data quality from
8	chat they called it a fireside chat in front	8	a broad perspective and where we can make the most
9	of a group of study coordinators and investigators,	9	impact and I'm someone who's been teaching
10	and there were no academic investigators. These	10	clinical trials for 10 years, so hopefully, there
11	were all pay-to-play type sites.	11	is some academic process to this.
12	The aim of the chat was to discuss concepts	12	The first thing that comes to mind from a
13	related to the placebo response, and topics	13	statistical perspective, where I do think we could
14	included things like how to balance your desire to	14	make enormous impact, and it's probably old news,
15	recruit more and more subjects versus selling the	15	but it's a point that Paul made on missing data.
16	study drug as the new wonder drug and raising	16	And the National Academy of Sciences put out a
17	expectations, how to balance study retention versus	17	report a couple of years ago, and there was a New
18	being warm and nurturing and fuzzy, and again,	18	England Journal of Medicine summary of that report
19	enhancing placebo response. And I could go on	19	a couple of years ago as well.
20	about the nature of the discussion, which was kind	20	Basically, the message in that report is
21	of entertaining.	21	that missing data is not a data analysis problem.
1	But what was ave apaping was at the and of	00	It's a design and conduct problem with the message

	Page 73		Page 75
1	at prevention and dealing with this upfront.	1	even, and you don't get their measurements that you
2	Now, I'm a part of a new clinical trials	2	expected to get at the end of the day, and we go to
3	network, and I've essentially said that efforts to	3	analyze pain, oh, all of a sudden, we've got a
4	minimize missing data is a standard section in the	4	missing data problem.
5	protocol, and we have to figure out ways to prevent	5	Well, it's a missing data problem when
6	it and deal with it because if you get it at the	6	you're trying to evaluate causal pathways and
7	end, as you know, prevention is the best medicine.	7	mechanisms of action and understand biology. It's
8	But fancy statistical methods are not going to	8	not a missing data problem in clinical medicine.
9	rescue design and conduct flaws. So I think this	9	It failed the nationt
10	whole process is really sort of a prevention issue	10	So either having to go off therapy or having
11	Picking up on the education piece. I think	11	to rescue them is actually part of the outcome
12	that that's really an educational message that if	12	It's not missing in a sense and getting to think
13	you can train people to understand fundamentals	13	about whether you need to characterize outcomes
14	about clinical trials, your quality is going to go	14	that bring in this information
15		15	So I've been pushing in other areas that in
16	up.	16	clinical trials these days, our tradition is we
17	distinction between needing to go off study because	17	collect data on nationts and then analyze the
10	of toxicity or needing to go off treatment	10	endpoints Well I want to reverse the order
10	because of toxicity doesn't mean you have to go off	10	Collect data on the endpoints and analyze the
20	study and that I'm going to lose your data	20	nations. That's who we're treating. That's
20	So there are a number of things, and there's	20	what's going to apply in practice. And that will
21	a checklict in the New England Journal of Medicine	21	halp aliminate some of the missing data issues
22		22	Theip eliminate some of the missing data issues.
	Page 74		Page 76
1	article or the Academy's report, data management	1	So there are certainly things we can do I
		_	
2	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening	2	did have a couple of comments about the central
2	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be	2	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We
2 3 4	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat	234	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned,
2 3 4 5	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent	2 3 4 5	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can
2 3 4 5 6	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless	2 3 4 5 6	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it
2 3 4 5 6 7	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a	2 3 4 5 6 7	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking
2 3 6 7 8 9	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still collect your data and follow you, and that has	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking for. And that's going to require more thought than
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still collect your data and follow you, and that has important implications.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking for. And that's going to require more thought than perhaps Amy's had to get in the tall weeds about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still collect your data and follow you, and that has important implications. Things in design, clearly thinking carefully	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking for. And that's going to require more thought than perhaps Amy's had to get in the tall weeds about it. But I think when you apply it, it's going to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still collect your data and follow you, and that has important implications. Things in design, clearly thinking carefully about the population, whether you want to do run-in	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking for. And that's going to require more thought than perhaps Amy's had to get in the tall weeds about it. But I think when you apply it, it's going to take more thought than sort of this 40,000-foot
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still collect your data and follow you, and that has important implications. Things in design, clearly thinking carefully about the population, whether you want to do run-in periods, which may reduce missing data later on;	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking for. And that's going to require more thought than perhaps Amy's had to get in the tall weeds about it. But I think when you apply it, it's going to take more thought than sort of this 40,000-foot approach.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still collect your data and follow you, and that has important implications. Things in design, clearly thinking carefully about the population, whether you want to do run-in periods, which may reduce missing data later on; flexible treatment regimens, how would you handle	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking for. And that's going to require more thought than perhaps Amy's had to get in the tall weeds about it. But I think when you apply it, it's going to take more thought than sort of this 40,000-foot approach. Then when you say, well, what is an outlier?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still collect your data and follow you, and that has important implications. Things in design, clearly thinking carefully about the population, whether you want to do run-in periods, which may reduce missing data later on; flexible treatment regimens, how would you handle the rescue medication issue? And this actually	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking for. And that's going to require more thought than perhaps Amy's had to get in the tall weeds about it. But I think when you apply it, it's going to take more thought than sort of this 40,000-foot approach. Then when you say, well, what is an outlier? And how do we decide what's true and false? This
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still collect your data and follow you, and that has important implications. Things in design, clearly thinking carefully about the population, whether you want to do run-in periods, which may reduce missing data later on; flexible treatment regimens, how would you handle the rescue medication issue? And this actually gets at the effectiveness versus efficacy piece.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking for. And that's going to require more thought than perhaps Amy's had to get in the tall weeds about it. But I think when you apply it, it's going to take more thought than sort of this 40,000-foot approach. Then when you say, well, what is an outlier? And how do we decide what's true and false? This is really a diagnostic problem. You're trying to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still collect your data and follow you, and that has important implications. Things in design, clearly thinking carefully about the population, whether you want to do run-in periods, which may reduce missing data later on; flexible treatment regimens, how would you handle the rescue medication issue? And this actually gets at the effectiveness versus efficacy piece. And in academic medicine, I try to get people to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking for. And that's going to require more thought than perhaps Amy's had to get in the tall weeds about it. But I think when you apply it, it's going to take more thought than sort of this 40,000-foot approach. Then when you say, well, what is an outlier? And how do we decide what's true and false? This is really a diagnostic problem. You're trying to figure out whether I can diagnose fraud or outlier
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still collect your data and follow you, and that has important implications. Things in design, clearly thinking carefully about the population, whether you want to do run-in periods, which may reduce missing data later on; flexible treatment regimens, how would you handle the rescue medication issue? And this actually gets at the effectiveness versus efficacy piece. And in academic medicine, I try to get people to think more about effectiveness.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking for. And that's going to require more thought than perhaps Amy's had to get in the tall weeds about it. But I think when you apply it, it's going to take more thought than sort of this 40,000-foot approach. Then when you say, well, what is an outlier? And how do we decide what's true and false? This is really a diagnostic problem. You're trying to figure out whether I can diagnose fraud or outlier or something that's a problem. And so this is a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still collect your data and follow you, and that has important implications. Things in design, clearly thinking carefully about the population, whether you want to do run-in periods, which may reduce missing data later on; flexible treatment regimens, how would you handle the rescue medication issue? And this actually gets at the effectiveness versus efficacy piece. And in academic medicine, I try to get people to think more about effectiveness. If a patient goes off treatment because of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking for. And that's going to require more thought than perhaps Amy's had to get in the tall weeds about it. But I think when you apply it, it's going to take more thought than sort of this 40,000-foot approach. Then when you say, well, what is an outlier? And how do we decide what's true and false? This is really a diagnostic problem. You're trying to figure out whether I can diagnose fraud or outlier or something that's a problem. And so this is a balance of sensitivity and specificity in a sense.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	practices about clear CRFs and not overburdening patients and doing things that enables them to be able to stay on study; the intention to treat principle, getting people to understand the intent to treat principle, that follow patients regardless of adherence; and their example language about if a patient wants to withdraw, whether we could actually withdraw you from treatment but still collect your data and follow you, and that has important implications. Things in design, clearly thinking carefully about the population, whether you want to do run-in periods, which may reduce missing data later on; flexible treatment regimens, how would you handle the rescue medication issue? And this actually gets at the effectiveness versus efficacy piece. And in academic medicine, I try to get people to think more about effectiveness. If a patient goes off treatment because of an adverse event, a toxicity associated with the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	did have a couple of comments about the central monitoring issue, statistical monitoring. We already do in clinical trials, as Mike mentioned, range checks and logical checks, and we can certainly turn up the temperature in that. And it will take effort and thought. You need to decide what you're looking for, and this is not entirely clear what we're looking for. And that's going to require more thought than perhaps Amy's had to get in the tall weeds about it. But I think when you apply it, it's going to take more thought than sort of this 40,000-foot approach. Then when you say, well, what is an outlier? And how do we decide what's true and false? This is really a diagnostic problem. You're trying to figure out whether I can diagnose fraud or outlier or something that's a problem. And so this is a balance of sensitivity and specificity in a sense. We can detect more outliers, but you're also

22 medication, and therefore, maybe they go off study

22 going to detect more false positives, and there's

га	II Assessment III Chinical Triais		June 3, 201
	Page	e 77	Page 79
1	going to be a consequence to that. And frankly, I	1	L clear it doesn't exist for pain.
2	don't even know what the gold standard is. We	2	In other therapeutic areas, are there kind
3	don't even have a gold standard. It's an imperfect	3	3 of training certificate programs for study
4	gold standard in many cases. So there are some	4	a coordinators and principal investigators? And it
5	real challenges here in thinking that through.	5	5 goes back to what Roy said, that maybe the
6	Then I think deciding how you handle a		5 beginning of an investigators meeting should be
7	particular issue, if you've identified		7 some kind of general introduction to analgesic
8	it there's been talked about intent to treat and	8	B clinical trials 101.
9	whether you exclude them or whether you	9	But doing it in that kind of decentralized,
10	don't we're really going to need to	10	leading up to the sponsor ad hoc way is clearly not
11	think we're going to need a more detailed	11	1 as good as if some organization, for example,
12	evaluation on the nature of the issue and the	12	2 ACTTION, put together a two- or three-day boot camp
13	consequences of different actions.	13	3 for junior investigators, senior investigators,
14	If you're on a case where you're running a	14	study coordinators, and it was kind of introduction
15	blinded trial and the blinding actually works, then	15	5 to analgesic clinical trials 101 with people like
16	if there's malfeasance going on or people are just	16	5 Mike and Scott and everybody on the panel, and many
17	enrolling patients that are just nonsense data,	17	7 of us in the room, instructing the people who come
18	well, that's going to hurt assay sensitivity. But	18	to the meeting. And they all walk home with a
19	if the blinding is really and so it's going to	19	ittle certificate. It could be set up as CME,
20	hurt the ability to detect differences and so	20	o that they spent three days learning all these
21	forth. But it's not necessarily differential	2	L challenging issues about clinical trials.
22	between arms. Although if you're doing a	22	2 So this just occurred actually completely
	Page	e 78	Page 80
1	noninferiority trial, it actually would bias toward	1	L independently to both Dennis and me while we were
2	non-interiority, and you get a different problem.	2	2 sitting here. Does that exist? Does anyone know
3	So I think the blinding issue is a real	1	3 whether anything like that exists anywhere else?
4	important one, and I often encourage people to	4	4 DR. MCDERMOTT: You just caused eight hands
5	evaluate the success of the blind. We often say	5	5 to go up.
6	we're running blinded trials, but whether the	(5 DAVID: There is an accredited organization
7	blinding worked is a whole different issue. And		7 called the American Association for Pharmaceutical
8	people often just refrain or refuse to evaluate if	8	3 Scientists, I believe. They've been around for a
9	it worked or not through questionnaires, and I	9	9 number of years, and they do grant some sort of a
10	think that may help us understand what the	10	o certification process. However, it's costly, it's
11	potential consequences of this are.	11	L time consuming, and a bit onerous.
12	So I'll end there. Thanks. Very quiet	12	2 So I think the solution that you propose, to
13	after that.	13	a have some sort of a training during an investigator
14	DR. McDERMOTT: You just quieted the room.	14	4 meeting that is iterative, that can be accessed on
15	DR. EVANS: So you guys have been thinking	19	a corporate or a CRO website, I think is part of
16	your lives about now to reduce pain, and	16	
17	STATISTICIANS THINK ADOUT NOW TO INFLICT IT.	17	DR. DWORKIN: David, I know there are
18		18	existing programs, but the ones I'm familiar with
19	DR. DWORKIN: This is only partly related to	19	are all generic. I'm talking about something
20	your comments, Scott, and follows up on what Lee	20	unaus pain specific. I don't know whether it's
21	was saying. I don't know whether this exists in	21	L just critonic pain or chronic and acute pain.
122	other therapeutic areas because it's certainly	22	2 So is there something like for

1	cardiovascular clinical trialists or people who do	1	(Laughter.)
2	type 2 diabetes trials? Does anyone know of	2	(Crosstalk.)
3	anything that's any kind of training program for	3	DR. ROWBOTHAM: Their offices are so full of
4	clinical trialists, both investigators and	4	patients, they don't have time to deal with doing
5	coordinators, that's therapeutic area specific?	5	research.
6	DR. EVANS: So recently, because of problems	6	But I just wanted to make one point.
7	associated with performing rheumatoid arthritis	7	Sometimes the investigators meetings will have a
8	clinical trials, which require you to actually do	8	lot of materials. I've done this like on how to
9	hands-on outcomes and it turns out that the most	9	examine postherpetic neuralgia patients and do
10	experienced rheumatologists can't do a physical	10	sensory mapping and injections and stuff.
11	exam appropriately, therefore, this has been	11	We create those, but one issue that comes
12	studied people like at Keystone and others in	12	up, especially at the organization that I'm in
13	Canada actually put together training programs for	13	where we do a lot of cancer trials, is that you can
14	investigators at investigators meetings, where they	14	have sub-investigators enroll patients as long as
15	go in and get tested whether they can actually feel	15	they've been trained by the PI on how to do
16	tender and swollen joints. I mean, it's like wait	16	everything.
17	a minute, this is what I do for a living, and yet,	17	So then you've moved one step away from what
18	in fact, passing such a test is ridiculous.	18	actually was covered at the investigators meeting,
19	Furthermore, there's another training system	19	and we have to spend a lot of time making sure that
20	for injectable drugs, intra-articular drugs. As it	20	when a PI trains a sub-I that we're confident as a
21	turns out, even the most experienced orthopedist	21	research organization that the sub-I really does
22	and rheumatologist miss 33 to 40 percent of the	22	know what they're doing on the protocol. And that
	Page 82		Page 84
1	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even	1	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research
1	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan.	1 2	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations.
1 2 3	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.)	1 2 3	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted
1 2 3 4	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created	1 2 3 4	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the
1 2 3 4 5	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then	1 2 3 4 5	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these trials unless, in fact, you pass this.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to insist that everyone who's involved in the study
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these trials unless, in fact, you pass this. DR. FARRAR: Just a quick comment on that.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to insist that everyone who's involved in the study will show up and get that training, which isn't
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these trials unless, in fact, you pass this. DR. FARRAR: Just a quick comment on that.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to insist that everyone who's involved in the study will show up and get that training, which isn't always possible.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these trials unless, in fact, you pass this. DR. FARRAR: Just a quick comment on that. Misha Backonja about seven years created a tape for study on exam to identify neuropathic pain, for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to insist that everyone who's involved in the study will show up and get that training, which isn't always possible. In regard to training, we've done it a few
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these trials unless, in fact, you pass this. DR. FARRAR: Just a quick comment on that. Misha Backonja about seven years created a tape for study on exam to identify neuropathic pain, for instance. So there are very specific instances	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to insist that everyone who's involved in the study will show up and get that training, which isn't always possible. In regard to training, we've done it a few times in studies where we've wanted to stratify or
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these trials unless, in fact, you pass this. DR. FARRAR: Just a quick comment on that. Misha Backonja about seven years created a tape for study on exam to identify neuropathic pain, for instance. So there are very specific instances like Lee is defining. And you're right. There are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to insist that everyone who's involved in the study will show up and get that training, which isn't always possible. In regard to training, we've done it a few times in studies where we've wanted to stratify or assess the presence of allodynia or mechanical
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these trials unless, in fact, you pass this. DR. FARRAR: Just a quick comment on that. Misha Backonja about seven years created a tape for study on exam to identify neuropathic pain, for instance. So there are very specific instances like Lee is defining. And you're right. There are other training programs for coordinators.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to insist that everyone who's involved in the study will show up and get that training, which isn't always possible. In regard to training, we've done it a few times in studies where we've wanted to stratify or assess the presence of allodynia or mechanical hypersensitivity. So we put together training
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these trials unless, in fact, you pass this. DR. FARRAR: Just a quick comment on that. Misha Backonja about seven years created a tape for study on exam to identify neuropathic pain, for instance. So there are very specific instances like Lee is defining. And you're right. There are other training programs for coordinators. At Penn, we had a four-week training	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to insist that everyone who's involved in the study will show up and get that training, which isn't always possible. In regard to training, we've done it a few times in studies where we've wanted to stratify or assess the presence of allodynia or mechanical hypersensitivity. So we put together training tapes with I guess Brett Stacey did our most
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these trials unless, in fact, you pass this. DR. FARRAR: Just a quick comment on that. Misha Backonja about seven years created a tape for study on exam to identify neuropathic pain, for instance. So there are very specific instances like Lee is defining. And you're right. There are other training programs for coordinators. At Penn, we had a four-week training program, but it's not specific on a particular	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to insist that everyone who's involved in the study will show up and get that training, which isn't always possible. In regard to training, we've done it a few times in studies where we've wanted to stratify or assess the presence of allodynia or mechanical hypersensitivity. So we put together training tapes with I guess Brett Stacey did our most recent one.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these trials unless, in fact, you pass this. DR. FARRAR: Just a quick comment on that. Misha Backonja about seven years created a tape for study on exam to identify neuropathic pain, for instance. So there are very specific instances like Lee is defining. And you're right. There are other training programs for coordinators. At Penn, we had a four-week training program, but it's not specific on a particular area. And I think that there could be real benefit	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to insist that everyone who's involved in the study will show up and get that training, which isn't always possible. In regard to training, we've done it a few times in studies where we've wanted to stratify or assess the presence of allodynia or mechanical hypersensitivity. So we put together training tapes with I guess Brett Stacey did our most recent one. So I think amongst everyone, there might be
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these trials unless, in fact, you pass this. DR. FARRAR: Just a quick comment on that. Misha Backonja about seven years created a tape for study on exam to identify neuropathic pain, for instance. So there are very specific instances like Lee is defining. And you're right. There are other training programs for coordinators. At Penn, we had a four-week training program, but it's not specific on a particular area. And I think that there could be real benefit to doing that.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to insist that everyone who's involved in the study will show up and get that training, which isn't always possible. In regard to training, we've done it a few times in studies where we've wanted to stratify or assess the presence of allodynia or mechanical hypersensitivity. So we put together training tapes with I guess Brett Stacey did our most recent one. So I think amongst everyone, there might be individual training videos and pieces specific to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 82 time getting the needle in the joint. My God, even the knee, which is like the size of Manhattan. (Laughter.) DR. EVANS: So they actually have created very specified training programs for this, and then they also have reminder programs during the time of the trial to bring people back up to date. And you cannot become a PI at a site for some of these trials unless, in fact, you pass this. DR. FARRAR: Just a quick comment on that. Misha Backonja about seven years created a tape for study on exam to identify neuropathic pain, for instance. So there are very specific instances like Lee is defining. And you're right. There are other training programs for coordinators. At Penn, we had a four-week training program, but it's not specific on a particular area. And I think that there could be real benefit to doing that. DR. McDERMOTT: Mike?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 84 may not actually happen at all research organizations. DR. MALAMUT: I think I had briefly hinted at that yesterday, that whoever shows up at the investigator meeting, often at the site, they may not have gotten the benefit of the training we're proposing. So if we're going to put some kind of training at the IM, we're going to then have to insist that everyone who's involved in the study will show up and get that training, which isn't always possible. In regard to training, we've done it a few times in studies where we've wanted to stratify or assess the presence of allodynia or mechanical hypersensitivity. So we put together training tapes with I guess Brett Stacey did our most recent one. So I think amongst everyone, there might be individual training videos and pieces specific to different studies, and maybe they just need all

Page 81

- DR. ROWBOTHAM: To Lee's comment, maybe an 21
- 22 aside, that's why they went into research.

22

DR. McDERMOTT: Our coordinating center will

Page 83

Pai	in Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 85		Page 87
1	do webinar training or they will have it's been	1	DR. McDERMOTT: Lee, did you have a comment?
2	like that when you have new personnel coming	2	DR. SIMON: I just wanted to comment that
3	onboard. I don't know if that's standard across	3	one has to wonder whether national professional
4	everyone, but that's what we typically do.	4	societies, be it in the U.S. or in Europe, have an
5	In the back?	5	obligation to do that. If they're going to help
6	MALE SPEAKER: There are some aspects of	6	their membership professionalized themselves, one
7	this that kind of exist within as people have	7	of the ways to professionalize is to become a
8	said, that exist now like GCP training, everybody	8	professional trialist. And what the problem has
9	has to. All investigators hate the fact that they	9	been is it's not considered an academically
10	have to do their GCP training every time they do a	10	scholarly activity to do clinical trial work here
11	clinical trial with a sponsor. That's a big issue.	11	in the United States.
12	But certainly with site initiation visit,	12	So there is no real pressure on somebody who
13	there's a lot of training that should be going on	13	does it in an academic site to publish. I mean, if
14	as well as stuff that goes on at the investigator	14	you're one of 400 investigators, you're not going
15	meeting. And certainly for site initiation visits,	15	to be one of the people who are going to be the
16	they should be able to get pretty good training,	16	author on the paper. You might get acknowledged,
17	and there's training online.	17	but then that's not recognized. And in certain
18	But with all of that said, I think the point	18	institutions, even if you're a first author because
19	Bob is making is a good one, is that we're really	19	it's a clinical trial, it's meaningless for
20	going beyond something. And I think if you can get	20	academic promotion.
21	like a certification so that people really get it	21	Until that changes, unfortunately, we're
22	and understand it, I think that's a huge, huge	22	going to have to rely upon either national
	Page 86		Page 88
	1 290 00		1 490 00
1	thing because medical schools aren't going to do	1	professional societies to do this, the sponsors to
2	it. Medical schools have been we've been trying	2	do this, or groups like this. And I think we can't
3	to teach medical schools to teach about chronic	3	rely because it hasn't worked so far. So something
4	pain for 20 years. They're still not going to do	4	has to be changed, and perhaps this group can do
5	it. So I endorse the idea.	5	that.
6	MALE SPEAKER: I guess I have a quick	6	DR. McDERMOTT: John?
7	question. How is this being handled for	7	JOHN: Just one quick comment that I made to
8	international folks where we're dealing with	8	Bob that I think is probably worth saying out loud
9	multi-regional trials and folks who are not always	9	is that there's clearly a big effort now on what's
10	proficient or even fluent in the language in which	10	called team science. It means lots of things in
11	the primary training materials have been created?	11	lots of situations. but in this particular case,
12	MALE SPEAKER: Well, that actually is an	12	one of the issues that we know about investigator
13	issue that people have to address. Frequently,	13	meetings is that everybody gets together at the
14	these materials are translated. Certainly, all the	14	beginning, and then the coordinators go off and do
15	patient materials are translated into other	15	their thing and the investigators go and do their
16	to and then in the translation right is a big	15	uning. And that's never made sense to me because
17	to and then is the translation right is a big	17	we really want the coordinators and the
18	thing an wall. There are all these dedicated	10	investigators to like bear the same thing as that
10	thing as well. There are all these dedicated	18	investigators to, like, hear the same thing so that
19	thing as well. There are all these dedicated translation services that go back, translation forward to make sure that they the got it right	18 19	investigators to, like, hear the same thing so that they can hold each other accountable.
19 20	thing as well. There are all these dedicated translation services that go back, translation forward to make sure that they've got it right.	18 19 20	investigators to, like, hear the same thing so that they can hold each other accountable. So I would argue that the best of all worlds obviously, you can't always do
19 20 21	thing as well. There are all these dedicated translation services that go back, translation forward to make sure that they've got it right. And then your CRAs speak the language, too. But it is an important issue	18 19 20 21	investigators to, like, hear the same thing so that they can hold each other accountable. So I would argue that the best of all worlds obviously, you can't always do that you would want actually to train the team.

	Page 89		Page 91
1	to work together to provide the services necessary.	1	whether the success of the blind. I think was
2	DR. McDERMOTT: Nat?	2	one important issue. But also the people doing
3	DR. KATZ: I have sort of a change of the	3	analyses are the ones making decisions about
4	subject, which is more back to the issue of central	4	whether there's an exclusion from the database or
5	surveillance of clinical trials. I think we need	5	not. In some ways, I want those people blinded. I
6	to say something about what corrective actions in	6	don't want that to be potentially based on
7	response to surveillance findings are and are not	7	treatment assignment, either.
8	appropriate. If we're going to be monitoring for	8	I think there are consequences, of course,
9	quality interpreted one way or another. then the	و	with exclusions. There was a mention in one of the
10	next question is, well, if you find something, what	10	talks earlier about, well, of course, you're going
11	are you going to do about it? Otherwise, there's	11	to lose power because it's going to have fewer
12	no purpose to surveillance unless it's connected to	12	patients. So there's one issue.
13	some type of corrective action.	13	But it's probably not the biggest issue.
14	The risk-based monitoring guidance has a lot	14	The biggest issue is whether, one, if you analyze,
15	of information about possible corrective actions.	15	say, what's left after you exclude, how
16	but it's a very suggestive and non-specific and	16	generalizable is it or have you hurt
17	certainly not focused in our therapeutic area. And	17	generalizability because now you're selecting. Is
18	I wonder if folks on our panel maybe could comment	18	it differential between treatment and is what I
19	on what types of corrective action are and are not	19	have left now a distorted view of what I started
20	appropriate because as we're designing these	20	with?
21	systems, we need to know.	21	So if the malfeasance is actually a result
22	DR. SCHUETTE: I think the well, there's	22	of poor results, I see poor results so I make them
		-	
	Page 90		Page 92
1	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data	1	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those,
1	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically	1	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I
1 2 3	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that	1 2 3	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble.
1 2 3 4	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these	1 2 3 4	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough
1 2 3 4 5	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our	1 2 3 4 5	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors.	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make an intervention either by going through and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a real hard problem.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make an intervention either by going through and training, confirming what's going on and making	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a real hard problem. Therefore, I think that as with the message
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make an intervention either by going through and training, confirming what's going on and making sure that the site investigator is following	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a real hard problem. Therefore, I think that as with the message with the missing data problem, that efforts are
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make an intervention either by going through and training, confirming what's going on and making sure that the site investigator is following protocol, that their staff is following protocol,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a real hard problem. Therefore, I think that as with the message with the missing data problem, that efforts are about prevention and avoidance.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make an intervention either by going through and training, confirming what's going on and making sure that the site investigator is following protocol, that their staff is following protocol, that there's a potential for corrective action	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a real hard problem. Therefore, I think that as with the message with the missing data problem, that efforts are about prevention and avoidance. DR. McDERMOTT: I get the sense that your
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make an intervention either by going through and training, confirming what's going on and making sure that the site investigator is following protocol, that their staff is following protocol, that there's a potential for corrective action there.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a real hard problem. Therefore, I think that as with the message with the missing data problem, that efforts are about prevention and avoidance. DR. McDERMOTT: I get the sense that your question was about an earlier stage of correction,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make an intervention either by going through and training, confirming what's going on and making sure that the site investigator is following protocol, that their staff is following protocol, that there's a potential for corrective action there. I think if it's done sort of in combination	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a real hard problem. Therefore, I think that as with the message with the missing data problem, that efforts are about prevention and avoidance. DR. McDERMOTT: I get the sense that your question was about an earlier stage of correction, though.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make an intervention either by going through and training, confirming what's going on and making sure that the site investigator is following protocol, that their staff is following protocol, that there's a potential for corrective action there. I think if it's done sort of in combination with sort of a DMC approach, that there's certainly	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a real hard problem. Therefore, I think that as with the message with the missing data problem, that efforts are about prevention and avoidance. DR. McDERMOTT: I get the sense that your question was about an earlier stage of correction, though. DR. KATZ: Yes, let me maybe follow up with
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make an intervention either by going through and training, confirming what's going on and making sure that the site investigator is following protocol, that their staff is following protocol, that there's a potential for corrective action there. I think if it's done sort of in combination with sort of a DMC approach, that there's certainly a possibility for, shall we say, rescuing some of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a real hard problem. Therefore, I think that as with the message with the missing data problem, that efforts are about prevention and avoidance. DR. McDERMOTT: I get the sense that your question was about an earlier stage of correction, though. DR. KATZ: Yes, let me maybe follow up with a more specific version of my question. What
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make an intervention either by going through and training, confirming what's going on and making sure that the site investigator is following protocol, that their staff is following protocol, that there's a potential for corrective action there. I think if it's done sort of in combination with sort of a DMC approach, that there's certainly a possibility for, shall we say, rescuing some of the sites.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a real hard problem. Therefore, I think that as with the message with the missing data problem, that efforts are about prevention and avoidance. DR. McDERMOTT: I get the sense that your question was about an earlier stage of correction, though. DR. KATZ: Yes, let me maybe follow up with a more specific version of my question. What patient level corrections of problems that are
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make an intervention either by going through and training, confirming what's going on and making sure that the site investigator is following protocol, that their staff is following protocol, that there's a potential for corrective action there. I think if it's done sort of in combination with sort of a DMC approach, that there's certainly a possibility for, shall we say, rescuing some of the sites. MALE SPEAKER: I think this is an important	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a real hard problem. Therefore, I think that as with the message with the missing data problem, that efforts are about prevention and avoidance. DR. McDERMOTT: I get the sense that your question was about an earlier stage of correction, though. DR. KATZ: Yes, let me maybe follow up with a more specific version of my question. What patient level corrections of problems that are observed in the patient performance in the clinical
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 90 two types of things. At the FDA, we get the data at the end. So corrective action is basically exclusionary from our perspective, although that can help. We're thinking of using some of these tools to help determine where we can send our office of scientific investigation inspectors. Before it happens, though, during the course, if it's done at the sponsor level, certainly, there's an opportunity to go in and make an intervention either by going through and training, confirming what's going on and making sure that the site investigator is following protocol, that their staff is following protocol, that there's a potential for corrective action there. I think if it's done sort of in combination with sort of a DMC approach, that there's certainly a possibility for, shall we say, rescuing some of the sites. MALE SPEAKER: I think this is an important question. I mentioned before that in some ways you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 92 more positive. Well, clearly, if I exclude those, I'm excluding what was poor results, and if I include them, then I've got trouble. So in some ways, you've got a real tough statistical problem because the data that you're either excluding or including is biased either way, and you've got real informative censoring problem going on. So that's where I think that much of the effort from a statistical standpoint, you've got a real hard problem. Therefore, I think that as with the message with the missing data problem, that efforts are about prevention and avoidance. DR. McDERMOTT: I get the sense that your question was about an earlier stage of correction, though. DR. KATZ: Yes, let me maybe follow up with a more specific version of my question. What patient level corrections of problems that are observed in the patient performance in the clinical trial would and would not be acceptable?

1	patient is providing nonsensical data, we can't	1	are going out of sync can be an issue, and I think
2	correct that on a patient level, and we need to	2	Amy referred to one site where they basically said,
3	accept that. I think that was the message we got	3	"Hmm. Your adverse event reporting rate seems to
4	from Sharon yesterday. The approach would be to	4	be a little off," and just that intervention seemed
5	sort of provide as much general training as	5	to be sufficient.
6	possible across the board, and then cross our	6	So in some cases, maybe just actually being
7	fingers and hope for the best without any type of	7	a reminder or actually part of a site inspection
8	for cause response in terms of retraining the	8	from the sponsor saying, "Show me how you're doing
9	patient on how to use the instruments more	9	this" could be sufficient. So I think that's the
10	effectively. That was the message I got yesterday.	10	level that I'm talking about. But that's actually
11	So I think that's one example of what I'm	11	something that would have to go through an entire
12	trying to ask in a more general way, which is	12	process that's separate and distinct.
13	what and we can talk about patient level	13	So I don't have a great answer for each and
14	corrective action or site level corrective action.	14	every aspect here.
15	which I think was the comment. Paul. that you made	15	DR. DWORKIN: This is on the agenda for this
16	earlier, that site level what I heard from you.	16	afternoon, this exact issue of what can be done.
 17	Paul, is that site level corrections in general	17	midstream course corrections versus what can be
18	sort of anything goes, right, except for unblinding	18	done legitimately after database lock and evidence
19	and sort of obvious violations of the rules of	19	of something funky is discovered. So this is
20	clinical trial conduct	20	pretty high on the agenda for this afternoon. Nat
21	I'm getting at least the beginning of an	21	DR McDERMOTT: I think that we're going to
22	impression from you that from your perspective	22	have I know there are other questions, but I've
22		22	
	Page 94		Page 96
1	virtually anything could go at a site level. If	1	been told it's time for a coffee break. So 10:30.
2	there are exceptions to that it would be great to	2	we'll reconvene Thank you
2	know about	3	(Applause)
4	How about on a patient level? Let's say	4	(Whereupon a recess was taken)
5	for example, the patient's not being compliant with	5	DR McDERMOTT: It's terrific that everybody
6	their electronic diary. Well is it okay to call	-	
7		6	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please
,	the natient and say can you be more compliant with	6	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to
×	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary?	6 7 8	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the pext session
8 9	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some	6 7 8 9	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session.
8 9 10	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a	6 7 8 9	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified
8 9 10 11	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a patient level as a for-cause response and some	6 7 8 9 10	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified at phase 1 to be a clinical investigator. However
8 9 10 11	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a patient level as a for-cause response and some things that would be considered acceptable. I'd	6 7 8 9 10 11	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified at phase 1 to be a clinical investigator. However, to be a fully appropriate a qualified
8 9 10 11 12	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a patient level as a for-cause response and some things that would be considered acceptable. I'd like to know what those are, and then the same	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified at phase 1 to be a clinical investigator. However, to be a fully non-provisional qualified IMMPACT trialist, it is essential that you have to
8 9 10 11 12 13	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a patient level as a for-cause response and some things that would be considered acceptable. I'd like to know what those are, and then the same thing on a site level	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified at phase 1 to be a clinical investigator. However, to be a fully non-provisional qualified IMMPACT trialist, it is essential that you have to respond to the manuscript, which will eventually be
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a patient level as a for-cause response and some things that would be considered acceptable. I'd like to know what those are, and then the same thing on a site level.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified at phase 1 to be a clinical investigator. However, to be a fully non-provisional qualified IMMPACT trialist, it is essential that you have to respond to the manuscript, which will eventually be drafted. And responding is not sufficient because
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a patient level as a for-cause response and some things that would be considered acceptable. I'd like to know what those are, and then the same thing on a site level. DR. SCHUETTE: I'm not necessarily the person to ask for some of these.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified at phase 1 to be a clinical investigator. However, to be a fully non-provisional qualified IMMPACT trialist, it is essential that you have to respond to the manuscript, which will eventually be drafted. And responding is not sufficient because the certifying committee, consisting of Dr. Dworkin
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a patient level as a for-cause response and some things that would be considered acceptable. I'd like to know what those are, and then the same thing on a site level. DR. SCHUETTE: I'm not necessarily the person to ask for some of those. I think	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified at phase 1 to be a clinical investigator. However, to be a fully non-provisional qualified IMMPACT trialist, it is essential that you have to respond to the manuscript, which will eventually be drafted. And responding is not sufficient because the certifying committee, consisting of Dr. Dworkin
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a patient level as a for-cause response and some things that would be considered acceptable. I'd like to know what those are, and then the same thing on a site level. DR. SCHUETTE: I'm not necessarily the person to ask for some of those. I think everything has to be consistent with the protocol.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified at phase 1 to be a clinical investigator. However, to be a fully non-provisional qualified IMMPACT trialist, it is essential that you have to respond to the manuscript, which will eventually be drafted. And responding is not sufficient because the certifying committee, consisting of Dr. Dworkin and Dr. Turk, will evaluate the quality of your
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a patient level as a for-cause response and some things that would be considered acceptable. I'd like to know what those are, and then the same thing on a site level. DR. SCHUETTE: I'm not necessarily the person to ask for some of those. I think everything has to be consistent with the protocol. Now, I think that's something that's	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified at phase 1 to be a clinical investigator. However, to be a fully non-provisional qualified IMMPACT trialist, it is essential that you have to respond to the manuscript, which will eventually be drafted. And responding is not sufficient because the certifying committee, consisting of Dr. Dworkin and Dr. Turk, will evaluate the quality of your responses and comments to the manuscript. So
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a patient level as a for-cause response and some things that would be considered acceptable. I'd like to know what those are, and then the same thing on a site level. DR. SCHUETTE: I'm not necessarily the person to ask for some of those. I think everything has to be consistent with the protocol. Now, I think that's something that's actually discussed further, and maybe there can be	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified at phase 1 to be a clinical investigator. However, to be a fully non-provisional qualified IMMPACT trialist, it is essential that you have to respond to the manuscript, which will eventually be drafted. And responding is not sufficient because the certifying committee, consisting of Dr. Dworkin and Dr. Turk, will evaluate the quality of your responses and comments to the manuscript. So simply saying "good job" will not do it. We need to have your input.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a patient level as a for-cause response and some things that would be considered acceptable. I'd like to know what those are, and then the same thing on a site level. DR. SCHUETTE: I'm not necessarily the person to ask for some of those. I think everything has to be consistent with the protocol. Now, I think that's something that's actually discussed further, and maybe there can be other meetings where what can be done could be	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified at phase 1 to be a clinical investigator. However, to be a fully non-provisional qualified IMMPACT trialist, it is essential that you have to respond to the manuscript, which will eventually be drafted. And responding is not sufficient because the certifying committee, consisting of Dr. Dworkin and Dr. Turk, will evaluate the quality of your responses and comments to the manuscript. So simply saying "good job" will not do it. We need to have your input.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the patient and say can you be more compliant with your electronic diary? So it seems like there probably are some things that you would consider forbidden on a patient level as a for-cause response and some things that would be considered acceptable. I'd like to know what those are, and then the same thing on a site level. DR. SCHUETTE: I'm not necessarily the person to ask for some of those. I think everything has to be consistent with the protocol. Now, I think that's something that's actually discussed further, and maybe there can be other meetings where what can be done could be discussed. But I don't have a great answer.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	is so stimulated for the discussions, but please take your seats and quiet down because we want to move on to the next session. I want to congratulate you all. By attending this meeting, you are all now qualified at phase 1 to be a clinical investigator. However, to be a fully non-provisional qualified IMMPACT trialist, it is essential that you have to respond to the manuscript, which will eventually be drafted. And responding is not sufficient because the certifying committee, consisting of Dr. Dworkin and Dr. Turk, will evaluate the quality of your responses and comments to the manuscript. So simply saying "good job" will not do it. We need to have your input. So thank you all very much. And thank all

Page 93

Page 95

1 ai	n Assessment in Chinear Triais		Suite 3, 201
	Page 97		Page 99
1	really creating what I think, in hearing from the	1	(Laughter.)
2	people around the room, from listening in at	2	DR. McDERMOTT: Our next speaker is going to
3	people's discussions, has been extremely	3	be John Markman, who is a unfortunately, he was
4	interesting, stimulating, exciting,	4	told neurologist, and the bad news we heard from
5	So thank all the speakers for accomplishing	5	Scott Evans about what neurologists are. So John
6	that so far. We're really moving forward now.	6	Markman is a neurologist, and he is director of one
7	This session will take us up to lunch and then	7	of the pain programs at the University of
8	after lunch we'll really have an opportunity to	8	Rochester. He has been involved with a large
9	spend more time discussing some of the kinds of	9	number of clinical trials, particularly related to
10	issues that we've been talking about.	10	back pain.
11	In the last panel discussion, we were really	11	John is going to. I think, give us some
12	starting to seque nicely into what we want to do	12	perspective of what it's like actually being there
13	now, which is vesterday and early this morning	13	as the clinician and being the investigator in
14	there was a perspective of quality in clinical	14	these types of trials and maybe baying some
15	trials that was really coming from somewhat of the	15	reflections on what he has heard to this point and
16	ideal what we'd like to see, what we really need to	16	how it influences the concerns he may see about
17	do what we need to accomplish. But there is	17	heing able to accomplish some of these things
10	another side to that balance, which is the poople	10	So John you'ro un
10	who are actually in the clinical trials transhos	10	Brosontation John Markman
20	doing the work	20	DR MARKMAN: The big 3-0
20	We started going into those things and what	20	(Laughter)
21	we started going into those timings, and what	21	DR MARKMAN: Liust want to first of all
22		22	
	Page 98		Page 100
1	allow people who are sort of at the other side of	1	thank Bob and Dennis. I think I come to these
2	this, who are actually in the trenches trying to do	2	meetings and I know this was said
3	the work, to try and carry out the best possible	3	yesterday and this is one of the most
4	clinical trial that they can given the realities.	4	professionally rewarding moments of the year for
5	I think the old adage that we need to be	5	me. I think I come out of this room thinking that
6	cautious about having the perfect be the enemy of	6	there are a cadre of incredibly talented people
7	the good is that we have to face some reality to	7	around the world who actually can move the field
8	what we can feasibly and appropriately do, given	8	forward and have sort of the knowledge and the
9	that we are knowledgeable about some of the	9	reach and the wherewithal and the energy to do it.
10	problems that could occur, but yet we still have to	10	And so, I always leave these meetings energized.
11			So it's a privilege to be here, and it's
	find ways to get these trials done.	11	So it's a privilege to be here, and it's
12	find ways to get these trials done. So what we're going to do in this session is	11 12	certainly a privilege to speak here. I'd also like
12 13	find ways to get these trials done. So what we're going to do in this session is take the perspective from somewhat in the trenches,	11 12 13	certainly a privilege to speak here. I'd also like to thank Valerie and Andrea for shepherding us to
12 13 14	find ways to get these trials done. So what we're going to do in this session is take the perspective from somewhat in the trenches, from the clinical perspective, from the CROs, from	11 12 13 14	certainly a privilege to speak here. I'd also like to thank Valerie and Andrea for shepherding us to this moment.
12 13 14 15	find ways to get these trials done. So what we're going to do in this session is take the perspective from somewhat in the trenches, from the clinical perspective, from the CROs, from the companies. We heard a bit about company	11 12 13 14 15	certainly a privilege to be here, and it's certainly a privilege to speak here. I'd also like to thank Valerie and Andrea for shepherding us to this moment. I'm going to try and provide what I will
12 13 14 15 16	find ways to get these trials done. So what we're going to do in this session is take the perspective from somewhat in the trenches, from the clinical perspective, from the CROs, from the companies. We heard a bit about company perspective from Rick Malamut, so we'll follow-up	11 12 13 14 15 16	certainly a privilege to be here, and it's certainly a privilege to speak here. I'd also like to thank Valerie and Andrea for shepherding us to this moment. I'm going to try and provide what I will call an academic perspective. This is in italics.
12 13 14 15 16 17	find ways to get these trials done. So what we're going to do in this session is take the perspective from somewhat in the trenches, from the clinical perspective, from the CROs, from the companies. We heard a bit about company perspective from Rick Malamut, so we'll follow-up on that.	11 12 13 14 15 16 17	certainly a privilege to be here, and it's certainly a privilege to speak here. I'd also like to thank Valerie and Andrea for shepherding us to this moment. I'm going to try and provide what I will call an academic perspective. This is in italics. These are some of my relationships in terms of
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	find ways to get these trials done. So what we're going to do in this session is take the perspective from somewhat in the trenches, from the clinical perspective, from the CROs, from the companies. We heard a bit about company perspective from Rick Malamut, so we'll follow-up on that. Before I introduce our next speaker, I want	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	certainly a privilege to be here, and it's certainly a privilege to speak here. I'd also like to thank Valerie and Andrea for shepherding us to this moment. I'm going to try and provide what I will call an academic perspective. This is in italics. These are some of my relationships in terms of research, as well as consulting. I serve on DSMBs.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	find ways to get these trials done. So what we're going to do in this session is take the perspective from somewhat in the trenches, from the clinical perspective, from the CROs, from the companies. We heard a bit about company perspective from Rick Malamut, so we'll follow-up on that. Before I introduce our next speaker, I want to say it's John Markman. And I want to say,	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	certainly a privilege to be here, and it's certainly a privilege to speak here. I'd also like to thank Valerie and Andrea for shepherding us to this moment. I'm going to try and provide what I will call an academic perspective. This is in italics. These are some of my relationships in terms of research, as well as consulting. I serve on DSMBs. I have served as a special government employee.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	find ways to get these trials done. So what we're going to do in this session is take the perspective from somewhat in the trenches, from the clinical perspective, from the CROs, from the companies. We heard a bit about company perspective from Rick Malamut, so we'll follow-up on that. Before I introduce our next speaker, I want to say it's John Markman. And I want to say, belatedly, happy birthday, John, yesterday. I	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	certainly a privilege to be here, and it's certainly a privilege to speak here. I'd also like to thank Valerie and Andrea for shepherding us to this moment. I'm going to try and provide what I will call an academic perspective. This is in italics. These are some of my relationships in terms of research, as well as consulting. I serve on DSMBs. I have served as a special government employee. But most importantly, for this talk, I've
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	find ways to get these trials done. So what we're going to do in this session is take the perspective from somewhat in the trenches, from the clinical perspective, from the CROs, from the companies. We heard a bit about company perspective from Rick Malamut, so we'll follow-up on that. Before I introduce our next speaker, I want to say it's John Markman. And I want to say, belatedly, happy birthday, John, yesterday. I understand you are finally now eligible to have	11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	certainly a privilege to be here, and it's certainly a privilege to speak here. I'd also like to thank Valerie and Andrea for shepherding us to this moment. I'm going to try and provide what I will call an academic perspective. This is in italics. These are some of my relationships in terms of research, as well as consulting. I serve on DSMBs. I have served as a special government employee. But most importantly, for this talk, I've buttonholed most of the people in this room to get

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 101		Page 103
1	is a real insurance policy against hostile	1	When you look at the whole creation versus
2	comments.	2	when you look at the particular sentence, in his
3	(Laughter.)	3	case, it's equally well constructed. So I think
4	DR. MARKMAN: So phone calls, long runs,	4	we're going to try and kind of balance between
5	cocktails, just about everyone here. So I think	5	those concepts.
6	I'm in good shape.	6	The second set of concepts I think we're
7	So I want to come back to where Nat started	7	going to work through are also, again, as I alluded
8	when he talked about quality as the ability of the	8	to, this notion about whether scientific and
9	system to detect, in our case, an analgesic signal.	9	regulatory quality, whether these consideration
10	And he introduced these two twin notions, one of	10	weigh equally across different types of scientific
11	scientific quality that had to do I think with the	11	questions.
12	question being asked about analgesic signal. And	12	In an explanatory trial, a trial with an
13	then he sort of parsed this into a second concept	13	explanatory goal, versus a trial that has a
14	or construct, which was regulatory quality, which	14	pragmatic goal, versus one that has an exploratory
15	was a little bit more about fidelity to the rules	15	goal, and how these different types of questions
16	of the trial and the execution piece.	16	that we ask in clinical trials I'm going to give
17	As a sort of preamble to my talk, I think	17	you an illustration of that in a moment how do
18	all of us need to think about, to the extent that	18	those different types of trials help us think about
19	we subscribe to these two constructs, what is their	19	how we would emphasize quality more or less in a
20	relationship? Is it hierarchical? Is the	20	particular case.
21	scientific somehow superior or more important or	21	So I'm going to start with this trial, which
22	privileged relative to the regulatory? Are they	22	last fall, a lot of people were talking about and I
	Page 102		Page 104
	Page 102		Page 104
1	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And	1	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a
1 2	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And	1 2	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop
1 2 3	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether	1 2 3	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been
1 2 3 4	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or	1 2 3 4	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today.
1 2 3 4 5	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to	1 2 3 4 5	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more colloquially, if you have a hierarchical	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain syndromes. And the take-home message of the study
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more colloquially, if you have a hierarchical relationship, and you put the scientific on top, I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain syndromes. And the take-home message of the study was peripheral neuropathic pain stratified by
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more colloquially, if you have a hierarchical relationship, and you put the scientific on top, I think you sort of run the risk of saying that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain syndromes. And the take-home message of the study was peripheral neuropathic pain stratified by phenotype. And I know there are different views in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more colloquially, if you have a hierarchical relationship, and you put the scientific on top, I think you sort of run the risk of saying that foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain syndromes. And the take-home message of the study was peripheral neuropathic pain stratified by phenotype. And I know there are different views in the room on NNTs, but this is one way of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more colloquially, if you have a hierarchical relationship, and you put the scientific on top, I think you sort of run the risk of saying that foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, and you sort of take the Emersonian view	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain syndromes. And the take-home message of the study was peripheral neuropathic pain stratified by phenotype. And I know there are different views in the room on NNTs, but this is one way of illustrating there was a difference by phenotype.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more colloquially, if you have a hierarchical relationship, and you put the scientific on top, I think you sort of run the risk of saying that foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, and you sort of take the Emersonian view that somehow the details are not quite that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain syndromes. And the take-home message of the study was peripheral neuropathic pain stratified by phenotype. And I know there are different views in the room on NNTs, but this is one way of illustrating there was a difference by phenotype. Basically, the notion of this trial was the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more colloquially, if you have a hierarchical relationship, and you put the scientific on top, I think you sort of run the risk of saying that foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, and you sort of take the Emersonian view that somehow the details are not quite that important; whereas if you say they are on par, in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain syndromes. And the take-home message of the study was peripheral neuropathic pain stratified by phenotype. And I know there are different views in the room on NNTs, but this is one way of illustrating there was a difference by phenotype. Basically, the notion of this trial was the idea that the irritable nociceptor phenotype, which
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more colloquially, if you have a hierarchical relationship, and you put the scientific on top, I think you sort of run the risk of saying that foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, and you sort of take the Emersonian view that somehow the details are not quite that important; whereas if you say they are on par, in my mind, what you're suggesting is sort of God is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain syndromes. And the take-home message of the study was peripheral neuropathic pain stratified by phenotype. And I know there are different views in the room on NNTs, but this is one way of illustrating there was a difference by phenotype. Basically, the notion of this trial was the idea that the irritable nociceptor phenotype, which is related to sensitization of the unmyelinated
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more colloquially, if you have a hierarchical relationship, and you put the scientific on top, I think you sort of run the risk of saying that foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, and you sort of take the Emersonian view that somehow the details are not quite that important; whereas if you say they are on par, in my mind, what you're suggesting is sort of God is in the details, in the sense that when Flaubert	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain syndromes. And the take-home message of the study was peripheral neuropathic pain stratified by phenotype. And I know there are different views in the room on NNTs, but this is one way of illustrating there was a difference by phenotype. Basically, the notion of this trial was the idea that the irritable nociceptor phenotype, which is related to sensitization of the unmyelinated cutaneous nociceptors, and where there was small
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more colloquially, if you have a hierarchical relationship, and you put the scientific on top, I think you sort of run the risk of saying that foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, and you sort of take the Emersonian view that somehow the details are not quite that important; whereas if you say they are on par, in my mind, what you're suggesting is sort of God is in the details, in the sense that when Flaubert said that, he was saying that with a really	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain syndromes. And the take-home message of the study was peripheral neuropathic pain stratified by phenotype. And I know there are different views in the room on NNTs, but this is one way of illustrating there was a difference by phenotype. Basically, the notion of this trial was the idea that the irritable nociceptor phenotype, which is related to sensitization of the unmyelinated cutaneous nociceptors, and where there was small fiber function preserved again, that has a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more colloquially, if you have a hierarchical relationship, and you put the scientific on top, I think you sort of run the risk of saying that foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, and you sort of take the Emersonian view that somehow the details are not quite that important; whereas if you say they are on par, in my mind, what you're suggesting is sort of God is in the details, in the sense that when Flaubert said that, he was saying that with a really important creation or a significant scientific	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain syndromes. And the take-home message of the study was peripheral neuropathic pain stratified by phenotype. And I know there are different views in the room on NNTs, but this is one way of illustrating there was a difference by phenotype. Basically, the notion of this trial was the idea that the irritable nociceptor phenotype, which is related to sensitization of the unmyelinated cutaneous nociceptors, and where there was small fiber function preserved again, that has a particular and I won't go too deeply into the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 102 are on par? Are they on an equal footing? And does it matter the question you are asking? And the way they are balanced might depend whether you're doing a phase 3 confirmatory trial or whether you're doing a phase 2 exploratory study to develop differential response to a certain neuropathic pain phenotype. And maybe how you weight these things will be different. The way I was thinking about more colloquially, if you have a hierarchical relationship, and you put the scientific on top, I think you sort of run the risk of saying that foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, and you sort of take the Emersonian view that somehow the details are not quite that important; whereas if you say they are on par, in my mind, what you're suggesting is sort of God is in the details, in the sense that when Flaubert said that, he was saying that with a really important creation or a significant scientific work, it's equally inspiring or equally powerful as	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 104 found particularly interesting. And this is a small trial done at a relatively small shop compared to a lot of the trials that we've been talking about today. This is a study looking at the effect of oxcarbazepine on peripheral neuropathic pain, and it asked the question whether a response to oxcarbazepine was differential with different phenotypes of peripheral nerve injury pain syndromes. And the take-home message of the study was peripheral neuropathic pain stratified by phenotype. And I know there are different views in the room on NNTs, but this is one way of illustrating there was a difference by phenotype. Basically, the notion of this trial was the idea that the irritable nociceptor phenotype, which is related to sensitization of the unmyelinated cutaneous nociceptors, and where there was small fiber function preserved again, that has a particular and I won't go too deeply into the weeds here, but this obviously has a very

Page 105 Page 107 1 findings that would respond differentially to 1 sense of regulatory quality in the sense that we're 2 oxcarbazepine than a picture, which was the sort of 3 asking of these large phase 3 confirmatory trials, 3 non-irritable nociceptor phenotype, the 3 where a drug is going to go into millions, if not 4 deafferented small fiber picture with profound pain 4 tens of millions, of patients. 5 and temperature impairment, and oftentimes 5 But there is an enormous amount of 6 associated with allodynia. 7 going to be studied further and further. How do we 9 would respond differentially to oxcartazepine with 9 study like this differently than in a phase 2 10 found was very interesting. And 'm not going to 10 trial? 11 go into all the details, but they found that there 11 This is another trial, one that we recently 12 was a significant treatment by phenotype 11 this is another trial, one that we recently 13 interaction for the infrable nociceptor group. 14 underpowered because of drug tolerability. It was 15 schedule. I think it wan to 2400 milligrams, and 15 underpowered because of drug tolerability. It was 15 adverse side effects, which led to low power 20 and we'd only enroll them if we can induce moderate 2 arried forward, and basically they went
1 findings - that would respond differentially to 1 sense of regulatory quality in the sense that we're 2 oxarbazepine than a picture, which was the sort of 3 non-irritable nociceptor phenotype, the 4 deafferented small fiber picture with protound pain 4 calferented small fiber picture with protound pain 5 and temperature impairment, and offentimes 5 associated with allodynia. 7 Again, the hypothesis was that the compound 8 would respond differentially to oxarbazepine with 8 would respond differentially to oxarbazepine with 9 study like this trial, and 1 think it's 9 float was very interesting. And I'm not going to 11 or into all the details, but they found that there 11 go into all the details, but they found that there 11 This is another trial, one that we recently 11 as study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 13 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 13 adverse side effects, which led to low power 10 fourd design is a single-dose design, for a problem 20 utimately led them to do an analysis, which is 12 pain in the low back and legs that patients have 21 wery hard to follow in the manuscript, 31 percent of the patients correctly 12 paradigm where we put patients on the treadmill, 2 adverse side effects, which led to low power 2 where ad us everal treads 1 paradigm where we put patients on the treadmill, 2 me, and I'we rec
2 ackarba of these large phase 3 confirmatory trials, 3 ackarba of these large phase 3 confirmatory trials, 4 deafferented small fiber picture with profound pain 5 ackarba of these large phase 3 confirmatory trials, 4 ackarba of these large phase 3 confirmatory trials, 5 But there is an enormous amount of 6 associated with allodynia. 7 Again, the hypothesis was that the compound 8 would respond differentially to oxcarbazepine with 9 tess two different phenotypes. And what they 10 found was a significant treatment by phenotype 11 go into all the details, but they found that there 12 go into all the details, but they found that there 13 interaction for the irritable nociceptor group 14 relative to the other group. 15 But it was a vary aggressive dosing 16 fourprowered because of drug tolerability. It was 17 there is a single-dose design for a problem 18 butty. And as they say, the high dropout due to 19 novel design is a single-dose design, for a problem
a non-inflable nociceptor phenotype, the 4 deafferented small fiber picture with profound pain 3 where a drug is going to go into millions, if not 4 deafferented small fiber picture with profound pain 5 But there is an enormous amount of 6 associated with allodynia. 5 But there is an enormous amount of 7 Again, the hypothesis was that the compound 9 would respond differentially to oxcarbazepine with 9 those two different phenotypes. And what they 10 found was very interesting. And I'm not going to 10 go into all the details, but they found that there 11 This is another trial, one that we recently 12 was a significant treatment by phenotype 12 published, which has a slightly different set of 13 interaction for the irritable nociceptor group 13 issues, but also was underpowered because of drug torelability. It was 14 relative to the other group. 14 underpowered because one of the study drugs was 15 sockedule. I think it went to 2400 milligrams, and 15 underpowered because one of the study drugs was 15 subjects screened to what they would hop to 13 havers aide effects, which hat set for 12 way hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 1 paradigm where we put patients have 12 way hard that they used last observation 2 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 14 nowel dots prandomized, and end up with only 3 subj
4 deafferented small fiber picture with profound pain 4 tens of millions, of patients. 5 and temperature impairment, and oftentimes 5 associated with allodynia. 6 associated with allodynia. 5 But there is an enormous amount of 7 Again, the hypothesis was that the compound 5 But there is an enormous amount of 9 ould respond differentially to oxcarbazepine with 9 thick about how we approach quality evaluation in a 9 ould respond differentially to oxcarbazepine with 9 thick about how we approach quality evaluation in a 10 found as very interesting. And I'm not going to 10 trial? 11 go into all the details, but they found that there 10 trial? 12 was a significant treatment by phenotype 10 trial? 13 interaction for the iritiable nociceptor group 11 This is another trial, one that we recently 14 relative to the other group. 14 underpowered because of drug tolerability. It was 15 but it was a very aggressive dosing 15 underpowered because one of the study drugs was 16 schedule. I think it went to 2400 miligrams, and 17 thes was a nonalysis, which is 19 adverse side effects, which led to low power 20 called norm the market, so basically we terminated 10 traction due analysis, which is 10 paradigm where we put patients on the treadmill, 2 carried forward, and basically
2 and temperature impairment, and offentimes 5 But there is an enormous amount of 6 associated with allodynia. 5 But there is an enormous amount of 7 Again, the hypothesis was that the compound 5 But there is an enormous amount of 9 dissociated with allodynia. 7 going to be studied further and further. How do we 10 found was very interesting. And I'm not going to 11 This is another trial, one that we recently 11 go into all the details, but they found that there 12 Published, which has a slightly different set of 13 interaction for the irritable nociceptor group. 14 Inderpowered because of drug tolerability. It was 15 But it was a very aggressive dosing 15 underpowered because one of the study drugs was 16 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 18 Sut this was a novel design, again. Our 19 adverse side effects, which led to low power 20 call deal deal score and to which which is 20 ultimately led them to do a malayis, which is 19 The was a single-dose design is a single-dose design, again. Our 19 adverse side effects, which led to low power 20 call deal deal mount of pobent 21 ure yead that they used last observation 2 and weld ony enourol thichoput enore
 a stochypenetic and a structure of a second and the structure of a second a structure of a second a structure of a st
Again, the hypothesis was that the compound a would respond differentially to excarbazepine with b found was very interesting. And I'm not going to b found was very interesting. And I'm not going to c found was very interesting. And I'm not going to b found was very interesting. And I'm not going to c found was very interesting. And I'm not going to c found was very interesting. And I'm not going to s double studied further and further. How do we c found was very interesting. And I'm not going to s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further and further. How do we s double studied further
Participantical index in the details, but they found that they 9 bins to base database function. In the the the 10 found was very interesting. And ifm not going to 10 that? 10 that? 11 go into all the details, but they found that there 10 that? 10 that? 12 go into all the details, but they found that there 10 that? 10 that? 12 go into all the details, but they found that there 11 This is another trial, one that we recently 12 was a significant treatment by phenotype 12 builtsed, which has a slightly different set of 13 interaction for the initiable nociceptor group. 13 insues, but also was underpowered. And it wasn't 14 relative to the other group. 13 insues, but also was underpowered because on of the study drugs was 16 subjects, which led to low power 14 underpowered because on of the study drugs was 16 subjects are very arge amount of dropout in this 15 underpowered because on of the study drugs was 10 were seide effects, which led to low power 16 pulled from the market, so basically we terminated 17 the study and basically they went from 281 3 subjects screened to
a those two different phenotypes. And what they 9 study like this different phenotypes. 10 found was very interesting. And I'm not going to 11 go into all the details, but they found that there 11 go into all the details, but they found that there 11 This is another trial, one that we recently 12 was a significant treatment by phenotype 12 published, which has a slightly different set of 13 interaction for the irritable nociceptor group 13 issues, but also was underpowered. And it wasn't 14 relative to the other group. 14 underpowered because of of the study drugs was 15 Subtil t was a very aggressive dosing 15 underpowered because of of the study drugs was 16 schedule. I think it went to 2400 milligrams, and 16 pulled from the market, so basically we terminated 17 there was a very large amount of dropout in this 17 the study early. 18 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 18 But this was a novel design, again. Our 19 adverse side effects, which led to low power 19 novel design is a single-dose design for a problem 20 utimately led them to do an analysis, which is 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 wery hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 22 when they are standing and walking. We used a 2 acried forward, and basically they went from 281 3 subjects. There is no irritable nociceptor 1
2 addy line this underlay that in the plase 2 10 found was very interesting. And I'm not going to 11 go into all the details, but they found that there 11 go into all the details, but they found that there 11 go into all the details, but they found that there 12 uses a significant treatment by phenotype 13 interaction for the irritable nociceptor group 14 relative to the other group. 15 But it was a very aggressive dosing 16 schedule. I think it went to 2400 milligrams, and 17 there was a very large amount of dropout the to 18 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 18 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 18 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 19 adverse side effects, which led to low power 20 uilimately led them to do an analysis, which is 21 very hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 22 me, and I've read it several times. 2 adverse side diffects, which hey went from 281 3 subjects. Screened to - what they would hope to 4 have would be 97 randomized, and end up wit
10 function was end of the details, but they found that there 10 that 11 go into all the details, but they found that there 11 This is another trial, one that we recently 12 was a significant treatment by phenotype 12 published, which has a slightly different set of 13 interaction for the irritable nociceptor group 13 issues, but also was underpowered because of drug tolerability. It was 14 relative to the other group. 14 underpowered because one of the study drugs was 15 But it was a very aggressive dosing 15 underpowered because one of the study drugs was 16 subjects, which led to low power 19 novel design is a single-dose design for a problem 20 ultimately led them to do an analysis, which is 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 yery hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 21 pain in the low back and legs that patients have 22 when they said that they used last observation 1 paradigm where we put patients on the treadmill, 2 carried forward, and basically they went from 281 3 pain form a baseline of mild pain. 3 subjects. There is no irritable nociceptor 5 <
11 guints and the question, but may both that the east of the transforment by phenotype 11 This is allother introphenotype 13 interaction for the irritable nociceptor group 13 issues, but also was underpowered. And it wasn't 14 relative to the other group. 14 underpowered because of drug tolerability. It was 15 But it was a very aggressive dosing 15 underpowered because of drug tolerability. It was 15 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 18 But this was a novel design, again. Our 19 adverse side effects, which led to low power 19 novel design is a single-dose design for a problem 20 ultimately led them to do an analysis, which is 20 alled neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 very hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 21 pain in the low back and legs that patients have 22 me, and I've read it several times. 20 and we'd only enroll them if we can induce moderate 3 subjects screened to what they would hope to 1 paradigm where we put patients on the treadmill, 2 and we'd only enroll them if we can induce moderate 3 pain from a baseline of mild pain. 4 have would be 97 randomized, and end up with onl
12 Page 106 12 public tree of the set of tree o
13 Interaction for the initiable indication power 14 initiable indication power 14 initiable indication power 15 But it was a very aggressive dosing 15 underpowered because of drug tolerability. It was 16 schedule. I think it went to 2400 milligrams, and 15 underpowered because one of the study drugs was 16 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 18 But it was a very aggressive dosing 17 there was a very large amount of dropout in this 16 pulled from the market, so basically we terminated 17 there was a very large amount of dropout due to 18 But th was a sovel design, again. Our 19 adverse side effects, which led to low power 19 novel design is a single-dose design for a problem 20 ultimately led them to do an analysis, which is 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 very hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 22 when they are standing and walking. We used a 16 page 108 1 paradigm where we put patients on the treadmill, 2 2 carried forward, and basically they went from 281 3 pain from a baseline of mild pain. 4 3 subjects. There is no
14 Inderpowered because of ubg ubreaming, in was 15 But it was a very aggressive dosing 15 16 schedule. I think it went to 2400 milligrams, and 16 17 there was a very large amount of dropout in this 17 18 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 18 But it was a very large amount of dropout in this 17 18 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 18 But this was a novel design, again. Our 19 adverse side effects, which led to low power 19 novel design is a single-dose design for a problem 20 ultimately led them to do an analysis, which is 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 very hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 21 pain in the low back and legs that patients have 22 me, and I've read it several times. 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is tha ve 2 me, and I've read it several times. 21 pain in the low back and legs that patients have 22 me, and I've read it several times. 20 and we'd only enroll them if we can induce moderate 3 subjects. Screened to what they would hope to 4 have would be 97 randomized, and end
15 But it was a very aggressive dosing 15 Underpowered because one of the study drugs was 16 schedule. I think it went to 2400 milligrams, and 16 pulled from the market, so basically we terminated 17 there was a very large amount of dropout in this 17 the study arly. 18 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 18 But this was a novel design, again. Our 19 adverse side effects, which led to low power 19 novel design is a single-dose design for a problem 20 ultimately led them to do an analysis, which is 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 very hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 22 me, and I've read it several times. 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 very hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 22 wen they are standing and walking. We used a 2 me, and I've read it several times. 20 wen they are standing and walking. We used a 1 They said that they used last observation 1 paradigm where we put patients on the treadmill, 2 carried forward, and basically they went from 281 a dawe
16 Schedule. Trimit it went to 2400 milligrams, and 16 pulse from the market, so basically we terminated 17 there was a very large amount of dropout in this 17 the study early. 18 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 19 novel design is a single-dose design for a problem 20 ultimately led them to do an analysis, which is 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 very hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 22 me, and I've read it several times. 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 yen, and I've read it several times. 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 wen, and I've read it several times. 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 wen, and I've read it several times. 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 me, and I've read it several times. 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 22 wen they are standing and walking. We used a 10 They said that they used last observation 1 pararidigm where we put patients on the treadmill,
17 there was a very large amount of dropout in this 18 study. And as they say, the high dropout due to 19 adverse side effects, which led to low power 20 ultimately led them to do an analysis, which is 21 very hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 22 me, and I've read it several times. Page 106 1 They said that they used last observation 2 carried forward, and basically they went from 281 3 subjects. There is no irritable nociceptor 6 phenotype placebo interaction at all when you look 1 this k they used their treatment allocation in period one 1 and &4 percent in period two. 12 So I think the question that this raises for 13 me is I hought this was a very important study. I 14 than eeds to be replicated and sort of revisited 15 But the fact that it was not sort of at the 9 manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly 10 We ended up terminating this study early. 11 thank learned a lot, and I think it's a study 12 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 14 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 15 that we do ind pain. <
18 Study. And as they say, the high aropout due to 19 adverse side effects, which led to low power 20 ultimately led them to do an analysis, which is 21 very hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 22 me, and I've read it several times. Page 106 Page 106 1 They said that they used last observation 2 carried forward, and basically they went from 281 3 subjects screened to what they would hope to 4 have would be 97 randomized, and end up with only 5 39 subjects. There is no irritable nociceptor 6 phentype placebo interaction at all when you look 7 at the data they provide. 8 As you learn further when you read the 9 manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly 10 guessed their treatment allocation in period one 11 and 84 percent in period two. 12 So I think the question that this raises for 13 me is I thought this was a very important study. I 14 than eeds to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17
19 adverse side effects, which led to low power 19 novel design is a single-dose design for a problem 20 ultimately led them to do an analysis, which is 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 very hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 21 pain in the low back and legs that patients have 22 when they are standing and walking. We used a Page 108 1 They said that they used last observation 1 paradigm where we put patients on the treadmill, 2 carried forward, and basically they went from 281 and we'd only enroll them if we can induce moderate 3 subjects screened to what they would hope to 4 Basically, this is a phase 2 clinical trial 5 39 subjects. There is no irritable nociceptor 6 phenotype placebo interaction at all when you look 7 at the data they provide. 7 trying to test a lot of compounds against this 8 8 As you learn further when you read the 9 active placebo controlled. 10 10 guessed their treatment allocation in period one 11 And the problem with that is that in terminating 12 So I think the question that this raises for 13 detect a 2-minute differe
20 uttrastely led them to do an analyss, which is 20 called neurogenic claudication, which is the evoked 21 very hard to follow in the manuscript, at least for 21 pain in the low back and legs that patients have 22 me, and I've read it several times. 22 when they are standing and walking. We used a Page 108 1 They said that they used last observation 2 when they are standing and walking. We used a 2 when they are standing and walking. We used a 22 Page 108 1 They said that they used last observation 2 and we'd only enroll them if we can induce moderate 3 subjects screened to what they would hope to 4 Basically, this is a phase 2 clinical trial 5 4 base cally, this is a phase 2 clinical trial 5 platform that we're trying to validate. This is 6 6 phenotype placebo interaction at all when you look 7 trying to test a lot of compounds against this 8 As you learn further when you read the 9 active placebo controlled. 10 10 guessed their treatment allocation in period one 11 And the problem with that is that in terminating
21 very hard to tollow in the manuscript, at least for 21 pain in the low back and legs that patients have 22 me, and I've read it several times. 22 when they are standing and walking. We used a Page 106 1 They said that they used last observation 1 2 carried forward, and basically they went from 281 23 when they are standing and walking. We used a 3 subjects screened to what they would hope to 4 4 have would be 97 randomized, and end up with only 5 5 39 subjects. There is no irritable nociceptor 4 6 phenotype placebo interaction at all when you look 7 7 at the data they provide. 8 8 As you learn further when you read the 9 9 manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly 10 10 guessed their treatment allocation in period one 11 11 and 84 percent in period two. 11 12 So I think the question that this raises for 13 13 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 11 14 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 12 15 that needs to be r
22 me, and I've read it several times. Page 106 Page 106 Page 106 Page 106 Page 108 1 They said that they used last observation 1 paradigm where we put patients on the treadmill, 2 and we'd only enroll them if we can induce moderate 3 subjects screened to what they would hope to 4 have would be 97 randomized, and end up with only 5 as ubjects. There is no irritable nociceptor 9 pain from a baseline of mild pain. 4 have would be 97 randomized, and end up with only 5 as ubjects. There is no irritable nociceptor 6 phenotype placebo interaction at all when you look 7 trying to test a lot of compounds against this 8 As you learn further when you read the 9 manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly 9 active placebo controlled. 10 We ended up terminating this study early. 11 and 84 percent in period two. 11 And the problem with that is that in terminating 12 earlier, basically it became underreported to 13 me is I thought this was a very important study. I 14 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 14 moderate pain intensity. 15 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 level of the threshold that we re looking for 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 when we originally designed it didn't mean that we 18 this study. 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory 19 w
Page 106Page 1061They said that they used last observation1paradigm where we put patients on the treadmill,2carried forward, and basically they went from 2812and we'd only enroll them if we can induce moderate3subjects screened to what they would hope to4have would be 97 randomized, and end up with only3539 subjects. There is no irritable nociceptor6phenotype placebo interaction at all when you look47at the data they provide.5platform that we're trying to validate. This is8As you learn further when you read the6very exploratory. It's a single-dose design,9manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly9active placebo controlled.10guessed their treatment allocation in period one10We ended up terminating this study early.11and 84 percent in period two.11And the problem with that is that in terminating12So I think the question that this raises for13detect a 2-minute difference in the onset of14think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study15But the fact that it was not sort of at the15because it raises some important questions. So for17when we originally designed it didn't mean that we18this study.14didn't learn anything. It basically learned that19I think from the point of view of regulatory19with a larger confidence interval, what we could
1They said that they used last observation1paradigm where we put patients on the treadmill,2carried forward, and basically they went from 281and we'd only enroll them if we can induce moderate3subjects screened to what they would hope toand we'd only enroll them if we can induce moderate4have would be 97 randomized, and end up with onlybasically, this is a phase 2 clinical trial539 subjects. There is no irritable nociceptor56phenotype placebo interaction at all when you look67at the data they provide.78As you learn further when you read the89manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly910guessed their treatment allocation in period one1011and 84 percent in period two.1112So I think the question that this raises for1213me is I thought this was a very important study. I1314think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study1415that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited1516because it raises some important questions. So for1617me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in1718this study.1819I think from the point of view of regulatory1914think from the point of view of regulatory19
 2 carried forward, and basically they went from 281 3 subjects screened to what they would hope to 4 have would be 97 randomized, and end up with only 5 39 subjects. There is no irritable nociceptor 6 phenotype placebo interaction at all when you look 7 at the data they provide. 8 As you learn further when you read the 9 manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly 10 guessed their treatment allocation in period one 11 and 84 percent in period two. 12 So I think the question that this raises for 13 me is I thought this was a very important study. I 14 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 15 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory
 3 subjects screened to what they would hope to 4 have would be 97 randomized, and end up with only 5 39 subjects. There is no irritable nociceptor 6 phenotype placebo interaction at all when you look 7 at the data they provide. 8 As you learn further when you read the 9 manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly 10 guessed their treatment allocation in period one 11 and 84 percent in period two. 12 So I think the question that this raises for 13 me is I thought this was a very important study. I 14 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 15 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory
4have would be 97 randomized, and end up with only5539 subjects. There is no irritable nociceptor56phenotype placebo interaction at all when you look57at the data they provide.68As you learn further when you read the99manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly910guessed their treatment allocation in period one1011and 84 percent in period two.1112So I think the question that this raises for1213me is I thought this was a very important study. I1314think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study1415that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited1516because it raises some important questions. So for1517me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in1718this study.19I think from the point of view of regulatory
 5 39 subjects. There is no irritable nociceptor 6 phenotype placebo interaction at all when you look 7 at the data they provide. 8 As you learn further when you read the 9 manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly 9 guessed their treatment allocation in period one 10 guessed their treatment allocation in period one 11 and 84 percent in period two. 12 So I think the question that this raises for 13 me is I thought this was a very important study. I 14 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 15 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory 5 platform that we're trying to validate. This is 5 overy exploratory. It's a single-dose design, 7 trying to test a lot of compounds against this 8 very, very common clinical pattern. And it was 9 active placebo controlled. 10 We ended up terminating this study early. 11 And the problem with that is that in terminating 12 earlier, basically it became underreported to 13 detect a 2-minute difference in the onset of 14 moderate pain intensity. 15 But the fact that it was not sort of at the 16 level of the threshold that we were looking for 17 when we originally designed it didn't mean that we 18 didn't learn anything. It basically learned that 19 with a larger confidence interval, what we could
 6 phenotype placebo interaction at all when you look 7 at the data they provide. 8 As you learn further when you read the 9 manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly 9 guessed their treatment allocation in period one 10 guessed their treatment allocation in period one 11 and 84 percent in period two. 12 So I think the question that this raises for 13 me is I thought this was a very important study. I 14 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 15 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory 6 very exploratory. It's a single-dose design, 7 trying to test a lot of compounds against this 8 very, very common clinical pattern. And it was 9 active placebo controlled. 10 We ended up terminating this study early. 11 And the problem with that is that in terminating 12 earlier, basically it became underreported to 13 detect a 2-minute difference in the onset of 14 moderate pain intensity. 15 But the fact that it was not sort of at the 16 level of the threshold that we were looking for 17 when we originally designed it didn't mean that we 18 didn't learn anything. It basically learned that 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory
 7 at the data they provide. 8 As you learn further when you read the 9 manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly 9 guessed their treatment allocation in period one 11 and 84 percent in period two. 12 So I think the question that this raises for 13 me is I thought this was a very important study. I 14 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 15 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory 7 trying to test a lot of compounds against this 8 very, very common clinical pattern. And it was 9 active placebo controlled. 10 We ended up terminating this study early. 11 And the problem with that is that in terminating 12 earlier, basically it became underreported to 13 detect a 2-minute difference in the onset of 14 moderate pain intensity. 15 But the fact that it was not sort of at the 16 level of the threshold that we were looking for 17 when we originally designed it didn't mean that we 18 didn't learn anything. It basically learned that 19 with a larger confidence interval, what we could
 As you learn further when you read the manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly guessed their treatment allocation in period one and 84 percent in period two. So I think the question that this raises for So I think the question that this raises for We ended up terminating this study early. And the problem with that is that in terminating earlier, basically it became underreported to detect a 2-minute difference in the onset of think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited because it raises some important questions. So for me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in this study. I think from the point of view of regulatory weisy, very common clinical pattern. And it was very, very common clinical pattern. And it was very, very common clinical pattern. And it was wery, very common clinical pattern. And it was wery, very common clinical pattern. And it was active placebo controlled. We ended up terminating this study early. And the problem with that is that in terminating earlier, basically it became underreported to detect a 2-minute difference in the onset of moderate pain intensity. But the fact that it was not sort of at the level of the threshold that we were looking for when we originally designed it didn't mean that we didn't learn anything. It basically learned that with a larger confidence interval, what we could
 9 manuscript, 81 percent of the patients correctly 9 active placebo controlled. 9 active placebo controlled. 10 We ended up terminating this study early. 11 And the problem with that is that in terminating 12 So I think the question that this raises for 13 me is I thought this was a very important study. I 14 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 15 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory 9 active placebo controlled. 10 We ended up terminating this study early. 11 And the problem with that is that in terminating 12 earlier, basically it became underreported to 13 detect a 2-minute difference in the onset of 14 moderate pain intensity. 15 But the fact that it was not sort of at the 16 level of the threshold that we were looking for 17 when we originally designed it didn't mean that we 18 didn't learn anything. It basically learned that 19 with a larger confidence interval, what we could
 10 guessed their treatment allocation in period one 11 and 84 percent in period two. 12 So I think the question that this raises for 13 me is I thought this was a very important study. I 14 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 15 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 10 We ended up terminating this study early. 11 And the problem with that is that in terminating 12 earlier, basically it became underreported to 13 detect a 2-minute difference in the onset of 14 moderate pain intensity. 15 But the fact that it was not sort of at the 16 level of the threshold that we were looking for 17 when we originally designed it didn't mean that we 18 didn't learn anything. It basically learned that 19 with a larger confidence interval, what we could
 11 and 84 percent in period two. 12 So I think the question that this raises for 13 me is I thought this was a very important study. I 14 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 15 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 11 And the problem with that is that in terminating 12 earlier, basically it became underreported to 13 detect a 2-minute difference in the onset of 14 moderate pain intensity. 15 But the fact that it was not sort of at the 16 level of the threshold that we were looking for 17 when we originally designed it didn't mean that we 18 didn't learn anything. It basically learned that 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory
12So I think the question that this raises for12earlier, basically it became underreported to13me is I thought this was a very important study. I13detect a 2-minute difference in the onset of14think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study14moderate pain intensity.15that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited15But the fact that it was not sort of at the16because it raises some important questions. So for16level of the threshold that we were looking for17me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in17when we originally designed it didn't mean that we18this study.18didn't learn anything. It basically learned that19I think from the point of view of regulatory19with a larger confidence interval, what we could
 13 me is I thought this was a very important study. I 14 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 15 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory 13 detect a 2-minute difference in the onset of 14 moderate pain intensity. 15 But the fact that it was not sort of at the 16 level of the threshold that we were looking for 17 when we originally designed it didn't mean that we 18 didn't learn anything. It basically learned that 19 with a larger confidence interval, what we could
 14 think I learned a lot, and I think it's a study 15 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 14 moderate pain intensity. 15 But the fact that it was not sort of at the 16 level of the threshold that we were looking for 17 when we originally designed it didn't mean that we 18 didn't learn anything. It basically learned that 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory
 15 that needs to be replicated and sort of revisited 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory 15 But the fact that it was not sort of at the 16 level of the threshold that we were looking for 17 when we originally designed it didn't mean that we 18 didn't learn anything. It basically learned that 19 with a larger confidence interval, what we could
 16 because it raises some important questions. So for 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory 16 level of the threshold that we were looking for 17 when we originally designed it didn't mean that we 18 didn't learn anything. It basically learned that 19 with a larger confidence interval, what we could
 17 me, there is a fair amount of scientific quality in 18 this study. 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory 17 when we originally designed it didn't mean that we 18 didn't learn anything. It basically learned that 19 with a larger confidence interval, what we could
18 this study.18 didn't learn anything. It basically learned that19 I think from the point of view of regulatory19 with a larger confidence interval, what we could
 19 I think from the point of view of regulatory 19 with a larger confidence interval, what we could
12 mar a larger connectively what we could
20 quality obviously we just heard about LOCE 20 really say was that the results suggested in this
21 analysis, we've talked about a study being 21 case oxymorphone and propoxyphene-acetaminophen

Pa	in Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 109		Page 111
1	evidence that it demonstrated basically providing	1	changing environment. That's one thought.
2	any more than 5 minutes of low pain walking.	2	Another thought is that these are the
3	So we wanted it to be 2 minutes. It turned	3	largest employers and the economic engines in the
4	out it was 5 minutes. Now, whether that's	4	region when you read their annual reports. I think
5	clinically relevant or not and whether we should be	5	that this has a little bit reprioritized the
6	allowed to change our prespecified endpoint is an	6	commercial interests in the output of a clinical
7	important question to ask. But I do think for us,	7	trial, and that has implications when you're trying
8	there is some scientific good quality to this.	8	to do a small trial and there is maybe some
9	There is obviously not regulatory quality. So,	9	potential intellectual property. It makes
10	again, how would we think about this differently,	10	contracting harder. It makes it harder to be a
11	. this flexibility?	11	small site because the level of scrutiny even any
12	So I'm going to talk now about with that	12	trial you do gets at the level of contracting. It
13	preamble, I'm going to talk about the spectrum of	13	just creates a whole other level of review, in my
14	academic clinical sites because I'm giving the	14	experience, and in terms of attention, and it makes
15	academic talk, and then I'm going to talk about	15	a little harder to work in that environment.
16	data quality, and then I'll talk about some future	16	There is also an increasing division of
17	considerations.	17	labor in these large systems where there aren't
18	So an academic medical center this is the	18	really that many clinician researcher investigators
19	academic talk. But we all know that what it means	19	anymore. You're being asked to sort of
20	to be an academic medical center is something which	20	differentiate from you're not going to be a
21	is in an incredible amount of flux. There are 119	21	triple set anymore. That really is going to go
22	or so of them in the United States, and they're	22	away.
	Page 110		Page 112
1	. very diverse. They're very different. And they	1	I think at certain institutions, like the
2	are rapidly becoming these regional networks where	2	University of Washington, where there is \$1 billion
3	we have a set of laws how, which is turning them	3	almost of annual funding and sponsored funding and
4	into either duopolies or triopolies in major	4	a few others, that may not be the case. But in the
5	i cities.	5	vast majority of those 119 medial centers, I do
6	That has important implications for patient	6	think that the imperatives of serving their local
7	fraud, of course, because that means that basically	7	region and living up to the Affordable Care Act
8	every one of us is going to be in one of these	8	will not really allow for a system that has people
9	large systems' medical records very soon, if you're	9	who want to live this hybrid life where they
10	not already, and it's going to be and I know	10	practice 40 percent of the time and do research

- 11 Dr. Rauck was raising this issue about let a
- 12 monitor sit in front of your Epic console or your 13 Cerner system.

But there are basically three large medical 14 15 records out there. It's a very consolidated 16 industry. The hospital industry is getting more 17 and more consolidated. Physicians are employees, 18 and basically there aren't going to be that many 19 medical systems out there, and we're all going to 20 be in these systems.

- 21 So I think some of the fraud issues are
- 22 going to be harder and harder to achieve in this

13 to sort of differentiate further. Then lastly, I think that as we've talked

12 our institution, I think there's a lot of pressure

14

11 60 percent of some variation there. At least at

- about a lot, there are less training opportunities 15
- 16 in these environments, and one of the reasons there
- 17 are less training opportunities is because we're
- moving sort of to a winner-take-all funding of the 18
- 19 infrastructure of these places.
- If your institution has a CTSA or a CTSI, 20
- 21 you have a huge largess from the government, which
- 22 supports this infrastructure not only for training

	Page 113		Page 115
1	future investigators, but also supporting a lot of	1	because they go to study site trainings, and we
2	pilot work where people get skills.	2	send them off to organizational trainings through
3	But the reality is that the grants that are	3	the ACR and others.
4	sort of in the next tier down are far, far smaller,	4	But the reality is there is not as much sort
5	and the ability to support a robust clinical	5	of moment-to-moment supervision of sites in an
6	research infrastructure for a lot of those 120	6	academic center for those that are doing sort of
7	academic medical centers is going to go away,	7	non-industry trials. There are some, but it
8	because they're not going to be in the 25 or 30	8	certainly pales in comparison to the kind of
9	places that get those big grants.	9	moment-to-moment supervision you would have if you
10	So I think that there is going to be an	10	were, say, doing clinical work.
11	erosion in who is an academic medical center and	11	If you tried to take a patient with an OR
12	what that means over the next 15 years, because	12	and don't sign the day of surgery update, nobody
13	unless there is a real change in the funding	13	will hang the bag of antibiotic. That's happening
14	environment, I think what an academic medical	14	in real time. That's not some monitor call at the
15	center is will look very different. So that's just	15	end of the day, that's not some query that you're
16	a simple preamble.	16	answering. That's a query that's right now every
17	So what is it like in an academic medical	17	second of every day.
18	center when you're running a research enterprise?	18	So even though there are some checks, and
19	Well, I think all of us probably have relatively	19	the IRB will come and they'll audit your site and
20	similar structures at some level. There is an IRB,	20	make sure you're being compliant, that's happening
21	and there's a lot of, obviously, review that goes	21	in a real time lag. It's not happening in real
22	along with that, with the consent and a lot of	22	time, whereas in clinical practice at these
	Page 114		Page 116
			r age r to
1	ancillary reviews about risk and other things	1	institutions. It's literally happening on a
2	potentially.	2	minute-to-minute basis.
3	Then there is the projects administration	3	So again, what goes on in an academic
4	component, which has a lot to do with financial	4	medical center is I think very diverse. I'm the
5	reporting and budget allocation and CMS	5	little dot, the little yellow dot down there are
6	reconciliation of care and those sorts of details.	6	the bottom. I called this week to find out how
7	And a lot of the sort of quality checking there is	7	many investigator-initiated and clinical
8	just making sure that those two parts of the	8	research-sponsor studies there are at our
9	organization are talking and the data you submit to	9	Institution. There are almost 300. We have
10	one is reconciled with the other.	10	\$400 million of sponsored funding, and only
11	I hen there is the academic department level,	11	5 percent of that, really, \$20 million, is from
12			
13	scientific merit, which his very different from	12	dedicated drug trials.
	scientific merit, which his very different from department to department. I work in a department	12 13	dedicated drug trials. Now, there are different ways to account for
14	scientific merit, which his very different from department to department. I work in a department with 11 faculty, with one clinical investigator	12 13 14	dedicated drug trials. Now, there are different ways to account for that money, but it's a relatively small amount of
14 15	scientific merit, which his very different from department to department. I work in a department with 11 faculty, with one clinical investigator basically, and there are departments with 200	12 13 14 15	dedicated drug trials. Now, there are different ways to account for that money, but it's a relatively small amount of the total research pie when you think about the
14 15 16	scientific merit, which his very different from department to department. I work in a department with 11 faculty, with one clinical investigator basically, and there are departments with 200 faculty with 60 investigators or 60 people who are	12 13 14 15 16	dedicated drug trials. Now, there are different ways to account for that money, but it's a relatively small amount of the total research pie when you think about the organization and what their priorities are.
14 15 16 17	scientific merit, which his very different from department to department. I work in a department with 11 faculty, with one clinical investigator basically, and there are departments with 200 faculty with 60 investigators or 60 people who are doing some clinical projects. And the review	12 13 14 15 16 17	dedicated drug trials. Now, there are different ways to account for that money, but it's a relatively small amount of the total research pie when you think about the organization and what their priorities are. There's a broad range of investigators and
14 15 16 17 18	scientific merit, which his very different from department to department. I work in a department with 11 faculty, with one clinical investigator basically, and there are departments with 200 faculty with 60 investigators or 60 people who are doing some clinical projects. And the review process for scientific merit is very different	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	dedicated drug trials. Now, there are different ways to account for that money, but it's a relatively small amount of the total research pie when you think about the organization and what their priorities are. There's a broad range of investigators and sites. There are sites like mine, which are a
14 15 16 17 18 19	scientific merit, which his very different from department to department. I work in a department with 11 faculty, with one clinical investigator basically, and there are departments with 200 faculty with 60 investigators or 60 people who are doing some clinical projects. And the review process for scientific merit is very different across those different kinds of academic	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	dedicated drug trials. Now, there are different ways to account for that money, but it's a relatively small amount of the total research pie when you think about the organization and what their priorities are. There's a broad range of investigators and sites. There are sites like mine, which are a single investigator doing a combination of
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	scientific merit, which his very different from department to department. I work in a department with 11 faculty, with one clinical investigator basically, and there are departments with 200 faculty with 60 investigators or 60 people who are doing some clinical projects. And the review process for scientific merit is very different across those different kinds of academic departments.	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	dedicated drug trials. Now, there are different ways to account for that money, but it's a relatively small amount of the total research pie when you think about the organization and what their priorities are. There's a broad range of investigators and sites. There are sites like mine, which are a single investigator doing a combination of sponsored research studies, as well as
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	scientific merit, which his very different from department to department. I work in a department with 11 faculty, with one clinical investigator basically, and there are departments with 200 faculty with 60 investigators or 60 people who are doing some clinical projects. And the review process for scientific merit is very different across those different kinds of academic departments. Then at the site center, there is a lot of	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	dedicated drug trials. Now, there are different ways to account for that money, but it's a relatively small amount of the total research pie when you think about the organization and what their priorities are. There's a broad range of investigators and sites. There are sites like mine, which are a single investigator doing a combination of sponsored research studies, as well as investigator-initiated trials, and then there's a

	Page 117		Page 11	19
1	professors, where there is an entire clinical trial	1	that was really how we learned best practices,	
2	infrastructure, and they're leading multicenter.	2	because one-half percent of the funding from the	
3	international, investigator-initiated trials in	3	NIH is for clinical trials, some small, paltry	
4	Parkinson's disease and Huntington's study group,	4	amount.	
5	which are of a whole different order of magnitude.	5	So where was I going to get the skill set to	
6	They have their own in-house attorney and a core	6	do these trials? The only way to really earn	
7	team of biostatisticians and a materials	7	what's done in industry and the best practices	
8	department.	8	would be for me to do those trials and learn by	
9	You can imagine managing guality in these	9	going to investigator meetings, and sitting down	
10	two different types of environments, just	10	with monitors, and looking at the protocols myself	
11	completely different efforts. The amount of	11	and trying to figure out what to do.	
12	quality control you need and what you can ask is	12	I know Lee has addressed this and others,	
13	sort of like being a public company versus being a	13	but this is really the core issue. It was an	
14	tailor shop or a dry cleaners on your corner. You	14	on-the-job process where I learned one trial at a	
15	just can't ask whether it's in compliance for both	15	time.	
16	of those structures.	16	Again, I think that the question here when	
17	So I'm just going to give you a snapshot of	17	we think about quality, and this is what I tried to	
18	where my perspective comes from over the last five	18	raise in the beginning, is the attempts that we're	
19	years. I've been a primary investigator in	19	going to take to minimize sources of error at the	
20	probably about 20 trials. These are mostly in	20	level of identification, at the level of	
21	neuropathic pain and OA. They have been in small	21	prevention, at the level of management, again, may	
22	molecules, they have been in oral drugs, IV drugs,	22	not be exactly even across these two types of	
	Page 118		Page 12	20
1	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation	1	Page 12 enterprises.	20
1	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid-	1	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you	20
1 2 3	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label	1 2 3	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that	20
1 2 3 4	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you	1 2 3 4	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is	20
1 2 3 4 5	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area.	1 2 3 4 5	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John.	20
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space.	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot of crossover trials. And again, those are largely	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on quality for and how that might affect assay	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot of crossover trials. And again, those are largely in low back pain, but we also do trials with pain	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on quality for and how that might affect assay sensitivity when you have patients come into that	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot of crossover trials. And again, those are largely in low back pain, but we also do trials with pain syndrome phenotpying.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on quality for and how that might affect assay sensitivity when you have patients come into that same environment. And these are the kinds of	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot of crossover trials. And again, those are largely in low back pain, but we also do trials with pain syndrome phenotpying. We do them in outcome studies for our	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on quality for and how that might affect assay sensitivity when you have patients come into that same environment. And these are the kinds of quality issues which a lot of academic sites	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot of crossover trials. And again, those are largely in low back pain, but we also do trials with pain syndrome phenotpying. We do them in outcome studies for our department and larger pain in the community, and we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on quality for and how that might affect assay sensitivity when you have patients come into that same environment. And these are the kinds of quality issues which a lot of academic sites contend with. There are a lot of sites that have	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot of crossover trials. And again, those are largely in low back pain, but we also do trials with pain syndrome phenotpying. We do them in outcome studies for our department and larger pain in the community, and we also do a lot of things related to service delivery	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on quality for and how that might affect assay sensitivity when you have patients come into that same environment. And these are the kinds of quality issues which a lot of academic sites contend with. There are a lot of sites that have their own clinical practice.	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot of crossover trials. And again, those are largely in low back pain, but we also do trials with pain syndrome phenotpying. We do them in outcome studies for our department and larger pain in the community, and we also do a lot of things related to service delivery in pain, for example, in urine tox screens, where	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on quality for and how that might affect assay sensitivity when you have patients come into that same environment. And these are the kinds of quality issues which a lot of academic sites contend with. There are a lot of sites that have their own clinical practice. But I want to come now to the factory floor,	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot of crossover trials. And again, those are largely in low back pain, but we also do trials with pain syndrome phenotpying. We do them in outcome studies for our department and larger pain in the community, and we also do a lot of things related to service delivery in pain, for example, in urine tox screens, where for us the quality issue is really about the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on quality for and how that might affect assay sensitivity when you have patients come into that same environment. And these are the kinds of quality issues which a lot of academic sites contend with. There are a lot of sites that have their own clinical practice. But I want to come now to the factory floor, if you will, because I see myself doing clinical	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot of crossover trials. And again, those are largely in low back pain, but we also do trials with pain syndrome phenotpying. We do them in outcome studies for our department and larger pain in the community, and we also do a lot of things related to service delivery in pain, for example, in urine tox screens, where for us the quality issue is really about the laboratory more than it is about other issues in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on quality for and how that might affect assay sensitivity when you have patients come into that same environment. And these are the kinds of quality issues which a lot of academic sites contend with. There are a lot of sites that have their own clinical practice. But I want to come now to the factory floor, if you will, because I see myself doing clinical trials more in the manner of someone who has a	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot of crossover trials. And again, those are largely in low back pain, but we also do trials with pain syndrome phenotpying. We do them in outcome studies for our department and larger pain in the community, and we also do a lot of things related to service delivery in pain, for example, in urine tox screens, where for us the quality issue is really about the laboratory more than it is about other issues in that case.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on quality for and how that might affect assay sensitivity when you have patients come into that same environment. And these are the kinds of quality issues which a lot of academic sites contend with. There are a lot of sites that have their own clinical practice. But I want to come now to the factory floor, if you will, because I see myself doing clinical trials more in the manner of someone who has a little independent bookstore and every morning goes	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot of crossover trials. And again, those are largely in low back pain, but we also do trials with pain syndrome phenotpying. We do them in outcome studies for our department and larger pain in the community, and we also do a lot of things related to service delivery in pain, for example, in urine tox screens, where for us the quality issue is really about the laboratory more than it is about other issues in that case. But the main reason I do these sponsor	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on quality for and how that might affect assay sensitivity when you have patients come into that same environment. And these are the kinds of quality issues which a lot of academic sites contend with. There are a lot of sites that have their own clinical practice. But I want to come now to the factory floor, if you will, because I see myself doing clinical trials more in the manner of someone who has a little independent bookstore and every morning goes out and hoses off the sidewalks, and people come in	20
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 118 biologics, device studies, and neuromodulation tools, abuse-deterrent opioid formulations, opioid- induced constipation studies, long-term open label studies, and obviously every possible design you can imagine in that area. Then we have a lot of single-site investigator trials. I showed you a little snippet of one, a crossover trial for low back pain. And like many small investigators, I tend to do a lot of crossover trials. And again, those are largely in low back pain, but we also do trials with pain syndrome phenotpying. We do them in outcome studies for our department and larger pain in the community, and we also do a lot of things related to service delivery in pain, for example, in urine tox screens, where for us the quality issue is really about the laboratory more than it is about other issues in that case. But the main reason I do these sponsor trials, at least initially, was to gain the skill	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 12 enterprises. You know that today is my birthday, and you know that I'm a Gemini. And we have the sense that there are sort of two Johns in the world, there is placebo John and there is assay-sensitivity John. Right? And I live these two lives, and my office and my clinical research space are the same space. Neil Singla and I were talking about the challenges of what that might have impact on quality for and how that might affect assay sensitivity when you have patients come into that same environment. And these are the kinds of quality issues which a lot of academic sites contend with. There are a lot of sites that have their own clinical practice. But I want to come now to the factory floor, if you will, because I see myself doing clinical trials more in the manner of someone who has a little independent bookstore and every morning goes out and hoses off the sidewalks, and people come in and look at the new books; or running a micro	20

	Page 121		Page 123
1	brewery.	1	to be like but I think this has been something
2	The nuts and bolts of our organization when	2	which has been very powerful. I think.
3	we're doing clinical trials are the coordinators.	3	We talked a lot about patient engagement and
4	They are running the trials. They are doing every	4	making our patients our partners in research. It's
5	one of those assessments, and their office is only	5	incredibly important to make your coordinators your
6	eight feet from mine, and I'm talking to them all	6	partners in research, and you can see how important
7	day long about all these decisions. But I think	7	it is to them to feel like they're getting more
8	Rob pointed out this and it was very poignant to	8	consistent reports and they're beloing patients do
9	me they are the outs of this	9	that
10	So I wanted to ask them some direct	10	I think that rather than having them
11	questions and I did this in the couple weeks	11	convince the nation that they're on the wonder
12	before L came so we could hear from them	12	drug or trying to guess what they're on what
13	By the way, you don't get to be a	13	they're actually do with the natients is coach them
14	coordinator in my group unless you have gone to	14	into being better subjects
15	Catholic high school unless you want to West	15	That's a fairly neutral thing actually
16	Point You have to be a very rule-oriented person	16	think about it and I think that's actually a
17	You cannot be someone who studied the hermeneutics	17	fairly positive thing. And you can see how
10	of Franch modernism	10	important it is to them in their work because they
10	(Laughter)	10	are concerned about arbitraringer and rendempass
19	(Laughter.)	19	and you caw Maria, the first woman who spoke
20	DR. MARRIMAN because that's not what this	20	and you saw mana, the first woman who spoke,
21	rules and they just are completely rule bound	21	difference. She says "How do I know?" And that's
22	rules, and they just are completely rule-bound.	22	unerence. She says, now do'r know? And that's
	Page 122		Page 124
1	Page 122	1	Page 124
1	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are	1	Page 124 the right answer, right?
1 2 3	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you	1 2 3	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the
1 2 3	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be	1 2 3	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to
1 2 3 4	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a	1 2 3 4	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analogsic signal of the trial. She's
1 2 3 4 5	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use	1 2 3 4 5	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of those trials, as we learned	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want people on the ground using their own judgment every	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about what's your motivation for doing clinical trials
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want people on the ground using their own judgment every moment. You want people following the rules every	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about what's your motivation for doing clinical trials within an academic medical center Neil Singla and I were talking about this vesterday as
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want people on the ground using their own judgment every moment. You want people following the rules every moment.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about what's your motivation for doing clinical trials within an academic medical center Neil Singla and I were talking about this yesterday as
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want people on the ground using their own judgment every moment. You want people following the rules every moment. So I asked Maria, "What's the most important training experience you've had recently?" And here	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about what's your motivation for doing clinical trials within an academic medical center Neil Singla and I were talking about this yesterday as opposed to an independent research group that basically their business is doing clinical trials
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want people on the ground using their own judgment every moment. You want people following the rules every moment. So I asked Maria, "What's the most important training experience you've had recently?" And here is what she said	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about what's your motivation for doing clinical trials within an academic medical center Neil Singla and I were talking about this yesterday as opposed to an independent research group that basically their business is doing clinical trials,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want people on the ground using their own judgment every moment. You want people following the rules every moment. So I asked Maria, "What's the most important training experience you've had recently?" And here is what she said.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about what's your motivation for doing clinical trials within an academic medical center Neil Singla and I were talking about this yesterday as opposed to an independent research group that basically their business is doing clinical trials, whereas in my case, how do we choose which trial to do I think that's important
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want people on the ground using their own judgment every moment. So I asked Maria, "What's the most important training experience you've had recently?" And here is what she said. (Whereupon, a video recording was played.) DR_MARKMAN: I got chills when I sow this	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about what's your motivation for doing clinical trials within an academic medical center Neil Singla and I were talking about this yesterday as opposed to an independent research group that basically their business is doing clinical trials, whereas in my case, how do we choose which trial to do. I think that's important.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want people on the ground using their own judgment every moment. You want people following the rules every moment. So I asked Maria, "What's the most important training experience you've had recently?" And here is what she said. (Whereupon, a video recording was played.) DR. MARKMAN: I got chills when I saw this	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about what's your motivation for doing clinical trials within an academic medical center Neil Singla and I were talking about this yesterday as opposed to an independent research group that basically their business is doing clinical trials, whereas in my case, how do we choose which trial to do. I think that's important. I know Rick gave a great talk yesterday
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want people on the ground using their own judgment every moment. You want people following the rules every moment. So I asked Maria, "What's the most important training experience you've had recently?" And here is what she said. (Whereupon, a video recording was played.) DR. MARKMAN: I got chills when I saw this video. I was looking at this, and I was like, oh,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about what's your motivation for doing clinical trials within an academic medical center Neil Singla and I were talking about this yesterday as opposed to an independent research group that basically their business is doing clinical trials, whereas in my case, how do we choose which trial to do. I think that's important. I know Rick gave a great talk yesterday talking about how companies and CROs we're going to hear from David choose sites - But here in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 22	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want people on the ground using their own judgment every moment. You want people following the rules every moment. So I asked Maria, "What's the most important training experience you've had recently?" And here is what she said. (Whereupon, a video recording was played.) DR. MARKMAN: I got chills when I saw this video. I was looking at this, and I was like, oh, my god, we had this issue yesterday. Are you allowed to ratrain people on the cocle or con you:	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about what's your motivation for doing clinical trials within an academic medical center Neil Singla and I were talking about this yesterday as opposed to an independent research group that basically their business is doing clinical trials, whereas in my case, how do we choose which trial to do. I think that's important. I know Rick gave a great talk yesterday talking about how companies and CROs we're going to hear from David choose sites. But here is how sites choose trials
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want people on the ground using their own judgment every moment. You want people following the rules every moment. So I asked Maria, "What's the most important training experience you've had recently?" And here is what she said. (Whereupon, a video recording was played.) DR. MARKMAN: I got chills when I saw this video. I was looking at this, and I was like, oh, my god, we had this issue yesterday. Are you allowed to retrain people on the scale or can you only do it the first time? I was like on my and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about what's your motivation for doing clinical trials within an academic medical center Neil Singla and I were talking about this yesterday as opposed to an independent research group that basically their business is doing clinical trials, whereas in my case, how do we choose which trial to do. I think that's important. I know Rick gave a great talk yesterday talking about how companies and CROs we're going to hear from David choose sites. But here is how sites choose trials.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 122 I found two incredible women who are incredibly rule-bound, and you need that. And I think that David made a great point about why you would be concerned that your physician might be your clinical trial coordinator? I think it's a total concern because clinicians are taught to use their own judgment, and that's not what you should be doing in a lot of these trials, as we learned yesterday even about training. You don't want people on the ground using their own judgment every moment. You want people following the rules every moment. So I asked Maria, "What's the most important training experience you've had recently?" And here is what she said. (Whereupon, a video recording was played.) DR. MARKMAN: I got chills when I saw this video. I was looking at this, and I was like, oh, my god, we had this issue yesterday. Are you allowed to retrain people on the scale or can you only do it the first time? I was like, oh, my god,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 124 the right answer, right? She doesn't know if this makes a difference, and she's not doing it to make a difference on the outcome of a trial. She's not doing this to increase the analgesic signal of the trial. She's doing this to have a less sort of arbitrary interaction with these people, and that's her goal. And that's a more meaningful interaction with them. So I think it's important to talk about what's your motivation for doing clinical trials within an academic medical center Neil Singla and I were talking about this yesterday as opposed to an independent research group that basically their business is doing clinical trials, whereas in my case, how do we choose which trial to do. I think that's important. I know Rick gave a great talk yesterday talking about how companies and CROs we're going to hear from David choose sites. But here is how sites choose trials. What drives my choices are what I'm

	Page 125		Page 127
1	in trying to develop better pain treatments for the	1	I think that I'm part of a larger project.
2	problems that I see every day in practice for which	2	which is important and helpful to people. And
3	I have to stare at people and don't have good	3	again, this is not sort of my core sort of
4	answers, or I have drugs which are intolerable.	4	compensation. This is no compensation, basically.
5	unsafe, or don't help them very much.	5	This is just something that I think is important to
6	So I tend to be in trials that are related	6	do and offer something to my work every day on the
7	to the indications of the target populations where	7	larger purpose.
8	I see the unmet need every day in my practice, and	8	I think that's a different motivation to do
9	I feel it. And I also tend to be interested in	9	this kind of research than at other centers, and I
10	being in trials where, as I said, my team is going	10	do think that may or may not matter. I don't know
11	to learn best practices and learn from being in	11	how impacts quality, but I think it matters at some
12	those trials.	12	level.
13	We're going to learn how to do an IV trial	13	So we talk a little bit more about
14	or follow the potential immunologic complications	14	recruitment, because I think recruitment
15	of being on a biologic. And I want my team to	15	issues as we've touched on it a lot of ways.
16	learn how to do that, and collect those samples,	16	And I thought Dr. Kerns' comment about what we're
17	and send them down, and send them out, and store	17	really assessing for when we're screening patients
18	them in all those records, and do those follow-up	18	for a trial is sort of how engaged they might be
19	exams.	19	and things like that.
20	We participate in a certain herpetic pain	20	There's a whole covert set of screenings
21	trial because I want them to learn how to use a	21	before the inclusion/exclusion criteria, I think,
22	tuning fork. But that's a lot of how I choose to	22	when a site is looking at patients, which are not
	Page 126		Page 128
1	sort of decide what we're going to do.	1	as explicit perhaps as we think they are. And I
2	Now, they have a different agenda. They	2	thought that was a great, insightful comment.
3	have an entire Excel scoring sheet that they got at	3	This is from the WIRB application when
4	their own industry conference, which is probably	4	you're trying to fill this out, but this is the
5	like this, just in a bigger ballroom. And it comes	5	only thing I could find about incentives for
6	with a spreadsheet, which looks at different	6	enrolling patients. Will the PI or the research
7	components of clinical trial complexity,	7	team receive recruitment bonuses, yes or no?
8	inclusion/exclusion criteria, study design,	8	I hat's it in all of our work. And basically this
9	screening steps, the study procedures themselves,	9	IS NOW WIRE DEFINES A RECRUITMENT DONUS OF
10	the duration of the study. And you can see those	10	But atherwise, the university decer't really
11	from their epresidencet	10	specifically ask me too much about it. There are
12	So they're looking at operational	12	specifically ask the too much about it. There are
14	complexity. They're looking at and we both are	14	question like this. But this is really all we have
15	looking at the feasibility, can we get these	15	at our institution
16	natients? Can we keen these natients	16	So the other issue around recruitment is how
17	Then we're obviously also looking at the	17	do we recruit? And I am a convert I dot into a
1 P	financial impact and we've talked a little hit	1 8	sidebar conversation several years ago with lim
19	about financial incentives for folks in the system	19	Campbell who was here earlier about recruiting
20	obviously. My financial incentive for the system	20	for one of his trials. And he said I'm like
21	is to break even. I want to keep it going. This	21	"What's the secret? How do vou do it?" And he
22	makes my clinical life richer.	22	said to me, "Drive Time radio." I was like we're
~~~			

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2		
	Page 129		Page 131		
1	going to do Drive Time radio because that works.	1	recruitment, whether it's Twitter or anything else,		
2	I did a trial here this is just some	2	and we think about what are the reasons that		
3	graphs on we do an analysis on how we recruit	3	patients turn us down, and how is it different,		
4	patients to our trial to figure out how we're	4	whether it's concomitant medications or comorbid		
5	spending our time and our resources and what we're	5	pain conditions, and how is that different for the		
6	asking for.	6	radio group versus our in-office group.		
7	This is from 60 weeks of recruitment of our	7	There is a lot of artifact there, and it's		
8	first study with 260 screens, and we looked at the	8	only 260 patients, and it's a small sample, so I'm		
9	yield on patients who we looked to recruit from the	9	not presenting this as hardcore statistical data.		
10	office versus the folks we got from Drive Time. Of	10	I'm just telling you this is kind of how we		
11	course, I'm interested in who is listening to Jimmy	11	approach it as a shop to think about.		
12	Buffett and who is listening to Rush Limbaugh and	12	So I think academic sites in the future are		
13	whether that's going to separate differently for	13	going to have potentially some advantages, maybe.		
14	placebo versus other listening preferences.	14	Again, I think that one of the questions that we		
15	(Laughter.)	15	face, though and I heard the rap yesterday in		
16	These are the deeper questions which I'm	16	Rick's talk a little bit about I think our site		
17	interested in. But we spent a lot of time looking	17	has, in the past, had some low recruitment in some		
18	at these patients. And again, we don't know if	18	studies and a few others, we've been the highest		
19	these are better or worse patients.	19	recruiting site.		
20	I have spoken with some of you about this	20	But the question is what is the low		
21	before. There is some experience, I think, in the	21	recruitment and how does that relate to quality?		
22	psychiatry literature about how patients who are	22	And I definitely think, in my own personal biases,		
	Page 130		Page 132		
1	recruited by advertising might perform differently	1	there is definitely a relationship, especially with		
2	as a clinical subject than folks who are not	2	these large phase 3 trials		
3	We have found this to be an incredible	2	When I'm doing a 50-person crossover trial		
4	evaluator of recruit patients. I think as Neil	4	obviously we're going to do the recruiting We're		
5	made the point earlier, screening patients is	5	going to see all those patients. We're going to		
6	extremely laborious, and screening patients from a	6	know our own protocol. But I think that the first		
7	Drive Time radio ad is much more laborious because	7	person we enroll in a protocol on the 10th, we're		
8	we don't have their source records. They're not in	8	iust handling that differently. We know the		
9	our electronic medical record. They're out there	9	receipt, we know the drill, we're doing it again		
10	in the world driving around the freeways of New	10	and again.		
11	York. So we have to go collate and get all that	11	Everyone is kind of we have the flow		
12	information, and we have to rely on them to verify	12	diagram up on the wall. Everybody can just point		
13	what we do in a phone screen. So it is enormously	13	to exactly where the patient is, patient number 9.		
14	labor intensive, but it's very high yield for us.	14	It's not the same way with patient number 1. And		
15	When I say high yield, I mean we've got like 10	15	that uncertainty affects every interaction. So I		
16	patients out of 200-plus screened.	16	definitely think that being too low recruiting is		
17	Here is a little graph just about the	17	an issue with quality, and I think that again,		
18	different reasons why patients don't want to	18	one of the reasons I got interested in the Drive		
19	participate in our trials and how that shapes up	19	Time radio is because I thought it was a way to		
20	whether they come from radio or they come from our	20	improve our quality, because as we get more		
21	office.	21	patients into the trial, we'll be better at doing		
22	So we do this analysis on every mode of	22	that trial, and that matters to me.		

	Page 133		Page 135
1	So I do think it's important for a lot of	1	comes in, and they have an altered mental status,
2	these private sites that can recruit a lot of	2	they might have had an intracranial hemorrhage, I'm
3	patients. Obviously, there are dangers about the	3	concerned about that patient overnight. And I can
4	incentives, and I understand that, but I also think	4	tell the nursing staff to do q 10 minute neuro
5	there is an upside to volume. And I don't know	5	checks, g 10 minutes. Every 10 minutes they're
6	what the magic number is, and I don't know where	6	going to wake the patient up and shine a light in
7	you cross the threshold for guality, but I do think	7	their eyes, and disturb that patient's sleep to see
8	it's a compelling issue, in my opinion.	8	if their pupil is bigger or lower.
9	Again, we try to do one of the other ways	9	That patient is going to have a terrible
10	we try and address the recruitment issue is we do	10	clinical outcome because they're not going to sleep
11	multiple drug trials in the same population with	11	because they're going be woken up every 10 minutes
12	similar indications and the same drug class. And	12	to look at their pupil.
13	again that develops our expertise in dealing with	13	Now I'm anxious about that patient I want
14	that drug class	14	to make sure that nations detail and patient in waith
15	We've done the COWS now in six different	15	surveillance. But that's not going to help that
16	trials We're good at doing the COWS right? We	16	patient, and it's probably not going to change the
17	can do it on an iPad. We've got all these little	17	
10	tools that everyone develops, but we can do the	10	I think that that's what Valerie is getting
10	COWS and we're good at it. And my clinical	10	at in this thing, and she's doing it in her own
20	coordinators are good at it, and I know when they	20	way
20	do it it's done right	20	(Whereupon, a video recording was played.)
22	For me, that gives me the confidence that	21	DR MARKMAN: So she will stay there until
22		22	
	Page 134		Page 136
1	we're doing a better ich, because we've done six o	1	9:00 at night until every query is answered. She
2	these trials, and we use the same instruments	2	is not going to go home until they are buttoned up
3	Again these things are very helpful because they	2	and I know that and it's every day. But when you
4	are not specialists in managing opioids. I'm that	4	ask her to report in when the blood pressure is 139
5	any So the more comfortable they get though the	5	one day and 141 the next, and she's got to deal
6	better they are at handling every question and	6	with that and she's got 50 of those to deal with
7	query So that's why I do a lot of overlap in what	7	you can see that frustration and what that does to
2	Lover	2	ber work
9	So let me just talk to you a little bit	9	So again I think Aiay mentioned
10	about documentation. Let me come back to Valerie	10	earlier and I know this came up with Rick's
11	Lapproached Valerie from the cardiac surgeon She	11	comment as well about the sort of data
12	has been a cardiac CCU nurse. She worked and did	12	infrastructure that academic medical centers are
13	cardiac surgery, different types of protocols with	13	developing and whether that's going to have
14	valves and heart replacement for many years. And	14	important implications not only for source
15	then later in her career she came to us. She is	15	documents and looking at people's medical
16	an incredible coordinator	16	histories, but also important implications for
17	I think that one of the challenges one of	17	fraud
18	the challenges of clinical medicine but also	1 A	This is just a diagram of Enic, which is the
19	designing clinical trials is how much you're going	19	dominant large health care system electronic
20	to put upon people who are actually doing then	20	medical record in the country i2B2 which is able
21	trial.	21	to scrape that. So I can go look for for about
			te t
2.2	When I work in the neuro ICU and a patient	22	400,000 people. I can go look and see who is on
22	When I work in the neuro ICU and a patient	22	400,000 people, I can go look and see who is on

			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Page 137		Page 139
1	300 milligrams of gabapentin and who has a	1	Appreciate it.
2	neuropathic pain diagnosis right now with the click	2	(Applause.)
3	of a button. Now, there are some IRB issues around	3	DR. McDERMOTT: Thanks, John. I think that
4	that and recruiting through that if I'm not	4	demonstrated that some neurologists are able
5	touching that patient clinically, but we have the	5	actually to be listened to, incredible, and not
6	capability to do that now, and that's only to get	6	liars. At least I'm going to assume so. However,
7	more and more robust.	7	we can do a reliability check because we have
8	So I think that's going to have enormous	8	another neurologist who is going to come along, but
9	implications not only for source document	9	now give us the perspective from in contrast to
10	verification, but also for identifying fraud and	10	the academic medical center, the perspective from
11	also for recruitment ultimately. And obviously,	11	CROs, but also from industry about how they think
12	the goal is that we'll have an implication for	12	about these things and what they have to do
13	doing pragmatic clinical trials in the clinical	13	day-to-day in their actual operations.
14	record, as well, down the road.	14	So it is my pleasure to introduce Dr. David
15	So better recruitment and optimize source	15	Hewitt, who is a card-carrying neurologist.
16	document verification may be something on the	16	Presentation – David Hewitt
17	horizon in a consolidated health care system where	17	DR. HEWITT: Well, thank you for inviting me
18	your academic medical centers change.	18	here today. This is something that is really
19	So just to come back to the opening point,	19	important to me. In fact, I was at Merck, and some
20	again, are the quality considerations for	20	events that happened at Merck, actually probably
21	investigator-initiated clinical trials somehow	21	related to the quality of doing one particular
22	different or related to the clinical question or	22	trial, led me to the interest of going into a CRO,
	Page 138		Page 140
-	the design of the trial or the number of subjects?	1	at least for a while to try to understand some of
1	We know there will be no control statistical	1	the things that happened
2	monitoring for a trial with 20 patients in a	2	So in terms of my disclosures. Lam
4	crossover trial That's not a feasible	4	currently working with inVentive, which is a
5	recommendation	5	contract research organization/commercial contract
6	So the question is what are the types of	6	organization combined. As inVentive, we are
7	things which could be equally prioritized in an	7	involved in multiple large and small
8	investigator-initiated trial and what are the	8	hiopharmaceutical company studies and involved in a
9	this so which should be loss important?	Ŭ	siopharmacoulour company studies and interved in a
-	Inings which should be less important?	9	lot of commercial work as well. Before that I
10	In one sidebar we had vesterday, obviously.	9 10	lot of commercial work, as well. Before that, I worked for Merck, and before that. Johnson &
10 11	In one sidebar we had yesterday, obviously, the quality issues as they relate to the primary	9 10 11	lot of commercial work, as well. Before that, I worked for Merck, and before that, Johnson & Johnson. So most of you know me.
10 11 12	In one sidebar we had yesterday, obviously, the quality issues as they relate to the primary endpoint or adverse event reporting I think are	9 10 11 12	lot of commercial work, as well. Before that, I worked for Merck, and before that, Johnson & Johnson. So most of you know me. I wanted to talk about a few things. I have
10 11 12 13	In one sidebar we had yesterday, obviously, the quality issues as they relate to the primary endpoint or adverse event reporting I think are going to have to be of the highest priority and on	9 10 11 12 13	lot of commercial work, as well. Before that, I worked for Merck, and before that, Johnson & Johnson. So most of you know me. I wanted to talk about a few things. I have a different perspective a little bit. Part of it
10 11 12 13 14	In one sidebar we had yesterday, obviously, the quality issues as they relate to the primary endpoint or adverse event reporting I think are going to have to be of the highest priority and on an equal footing everywhere, in all trials. But	9 10 11 12 13 14	lot of commercial work, as well. Before that, I worked for Merck, and before that, Johnson & Johnson. So most of you know me. I wanted to talk about a few things. I have a different perspective a little bit. Part of it comes from being in big pharma. I've only been in
10 11 12 13 14 15	In one sidebar we had yesterday, obviously, the quality issues as they relate to the primary endpoint or adverse event reporting I think are going to have to be of the highest priority and on an equal footing everywhere, in all trials. But again, quality issues related to the signatures on	9 10 11 12 13 14 15	lot of commercial work, as well. Before that, I worked for Merck, and before that, Johnson & Johnson. So most of you know me. I wanted to talk about a few things. I have a different perspective a little bit. Part of it comes from being in big pharma. I've only been in the CRO industry for about a year. So I still
10 11 12 13 14 15 16	In one sidebar we had yesterday, obviously, the quality issues as they relate to the primary endpoint or adverse event reporting I think are going to have to be of the highest priority and on an equal footing everywhere, in all trials. But again, quality issues related to the signatures on the CVs an whether those are up-to-date, those	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	lot of commercial work, as well. Before that, I worked for Merck, and before that, Johnson & Johnson. So most of you know me. I wanted to talk about a few things. I have a different perspective a little bit. Part of it comes from being in big pharma. I've only been in the CRO industry for about a year. So I still carry a lot of my Merck view of the world. I
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	In one sidebar we had yesterday, obviously, the quality issues as they relate to the primary endpoint or adverse event reporting I think are going to have to be of the highest priority and on an equal footing everywhere, in all trials. But again, quality issues related to the signatures on the CVs an whether those are up-to-date, those administrative issues, may not be the core issue	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	lot of commercial work, as well. Before that, I worked for Merck, and before that, Johnson & Johnson. So most of you know me. I wanted to talk about a few things. I have a different perspective a little bit. Part of it comes from being in big pharma. I've only been in the CRO industry for about a year. So I still carry a lot of my Merck view of the world. I haven't lost that yet, and maybe a little bit of my
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	In one sidebar we had yesterday, obviously, the quality issues as they relate to the primary endpoint or adverse event reporting I think are going to have to be of the highest priority and on an equal footing everywhere, in all trials. But again, quality issues related to the signatures on the CVs an whether those are up-to-date, those administrative issues, may not be the core issue that's going to improve the ability to detect the	9 10 11 13 14 15 16 17 18	lot of commercial work, as well. Before that, I worked for Merck, and before that, Johnson & Johnson. So most of you know me. I wanted to talk about a few things. I have a different perspective a little bit. Part of it comes from being in big pharma. I've only been in the CRO industry for about a year. So I still carry a lot of my Merck view of the world. I haven't lost that yet, and maybe a little bit of my J&J view of the world, but definitely Merck
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	In one sidebar we had yesterday, obviously, the quality issues as they relate to the primary endpoint or adverse event reporting I think are going to have to be of the highest priority and on an equal footing everywhere, in all trials. But again, quality issues related to the signatures on the CVs an whether those are up-to-date, those administrative issues, may not be the core issue that's going to improve the ability to detect the analgesic signal or test your hypothesis in an	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	lot of commercial work, as well. Before that, I worked for Merck, and before that, Johnson & Johnson. So most of you know me. I wanted to talk about a few things. I have a different perspective a little bit. Part of it comes from being in big pharma. I've only been in the CRO industry for about a year. So I still carry a lot of my Merck view of the world. I haven't lost that yet, and maybe a little bit of my J&J view of the world, but definitely Merck oriented.
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	In one sidebar we had yesterday, obviously, the quality issues as they relate to the primary endpoint or adverse event reporting I think are going to have to be of the highest priority and on an equal footing everywhere, in all trials. But again, quality issues related to the signatures on the CVs an whether those are up-to-date, those administrative issues, may not be the core issue that's going to improve the ability to detect the analgesic signal or test your hypothesis in an investigator-initiated trial.	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	lot of commercial work, as well. Before that, I worked for Merck, and before that, Johnson & Johnson. So most of you know me. I wanted to talk about a few things. I have a different perspective a little bit. Part of it comes from being in big pharma. I've only been in the CRO industry for about a year. So I still carry a lot of my Merck view of the world. I haven't lost that yet, and maybe a little bit of my J&J view of the world, but definitely Merck oriented. I want to talk a little bit about quality by
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	In one sidebar we had yesterday, obviously, the quality issues as they relate to the primary endpoint or adverse event reporting I think are going to have to be of the highest priority and on an equal footing everywhere, in all trials. But again, quality issues related to the signatures on the CVs an whether those are up-to-date, those administrative issues, may not be the core issue that's going to improve the ability to detect the analgesic signal or test your hypothesis in an investigator-initiated trial. So I'm going to stop there. I want to thank	9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	lot of commercial work, as well. Before that, I worked for Merck, and before that, Johnson & Johnson. So most of you know me. I wanted to talk about a few things. I have a different perspective a little bit. Part of it comes from being in big pharma. I've only been in the CRO industry for about a year. So I still carry a lot of my Merck view of the world. I haven't lost that yet, and maybe a little bit of my J&J view of the world, but definitely Merck oriented. I want to talk a little bit about quality by design, the need for that it's more than just a
	Page 141		Page 143
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
1	interested in, which is really not just the	1 like ma	ajor things, like rater training. They say,
2	quality, I should say, of the clinical trial and	2 "Well,	we'll just pas by the rater training. You
3	the integrity of the data, it's really the quality	3 know,	well just give us the Reader's Digest version
4	of the product that you're going to bring to market	4 of that	" "
5	that people are going to take, and it's going to	5 T	he other thing is that small companies burn
6	potentially impact their lives.	6 throug	h cash verify quickly, and they can actually
7	That's important because I do think that the	7 lose m	noney as they're waiting for the first patient
8	higher the quality is, before it even hits a	8 to be e	entered, which I think is a really stressful
9	patient and before it gets into a phase 3 study,	9 experi	ence for them.
10	the higher the quality that phase 3 study will be,	о. А	lso, their goal is often to be sold or to
11	as well. That would be my argument.	1 go pub	blic and really to make money in a relatively
12	I'll talk a little bit about investigator	2 short p	period of time, which I think can influence
13	sites and trial execution, but I think a lot of the	3 them.	
14	points have been made already, so I won't belabor	4 B	ig pharma has cash, but there are limits.
15	them.	5 They'r	e not going to invest in everything. And the
16	I do want to talk a little bit about the	6 import	ant part of cash, I think it was kind of
17	differences and I do think this affects	7 mentic	oned previously, is that sites might enter
18	quality between big biopharmaceutical companies	8 patien	ts into clinical trials based on how much a
19	and small. One is that in big pharmaceutical	9 clinica	I trial actually pays, so they may
20	companies and some of you can correct me if this	o prefer	entially go and enroll patients into the
21	has not been your experience, because I know we	1 study	that's paying more than the one that's paying
22	have got a lot of big pharma here is that there	2 less.	
	Page 142		Page 144
1	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider	1 A	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely
1	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I	1 A 2 to enro	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely Il patients in the study that's less
1 2 3	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big	1 A 2 to enro 3 comple	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like
1 2 3 4	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can	1 A 2 to enro 3 compl 4 compl	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity.
1 2 3 4 5	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality.	1 A 2 to enro 3 compl 4 compl 5 A	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ittle bit more about contract research
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions	1 A 2 to enro 3 compl 4 compl 5 A 6 organi	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. I little bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical	1 A 2 to enro 3 comple 4 comple 5 A 6 organi 7 contra	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ittle bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses	1 A 2 to enro 3 comple 4 comple 5 A 6 organi 7 contra 8 with th	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ititle bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work nem closely, you have positive experiences,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the	1 A 2 to enro 3 comple 4 comple 5 A 6 organi 7 contra 8 with th 9 negati	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ititle bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work them closely, you have positive experiences, we experiences. My view, in general, is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the protocol at the end should not need to be amended	1 A 2 to enro 3 comple 5 A 6 organi 7 contra 8 with th 9 negati 0 wheth	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ititle bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work hem closely, you have positive experiences, ve experiences. My view, in general, is er you do a study internally or externally,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the protocol at the end should not need to be amended too many times because it's been looked at a lot.	1A2to enror3compliant4compliant5A6organi7contra8with th9negati0wheth1you're	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. It little bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work nem closely, you have positive experiences, ve experiences. My view, in general, is er you do a study internally or externally, going to be complaining because it's not
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the protocol at the end should not need to be amended too many times because it's been looked at a lot. Small pharmaceutical companies, there are a	1A2to enror3completion4completion5A6organi7contra8with th9negati0wheth1you're2enrolli	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ititle bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work nem closely, you have positive experiences, ve experiences. My view, in general, is er you do a study internally or externally, going to be complaining because it's not ng fast enough or there is some issue. I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the protocol at the end should not need to be amended too many times because it's been looked at a lot. Small pharmaceutical companies, there are a number of stakeholders, and they can be very	1A2to enror3completion4completion5A6organi7contra8with th9negati0whether1you're2enrolli3don't t	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ititle bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work nem closely, you have positive experiences, we experiences. My view, in general, is er you do a study internally or externally, going to be complaining because it's not ng fast enough or there is some issue. I hink it's germane to whether it's a CRO or a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the protocol at the end should not need to be amended too many times because it's been looked at a lot. Small pharmaceutical companies, there are a number of stakeholders, and they can be very influential. Ultimately, there is a different	1A2to enror3completion4completion5A6organi7contra8with th9negati0wheth1you're2enrolli3don't t4big co	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ittle bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work hem closely, you have positive experiences, ve experiences. My view, in general, is er you do a study internally or externally, going to be complaining because it's not ng fast enough or there is some issue. I hink it's germane to whether it's a CRO or a mpany.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the protocol at the end should not need to be amended too many times because it's been looked at a lot. Small pharmaceutical companies, there are a number of stakeholders, and they can be very influential. Ultimately, there is a different intent with small pharma companies. I think it	1       A         2       to enror         3       completion         4       completion         5       A         6       organi         7       contra         8       with th         9       negati         0       wheth         1       you're         2       enrolli         3       don't t         4       big co         5       B	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ititle bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work em closely, you have positive experiences, we experiences. My view, in general, is er you do a study internally or externally, going to be complaining because it's not ng fast enough or there is some issue. I hink it's germane to whether it's a CRO or a mpany. But for CRO, there is a focus on study
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the protocol at the end should not need to be amended too many times because it's been looked at a lot. Small pharmaceutical companies, there are a number of stakeholders, and they can be very influential. Ultimately, there is a different intent with small pharma companies. I think it makes it different, particularly the small, almost	1         A           2         to enror           3         completion           4         completion           5         A           6         organi           7         contra           8         with the           9         negati           0         whethe           1         you're           2         enrolli           3         don't t           4         big color           5         E           6         execution	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ititle bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work nem closely, you have positive experiences, ve experiences. My view, in general, is er you do a study internally or externally, going to be complaining because it's not ing fast enough or there is some issue. I hink it's germane to whether it's a CRO or a mpany. But for CRO, there is a focus on study tion, quality and speed, and the idea is that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the protocol at the end should not need to be amended too many times because it's been looked at a lot. Small pharmaceutical companies, there are a number of stakeholders, and they can be very influential. Ultimately, there is a different intent with small pharma companies. I think it makes it different, particularly the small, almost virtual companies.	1A2to enror3completion4completion5A6organi7contra8with th9negati0wheth1you're2enrolli3don't t4big col5E6execur7if you	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. It the bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work them closely, you have positive experiences, we experiences. My view, in general, is er you do a study internally or externally, going to be complaining because it's not ing fast enough or there is some issue. I hink it's germane to whether it's a CRO or a impany. But for CRO, there is a focus on study tion, quality and speed, and the idea is that do one thing over and over again, whether
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the protocol at the end should not need to be amended too many times because it's been looked at a lot. Small pharmaceutical companies, there are a number of stakeholders, and they can be very influential. Ultimately, there is a different intent with small pharma companies. I think it makes it different, particularly the small, almost virtual companies. I do also want to make the point that I	1A2to enror3completion4completion5A6organi7contra8with the9negati0whethe1you're2enrolli3don't the4big con5E6execure7if you e8you're	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ititle bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work nem closely, you have positive experiences, we experiences. My view, in general, is er you do a study internally or externally, going to be complaining because it's not ing fast enough or there is some issue. I hink it's germane to whether it's a CRO or a mpany. But for CRO, there is a focus on study tion, quality and speed, and the idea is that do one thing over and over again, whether at the medical monitor level or you're at
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the protocol at the end should not need to be amended too many times because it's been looked at a lot. Small pharmaceutical companies, there are a number of stakeholders, and they can be very influential. Ultimately, there is a different intent with small pharma companies. I think it makes it different, particularly the small, almost virtual companies. I do also want to make the point that I think money is important. Money impacts quality.	1A2to enror3completion4completion5A6organi7contra8with th9negati0whether1you're2enrolli3don't t4big coi5E6execur7if you f8you're9the CF	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ititle bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work nem closely, you have positive experiences, ve experiences. My view, in general, is er you do a study internally or externally, going to be complaining because it's not ng fast enough or there is some issue. I hink it's germane to whether it's a CRO or a mpany. But for CRO, there is a focus on study tion, quality and speed, and the idea is that do one thing over and over again, whether at the medical monitor level or you're at RA level, that you're going to bet better at
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the protocol at the end should not need to be amended too many times because it's been looked at a lot. Small pharmaceutical companies, there are a number of stakeholders, and they can be very influential. Ultimately, there is a different intent with small pharma companies. I think it makes it different, particularly the small, almost virtual companies. I do also want to make the point that I think money is important. Money impacts quality. There is no question in my mind that it does. We	1A2to enror3completion4completion5A6organi7contra8with the9negati0whethe1you're2enrolli3don't t4big contra5B6executor7if you te8you're9the CF0it.	Page 144 Also I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. I little bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work been closely, you have positive experiences, we experiences. My view, in general, is er you do a study internally or externally, going to be complaining because it's not ing fast enough or there is some issue. I hink it's germane to whether it's a CRO or a mpany. But for CRO, there is a focus on study tion, quality and speed, and the idea is that do one thing over and over again, whether at the medical monitor level or you're at RA level, that you're going to bet better at
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 142 is a significant time to think, rethink, reconsider decisions, and then change things again. And I think that that churn that exists within big pharma, which I'm sure we're all familiar with, can really impact quality. Big pharma, there is our complex decisions process with significant input from a hierarchical reporting structure, and I think there are pluses and minuses to that. It does ensure that the protocol at the end should not need to be amended too many times because it's been looked at a lot. Small pharmaceutical companies, there are a number of stakeholders, and they can be very influential. Ultimately, there is a different intent with small pharma companies. I think it makes it different, particularly the small, almost virtual companies. I do also want to make the point that I think money is important. Money impacts quality. There is no question in my mind that it does. We bid with a lot of companies right now, and they	1       A         2       to enror         3       completion         4       completion         5       A         6       organi         7       contra         8       with the         9       negati         0       whethe         1       you're         2       enrolli         3       don't t         4       big collision         5       E         6       execution         7       if you're         9       the CF         0       it.         1       Y	Page 144 Iso I should say, that they are more likely oll patients in the study that's less ex. And we all, as bright people, like exity. Ititle bit more about contract research zations. Obviously, there are issues with ct research organizations. Some of you work eem closely, you have positive experiences, we experiences. My view, in general, is er you do a study internally or externally, going to be complaining because it's not ing fast enough or there is some issue. I hink it's germane to whether it's a CRO or a mpany. But for CRO, there is a focus on study tion, quality and speed, and the idea is that do one thing over and over again, whether at the medical monitor level or you're at RA level, that you're going to bet better at You also have a project team, and the CROs

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 145		Page 147
1	trials in the same area. On the other hand, the	1	from all of these sponsors, from big and small.
2	pharmaceutical company, the biopharm company, this	2	And I get to say to them, well, you know what?
3	may be the first time doing a study in Parkinson's	3	Maybe you should be using Bob Dworkin's algorithm
4	disease or neuropathic pain. Maybe they haven't	4	for baseline pain.
5	done a neuropathic pain study in five years, so	5	I will throw that out there, and some people
6	there's a reason that a CRO may be of some value.	6	like to say, we're going to actually revise our
7	And for small companies, there is really no other	7	protocol because we think that's important. And I
8	choice. They need to use a CRO.	8	actually had a big company do exactly that, revise
9	Now, one of things I have as underlined, in	9	their protocol just based on adding that in. But
10	italics, and shaded is the CRAs. And I think the	10	we do other things, as well.
11	point that John made before about the study	11	But I think there is a huge actual joy. If
12	coordinators is also made about the CRAs. The CRAs	12	you're into clinical trial and clinical trial
13	are where the rubber meets the road for clinical	13	methodology, being able to see this is great. And
14	trials. That's the ability for the sponsor to have	14	of course, being within and covering such a large
15	eyes on the ground. You know, the eyes thing?	15	group of people, I get to see everything from
16	That's it.	16	Duchenne muscular dystrophy, to Alzheimer's,
17	So you really do need to have great CRAs.	17	Parkinson's disease, and, of course, pain.
18	And I think if we can I could spend a lot of	18	The other thing that's kind of interesting,
19	time talking about CRAs and study coordinators	19	as well, which I like where I'm at, is that we do
20	because I think they're hugely important, and they	20	have this contract commercial organization. So in
21	need to be experienced.	21	every protocol that we look at and that we get, we
22	I think somebody said, "Oh, they're	22	actually look at the market and the need and the
	Page 146		Page 148
1	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's	1	Page 148 value of it.
1	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire	1	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will
1 2 3	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid.	1 2 3	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by
1 2 3 4	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to	1 2 3 4	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who
1 2 3 4 5	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these	1 2 3 4 5	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market,
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring the quality of the data, and I really can't stress	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug. But I do think that quality clinical trials
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring the quality of the data, and I really can't stress it enough.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug. But I do think that quality clinical trials begins really early on in development. When you're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring the quality of the data, and I really can't stress it enough. If you're a CRO, you know sites, you know	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug. But I do think that quality clinical trials begins really early on in development. When you're a big pharmaceutical company, you have a portfolio
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring the quality of the data, and I really can't stress it enough. If you're a CRO, you know sites, you know them well. I mentioned this earlier to Nat's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug. But I do think that quality clinical trials begins really early on in development. When you're a big pharmaceutical company, you have a portfolio of products. And if you buy another company, like
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring the quality of the data, and I really can't stress it enough. If you're a CRO, you know sites, you know them well. I mentioned this earlier to Nat's comment. You get to know how they respond to your	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug. But I do think that quality clinical trials begins really early on in development. When you're a big pharmaceutical company, you have a portfolio of products. And if you buy another company, like Schering-Plough, you even have more portfolio
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring the quality of the data, and I really can't stress it enough. If you're a CRO, you know sites, you know them well. I mentioned this earlier to Nat's comment. You get to know how they respond to your queries. We also had a CRO no contracts.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug. But I do think that quality clinical trials begins really early on in development. When you're a big pharmaceutical company, you have a portfolio of products. And if you buy another company, like Schering-Plough, you even have more portfolio products, and you have to decide what are you going
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring the quality of the data, and I really can't stress it enough. If you're a CRO, you know sites, you know them well. I mentioned this earlier to Nat's comment. You get to know how they respond to your queries. We also had a CRO no contracts. Contracts would be a killer, as many of you know.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug. But I do think that quality clinical trials begins really early on in development. When you're a big pharmaceutical company, you have a portfolio of products. And if you buy another company, like Schering-Plough, you even have more portfolio products, and you have to decide what are you going to move forward and what are you not going to move
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring the quality of the data, and I really can't stress it enough. If you're a CRO, you know sites, you know them well. I mentioned this earlier to Nat's comment. You get to know how they respond to your queries. We also had a CRO no contracts. Contracts would be a killer, as many of you know. So if you know the sites, you know the contract	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug. But I do think that quality clinical trials begins really early on in development. When you're a big pharmaceutical company, you have a portfolio of products. And if you buy another company, like Schering-Plough, you even have more portfolio products, and you have to decide what are you going to move forward and what are you not going to move forward.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring the quality of the data, and I really can't stress it enough. If you're a CRO, you know sites, you know them well. I mentioned this earlier to Nat's comment. You get to know how they respond to your queries. We also had a CRO no contracts. Contracts would be a killer, as many of you know. So if you know the sites, you know the contract issues, that could be hugely important. We have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug. But I do think that quality clinical trials begins really early on in development. When you're a big pharmaceutical company, you have a portfolio of products. And if you buy another company, like Schering-Plough, you even have more portfolio products, and you have to decide what are you going to move forward and what are you not going to move forward. In the absence of information, really good
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring the quality of the data, and I really can't stress it enough. If you're a CRO, you know sites, you know them well. I mentioned this earlier to Nat's comment. You get to know how they respond to your queries. We also had a CRO no contracts. Contracts would be a killer, as many of you know. So if you know the sites, you know the contract issues, that could be hugely important. We have regulatory experience.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug. But I do think that quality clinical trials begins really early on in development. When you're a big pharmaceutical company, you have a portfolio of products. And if you buy another company, like Schering-Plough, you even have more portfolio products, and you have to decide what are you going to move forward and what are you not going to move forward. In the absence of information, really good information, it's really, really difficult.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring the quality of the data, and I really can't stress it enough. If you're a CRO, you know sites, you know them well. I mentioned this earlier to Nat's comment. You get to know how they respond to your queries. We also had a CRO no contracts. Contracts would be a killer, as many of you know. So if you know the sites, you know the contract issues, that could be hugely important. We have regulatory experience. Then there is this ability to have what I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug. But I do think that quality clinical trials begins really early on in development. When you're a big pharmaceutical company, you have a portfolio of products. And if you buy another company, like Schering-Plough, you even have more portfolio products, and you have to decide what are you going to move forward and what are you not going to move forward. In the absence of information, really good information, it's really, really difficult. Consequently, as many of you know, there are great
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 146 inexperienced and they're underpaid." Well, that's true, except at companies where you don't hire people who are inexperienced and underpaid. I left the meeting yesterday, in part, to talk to a sponsor and say, yeah, the reason these people cost a little bit more is because they're experienced, and they've done this multiple times, and we get into conversations like that. And they really are the ones who are the control of ensuring the quality of the data, and I really can't stress it enough. If you're a CRO, you know sites, you know them well. I mentioned this earlier to Nat's comment. You get to know how they respond to your queries. We also had a CRO no contracts. Contracts would be a killer, as many of you know. So if you know the sites, you know the contract issues, that could be hugely important. We have regulatory experience. Then there is this ability to have what I think is the most exciting part of being in a CRO,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 148 value of it. What's interesting there is it really will change the measures that you may want to put in by understanding who you are marketing this who this is actually intended for. And I say market, and that's kind of business speak. But it's really is it going to really meet the needs of the patients who might potentially be getting this drug. But I do think that quality clinical trials begins really early on in development. When you're a big pharmaceutical company, you have a portfolio of products. And if you buy another company, like Schering-Plough, you even have more portfolio products, and you have to decide what are you going to move forward and what are you not going to move forward. In the absence of information, really good information, it's really, really difficult. Consequently, as many of you know, there are great drugs that are withering away in the vaults at big

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 149		Page 151
1	interesting historically. But the goal is to	1	and one of the issues that came up is they've got
2	really make these drugs safe and effective, and	2	these great drugs, checkpoint inhibitors, that cost
3	that's all about quality.	3	hundreds of like \$100,000, \$200,000 a year. And
4	Now, there used to be this idea we want to	4	there are some implications about financial
5	take multiple shots on goal, and that I think was a	5	toxicity, as well as the toxicity associated with
6	risk to quality when you're trying to push	6	the drug. And that's something that comes
7	everything forward. Now, I think in most	7	from actually, from all of Sloan Kettering.
8	pharmaceutical companies, there is a de-risking	8	It's a big issue for them now.
9	exercise that really does ensure the quality of the	9	I think to ensure quality, it's important to
10	molecule or the compound.	10	talk to KOL. I think a lot of times people ask me
11	We spend a lot of time demonstrating things	11	for KOLs. Luckily, I know a lot of you in here.
12	like target engagement, proof of pharmacology,	12	Some of you may want me to stop referring people to
13	safety, really, in order to select the optimum	13	you, but I'm often referring people who work with
14	dose. Again, I think this all really does fit into	14	IMMPACT, as well as others.
15	efficacy.	15	I think it's also important and I stress
16	In terms of the quality of the clinical	16	this point a lot, is I think we need to put
17	trial, I think there's a tension that we need to be	17	in to really ensure quality, we need to talk to
18	honest about between stopping clinical trial	18	patients more. We need to get their perspective on
19	development early and recognizing that a lot of	19	what they want.
20	clinical trials, a lot of drugs that are out there,	20	The FDA is really important, there is no
21	have only survived because they have had one person	21	question about it, but it's the patient, and
22	who was really willing to take all the shots, go	22	they're really at the end let me just say
	D (10)		
	Page 150		Page 152
1	the distance, and really be an advocate for the	1	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality,
1 2	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really	1 2	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our
1 2 3	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other	1 2 3	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a
1 2 3 4	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them.	1 2 3 4	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put
1 2 3 4 5	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to	1 2 3 4 5	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important.
1 2 3 4 5 6	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus	1 2 3 4 5 6	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now	1 2 4 5 6 7 8	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer.
1 2 4 5 6 7 8 9	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there	1 2 4 5 6 7 8 9	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there are a lot of other studies that go on, and there's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they willing to put up with in terms of pain and side
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there are a lot of other studies that go on, and there's a lot that really gets built in here.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they willing to put up with in terms of pain and side effects, what does success look like. You can take
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there are a lot of other studies that go on, and there's a lot that really gets built in here. Again, in this process, there is significant	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they willing to put up with in terms of pain and side effects, what does success look like. You can take a lot of the lessons from cancer and put them into
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there are a lot of other studies that go on, and there's a lot that really gets built in here. Again, in this process, there is significant time to put in to de-risking; again, a significant	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they willing to put up with in terms of pain and side effects, what does success look like. You can take a lot of the lessons from cancer and put them into pain patients, and sometimes just having a good
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there are a lot of other studies that go on, and there's a lot that really gets built in here. Again, in this process, there is significant time to put in to de-risking; again, a significant time put into what are the customers' needs, how	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they willing to put up with in terms of pain and side effects, what does success look like. You can take a lot of the lessons from cancer and put them into pain patients, and sometimes just having a good response is a pretty good thing and how many
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there are a lot of other studies that go on, and there's a lot that really gets built in here. Again, in this process, there is significant time to put in to de-risking; again, a significant time put into what are the customers' needs, how can this molecule be used and how should be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they willing to put up with in terms of pain and side effects, what does success look like. You can take a lot of the lessons from cancer and put them into pain patients, and sometimes just having a good response is a pretty good thing and how many patients have a good response.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there are a lot of other studies that go on, and there's a lot that really gets built in here. Again, in this process, there is significant time to put in to de-risking; again, a significant time put into what are the customers' needs, how can this molecule be used and how should be investigated appropriately.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they willing to put up with in terms of pain and side effects, what does success look like. You can take a lot of the lessons from cancer and put them into pain patients, and sometimes just having a good response is a pretty good thing and how many patients have a good response. In terms of clinical trial designs,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there are a lot of other studies that go on, and there's a lot that really gets built in here. Again, in this process, there is significant time to put in to de-risking; again, a significant time put into what are the customers' needs, how can this molecule be used and how should be investigated appropriately. There are a lot of health economic	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they willing to put up with in terms of pain and side effects, what does success look like. You can take a lot of the lessons from cancer and put them into pain patients, and sometimes just having a good response is a pretty good thing and how many patients have a good response. In terms of clinical trial designs, obviously, I won't go into a lot of choice on this.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there are a lot of other studies that go on, and there's a lot that really gets built in here. Again, in this process, there is significant time to put in to de-risking; again, a significant time put into what are the customers' needs, how can this molecule be used and how should be investigated appropriately. There are a lot of the things we really	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they willing to put up with in terms of pain and side effects, what does success look like. You can take a lot of the lessons from cancer and put them into pain patients, and sometimes just having a good response is a pretty good thing and how many patients have a good response. In terms of clinical trial designs, obviously, I won't go into a lot of choice on this. But there is a decision on co-primaries versus one
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there are a lot of other studies that go on, and there's a lot that really gets built in here. Again, in this process, there is significant time to put in to de-risking; again, a significant time put into what are the customers' needs, how can this molecule be used and how should be investigated appropriately. There are a lot of health economic considerations. One of the things we really haven't hit on today is that these drugs that we're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they willing to put up with in terms of pain and side effects, what does success look like. You can take a lot of the lessons from cancer and put them into pain patients, and sometimes just having a good response is a pretty good thing and how many patients have a good response. In terms of clinical trial designs, obviously, I won't go into a lot of choice on this. But there is a decision on co-primaries versus one primary, what the secondary endpoints are.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there are a lot of other studies that go on, and there's a lot that really gets built in here. Again, in this process, there is significant time to put in to de-risking; again, a significant time put into what are the customers' needs, how can this molecule be used and how should be investigated appropriately. There are a lot of health economic considerations. One of the things we really haven't hit on today is that these drugs that we're developing cost a lot of money, and you really have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they willing to put up with in terms of pain and side effects, what does success look like. You can take a lot of the lessons from cancer and put them into pain patients, and sometimes just having a good response is a pretty good thing and how many patients have a good response. In terms of clinical trial designs, obviously, I won't go into a lot of choice on this. But there is a decision on co-primaries versus one primary, what the secondary endpoints are. Sometimes the studies I think get very
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the distance, and really be an advocate for the molecule. And those drugs, like topamine, really became very important drugs. There are other drugs. We all have examples of them. So that's a challenge as you're trying to focus in on quality. And I think there is a focus on the clinical development plan and life cycle management, where we're kind of focused right now on I think the registration study, but really there are a lot of other studies that go on, and there's a lot that really gets built in here. Again, in this process, there is significant time to put in to de-risking; again, a significant time put into what are the customers' needs, how can this molecule be used and how should be investigated appropriately. There are a lot of the things we really haven't hit on today is that these drugs that we're developing cost a lot of money, and you really have to defend the cost of these drugs.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	this. The FDA, when we're talking about quality, that's what Congress created to ensure that our products that hit the market for patients are of a high quality. And I think that needs to be put into the paper, as well, because that's important. Historically, it wasn't necessarily that way 200 years ago. But I do think patients have a lot to offer. They have a lot to offer in terms of what are they willing to put up with in terms of pain and side effects, what does success look like. You can take a lot of the lessons from cancer and put them into pain patients, and sometimes just having a good response is a pretty good thing and how many patients have a good response. In terms of clinical trial designs, obviously, I won't go into a lot of choice on this. But there is a decision on co-primaries versus one primary, what the secondary endpoints are. Sometimes the studies I think get very complex as we're trying to really put science

	Page 153		Page 155
1	quantitative sensory testing, which I'm obviously	1	started and they don't know when it's going to get
2	an advocate for. I think they're very important.	2	stopped, you are actually collecting data that is
3	But in large phase 3 studies in the United States,	3	going to be, I think, potentially more less
4	it's hard to find a lot of centers that are really	4	biased, I should say.
5	good at guantitative sensory testing, and it	5	I do want to encourage people. I think
6	increases the cost of the study significantly. So	6	adaptive designs are really important. I think
7	I do think we need to be careful about, as we add	7	they're very informative. I think they're very
8	these in, there are some risks associated.	8	efficient. I did a very nice adaptive design
9	But the big thing for me is the large number	9	study, while the enriched enrollment one that many
10	of outcome measures and the complexity of the study	10	of you know is clearly and adaptive design in some
11	decreases quality. There is no question about it.	11	ways.
12	If you have a complex study, and you are getting	12	I did a nice migraine study where we could
13	the study coordinator and the investigator really	13	add dose at the bottom end, and it was really kind
14	annoyed, and the patient is annoyed, and if a	14	of cool. But it can be very informative to
15	patient has to spend four or six hours at the	15	clinical trials; not necessarily approved for the
16	clinic, I think your quality is going to decrease	16	FDA right now for phase 3 studies, but very useful
17	and decrease significantly. Patient burden needs	17	in phase 2.
18	to be considered an important part of quality, as	18	Definitely it's important for efficacy and
19	well.	19	safety, and I like to think it minimizes harm. I
20	Now, obviously, sometimes protocol	20	think anything we can do to minimize harm to
21	complexity is really important. I'm working on a	21	patients is a huge thing.
22	very complex protocol, and it's to assess a very	22	The other thing I wanted to mention, I think
	Page 154		Page 156
1	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge	1	Page 156 we touched on this vesterday, was the importance of
1	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be	1	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An
1 2 3	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done.	1 2 3	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you
1 2 3 4	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously. I can't talk about it in	1 2 3 4	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not.
1 2 3 4 5	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big.	1 2 3 4 5	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no guestion, as I mentioned before,	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for creating very complicated protocols. We've prided	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in Parkinson's disease. We were able to demonstrate
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for creating very complicated protocols. We've prided ourselves on that. And then they kind of pushed	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in Parkinson's disease. We were able to demonstrate that it was no better than placebo and, in fact, in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for creating very complicated protocols. We've prided ourselves on that. And then they kind of pushed back on that, our bosses, but it was really an	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in Parkinson's disease. We were able to demonstrate that it was no better than placebo and, in fact, in certain countries, placebo was a lot better than
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for creating very complicated protocols. We've prided ourselves on that. And then they kind of pushed back on that, our bosses, but it was really an important issue.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in Parkinson's disease. We were able to demonstrate that it was no better than placebo and, in fact, in certain countries, placebo was a lot better than rasagiline and preladenant, which was the drug I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for creating very complicated protocols. We've prided ourselves on that. And then they kind of pushed back on that, our bosses, but it was really an important issue. I'm not going to belabor this point. I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in Parkinson's disease. We were able to demonstrate that it was no better than placebo and, in fact, in certain countries, placebo was a lot better than rasagiline and preladenant, which was the drug I was studying for Parkinson's disease.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for creating very complicated protocols. We've prided ourselves on that. And then they kind of pushed back on that, our bosses, but it was really an important issue. I'm not going to belabor this point. I think this was discussed before. I think to have a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in Parkinson's disease. We were able to demonstrate that it was no better than placebo and, in fact, in certain countries, placebo was a lot better than rasagiline and preladenant, which was the drug I was studying for Parkinson's disease. So a failed study really does suggest a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for creating very complicated protocols. We've prided ourselves on that. And then they kind of pushed back on that, our bosses, but it was really an important issue. I'm not going to belabor this point. I think this was discussed before. I think to have a clinical trial that's really successful, you need	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in Parkinson's disease. We were able to demonstrate that it was no better than placebo and, in fact, in certain countries, placebo was a lot better than rasagiline and preladenant, which was the drug I was studying for Parkinson's disease. So a failed study really does suggest a problem, and it was that failed study that really
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for creating very complicated protocols. We've prided ourselves on that. And then they kind of pushed back on that, our bosses, but it was really an important issue. I'm not going to belabor this point. I think this was discussed before. I think to have a clinical trial that's really successful, you need to blind the patient and the investigator to as	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in Parkinson's disease. We were able to demonstrate that it was no better than placebo and, in fact, in certain countries, placebo was a lot better than rasagiline and preladenant, which was the drug I was studying for Parkinson's disease. So a failed study really does suggest a problem, and it was that failed study that really said to me, you know what, as I'm looking at career
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for creating very complicated protocols. We've prided ourselves on that. And then they kind of pushed back on that, our bosses, but it was really an important issue. I'm not going to belabor this point. I think this was discussed before. I think to have a clinical trial that's really successful, you need to blind the patient and the investigator to as many things as possible, from what the entry	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in Parkinson's disease. We were able to demonstrate that it was no better than placebo and, in fact, in certain countries, placebo was a lot better than rasagiline and preladenant, which was the drug I was studying for Parkinson's disease. So a failed study really does suggest a problem, and it was that failed study that really said to me, you know what, as I'm looking at career options and possibly becoming where I could go
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for creating very complicated protocols. We've prided ourselves on that. And then they kind of pushed back on that, our bosses, but it was really an important issue. I'm not going to belabor this point. I think this was discussed before. I think to have a clinical trial that's really successful, you need to blind the patient and the investigator to as many things as possible, from what the entry criteria are to really when the study drug is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in Parkinson's disease. We were able to demonstrate that it was no better than placebo and, in fact, in certain countries, placebo was a lot better than rasagiline and preladenant, which was the drug I was studying for Parkinson's disease. So a failed study really does suggest a problem, and it was that failed study that really said to me, you know what, as I'm looking at career options and possibly becoming where I could go from where I was at Merck, where should I go? And
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for creating very complicated protocols. We've prided ourselves on that. And then they kind of pushed back on that, our bosses, but it was really an important issue. I'm not going to belabor this point. I think this was discussed before. I think to have a clinical trial that's really successful, you need to blind the patient and the investigator to as many things as possible, from what the entry criteria are to really when the study drug is actually started and when it is discontinued,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in Parkinson's disease. We were able to demonstrate that it was no better than placebo and, in fact, in certain countries, placebo was a lot better than rasagiline and preladenant, which was the drug I was studying for Parkinson's disease. So a failed study really does suggest a problem, and it was that failed study that really said to me, you know what, as I'm looking at career options and possibly becoming where I could go from where I was at Merck, where should I go? And I thought, CRO would be a good place.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 154 important safety measure. And it has led to huge complexity. There is imaging that needs to be done. There's lab work that needs to be done. It's huge. Obviously, I can't talk about it in detail, but it's big. There is no question, as I mentioned before, that the PI would much prefer to work on less complex studies. Part of this comes from my own experience at Merck. Merck was actually known for creating very complicated protocols. We've prided ourselves on that. And then they kind of pushed back on that, our bosses, but it was really an important issue. I'm not going to belabor this point. I think this was discussed before. I think to have a clinical trial that's really successful, you need to blind the patient and the investigator to as many things as possible, from what the entry criteria are to really when the study drug is actually started and when it is discontinued, because if they know, there is an expectation. If	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 156 we touched on this yesterday, was the importance of the placebo, but I also an active placebo. An active placebo combined with a placebo can tell you whether you've had a failed study or not. As some of you know, I did a very large study, international, worldwide study with thousands of patients, unfortunately, that failed. We actually were able to demonstrate rasagiline, made by Teva, very good drug, that we know works in Parkinson's disease. We were able to demonstrate that it was no better than placebo and, in fact, in certain countries, placebo was a lot better than rasagiline and preladenant, which was the drug I was studying for Parkinson's disease. So a failed study really does suggest a problem, and it was that failed study that really said to me, you know what, as I'm looking at career options and possibly becoming where I could go from where I was at Merck, where should I go? And I thought, CRO would be a good place. It is kind of like the candy store. When I

	Page 157		Page 159
1	reasons I went in there were two reasons. One	1	Unfortunately, they had already had videos, and
2	is because I wanted power, statistical power, that	2	they were way ahead of me already. But this was
3	is	3	something that was really exciting to me that I
4	(Laughter.)	4	didn't even know existed when I joined.
5	DR. HEWITT: and then the other one is	5	So in this case, patients confuse
6	that's where the drugs are. It's like what is	6	participation in clinical trial with the primary
7	it? Willy Sutton? Why do you rob banks? Because	7	care for their condition, and this is done all the
8	that's where the money is. I went into the	8	time. The study subject is really a partner in
9	pharmaceutical industry because that's where the	9	clinical research and not a patient.
10	drugs are. So it's pretty fun.	10	I know we keep referring to them as
11	But going into a CRO is also fun because	11	patients, but I think there are ethical issues
12	that's where the studies are, and you get to see	12	that I'm into ethics need to be recognized,
13	all I have like 35 people reporting in to me.	13	that the power relationship between a patient and
14	Each one is running there's a medical monitor	14	doctor is sacrosanct. That is a very special
15	involved in at least two or three studies. So the	15	relationship. And once a patient goes and makes
16	number of protocols I see across everything from	16	the decision that I want to do you, Dr. Hewitt, a
17	oncology to it's really, I think, going to make	17	favor and become a study subject, that leads to a
18	me and has made me better at thinking about	18	whole other set of ethical considerations.
19	clinical trial issues.	19	I think we need to respect them because
20	I wanted to talk about rater training, which	20	they're really and by doing them and making that
21	I think is huge. I think this is one of the	21	study subject our partner, they understand their
22	biggest things. And really, this is where	22	role better, and that is part of what rater
			_
	Page 158		Page 160
1	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot	1	Page 160 training does as well.
1 2	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned.	1 2	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some
1 2 3	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real.	1 2 3	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials
1 2 3 4	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in	1 2 3 4	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical
1 2 3 4 5	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous	1 2 3 4 5	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm. You're looking at somebody who, in general,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the investigator matters, you really need to make sure
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm. You're looking at somebody who, in general, finds it hard to contain his enthusiasm, and my	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the investigator matters, you really need to make sure that there is consistency, that everybody does it
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm. You're looking at somebody who, in general, finds it hard to contain his enthusiasm, and my patients saw that I was always concerned that I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the investigator matters, you really need to make sure that there is consistency, that everybody does it the same way.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm. You're looking at somebody who, in general, finds it hard to contain his enthusiasm, and my patients saw that I was always concerned that I might be increasing the placebo effect.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the investigator matters, you really need to make sure that there is consistency, that everybody does it the same way. I can tell you some of the world's greatest
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm. You're looking at somebody who, in general, finds it hard to contain his enthusiasm, and my patients saw that I was always concerned that I might be increasing the placebo effect. But there is also something that to me is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the investigator matters, you really need to make sure that there is consistency, that everybody does it the same way. I can tell you some of the world's greatest Parkinson's disease experts go into battle about
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm. You're looking at somebody who, in general, finds it hard to contain his enthusiasm, and my patients saw that I was always concerned that I might be increasing the placebo effect. But there is also something that to me is equally important, which so therapeutic	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the investigator matters, you really need to make sure that there is consistency, that everybody does it the same way. I can tell you some of the world's greatest Parkinson's disease experts go into battle about how you do UPS Part 3. And it's kind of funny to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm. You're looking at somebody who, in general, finds it hard to contain his enthusiasm, and my patients saw that I was always concerned that I might be increasing the placebo effect. But there is also something that to me is equally important, which so therapeutic misconception. And we've kind of talked around	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the investigator matters, you really need to make sure that there is consistency, that everybody does it the same way. I can tell you some of the world's greatest Parkinson's disease experts go into battle about how you do UPS Part 3. And it's kind of funny to watch when that hasn't been your whole thing, but
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm. You're looking at somebody who, in general, finds it hard to contain his enthusiasm, and my patients saw that I was always concerned that I might be increasing the placebo effect. But there is also something that to me is equally important, which so therapeutic misconception. And we've kind of talked around this issue a bit, but it's a really important	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the investigator matters, you really need to make sure that there is consistency, that everybody does it the same way. I can tell you some of the world's greatest Parkinson's disease experts go into battle about how you do UPS Part 3. And it's kind of funny to watch when that hasn't been your whole thing, but it's very important to get consistency of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm. You're looking at somebody who, in general, finds it hard to contain his enthusiasm, and my patients saw that I was always concerned that I might be increasing the placebo effect. But there is also something that to me is equally important, which so therapeutic misconception. And we've kind of talked around this issue a bit, but it's a really important issue.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the investigator matters, you really need to make sure that there is consistency, that everybody does it the same way. I can tell you some of the world's greatest Parkinson's disease experts go into battle about how you do UPS Part 3. And it's kind of funny to watch when that hasn't been your whole thing, but it's very important to get consistency of assessments across sites.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm. You're looking at somebody who, in general, finds it hard to contain his enthusiasm, and my patients saw that I was always concerned that I might be increasing the placebo effect. But there is also something that to me is equally important, which so therapeutic misconception. And we've kind of talked around this issue a bit, but it's a really important issue. One of the things I was really happy with	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the investigator matters, you really need to make sure that there is consistency, that everybody does it the same way. I can tell you some of the world's greatest Parkinson's disease experts go into battle about how you do UPS Part 3. And it's kind of funny to watch when that hasn't been your whole thing, but it's very important to get consistency of assessments across sites. You need dedicated teams with real expertise
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm. You're looking at somebody who, in general, finds it hard to contain his enthusiasm, and my patients saw that I was always concerned that I might be increasing the placebo effect. But there is also something that to me is equally important, which so therapeutic misconception. And we've kind of talked around this issue a bit, but it's a really important issue. One of the things I was really happy with coming to my new job at a CRO is because they had a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the investigator matters, you really need to make sure that there is consistency, that everybody does it the same way. I can tell you some of the world's greatest Parkinson's disease experts go into battle about how you do UPS Part 3. And it's kind of funny to watch when that hasn't been your whole thing, but it's very important to get consistency of assessments across sites. You need dedicated teams with real expertise in rater training. You need to ensure the quality
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 158 the in this article, there has got to be a lot of focus on this, as far as I'm concerned. The placebo effect is real. It's very real. As I just mentioned, it killed my study in Parkinson's disease. There is tremendous investigator enthusiasm for the drugs that we are investigating. They're novel mechanisms often. It's really exciting. It's hard to contain your enthusiasm. You're looking at somebody who, in general, finds it hard to contain his enthusiasm, and my patients saw that I was always concerned that I might be increasing the placebo effect. But there is also something that to me is equally important, which so therapeutic misconception. And we've kind of talked around this issue a bit, but it's a really important issue. One of the things I was really happy with coming to my new job at a CRO is because they had a rater training group, and I was going to be able to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 160 training does as well. My other concern, of course, is that in some countries, that are underinsured, clinical trials may be a way for people to get primary medical care. And of course, as many of you know, this was really an issue and a concern in India. Obviously, the KOLs and PIs know a lot about how to assess pain in Parkinson's disease and all of these things. But on measures where the investigator matters, you really need to make sure that there is consistency, that everybody does it the same way. I can tell you some of the world's greatest Parkinson's disease experts go into battle about how you do UPS Part 3. And it's kind of funny to watch when that hasn't been your whole thing, but it's very important to get consistency of assessments across sites. You need dedicated teams with real expertise in rater training. You need to ensure the quality of the data collected. So they don't only just do

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials	June 5, 2		
	Page 161		Page 163	
1	talked about before, which is they look at	1	can exclude them based on other factors if we don't	
2	consistency across measures, both qualitative and	2	think that they're going to be able to do well, and	
3	quantitatively, and that's a huge issue, too much	3	if they can't be good observers of their own	
4	for today. And it's already been touched on, but I	4	experience.	
5	can't stress that enough.	5	So one of the questions that I ask myself a	
6	Ensure that all sites are thinking the same	6	lot is why do patients participate in clinical	
7	way. We want to provide significant materials to	7	trials. I don't know the answer to that. I myself	
8	understand the placebo effect. So we have videos.	8	participated in a clinical trial when I was in	
9	You guys were talking about what you did live,	9	medical school at the University of Rochester, and	
10	which I think is really good. But we have videos	10	I know why I did it. I did it for money. I had	
11	that people can watch over and over and over again.	11	somebody put a catheter put a tube down in my	
12	And we say how often do you have to watch that	12	lungs, and they collected the macrophages from my	
13	placebo video? And we'll say, well, maybe we need	13	lungs for a very interesting study. But I knew why	
14	to do it once every month or maybe it's every two	14	I was doing it, and it was not really to better	
15	months, but it's one of the things we talk about a	15	humanity. I wanted 400 bucks.	
16	lot.	16	So what is the benefit for the patient?	
17	There is ongoing training of patients.	17	There really is none. It's really an altruistic	
18	We've talked about this in the meeting. There is	18	thing, getting back to concepts of ethics.	
19	no problem. Part of being a medical monitor is to	19	Are they really seeking primary care? I	
20	monitor the study. If things are not going well,	20	mentioned that before.	
21	you fix them. You still have an intent-to-treat	21	Are they refractory pain patients? A major	
22	analysis, you can't change the data, but you can	22	concern of mine.	
	Page 162		Page 164	
1	fix and make the data that comes in following that	1	Are there comorbidities that will impact the	
2	Intervention much better.	2	results that the patients have? We've hit upon	
3	You have to train the PI and their staff.	3	that, as well. We've hit upon professional	
4	when the receptionist says, firs. Dworkin, you look	4	patients.	
5	wondenui today and that medication must be really	5	Should subsets of patients be assessed based	
6	working for you, you know that you are pushing the	6	things?	
,	onough Patients are our partners more than	,	These are all your interacting kind of	
0	nations, and the question is does the nations	0	endpoints that one could look at to verify the	
10	exist?	10	patient has what you think they might have but	
11	Patients are study subjects with a specific	11	also to ensure the quality of the study	
12	skill set I want to get back to this because we	12	a nice example of that with 1 think the irritated	
13	talked about this vesterday. We have	13	nociceptor as an example	
14	inclusion/exclusion criteria that enrich our	14	Now. I want to move on to sites. Sites are	
15	population and make our population different, much	15	really important. What I always think about is	
16	different than the general patient out there, and	16	that we don't do basic research and have lab rats.	
17	we can go into that. But there is no reason and	17	We basically have an extended team. And so this is	
18	we've already done this.	18	the way I think about it.	
19	We select out people based on their pain	19	I have a team that is very large, and	
20	intensity with the algorithm, for instance, or with	20	sometimes we have 50 sites, and all those	
21	their ability to in a run-in period, their	21	investigators and all those people are part of my	
22	ability to do an electronic diary. We certainly	22	team. And when I go into investigator meetings.	

1	and some of you may have seen me do this, I say,	1	have been doing on in this room, I don't think	
2	"You're part of our team." One of the things I	2	there's a problem with studies enrolling too fast.	
3	want to make sure is that everybody feels like	3	And one of my folks who are in industry might want	
4	there is skin in the game. I always talk about	4	to contradict me on that, but I've never seen a	
5	skin in the game, so everybody is going to do the	5	study enroll too fast because people are so eager	
6	best quality work they can do.	6	to get patients in and are pushing that hard.	
7	So it is important, though, in terms of	7	But I do think the longer there is an issue,	
8	sites, to have geographic diversity, but too much	8	it takes sometimes a long time to get sites up and	
9	diversity can be a problem. I think a lot of	9	running, particularly after the investigator	
10	places, like Eastern Europe, have gotten much	10	meeting. There are issues with contracts. I	
11	better at doing clinical trials, based on my	11	mentioned some of these issues, as well.	
12	experience, over the last 10 years in industry.	12	But I did want to mention one of the points	
13	But still you need to pick the right sites.	13	that Rob mentioned, which is I do think it is very	
14	In Latin America, there are still issues,	14	important to visit the sites and to know the sites	
15	and we can talk about this. The placebo effect is	15	and talk to the sites. And I like to have a lot of	
16	clearly regional. If you want an example of that,	16	conversations with sites, particularly when things	
17	I'll send you a poster on my Parkinson's disease	17	aren't going well.	
18	study.	18	Again, there is huge value in face-to-face	
19	There are different practice patterns when	19	investigator meetings. I think that they know that	
20	it comes to what we're treating patients for, and	20	you really are basically, when you're dealing	
21	that can be impactful. There are different startup	21	with these drugs, it's like giving your baby to a	
22	times, which can impact study execution, as well.	22	stranger or to a babysitter, and you shouldn't be	
	Page 166		Page 168	8
			•	Č
1	And then there is I think this point of	1	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the	•
1 2	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked	1 2	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go	•
1 2 3	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research	1 2 3	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away.	
1 2 3 4	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions.	1 2 3 4	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that	•
1 2 3 4 5	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to	1 2 3 4 5	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a	
1 2 3 4 5 6	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and	1 2 3 4 5 6	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys, and there are sites and there are networks that are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really last a very long time.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys, and there are sites and there are networks that are truly amazing, where they pride themselves on the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really last a very long time. One of the things I do want to mention is we	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys, and there are sites and there are networks that are truly amazing, where they pride themselves on the quality of their work, and they will get the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really last a very long time. One of the things I do want to mention is we don't have enough sites in minority areas. This is	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys, and there are sites and there are networks that are truly amazing, where they pride themselves on the quality of their work, and they will get the neurologist to do a neurology study or an well,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really last a very long time. One of the things I do want to mention is we don't have enough sites in minority areas. This is one of the biggest failings of clinical trials	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys, and there are sites and there are networks that are truly amazing, where they pride themselves on the quality of their work, and they will get the neurologist to do a neurology study or an well, you need an anesthesiologist to do a lot of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really last a very long time. One of the things I do want to mention is we don't have enough sites in minority areas. This is one of the biggest failings of clinical trials right now. And I think to Bob's point, if you get	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys, and there are sites and there are networks that are truly amazing, where they pride themselves on the quality of their work, and they will get the neurologist to do a neurology study or an well, you need an anesthesiologist to do a lot of anesthesia studies. But there really are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really last a very long time. One of the things I do want to mention is we don't have enough sites in minority areas. This is one of the biggest failings of clinical trials right now. And I think to Bob's point, if you get your school up and running, I would like to get	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys, and there are sites and there are networks that are truly amazing, where they pride themselves on the quality of their work, and they will get the neurologist to do a neurology study or an well, you need an anesthesiologist to do a lot of anesthesia studies. But there really are Parkinson's disease experts doing Parkinson's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really last a very long time. One of the things I do want to mention is we don't have enough sites in minority areas. This is one of the biggest failings of clinical trials right now. And I think to Bob's point, if you get your school up and running, I would like to get some hospitals that serve under the sites that	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys, and there are sites and there are networks that are truly amazing, where they pride themselves on the quality of their work, and they will get the neurologist to do a neurology study or an well, you need an anesthesiologist to do a lot of anesthesia studies. But there really are Parkinson's disease experts doing Parkinson's studies. So they're very serious places, and there	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really last a very long time. One of the things I do want to mention is we don't have enough sites in minority areas. This is one of the biggest failings of clinical trials right now. And I think to Bob's point, if you get your school up and running, I would like to get some hospitals that serve under the sites that serve minorities to really take the opportunity to	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys, and there are sites and there are networks that are truly amazing, where they pride themselves on the quality of their work, and they will get the neurologist to do a neurology study or an well, you need an anesthesiologist to do a lot of anesthesia studies. But there really are Parkinson's disease experts doing Parkinson's studies. So they're very serious places, and there are more of these.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really last a very long time. One of the things I do want to mention is we don't have enough sites in minority areas. This is one of the biggest failings of clinical trials right now. And I think to Bob's point, if you get your school up and running, I would like to get some hospitals that serve under the sites that serve minorities to really take the opportunity to put them in clinical trials, as well, because they	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys, and there are sites and there are networks that are truly amazing, where they pride themselves on the quality of their work, and they will get the neurologist to do a neurology study or an well, you need an anesthesiologist to do a lot of anesthesia studies. But there really are Parkinson's disease experts doing Parkinson's studies. So they're very serious places, and there are more of these. Sites are important. A large number of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really last a very long time. One of the things I do want to mention is we don't have enough sites in minority areas. This is one of the biggest failings of clinical trials right now. And I think to Bob's point, if you get your school up and running, I would like to get some hospitals that serve under the sites that serve minorities to really take the opportunity to put them in clinical trials, as well, because they really need to be.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys, and there are sites and there are networks that are truly amazing, where they pride themselves on the quality of their work, and they will get the neurologist to do a neurology study or an well, you need an anesthesiologist to do a lot of anesthesia studies. But there really are Parkinson's disease experts doing Parkinson's studies. So they're very serious places, and there are more of these. Sites are important. A large number of sites can be certainly useful to enroll studies	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really last a very long time. One of the things I do want to mention is we don't have enough sites in minority areas. This is one of the biggest failings of clinical trials right now. And I think to Bob's point, if you get your school up and running, I would like to get some hospitals that serve under the sites that serve minorities to really take the opportunity to put them in clinical trials, as well, because they really need to be.	
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	And then there is I think this point of controlled drugs has been mentioned. We talked about academic versus quality private research institutions. I've changed my view on this. I used to think that academic institutions were the best, and I used to think that these what did we call them mills, these drug mills were horrible and that they were really bad. But then I got to meet some of these guys, and there are sites and there are networks that are truly amazing, where they pride themselves on the quality of their work, and they will get the neurologist to do a neurology study or an well, you need an anesthesiologist to do a lot of anesthesia studies. But there really are Parkinson's disease experts doing Parkinson's studies. So they're very serious places, and there are more of these. Sites are important. A large number of sites can be certainly useful to enroll studies faster. Contrary to a lot of the thoughts that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	doing that lightheartedly. And I think one of the issues is that there's this thought that if you go to a CRO, you give it to the CRO, and you go away. I don't like that method. I don't like that interaction. I think you really need to have a partnership as you do these studies. I think that part of it, whether you're a CRO or whether you're the biopharmaceutical company, face-to-face is better than on the phone. Relationships are relationships that can really last a very long time. One of the things I do want to mention is we don't have enough sites in minority areas. This is one of the biggest failings of clinical trials right now. And I think to Bob's point, if you get your school up and running, I would like to get some hospitals that serve under the sites that serve minorities to really take the opportunity to put them in clinical trials, as well, because they really need to be. I do want to mention that speed of enrollment really does negatively impact quality.	

Page 165

June 5, 2015 Page 167

	Page 169		Page 171
1	We are always pushing, pushing, pushing, and when	1	scales to make sure that they are aligned and
2	vou do that, there is a concern that investigators	2	correlated. And then you can look at site
3	may start to enroll patients who are not really	3	differences and regional differences, which I think
4	truly qualified for your study.	4	can be helpful.
5	We had one example of a study that was	5	One of the big issues that we do in industry
6	really positive in the first half, with a low	6	and CROs is really look at the inclusion/exclusion
7	placebo effect. In the second half, it was a huge	7	criteria because a lot of times they are not
8	placebo effect. It was really problematic. And we	8	followed, and that leads to significant protocol,
9	know that enrollment increases over time, and when	9	major protocol deviations. And those are
10	it speeds up, we should be a little concerned.	10	high-quality problems, because then you're not
11	I want to talk a little bit about diaries.	11	really studying the population that you thought you
12	My time is running out; I should be careful here.	12	were studying.
13	Paper diaries, I don't think they should be used	13	I do want to speak to the importance of
14	anymore. Electronic diaries are very useful. They	14	DMCs. I think these independent data monitoring
15	can assess compliance in the run-in period. You	15	committees are huge. And if any of you want to
16	can avoid the hood effect that you have with paper	16	participate in one, just let me know. People are
17	diaries, where people fill them out on the hood of	17	asking all the time for people to do this. It's
18	the car while they're waiting to come and see you	18	big. It's a big industry now, I think.
19	in the clinic.	19	Of course, they need an independent
20	There is evidence that supports that diaries	20	statistician. You can assess efficacy and safety,
21	are not only filled out retrospectively, but in one	21	and you can actually stop studies. But for
22	study in Parkinson's disease, they were filled out	22	efficacy, you can stop studies for futility, which
	Page 170		Page 1/2
1	prospectively.	1	I think is a very important thing, and I talked
2	(Laughter.)	2	about that before in terms of interim analyses.
3	DR. HEWITT: So that was a major new one to	3	We've talked about risk-based monitoring. I
4	me, and I think that will be presented in the near	4	think we've hit a lot of these things already. Let
5	future.	5	me skip over that.
6	There is also the assumption that the more	6	So the data, I think this has also been hit
7	accurate the data is, there is an increase in	7	on already, the use of flags in programming data
8	quality of the study results. I know some people	8	checks. I do think one of the things to ensure
9	believe that a lot. I'm not sure if it's	9	quality is the use of soft locks. That's where you
10	absolutely true, but it probably is.	10	really lock the patients' data, and you really
11	Translation is an issue we talked about.	11	clean it up, really as you go along instead of
12	Let me skip over that.	12	trying to do it at the end.
13	Obviously, safety monitoring is a big part	13	Unless you're a pharmaceutical company, you
14	of what we do, and the CRAs and the medical	14	may not know what I'm talking about. For those of
15	monitors and the MDs are a big part of that. I	15	us in the industry, that's a big issue because you
16	think this was covered pretty well previously in	16	spend a lot of time at the end trying to clean up
17	terms of alerts of these lab values, I think is	17	data. So I'm a big advocate of soft locks. And to
18	important.	18	check, of course, the program before you finish.
			We talked about this before ansuring that

- 20 monitoring. It's hard to monitor efficacy in a
- 21 blinded fashion, but there are methodologies that
- $\ensuremath{\ensuremath{\text{22}}}$  one can use to look at consistency of response on

20 people take the drug, and I was very excited by the

21 technology that was just mentioned. I do think

22 that the quality of a study overall begins way

Min-U-Script®

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 173		Page 175
1	before even your selection of a molecule. It's	1	Just a caution that I should have mentioned
2	really the intent of the pharmaceutical company.	2	in the housekeeping details. This is being
3	It's a decision on what mechanisms you're going to	3	transcribed. So, David, to say you get fun from
4	pursue and what molecules you're going to push	4	drugs, I'm not sure you want that to be in the
5	through.	5	record.
6	I think, obviously, you need more than a	6	(Laughter.)
7	good protocol, but a good protocol is essential.	7	DR. McDERMOTT: It could be a concern. For
8	We've talked about some clinical trial designs. I	8	those who have looked at their program and are
9	think there are some really interesting clinical	9	expecting Sharon Hertz to be here, and I'm not her,
10	trial designs that we're using right now, but one	10	in case you were wondering, she, unfortunately, was
11	of the benefits of my position right now at a CRO	11	ill and wasn't able to come in today. So I've been
12	is I get to see clinical trial designs from other	12	filling in for her.
13	areas, including oncology. And there are things	13	So let me start this off and then I'll let
14	like umbrella designs and basket designs I don't	14	any questions. One thing that both of you pointed
15	know, John, maybe we can talk about this at some	15	out, and I think really maybe we need to underscore
16	point which are really kind of interesting to	16	even more, is we've talked about patient training
17	me, whether we could start to employ adaptations of	17	and we've talked about site staff training. But I
18	those designs to pain studies, as well.	18	also heard both your two coordinators mention this,
19	I think trial execution is important. But	19	and, David, you mentioned this, is the
20	the last point is this. It really is a	20	recalibration.
21	collaborative partnership that is the quality among	21	Doing this once at the beginning of the
22	sponsor, the biopharmaceutical company, the CRO, if	22	study is probably not sufficient. This may be the
	Page 174		Page 176
1	there is one the site and most importantly the	1	kind of thing that should be planned into your
2	study subject partner, which I'll emphasize again	2	protocol, or could be considered to plan into the
2	I think with that when you realize that	2	protocol, both the site training and
4	it's really a partnership and that you have to work	4	potentially and we can talk about it
5	together observing how to do that well is I think	5	later about how you want to do this with
6	what really will ensure the quality of studies and	6	patients, should that be planned, that is not to
7	the quality of the output, and hopefully the	7	wait until it's a problem, but to actually plan
8	quality of drugs that are going to get to the	8	that recalibration.
9	patients who need them.	9	I know we're involved with some procedures
10	Thank you.	10	that do require some physical examination, and what
11	(Applause.)	11	we've learned early on is that training our
12	Q&A and Panel Discussion	12	physicians to do these evaluations, if you follow
13	DR. McDERMOTT: As always happens, we're	13	them up two or three months later, they were fine
14	sort of tweaking and modifying the schedule. Not	14	initially, but they start drifting from that. So
15	John Farrar. John Farrar, stay there, and Markman	15	that that becomes important.
16	come up here.	16	So I don't know if you want to add anymore
17	We're doing some slight modification. What	17	to that or expand, but I think it's something that
18	we're going to try and do is the panel discussion	18	you both mentioned, and I think it's something that
19	we're going to save until after lunch, but rather	19	we haven't talked enough about.
20	take a few minutes to have an opportunity to ask	20	DR. MARKMAN: We mentioned sort of the
21	questions of our two presenters, and then we'll	21	paradigm of prevent, identify, and manage. And it
22	break for lunch in 15 or 20 minutes.	22	would seem to me that doing it up front is the

Tuno	5	201
June	э,	401

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 177		Page 179
1	prevention piece. But in the protocol, if you sort	1	see all that far back. So if, for some reason, you
2	of had a remediated component, if you identify an	2	are sitting in, I'd say, the last two-thirds of the
3	issue that you think raises a question about how	3	room, I may not see you by name, but I'll sort of
4	the rating is going, based on some statistical	4	point at you to call on you.
5	analysis or other observation, and then a dose of	5	But in this part of the room, I think I saw
6	education to manage it, I think if that were	6	already a hand going up. Yes, Rob?
7	prespecified, that might be a way of not creating	7	ROB: John, one thing you mentioned I wanted
8	the issue which we were concerned about yesterday,	8	to just follow-up on, and it resonates with some of
9	where education might be started on an ad hoc	9	the work that Nat has done about sites that don't
10	basis, and that might be even be introducing	10	enroll a lot of patients. And you hinted that the
11	variability from subject to subject.	11	first patient or two that come into your trial,
12	So I think maybe making that a little more	12	you're learning on.
13	standardized with some contingencies built in would	13	It would be interesting to know if there's
14	be the way to go.	14	actually an evaluation of that first patient at
15	DR. HEWITT: I think it's huge. Obviously,	15	each site and whether we do all learn with the
16	we're talking about pain. But if we were talking	16	first patient. Are there more mistakes made? Is
17	about Alzheimer's disease, this wouldn't even be a	17	there more data missing? Is the quality of that
18	question. Rater drift is recognized in a lot of	18	first patient or two worth looking at?
19	areas within neurosciences as a really big issue,	19	One thing we did when I was with a recent
20	and you have to keep training people.	20	company is we ran a number of pilot studies, and
21	It can even get more complicated. You could	21	you almost wonder do you want to run the first
22	have central raters who look at videos to make sure	22	patient in as a pilot at each site to get the site
	Page 178		Page 180
1	people are doing the physical exam correctly, or	1	greased. They have all been to investigator
2	you can record people to see if they're really	2	meetings. We know they don't pay attention until
3	presenting the instrument correctly.	3	they have that first patient, and that's when they
4	So how you do it, even how you talk to the	4	work out the kinks of the study.
5	staff about interactions and whether you're sort of	5	But I'd be curious to know if, one, the
6	gaming the system to increase the placebo effect,	6	analysis has been done. Even sites that enroll
7	you can record sessions, you can videotape them,	7	lots of patients, what do those first one or two
8	you can send them in to the central reviewer and	8	patients look like when you separate them out?
9	see how that works.	9	Again, I know, Nat, you've done an analysis
10	But I do think whatever the particularly	10	that suggested if you're a site and you only enroll
11	for the outcome measure, it's important to get	11	one or two patients, that's not a very good site.
12	training and re-training. And I think for a lot of	12	You want the sites that have more patients. But
13	times, even though we're doing electronic diaries,	13	I'm just curious about your thoughts.
14	we think they're going to be better. I have to	14	DR. MARKMAN: I'm not aware of any data on
15	say, if I were a patient and I were doing it, there	15	how basically, how the detection machine is
16			affected by that initial patient. But Lagree with
	are going to be some times if I'm filling this out	16	anootou by that mila patoria Dati agroo mar
17	are going to be some times if I'm filling this out every day that I might I'll put down a 6. This	16 17	you, there is learning on that patient.
17 18	are going to be some times if I'm filling this out every day that I might I'll put down a 6. This is a 6 day. And I might not give it the	16 17 18	you, there is learning on that patient. I think of the analogy as to surgery,
17 18 19	are going to be some times if I'm filling this out every day that I might I'll put down a 6. This is a 6 day. And I might not give it the consideration that it was really worth doing.	16 17 18 19	you, there is learning on that patient. I think of the analogy as to surgery, basically. You don't want someone to do your
17 18 19 20	are going to be some times if I'm filling this out every day that I might I'll put down a 6. This is a 6 day. And I might not give it the consideration that it was really worth doing. So I think it's very important to stress	16 17 18 19 20	you, there is learning on that patient. I think of the analogy as to surgery, basically. You don't want someone to do your Whipple procedure who does two a year. You're
17 18 19 20 21	are going to be some times if I'm filling this out every day that I might I'll put down a 6. This is a 6 day. And I might not give it the consideration that it was really worth doing. So I think it's very important to stress that with patients.	16 17 18 19 20 21	you, there is learning on that patient. I think of the analogy as to surgery, basically. You don't want someone to do your Whipple procedure who does two a year. You're right. You want to go to someone who does a lot a

	Page 181		Page 183
1	how we think there's a relationship in medicine,	1	Singla's study with folks from Pfizer, where they
2	and we think there is some level at which quality	2	showed that in three studies of pregabalin for
3	improves after exposure.	3	acute pain, sites that only enrolled a small number
4	I don't know what that is, and I don't know	4	of patients did not separate pregabalin from
5	what the effect of that is on analgesic signal	5	placebo, whereas sites that enrolled more than a
6	detection. But I do think it's an interesting	6	certain threshold of patients
7	question, and I've observed it myself and in our	7	MALE SPEAKER: Talk into the mic.
8	team.	8	DR. KATZ: Sites that enrolled more than
9	I think the other countervailing factor.	9	that certain threshold, patients all of a sudden on
10	though, is I do think that the first patient you	10	pregabalin did look better than placebo. I don't
11	enroll, in our experience, tends to be a super	11	know. Neil, if you want to add anymore comments to
12	buttoned-up crisp patient Right? Because you've	12	that
13	been searching for that patient for a while	13	DR SINGLA: No I don't mind being
14	Right? It's sort of like dating and now you've	14	confused with you Nat. That's a compliment. We
15	not Mr. and Mrs. Right. And you could have	15	look so much alike too that's the thing
16	screened 200 people to get that person	16	(Laughter)
17	In some ways, though I think that that is a	17	DR SINGLA: That's the summary of that
1 9	very crisp patient, and you tend to have less creep	1.9	study exactly
19	with that first patient. So I don't know might be	19	DR HEWITT: Liust want to say one other
20	a couple of ways	20	thing though since this is about quality.
21	DR McDERMOTT: David do you want to	21	really believe that after the first two or three
22	comment? I'll get to you Nat Liust want to see	22	natients get in on a site, the site stops
		22	
	Page 182		Page 184
1	if David wanted to comment.	1	enrollment. So the CRA has to be out there, and
2	DR. HEWITT: No. I think that that's a	2	they have to look at the data to see if it's
3	really good question. In my experience, I have	3	guality data or not.
4	looked at the data in a few studies, and I haven't	4	I think this idea, and I have seen this
5	noted that the first patients are that much	5	before, where people let patients enroll at five or
6	different from patients who come in later. I have	6	six sites, just go crazy with enrollment, because
7	seen studies where it definitely feels like the	7	there is such speed to get the studies done, is an
8	quality drops off over time and that people may be	8	example of quality being diminished.
9	more cautious. Particularly, sometimes the CRA	9	I didn't put that in there, but if I was
10	might be really close at hand, and they may be	10	going to redo the slide deck. I'd say you need a
11	being guided by the sponsor very carefully to the	11	visit after the first two or three patients.
12	CRA in those first few patients.	12	DR. McDERMOTT: I can't see.
13	With that said. I do think there is a	13	DR. JUGE: Dean Juge. In these discussions.
14	learning curve and people get better and better	14	you have academic and CRO as kind of two pieces.
15	over time, particularly for good sites.	15	but in the last 10 years. I've seen kind of a
16	DR. MARKMAN: You're verv invested in that	16	hybrid, and let me explain that. It may be an
17	first patient, though. You want that first patient	17	issue to the companies and their sponsors when
18	to make it through. It's sort of like not making	18	they're getting studies done in that you have a lot
	te mane it in origin it o cort of into not muturing		
19	the sale at the local market to the first person	19	of academic areas or the academic PIs that belong
19 20	the sale at the local market to the first person who comes to your stand. It's a bad omen	19 20	of academic areas or the academic PIs that belong to an outside CRO entity to get their research
19 20 21	the sale at the local market to the first person who comes to your stand. It's a bad omen. DR. KATZ: Just a guick correction in	19 20 21	of academic areas or the academic PIs that belong to an outside CRO entity to get their research done.
19 20 21 22	the sale at the local market to the first person who comes to your stand. It's a bad omen. DR. KATZ: Just a quick correction in response to Rob's comment. That was actually Neil	19 20 21 22	of academic areas or the academic PIs that belong to an outside CRO entity to get their research done.

	Page 185		Page 187
1	institution, but for whatever reasons and the	1	think as the focus of these large academic medical
2	biggest reasons I've seen, primarily two, is that	2	centers and their networks change, which they will,
3	it takes so long for an institution to get an IRB	3	I think their research priorities are going to be
4	reviewed and approved, or the institution wants to	4	recalibrated. I don't think that's going to be at
5	collect so much funds from that for the	5	all 119 in the same way, but I do think that these
6	institution, and not as much is coming back to your	6	changes are happening.
7	department, that it's easier to take outside if the	7	I think in our own institution, we use WIRB
8	rules of that institution allow it. But that could	8	for a lot of our sponsor trials, which is pretty
9	be an issue for the research organization.	9	efficient, and our IRB is now run from someone who
10	For instance, at the University of Iowa, we	10	came from industry. So that's been incredibly
11	were doing a study in a company I worked for in the	11	helpful, or at least the administrative component,
12	past, and we had a sleep apnea study going on. So	12	and that's been a real sort of accelerant.
13	within the pulmonary department, they had to use	13	But what has not improved, in my experience,
14	internally, and it took forever to get the IRB,	14	in fact, may be just as challenging as eight years
15	that they just didn't meet the timeframe and we had	15	ago, is contracting. I just find that to be just
16	to drop them and contract on that end.	16	incredibly laborious and frustrating, and it's
17	Yet, with the psych department in a TBI	17	literally months, and there is no reason it needs
18	study that we were doing with the same product,	18	to be.
19	they were using an outside IRB institution and	19	I think that, from my perspective, that's
20	conducting it through an outside organization.	20	the biggest disadvantage to our own institution,
21	So the principal investigators are part of	21	and I think that, as I mentioned, the larger groups
22	an outside group, but yet the patients and their	22	at our institution have their own attorney. And so
	Page 186		Page 188
1	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it	1	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that
1	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic,	1	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm
1 2 3	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside	1 2 3	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure
1 2 3 4	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution.	1 2 3 4	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and
1 2 3 4 5	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look	1 2 3 4 5	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients come from that.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new concept that they've been using. Somebody
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients come from that. So I don't know if there are issues with	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new concept that they've been using. Somebody mentioned that they were a highly funded research
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients come from that. So I don't know if there are issues with quality or sites or whatever that happens there.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new concept that they've been using. Somebody mentioned that they were a highly funded research facility. And that is the concept of dollars per
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients come from that. So I don't know if there are issues with quality or sites or whatever that happens there, but those are things that I have dealt with in the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new concept that they've been using. Somebody mentioned that they were a highly funded research facility. And that is the concept of dollars per square foot.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients come from that. So I don't know if there are issues with quality or sites or whatever that happens there, but those are things that I have dealt with in the field, and I was wondering if you could respond to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new concept that they've been using. Somebody mentioned that they were a highly funded research facility. And that is the concept of dollars per square foot. That is, they look at clinical space, and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients come from that. So I don't know if there are issues with quality or sites or whatever that happens there, but those are things that I have dealt with in the field, and I was wondering if you could respond to that.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new concept that they've been using. Somebody mentioned that they were a highly funded research facility. And that is the concept of dollars per square foot. That is, they look at clinical space, and they want to know how much revenue is being
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients come from that. So I don't know if there are issues with quality or sites or whatever that happens there, but those are things that I have dealt with in the field, and I was wondering if you could respond to that. DR. MARKMAN: I think that's exactly I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new concept that they've been using. Somebody mentioned that they were a highly funded research facility. And that is the concept of dollars per square foot. That is, they look at clinical space, and they want to know how much revenue is being generated on that clinical space. And the amount
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients come from that. So I don't know if there are issues with quality or sites or whatever that happens there, but those are things that I have dealt with in the field, and I was wondering if you could respond to that. DR. MARKMAN: I think that's exactly I think it's a very astute comment. I think that is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new concept that they've been using. Somebody mentioned that they were a highly funded research facility. And that is the concept of dollars per square foot. That is, they look at clinical space, and they want to know how much revenue is being generated on that clinical space. And the amount of revenue that's generated on clinical space on
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients come from that. So I don't know if there are issues with quality or sites or whatever that happens there, but those are things that I have dealt with in the field, and I was wondering if you could respond to that. DR. MARKMAN: I think that's exactly I think it's a very astute comment. I think that is what I tried to get at with this notion of what it	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new concept that they've been using. Somebody mentioned that they were a highly funded research facility. And that is the concept of dollars per square foot. That is, they look at clinical space, and they want to know how much revenue is being generated on that clinical space. And the amount of revenue that's generated on clinical space on these types of trials is substantially lower that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients come from that. So I don't know if there are issues with quality or sites or whatever that happens there, but those are things that I have dealt with in the field, and I was wondering if you could respond to that. DR. MARKMAN: I think that's exactly I think it's a very astute comment. I think that is what I tried to get at with this notion of what it means to be an academic is changing. And I think	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new concept that they've been using. Somebody mentioned that they were a highly funded research facility. And that is the concept of dollars per square foot. That is, they look at clinical space, and they want to know how much revenue is being generated on that clinical space. And the amount of revenue that's generated on clinical space on these types of trials is substantially lower that we developed if, in fact, John was doing a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients come from that. So I don't know if there are issues with quality or sites or whatever that happens there, but those are things that I have dealt with in the field, and I was wondering if you could respond to that. DR. MARKMAN: I think that's exactly I think it's a very astute comment. I think that is what I tried to get at with this notion of what it means to be an academic is changing. And I think there's going to be all sorts of hybrid models and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new concept that they've been using. Somebody mentioned that they were a highly funded research facility. And that is the concept of dollars per square foot. That is, they look at clinical space, and they want to know how much revenue is being generated on that clinical space. And the amount of revenue that's generated on clinical space on these types of trials is substantially lower that we developed if, in fact, John was doing a procedure on a patient.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 186 day job is within the institution itself. So it was really like they are there an academic, however, the studies are done through an outside institution. In some of those studies, when you go look up their address or their affiliation in the study protocols, you'll see that affiliation is not the institution, but the affiliation is the organization they did the study through, although they are an academic institution and the patients come from that. So I don't know if there are issues with quality or sites or whatever that happens there, but those are things that I have dealt with in the field, and I was wondering if you could respond to that. DR. MARKMAN: I think that's exactly I think it's a very astute comment. I think that is what I tried to get at with this notion of what it means to be an academic is changing. And I think there's going to be all sorts of hybrid models and other versions which evolve, because, again. I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 188 for them, that person really is accountable to that department, but I'm using the attorneys and I'm using the individual contracting infrastructure that those other 300 investigators are using, and I'm just one group. I think that is the biggest rate-limiting step in our process. DR. McDERMOTT: Let me just add one thing that might be related to this. I think you're right and you're right from what we're seeing. At the University of Washington, there is a new concept that they've been using. Somebody mentioned that they were a highly funded research facility. And that is the concept of dollars per square foot. That is, they look at clinical space, and they want to know how much revenue is being generated on that clinical space. And the amount of revenue that's generated on clinical space on these types of trials is substantially lower that we developed if, in fact, John was doing a procedure on a patient. So I think you're going to see more of that

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 189		Page 191
1	partnering out, extending out. I think that is the	1	the time, if the CRO is going to be the one that
2	wave of the future.	2	manages the contracts, that's fine. But I think
3	Mike Rowbotham, I saw your hand up.	3	when it gets into trouble is when you have the CRO,
4	DR. ROWBOTHAM: I just wanted to say	4	the site, and the biopharmaceutical company all
5	something about the contracting process. Dave,	5	wanting to play with the because the sites
6	maybe you're in a position now to do something	6	change it. Most of the time, it's the sites that
7	about it. But our contracts for Sutter Health are	7	want to change things. And then you spend a lot of
8	all done centrally, one office for all 27	8	time with the churn.
9	hospitals, all the physicians. And we work hard to	9	So this has been a big issue, and I'm always
10	try and develop master contract templates with the	10	working on this one. This is a continuous issue.
11	major sponsoring companies. But then when they	11	So it's important.
12	send the study to a CRO, the CROs insist on their	12	DR. McDERMOTT: Roy?
13	own contracts, and that just hugely slows things	13	DR. FREEMAN: A couple of things. I think I
14	down.	14	was little bothered yesterday with Nat's very
15	There has been an effort in California that	15	creative fall below the threshold, intervene,
16	I've been a part of for a few years. I'm not sure	16	coach, retrain, system, although I think there are
17	if it's ever really going to get off the ground.	17	ways of getting around that and doing it in a way
18	It's something called PACT, Partnership to	18	that does not induce bias.
19	Accelerate Clinical Trials. And that was bringing	19	I liked John's Catholic high school
20	together 13 major research organizations from the	20	graduates way of coaching each time the patient
21	state. So it was all five UC biomedical campuses:	21	came in, provided that that is done globally across
22	Stanford, USC, Sutter Health, Dignity, all the	22	the trial. And it was fascinating that they picked
	Page 190		Page 192
1	biggest healthcare organizations, to have a single	1	on the average daily pain and we train them what it
2	contract template, a single IRB, and really try and	2	is. I'd love to hear how they explain the average
3	streamline things and get all those barriers out of	3	daily pain.
4	the way.	4	MALE SPEAKER: Dr. Dworkin will be happy to
5	But it has actually been very hard to get	5	talk to you at lunch about how you do that.
6	industry to actually fund these kinds of	6	DR. FREEMAN: But the point I do want to
7	streamlining efforts on a regional basis and to try	7	make with that preamble is that training is
8	and reduce the number of thinkers messing around	8	obviously so very important, and I think patients
9	with the contracts that make it take so long.	9	need to be retrained, and I think sites need to be
10	DR. HEWITT: Yes. Look, I think that one of	10	retrained. And here I'm going to the question
11	the biggest impediments to actually, this is a	11	is really directed at David.
12	good point. I didn't make a point of it on mine.	12	There seems to me to be a reluctance on the
13	I think that impacts quality, because when there is	13	part of CROs to actually get involved in the
14	a huge time for site startup, particularly the time	14	retraining process. And I know specifically with
15	between the investigator meeting and the site being	15	the bedside QST that I've introduced to a number of
16	ready to get their patient in, I think that's a	16	studies and have wanted for reproducibility,
17	huge negative. I talked about this when I was at	17	reliability, all of the obvious reasons, have the
18	Merck, and I talked about it at inVentive, as well.	18	CROs get involved in training, and somehow there
19	I do have some power to make changes like that, so	19	has been a block. They haven't wanted to do it.
20	I have started to do that.	20	Perhaps the pharmaceutical companies felt it's too
21	I think that one of the issues is it's not	21	expensive and have made the CRO be the bad guy and
22	always as simple as it may appear because most of	22	say, no, we can't do it, but there has been some

	Page 193		Page 195
1	reluctance.	1	then I recommend that we have a way of checking it.
2	So I wanted to get a sense of the notion of	2	So it's a really good point.
3	the CRO not just looking at data and putting yellow	3	In terms of yes. I answered both
4	stickies in, but actually training the sites on	4	questions.
5	measures and assessment tools. That's the one.	5	DR. McDERMOTT: Laurie?
6	Then the other thing is who actually trains	6	MS. BURKE: Right. I would like to take
7	the trainers? How well do your guys actually know	7	this discussion one step further, because it is
8	the protocols? You're sending people out to sites,	8	really standard now that every measurement
9	but do they know the story?	9	instrument is accompanied by a user manual and a
10	DR. HEWITT: What I would say is that,	10	training module for the reporter. That is part of
11	obviously, ours, there aren't that many CROs that	11	what is required for review at well, required.
12	have a rater training group embedded within them.	12	I can talk about required now because I'm
13	As a matter of fact, I think we're the only one.	13	not at FDA. Okay. But the user manual and the
14	So we put a lot of effort into rater training, and	14	accompanying training module will have an impact on
15	we always recommend it to every single study that	15	the measurement properties of any assessment tool.
16	we do, because I think it makes a big difference.	16	So in order to evaluate the measurement properties
17	There are people who have been doing this	17	of an assessment tool, there has to be those
18	rater training for a long time. They've had a lot	18	accompanying modules, and they have to be
19	of experience in the instruments, whether they are	19	standardized.
20	pain instruments like the BTI, or they're	20	So it's not a recommendation. This isn't
21	instruments for Parkinson's disease, like the	21	like something that's a good idea. It really is a
22	UPDRS. So they have that experience.	22	best practice bordering on if you don't do it, you
	Page 194		Page 196
1	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the	1	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment
1	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality	1	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and
1 2 3	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this	1 2 3	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable.
1 2 3 4	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't	1 2 3 4	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my
1 2 3 4 5	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done.	1 2 3 4 5	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance. So we would make sure that whatever it is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing. This is part of what they got trained in medical
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance. So we would make sure that whatever it is that you do I mean, we'd probably have you do a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing. This is part of what they got trained in medical school, everybody knows how to do it. But we know
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance. So we would make sure that whatever it is that you do I mean, we'd probably have you do a video, probably have you at the investigator	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing. This is part of what they got trained in medical school, everybody knows how to do it. But we know that they all do it differently, and in a clinical
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance. So we would make sure that whatever it is that you do I mean, we'd probably have you do a video, probably have you at the investigator meeting, and we would probably have you and some	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing. This is part of what they got trained in medical school, everybody knows how to do it. But we know that they all do it differently, and in a clinical trial, this is going to be a problem.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance. So we would make sure that whatever it is that you do I mean, we'd probably have you do a video, probably have you at the investigator meeting, and we would probably have you and some people like you that you've trained and that you	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing. This is part of what they got trained in medical school, everybody knows how to do it. But we know that they all do it differently, and in a clinical trial, this is going to be a problem. So I think this paper really needs to be
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance. So we would make sure that whatever it is that you do I mean, we'd probably have you do a video, probably have you at the investigator meeting, and we would probably have you and some people like you that you've trained and that you have because this is a really big issue. QST	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing. This is part of what they got trained in medical school, everybody knows how to do it. But we know that they all do it differently, and in a clinical trial, this is going to be a problem. So I think this paper really needs to be much more strong than what we've actually been
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance. So we would make sure that whatever it is that you do I mean, we'd probably have you do a video, probably have you at the investigator meeting, and we would probably have you and some people like you that you've trained and that you have because this is a really big issue. QST can be very different in different hands. You need	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing. This is part of what they got trained in medical school, everybody knows how to do it. But we know that they all do it differently, and in a clinical trial, this is going to be a problem. So I think this paper really needs to be much more strong than what we've actually been discussing here, and say that if you don't do it,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance. So we would make sure that whatever it is that you do I mean, we'd probably have you do a video, probably have you at the investigator meeting, and we would probably have you and some people like you that you've trained and that you have because this is a really big issue. QST can be very different in different hands. You need to make sure everybody is doing it the same. So	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing. This is part of what they got trained in medical school, everybody knows how to do it. But we know that they all do it differently, and in a clinical trial, this is going to be a problem. So I think this paper really needs to be much more strong than what we've actually been discussing here, and say that if you don't do it, it's contrary to standard recommendations. The PRO
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance. So we would make sure that whatever it is that you do I mean, we'd probably have you do a video, probably have you at the investigator meeting, and we would probably have you and some people like you that you've trained and that you have because this is a really big issue. QST can be very different in different hands. You need to make sure everybody is doing it the same. So we've talked about this in studies where they've	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing. This is part of what they got trained in medical school, everybody knows how to do it. But we know that they all do it differently, and in a clinical trial, this is going to be a problem. So I think this paper really needs to be much more strong than what we've actually been discussing here, and say that if you don't do it, it's contrary to standard recommendations. The PRO guidance talks about this. The qualification
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance. So we would make sure that whatever it is that you do I mean, we'd probably have you do a video, probably have you at the investigator meeting, and we would probably have you and some people like you that you've trained and that you have because this is a really big issue. QST can be very different in different hands. You need to make sure everybody is doing it the same. So we've talked about this in studies where they've had QST.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing. This is part of what they got trained in medical school, everybody knows how to do it. But we know that they all do it differently, and in a clinical trial, this is going to be a problem. So I think this paper really needs to be much more strong than what we've actually been discussing here, and say that if you don't do it, it's contrary to standard recommendations. The PRO guidance talks about this. All the best
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance. So we would make sure that whatever it is that you do I mean, we'd probably have you do a video, probably have you at the investigator meeting, and we would probably have you and some people like you that you've trained and that you have because this is a really big issue. QST can be very different in different hands. You need to make sure everybody is doing it the same. So we've talked about this in studies where they've had QST. In the year I've been there, nobody has done	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing. This is part of what they got trained in medical school, everybody knows how to do it. But we know that they all do it differently, and in a clinical trial, this is going to be a problem. So I think this paper really needs to be much more strong than what we've actually been discussing here, and say that if you don't do it, it's contrary to standard recommendations. The PRO guidance talks about this. The qualification guidance at FDA talks about this. All the best practice papers put out by ISCOR on outcome
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 194 We, as a company, really believe in the power of retraining in terms of having quality data. I can't really speak for other CROs in this regard. It is true that if the sponsor doesn't want to have it, it won't get done. In terms of who trains the trainer, it really depends a little bit on what the instrument is. So, for instance, this came up about QST, and we would get somebody who was like an expert in QST to train the trainer, like you, for instance. So we would make sure that whatever it is that you do I mean, we'd probably have you do a video, probably have you at the investigator meeting, and we would probably have you and some people like you that you've trained and that you have because this is a really big issue. QST can be very different in different hands. You need to make sure everybody is doing it the same. So we've talked about this in studies where they've had QST. In the year I've been there, nobody has done QST, but this is something that I'd recommend, and	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 196 really aren't even implementing your assessment tool in a way that is scientifically valid and reliable. So I'm having a really hard time in my current life because I'm working with companies who are developing clinician-reported outcome measures, taking tools and assessing patients. And we create a training module for the clinician, and they think I'm being unreasonable, and they don't want to sit through it. They all know how to do this thing. This is part of what they got trained in medical school, everybody knows how to do it. But we know that they all do it differently, and in a clinical trial, this is going to be a problem. So I think this paper really needs to be much more strong than what we've actually been discussing here, and say that if you don't do it, it's contrary to standard recommendations. The PRO guidance talks about this. The qualification guidance at FDA talks about this. All the best practice papers put out by ISCOR on outcome assessment and clinical trials, all state this. So

	Page 197		Page 199
1	it's not just a good idea.	1	point, because I've worked with when I was at
2	DR. HEWITT: Let me clarify that. I think	2	Merck and J&J, I worked almost exclusively with
3	the difference we should make is the difference	3	CROs, and so I've worked on a lot of studies. I
4	between being trained on these things the first	4	don't remember there being that much variability in
5	time, which is what obviously versus the ongoing	5	the pain world, but you may be right. And I think
6	continuing training over time. I think that's the	6	it's worth looking into further.
7	distinction I was trying to make in response to	7	In terms of Parkinson's disease, it's pretty
8	that question.	8	uniform. Whether you work on a Parkinson's disease
9	MS. BURKE: Well, I think that that should	9	study done by you all have to have training
10	be in the training manual. Whether you have found	10	videos, and you have to show them what a
11	that you need to do this only the first time at	11	Parkinson's disease patient looks like in the
12	baseline or whether this is something that needs to	12	on-state and the off-state.
13	be re-administered throughout over time, how long	13	Part of that training is it goes beyond what
14	does it stick in terms of the training.	14	you do in pain. It really goes on to can I
15	DR. McDERMOTT: I'm going to take two more	15	identify a patient who is in the on-state or the
16	questions, and then we're going to go to lunch.	16	off-state. And you'd need to talk to the patient
17	And then we will come back, so that those questions	17	about whether their dyskinesias are troublesome or
18	that don't get picked up during these next two,	18	not troublesome. And so you need to talk to them.
19	which his going to be Bob and Nat and, Ajay, I	19	So there is this training. There are two
20	saw your hand up, but you were the third. But	20	different types of training. One is the training
21	definitely when we come back, we'll have an	21	that looks at intra-rater reliability or whether
22	opportunity.	22	all sites are doing it the same way and when there
	Page 198		Page 200
1	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and-	1	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and
1	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more	1	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people
1 2 3	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of	1 2 3	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater
1 2 3 4	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go	1 2 3 4	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't
1 2 3 4 5	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat.	1 2 3 4 5	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing.
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based. I take Laurie's point that it's important, but we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not going to go well.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based. I take Laurie's point that it's important, but we don't have any evidence of any kind of improvement	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not going to go well. I'm not sure if you need to do I mean,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based. I take Laurie's point that it's important, but we don't have any evidence of any kind of improvement associated with training, that I know.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not going to go well. I'm not sure if you need to do I mean, there are some things that are kind of so obvious,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based. I take Laurie's point that it's important, but we don't have any evidence of any kind of improvement associated with training, that I know. Secondly, every SRO does it differently.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not going to go well. I'm not sure if you need to do I mean, there are some things that are kind of so obvious, I'm not sure they need to be trained.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based. I take Laurie's point that it's important, but we don't have any evidence of any kind of improvement associated with training, that I know. Secondly, every SRO does it differently.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not going to go well. I'm not sure if you need to do I mean, there are some things that are kind of so obvious, I'm not sure they need to be trained. BOB: I wasn't clear. I really meant
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based. I take Laurie's point that it's important, but we don't have any evidence of any kind of improvement associated with training, that I know. Secondly, every SRO does it differently. What you guys do at inVentive is not what they do at Premier, is not what they do at INC, is not what	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not going to go well. I'm not sure if you need to do I mean, there are some things that are kind of so obvious, I'm not sure they need to be trained. BOB: I wasn't clear. I really meant training about our efficacy assessments, our
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based. I take Laurie's point that it's important, but we don't have any evidence of any kind of improvement associated with training, that I know. Secondly, every SRO does it differently. What you guys do at inVentive is not what they do at Premier, is not what they do at INC, is not what they do at Quintiles. So we have this incredible	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not going to go well. I'm not sure if you need to do I mean, there are some things that are kind of so obvious, I'm not sure they need to be trained. BOB: I wasn't clear. I really meant training about our efficacy assessments, our zero-to-10 scales, and the other secondary
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based. I take Laurie's point that it's important, but we don't have any evidence of any kind of improvement associated with training, that I know. Secondly, every SRO does it differently. What you guys do at inVentive is not what they do at Premier, is not what they do at INC, is not what they do at Quintiles. So we have this incredible variability of what exactly we mean by training,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not going to go well. I'm not sure if you need to do I mean, there are some things that are kind of so obvious, I'm not sure they need to be trained. BOB: I wasn't clear. I really meant training about our efficacy assessments, our zero-to-10 scales, and the other secondary endpoints in a clinical trial. And I think that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based. I take Laurie's point that it's important, but we don't have any evidence of any kind of improvement associated with training, that I know. Secondly, every SRO does it differently. What you guys do at inVentive is not what they do at Premier, is not what they do at INC, is not what they do at Quintiles. So we have this incredible variability of what exactly we mean by training, and however it is being done, no one has ever	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not going to go well. I'm not sure if you need to do I mean, there are some things that are kind of so obvious, I'm not sure they need to be trained. BOB: I wasn't clear. I really meant training about our efficacy assessments, our zero-to-10 scales, and the other secondary endpoints in a clinical trial. And I think that varies all over the map from no training at
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based. I take Laurie's point that it's important, but we don't have any evidence of any kind of improvement associated with training, that I know. Secondly, every SRO does it differently. What you guys do at inVentive is not what they do at Premier, is not what they do at INC, is not what they do at Quintiles. So we have this incredible variability of what exactly we mean by training, and however it is being done, no one has ever systematically studied the impact of it.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not going to go well. I'm not sure if you need to do I mean, there are some things that are kind of so obvious, I'm not sure they need to be trained. BOB: I wasn't clear. I really meant training about our efficacy assessments, our zero-to-10 scales, and the other secondary endpoints in a clinical trial. And I think that varies all over the map from no training at all the patient is given BPI
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based. I take Laurie's point that it's important, but we don't have any evidence of any kind of improvement associated with training, that I know. Secondly, every SRO does it differently. What you guys do at inVentive is not what they do at Premier, is not what they do at INC, is not what they do at Quintiles. So we have this incredible variability of what exactly we mean by training, and however it is being done, no one has ever systematically studied the impact of it. I don't have an answer to that but I think	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not going to go well. I'm not sure if you need to do I mean, there are some things that are kind of so obvious, I'm not sure they need to be trained. BOB: I wasn't clear. I really meant training about our efficacy assessments, our zero-to-10 scales, and the other secondary endpoints in a clinical trial. And I think that varies all over the map from no training at all the patient is given BPI DR. HEWITT: Right. I see what you're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 198 Probably the best thing about question-and- answer sessions is when people leave with more questions, because that means that there's a lot of interest and enthusiasm. So Bob, and then we'll go to Nat. BOB: David, I'm all for training, as you know. I think, first of all, there are two huge problems. And this has been alluded to, but I'll say it explicitly. One is it's not evidence-based. I take Laurie's point that it's important, but we don't have any evidence of any kind of improvement associated with training, that I know. Secondly, every SRO does it differently. What you guys do at inVentive is not what they do at Premier, is not what they do at INC, is not what they do at Quintiles. So we have this incredible variability of what exactly we mean by training, and however it is being done, no one has ever systematically studied the impact of it. I don't have an answer to that but I think it's a huge set of issues.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 200 is variability there, and do you follow that and test that. And you do do that. There are people who spend a lot of time looking at intra-rater reliability to make sure that there isn't discordance over time. I think that's one thing. But the other thing is just to make sure people know how to do the study in the first place, they need to be trained. So if you don't train somebody for a study, they're untrained. It's not going to go well. I'm not sure if you need to do I mean, there are some things that are kind of so obvious, I'm not sure they need to be trained. BOB: I wasn't clear. I really meant training about our efficacy assessments, our zero-to-10 scales, and the other secondary endpoints in a clinical trial. And I think that varies all over the map from no training at all the patient is given BPI DR. HEWITT: Right. I see what you're saying.

Pai	in Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 201		Page 203
1	begun to do, which is to look at the kinds of	1	would be to require that instruments have to be
2	things that the FDA would require.	2	revalidated from the get-go.
3	DR. HEWITT: No. I mean, I think that's a	3	So I wonder what other people think about
4	good point. I think that's a good point.	4	that and whether that's worth addressing in this
5	BOB: And it's huge variability, and it	5	paper.
6	isn't evidence-based. I think at this stage,	6	DR. McDERMOTT: Well, first, back to these
7	variability is good because one could at least	7	gentlemen. Do either one of you want to comment on
8	imagine a study where Nat's training program is	8	that observation?
9	compared to our training program is compared to	9	DR. HEWITT: I guess one of the comments I'd
10	Neil's training program, and that would be really	10	make is this. We've had a lot of clinical trials
11	cool, and which of the three training programs have	11	over the years, and we've had a lot of drugs to get
12	the best performance.	12	approved by the FDA. So I think one of the things
13	DR. HEWITT: I see what you're saying, yes.	13	that I think this kind of raises, to my mind, is
14	l agree.	14	what we're really trying to do is do it better.
15	BOB: None of that is being done. Right now	15	I think the question we always have to ask
16	it's all totally ad hoc.	16	ourselves is are there any drugs that have not
17	DR. McDERMOTT: Nat. And then we're going	17	gotten approved because there was not adequate
18	to have lunch. But before we're going to go to	18	training on an instrument. I think that's a
19	lunch and don't run out the door I'm going to	19	question we can ask ourselves. Do we know that
20	ask Valorie if she's got any comments. So Nat,	20	that have there been drugs that have not been
21	then Valorie, then lunch.	21	approved, and then, conversely, are there drugs
22	Nat?	22	that have been approved that shouldn't have been
	Page 202		Page 204
1	DR KATZ: I wanted to follow on Laurie	1	approved
1	Burko's commont in that I completely agree with her	1 2	BOB: David L bave to interrupt. What do
2	that anything that you want any instrument that	2	you think happened with toniramate for DPN2 You
4	you want the site to utilize to assess a natient	4	were involved in that. Your trial was positive
5	if it's important to assess that aspect of the	5	three other trials in Europe, as Lirecall, were
6	natient's state it's important to train the people	6	negative
7	doing it how to do it	7	DR HEWITT: Worldwide
8	So Lagree with that. But I wanted to point	8	BOB: Do you think if those European trial
9	out that there is a certain trap there that is	9	investigators had been trained, topiramate would
10	worth recognizing that I've run into once or twice.	10	now be available?
11	where I've run into people who say, "Yeah, we want	11	DR. HEWITT: I think that's a good point and
12	to do a training" it's fine to use a training	12	I think yes, I mean, I guess just prove me
13	program, but if you're going to do that, you have	13	wrong.
14	to revalidate the entire instrument from the very	14	BOB: You couldn't have been more central.
15	beginning because the training program might	15	(Laughter.)
16	somehow if you were going to put an 8, maybe you	16	DR. HEWITT: That is a good point, but I
17	would have put a 7. It changes the performance	17	guess that is true that you can that that has
18	characteristics of the instrument sufficiently that	18	happened. But the flipside is
19	we can't really sign off on the use of that	19	BOB: Three European trials killed your
20		1	deuro
	instrument.	20	arug.
21	Instrument. If we wanted to stifle improvement in	20 21	DR. HEWITT: I know, I know. That is true.
21 22	Instrument. If we wanted to stifle improvement in quality, that's the best way to do it, I think,	20 21 22	DR. HEWITT: I know, I know. That is true. That is true. But the thing is that even with

		1	
	Page 205		Page 207
1	that, I will say this, that all those studies, it	1	the new measurement properties are, like
2	could be I mean, to be honest, it could be that	2	test/retest reliability, you would have to
3	topiramate really isn't that good for neuropathic	3	re-measure them.
4	pain, and that our study was the outlier, and that	4	DR. McDERMOTT: Let's hold it there. You
5	the other three studies were better.	5	want to go back and forth, and that's great, but we
6	From an evidence-based point of view, I have	6	do need to go to lunch.
7	to be obviously, I wanted my study to be the one	7	So, Valorie, any comments that you want to
8	that's positive, but the way the world goes is it's	8	make to people?
9	not necessarily the greatest I mean, sorry for	9	MS. THOMPSON: If you want to order a taxi,
10	those people who do topiramate. But part of the	10	we will have a notice at your desk when you come
11	problem with that study we could go on a lot	11	back after lunch [inaudible - off microphone].
12	about it had to do with dropouts due to taste	12	DR. McDERMOTT: Valorie was not in here when
13	differences and to the fact of CNS, what they call	13	I thanked her and Andrea earlier. So I want to,
14	Topamax.	14	again, thank you for all the efforts that you and
15	So there is no question that the drug who	15	Andrea have done to make this meeting useful.
16	came up with it? There was a great line that	16	(Applause.)
17	somebody had today about effectiveness, that it may	17	DR. McDERMOTT: So we're going to be going
18	not be it might be an efficacious drug, but it	18	to lunch, which is back where we had lunch
19	may not be an effective drug.	19	yesterday. Come back here at let's make it
20	In that regard, it probably isn't a bad	20	1:30, to give you a little bit of extra time, and
21	thing that Topamax isn't approved. It's getting	21	we'll then have the panel discussion.
22	used for it, as well, but good point.	22	(Whereupon, a luncheon recess was taken.)
	Page 206		Page 208
	Page 206		Page 206
1	DR. McDERMOTT: I don't think we need to get	1	AFTERNOON SESSION
2	into the details of the studies here.	2	MODERATOR: Okay, please take your seats so
3	Laurie, let me just have the last		
4		3	we can get started again. And for those of you
-	word you need to respond. Okay.	3 4	we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you
5	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I	3 4 5	we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would
5	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's	3 4 5 6	we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification.
5 6 7	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion	3 4 5 6 7	we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification. Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional
5 6 7 8	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program	3 4 5 6 7 8	we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification. Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional until you do the paper.
5 6 7 8 9	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure,	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification. Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional until you do the paper. Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel,
5 6 7 8 9 10	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure, then, of course, you would want to have additional	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification. Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional until you do the paper. Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel, but I realize that as I was sort of rushing you to
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure, then, of course, you would want to have additional test/retest reliability on that measure so that you	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification. Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional until you do the paper. Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel, but I realize that as I was sort of rushing you to lunch, because I could see hunger in your eyes,
5 6 7 8 9 10 11	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure, then, of course, you would want to have additional test/retest reliability on that measure so that you have a better idea of how you interpret your	3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12	we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification. Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional until you do the paper. Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel, but I realize that as I was sort of rushing you to lunch, because I could see hunger in your eyes, that I may have short-circuited a bit the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure, then, of course, you would want to have additional test/retest reliability on that measure so that you have a better idea of how you interpret your clinical trial results. You would want to have	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification. Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional until you do the paper. Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel, but I realize that as I was sort of rushing you to lunch, because I could see hunger in your eyes, that I may have short-circuited a bit the conversation that was going on with Laurie Burke
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure, then, of course, you would want to have additional test/retest reliability on that measure so that you have a better idea of how you interpret your clinical trial results. You would want to have that. You also would want to do exploratory work	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification. Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional until you do the paper. Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel, but I realize that as I was sort of rushing you to lunch, because I could see hunger in your eyes, that I may have short-circuited a bit the conversation that was going on with Laurie Burke and with Nat Katz.
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure, then, of course, you would want to have additional test/retest reliability on that measure so that you have a better idea of how you interpret your clinical trial results. You would want to have that. You also would want to do exploratory work during your clinical trial to correlate with other	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification. Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional until you do the paper. Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel, but I realize that as I was sort of rushing you to lunch, because I could see hunger in your eyes, that I may have short-circuited a bit the conversation that was going on with Laurie Burke and with Nat Katz. So Laurie, I just want to give you the
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure, then, of course, you would want to have additional test/retest reliability on that measure so that you have a better idea of how you interpret your clinical trial results. You would want to have that. You also would want to do exploratory work during your clinical trial to correlate with other related measures and do some construct validity.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	<ul> <li>we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification.</li> <li>Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional until you do the paper.</li> <li>Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel, but I realize that as I was sort of rushing you to lunch, because I could see hunger in your eyes, that I may have short-circuited a bit the conversation that was going on with Laurie Burke and with Nat Katz.</li> <li>So Laurie, I just want to give you the chance to in case there was something you wanted</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure, then, of course, you would want to have additional test/retest reliability on that measure so that you have a better idea of how you interpret your clinical trial results. You would want to have that. You also would want to do exploratory work during your clinical trial to correlate with other related measures and do some construct validity. I completely would argue with anybody who	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>we can get started again. And for those of you</li> <li>that are sort of wandering around, come in or you</li> <li>won't be able to get your certification. It would</li> <li>be required. Only your level 1 certification.</li> <li>Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional</li> <li>until you do the paper.</li> <li>Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel,</li> <li>but I realize that as I was sort of rushing you to</li> <li>lunch, because I could see hunger in your eyes,</li> <li>that I may have short-circuited a bit the</li> <li>conversation that was going on with Laurie Burke</li> <li>and with Nat Katz.</li> <li>So Laurie, I just want to give you the</li> <li>chance to in case there was something you wanted</li> <li>to finish off that I didn't give you the chance to.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure, then, of course, you would want to have additional test/retest reliability on that measure so that you have a better idea of how you interpret your clinical trial results. You would want to have that. You also would want to do exploratory work during your clinical trial to correlate with other related measures and do some construct validity. I completely would argue with anybody who says that you have to start from scratch and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>we can get started again. And for those of you</li> <li>that are sort of wandering around, come in or you</li> <li>won't be able to get your certification. It would</li> <li>be required. Only your level 1 certification.</li> <li>Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional</li> <li>until you do the paper.</li> <li>Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel,</li> <li>but I realize that as I was sort of rushing you to</li> <li>lunch, because I could see hunger in your eyes,</li> <li>that I may have short-circuited a bit the</li> <li>conversation that was going on with Laurie Burke</li> <li>and with Nat Katz.</li> <li>So Laurie, I just want to give you the</li> <li>chance to in case there was something you wanted</li> <li>to finish off that I didn't give you the chance to.</li> <li>And then if Nat has any comment on that, and then</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure, then, of course, you would want to have additional test/retest reliability on that measure so that you have a better idea of how you interpret your clinical trial results. You would want to have that. You also would want to do exploratory work during your clinical trial to correlate with other related measures and do some construct validity. I completely would argue with anybody who says that you have to start from scratch and revalidate from the get-go and go through your	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification.</li> <li>Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional until you do the paper.</li> <li>Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel, but I realize that as I was sort of rushing you to lunch, because I could see hunger in your eyes, that I may have short-circuited a bit the conversation that was going on with Laurie Burke and with Nat Katz.</li> <li>So Laurie, I just want to give you the chance to in case there was something you wanted to finish off that I didn't give you the chance to.</li> <li>And then if Nat has any comment on that, and then we'll go back to the panel.</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure, then, of course, you would want to have additional test/retest reliability on that measure so that you have a better idea of how you interpret your clinical trial results. You would want to have that. You also would want to do exploratory work during your clinical trial to correlate with other related measures and do some construct validity. I completely would argue with anybody who says that you have to start from scratch and revalidate from the get-go and go through your whole process. But there are some it is going	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>we can get started again. And for those of you that are sort of wandering around, come in or you won't be able to get your certification. It would be required. Only your level 1 certification.</li> <li>Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional until you do the paper.</li> <li>Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel, but I realize that as I was sort of rushing you to lunch, because I could see hunger in your eyes, that I may have short-circuited a bit the conversation that was going on with Laurie Burke and with Nat Katz.</li> <li>So Laurie, I just want to give you the chance to in case there was something you wanted to finish off that I didn't give you the chance to.</li> <li>And then if Nat has any comment on that, and then we'll go back to the panel.</li> <li>MS. BURKE: Sure. I think I had the</li> </ul>
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	word you need to respond. Okay. MS. BURKE: I need to respond to Nat. I think that there is revalidation and then there's revalidation. And so there may be some confusion about this. If you implement a training program that you think really tightens up your measure, then, of course, you would want to have additional test/retest reliability on that measure so that you have a better idea of how you interpret your clinical trial results. You would want to have that. You also would want to do exploratory work during your clinical trial to correlate with other related measures and do some construct validity. I completely would argue with anybody who says that you have to start from scratch and revalidate from the get-go and go through your whole process. But there are some it is going to modify the measurement properties of the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>we can get started again. And for those of you</li> <li>that are sort of wandering around, come in or you</li> <li>won't be able to get your certification. It would</li> <li>be required. Only your level 1 certification.</li> <li>Remember, you have to go up to it's provisional</li> <li>until you do the paper.</li> <li>Okay. So we want to pick up with the panel,</li> <li>but I realize that as I was sort of rushing you to</li> <li>lunch, because I could see hunger in your eyes,</li> <li>that I may have short-circuited a bit the</li> <li>conversation that was going on with Laurie Burke</li> <li>and with Nat Katz.</li> <li>So Laurie, I just want to give you the</li> <li>chance to in case there was something you wanted</li> <li>to finish off that I didn't give you the chance to.</li> <li>And then if Nat has any comment on that, and then</li> <li>we'll go back to the panel.</li> <li>MS. BURKE: Sure. I think I had the</li> <li>opportunity to say most of what I wanted to say,</li> </ul>

	Page 209		Page 211
1	mark in some people's minds about exactly what I	1	what we heard was these are coming closer and
2	did say.	2	closer together. So what I thought I would do is
3	The point is that Nat's question was do you	3	start by having Ian Gilron and John Farrar, any
4	have to revalidate the instrument once you have	4	comments they have about either what they heard in
5	changed it in terms of attaching a training program	5	those presentations in particular, also to chance
6	and a user manual to it. The answer is	6	if they want to drift off other places we might let
7	(Laughter.)	7	them. But try and focus, at least initially, on
8	MALE SPEAKER: The FDA talks.	8	what you heard from David and from John.
9	MS. BURKE: yes, but not in the way you	9	DR. GILRON: Okay. I was just telling John
10	might think. The answer is you would want to know	10	earlier I usually give unsolicited opinions, so
11	what the new measurement properties of that	11	I've actually been asked for it, so it's kind of
12	instrument are. You would want to know, in	12	exciting.
13	particular, what the test/retest reliability of	13	MODERATOR: I'm asking for an unsolicited
14	that measure is, and what the variability, then,	14	opinion.
15	estimates are to help you in the interpretation	15	DR. GILRON: Yes, okay. Well I'm just going
16	with clinical trial results.	16	to start just with some general comments talking
17	If nothing else, at a very minimum, you	17	about the dichotomy that Nat started talking about
18	should do this testing at baseline in the week	18	and John discussed further. And I think of it. as
19	before randomization in your clinical trial. So	19	well, from the perspective of, as John described.
20	therefore, you have an estimate of variability in	20	someone who does trials more from a proof of
21	your patient population. You'll be able to use	21	concept, academic perspective.
22	that in the interpretation of your treatment	22	I think of the onus on the scientific part
	Page 210		Page 212
1	effect	1	of things really to be exploratory and to provide
2	At the end of the day it will give everybody	2	appropriate guidance towards coming up with new
2	more confidence in the particularly small-ish	2	treatments, whereas the regulatory approach is
4	differences between treatment groups, and it can be	4	really one of public health responsibility and
5	a real advantage. And also, the other types of	5	looking at cost effectiveness, meaning not to
6	validation like construct validity testing can be	6	approve treatments that are only marginally
7	done as exploratory analyses in the phase 3 trial	7	effective and possibly very expensive, but also a
,	Of course optimally you would want to do	,	hig emphasis on safety
0	this in a stand-alone study, but few people want to	0	So I was woodering that I don't know if
10	fund that and it's not necessary	10	we have spent enough time talking about quality
11	MODERATOR: Nat. do you want to amend at all	11	with respect to safety assessment in reporting, and
12	vour comment?	12	I know ACTTION has very involved in sort of waying
12	DR KATZ: No we agreed on that so we're	12	the flag of improving safety reporting. So I was
14	friends again now	14	iust wondering whether we need to in the paper
15	(Laughter)	15	make more noise about quality with respect to that
16	MODERATOR: Okay Well you know when Laurie	16	nart of things
17	Burke wants to talk everybody stops	17	MODERATOR: John?
18	MALE SPEAKER: We're all going to listen	18	JOHN: So I was taken in the presentation
10	MODERATOR: So let's go back to the panel	10	by John Markman of the comment of the obviously
		19	
20	Just before lunch, we had had David Hewitt and John	20	very talented coordinators that he has relative to
20 21	Just before lunch, we had had David Hewitt and John Markman sort of give perspectives again from	20 21	very talented coordinators that he has, relative to
20 21 22	Just before lunch, we had had David Hewitt and John Markman sort of give perspectives again from academic and from the CRO industry But Lthink	20 21 22	the conversation or multiple conversations that she'd had, obviously recently, relative to blood
20 21 22	Just before lunch, we had had David Hewitt and John Markman sort of give perspectives again from academic and from the CRO industry. But I think	20 21 22	the conversation or multiple conversations that she'd had, obviously recently, relative to blood

## IMMPACT XVIII - Initiative on Methods, Measurement, and Pain Assessment in Clinical Trials

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 213		Page 215
1	pressures of 141 over 82 versus 139 over 79	1	realizing that nothing is ever perfect and that we
2	It brought to mind something that I think	2	are always going to have to make some compromise.
3	was brought up a little bit vesterday, which is	3	We just need to decide where those
4	that we need to be very careful as we move forward.	4	compromises are and be efficient and comprehensive
5	to meld a couple of ideas that IMMPACT and ACTTION	5	and careful to try and make the studies answer the
6	have been working on, which is one of them is	6	right question and provide us with the data that we
7	obviously to make trials responsible and conducted	7	need.
8	in a way that makes sense and that provides valid	8	MODERATOR: John. did you want to comment on
9	results	9	that? I saw you look at me
10	But on the other hand, not to impose on	10	IOHN: Well Liust thought I think John's
11	those trials a burden of control regulatory	11	point about a little bit of flexibility is
12	control that doesn't actually benefit the trial	12	important I think that's some of what you're
13	and adds additional time and effort frustration	13	suggesting
14	to the process	14	The other question I've had, and I've heen
15	I'm reminded that many of our young	15	really trying to get my head around is at some
16	investigators that come to us, when we ask what	16	level when you're doing one of these smaller
17	they want to measure, they basically say	17	trials too you're thinking about the next trial
10	"over thing " They want to know how the patient's	10	because your hypothesis comes out of the
10	fooling. They want to know a best of different	10	observations of doing the trial you're ourrently
19	things, and we need to remind them that we have	19	doing And I think that and I thought of this
20	anily so many things that we can ask in any one	20	kind of vic è vic the issue of blinding a site to
21	trial And I think that applies through a number	21	and blinding every piece to it
22	that. And I think that applies through a humber	22	an, and binding every piece to it.
	Page 214		Page 216
1	of different components of what we've talked about	1	l mean you're really how much are you
2	today	2	really giving up a serendipitous observation, which
3	All of the things that we've talked about in	3	will be the germ of your next hypothesis by
4	terms of looking for potential signs and markers	4	disengaging everyone at the site from their little
5	for different kinds of problems careful	5	local observations?
6	monitoring visiting maybe after the third patient	6	It's sort of a little bit of tangential
7	doing central monitoring on ongoing basis are	7	point, but it also kind of plays on this notion of
, 8	all important. But we do need to take them with	, 8	how much flexibility and again the
9	iust a few grains of salt and ask ourselves the	9	differentiation between a public health consequence
10	harder question which is are we going to gain	10	of a trial versus a trial which is exploratory
11	benefit from what we're actually doing?	11	MALE SPEAKER: But I think your point is
12	Is the trial going to be better at its	12	exactly the right one, which is that the question
13	ability to differentiate a real effect between a	13	is what's the goal of the trial? If the goal of
14	treatment either two treatments or a treatment and	14	the trial is to approve a drug that's going to be
15	a placebo, assuming that that treatment actually	15	used in millions of people, then you damn well
16	exists?	16	better be sure it's safe.
17	So I really feel very strongly that we need	17	If the goal is to know whether that drug
18	to be cognizant of the cost benefit value of the	18	works at all so that you might use it as a model
19	kinds of things that we might impose to improve	19	for another drug that you might develop or you do
20	both the ability to detect efficacy and safety	20	formal testing, or if it's a nilot study, then the
21	would just push that as a component of how we do	21	requirements are somewhat less
22	about implementing all of the various steps.	22	So keeping in mind what the goal of the
	1 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

	Page 217		Page 219
1	trial is, and you presented three different	1	But if you're educating people about being
2	potential goals I one might argue that there are	2	qualified to be clinical trial investigators, what
3	four or five. But if we understand what the	3	are we learning that we could then feedback to
4	question is that we're asking, we're much better at	4	those people?
5	figuring out how to answer it.	5	So unless any of you want to comment on each
6	MODERATOR: An important point that you're	6	other's David?
7	sort of implying, and I was thinking about this	7	DR. HEWITT: I just want to make a comment
8	when I was sitting there was that we, in some	8	about what you said
9	sense, have been talking about and thinking about	9	MODERATOR: Sure.
10	these trials as if they are, once you do it, you	10	MALE SPEAKER: because I think that's
11	design it, you run it, you're done. But what we	11	really key is and I was kind of getting to this
12	learn from those trials potentially influences the	12	with the Six Sigma comment I made yesterday, is
13	things we can benefit.	13	that this is really an iterative process, and it's
14	So when Bernard talked about the placebo	14	actually iterative during the course of the study
15	issues and when we've heard issues about fraud from	15	when you're retraining people.
16	Eric Devine, as we learn those things, that feeds	16	But it's also iterative in terms of taking
17	back to so that we improve the science. So take	17	the lessons you've learned and making sure that you
18	the information you're gaining, and in addition to	18	disseminate them. And so it doesn't matter if it's
19	whatever you find out for that one study, that	19	a bid defense for me or a clinical trial, I'm
20	information then becomes	20	really kind of a stickler for having a lessons
21	So if we talk about what can you anticipate	21	learned meeting after whatever's happened, as soon
22	and try to prevent in the next study, you'll use	22	as possible. And I think in that way, you can
	Page 218		Page 220
1	this as an opportunity to learn something and not	_	
2		1	disseminate that information across an organization
- 4	about the study, study design going forward; and	1 2	disseminate that information across an organization or a group.
2 3	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're	1 2 3	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups
2 3 4	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and	1 2 3 4	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at
2 3 4 5	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really	1 2 3 4 5	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if
2 3 4 5 6	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired.	1 2 3 4 5 6	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you
2 3 4 5 6 7	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems, issues, difficulties, things you need to control,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so don't there's no reason to screw up twice.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems, issues, difficulties, things you need to control, some of which may be controllable, some of which	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so don't there's no reason to screw up twice. MODERATOR: Well, I think this gives you a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems, issues, difficulties, things you need to control, some of which may be controllable, some of which you may have to understand that are not	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so don't there's no reason to screw up twice. MODERATOR: Well, I think this gives you a sense of why Bob and I and the rest of us who've
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems, issues, difficulties, things you need to control, some of which may be controllable, some of which you may have to understand that are not controllable.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so don't there's no reason to screw up twice. MODERATOR: Well, I think this gives you a sense of why Bob and I and the rest of us who've been involved going back to the early days of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems, issues, difficulties, things you need to control, some of which may be controllable, some of which you may have to understand that are not controllable. But I think we really need to think about	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so don't there's no reason to screw up twice. MODERATOR: Well, I think this gives you a sense of why Bob and I and the rest of us who've been involved going back to the early days of IMMPACT and to ACTTION, was to say not only do we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems, issues, difficulties, things you need to control, some of which may be controllable, some of which you may have to understand that are not controllable. But I think we really need to think about programmatic research, where we used to talk about	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so don't there's no reason to screw up twice. MODERATOR: Well, I think this gives you a sense of why Bob and I and the rest of us who've been involved going back to the early days of IMMPACT and to ACTTION, was to say not only do we want to have meetings and discuss things and get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems, issues, difficulties, things you need to control, some of which may be controllable, some of which you may have to understand that are not controllable. But I think we really need to think about programmatic research, where we used to talk about when we were promoting professors, it wasn't that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so don't there's no reason to screw up twice. MODERATOR: Well, I think this gives you a sense of why Bob and I and the rest of us who've been involved going back to the early days of IMMPACT and to ACTTION, was to say not only do we want to have meetings and discuss things and get things around, but how do we get that information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems, issues, difficulties, things you need to control, some of which may be controllable, some of which you may have to understand that are not controllable. But I think we really need to think about programmatic research, where we used to talk about when we were promoting professors, it wasn't that they had one article or one well-known paper, but	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so don't there's no reason to screw up twice. MODERATOR: Well, I think this gives you a sense of why Bob and I and the rest of us who've been involved going back to the early days of IMMPACT and to ACTTION, was to say not only do we want to have meetings and discuss things and get things around, but how do we get that information out there so that and we'll be talking very
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems, issues, difficulties, things you need to control, some of which may be controllable, some of which you may have to understand that are not controllable. But I think we really need to think about programmatic research, where we used to talk about when we were promoting professors, it wasn't that they had one article or one well-known paper, but what's their program of research. And maybe we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so don't there's no reason to screw up twice. MODERATOR: Well, I think this gives you a sense of why Bob and I and the rest of us who've been involved going back to the early days of IMMPACT and to ACTTION, was to say not only do we want to have meetings and discuss things and get things around, but how do we get that information out there so that and we'll be talking very shortly about a manuscript. It's because we want
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems, issues, difficulties, things you need to control, some of which may be controllable, some of which you may have to understand that are not controllable. But I think we really need to think about programmatic research, where we used to talk about when we were promoting professors, it wasn't that they had one article or one well-known paper, but what's their program of research. And maybe we should be thinking more broadly about what's the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so don't there's no reason to screw up twice. MODERATOR: Well, I think this gives you a sense of why Bob and I and the rest of us who've been involved going back to the early days of IMMPACT and to ACTTION, was to say not only do we want to have meetings and discuss things and get things around, but how do we get that information out there so that and we'll be talking very shortly about a manuscript. It's because we want to make sure that the information gets there, so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems, issues, difficulties, things you need to control, some of which may be controllable, some of which you may have to understand that are not controllable. But I think we really need to think about programmatic research, where we used to talk about when we were promoting professors, it wasn't that they had one article or one well-known paper, but what's their program of research. And maybe we should be thinking more broadly about what's the program of a research related to clinical trials.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so don't there's no reason to screw up twice. MODERATOR: Well, I think this gives you a sense of why Bob and I and the rest of us who've been involved going back to the early days of IMMPACT and to ACTTION, was to say not only do we want to have meetings and discuss things and get things around, but how do we get that information out there so that and we'll be talking very shortly about a manuscript. It's because we want to make sure that the information gets there, so that whatever wisdom we've picked up along the way
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	about the study, study design going forward; and not just, okay, we've now done our study, we're done with that, and move off to our next study and start essentially as if nothing was really acquired. I don't mean nothing, because obviously the outcomes people will be aware of, but to realize other things that came up along the way, problems, issues, difficulties, things you need to control, some of which may be controllable, some of which you may have to understand that are not controllable. But I think we really need to think about programmatic research, where we used to talk about when we were promoting professors, it wasn't that they had one article or one well-known paper, but what's their program of research. And maybe we should be thinking more broadly about what's the program of a research related to clinical trials. And maybe that goes back to the discussion we had,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	disseminate that information across an organization or a group. But a lot of it has to do with how groups and organizations work and how they get better at what they do. And I think you're right. It's if you reinvent the wheel each time for you shouldn't. You should have methodologies, and you should be realizing this is where you're going to have the potential to really screw up, so don't there's no reason to screw up twice. MODERATOR: Well, I think this gives you a sense of why Bob and I and the rest of us who've been involved going back to the early days of IMMPACT and to ACTTION, was to say not only do we want to have meetings and discuss things and get things around, but how do we get that information out there so that and we'll be talking very shortly about a manuscript. It's because we want to make sure that the information gets there, so that whatever wisdom we've picked up along the way from the presentations, from the discussions, gets

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 221		Page 223
1	come along and people will learn from this	1	hard to get a drug before it's been approved and do
2	experience.	2	a study on it. You can, but I think it's a big
3	So okay, let's open it up for the audience.	3	challenge to do that.
4	Any questions for our panelists? Yes, Rob?	4	So in a way, once you get through all that
5	ROB: So maybe this has been emphasized	5	safety data, right, and the efficacy data with the
6	enough, but certainly one size won't fit all. I	6	original approval and the regulatory process,
7	mean, in the drug development process at	7	things ought to to John's point, things should
8	Wyeth no longer Wyeth, now called Pfizer we	8	be a little bit easier. There should be
9	had this concept of learn and confirm, and whether	9	less not less rigor, but maybe less neurosis
10	those terms mean anything.	10	around the compulsion to cross every T and dot
11	Learn, from my perspective, was explore.	11	every I, because the drug's already been approved,
12	You're early in the stage of drug development. You	12	and we know that it's safe, from a safety point of
13	want to work with small numbers of sites, very	13	view.
14	scientifically based questions. Confirm, not to	14	Now from a quality point of view and
15	label it as a regulatory requirement, but that	15	demonstrating that your efficacy really is your
16	really was the burden of a drug development program	16	efficacy, that goes back to I think the point
17	to look at all the safety issues and to confirm	17	you're making. But I think that's important.
18	what you've learned in earlier trials.	18	MODERATOR: Let me just add one thing, and
19	The burden and the responsibilities of each	19	I'll get to you. We keep talking about drug
20	of those two phases takes on a very different	20	studies, and I'd be interested in knowing whether
21	profile. You might have a Web-based medical	21	there's anything that we've talked about, if we
22	investigator meeting once you've established sites	22	took the word drug out and put complementary
	Page 222		Page 224
1	and you've established the product, but early on	1	medicine or put rehabilitation, other than unique
2	you want to have face-to-face. You want to have	2	features that are specific to a particular drug's
3	very personal relationships with your investigators	3	side effects or the worry about other medication
4	and your study staff.	4	they're taking, is there anything different about
5	Again, as we start to think about solutions,	5	what we've been describing for what would go into a
6	there may be some that run across both a learn and	6	well-done, well-designed, carefully-controlled,
7	a confirm phase of drug development or even a	7	high-quality clinical trial, anything that isn't
8	post-approval. We haven't even talked about how	8	necessarily a drug?
9	you control trials after they've been approved.	9	MODERATOR: John? You've done some of those
10	But I think we need to think about there	10	studies, complementary medicine.
11	may be common threads, but there may be distinct	11	JOHN: Right. I think that exactly the same
12	differences.	12	principles apply. Procedural studies, however, add
13	MODERATOR: Anybody want to comment?	13	an additional complexity. If you have trouble
14	Everybody nodding agreement.	14	blinding the patients to a particular procedure, if
15	MALE SPEAKER: There is one comment I want I	15	you have trouble figuring out how to standardize
16	want to pick on, which I think one first made,	16	the application of acupuncture in your trial, if
17	which was the difference between academic studies	17	you are trying to compare surgical outcomes and
18	and pharmaceutical studies and about the drug.	18	you're using five differentiation surgeons, you
19	The fact is, all the drugs that are out	19	know that you're going to have slightly different
20	there, for the most part, that are done within	20	techniques by those various surgeons.
21	academic centers are drugs that have been approved	21	So I think there may be some value, and I'm
22	or I think for the most part. I think it's very	22	not sure we have time today, but some value of at

	Page 225		Page 227
1	least thinking whether there are some additional	1	to be overlap. Does every tango dancer instructor
2	issues that we might want to consider in those	2	need to teach the person how to tango exactly the
3	trials.	3	same way for the results of the trial to be
4	When talked about blinding, we all agreed	4	important? Are you comparing hip hop versus tango?
5	that blinding in a pharmaceutical trial and making	5	Will it make a difference?
6	the pills look the same, maybe even I mean there	6	But I think the point is, is that I think
7	was talk, back in the day, in the testing of	7	that the questions are different and the
8	opioids, of trying to use a benzodiazepine as a	8	methodologies are different. In terms of writer
9	placebo, or putting a little benzodiazepine as a	9	training and quality and consistency across
10	comparator, because in fact you wanted to make the	10	centers, yeah. I mean, I think it's you know,
11	patients a little sleepy to hide the side effects.	11	you want to try to do that.
12	But in situations where it's really not	12	Hopefully everybody does like in
13	ethical to do that, and certainly surgical and many	13	Rochester, they had a big tai chi effort, didn't
14	procedural things fall into that category, I think	14	they, way back when? You want to make sure
15	there may be some other things to consider and how	15	everybody does tai chi the same way.
16	to deal with those.	16	What interests me, and I've mentioned this
17	MODERATOR: Blinding the control groups may	17	before and in emails as well, which maybe I
18	be more challenging in a surgical study or a	18	shouldn't have combining these drug studies with
19	physical therapy study or an acupuncture study, but	19	alternative therapies like yoga or physical therapy
20	as far as the need to pay attention to the kinds of	20	maneuvers, because it does interest me
21	things we're talking about	21	whether because we don't control for that.
22	JOHN: I agree.	22	One of the things we haven't talked about
	Page 226		Page 228
1	MODERATOR: those would be let's	1	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for
1 2	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is	1 2	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity
1 2 3	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the	1 2 3	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a
1 2 3 4	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then	1 2 3 4	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they
1 2 3 4 5	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer	1 2 3 4 5	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some
1 2 3 4 5 6	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at	1 2 3 4 5 6	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials. I'm sorry. That's all I have.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're just studying a drug, and then you just leave it up
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials. I'm sorry. That's all I have. MALE SPEAKER: So I would say I disagree.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're just studying a drug, and then you just leave it up to whomever, whatever they want to do, in terms of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials. I'm sorry. That's all I have. MALE SPEAKER: So I would say I disagree. MODERATOR: Okay.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're just studying a drug, and then you just leave it up to whomever, whatever they want to do, in terms of what if I were in a study, all of sudden I'd be
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials. I'm sorry. That's all I have. MALE SPEAKER: So I would say I disagree. MODERATOR: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: I think that a big chunk of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're just studying a drug, and then you just leave it up to whomever, whatever they want to do, in terms of what if I were in a study, all of sudden I'd be like, "Oh, I want to get healthy," so I should
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials. I'm sorry. That's all I have. MALE SPEAKER: So I would say I disagree. MODERATOR: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: I think that a big chunk of what we do, like biggest part of it is safety.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're just studying a drug, and then you just leave it up to whomever, whatever they want to do, in terms of what if I were in a study, all of sudden I'd be like, "Oh, I want to get healthy," so I should start doing healthy things. I'm going to change
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials. I'm sorry. That's all I have. MALE SPEAKER: So I would say I disagree. MODERATOR: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: I think that a big chunk of what we do, like biggest part of it is safety. It's safety, safety, safety. And the safety issues	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're just studying a drug, and then you just leave it up to whomever, whatever they want to do, in terms of what if I were in a study, all of sudden I'd be like, "Oh, I want to get healthy," so I should start doing healthy things. I'm going to change the way I eat. I'm going to go to sleep at a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials. I'm sorry. That's all I have. MALE SPEAKER: So I would say I disagree. MODERATOR: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: I think that a big chunk of what we do, like biggest part of it is safety. It's safety, safety, safety. And the safety issues associated with a clinical trial I think are going	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're just studying a drug, and then you just leave it up to whomever, whatever they want to do, in terms of what if I were in a study, all of sudden I'd be like, "Oh, I want to get healthy," so I should start doing healthy things. I'm going to change the way I eat. I'm going to go to sleep at a better time.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials. I'm sorry. That's all I have. MALE SPEAKER: So I would say I disagree. MODERATOR: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: I think that a big chunk of what we do, like biggest part of it is safety. It's safety, safety, safety. And the safety issues associated with a clinical trial I think are going to be different if you're looking at yoga, or	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're just studying a drug, and then you just leave it up to whomever, whatever they want to do, in terms of what if I were in a study, all of sudden I'd be like, "Oh, I want to get healthy," so I should start doing healthy things. I'm going to change the way I eat. I'm going to go to sleep at a better time. There are all these other things I might do
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials. I'm sorry. That's all I have. MALE SPEAKER: So I would say I disagree. MODERATOR: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: I think that a big chunk of what we do, like biggest part of it is safety. It's safety, safety, safety. And the safety issues associated with a clinical trial I think are going to be different if you're looking at yoga, or bicycling, or tango. I'm giving you examples of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're just studying a drug, and then you just leave it up to whomever, whatever they want to do, in terms of what if I were in a study, all of sudden I'd be like, "Oh, I want to get healthy," so I should start doing healthy things. I'm going to change the way I eat. I'm going to go to sleep at a better time. There are all these other things I might do because I'm now taking care of myself, because I've
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials. I'm sorry. That's all I have. MALE SPEAKER: So I would say I disagree. MODERATOR: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: I think that a big chunk of what we do, like biggest part of it is safety. It's safety, safety, safety. And the safety issues associated with a clinical trial I think are going to be different if you're looking at yoga, or bicycling, or tango. I'm giving you examples of things from Parkinson's disease world that have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're just studying a drug, and then you just leave it up to whomever, whatever they want to do, in terms of what if I were in a study, all of sudden I'd be like, "Oh, I want to get healthy," so I should start doing healthy things. I'm going to change the way I eat. I'm going to go to sleep at a better time. There are all these other things I might do because I'm now taking care of myself, because I've just enrolled in a Farrar study, and I really want
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials. I'm sorry. That's all I have. MALE SPEAKER: So I would say I disagree. MODERATOR: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: I think that a big chunk of what we do, like biggest part of it is safety. It's safety, safety, safety. And the safety issues associated with a clinical trial I think are going to be different if you're looking at yoga, or bicycling, or tango. I'm giving you examples of things from Parkinson's disease world that have shown to be effective.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're just studying a drug, and then you just leave it up to whomever, whatever they want to do, in terms of what if I were in a study, all of sudden I'd be like, "Oh, I want to get healthy," so I should start doing healthy things. I'm going to change the way I eat. I'm going to go to sleep at a better time. There are all these other things I might do because I'm now taking care of myself, because I've just enrolled in a Farrar study, and I really want to make sure that I do a good job. So I start
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MODERATOR: those would be let's say and the only reason I'm pushing that is that, to the extent possible, I try to make the papers that we write be as general and then refer when there are specific callouts to refer to those. So I would hope that we'll be able to at least talk about the importance of these in clinical trials and not in just in drug clinical trials. I'm sorry. That's all I have. MALE SPEAKER: So I would say I disagree. MODERATOR: Okay. MALE SPEAKER: I think that a big chunk of what we do, like biggest part of it is safety. It's safety, safety, safety. And the safety issues associated with a clinical trial I think are going to be different if you're looking at yoga, or bicycling, or tango. I'm giving you examples of things from Parkinson's disease world that have shown to be effective. I think it's much different. I think it's a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	for a lot of this is we're not controlling for activity. And we say don't change your activity level, but I would say everybody who gets into a drug study should probably particularly if they have a severe pain, you may want to add some physical therapy modality and just make that constant through the study, so everybody's getting that, so you control for that. I think it's really problematic when you're just studying a drug, and then you just leave it up to whomever, whatever they want to do, in terms of what if I were in a study, all of sudden I'd be like, "Oh, I want to get healthy," so I should start doing healthy things. I'm going to change the way I eat. I'm going to go to sleep at a better time. There are all these other things I might do because I'm now taking care of myself, because I've just enrolled in a Farrar study, and I really want to make sure that I do a good job. So I start doing these things that potentially would help me

## IMMPACT XVIII - Initiative on Methods, Measurement, and Pain Assessment in Clinical Trials

	Page 229		Page 231
1	the goal isn't to get better. The goal is to make	1	MODERATOR: I disagree, but okay, that's
2	a controlled trial and keep things as much as	2	another discussion.
3	possible the same.	3	MALE SPEAKER: Unless you're getting chest
4	MODERATOR: But wait a second. Let me push	4	X-rays and CT scans and lab work every month or
5	you a little bit on that. So the issue of blinding	5	something, looking for particular things maybe
6	can be more challenging. The issue of alternative	6	I'm misunderstanding what you're saying. I might
7	comparative treatments can be more challenging, but	7	be being too literal. I don't know.
8	we still think about this.	8	MODERATOR: Okay. Well, I'm going to close
9	But the safety issue, did I hear you say	9	on this one and take my prerogative and turn it
10	that you don't think safety is a concern for	10	off.
11	rehabilitation studies, or for physical therapy, or	11	(Laughter.)
12	for surgery, or for acupuncture?	12	MODERATOR: We're doing a geriatric study,
13	MALE SPEAKER: I think they're	13	and we're putting people into some type of exercise
14	different I think the regulatory issues are much	14	program, am I going to be concerned about the
15	different. The safety the amount of hoops we	15	potential safety issues with whether people should
16	jump through in the pharmaceutical industry to	16	be doing tai chi? If they have limitations in
17	follow the safety of a drug is much more	17	their ability to walk, do you have to modify the
18	significant.	18	tai chi? Do I have to record that? So I obviously
19	You won't get lab values, I don't think, for	19	need to pay attention to that.
20	most rehabilitative processes. You won't get chest	20	MALE SPEAKER: Well, I'm not saying you
21	X-rays or you know, there's a lot of really	21	don't pay attention; I'm just saying that the
22	invasive stuff we do. I don't know why you would	22	safety issues are different. You still need to
	Page 230		Page 232
1	get an ECG on somebody if you're looking for	1	follow safety It's just that they're different
2	long-QT syndrome and things like that	2	MALE SPEAKER: So Liust have to interrupt
3	MODERATOR: Is Ann Costello here	3	and say that we focused this meeting on quality of
4	still can't see her who works with devices?	4	efficacy outcomes, and we obviously haven't had any
5	I'd be interested in her perspective of whether	5	presentations, haven't had any discussion about
6	safety is an issue for devices within the	6	quality of safety outcomes. And so that's really
7	MALE SPEAKER: Well, they are. I mean	7	off the table.
8	devices are a little different though.	8	Though lan, thank you for an idea for
9	MODERATOR: Okay. But we did some studies	9	another IMMPACT meeting, which would be just like
10	early on for self-disclosure in a rehabilitation	10	this one, but addressing safety outcomes and trying
11	program, and one of our people fell off the	11	to resolve the difference of opinion between David
12	exercycle and twisted his ankle. Is that a safety	12	and Dennis.
13	issue I should have been concerned about? Was it	13	MODERATOR: Okay. And I think, Michael
14	reported then?	14	Rowbotham, I think I saw your hand.
15	MALE SPEAKER: No, absolutely. I'm not	15	DR. ROWBOTHAM: This may seem a little off
16	saying that there aren't any safety issues, but the	16	topic now, but I think it's a good segue to the
17	way we approach safety and we assess safety is	17	next section. I'm going to give a talk, an
18	different in a drug trial than it would be in one	18	informal talk, at the end of the month, and I've
19	of these other trials.	19	decided to entitle it about the what I learned
20	MODERATOR: Is the rigor different?	20	here, and it's the four "F" words, which are fraud,
21	MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I mean, you're doing	21	fabrication, failure, and futility.
22	much more surveillance of safety issues.	22	So as we go through the discussion, I'd

	Page 233		Page 235
1	really like to get an idea, from the panel and also	1	Nobody responded at placebo; nobody responded to
2	everybody, really how big an issue especially	2	Topamax. And it was like a profound thing.
3	when you start putting them all together, are these	3	So when nobody responds to a drug that you know
4	different things we've talked about: people not	4	that it works and they had like 12, 14 people,
5	taking their meds on time, people lying to get into	5	is that fraud? I don't even know. I still can't
6	studies, study sites fabricating subjects or	6	figure that out. So I don't think these are easy
7	fraudulently double enrolling them, and all these	7	questions to answer.
8	other things.	8	MODERATOR: Lee?
9	When we put it all together, does that mean	9	DR. SIMON: So I think that the problem is
10	that many of our trials are doomed to failure or	10	pervasive, but it is not ubiquitous. So I would
11	futility because there's so much data and so many	11	bet you that every trial, no matter who's running
12	subjects you just have to exclude as not being	12	it, where it's being run, will have some problem.
13	usable for data analysis?	13	It probably isn't consistently fraud, but I do have
14	MODERATOR: I'm tempted, but I'm not going	14	to just share one unbelievable story with everybody
15	to do this. You're going to give this talk in a	15	in the room.
16	month, we'd be more than happy to have you	16	So there was a new formulation of
17	practice.	17	methotrexate that was being developed by a guy who
18	(Laughter.)	18	spent 22 years in Louisiana at the university doing
19	MODERATOR: Obviously, you're waiting to get	19	this work, extraordinary idea, physical chemical
20	more data to do it. Does anybody want to comment	20	property difference, and he got his buddy in Peru
21	on Mike's comment?	21	to actually do a clinical study.
22	MALE SPEAKER: I would, because this is	22	Adequate and well-controlled by design.
	Page 234		Page 236
1	something I think about a lot. And I was thinking	1	They did this trial in Peru, and they had we use
2	about this across I've done a lot of clinical	2	in rheumatoid arthritis something called the ACR20
3	trials in industry over the years, and I would say	3	as the primary outcome. And typically, you get 60,
4	that on average, I see about one or two sites per	4	40, and 20. Sixty percent of the patients will
5	study where there are real concerns. And these are	5	have a 20 percent ACR20 response with a drug that
6	large studies; they're large phase 3 studies.	6	works. Ninety-eight percent of the patients had an
7	So I do think there is an issue there. I	7	ACR20.
8	don't think it's an overwhelming issue, but I do	8	The way this trial was designed, the patient
9	think it's an issue. And what I see at those sites	9	came in, got picked up, they actually included them
10	are not necessarily fraud; sometimes it's	10	in the trial, they got the drug, and they
11	absurdity, like people who keep their medical	11	disappeared for 12 weeks. And then they came back
12	records in the basement of their house. You're	12	at the 12-week mark to get analyzed.
13	supposed to hold on to all of this stuff for like	13	Basically, I did due diligence on this
14	whatever the rules are until this drug's approved	14	product for a company. Despite what I told them,
15	or two years after or whatever.	15	the company said, "We're going to buy this." They

- 16 bought the product. They actually started to study
- 17 it, and it was totally non-bioavailable. You would
- 18 take the drug orally, and there was no drug in the
- **19** body, and yet they had a 98 percent ACR20 response.
- 20 I don't actually happen to believe that it's
- 21 fraud. I actually happen to believe they probably
- 22 took whatever they took after they left the clinic,

The point is, I've seen a lot of -- I've

18 haven't seen -- I don't always know when the data's

21 Topamax as one of our drugs for migraine, which it

22 is approved for migraine, and nobody responded.

There was a study in India where we used

17 seen not a lot of -- I've seen that happen. I

19 being fabricated. That's the problem.

16

20

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 237		Page 239
1	and they were never seen again until the 12-week	1	disregard less regard for what we're trying to
2	mark, and may have had a response.	2	promote here.
3	If you do a trial in India, if you do a	3	So the idea of getting it discussed out
4	trial in China, if you do a trial in some other	4	there in the public, producing these materials to
5	places, this is the kind of data that you get.	5	explain why rigor is important, why these ideas
6	Every autoimmune disease trial in China, every	6	that we're talking about are important to think
7	patient in China takes thunder god vine, off the	7	about, are critical. So I just wanted to make that
8	shelf from their, you know, naturalist physician,	8	point before the end of the day.
9	despite the fact that they're told not to.	9	MODERATOR: Before I ask the panel to
10	So I think that every trial has a problem,	10	respond, Mike Rowbotham, I know you've done a lot
11	and every system has a problem, but I don't believe	11	of thinking about comparative effectiveness
12	it's probably fraud. There'll always be something	12	research or effectiveness research. Do you have
13	you'll find. The more we can improve the quality	13	any response to what Laurie was raising a concern
14	and the more we can improve the PI's behavior	14	about that type of research?
15	associated with what's required, the more likely it	15	DR. ROWBOTHAM: I think the hardest part is
16	is that it'll get tighter and tighter and tighter.	16	to get it funded, because it's just not it's not
17	MODERATOR: Laurie, did I see your hand up?	17	the new-new. It's not going to lead to a
18	MS. BURKE: Right. I'm responding to what I	18	regulatory approval or anything else. But really,
19	heard on the panel before Lee's comment, and that	19	it's so important, we should be looking at
20	is a reason I want to support the idea of	20	everything that we do in clinical medicine for
21	training and certification and some sort of	21	whether or not it's better than something that
22	initiative that this group could lead in terms of	22	might be less expensive or easier or safer.
	Page 238		Page 240
-	read practice in clinical trials and teaching	_	
T	good practice in clinical trials and teaching	T	So I don't know now much we're going to try
2	be participating, because there is a hig huge	2	this particular document, but it really gets to the
3	be participating, because there is a big huge	3	this particular document, but it really gets to the
4	colonge, and that's what compatings is called	4	where some of the issues that we've talked about
5	comparative offectiveness research. It's comptimes	5	actually go away because the patients are treated
7	colled pharmacooconomics	7	within their usual practice setting, and then it's
, ,	It's the real-world ideas of not really	, ,	embedded within the electronic health record
9	looking for a treatment effect, but looking for the	9	So a couple of the biggest issues we've
10	effect of a condomerate of issues in different	10	talked about in terms of potential fraud or
11	types of environments, in the clinical	11	fabrication are people exaggerating to get into a
12	environments. And I think that this has really	12	trial that just disappears because they're already
13	taken hold and is being talked about a lot because	13	in it, and they may not even know it, because it's
14	of the billions of dollars of the Cory funding,	14	just really how their care is delivered. And
15	because of HTA and AMCP being convinced that they	15	that's one way of doing comparative effectiveness
16	need real-world, non-clinical trial data.	16	research, almost a little bit in the background, is
17	So in terms of weighing the amount of	17	through pragmatic trials.
18	information out there for well done, randomized,	18	MODERATOR: Thank you. Anybody? John?
19	controlled trials, with the amount of other types	19	MALE SPEAKER: Laurie, I understand where
20	of information that are now being generated because	20	you're coming from, from the perspective of a drug
21	of all this interest and money being poured into	21	approval, but I agree completely with Mike
22	it, I worry that there's going to become more	22	Rowbotham that comparative effectiveness trials are
Ì			

Pai	in Assessment in Clinical Trials	June 5, 2		
	Page 241		Page 243	
1	actually very important in terms of understanding	1	a lot of stories about fraud and about the	
2	how drugs end up being used in an environment and	2	professional patient and a bunch of other things,	
3	understanding the interaction of complex medication	3	and I think it behooves us to look at the relative	
4	combinations and complex environmental medication	4	risk of those problems to the cost of trying to	
5	interactions.	5	detect them.	
6	But I think the point to be made is that	6	I'm all in favor of a little bit of	
7	we're talking about clinical trials, and I think	7	monitoring going a very long way. So I'm very much	
8	we're talking predominantly about phase 3 clinical	8	in favor of doing a lot of the things that we've	
9	trials. So we need to keep focused on the question	9	just talked about over the last couple of days, but	
10	we're trying to answer.	10	to be a little bit careful about over-emphasizing	
11	Clinical effectiveness research is trying to	11	some of the stories that we hear.	
12	answer a different question and has a whole	12	MODERATOR: I think we are going to narrow	
13	different set of issues. And so if we	13	this down, so it's probably not going to be broad	
14	MS. BURKE: And that's exactly my point.	14	to cover both of these. It doesn't mean we won't	
15	And I'm sorry if I wasn't clear. But yes, there's	15	have a sentence or a small paragraph saying that	
16	a place for both, but they're very different.	16	some of these principles are relevant and they've	
17	MALE SPEAKER: Yes, no question.	17	been modified, but that's not the purpose of the	
18	MS. BURKE: And I think that we hear people	18	paper.	
19	say they devalue clinical trials because they want	19	So I don't think we're going to go unless	
20	to see the real-world pragmatic stuff. And there's	20	Bob Dworkin tells me otherwise, I don't think we're	
21	not enough information about the value of clinical	21	going to focus on comparative effectiveness, but	
22	trials and why, in fact, you have to have a	22	it's not to say sweep it under the rug and say it	
	Page 242		Page 244	
1	randomized controlled trial that's not real world			
- <b>-</b>		1	doesn't exist	
2	that's not pragmatic in order to be able to detect	1	doesn't exist.	
2	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect	1 2 3	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most	
2 3 4	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes I think there isn't a	1 2 3 4	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence	
2 3 4 5	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the	1 2 3 4 5	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy	
2 3 4 5 6	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to	1 2 3 4 5 6	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between	
2 3 4 5 6 7	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the guestions that we're going to try to put forward in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point. I think it might just be	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the questions that we're going to try to put forward in this paper are going to be different, in different	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point, I think it might just be important to say that we think these types	
2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the questions that we're going to try to put forward in this paper are going to be different, in different circumstances, in different situations. And how	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point, I think it might just be important to say that we think these types of answering the questions in these ways are	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the questions that we're going to try to put forward in this paper are going to be different, in different circumstances, in different situations. And how broad to make this and how restricted to make it,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point, I think it might just be important to say that we think these types of answering the questions in these ways are different. They give us different answers for	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the questions that we're going to try to put forward in this paper are going to be different, in different circumstances, in different situations. And how broad to make this and how restricted to make it, I'm not sure. But it seemed to me that the purpose	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point, I think it might just be important to say that we think these types of answering the questions in these ways are different. They give us different answers for different methodologies to get there. And the	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the questions that we're going to try to put forward in this paper are going to be different, in different circumstances, in different situations. And how broad to make this and how restricted to make it, I'm not sure. But it seemed to me that the purpose of the meeting was really to focus on sort of large	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point, I think it might just be important to say that we think these types of answering the questions in these ways are different. They give us different answers for different methodologies to get there. And the reason to get this right is because we want to be	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the questions that we're going to try to put forward in this paper are going to be different, in different circumstances, in different situations. And how broad to make this and how restricted to make it, I'm not sure. But it seemed to me that the purpose of the meeting was really to focus on sort of large phase 3 trials where we're really trying to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point, I think it might just be important to say that we think these types of answering the questions in these ways are different. They give us different answers for different methodologies to get there. And the reason to get this right is because we want to be sure that we're asking the question in this world,	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the questions that we're going to try to put forward in this paper are going to be different, in different circumstances, in different situations. And how broad to make this and how restricted to make it, I'm not sure. But it seemed to me that the purpose of the meeting was really to focus on sort of large phase 3 trials where we're really trying to demonstrate efficacy.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point, I think it might just be important to say that we think these types of answering the questions in these ways are different. They give us different answers for different methodologies to get there. And the reason to get this right is because we want to be sure that we're asking the question in this world, not in the comparative effectiveness world. So I	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the questions that we're going to try to put forward in this paper are going to be different, in different circumstances, in different situations. And how broad to make this and how restricted to make it, I'm not sure. But it seemed to me that the purpose of the meeting was really to focus on sort of large phase 3 trials where we're really trying to demonstrate efficacy. Just to sound like a broken record, I think	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point, I think it might just be important to say that we think these types of answering the questions in these ways are different. They give us different answers for different methodologies to get there. And the reason to get this right is because we want to be sure that we're asking the question in this world, not in the comparative effectiveness world. So I thought that was what was particularly compelling	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the questions that we're going to try to put forward in this paper are going to be different, in different circumstances, in different situations. And how broad to make this and how restricted to make it, I'm not sure. But it seemed to me that the purpose of the meeting was really to focus on sort of large phase 3 trials where we're really trying to demonstrate efficacy. Just to sound like a broken record, I think we need to include in that the ability to do them	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point, I think it might just be important to say that we think these types of answering the questions in these ways are different. They give us different answers for different methodologies to get there. And the reason to get this right is because we want to be sure that we're asking the question in this world, not in the comparative effectiveness world. So I thought that was what was particularly compelling about how you framed that.	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the questions that we're going to try to put forward in this paper are going to be different, in different circumstances, in different situations. And how broad to make this and how restricted to make it, I'm not sure. But it seemed to me that the purpose of the meeting was really to focus on sort of large phase 3 trials where we're really trying to demonstrate efficacy. Just to sound like a broken record, I think we need to include in that the ability to do them efficiently, effectively, and validly, looking for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point, I think it might just be important to say that we think these types of answering the questions in these ways are different. They give us different answers for different methodologies to get there. And the reason to get this right is because we want to be sure that we're asking the question in this world, not in the comparative effectiveness world. So I thought that was what was particularly compelling about how you framed that. DR. VRIJENS: I think the answer to that in	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the questions that we're going to try to put forward in this paper are going to be different, in different circumstances, in different situations. And how broad to make this and how restricted to make it, I'm not sure. But it seemed to me that the purpose of the meeting was really to focus on sort of large phase 3 trials where we're really trying to demonstrate efficacy. Just to sound like a broken record, I think we need to include in that the ability to do them efficiently, effectively, and validly, looking for issues, but keeping in mind something, which is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point, I think it might just be important to say that we think these types of answering the questions in these ways are different. They give us different answers for different methodologies to get there. And the reason to get this right is because we want to be sure that we're asking the question in this world, not in the comparative effectiveness world. So I thought that was what was particularly compelling about how you framed that. DR. VRIJENS: I think the answer to that in the future because the problem today, we try to	
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that's not pragmatic, in order to be able to detect a treatment effect. MALE SPEAKER: Yes. I think there isn't a person in this room that would disagree with the concept that we need clinical trials in order to demonstrate effects. But I guess where I was going is that I think that the answers to some of the questions that we're going to try to put forward in this paper are going to be different, in different circumstances, in different situations. And how broad to make this and how restricted to make it, I'm not sure. But it seemed to me that the purpose of the meeting was really to focus on sort of large phase 3 trials where we're really trying to demonstrate efficacy. Just to sound like a broken record, I think we need to include in that the ability to do them efficiently, effectively, and validly, looking for issues, but keeping in mind something, which is that we all know somebody who has something, who	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	doesn't exist. MALE SPEAKER: I thought one of the most provocative comments in the last two days was Bernard's comment regarding medication adherence when you said, we think we're doing an efficacy trial, but we're really doing something between efficacy and effectiveness. I thought that was just beautifully framed. To Laurie's point, I think it might just be important to say that we think these types of answering the questions in these ways are different. They give us different answers for different methodologies to get there. And the reason to get this right is because we want to be sure that we're asking the question in this world, not in the comparative effectiveness world. So I thought that was what was particularly compelling about how you framed that. DR. VRIJENS: I think the answer to that in the future because the problem today, we try to navigate between the two. We try to be selective,	

## IMMPACT XVIII - Initiative on Methods, Measurement, and Pain Assessment in Clinical Trials

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials	June 5, 2		
	Page 245		Page 247	
1	placebo, but we still want to be somewhat	1	We talk about fabrication and fraud, and	
2	representative of real world. So we try to	2	that's really scary. And as Lee said, I don't know	
3	navigate in between the two, and we don't answer	3	how it's not going to stop, but we don't know	
4	either of the questions.	4	how common of a problem it is.	
5	I think the future is, at the beginning, we	5	So I'm just wondering like, for example.	
6	will need to be even more selective and even better	6	whether we should change the title from "Ensuring"	
7	train the center, and do everything even better to	7	to "Improving" and make sure that we're not giving	
8	show efficacy as soon as possible with a limited	8	the impression that there's a crisis here in data	
9	number of patients.	9	quality	
10	Then we need to go to the more broader	10	MODERATOR: Bob?	
11	population, and there will be other in the	11	BOB: Yes. So I want to take issue with	
12	effectiveness measurement And we have to measure	12	that You know I haven't done these kinds of	
13	the sources of viability because we need to	13	studies, but I presented vesterday three very	
14	understand when it doesn't work, why it doesn't	14	different groups that have been looking in a verv	
15	work	15	focused way on duplicate patients: that	
16	MALE SPEAKER: Exactly	16	Rabinowitz' IMI ELLIsraeli initiative: Mitchell	
17	DR VRLIENS: But we need I think to answer	17	Efros who's based in Long Island, New York: and	
1 9	the two questions a bit separately. And I don't	19	the duy in Southern California Shaevitz And	
10	know if it still fits the phase 1 phase 2 phase 3	10	the guy in countern california, chacviz. And	
20	design that we are used to But I think that's the	20	of 8 to 10 percent of the patients in CNS and kind	
20	way to go in the future	20	of symptomatic trials are duplicates	
21	Lwas at the ALL Inion and there was a	21	That to me is a huge number because if	
22	i was at the AO Onion, and there was a	22	mai, to me, is a huge number, because in	
	Page 246		Page 248	
1	president of the [indiscernible]. This is an	1	you then add to that 10 percent of patients who are	
2	association of GPs of any AUs from the U.S. It was	2	participating in the same clinical trial in	
3	striking. He said, "I have not a single patient	3	Los Angeles and San Diego, all the stuff that Eric	
4	who fits a clinical trial. I don't trust clinical	4	has found, to me it suggests and I know, as has	
5	trials at all."	5	been said, it's terrifying there could be	
6	Those messages become very dangerous because	6	30 percent of the patients in a trial are doing	
7	they don't want trials at all. They don't trust	7	something seriously funky.	
8	them at all anymore. And I think navigating in	8	So I'm really struck by the Rabinowitz, the	
9	between makes us they don't trust us anymore.	9	Efros, and the Shaevitz coming up with the same	
10	So I think we need to be more selective at the	10	10 percent duplicate. And I want to say one other	
11	beginning and more broad at the end, and answer	11	thing. By the way, that 10 percent was exactly the	
12	both questions.	12	figure in the IOM report for that schizophrenia	
13	MODERATOR: I think we're reached our first	13	trial with 300 patients. And when the FDA	
14	consensus. I saw every head nodding in agreement,	14	investigated, 30 of them were duplicate.	
15	so I put that into the paper.	15	So to me, that's not a kind of minor	
16	MALE SPEAKER: I just want to follow that	16	problem. That seems to me like a huge canary.	
17	just by saying that working clinically in the	17	MALE SPEAKER: Inasmuch as that's a	
18	operating room, we have problem rounds every Friday	18	problem well, I mean I don't want to minimize	
19	morning, and we talk about the horrendomas that	19	that. But is it systematically biasing results in	
20	happened all week. And it's really all we think	20	a particular direction?	
21	about. We don't think about there were a couple of	21	BOB: Well, it's hard to imagine how	
22	quiet nights	22	duplicate patients, if they're intact at all,	
		1	-	

Pain Assessment in Clinical Trials			June 5, 20		
	Page 249		Page 251		
1	aren't taking twice as much medication and probably	1	So I would argue that it's well worth		
2	aren't taking any medication at all, it's hard to	2	looking at; that there ought to be some way to do		
3	imagine how that'll give you a false positive. But	3	that within HIPAA regulations that would allow us		
4	it's awfully easy to imagine that it's responsible	4	to compare. And that a little bit of monitoring		
5	for false negative results.	5	that way would go a very long way to reducing the		
6	In fact, there was the analysis that	6	number.		
7	Rabinowitz did showing that when he removed	7	It's never going to get to zero, and so we		
8	post hoc, 10 duplicate patients from a	8	need to just be cognizant of the fact that we need		
9	schizophrenia trial, the p-value, for what it's	9	to focus on looking at each of these problems,		
10	worth, went from 0.08 to 0.03.	10	trying to make them smaller, and being efficient		
11	MALE SPEAKER: I want to make one quick	11	about them and not being onerous in terms of the		
12	point, which is that it wasn't that the study went	12	regulations and other things that we impose that		
13	from being positive to negative. It went from	13	would make clinical trials harder.		
14	being statistically significant to not	14	MODERATOR: Ajay?		
15	statistically significant. I would be willing to	15	DR. WASAN: One thing to add about this		
16	bet that the effect size was altered a little, but	16	pragmatic versus efficacy trial issue is that I		
17	it didn't change direction.	17	know we've all been keeping in mind phase 3		
18	BOB: But if that was a phase 3	18	clinical trials with our comments, but I would say		
19	schizophrenia trial and the missing data were	19	almost every single issue we've talked about		
20	handled in the way that the FDA requires, in one	20	actually applies to large pragmatic trials as well,		
21	case the trial doesn't get the drug on the market,	21	and the thinking about them and how you would		
22	and in the other case it does.	22	design them.		
	Page 250		Page 252		
1	MALE SPEAKER: No, no, no. I'm not arguing	1	So I really see our comments being kind of		
2	that issue. What I'm saying is that we talk about	2	broadly applicable, not necessarily just the		
3	them as negative trials. And the best way to	3	phase 3 trials. Plus, I think the vast majority of		
4	present a trial is that the trial shows an effect,	4	sort of published clinical research in pain		
5	but that it did not reach statistical significance.	5	medicine are blended trials that have both aspects		
6	Because to talk about it as a negative trial	6	of effectiveness and efficacy in there, if not for		
7	suggests that it showed no effect, and it doesn't.	7	the only reason of adherence, for instance.		
8	It's a pet peeve of mine.	8	So I think that's part of what we want to		
9	BOB: I'm using it as shorthand for the	9	come across, too, is saying that these are to		
10	FDA's not	10	get to your sense of trying to be as general as		
1		1			

BOB: -- going to consider it, in most

MALE SPEAKER: I understand.

- **13** cases, as evidence that counts towards approval.
- 14 MALE SPEAKER: The point I'd like to make is
- 15 that I think that a little bit of monitoring would
- 16 go a long way to avoiding duplicate patients. It
- 17 makes a great deal of sense. I would argue,
- 18 though, that our target is not zero. Our target is
- **19** 5 percent or our target is something; that if we
- 20 said that this is a huge problem and we need to
- 21 focus on getting it to zero, that we're going to
- 22 over expend resources on trying to do that.

11

15

16

11 possible, but mention some specifics, I think that12 would be important, too, for what we're coming at.

13 We're not just giving this narrow lens. So I'd

18 of the conference which is, I do think a lot of

20 minimize it. I want to make sure some of my

21 comments aren't out of hand. I mean I've been

22 dealing a lot with Parkinson's disease lately, and

19 this is really terrifying. I just don't want to

MODERATOR: David?

14 like to see that go forward as a group with that.

17 pick up on what Bob has said is the general theme

MALE SPEAKER: Yes, I just want to kind of

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 253		Page 255
1	Alzheimer's, and fraud in those is probably	1	If a clinical trial subject like that was at
2	different than fraud in pain.	2	this meeting, they would be very upset, because
3	But I do think I am a very big advocate	3	they're putting themselves at risk of side effects,
4	of and Mitchell Efros has reached out to me many	4	of getting placebo. And what we've spent two days
5	times. And in many bid defenses and many	5	talking about is all these things that are working
6	proposals, I've suggested using that in the past,	6	to make the data uninformative.
7	was to try to find duplicate patients.	7	So I think we need to somehow get into the
8	I think what Bernard came up with is	8	article not only how terrifying this is to us, as
9	probably the most terrifying thing that I've heard	9	the people doing the trials, but how terrifying
10	yet, and I don't even I'm almost stunned and	10	this should be to the patients who are
11	speechless by that presentation. And I think that	11	participating, who are the straight-shooting
12	it really behooves all of us, particularly those of	12	patients and trying to make a contribution, but
13	us that are doing a lot of clinical trials that are	13	there are all these forces that are working against
14	for pivotal studies, where there's really a lot of	14	them.
15	dollars on the table, to think about whether we can	15	MALE SPEAKER: But I mean it's an ethical
16	really go home and be happy knowing what we've	16	issue, I think.
17	heard and not be really, really disturbed by what	17	MALE SPEAKER: Exactly.
18	Bernard said.	18	MALE SPEAKER: They go into clinical trials
19	I think that all of these things together	19	with the idea that they're going to suffer, they're
20	makes me wonder in certain areas wonder like why	20	going to have inconveniences, maybe have bad side
21	is there placebo creep? And one of my favorite	21	effects, but with the idea that they're results are
22	areas is migraine, and there's this placebo creep	22	going to have meaning and are interpretable. When
	Page 254		Page 256
1	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine	1	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And
1 2	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're	1 2	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical
1 2 3	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients.	1 2 3	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind.
1 2 3 4	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the	1 2 3 4	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more
1 2 3 4 5	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of	1 2 3 4 5	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I think they're pretty accurate.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to look at the patient's perspective on this," or the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I think they're pretty accurate. But it could explain why there's this	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to look at the patient's perspective on this," or the person who has the problem and since you might want
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I think they're pretty accurate. But it could explain why there's this placebo drift, and our drugs seem to be less	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to look at the patient's perspective on this," or the person who has the problem and since you might want to use it.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I think they're pretty accurate. But it could explain why there's this placebo drift, and our drugs seem to be less effective for migraine, like if you look at a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to look at the patient's perspective on this," or the person who has the problem and since you might want to use it. Also the lady in Palatka on her website, I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I think they're pretty accurate. But it could explain why there's this placebo drift, and our drugs seem to be less effective for migraine, like if you look at a Maxwell study from 20 years ago, and now it seems	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to look at the patient's perspective on this," or the person who has the problem and since you might want to use it. Also the lady in Palatka on her website, I don't know if she at all talks about that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I think they're pretty accurate. But it could explain why there's this placebo drift, and our drugs seem to be less effective for migraine, like if you look at a Maxwell study from 20 years ago, and now it seems to be a little bit less effective.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to look at the patient's perspective on this," or the person who has the problem and since you might want to use it. Also the lady in Palatka on her website, I don't know if she at all talks about that perspective that might be of interest for us, those
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I think they're pretty accurate. But it could explain why there's this placebo drift, and our drugs seem to be less effective for migraine, like if you look at a Maxwell study from 20 years ago, and now it seems to be a little bit less effective. Bob, you were going to say something?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to look at the patient's perspective on this," or the person who has the problem and since you might want to use it. Also the lady in Palatka on her website, I don't know if she at all talks about that perspective that might be of interest for us, those that haven't I'm not familiar with it to go look
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I think they're pretty accurate. But it could explain why there's this placebo drift, and our drugs seem to be less effective for migraine, like if you look at a Maxwell study from 20 years ago, and now it seems to be a little bit less effective. Bob, you were going to say something? BOB: No. what you said there makes me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to look at the patient's perspective on this," or the person who has the problem and since you might want to use it. Also the lady in Palatka on her website, I don't know if she at all talks about that perspective that might be of interest for us, those that haven't I'm not familiar with it to go look at it and see what she has to say.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I think they're pretty accurate. But it could explain why there's this placebo drift, and our drugs seem to be less effective for migraine, like if you look at a Maxwell study from 20 years ago, and now it seems to be a little bit less effective. Bob, you were going to say something? BOB: No. what you said there makes me think one thing we've left out for the last two	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to look at the patient's perspective on this," or the person who has the problem and since you might want to use it. Also the lady in Palatka on her website, I don't know if she at all talks about that perspective that might be of interest for us, those that haven't I'm not familiar with it to go look at it and see what she has to say. There are going to be two last questions.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I think they're pretty accurate. But it could explain why there's this placebo drift, and our drugs seem to be less effective for migraine, like if you look at a Maxwell study from 20 years ago, and now it seems to be a little bit less effective. Bob, you were going to say something? BOB: No. what you said there makes me think one thing we've left out for the last two days is thinking about this from the perspective of	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to look at the patient's perspective on this," or the person who has the problem and since you might want to use it. Also the lady in Palatka on her website, I don't know if she at all talks about that perspective that might be of interest for us, those that haven't I'm not familiar with it to go look at it and see what she has to say. There are going to be two last questions. One, Eric Devine's had his hand up, and then Mark
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I think they're pretty accurate. But it could explain why there's this placebo drift, and our drugs seem to be less effective for migraine, like if you look at a Maxwell study from 20 years ago, and now it seems to be a little bit less effective. Bob, you were going to say something? BOB: No. what you said there makes me think one thing we've left out for the last two days is thinking about this from the perspective of the patient in the clinical trial who's actually a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to look at the patient's perspective on this," or the person who has the problem and since you might want to use it. Also the lady in Palatka on her website, I don't know if she at all talks about that perspective that might be of interest for us, those that haven't I'm not familiar with it to go look at it and see what she has to say. There are going to be two last questions. One, Eric Devine's had his hand up, and then Mark Jensen. Then I'm going to cut it off at this
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 254 in migraine. And I always thought, well, migraine is this great area, because of course they're always recycling these patients. I guess Nat left. But the point, the question is it ever right to have a cadre of professional patients? What I would say, in migraine maybe it makes sense, because they've certainly they know what it is to take a triptan, and these studies go very quickly, and I think they're pretty accurate. But it could explain why there's this placebo drift, and our drugs seem to be less effective for migraine, like if you look at a Maxwell study from 20 years ago, and now it seems to be a little bit less effective. Bob, you were going to say something? BOB: No. what you said there makes me think one thing we've left out for the last two days is thinking about this from the perspective of the patient in the clinical trial who's actually a partner and is doing his or her best to provide	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 256 we have all of this going on, it impedes that. And if we don't address it, there is an ethical dimension to it in my mind. MODERATOR: There's going to be two more questions. I'm only going to take two more because we've got a lot of things we want to cover. But it seems to me like, number one, I would imagine that Penney Cowan got extremely excited when she heard the comment from Bob about, "Gee, we really need to look at the patient's perspective on this," or the person who has the problem and since you might want to use it. Also the lady in Palatka on her website, I don't know if she at all talks about that perspective that might be of interest for us, those that haven't I'm not familiar with it to go look at it and see what she has to say. There are going to be two last questions. One, Eric Devine's had his hand up, and then Mark Jensen. Then I'm going to cut it off at this point. If you have additional questions, hopefully

	Page 257		Page 259
1	maybe they'll fit right in there. So Eric, you're	1	events, is we use MI to train for adherence, but I
2	first in line.	2	don't know how many drug trials do that now.
3	DR. DEVINE: Oh, thank you. So despite the	3	MALE SPEAKER: The only thing
4	numbers that I saw in my study with a high level of	4	MODERATOR: Last word.
5	deception and fabrication, and the numbers that Bob	5	MALE SPEAKER: Okay. The issue about
6	is referencing, I don't have the perception that	6	adherence, I think we need to be a little bit
7	this is a crisis across lots of phases of research,	7	circumspect from the perspective that I'm convinced
8	because I think it has to do with the vulnerability	8	that pain trials have different adherence issues
9	of the study.	9	than an Alzheimer's or a blood pressure trial, or
10	Studies with criterion that are diseases	10	things where patients are not symptomatic. And
11	that are assessed by subjective assessment versus	11	it's somewhat telling that they're unless
12	objective, like Amy said earlier, in an oncology	12	Bernard knows of a larger population of studies.
13	trial where there's no reimbursement and people	13	But there are very few studies that look at
14	already have free access to healthcare, the chance	14	adherence and anything related to pain. Maybe
15	of people gaming for some sort of study enrollment	15	those should be done.
16	is very low. And while there could duplicate	16	I'm not at all suggesting it shouldn't be
17	entry, because people are desperate for care,	17	mentioned in the paper. I'm simply saying that I
18	that's a little bit different than the population	18	think we should be cognizant of the fact that, at
19	that I'm noting.	19	least in my patient population, the issue is not
20	So when you think about how do you allocate	20	taking too few rescue drugs, it's taking too many.
21	resources to combat this problem, you really have	21	And so the problem of taking their drugs on a
22	to look at the vulnerability of the study. Is it	22	regular basis is not as much an issue.
	Page 258		Page 260
1	paying money? Is it a condition for which subjects	1	One could argue that in drugs where we're
2	can fake their way, and we know that they can. Do	2	giving them and they don't see a dramatic effect
3	they have access to it through clinical trials? Is	3	immediately pregabalin would be an example I
4	it something that's a network where they can go	4	certainly have patients who come back and say, "I
5	from site to site?	5	took two pills. It didn't help" and I have to
6	If you have a narcotic pain relief that's	6	educate them on taking them regularly. So I would
7	part of being in the study, that bumps up the	7	agree with teaching in that area.
8	vulnerability, because the street value is just too	8	MODERATOR: I think you better be careful
9	tempting. So you get reimbursement plus a little	9	about saying that there's no studies on adherence
10	recreational drug use, and maybe some money on the	10	in pain. Just as a crude area, in the opioid area,
11	side from selling what you don't use. So	11	there have been a number of studies that looked at
12	5 ,		
13	vulnerability is what we need to	12	urine tests on people to people who are supposedly
	vulnerability is what we need to MODERATOR: So obviously, some balance.	12 13	urine tests on people to people who are supposedly being prescribed opioids, and by far, many more
14	vulnerability is what we need to MODERATOR: So obviously, some balance. Yes, Mark? Last word on this section.	12 13 14	urine tests on people to people who are supposedly being prescribed opioids, and by far, many more underuse the medication than overuse the
14 15	vulnerability is what we need to MODERATOR: So obviously, some balance. Yes, Mark? Last word on this section. DR. JENSEN: So I'll just respond a little	12 13 14 15	urine tests on people to people who are supposedly being prescribed opioids, and by far, many more underuse the medication than overuse the medication.
14 15 16	vulnerability is what we need to MODERATOR: So obviously, some balance. Yes, Mark? Last word on this section. DR. JENSEN: So I'll just respond a little bit to what David said about it, the issue of	12 13 14 15 16	urine tests on people to people who are supposedly being prescribed opioids, and by far, many more underuse the medication than overuse the medication. So it's not as it, number one, we don't do
14 15 16 17	vulnerability is what we need to MODERATOR: So obviously, some balance. Yes, Mark? Last word on this section. DR. JENSEN: So I'll just respond a little bit to what David said about it, the issue of adherence that Bernard mentioned. We've talked	12 13 14 15 16 17	urine tests on people to people who are supposedly being prescribed opioids, and by far, many more underuse the medication than overuse the medication. So it's not as it, number one, we don't do this, and number two, there are plenty of people
14 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>vulnerability is what we need to</li> <li>MODERATOR: So obviously, some balance.</li> <li>Yes, Mark? Last word on this section.</li> <li>DR. JENSEN: So I'll just respond a little</li> <li>bit to what David said about it, the issue of</li> <li>adherence that Bernard mentioned. We've talked</li> <li>about training patients for better assessment, and</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18	urine tests on people to people who are supposedly being prescribed opioids, and by far, many more underuse the medication than overuse the medication. So it's not as it, number one, we don't do this, and number two, there are plenty of people who underutilize. So let's end this session.
14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>vulnerability is what we need to</li> <li>MODERATOR: So obviously, some balance.</li> <li>Yes, Mark? Last word on this section.</li> <li>DR. JENSEN: So I'll just respond a little</li> <li>bit to what David said about it, the issue of</li> <li>adherence that Bernard mentioned. We've talked</li> <li>about training patients for better assessment, and</li> <li>I don't know that it was specifically talked about</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	urine tests on people to people who are supposedly being prescribed opioids, and by far, many more underuse the medication than overuse the medication. So it's not as it, number one, we don't do this, and number two, there are plenty of people who underutilize. So let's end this session. Now the fun begins. This is the part you've
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	<ul> <li>vulnerability is what we need to</li> <li>MODERATOR: So obviously, some balance.</li> <li>Yes, Mark? Last word on this section.</li> <li>DR. JENSEN: So I'll just respond a little</li> <li>bit to what David said about it, the issue of</li> <li>adherence that Bernard mentioned. We've talked</li> <li>about training patients for better assessment, and</li> <li>I don't know that it was specifically talked about</li> <li>whether we should include in the paper training for</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	urine tests on people to people who are supposedly being prescribed opioids, and by far, many more underuse the medication than overuse the medication. So it's not as it, number one, we don't do this, and number two, there are plenty of people who underutilize. So let's end this session. Now the fun begins. This is the part you've all been waiting for. The exam. This is the exam.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	<ul> <li>vulnerability is what we need to</li> <li>MODERATOR: So obviously, some balance.</li> <li>Yes, Mark? Last word on this section.</li> <li>DR. JENSEN: So I'll just respond a little</li> <li>bit to what David said about it, the issue of</li> <li>adherence that Bernard mentioned. We've talked</li> <li>about training patients for better assessment, and</li> <li>I don't know that it was specifically talked about</li> <li>whether we should include in the paper training for</li> <li>adherence, that we would want to include issues</li> </ul>	12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	urine tests on people to people who are supposedly being prescribed opioids, and by far, many more underuse the medication than overuse the medication. So it's not as it, number one, we don't do this, and number two, there are plenty of people who underutilize. So let's end this session. Now the fun begins. This is the part you've all been waiting for. The exam. This is the exam. This is the did you earn your provisional

1       Thank you, gentlemen.       1       very knowledgeable about clinical trials.         2       Consensus Discussion       3       This is David Hewitt's clinical trial shop.         3       DR. DWORKIN: Okay. So you're in the home       3       This is obviously on a much larger scale. And if         4       stretch. There is no formal coffee break this       5       This is obviously on a much larger scale. And if         5       affernoon, so it wonth hurt my feelings if you       5       up for work. Tom Hanks was one of David's early         6       else.       5       up for work. Tom Hanks was one of David's early         1       is diabate there are taxi arrangements and everything       6       else.       5         9       I only have a couple of slides. And really.       7       form You've Got Mail.       8         11       is diabate there are taxi arrangements and everything       9       really the important Slide. We would like these         11       is diabate the definitions of quality that put up       15       to ind of summarize what a few of us thought were         14       to definitions and hig about. This is more or less       13       to kind point and and menon. This is more or less       14       to kind point and and the with recommendations. Or         15       to far were tone more datons, because there's       15		Page 261		Page 263
2         Consensus Discussion           3         DR. DWORKIN: Okay. So you're in the home           4         stretch. There is no formal coffee break this           5         aftermoon, so it won't hurt my feelings if you           6         wander out. We have a very hard stop at 4.00,           7         because there are taki arrangements and everything           9         lonly have a couple of slides. And really,           10         for the next hour and a half, or however much time           11         is the before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,           12         it's going to be discussion and argument.           12         it's oging to be discussion and his own. This is more or less           14         two definitions of quality that Nat put up           15         vesteridy moring: the one from the FDA           16         the difficult of an article with recommendations. Or           20         if we don't have recommendations. We've used all of           17         treally my last slide, except for one more that           18         that language in the past.           2         or recommendations, si that           4         that language in the past.           3         moring is weld like the recommendations to be           3         applicable to clinical trial. </th <th>1</th> <th>Thank you, gentlemen.</th> <th>1</th> <th>verv knowledgeable about clinical trials.</th>	1	Thank you, gentlemen.	1	verv knowledgeable about clinical trials.
3       DR. DWORKIN: Okay. So you're in the home         4 strach. There is no formal coffee break this         5 afterroom, so it won't hurt my feelings if you         6 stact.         7 because there are taxi arrangements and everything         8 else.         9 I only have a couple of slides. And really,         10 for the next hour and a half, or however much time         11 is left before 40.0, or we might finish score,         12 is left before 40.0, or we might finish score,         13 I thought a good place to start was with the         14 two definitions of quality that Nat put put         15 vesterday morning; the one from the FDA         16 the bene taking about. And as you all         17 what we'be we to be making about. And as you all         18 mow, these two days really are to provide the raw         19 medicating with sefort, these recommendations. Or         10 if we dorb have teroimendations, be case there's         21 not a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations         22 or recommended considerations, is that         4 to be extent possible, we want them to be as         3 applicable to alinical trial arg. Guadrow that as two days.         3 arelevant as possible in non-regulatory so taxing.         11 Theo there there are bailed in an Artice.         2 Dennis, I thought made an important point         3 ast	2	Consensus Discussion	2	This is David Hewitt's clinical trial shop.
<ul> <li>4 stretch. There is no formal coffee break this</li> <li>5 aftermoon, so it won't hurt my feelings if you</li> <li>6 wander out. We have a very hard stop at 4:00,</li> <li>7 because there are taxi arrangements and everything</li> <li>8 else.</li> <li>9 I only have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>10 for the next hour and a half, or however much time</li> <li>11 is left before 4:00, or we might finish sconer,</li> <li>12 it's going to be discussion and argument.</li> <li>13 it bught a good place to start was with the</li> <li>14 two definitions of quality that Nat put up</li> <li>15 pesterday morning; the one from the FDA</li> <li>16 presentation and his own. This is more or less</li> <li>17 what we ve been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>18 know, these two days really are to provide the raw</li> <li>19 material for an article with recommendations. Or</li> <li>20 or recommended considerations.</li> <li>21 or and the way them the past.</li> <li>22 or recommended considerations.</li> <li>23 applicable to aclinical trial.</li> <li>24 to the extent possible, we want them to be as</li> <li>25 applicable to aclinical trial.</li> <li>26 been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>29 recommendations are kind of generally promiscuosity</li> <li>21 or probas as hey are to drugs, and that's always</li> <li>23 a prolizable to aclinical trial.</li> <li>24 morth this is recommendations to be</li> <li>25 the slide score and that's always</li> <li>36 been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>31 mort as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>31 mort as possible in on-regulatory settings,</li> <li>32 mort as polizable to clinical trials.</li> <li>33 they are to care, Shi and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>34 the attay coordinator, Iwave to show you a</li> <li>35 policable to aclinical trials.</li> <li>36 the attay that with ecore and that's always</li> <li>36 been our hope with MMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>31 mort and trial of yoga or</li> <li>32 morting - is wed like</li></ul>	3	DR. DWORKIN: Okay. So you're in the home	3	This is obviously on a much larger scale. And if
<ul> <li>s aftermon, so it won't hurt my feelings if you</li> <li>s ander out. We have a very hard stop at 4:00,</li> <li>b because there are taxi arrangements and everything</li> <li>a lotoy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f or hy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f or hy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f or hy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f or hy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f or hy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f or hy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f or hy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f or hy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f or hy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f or hy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f to hy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f to hy have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>f to hydh a good place to start was with the</li> <li>to presentiation and his own. This is more or less</li> <li>f what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>f to know, these two days really are to provide the raw</li> <li>i that language in the past.</li> <li>2 or recommendations, because there's</li> <li>a paplicable to a clinical trial of yoga or</li> <li>s applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or</li> <li>s been our hope with IMMPACT articles, hat the</li> <li>precommendations are kind of generally promiscuously</li> <li>a policable to clinical trial.</li> <li>a relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>trais relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>f trank for mainal in Africa.</li> <li>to her with the form than a hardia.</li> <li>to her with the recommendations to be</li> <li>a so relevant the read that came out this</li> <li>the hease that for mainal in Africa.</li> <li>to the acter, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>f trank mark pain clinic. That's Mag Ryan who was his</li> <li>photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>Markmaris pain clinic. That's Mag Ryan who w</li></ul>	4	stretch. There is no formal coffee break this	4	you look really hard, you can see Tom Hanks showing
<ul> <li>wander out. We have a very hard stop at 4:00,</li> <li>because there are taxi arrangements and everything</li> <li>else.</li> <li>I only have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>of tor the next hour and a haf, or however much time</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sconer,</li> <li>it is left before 4:00, or we might finish sconer,</li> <li>it hought a good place to start was with the</li> <li>two definitions of quality that Nat put up</li> <li>yesterday morning: the one from the FDA</li> <li>for early the important slide. We would like these</li> <li>two definitions of quality that Nat put up</li> <li>yesterday morning: the one from the FDA</li> <li>for early the ve been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>two definitions and ally are to provide the raw</li> <li>the don't have recommendations. Or</li> <li>if we don't have recommendations, because there's</li> <li>in tal oi of evidence, there lib e considerations</li> <li>2 or ercommended considerations. We've used all of</li> <li>that language in the past.</li> <li>Dennis, I thought made an important point</li> <li>about this effort, these recommendations, is that</li> <li>to the ext th possible, we want them to be as</li> <li>applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or</li> <li>focused at all on safey. That's Mag Ryan who was his</li> <li>you know, academic setting. Fourtaits and the satury of the sature days.</li> <li>treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>To make that point, I, wanted to show you</li> <li>photograph took of - this is the outside of John</li> <li>Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>we virk tudy coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> </ul>	5	afternoon, so it won't hurt my feelings if you	5	up for work. Tom Hanks was one of David's early
<ul> <li>Theorem the part tax arrangements and everything</li> <li>because there are tax arrangements and everything</li> <li>else.</li> <li>Ionly have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>for the next hour and a half, or however much time</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is bout sources of uppe with the FDA</li> <li>is the least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is about this ecommendations, for a coupter on solution. We've used all of</li> <li>paglotable to a clinical trial of yoga or</li> <li>a coupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or</li> <li>the other thing and that came out this</li> <li>a relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>peen our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>recommendations as bus dive of generally promiscuously</li> <li>the other thing and that came out this</li> <li>as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>tratements for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>The other thing and that came out this</li> <li>the disease that the clinical tr</li></ul>	6	wander out We have a very hard stop at 4.00	6	study coordinators. But so you all know this is
a else.       I only have a couple of slides. And really,       is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,         10 is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,       is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,         11 is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,       is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,         12 it's going to be discussion and argument.       12 boutique, clinical trial, academic operations as         13 If thought a good place to start was with the       13 bety are to the much larger situations.         14 two definitions of quality that Nat put up       14 so definitions of quality that Nat put up         15 yesterday morning; the one from the FDA       15 to kind of summarize what a few of us thought were         16 presentation and his own. This is more or less       16 the high points of the last two days. And so this         17 what we've been talking about. And as you all       13 is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of         19 material for an article with recommendations.       19 scaffolding of the article that will be drafted.         20 or recommended considerations.       20 So it seems that we've really been talking         21 that language in the past.       1 trial protocol is intended to do, the study fthe         2 investigators intended, the objectives they had       3 mind, and the way the study gets executed that can         4 to the extent possible, we want them to be as       5 As I said a moment ago, we really haven't	7	because there are taxi arrangements and everything	7	from You've Got Mail
<ul> <li>I only have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>I only have a couple of slides. And really,</li> <li>of the next hour and a half, or however much time</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>I thought a good place to start was with the</li> <li>I thought a good place to start was with the</li> <li>two definitions of quality that Nat put up</li> <li>sexterday moming; the one from the FDA</li> <li>presterday moming; the one from the FDA</li> <li>presterday moming; the one from the FDA</li> <li>presterday moming; the one from the FDA</li> <li>the yeas tho days really are to provide the raw</li> <li>material for an article with recommendations. Or</li> <li>if we don't have recommendations, because there's</li> <li>or a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>about this effort, these recommendations, is that</li> <li>a bapticable to a clinical trial of yoga or</li> <li>a applicable to a clinical trial.</li> <li>the extent possible, we want them to be as</li> <li>a applicable to a clinical trial.</li> <li>the extent possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>presormendations are kind of generally promiscously</li> <li>a presormendations are kind of generally promiscously</li> <li>a stelevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>trast as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>trast as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>trastements for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>presormendations, show and are they show you an as pain clinic. That's Meg Rya mwhow wash is</li> <li>werd first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>or eray. And you can see this is a very small</li> </ul>	8	else.	8	But I think this is important for us to
10       for the next hour and a half, or however much time         11       is left before 4:00, or we might finish sconer,         11       is left before 4:00, or we might finish sconer,         12       it's going to be discussion and argument.         13       Ithought a good place to start was with the         14       two definitions of quality that Nat put up         15       two definitions of quality that Nat put up         16       presentation and his own. This is more or less         16       presentation and his own. This is more or less         17       the we've been talking about. And as you all         18       know, these two days really are to provide the raw         19       material for an article with recommendations. Cor         20       if we don't have recommendations, because there's         21       not a tor of evidence, there'l be considerations         22       or commended considerations.         23       nor to tor devidence, there'l be considerations, is that         3       about this effort, these recommendations, is that         4       to the extent possible, we want them to be as         5       applicable to clinical trial of yoga or         6       cuspuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or         7       hypnosis as they are to druge, and th	9	Lonly have a couple of slides And really	9	remember as we go to the next slide, which is
<ul> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner,</li> <li>is trails, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>trails, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>the dates an initial is study.</li> <li>prostigator?</li> <li>prostigator?</li> <li>prostigator in ther for all and box or we have a box or come out of the systemations as a possible in non-regulatory settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>trails, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>the dates an bain dis study:</li> <li>the disease that the clinical trails is study:</li> <li>the disease that the clinical trail is studying;</li></ul>	10	for the next hour and a half or however much time	10	really the important slide. We would like these
2       it is going to be discussion and argument.       12       it wo definitions of quality that Nat put up       13       it wo definitions of quality that Nat put up       14       So what we've tied to do on this slide is         15       yesterday moning; the one from the FDA       14       So what we've tied to do on this slide is         16       presentation and his own. This is more or less       16       the high points of the last two days. And so this         17       what we've been talking about. And as you all       17       is really my last slide, except for one more that         18       how, these two days really are to provide the raw       19       sate an initial summary, an initial will of         19       material for an article with recommendations, because there's       20       So it seems that we've really been talking         21       not a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations       21       been talking about sources of discordance,         22       or recommended considerations, is that       4       the extent possible, we want them to be as         3       applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or       4       adversely affect the quality of efficacy data.         5       been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the       9       reseting. And so what are these kind of         9       recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously       1       fite a	11	is left before 4:00, or we might finish sooner	11	recommendations to be as relevant to the small
13       I thought a good place to start was with the         14       two definitions of quality that Nat put up       13       I thought a good place to start was with the         14       two definitions of quality that Nat put up       14       So what we've tried to do on this slide is         15       yesterday morning; the one from the FDA       15       to kind of summarize what a few of us thought were         16       presentation and his own. This is more or less       16       the high points of the last two days. And so this         17       what we've been talking about. And as you all       17       is really my last slide, except for one more that         18       know, these two days really are to provide the raw       19       scaffolding of the article that will be drafted.         20       for don't have recommendations. Cor       20       So it seems that we've really been talking         21       not a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations       21       been talking about sources of discordance,         22       or recommendations, is that       1       trial protocol is intended to do, the study the         2       Dennis, I thought made an important point       3 about this effort, these recommendations, is that       1       trial protocol is intended to do, the study gets executed that can         3       about the extent possible, we want them to be as       5	12	it's going to be discussion and argument	12	boutique clinical trial academic operations as
14 two definitions of quality that Nat put up       14 two definitions of quality that Nat put up       15 the functions of quality that Nat put up         15 yesterday morning; the one from the FDA       15 to kind of summarize what a few of us thought were         16 presentation and his own. This is more or less       16 the high points of the last two days. And so this         17 what we've been talking about. And as you all       17 is really my last slide, except for one more that         18 know, these two days really are to provide the raw       18 is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of         19 material for an article with recommendations. Or       19 scaffolding of the article that will be drafted.         20 if we don't have recommendations, because there's       20 is or isseems that we've really been talking         21 not a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations       20 So it seems that we've really been talking         21 not a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations.       20 We've used all of         22 or recommended considerations. We've used all of       21 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the         3 about this effort, these recommendations, is that       3 mind, and the way the study gets executed that can         4 to the extent possible, we want them to be as       5 As I said a moment ago, we really haven't         6 focused at all on safety. That's always       5 As I said a moment ago, we really haven't         10 applicable to clinical trials.       10	13	I thought a good place to start was with the	13	they are to the much larger situations
<ul> <li>It is oblighted by the probability in the properties of the probability of the probability in the properties of the properties of the probability in the properties of the properime the properiment of the properiment of the properimpre</li></ul>	14	two definitions of quality that Nat put up	14	So what we've tried to do on this slide is
<ul> <li>Is or exertation and his own. This is more or less</li> <li>if what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>if what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>if what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>if what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>if what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>if what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>if what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>if what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>if what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>if what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>if what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>if what we've been talking about. And as you all</li> <li>if is really my last slide, except for one more that</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial kind of</li> <li>is at least an initial summary, an initial summary, an initial sumation of an a</li></ul>	15	vesterday morning: the one from the EDA	15	to kind of summarize what a few of us thought were
1       production factor from the or more that         1       what we've been talking about. And as you all         18       know, these two days really are to provide the raw         19       material for an article with recommendations. Or         20       if we don't have recommendations, because there's         21       not a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations         22       or recommended considerations. We've used all of         21       to a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations, is that         2       beennis, I thought made an important point         3       about this effort, these recommendations, is that         4       to the extent possible, we want them to be as         5       applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or         6       acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or         7       hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always         8       been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the         9       recordance, seconder out his         11       The other thing and that came out this         12       more that seems to have come out of the last two days.         13       as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings, foundation clinical         14       you know, academic settings, foundation clinical         15       trials	16	presentation and his own. This is more or less	16	the high points of the last two days. And so this
<ul> <li>18 know, these two days really are to provide the raw</li> <li>19 material for an article with recommendations. Or</li> <li>20 if we don't have recommendations, because there's</li> <li>21 not a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>22 or recommended considerations. We've used all of</li> <li>23 precommended considerations. We've used all of</li> <li>24 been talking about sources of discordance,</li> <li>25 or recommended considerations. We've used all of</li> <li>26 been talking about sources of discordance,</li> <li>27 or recommended considerations, is that</li> <li>28 to the extent possible, we want them to be as</li> <li>29 about this effort, these recommendations, is that</li> <li>4 to the extent possible, we want them to be as</li> <li>3 about this effort, these recommendations, is that</li> <li>4 to the extent possible, we want them to be as</li> <li>5 applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or</li> <li>6 acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or</li> <li>7 hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always</li> <li>8 been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>9 recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously</li> <li>10 applicable to clinical trials.</li> <li>11 The other thing - and that came out this</li> <li>12 morning is we'd like the recommendations to be</li> <li>13 as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> </ul>	17	what we've been talking about And as you all	17	is really my last slide, except for one more that
<ul> <li>In our integration of the article with recommendations. Or</li> <li>if we don't have recommendations, because there's</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in ot a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations</li> <li>in that language in the past.</li> <li>in that language in the past.</li> <li>in the there to possible, we want them to be as</li> <li>a about this effort, these recommendations, is that</li> <li>a to the extent possible, we want them to be as</li> <li>a policiable to a linical trial of yoga or</li> <li>f hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always</li> <li>b been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>g recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously</li> <li>a policiable to clinical trials.</li> <li>in the other thing and that came out this</li> <li>as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>p hotograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>p hotograph I lock of this is the outside of John</li> <li>make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>p hotograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>mate and mate that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>p hotograph I took of this</li></ul>	18	know these two days really are to provide the raw	18	is at least an initial summary an initial kind of
<ul> <li>21 Individual of the past.</li> <li>22 or recommended considerations. We've used all of</li> <li>Page 262</li> <li>Page 262</li> <li>Page 264</li> <li>1 that language in the past.</li> <li>2 Dennis, I thought made an important point</li> <li>3 about this effort, these recommendations, is that</li> <li>4 to the extent possible, we want them to be as</li> <li>5 applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or</li> <li>6 acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or</li> <li>7 hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always</li> <li>8 been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>9 recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously</li> <li>10 applicable to clinical trials.</li> <li>11 The other thing and that came out this</li> <li>12 morning is we'd like the recommendations to be</li> <li>13 as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's</li> </ul>	19	material for an article with recommendations. Or	19	scaffolding of the article that will be drafted
21       not a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations         22       or recommended considerations. We've used all of         21       page 262         22       or recommended considerations. We've used all of         22       about this effort, there an important point         3       about this effort, these recommendations, is that         4       to the extent possible, we want them to be as         5       applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or         6       accupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or         7       hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always         8       been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the         9       recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously         10       applicable to clinical trials.         11       The other thing and that came out this         12       moring is we'd like the recommendations to be         13       as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,         14       you know, academic settings, foundation clinical         15       trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying         16       trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying         17       To make that point, I wanted to show you a         18       photograph I took of this is the outside of John <th>20</th> <th>if we don't have recommendations, because there's</th> <th>20</th> <th>So it seems that we've really been talking</th>	20	if we don't have recommendations, because there's	20	So it seems that we've really been talking
21       Initial for or or ecommended considerations. We've used all of       22       discrepancy, mismatches, between what a clinical         22       Page 262       Page 264         1       that language in the past.       1       trial protocol is intended to do, the study the         2       Dennis, I thought made an important point       3 about this effort, these recommendations, is that       1       trial protocol is intended to do, the study the         3       about this effort, these recommendations, is that       4       to the extent possible, we want them to be as       5       As I said a moment ago, we really haven't         6       acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or       7       hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always       5       As I said a moment ago, we really haven't         6       focused at all on safety. That's a whole other       7       meeting. And so what actually happened when the         10       applicable to clinical trials.       10       This is really the summary of those sources         11       The other thing and that came out this       11       This is really the summary of those sources, so         12       that seems to have come out of the last two days.       13       There are patient sources, site sources, so         13       as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,       14       characteristics of the patients, whe	21	not a lot of evidence, there'll be considerations	21	been talking about sources of discordance
Page 262       Page 264         1 that language in the past.       1 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the         2 Dennis, I thought made an important point       3 about this effort, these recommendations, is that         4 to the extent possible, we want them to be as       5 applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or         5 applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or       5 As I said a moment ago, we really haven't         6 acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or       7 hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always         8 been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the       9 recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously         10 applicable to clinical trials.       10 rubber met the road?         11 The other thing and that came out this       11 This is really the summary of those sources         12 as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,       11 The other thang and that came out this         13 as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,       14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical         14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical       14 characteristics of the patients, whether they have         15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying       15 the disease that the clinical trial is studying;         16 has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms         17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a       18 some did in Eric's study, treatments from the         19 i	22	or recommended considerations. We've used all of	22	discrepancy mismatches between what a clinical
Page 262Page 2621 that language in the past.1 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the2 Dennis, I thought made an important point3 about this effort, these recommendations, is that3 about this effort, these recommendations, is that3 mind, and the way the study gets executed that can4 to the extent possible, we want them to be as3 mind, and the way the study gets executed that can5 applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or5 As I said a moment ago, we really haven't6 acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or7 hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always8 been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the9 recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously10 applicable to clinical trials.11 The other thing and that came out this11 The other thing and that came out this11 This is really the summary of those sources12 morning is we'd like the recommendations to be11 This really the summary of those sources, so14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical14 characteristics of the patients, whether they have15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying15 the disease that the clinical trial is studying;16 treatments for malaria in Africa.16 has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a18 some did in Eric's study, treatments from the19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his19 investigator?20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work20 There are sources of discordance involving21 one day. And you can see this is a very small21 outcome reporting.	~~		22	
1that language in the past.1trial protocol is intended to do, the study the2Dennis, I thought made an important pointabout this effort, these recommendations, is that1trial protocol is intended to do, the study the3about this effort, these recommendations, is that3mind, and the way the study gets executed that can4to the extent possible, we want them to be as3mind, and the way the study gets executed that can4to the extent possible, we want them to be as5As I said a moment ago, we really haven't6acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or6focused at all on safety. That's a whole other7hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always7meeting. And so what are these kind of8been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the9the protocol and what actually happened when the10applicable to clinical trials.10ruber met the road?11The other thing and that came out this11This is really the summary of those sources12morning is we'd like the recommendations to be12that seems to have come out of the last two days.13as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,14characteristics of the patients, whether they have15trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying15the disease that the clinical trial is studying;16treatments for malaria in Africa.16has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms17To make that point, I wanted to show you a18some d				
<ul> <li>Dennis, I thought made an important point</li> <li>about this effort, these recommendations, is that</li> <li>to the extent possible, we want them to be as</li> <li>applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or</li> <li>acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or</li> <li>hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always</li> <li>been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously</li> <li>applicable to clinical trials.</li> <li>The other thing and that came out this</li> <li>morning is we'd like the recommendations to be</li> <li>as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>investigators intended, the objectives they had</li> <li>investigators intended</li></ul>		Page 262		Page 264
<ul> <li>about this effort, these recommendations, is that</li> <li>to the extent possible, we want them to be as</li> <li>applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or</li> <li>acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or</li> <li>hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always</li> <li>been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously</li> <li>applicable to clinical trials.</li> <li>The other thing and that came out this</li> <li>morning is we'd like the recommendations to be</li> <li>as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>a mond, and the way the study gets executed that can</li> <li>a mind, and the way the study gets executed that can</li> <li>a mind, and the way the study gets executed that can</li> <li>a moment ago, we really haven't</li> <li>focused at all on safety. That's a whole other</li> <li>meeting. And so what are these kind of</li> <li>discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of</li> <li>the other the road?</li> <li>The other thing and that came out this</li> <li>that seems to have come out of the last two days.</li> <li>There are patient sources, site sources, so</li> <li>the disease that the clinical trial is studying;</li> <li>the disease that the clinical trial is studying;</li></ul>	1	Page 262 that language in the past.	1	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the
<ul> <li>4 to the extent possible, we want them to be as</li> <li>5 applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or</li> <li>6 acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or</li> <li>7 hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always</li> <li>8 been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>9 recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously</li> <li>10 applicable to clinical trials.</li> <li>11 The other thing and that came out this</li> <li>12 morning is we'd like the recommendations to be</li> <li>13 as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>4 adversely affect the quality of efficacy data.</li> <li>5 As I said a moment ago, we really haven't</li> <li>6 focused at all on safety. That's a whole other</li> <li>7 meeting. And so what are these kind of</li> <li>8 discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of</li> <li>9 the protocol and what actually happened when the</li> <li>10 rubber met the road?</li> <li>11 This is really the summary of those sources</li> <li>12 that seems to have come out of the last two days.</li> <li>13 There are patient sources, site sources, so</li> <li>14 characteristics of the patients, whether they have</li> <li>15 the disease that the clinical trial is studying;</li> <li>16 has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms</li> <li>17 so they can get randomized; are they hiding, as</li> <li>18 some did in Eric's study, treatments from the</li> <li>19 investigator?</li> <li>20 There are sources of discordance involving</li> <li>21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's</li> </ul>	1	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point	1	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had
<ul> <li>5 applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or</li> <li>6 acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or</li> <li>7 hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always</li> <li>8 been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>9 recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously</li> <li>10 applicable to clinical trials.</li> <li>11 The other thing and that came out this</li> <li>12 morning is we'd like the recommendations to be</li> <li>13 as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>5 As I said a moment ago, we really haven't</li> <li>6 focused at all on safety. That's a whole other</li> <li>7 meeting. And so what are these kind of</li> <li>8 discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of</li> <li>9 the protocol and what actually happened when the</li> <li>10 rubber met the road?</li> <li>11 This is really the summary of those sources</li> <li>12 that seems to have come out of the last two days.</li> <li>13 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>14 characteristics of the patients, whether they have</li> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 some did in Eric's study, treatments from the</li> <li>19 investigator?</li> <li>20 There are sources of discordance involving</li> <li>21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's</li> </ul>	1 2 3	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that	1 2 3	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can
<ul> <li>6 acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or 7 hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always</li> <li>8 been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the 9 recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously</li> <li>10 applicable to clinical trials.</li> <li>11 The other thing and that came out this</li> <li>12 morning is we'd like the recommendations to be</li> <li>13 as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings, 14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as	1 2 3 4	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data.
<ul> <li>7 hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always</li> <li>8 been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>9 recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously</li> <li>10 applicable to clinical trials.</li> <li>11 The other thing and that came out this</li> <li>12 morning is we'd like the recommendations to be</li> <li>13 as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of voga or	1 2 3 4 5	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't
<ul> <li>8 been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the</li> <li>9 recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously</li> <li>10 applicable to clinical trials.</li> <li>11 The other thing and that came out this</li> <li>12 morning is we'd like the recommendations to be</li> <li>13 as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other
<ul> <li>9 recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously</li> <li>10 applicable to clinical trials.</li> <li>11 The other thing and that came out this</li> <li>12 morning is we'd like the recommendations to be</li> <li>13 as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>9 the protocol and what actually happened when the</li> <li>10 rubber met the road?</li> <li>11 This is really the summary of those sources</li> <li>12 that seems to have come out of the last two days.</li> <li>13 There are patient sources, site sources, so</li> <li>14 characteristics of the patients, whether they have</li> <li>15 the disease that the clinical trial is studying;</li> <li>16 has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms</li> <li>17 so they can get randomized; are they hiding, as</li> <li>18 some did in Eric's study, treatments from the</li> <li>19 investigator?</li> <li>20 There are sources of discordance involving</li> <li>21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of
<ul> <li>applicable to clinical trials.</li> <li>The other thing and that came out this</li> <li>morning is we'd like the recommendations to be</li> <li>as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>treatments for clinical trial is a very small</li> <li>the disease that the clinical trial is studying;</li> <li>the disease that the clinical trial is studying</li></ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of
11The other thing and that came out this11This is really the summary of those sources12morning is we'd like the recommendations to be11This is really the summary of those sources13as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,12that seems to have come out of the last two days.14you know, academic settings, foundation clinical13There are patient sources, site sources, so15trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying14characteristics of the patients, whether they have15treatments for malaria in Africa.16has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms17To make that point, I wanted to show you a17so they can get randomized; are they hiding, as18photograph I took of this is the outside of John18some did in Eric's study, treatments from the19Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his20There are sources of discordance involving20ore day. And you can see this is a very small21outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the
<ul> <li>12 morning is we'd like the recommendations to be</li> <li>13 as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>12 that seems to have come out of the last two days.</li> <li>13 There are patient sources, site sources, so</li> <li>14 characteristics of the patients, whether they have</li> <li>15 the disease that the clinical trial is studying;</li> <li>16 has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms</li> <li>17 so they can get randomized; are they hiding, as</li> <li>18 some did in Eric's study, treatments from the</li> <li>19 investigator?</li> <li>20 There are sources of discordance involving</li> <li>21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously applicable to clinical trials.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the rubber met the road?
<ul> <li>13 as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,</li> <li>14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>13 There are patient sources, site sources, so</li> <li>14 characteristics of the patients, whether they have</li> <li>15 the disease that the clinical trial is studying;</li> <li>16 has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 some did in Eric's study, treatments from the</li> <li>19 investigator?</li> <li>20 There are sources of discordance involving</li> <li>21 one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>23 There are patient sources, site sources, so</li> <li>14 characteristics of the patients, whether they have</li> <li>15 the disease that the clinical trial is studying;</li> <li>16 has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms</li> <li>17 so they can get randomized; are they hiding, as</li> <li>18 some did in Eric's study, treatments from the</li> <li>19 investigator?</li> <li>20 There are sources of discordance involving</li> <li>21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously applicable to clinical trials. The other thing and that came out this	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the rubber met the road? This is really the summary of those sources
<ul> <li>14 you know, academic settings, foundation clinical</li> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>14 characteristics of the patients, whether they have</li> <li>15 the disease that the clinical trial is studying;</li> <li>16 has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms</li> <li>17 so they can get randomized; are they hiding, as</li> <li>18 some did in Eric's study, treatments from the</li> <li>19 investigator?</li> <li>20 There are sources of discordance involving</li> <li>21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously applicable to clinical trials. The other thing and that came out this morning is we'd like the recommendations to be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the rubber met the road? This is really the summary of those sources that seems to have come out of the last two days.
<ul> <li>15 trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying</li> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>15 the disease that the clinical trial is studying;</li> <li>16 has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 some did in Eric's study, treatments from the</li> <li>19 investigator?</li> <li>20 There are sources of discordance involving</li> <li>21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously applicable to clinical trials. The other thing and that came out this morning is we'd like the recommendations to be as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the rubber met the road? This is really the summary of those sources that seems to have come out of the last two days. There are patient sources, site sources, so
<ul> <li>16 treatments for malaria in Africa.</li> <li>17 To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>16 has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms</li> <li>17 so they can get randomized; are they hiding, as</li> <li>18 some did in Eric's study, treatments from the</li> <li>19 investigator?</li> <li>20 There are sources of discordance involving</li> <li>21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously applicable to clinical trials. The other thing and that came out this morning is we'd like the recommendations to be as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings, you know, academic settings, foundation clinical	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the rubber met the road? This is really the summary of those sources that seems to have come out of the last two days. There are patient sources, site sources, so characteristics of the patients, whether they have
<ul> <li>To make that point, I wanted to show you a</li> <li>photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>the day is a very small very small</li> <li>the day is a very small very small very small</li> <li>the day is a very small very small very small very small</li> <li>the day is a very small very small</li></ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously applicable to clinical trials. The other thing and that came out this morning is we'd like the recommendations to be as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings, you know, academic settings, foundation clinical trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the rubber met the road? This is really the summary of those sources that seems to have come out of the last two days. There are patient sources, site sources, so characteristics of the patients, whether they have the disease that the clinical trial is studying;
<ul> <li>18 photograph I took of this is the outside of John</li> <li>19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his</li> <li>20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work</li> <li>21 one day. And you can see this is a very small</li> <li>18 some did in Eric's study, treatments from the</li> <li>19 investigator?</li> <li>20 There are sources of discordance involving</li> <li>21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's</li> </ul>	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously applicable to clinical trials. The other thing and that came out this morning is we'd like the recommendations to be as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings, you know, academic settings, foundation clinical trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying treatments for malaria in Africa.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the rubber met the road? This is really the summary of those sources that seems to have come out of the last two days. There are patient sources, site sources, so characteristics of the patients, whether they have the disease that the clinical trial is studying; has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms
19 Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his19 investigator?20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work20 There are sources of discordance involving21 one day. And you can see this is a very small21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously applicable to clinical trials. The other thing and that came out this morning is we'd like the recommendations to be as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings, you know, academic settings, foundation clinical trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying treatments for malaria in Africa. To make that point, I wanted to show you a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the rubber met the road? This is really the summary of those sources that seems to have come out of the last two days. There are patient sources, site sources, so characteristics of the patients, whether they have the disease that the clinical trial is studying; has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms so they can get randomized; are they hiding, as
20 very first study coordinator, showing up for work20 There are sources of discordance involving21 one day. And you can see this is a very small21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously applicable to clinical trials. The other thing and that came out this morning is we'd like the recommendations to be as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings, you know, academic settings, foundation clinical trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying treatments for malaria in Africa. To make that point, I wanted to show you a photograph I took of this is the outside of John	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the rubber met the road? This is really the summary of those sources that seems to have come out of the last two days. There are patient sources, site sources, so characteristics of the patients, whether they have the disease that the clinical trial is studying; has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms so they can get randomized; are they hiding, as some did in Eric's study, treatments from the
21 one day. And you can see this is a very small       21 outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously applicable to clinical trials. The other thing and that came out this morning is we'd like the recommendations to be as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings, you know, academic settings, foundation clinical trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying treatments for malaria in Africa. To make that point, I wanted to show you a photograph I took of this is the outside of John Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Rvan who was his	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the rubber met the road? This is really the summary of those sources that seems to have come out of the last two days. There are patient sources, site sources, so characteristics of the patients, whether they have the disease that the clinical trial is studying; has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms so they can get randomized; are they hiding, as some did in Eric's study, treatments from the investigator?
	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously applicable to clinical trials. The other thing and that came out this morning is we'd like the recommendations to be as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings, you know, academic settings, foundation clinical trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying treatments for malaria in Africa. To make that point, I wanted to show you a photograph I took of this is the outside of John Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his very first study coordinator, showing up for work	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the rubber met the road? This is really the summary of those sources that seems to have come out of the last two days. There are patient sources, site sources, so characteristics of the patients, whether they have the disease that the clinical trial is studying; has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms so they can get randomized; are they hiding, as some did in Eric's study, treatments from the investigator? There are sources of discordance involving
22 operation, and they're very sophisticated, they're  22 presentation yesterday morning, the intentional	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 262 that language in the past. Dennis, I thought made an important point about this effort, these recommendations, is that to the extent possible, we want them to be as applicable to a clinical trial of yoga or acupuncture or cognitive behavior therapy or hypnosis as they are to drugs, and that's always been our hope with IMMPACT articles, that the recommendations are kind of generally promiscuously applicable to clinical trials. The other thing and that came out this morning is we'd like the recommendations to be as relevant as possible in non-regulatory settings, you know, academic settings, foundation clinical trials, et cetera, Bill and Melinda Gates studying treatments for malaria in Africa. To make that point, I wanted to show you a photograph I took of this is the outside of John Markman's pain clinic. That's Meg Ryan who was his very first study coordinator, showing up for work one day. And you can see this is a very small	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 264 trial protocol is intended to do, the study the investigators intended, the objectives they had mind, and the way the study gets executed that can adversely affect the quality of efficacy data. As I said a moment ago, we really haven't focused at all on safety. That's a whole other meeting. And so what are these kind of discordances, discrepancies, between the intent of the protocol and what actually happened when the rubber met the road? This is really the summary of those sources that seems to have come out of the last two days. There are patient sources, site sources, so characteristics of the patients, whether they have the disease that the clinical trial is studying; has there been some exaggeration of their symptoms so they can get randomized; are they hiding, as some did in Eric's study, treatments from the investigator? There are sources of discordance involving outcome reporting. This is, of course, Mark's

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials	Jun		
	Page 265		Page 267	
1	unblinding that I talked a little bit about. Of	1	we didn't talk about, so I'm not sure how that will	
2	course what we were all very, very troubled by, the	2	be brought to bear here.	
3	lack of medication adherence that Bernard talked	3	DR. DWORKIN: So four cells so in a row	
4	about, and then a set of site characteristics; I'm	4	obviously Bernard had to leave early.	
5	not going to go through them in detail.	5	Obviously, we will rely on Bernard to fill in the	
6	One of the themes it seems over the last two	6	four cells here: prevention of medication	
7	days has been what can we do to prevent these	7	mis-adherence.	
8	discordances. Quality by design is obviously an	8	Identification, he talked a lot about that	
9	approach to this. You build in, as much as	9	yesterday in terms of the electronic approaches to	
10	possible, safeguards into the protocol, but of	10	identifying medication adherence; and then of	
11	course nothing is perfect. And what can we do to	11	course the issue of	
12	identify these mismatches between the intention of	12	One question I talked about at the break	
13	the protocol and the study execution, as they're	13	with someone is if Bernard's electronic system says	
14	occurring.	14	the patient stopped taking their medication a week	
15	Then this is something we've danced	15	ago, is it appropriate for a coordinator at the	
16	around a lot about, and I don't know that we've got	16	site to call the patient and say, "Mr. Smith, we	
17	a whole lot of answers here once you've	17	noticed that you stopped taking your medication a	
18	identified something funky, what do you do? What	18	week ago; what's going on?" Or is that that kind	
19	can you do legitimately, to address it in the	19	of midcourse correction not appropriate?	
20	middle of a trial; and if you can't, afterwards in	20	I know what I think, but I'm not sure we	
21	the analysis?	21	could get an answer today.	
22	So when I look at this slide and forgive	22	Then, of course, what Bernard talked a lot	
	Page 266		Page 268	
-	wy inshility to work with Eyzol it roolly should	-	shout is often the fact when you've get the	
T	my inability to work with Excer it really should	T	about is alter the fact when you've got the	
2	there are kind of 26 colls on this slide that you	2	adherence data, you can do a secondary post noc	
3	chere are kind of 56 cens on this side that you	3	whether the notions was taking their mediaction and	
4	those four wave of addressing disperdance across	4	officery and at actors. So that's the 26 colls	
5	these nine aspects of patient and site arenas	5	that aren't on this slide	
7	domains for discordance Bob?	7	BOB: One other minor well maybe not so	
2	BOB: Immediate reaction 1 think this is	/ 0	minor I think we did focus on	
9	actually terrific. Two things that come to mind:	9	unintentional or excuse me intentional	
10	one is another dimension, which was in the	10	unblinding. That really isn't unblinding, and	
11	definition of quality, may be possible to both	11	including unintentional	
12	address. I guess, the importance of these factors	12	DR. DWORKIN: Yes.	
13	in the integrity of the study and the ability to	13	BOB: There are things at the level of	
14	produce reliable results and protection of human	14	prevention, et cetera, related to well,	
15	subjects.	15	prevention of	
16	DR. DWORKIN: Yes.	16	DR. DWORKIN: You know, I agree, Bob. I'm	
17	BOB: So bringing both those. And then the	17	not sure	
18	only other thing I would say is I wonder I'm	18	BOB: not intentional.	
19	very interested in the medication adherence thing	19	MODERATOR: I'm not sure why I made this	
20	we had a presentation on. I don't think we really	20	intentional, because as one of the speakers I	
21	focused much discussion on that. I think Dennis	21	forget who mentioned assessing whether patients	
22	just mentioned it. I think there's a lot more that	22	became unblinded from side effects is a very	

	Page 269		Page 271
1	reasonable thing to do. Consider the word	1	recommendations, there's going to be different
2	"intentional" withdrawn because it's verv	2	levels of evidence, the strength of evidence before
3	reasonable to ask patients at the end of the trial,	3	those recommendations, so we need to incorporate in
4	Which group do you think you were randomized to?	4	the table or in the text how strongly we think you
5	Just because some of you may not be able to	5	ought to be doing the thing that we're saying.
6	see it, at the bottom, I tried to emphasize that	6	So I think there's a consensus, no paper
7	this all applies to eligibility criteria, efficacy	7	diaries to assess adherence, but there are probably
8	outcome data, adherence data, follow-up, and	8	other ways to assess adherence that we think are
9	subject disposition, but not adverse events.	9	pretty good. But in terms of training, for
10	David?	10	example, we don't have the evidence yet. We think
11	DAVID: One of the things we didn't mention,	11	this would be a good thing to do, but we don't
12	I don't think, was the idea of overdose, and that's	12	have so just some way of indicating the level of
13	kind of the opposite, right, of this adherence	13	evidence in the table or in the paper.
14	issue. But certainly, it speaks to quality issues.	14	DR. DWORKIN: Yeah, we're going to need to
15	And how we give out drugs, whether we use blister	15	do that. I actually think that we're probably
16	packs or bottles, we didn't get into that, I don't	16	going to end up my guess based on previous
17	think. I think that becomes very impactful as	17	impact articles is that we're going to end up
18	well. In addition to missing doses, is overdose.	18	calling these "considerations" rather than
19	Of course, with that is always the concern,	19	"recommendations" because there is no evidence, so
20	particularly for some of our drugs, that there may	20	we can't really have evidence-based
21	be diversion of these drugs as well if there's a	21	recommendations.
22	concern that there is a positive reinforcing effect	22	I think even for electronic versus paper, my
	Page 270		Page 272
1	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines	1	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time,
1	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study.	1	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really
1 2 3	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse	1 2 3	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get
1 2 3 4	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event?	1 2 3 4	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than
1 2 3 4 5	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event.	1 2 3 4 5	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're attempt on the trial is, what's your the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad. DR. DWORKIN: So what would you cite to show
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're attempt on the trial is, what's your the importance of the trial. There are trials that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad. DR. DWORKIN: So what would you cite to show that paper diaries are bad?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're attempt on the trial is, what's your the importance of the trial. There are trials that have overdose as a primary outcome.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad. DR. DWORKIN: So what would you cite to show that paper diaries are bad? MALE SPEAKER: Oh, there's plenty of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're attempt on the trial is, what's your the importance of the trial. There are trials that have overdose as a primary outcome. DR. DWORKIN: Absolutely. Right.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad. DR. DWORKIN: So what would you cite to show that paper diaries are bad? MALE SPEAKER: Oh, there's plenty of evidence, observations of people doing the hood,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're attempt on the trial is, what's your the importance of the trial. There are trials that have overdose as a primary outcome. DR. DWORKIN: Absolutely. Right. DAVID: Well, it's an adherence issue, I	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad. DR. DWORKIN: So what would you cite to show that paper diaries are bad? MALE SPEAKER: Oh, there's plenty of evidence, observations of people doing the hood, the lack of consistency in their responding. We
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're attempt on the trial is, what's your the importance of the trial. There are trials that have overdose as a primary outcome. DR. DWORKIN: Absolutely. Right. DAVID: Well, it's an adherence issue, I think, because you're taking too much. Not all	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad. DR. DWORKIN: So what would you cite to show that paper diaries are bad? MALE SPEAKER: Oh, there's plenty of evidence, observations of people doing the hood, the lack of consistency in their responding. We have papers. I can find them for you that have the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're attempt on the trial is, what's your the importance of the trial. There are trials that have overdose as a primary outcome. DR. DWORKIN: Absolutely. Right. DAVID: Well, it's an adherence issue, I think, because you're taking too much. Not all overdoses are assigned the designation of an	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad. DR. DWORKIN: So what would you cite to show that paper diaries are bad? MALE SPEAKER: Oh, there's plenty of evidence, observations of people doing the hood, the lack of consistency in their responding. We have papers. I can find them for you that have the evidence.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're attempt on the trial is, what's your the importance of the trial. There are trials that have overdose as a primary outcome. DR. DWORKIN: Absolutely. Right. DAVID: Well, it's an adherence issue, I think, because you're taking too much. Not all overdoses are assigned the designation of an adverse event. If there's no adverse event	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad. DR. DWORKIN: So what would you cite to show that paper diaries are bad? MALE SPEAKER: Oh, there's plenty of evidence, observations of people doing the hood, the lack of consistency in their responding. We have papers. I can find them for you that have the evidence. Clearly, we'll have some qualifiers saying
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're attempt on the trial is, what's your the importance of the trial. There are trials that have overdose as a primary outcome. DR. DWORKIN: Absolutely. Right. DAVID: Well, it's an adherence issue, I think, because you're taking too much. Not all overdoses are assigned the designation of an adverse event. If there's no adverse event associated with it, it's not an adverse event.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad. DR. DWORKIN: So what would you cite to show that paper diaries are bad? MALE SPEAKER: Oh, there's plenty of evidence, observations of people doing the hood, the lack of consistency in their responding. We have papers. I can find them for you that have the evidence. Clearly, we'll have some qualifiers saying these are recommendations. But I think there may
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're attempt on the trial is, what's your the importance of the trial. There are trials that have overdose as a primary outcome. DR. DWORKIN: Absolutely. Right. DAVID: Well, it's an adherence issue, I think, because you're taking too much. Not all overdoses are assigned the designation of an adverse event. If there's no adverse event associated with it, it's not an adverse event. It's not adherence.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad. DR. DWORKIN: So what would you cite to show that paper diaries are bad? MALE SPEAKER: Oh, there's plenty of evidence, observations of people doing the hood, the lack of consistency in their responding. We have papers. I can find them for you that have the evidence. Clearly, we'll have some qualifiers saying these are recommendations. But I think there may be some recommendations we feel more strongly about
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're attempt on the trial is, what's your the importance of the trial. There are trials that have overdose as a primary outcome. DR. DWORKIN: Absolutely. Right. DAVID: Well, it's an adherence issue, I think, because you're taking too much. Not all overdoses are assigned the designation of an adverse event. If there's no adverse event associated with it, it's not an adverse event. It's not adherence. DR. DWORKIN: Right. Mark?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad. DR. DWORKIN: So what would you cite to show that paper diaries are bad? MALE SPEAKER: Oh, there's plenty of evidence, observations of people doing the hood, the lack of consistency in their responding. We have papers. I can find them for you that have the evidence. Clearly, we'll have some qualifiers saying these are recommendations. But I think there may be some recommendations we feel more strongly about than others, and I think we should just make that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 270 of the drug and sharing it outside of the confines of the study. DR. DWORKIN: So you see overdose an adverse event? DAVID: It can be an adverse event. MALE SPEAKER: So shouldn't that be off the table for this if we're focusing on efficacy outcomes? MALE SPEAKER: It depends what you're attempt on the trial is, what's your the importance of the trial. There are trials that have overdose as a primary outcome. DR. DWORKIN: Absolutely. Right. DAVID: Well, it's an adherence issue, I think, because you're taking too much. Not all overdoses are assigned the designation of an adverse event. If there's no adverse event associated with it, it's not an adverse event. It's not adherence. DR. DWORKIN: Right. Mark? DR. DWORKIN: Right. Mark? DR. JENSEN: Just another complication,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 272 sense is we all agree that at this point in time, electronic is preferable, but it would be really hard-put to cite something showing that you get better quality data from an electronic device than from a paper diary. I don't know. What would I cite? MALE SPEAKER: I would cite that the paper diaries we know are bad. We know they're bad. The electronic diaries, we don't know that they're bad. DR. DWORKIN: So what would you cite to show that paper diaries are bad? MALE SPEAKER: Oh, there's plenty of evidence, observations of people doing the hood, the lack of consistency in their responding. We have papers. I can find them for you that have the evidence. Clearly, we'll have some qualifiers saying these are recommendations. But I think there may be some recommendations we feel more strongly about than others, and I think we should just make that clear. That's my point.

	Page 273		Page 275
1	have strength of recommendation or considerations.	1	to be patients and getting on to these kind of
2	strength of evidence. And those could be we	2	patient websites, and then inquiring about side
3	could have a strong recommendation with weak	3	effects and sort of going by what was maybe in
4	evidence because it's just common sense. And any	4	clinicaltrials.gov or something else. Then getting
5	reasonable, thoughtful person would agree with it,	5	to know electronically other subjects, and then
6	even though we can't cite chapter and verse of	6	asking them about efficacy, and trying to pick out
7	randomized trial.	7	the ones that they thought were really on the
8	I think that's brilliant, kind of strength	8	active drug and getting an early read as to whether
9	of evidence, and it's often going to be not very	9	or not they should buy this stock or dump the
10	much at all. But we can also give the strength of	10	stock.
11	our recommendations. Yeah, Mike?	11	MALE SPEAKER: That's brilliant.
12	MIKE: I just have a question about this	12	MALE SPEAKER: Oh, yeah. It makes a lot of
13	intentional unblinding aspect. If it's really	13	sense.
14	intentional on the part of the site to either have	14	DR. DWORKIN: If you will send us a
15	access to something that they're not really	15	reference Mike, I promise to include this in the
16	supposed to be looking at, that's really site	16	article if you can send me a reference to that.
17	misconduct. But I've always had concerns about	17	(Laughter.)
18	explicitly asking subjects what treatment they	18	(Crosstalk.)
19	think they got assigned to, partly because it helps	19	DR. DWORKIN: That is too titillating a
20	unblind the staff who may not have thought very	20	tidbit to ignore. Ian?
21	deeply about it, so in the process of querying the	21	DR. GILRON: Thanks to Mitchell Max, how we
22	subject, the subject will say I felt this and I	22	did this when I trained and learned how to do
	Page 274		Page 276
1	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things	1	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do
1	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually	1	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding guestionnaires. We routinely, at the same
1 2 3	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug.	1 2 3	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they
1 2 3 4	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this	1 2 3 4	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought.
1 2 3 4 5	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things	1 2 3 4 5	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that, and I don't know that anyone else has in print.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the research staff has always been more unblinded than
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that, and I don't know that anyone else has in print. One way to address it would be to have the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the research staff has always been more unblinded than the patient. We do it at the end of the study.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that, and I don't know that anyone else has in print. One way to address it would be to have the assessment being done at the end of the trial	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the research staff has always been more unblinded than the patient. We do it at the end of the study. And to be honest, I can't say that we've
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that, and I don't know that anyone else has in print. One way to address it would be to have the assessment being done at the end of the trial electronically with the study staff being blinded	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the research staff has always been more unblinded than the patient. We do it at the end of the study. And to be honest, I can't say that we've protocolized the order in which it's done.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that, and I don't know that anyone else has in print. One way to address it would be to have the assessment being done at the end of the trial electronically with the study staff being blinded to it. The patient says in some kind of electronic	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the research staff has always been more unblinded than the patient. We do it at the end of the study. And to be honest, I can't say that we've protocolized the order in which it's done. I think Mike's concern is that it's going to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that, and I don't know that anyone else has in print. One way to address it would be to have the assessment being done at the end of the trial electronically with the study staff being blinded to it. The patient says in some kind of electronic capture did they think they were randomized to drug	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the research staff has always been more unblinded than the patient. We do it at the end of the study. And to be honest, I can't say that we've protocolized the order in which it's done. I think Mike's concern is that it's going to somehow affect allocation concealment. I'm not
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that, and I don't know that anyone else has in print. One way to address it would be to have the assessment being done at the end of the trial electronically with the study staff being blinded to it. The patient says in some kind of electronic capture did they think they were randomized to drug or placebo and why, and the site staff never see	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the research staff has always been more unblinded than the patient. We do it at the end of the study. And to be honest, I can't say that we've protocolized the order in which it's done. I think Mike's concern is that it's going to somehow affect allocation concealment. I'm not even sure what the problem would be. If you're
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that, and I don't know that anyone else has in print. One way to address it would be to have the assessment being done at the end of the trial electronically with the study staff being blinded to it. The patient says in some kind of electronic capture did they think they were randomized to drug or placebo and why, and the site staff never see those responses.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the research staff has always been more unblinded than the patient. We do it at the end of the study. And to be honest, I can't say that we've protocolized the order in which it's done. I think Mike's concern is that it's going to somehow affect allocation concealment. I'm not even sure what the problem would be. If you're asking at the end of treatment if you think
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that, and I don't know that anyone else has in print. One way to address it would be to have the assessment being done at the end of the trial electronically with the study staff being blinded to it. The patient says in some kind of electronic capture did they think they were randomized to drug or placebo and why, and the site staff never see those responses. MIKE: Can I just add a quick follow up?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the research staff has always been more unblinded than the patient. We do it at the end of the study. And to be honest, I can't say that we've protocolized the order in which it's done. I think Mike's concern is that it's going to somehow affect allocation concealment. I'm not even sure what the problem would be. If you're asking at the end of treatment if you think somehow that the study subjects' response is
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that, and I don't know that anyone else has in print. One way to address it would be to have the assessment being done at the end of the trial electronically with the study staff being blinded to it. The patient says in some kind of electronic capture did they think they were randomized to drug or placebo and why, and the site staff never see those responses. MIKE: Can I just add a quick follow up? I'm sorry. There was something in the news some	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the research staff has always been more unblinded than the patient. We do it at the end of the study. And to be honest, I can't say that we've protocolized the order in which it's done. I think Mike's concern is that it's going to somehow affect allocation concealment. I'm not even sure what the problem would be. If you're asking at the end of treatment if you think somehow that the study subjects' response is unblinding the research staff for that particular
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that, and I don't know that anyone else has in print. One way to address it would be to have the assessment being done at the end of the trial electronically with the study staff being blinded to it. The patient says in some kind of electronic capture did they think they were randomized to drug or placebo and why, and the site staff never see those responses. MIKE: Can I just add a quick follow up? I'm sorry. There was something in the news some years ago where they were reporting on venture	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the research staff has always been more unblinded than the patient. We do it at the end of the study. And to be honest, I can't say that we've protocolized the order in which it's done. I think Mike's concern is that it's going to somehow affect allocation concealment. I'm not even sure what the problem would be. If you're asking at the end of treatment if you think somehow that the study subjects' response is unblinding the research staff for that particular patient, I'm not sure what the implications would
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 274 felt that; and when I put all these things together, it convinced me that I was actually receiving the experimental drug. I would want to have some caution in this about explicitly asking subjects too many things about what treatment group they were assigned to because, cumulatively, if they're guessing more correctly than by chance, it will start to unblind the investigators in the studies. DR. DWORKIN: I never thought about that, and I don't know that anyone else has in print. One way to address it would be to have the assessment being done at the end of the trial electronically with the study staff being blinded to it. The patient says in some kind of electronic capture did they think they were randomized to drug or placebo and why, and the site staff never see those responses. MIKE: Can I just add a quick follow up? I'm sorry. There was something in the news some years ago where they were reporting on venture capital and other equity groups who were pretending	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Page 276 trials with him was to routinely ask people to do blinding questionnaires. We routinely, at the same time, asked the research staff to see what they thought. John Markman showed obviously a very dedicated and insightful research staff who pay a lot of attention. You can't have it all ways. We want good quality and stuff, but they also they think about what they're doing, right? Our experience has always been that the research staff has always been more unblinded than the patient. We do it at the end of the study. And to be honest, I can't say that we've protocolized the order in which it's done. I think Mike's concern is that it's going to somehow affect allocation concealment. I'm not even sure what the problem would be. If you're asking at the end of treatment if you think somehow that the study subjects' response is unblinding the research staff for that particular patient, I'm not sure what the implications would be there.

	Page 277		Page 279
1	If they're thinking about the block	1	don't repeat that outside of this room.
2	randomization, it might affect their allocation	2	DR. GILRON: It's in the transcript.
3	concealment for its subsequent patients. But I'm	3	DR. DWORKIN: John?
4	not sure what the liability is for doing unblinding	4	JOHN: In thinking about this table, I think
5	questionnaires.	5	it's a great table in terms of the implementation.
6	MIKE: For example, there were some drugs in	6	But we heard a number of presentations that talked
7	development that caused this distinct change in	7	about things and issues related to the design.
8	taste in the part of the subjects. So really,	8	Maybe you're going under that. But the other
9	elaborate procedures were done to change the way	9	one
10	the pills looked, or other things, to get it into	10	DR. DWORKIN: [Indiscernible] my last slide.
11	clinical trials and not have inadvertent	11	JOHN: Okay.
12	unblinding. And that's fine. You may want to test	12	DR. DWORKIN: So I sent Nat because Nat
13	the adequacy. But it really is more the	13	had to leave early, I sent him the previous table,
14	interaction between the subject and the site	14	and he said it's leaving something out, which is
15	personnel.	15	kind of my bunionectomy example of designing the
16	So if you're doing it after the fact,	16	trial to minimize and Amy, and Nat, and I tried
17	completely separately from like an independent	17	to come up with a term, and the best we came up
18	grader, completely separately from these active	18	with was minimize experimental noise in the way the
19	clinical staff, that's fine. I already found the	19	trial becomes conducted.
20	reference at least one. There's lots of them	20	We thought about whether the word is
21	from 2002 Wall Street Journal.	21	"covariates," so see if this is what you were
22	DR. DWORKIN: So Ian, I'm not sure I	22	mentioning. This is Nat's slide really, not my
	Page 278		Page 280
1	understood your question because isn't the risk	1	slide.
2	that the study staff become unblinded because they	2	In the bunionectomy example that he
3	start to and the expectations that they then	3	presented yesterday, remember when, I guess it was
4	have somehow unintentionally, nonverbally get	4	Scirex, first started doing that as a phase 2
5	communicated to patients if the staff over the	5	design, they hadn't really learned and Rob, I
6	first few patients learns that half the patients	6	think you were there the different factors in
7	seem to have dizziness and half don't.	7	the procedure with the patient who was being
8	The patients are kind of saying, I think I	8	assessed while they were lying down or sitting up.
9	was on drug because I was dizzy, but my pain also	9	And over time, they standardized all those
		1	

- 10 got better; that the staff develops an expectation
- 11 that patients who report dizziness are going to get
- 12 better, and that somehow augments the drug effect
- 13 and decreases the placebo effect when there's no14 dizziness.
- 15 DR. GILRON: I understand that. But I mean,
- 16 except for a phase 1 trial, every consent form is
- 17 going to have AE information. I mean there's
- 18 always a potential that patients are going to be19 unblinded and --
- DR. DWORKIN: But I assume that the patients either don't read the consent form or forget it
- 22 within 15 minutes of leaving the clinic. Please

- 10 experimental procedures. and all of a sudden, assay11 sensitivity went up.
- 12 So Nat said what's left off the previous
- 13 slide is this set of considerations about these
- 14 sources of noise in a trial that should be
- 15 addressed ideally in the design.
- **16** So is this what you were thinking of?
- 17 JOHN: Partially. But for example, it's
- 18 alluded to even in the second statement there,
- 19 which is the factors that affect the primary20 endpoint.
- 21 An issue that was brought up, I think, very
- 22 nicely by Scott Evans in his comments on the panel

	Page 281		Page 283
1	was the issue of designing the trial to avoid	1	some of that is sort of built in to this process.
2	missing data. I'm not sure how that fits here, but	2	DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Laurie and then Andrew.
3	it's critical.	3	MS. BURKE: I think that the bunionectomy
4	I like to say that if you want weekly data,	4	example is part of the assessment; it's part of
5	measure it daily; if you want monthly data, measure	5	what you would do with this training to make the
6	it weekly; and if you want quarterly data, measure	6	assessment in the assessment tool. Maybe outcome
7	it monthly because that way, at least you get	7	reporting is just part of that assessment.
8	something that you can then average if you're	8	I think it's combined in there. I think it
9	missing a little bit.	9	should be more than reporting. The whole
10	If you design your outcome as a very complex	10	assessment process would take care of that missing
11	multi-leveled questionnaire, you're going to get	11	piece, don't you think?
12	different kinds of answers. So I think that the	12	DR. DWORKIN: I mean, I agree, but I also
13	issue there is I could see it fitting here, but	13	think it's sort of assay sensitivity. I think
14	I don't see it there. And I'm wondering how you'd	14	about like third molar extraction, the type of
15	see it there.	15	extraction, as I understand I don't know much
16	DR. DWORKIN: I was going to say, Shouldn't	16	about it is associated with the assay
17	missing data be number 6 on well, either	17	sensitivity of the model.
18	number 5	18	It's something about outcome assessment and
19	JOHN: I understand.	19	also the model. So I think we're going to have to
20	DR. DWORKIN: number 5 under patient. So	20	struggle how this set of issues can it be
21	wouldn't we consider having missing data one of	21	incorporated into the previous slide or is it a
22	these discordances between the intention of the	22	kind of separate set of issues?
	Page 282		Page 284
	T dye 202		Fage 204
1	protocol	1	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for
1	protocol JOHN: Yes.	1	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best
1 2 3	JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol	1 2 3	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we
1 2 3 4	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the	1 2 3 4	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy?
1 2 3 4 5	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there	1 2 3 4 5	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not
1 2 3 4 5 6	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted	1 2 3 4 5 6	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal with it?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the procedure or whatever it is that you're looking at.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal with it? JOHN: Correct. I don't know if this is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the procedure or whatever it is that you're looking at. DR. DWORKIN: And that's partly training but
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal with it? JOHN: Correct. I don't know if this is exactly right, but you start off at the bottom,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the procedure or whatever it is that you're looking at. DR. DWORKIN: And that's partly training but partly protocol. So that's right.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal with it? JOHN: Correct. I don't know if this is exactly right, but you start off at the bottom, which I can only partially see, I think with	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the procedure or whatever it is that you're looking at. DR. DWORKIN: And that's partly training but partly protocol. So that's right. DR. VANHOVE: Partly protocol, exactly, yes.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal with it? JOHN: Correct. I don't know if this is exactly right, but you start off at the bottom, which I can only partially see, I think with eligibility. I think it actually backs up to the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the procedure or whatever it is that you're looking at. DR. DWORKIN: And that's partly training but partly protocol. So that's right. DR. VANHOVE: Partly protocol, exactly, yes. DR. DWORKIN: Yes, it's partly protocol,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal with it? JOHN: Correct. I don't know if this is exactly right, but you start off at the bottom, which I can only partially see, I think with eligibility. I think it actually backs up to the issue of project design. and I'm not sure how to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the procedure or whatever it is that you're looking at. DR. DWORKIN: And that's partly training but partly protocol. So that's right. DR. VANHOVE: Partly protocol, exactly, yes. DR. DWORKIN: Yes, it's partly protocol, partly training.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal with it? JOHN: Correct. I don't know if this is exactly right, but you start off at the bottom, which I can only partially see, I think with eligibility. I think it actually backs up to the issue of project design. and I'm not sure how to include that exactly.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the procedure or whatever it is that you're looking at. DR. DWORKIN: And that's partly training but partly protocol. So that's right. DR. VANHOVE: Partly protocol, exactly, yes. DR. DWORKIN: Yes, it's partly protocol, partly training. DR. VANHOVE: It's not a training issue, but
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal with it? JOHN: Correct. I don't know if this is exactly right, but you start off at the bottom, which I can only partially see, I think with eligibility. I think it actually backs up to the issue of project design. and I'm not sure how to include that exactly. My point I mean, I think you get the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the procedure or whatever it is that you're looking at. DR. DWORKIN: And that's partly training but partly protocol. So that's right. DR. VANHOVE: Partly protocol, exactly, yes. DR. DWORKIN: Yes, it's partly protocol, partly training. DR. VANHOVE: It's not a training issue, but it is an assessment issue as which size are you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal with it? JOHN: Correct. I don't know if this is exactly right, but you start off at the bottom, which I can only partially see, I think with eligibility. I think it actually backs up to the issue of project design. and I'm not sure how to include that exactly. My point I mean, I think you get the point, which is that I think we need to think about	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the procedure or whatever it is that you're looking at. DR. DWORKIN: And that's partly training but partly protocol. So that's right. DR. VANHOVE: Partly protocol, exactly, yes. DR. DWORKIN: Yes, it's partly protocol, partly training. DR. VANHOVE: It's not a training issue, but it is an assessment issue as which size are you going to enroll.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal with it? JOHN: Correct. I don't know if this is exactly right, but you start off at the bottom, which I can only partially see, I think with eligibility. I think it actually backs up to the issue of project design. and I'm not sure how to include that exactly. My point I mean, I think you get the point, which is that I think we need to think about the design issues that lead to improper data	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the procedure or whatever it is that you're looking at. DR. DWORKIN: And that's partly training but partly protocol. So that's right. DR. VANHOVE: Partly protocol, exactly, yes. DR. DWORKIN: Yes, it's partly protocol, partly training. DR. VANHOVE: It's not a training issue, but it is an assessment issue as which size are you going to enroll. MALE SPEAKER: It could be a separate
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal with it? JOHN: Correct. I don't know if this is exactly right, but you start off at the bottom, which I can only partially see, I think with eligibility. I think it actually backs up to the issue of project design. and I'm not sure how to include that exactly. My point I mean, I think you get the point, which is that I think we need to think about the design issues that lead to improper data collection for a variety of reasons. These are	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the procedure or whatever it is that you're looking at. DR. DWORKIN: And that's partly training but partly protocol. So that's right. DR. VANHOVE: Partly protocol, exactly, yes. DR. DWORKIN: Yes, it's partly protocol, partly training. DR. VANHOVE: It's not a training issue, but it is an assessment issue as which size are you going to enroll. MALE SPEAKER: It could be a separate section.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	protocol JOHN: Yes. DR. DWORKIN: The intention of the protocol was that everybody gives you complete data, but the execution, of course, some patients drop out; there are missing data. I think missing data is omitted here, inadvertently, and it should be number 5 under patient. And we build into the trial everything we can to prevent missing data, but we also want to identify it, and then how do we deal with it? JOHN: Correct. I don't know if this is exactly right, but you start off at the bottom, which I can only partially see, I think with eligibility. I think it actually backs up to the issue of project design. and I'm not sure how to include that exactly. My point I mean, I think you get the point, which is that I think we need to think about the design issues that lead to improper data collection for a variety of reasons. These are what the patient does and what the site does, but	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Amy, and Nat, and I did struggle with it for about a half hour over lunch, and this was the best we could do, to put it on a separate slide, but we will be working with this. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: I was thinking could you not put it under site because, really, you would want the procedure to be similar between sites, the bunionectomy procedure. DR. DWORKIN: Standardization of DR. VANHOVE: A standardization of the procedure or whatever it is that you're looking at. DR. DWORKIN: And that's partly training but partly protocol. So that's right. DR. VANHOVE: Partly protocol, exactly, yes. DR. DWORKIN: Yes, it's partly protocol, partly training. DR. VANHOVE: It's not a training issue, but it is an assessment issue as which size are you going to enroll. MALE SPEAKER: It could be a separate section. DR. VANHOVE: Selection?
1	MALE SPEAKER: You have patients and site;	1	most of Northwestern Europe.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
2	you could also have protocol, or design, or	2	There's also a very interesting comment that
3	something that would just fit therein, and then you	3	was made over lunch that there's a very close
4	could put the missing data and the other pieces	4	relationship, generally in the UK and many other
5	right into that. It might be a way.	5	European countries, between patients and their
6	DR. VANHOVE: But it's a site selection	6	doctors. And you'll often hear a form of bias
7	issue.	7	creeping in where you suspect patients are giving
8	My other comment would be, could we well,	8	more positive answers because they don't want to
9	would it be possible to replace "mid-trial" with	9	upset the doctor about his nice new drug.
10	"during the trial"?	10	I suspect the motives may be different also
11	DR. DWORKIN: Yes, absolutely.	11	in other healthcare settings. I've done trials in
12	DR. VANHOVE: Okay.	12	the developing world, and that to do not financial
13	DR. DWORKIN: I think we will have a whole	13	gain but to gain access to healthcare.
14	lot of back and forth with our colleagues at FDA	14	I guess we've got two choices here. We can
15	about this, what is appropriate, reasonable to do	15	either talk about these professional patient issues
16	during a trial versus and I think Sharon was	16	and say this is just about I'm not sure it's
17	very clear about one thing.	17	just the USA or it includes Canada as North
18	One example of this yesterday, where Sharon	18	America. And these issues are pertinent to those
19	said quite clearly that saying to a patient, during	19	settings, but there are very different issues with
20	their participation in a trial, "Notice that you	20	regards to other healthcare settings.
21	said your worst pain was less than your average	21	I think it's a really interesting research
22	pain. You need to think more clearly because that	22	question just to try and document what incentives
	Page 286		Page 28
1	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's	1	Page 288 might be in different countries.
1 2	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable.	1 2	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have
1 2 3	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a	1 2 3	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up
1 2 3 4	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable?	1 2 3 4	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going
1 2 3 4 5	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't	1 2 3 4 5	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country.
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's
1 2 4 5 6 7	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew?	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew? DR. RICE: Bob, I wonder if we can put one	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in the category of moderators of these factors and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew? DR. RICE: Bob, I wonder if we can put one other factor under patient, and it's been the issue	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in the category of moderators of these factors and what can be done about them.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew? DR. RICE: Bob, I wonder if we can put one other factor under patient, and it's been the issue that I was aware about before I came, but it's been	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in the category of moderators of these factors and what can be done about them. DR. RICE: But I do think it's important to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew? DR. RICE: Bob, I wonder if we can put one other factor under patient, and it's been the issue that I was aware about before I came, but it's been really emphasized. That's the issue of the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in the category of moderators of these factors and what can be done about them. DR. RICE: But I do think it's important to have a discussion about this professional patient
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew? DR. RICE: Bob, I wonder if we can put one other factor under patient, and it's been the issue that I was aware about before I came, but it's been really emphasized. That's the issue of the healthcare setting or the country in which a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in the category of moderators of these factors and what can be done about them. DR. RICE: But I do think it's important to have a discussion about this professional patient and earning from a clinical trial issue because I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew? DR. RICE: Bob, I wonder if we can put one other factor under patient, and it's been the issue that I was aware about before I came, but it's been really emphasized. That's the issue of the healthcare setting or the country in which a patient is recruited.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in the category of moderators of these factors and what can be done about them. DR. RICE: But I do think it's important to have a discussion about this professional patient and earning from a clinical trial issue because I think a lot of people in Europe just don't
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew? DR. RICE: Bob, I wonder if we can put one other factor under patient, and it's been the issue that I was aware about before I came, but it's been really emphasized. That's the issue of the healthcare setting or the country in which a patient is recruited. So this concept of a professional patient is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in the category of moderators of these factors and what can be done about them. DR. RICE: But I do think it's important to have a discussion about this professional patient and earning from a clinical trial issue because I think a lot of people in Europe just don't understand that. It's not a concept that they
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew? DR. RICE: Bob, I wonder if we can put one other factor under patient, and it's been the issue that I was aware about before I came, but it's been really emphasized. That's the issue of the healthcare setting or the country in which a patient is recruited. So this concept of a professional patient is totally news to me. We've had a lot of interesting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in the category of moderators of these factors and what can be done about them. DR. RICE: But I do think it's important to have a discussion about this professional patient and earning from a clinical trial issue because I think a lot of people in Europe just don't understand that. It's not a concept that they grasp very easily.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew? DR. RICE: Bob, I wonder if we can put one other factor under patient, and it's been the issue that I was aware about before I came, but it's been really emphasized. That's the issue of the healthcare setting or the country in which a patient is recruited. So this concept of a professional patient is totally news to me. We've had a lot of interesting discussions about the fact that patients can earn	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in the category of moderators of these factors and what can be done about them. DR. RICE: But I do think it's important to have a discussion about this professional patient and earning from a clinical trial issue because I think a lot of people in Europe just don't understand that. It's not a concept that they grasp very easily. MALE SPEAKER: I would agree, Andrew, and I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew? DR. RICE: Bob, I wonder if we can put one other factor under patient, and it's been the issue that I was aware about before I came, but it's been really emphasized. That's the issue of the healthcare setting or the country in which a patient is recruited. So this concept of a professional patient is totally news to me. We've had a lot of interesting discussions about the fact that patients can earn money and income from participation in clinical	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in the category of moderators of these factors and what can be done about them. DR. RICE: But I do think it's important to have a discussion about this professional patient and earning from a clinical trial issue because I think a lot of people in Europe just don't understand that. It's not a concept that they grasp very easily. MALE SPEAKER: I would agree, Andrew, and I think it's not kind of up there because we did
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew? DR. RICE: Bob, I wonder if we can put one other factor under patient, and it's been the issue that I was aware about before I came, but it's been really emphasized. That's the issue of the healthcare setting or the country in which a patient is recruited. So this concept of a professional patient is totally news to me. We've had a lot of interesting discussions about the fact that patients can earn money and income from participation in clinical trials. That just wouldn't happen in Europe. And	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in the category of moderators of these factors and what can be done about them. DR. RICE: But I do think it's important to have a discussion about this professional patient and earning from a clinical trial issue because I think a lot of people in Europe just don't understand that. It's not a concept that they grasp very easily. MALE SPEAKER: I would agree, Andrew, and I think it's not kind of up there because we did spend a lot of time. But under patient, you could
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 286 really isn't logical." Sharon said that's unacceptable. So that raises the question, I think, in a lot of our minds, well, then what is acceptable? Is it acceptable to say to the patient you haven't taken your medication; you haven't completed any of your diaries? Obviously, we're going to have to get those issues ironed out after this meeting. Andrew? DR. RICE: Bob, I wonder if we can put one other factor under patient, and it's been the issue that I was aware about before I came, but it's been really emphasized. That's the issue of the healthcare setting or the country in which a patient is recruited. So this concept of a professional patient is totally news to me. We've had a lot of interesting discussions about the fact that patients can earn money and income from participation in clinical trials. That just wouldn't happen in Europe. And therefore, the motives of the patients entering the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 288 might be in different countries. DR. DWORKIN: I agree that we need to have something in the manuscript that whatever we end up putting in this 36-cell table is very likely going to vary by region, country. It might vary importantly by whether it's phase 2 or phase 3, whether it's a single-site academic study or a kind of multinational, multisite phase 3 protocol. So region would go in the category of moderators of these factors and what can be done about them. DR. RICE: But I do think it's important to have a discussion about this professional patient and earning from a clinical trial issue because I think a lot of people in Europe just don't understand that. It's not a concept that they grasp very easily. MALE SPEAKER: I would agree, Andrew, and I think it's not kind of up there because we did spend a lot of time. But under patient, you could call just "patient misconduct," and that would

Page 285

Page 287

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 289		Page 291
1	I'm a little surprised that you would think	1	is, until you do the study, you don't know whether
2	in today's world it'd be so easy to have software	2	there is, in some level, fraud going on there. The
3	for the CROs or sponsor, but certainly the CROs.	3	motivations could be completely different. I mean
4	And it should be picked up at screening this	4	I think it's a study that was worth doing.
5	patient has already been in a trial, and that would	5	Certainly, it would have different
6	be a huge service to those guys, where it doesn't	6	motivations. I mean, it wouldn't be for money.
7	disrupt the trial or turn a significant trial into	7	But I'm not sure how much of it is all about the
8	a non-statistically significant trial as you said.	8	money in the United States either. I think that's
9	You know what you could do? You could carry	9	one question. I think that's something to
10	it one step further. Is it inappropriate? If a	10	consider.
11	patient has done that, that's a willful act.	11	DR. DWORKIN: Dave is suggesting that
12	That's sort of me, that's a one and done if it's	12	ACTTION fund Eric Devine to go to London and redo
13	a urine analysis. Certain urine analysis in my	13	the Boston study there.
14	clinic, a little THC, I sort of forgive the	14	(Laughter.)
15	patient, ask who their supplier was, and then move	15	DR. DWORKIN: And it looks like Eric is all
16	on or whatever.	16	for this idea.
17	(Laughter.)	17	(Laughter.)
18	MALE SPEAKER: But a duplicative patient in	18	MALE SPEAKER: I just wanted to find out if
19	the same trial, that is a pretty much of a serious	19	this is going to be part of the paper as well, is
20	thing. The CROs could blackball that person from	20	that when you address all these areas, one of the
21	ever going into any clinical trial again, at least	21	things you may do at the end and it will be
22	within that context. John is shaking his head no.	22	interesting to opine on is whether you're going
	Page 290		Page 292
1	I don't know. But it seems to me like you could	1	to increase the assay sensitivity of the study.
2	penalize, to some extent, that patient. That's a	2	With that, what is the implications for
3	pretty most of the people, I would think in this	3	moving forward in terms of our historical data and
4	room, would not want to risk, if they could, that	4	how we power studies. I mean, it might change
5	patient participating, subsequently.	5	things in a very fundamental way, and maybe we'll
6	DR. DWORKIN: I completely agree. I think	6	be able to get away with smaller numbers of
7	the HIPAA issues and confidentiality issues have	7	patients to be able to do some of these studies.
8	been resolved by Rabinowitz, and Efros, and	8	It's an interesting thought.
9	Shaevitz . And we thought about inviting all three	9	DR. DWORKIN: I think that's the hope.
10	of them to this meeting. But since they're all	10	Raymond?
11	doing this separately and presumably are competing	11	DR. CHEUNG: I notice with Nat's the
12	with each other, we didn't want this meeting to	12	slide that you showed Neil and I both have
13	turn into a kind of slug fest of who has a better	13	bitter experience with failed clinical trials,
14	online system for identifying duplicate patients.	14	specifically in the post-op space where
15	But I agree, that all three of their	15	standardization of the procedure would affect the
16	approaches seem very straightforward, and it's hard	16	baseline pain if you didn't do that.
17	to imagine a reason why you wouldn't implement it	17	If you didn't standardize the procedure and
18	because these are people you don't want in the	18	the post-operative analgesic regimen and I guess
19	trial. Dave?	19	Nat also pointed out some other factors like how
20	DAVE: Yeah, just a couple of things. One	20	you actually ask the patients their pain. I think
21	is, with all due respect to England and all the	21	maybe there could be a category of the condition of
22	medicine being better there, which I'm sure that it	22	the procedure that could affect the results.
1		1	

1 a	in Assessment in Chincar Triais		Suite 5, 201
	Page 293		Page 295
1	DR. DWORKIN: Yeah. No, I think John	1	Lee?
2	suggested this, that there's probably a third block	2	DR. SIMON: I'm interested that no one has
3	on this slide that is something about the model,	3	actually referred to a problem, which is ubiquitous
4	the design, and that's where we'll put in things	4	in the orthopedic community in pain trials,
5	like missing data, standardizing the procedure, the	5	particularly when you're using devices that have
6	assessment; partly, that's training as well as	6	been invented by the person doing the study.
7	Laurie pointed out. So yes, we will add some third	7	I've been involved in a couple of trials
8	category here to address Nat's bunionectomy and	8	where the inventor of a drug was a study site, and
9	related issues.	9	the patients he recruited actually knew he was the
10	Neil?	10	inventor of the drug and wanted to make him happy,
11	DR. SINGLA: Yes, just one quick point	11	and all had a response, including those responding
12	regarding the site factors; there's five factors	12	on placebo. Therefore, the studies failed.
13	listed. This is just my opinion, but I think that	13	This is a training issue. We should know
14	it's more actionable right now to help sites get	14	that if we are invested in such an event, that we
15	better quality by improving their processes, and	15	should not be the person carrying out the trial of
16	that most investigators out there are not	16	studying that product. But nowhere up there is
17	fraudulent, and that the FDA the whole construct	17	actually this been said. And because it's
18	of clinical trials that are being done for industry	18	ubiquitous in the orthopedic community, it perhaps
19	right now very much looks for fraud a lot instead	19	isn't something that people recognize because it's
20	of looking for true quality.	20	clearly not the right thing to do. But nobody
21	So if we're trying to improve the quality of	21	keeps saying it.
22	clinical trials, it probably makes sense for us as	22	DR. DWORKIN: Somewhere up here is kind of
	Page 294		Page 296
1	a group to talk a lot about the last two and not so	1	making sure we've done our best so the patients
2	much about the first three because they're all the	2	have realistic expectations, and this is something
3	same in a way: fabrication, falsification. And if	3	that's making
4	you make it like a police article, where it's all	4	MALE SPEAKER: Removing bias.
5	about how to police more, that's not really, in my	5	DR. DWORKIN: Exactly. S that's up here
6	opinion, what we need. We need to just be better	6	somewhere. We can put that in.
7	at what we do.	7	Laurie, you had your hand up.
8	(Applause.)	8	MS. BURKE: I was just going to say that I
9	DR. DWORKIN: I agree, Neil. I originally	9	think under site 1, 2 and 3 really belong under 5.
10	had a big red box around these two, and we could	10	They're like subsets of systematic error that need
11	put a red box around this also because that's where	11	to be addressed. I don't know.
12	training is targeted. Training is targeted at the	12	DR. DWORKIN: Yeah. We based some of this
13	patient not doing a very good job of reporting	13	on publications in the literature, and so we'll go
14	their pain. And then, of course, training is	14	over that. That's right, they are systematic but
15	targeted at the carelessness, poor training,	15	they seem in another level of kind of illegal.
16	recording errors, misunderstanding, incompetence	16	MS. BURKE: I'm reacting to the suggestion
17	down there.	17	that we don't want to make this all about the fact
18	So I think we actually, as you heard from	18	that there's so much fraud in the clinical trial
19	the applause, we all agree with you that we need	19	world. These are exceptions rather than the rules.
20	training; we need standardized training; we need	20	DR. DWORKIN: One thing we can obviously do
21	evidence-based training, and that's hugely	21	is combine 1, 2, 3 and make it just one subsection.
	g,		

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 297		Page 299
1	splitting them out. I just wanted to put down the	1	it's got to be extensively, clearly documented.
2	definitions for fabrication, falsification that	2	This is going to be the most challenging part of
3	comes from, I think, the article by Biogen. But in	3	the manuscript to draft, I think, that column of 9
4	the article, we will not make it look so lopsided	4	or 10 recommendations. Dave?
5	as Neil and you both pointed out.	5	DAVE: Just to be clear, you're not going to
6	Other omissions, additions, et cetera? Bob?	6	include the company, the planning, the
7	BOB: Well, in the service of just maybe	7	sponsor it's kind of interesting because it
8	stating the obvious, the word "fidelity" isn't up	8	means that you're really putting all the onus on
9	there, and maybe it's similar to "quality." The	9	the patient and the site, and that you don't really
10	basic premise of designing a study, developing a	10	think any of the risk to quality sits with the
11	protocol, and then following it, and knowing that	11	biopharmaceutical company.
12	you've done what you said you were going to do in	12	DR. DWORKIN: No. Isn't that this? Have
13	the service of producing replicable methods and	13	they designed the right study that prevents
14	results, I think that that really is a core	14	DAVE: Okay. I'm sorry.
15	principle of value or I mean of quality, excuse	15	DR. DWORKIN: Yeah. No. I think the
16	me.	16	company is actually the company is responsible
17	So it comes to things like it's really about	17	for all of this because this should all be in the
18	designing the trial and developing a protocol	18	protocol, right?
19	that's going to prevent problems as a really	19	DAVE: Okay.
20	fundamental premise about this enterprise.	20	MALE SPEAKER: Just to follow up to David's
21	Then in terms of correction, identification,	21	point, obviously, the data comes in from the
22	you want a protocol that's going to help you	22	patient. The site does something with it. Then it
	Page 208		Page 300
	Page 298		Page 300
1	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them.	1	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed,
1 2	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important	1 2	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint,
1 2 3	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that	1 2 3	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to
1 2 3 4	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that.	1 2 3 4	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct
1 2 3 4 5	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to	1 2 3 4 5	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process.
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation."
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient care.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation." MALE SPEAKER: Not analysis. Okay.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient care. But having said that, I think that it's	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation." MALE SPEAKER: Not analysis. Okay. DR. DWORKIN: Because analysis and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient care. But having said that, I think that it's fundamentally important that these mid-trial	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation." MALE SPEAKER: Not analysis. Okay. DR. DWORKIN: Because analysis and interpretation, I think, would be a whole other
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient care. But having said that, I think that it's fundamentally important that these mid-trial corrections, if you will, are really carefully	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation." MALE SPEAKER: Not analysis. Okay. DR. DWORKIN: Because analysis and interpretation, I think, would be a whole other meeting. So this is really just about what happens
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient care. But having said that, I think that it's fundamentally important that these mid-trial corrections, if you will, are really carefully considered in the context of that overarching	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation." MALE SPEAKER: Not analysis. Okay. DR. DWORKIN: Because analysis and interpretation, I think, would be a whole other meeting. So this is really just about what happens before the database is locked and the statisticians
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient care. But having said that, I think that it's fundamentally important that these mid-trial corrections, if you will, are really carefully considered in the context of that overarching concern about the fidelity of the trial.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation." MALE SPEAKER: Not analysis. Okay. DR. DWORKIN: Because analysis and interpretation, I think, would be a whole other meeting. So this is really just about what happens before the database is locked and the statisticians take over.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient care. But having said that, I think that it's fundamentally important that these mid-trial corrections, if you will, are really carefully considered in the context of that overarching concern about the fidelity of the trial. DR. DWORKIN: I think that right.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation." MALE SPEAKER: Not analysis. Okay. DR. DWORKIN: Because analysis and interpretation, I think, would be a whole other meeting. So this is really just about what happens before the database is locked and the statisticians take over. Trudy?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient care. But having said that, I think that it's fundamentally important that these mid-trial corrections, if you will, are really carefully considered in the context of that overarching concern about the fidelity of the trial. DR. DWORKIN: I think that right. BOB: So it's maybe just restating	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation." MALE SPEAKER: Not analysis. Okay. DR. DWORKIN: Because analysis and interpretation, I think, would be a whole other meeting. So this is really just about what happens before the database is locked and the statisticians take over. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: Bob, where would you put like
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient care. But having said that, I think that it's fundamentally important that these mid-trial corrections, if you will, are really carefully considered in the context of that overarching concern about the fidelity of the trial. DR. DWORKIN: I think that right. BOB: So it's maybe just restating DR. DWORKIN: I think the most	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation." MALE SPEAKER: Not analysis. Okay. DR. DWORKIN: Because analysis and interpretation, I think, would be a whole other meeting. So this is really just about what happens before the database is locked and the statisticians take over. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: Bob, where would you put like a bad medical monitor? Because you have a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient care. But having said that, I think that it's fundamentally important that these mid-trial corrections, if you will, are really carefully considered in the context of that overarching concern about the fidelity of the trial. DR. DWORKIN: I think that right. BOB: So it's maybe just restating DR. DWORKIN: I think the most challenging the most challenging column here, in	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation." MALE SPEAKER: Not analysis. Okay. DR. DWORKIN: Because analysis and interpretation, I think, would be a whole other meeting. So this is really just about what happens before the database is locked and the statisticians take over. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: Bob, where would you put like a bad medical monitor? Because you have a brilliant protocol, and the medical monitor,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient care. But having said that, I think that it's fundamentally important that these mid-trial corrections, if you will, are really carefully considered in the context of that overarching concern about the fidelity of the trial. DR. DWORKIN: I think that right. BOB: So it's maybe just restating DR. DWORKIN: I think the most challenging the most challenging column here, in some ways, is exactly this midstream correction,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation." MALE SPEAKER: Not analysis. Okay. DR. DWORKIN: Because analysis and interpretation, I think, would be a whole other meeting. So this is really just about what happens before the database is locked and the statisticians take over. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: Bob, where would you put like a bad medical monitor? Because you have a brilliant protocol, and the medical monitor, however, gets calls, and he lets in patients that
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 298 identify problems so that you can correct them. And then the correction, I think, it's important that it's transparent when that occurs and that there's thought about that. Of course, it's important at a local site to be able to move clinically with good clinical practice in mind and the patients', human subject, protection in mind to act, to deviate from a protocol, if you will, on behalf of the patient care. But having said that, I think that it's fundamentally important that these mid-trial corrections, if you will, are really carefully considered in the context of that overarching concern about the fidelity of the trial. DR. DWORKIN: I think that right. BOB: So it's maybe just restating DR. DWORKIN: I think the most challenging the most challenging column here, in some ways, is exactly this midstream correction, and it should be prespecified ideally, transparent.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 300 gets put into a database, then it gets programmed, then the statistical analysis, then the endpoint, the final results. We're not really going to David's point, we're not thinking we can correct those aspects of data quality and data process. DR. DWORKIN: Right. So the first version of the slide had after the word "execution" in parentheses, it said "not analysis and interpretation." MALE SPEAKER: Not analysis. Okay. DR. DWORKIN: Because analysis and interpretation, I think, would be a whole other meeting. So this is really just about what happens before the database is locked and the statisticians take over. Trudy? DR. VANHOVE: Bob, where would you put like a bad medical monitor? Because you have a brilliant protocol, and the medical monitor, however, gets calls, and he lets in patients that really don't meet the eligibility criteria. But

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 301		Page 303
1	just a bad medical monitor. Where would that go?	1	So it really is we have to be really
2	MALE SPEAKER: Carelessness.	2	careful not to give people the sense that this kind
3	DR. DWORKIN: Mike!	3	of tweaking is de riqueur and welcomed. It may not
4	MALE SPEAKER: I was just going to say, the	4	be welcomed.
5	last two comments remind me that maybe it's patient	5	DR. DWORKIN: That's right. I could even
6	site, but you also have the people who are	6	imagine it's late in the day; we don't have to
7	responsible for overseeing the study. It isn't	7	think about this that we could recommend, in
8	just designing it. It's overseeing the conduct.	8	certain settings, we as a group think it's
9	And I think that's what you're starting to hearing	9	perfectly reasonable to call up a patient and say,
10	from people.	10	"Mr. Jones, it looks like you didn't fill out your
11	DR. VANHOVE: Yes.	11	diary yesterday or you didn't take your medication
12	DR. DWORKIN: So there's a third or a	12	yesterday." And we might say that, but it's going
13	fourth, depending on what we do with design,	13	to be followed by, "However, for registration
14	category of oversight, absolutely. That's an	14	trials, the regulatory agency needs to be kind of
15	omission.	15	contacted to ensure that this is acceptable." We
16	MALE SPEAKER: Bob Kerns mentioned the	16	will stick that in after any recommendation where
17	fidelity with the protocol, which is essentially	17	we think it could be problematic at either FDA or
18	capturing that point. Bob Kerns talked about the	18	EMA.
19	fidelity of the protocol, as are people following	19	DR. TURK: So that's like a black box
20	the protocol. A bad monitor is not following the	20	warning?
21	protocol.	21	DR. DWORKIN: that's our black box warning,
22	DR. DWORKIN: No. You can have a rogue	22	exactly.
	Page 302		Page 304
	1 490 502		
1	monitor who isn't doing his job, and that's	1	Rick?
2	not the job of the monitor isn't really	2	RICK: That's what I was actually going to
3	specified in the protocol. It's specified I guess	3	address, is that mid-trial correction piece is I
4	in SOPs of the CRO.	4	think going to be very problematic. Analysis,
5	FEMALE SPEAKER: Oversight makes sense.	5	sure, we can talk about what we did wrong and how
6	DR. DWORKIN: I think oversight makes a lot	6	to address it for future studies. But for
7	of sense. Yeah.	7	mid-trial correction, we want to be careful, as has
8		8	been said, what we can correct.
9	DR. SIMON: So just to go back to your issue	9	We can retrain monitors if they're letting
10	about this mid-trial column and Laurie and I are	10	patients in as exceptions in the protocol. We can
11	probably the only leftover people from former FDA	11	retrain there's a lot of things we can retrain,
12	as opposed to any FDA people here. It's really	12	but there's a lot we can't. So we just have to be
13	critical not to make anybody who reads this paper	13	very careful when we write that section, what
14	to believe that they have carte blanche to	14	passes muster for mid-trial correction and what we
15	manipulate issues that come up or become evident in	15	should address.
16	the mid-trial or ongoing review.	16	DR. DWORKIN: So just out of curiosity, now
17	I can't tell you the numbers of times that	17	many people in the room think it would be forget
18	i ve actually had to see, on both sides of the	18	about FDA for the time being. How many people in
19	table, where we see a data set that it suddenly	19	the room, just as investigators, researchers, think
20	dawns on them something is not right. And they	20	it would be reasonable and acceptable to call the
21	don t understand that the trial then is obviated	21	patient and say, "Wr. Smith, yesterday, you didn't
22	pased on now much they do or what they do.	22	complete your pain diary, and we note that, you

Min-U-Script®

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 305		Page 307
1	know. from now on. you are more careful about	1	going back and saving. "Hey, does this correct a
2	that."	2	score?"
3	MALE SPEAKER: If it was written in the	3	MALE SPEAKER: And she backtracked a little
4	protocol.	4	bit on that, Bob, in the break. You should get it
5	FEMALE SPEAKER: You can write in the	5	from her.
6	protocol	6	DR. DWORKIN: It might be that you're all
7	MALE SPEAKER: If it was prespecified in the	7	right. I'm just saying I don't want to write that
8	protocol.	8	and publish it until we confirm it.
9	(Crosstalk.)	9	MALE SPEAKER: Of course.
10	DR. DWORKIN: Okay. But Sharon also said	10	DR. DWORKIN: We all agree.
11	yesterday that in no circumstances would it be	11	(Laughter.)
12	acceptable to call Mr. Smith and say, "Hey,	12	Raymond?
13	yesterday, you said your worst pain was less than	13	DR. CHEUNG: I think in the conduct of the
14	your average pain."	14	study and we talk about there are opportunities
15	(Crosstalk.)	15	for training you don't need to necessarily
16	DR. DWORKIN: I'm not going to say	16	reference that I know that you're doing it wrong.
17	they're well, I'll tell you, if I'm drafting	17	But as part of the training, that you can always
18	this article, I'm not going to say there are two	18	remind people, are you taking your medication; are
19	different issues until Sharon says to me that	19	you filling out your electronic diary? I don't
20	they're two different issues because of exactly	20	think that that would I think that might be less
21	what Lee said. I don't want us to make	21	of a problem.
22	recommendations that it turns out the FDA doesn't	22	DR. DWORKIN: That was clearly not a
	Page 306		Page 308
1	Page 306 agree with.	1	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that
1	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob	1	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the
1 2 3	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's	1 2 3	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly
1 2 3 4	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you	1 2 3 4	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted
1 2 3 4 5	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary.	1 2 3 4 5	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable.
1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only	1 2 3 4 5 6	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.) DR. VANHOVE: Exactly. I mean, very often,	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and coaching. And I think what's happening right now
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.) DR. VANHOVE: Exactly. I mean, very often, it will say if the patient hasn't filled it out for	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and coaching. And I think what's happening right now is we're combining those two things.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.) DR. VANHOVE: Exactly. I mean, very often, it will say if the patient hasn't filled it out for two days, there's going to be a call. It's written	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and coaching. And I think what's happening right now is we're combining those two things. If you say to somebody, I saw what you did,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.) DR. VANHOVE: Exactly. I mean, very often, it will say if the patient hasn't filled it out for two days, there's going to be a call. It's written down, it's prespecified, and you follow that.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and coaching. And I think what's happening right now is we're combining those two things. If you say to somebody, I saw what you did, right, and you're doing it wrong; let me tell you
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.) DR. VANHOVE: Exactly. I mean, very often, it will say if the patient hasn't filled it out for two days, there's going to be a call. It's written down, it's prespecified, and you follow that. DR. DWORKIN: But Trudy, what I'm saying is	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and coaching. And I think what's happening right now is we're combining those two things. If you say to somebody, I saw what you did, right, and you're doing it wrong; let me tell you how I think it should be done, that's coaching. I
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.) DR. VANHOVE: Exactly. I mean, very often, it will say if the patient hasn't filled it out for two days, there's going to be a call. It's written down, it's prespecified, and you follow that. DR. DWORKIN: But Trudy, what I'm saying is if the way I understood Sharon yesterday is even	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and coaching. And I think what's happening right now is we're combining those two things. If you say to somebody, I saw what you did, right, and you're doing it wrong; let me tell you how I think it should be done, that's coaching. I think training is to just say, "You have to fill
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.) DR. VANHOVE: Exactly. I mean, very often, it will say if the patient hasn't filled it out for two days, there's going to be a call. It's written down, it's prespecified, and you follow that. DR. DWORKIN: But Trudy, what I'm saying is if the way I understood Sharon yesterday is even if it was written in the protocol that you call the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and coaching. And I think what's happening right now is we're combining those two things. If you say to somebody, I saw what you did, right, and you're doing it wrong; let me tell you how I think it should be done, that's coaching. I think training is to just say, "You have to fill out your diary every day." That's fine to get a
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.) DR. VANHOVE: Exactly. I mean, very often, it will say if the patient hasn't filled it out for two days, there's going to be a call. It's written down, it's prespecified, and you follow that. DR. DWORKIN: But Trudy, what I'm saying is if the way I understood Sharon yesterday is even if it was written in the protocol that you call the patient to say the patient's worst pain cannot be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and coaching. And I think what's happening right now is we're combining those two things. If you say to somebody, I saw what you did, right, and you're doing it wrong; let me tell you how I think it should be done, that's coaching. I think training is to just say, "You have to fill out your diary every day." That's fine to get a notification that you need to fill out your diary.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.) DR. VANHOVE: Exactly. I mean, very often, it will say if the patient hasn't filled it out for two days, there's going to be a call. It's written down, it's prespecified, and you follow that. DR. DWORKIN: But Trudy, what I'm saying is if the way I understood Sharon yesterday is even if it was written in the protocol that you call the patient to say the patient's worst pain cannot be less than average pain	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and coaching. And I think what's happening right now is we're combining those two things. If you say to somebody, I saw what you did, right, and you're doing it wrong; let me tell you how I think it should be done, that's coaching. I think training is to just say, "You have to fill out your diary every day." That's fine to get a notification that you need to fill out your diary. Those are different things. It's making
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.) DR. VANHOVE: Exactly. I mean, very often, it will say if the patient hasn't filled it out for two days, there's going to be a call. It's written down, it's prespecified, and you follow that. DR. DWORKIN: But Trudy, what I'm saying is if the way I understood Sharon yesterday is even if it was written in the protocol that you call the patient to say the patient's worst pain cannot be less than average pain MALE SPEAKER: But that's asking them to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and coaching. And I think what's happening right now is we're combining those two things. If you say to somebody, I saw what you did, right, and you're doing it wrong; let me tell you how I think it should be done, that's coaching. I think training is to just say, "You have to fill out your diary every day." That's fine to get a notification that you need to fill out your diary. Those are different things. It's making sure that they're adhering to the protocol design
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.) DR. VANHOVE: Exactly. I mean, very often, it will say if the patient hasn't filled it out for two days, there's going to be a call. It's written down, it's prespecified, and you follow that. DR. DWORKIN: But Trudy, what I'm saying is if the way I understood Sharon yesterday is even if it was written in the protocol that you call the patient to say the patient's worst pain cannot be less than average pain MALE SPEAKER: But that's asking them to change the data.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and coaching. And I think what's happening right now is we're combining those two things. If you say to somebody, I saw what you did, right, and you're doing it wrong; let me tell you how I think it should be done, that's coaching. I think training is to just say, "You have to fill out your diary every day." That's fine to get a notification that you need to fill out your diary. Those are different things. It's making sure that they're adhering to the protocol design is absolutely legitimate. And I think if you need
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 306 agree with. MALE SPEAKER: But Bob DR. DWORKIN: So we all agree that there's no problem with calling the patient and saying you didn't complete your diary. MALE SPEAKER: If it's in the protocol; only if it's in the protocol. It's got to be transparent, and you can plan them. (Crosstalk.) DR. VANHOVE: Exactly. I mean, very often, it will say if the patient hasn't filled it out for two days, there's going to be a call. It's written down, it's prespecified, and you follow that. DR. DWORKIN: But Trudy, what I'm saying is if the way I understood Sharon yesterday is even if it was written in the protocol that you call the patient to say the patient's worst pain cannot be less than average pain MALE SPEAKER: But that's asking them to change the data. (Crosstalk.)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Page 308 problem, but what many of us wondered about is that kind of retraining on a regular basis all of the patients is obviously much more cumbersome, costly than targeted intervention. But targeted intervention might not be acceptable. Dave? DAVE: Yes. [Inaudible – off mic]. Part of medical monitoring in so many clinical trials to do there's a difference between training and coaching. And I think what's happening right now is we're combining those two things. If you say to somebody, I saw what you did, right, and you're doing it wrong; let me tell you how I think it should be done, that's coaching. I think training is to just say, "You have to fill out your diary every day." That's fine to get a notification that you need to fill out your diary. Those are different things. It's making sure that they're adhering to the protocol design is absolutely legitimate. And I think if you need to spend some time and say, well, I want to make

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 309		Page 311
1	pain, worst pain, and average pain, you can do	1	changes.
2	that. You can train them on that. That's a	2	You got to be careful too, right? You don't
3	difficult concept for some people to get.	3	go overboard and fundamentally change and
4	But you can't go, "Oh, I saw that you wrote	4	compromise the primary outcome you're looking for,
5	something that was really crazy yesterday; go	5	which may be physiological.
6	change it because it was wrong." I think that's	6	So I think we have to be really just careful
7	what Sharon was referring to.	7	on the context and define the context in which
8	MALE SPEAKER: Yes, exactly.	8	DR. DWORKIN: That's exactly the kind of
9	DR. DWORKIN: I blame Lee for all of this	9	language we will have. Depending on the context,
10	because	10	targeted intervention retraining may be
11	(Laughter.)	11	appropriate, but in regulatory contexts, don't
12	DR. DWORKIN: I was just agreeing with Lee	12	assume it is without getting approval from the
13	that we don't want to make a recommendation that's	13	regulatory agencies. That's the kind of language
14	going to end up biting some sponsor six months down	14	I'm imagining. It's what Dennis said; it's a black
15	the line because they read our article, and they	15	box warning. Other comments? Laurie?
16	think something is acceptable when it isn't.	16	MS. BURKE: I think it might be an overkill
17	So I hope that we can all agree that we just	17	to try to have a mid-trial column. You might just
18	want to make sure that our recommendations are	18	want to have this mid-trial considerations
19	either acceptable or unacceptable, and that we know	19	paragraph, and then the considerations are to
20	what they are before we make them.	20	change change your processes midstream are
21	Ajay?	21	usually a bad idea, but there may be a reason to do
22	DR. WASAN: I think it's really important in	22	something if you notice something that would deep
	5		5
	Page 310		Page 312
1	this section to define context. And obviously, the	1	six your whole program.
2	context of an FDA phase 3 trial, such iterative	2	DR. DWORKIN: SP I agree that I hope that we
3	processes, you have to have very tight parameters.	3	end up with fewer than 36 cells
4	But on the other hand, there's the opposite view,	4	(Laughter.)
5	not for the FDA registration trials but some other	5	DR. DWORKIN: either by deleting a
6	kind of trials. Let me give you some good	6	row I mean a column, as you suggest, or by
7	examples.	7	combining, as I just suggested, some of the rows.
8	Obviously, there's agreement that the best	8	I would hate for the ultimate manuscript to go in
9	science is done as an iterative process. Let's say	9	with an Excel spreadsheet that I can't do myself
10	your outcomes you're looking at are physiological	10	with 36 cells in it.
11	outcomes, so QST changes or FMRI changes. Those	11	Yes, John?
12	are some of the studies that Rob and I do for	12	JOHN: To say something that may already be
13	instance, and that you use the clinical trial as a	13	obvious, but I think the point is that studies can
14	mechanism to look at changes in physiology, and	14	be designed to monitor certain things and implement
15	that's your main outcome.	15	certain changes if things are found. You design
16	If someone is not adhering and you found	16	the study I mean as David was just saying, it's
17	out, it's kind of good that you talk to them about	17	completely reasonable to encourage a continued
18	it. If they don't do their rating scales and	18	enrollment and filling out the forms. And if you
19	something's bizarre about them, actually, since	19	know that people are not filling out forms, that
20	you're not primarily testing efficacy, you're	20	you contact them.
21	actually trying to look at physiological outcomes,	21	I don't think anybody would object to that,
		1	

22 it's actually better that you have these iterative

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 313		Page 315
1	brings me to the second point, which I think Laurie	1	is trying to do. I'm hard-pressed to find an
2	would is partly what she's saving. And	2	instance where you could do an intervention that
3	certainly, Sharon said yesterday, is be sure that	3	would be as long as you're not changing the data
4	you're upfront and transparent about what you do.	4	or coaching the patient, I think you're fine.
5	And if you're in a registration trial, before you	5	DR. DWORKIN: Trudy?
6	make any mid-trial corrections, you damn well	6	DR. VANHOVE: I totally agree. I would say
7	better talk to the registering agency.	7	data falsification, if you identify that but you
8	Honestly, I don't know how	8	can't correct it, or you don't let the FDA know
9	clinicaltrials.gov works in this score, but if you	9	that, hey, I've got these patients that reenrolled
10	change the protocol halfway through, somebody is	10	10 times or whatever it is, or misconduct, then
11	going to be upset unless you and I think you	11	what? Okay, you identified it, and what are you
12	need to go there and actually make the change there	12	going to do?
13	as well as a change. I'm not sure. But my point	13	DR. DWORKIN: I don't know.
14	is transparency is really key.	14	DR. VANHOVE: You can't correct anything.
15	DR. DWORKIN: Other comments?	15	MALE SPEAKER: That's what's going to be fun
16	MALE SPEAKER: The only thing is you can't	16	about writing this paper.
17	always anticipate, right? When you're doing	17	DR. VANHOVE: I totally agree.
18	science, vou can't anticipate all the problems, so	18	DR. DWORKIN: I think the issue and Paul.
19	vou just that's the other caveat too. You can't	19	vou've been silent. But the issue of what's
20	prespecify unless you say a general term. "If	20	appropriate when these things are identified in an
21	there's something that comes up I can't think about	21	ongoing trial I said this already I think
22	right now, then I reserve the right to make some	22	it's the most challenging part of this paper to
	Page 314		Page 316
			-
1	changes."	1	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it
1 2	changes." (Laughter.)	1	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in
1 2 3	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I	1 2 3	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a
1 2 3 4	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it.	1 2 3 4	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with
1 2 3 4 5	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of	1 2 3 4 5	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I
1 2 3 4 5 6	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be	1 2 3 4 5 6	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be able to know everything that won't be followed, but	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it is that's going to be acceptable to the regulatory
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be able to know everything that won't be followed, but part of the job is to make sure they adhere to the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it is that's going to be acceptable to the regulatory agencies, unless I'm missing something. This goes
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be able to know everything that won't be followed, but part of the job is to make sure they adhere to the protocol. That's what the protocol is.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it is that's going to be acceptable to the regulatory agencies, unless I'm missing something. This goes back to Lee's point. We just can't run the risk of
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 12	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be able to know everything that won't be followed, but part of the job is to make sure they adhere to the protocol. That's what the protocol is. If they don't adhere to the protocol, that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it is that's going to be acceptable to the regulatory agencies, unless I'm missing something. This goes back to Lee's point. We just can't run the risk of misleading people that something is acceptable when
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be able to know everything that won't be followed, but part of the job is to make sure they adhere to the protocol. That's what the protocol is. If they don't adhere to the protocol, that actually is really bad, and you don't need to have	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it is that's going to be acceptable to the regulatory agencies, unless I'm missing something. This goes back to Lee's point. We just can't run the risk of misleading people that something is acceptable when it might not be.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be able to know everything that won't be followed, but part of the job is to make sure they adhere to the protocol. That's what the protocol is. If they don't adhere to the protocol, that actually is really bad, and you don't need to have somebody you don't need to have extra provision	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it is that's going to be acceptable to the regulatory agencies, unless I'm missing something. This goes back to Lee's point. We just can't run the risk of misleading people that something is acceptable when it might not be. MALE SPEAKER: I think we definitely need
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be able to know everything that won't be followed, but part of the job is to make sure they adhere to the protocol. That's what the protocol is. If they don't adhere to the protocol, that actually is really bad, and you don't need to have somebody you don't need to have extra provision from the FDA saving that you have to it's okay	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it is that's going to be acceptable to the regulatory agencies, unless I'm missing something. This goes back to Lee's point. We just can't run the risk of misleading people that something is acceptable when it might not be. MALE SPEAKER: I think we definitely need Sharon to weigh in on some of this. Usually.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be able to know everything that won't be followed, but part of the job is to make sure they adhere to the protocol. That's what the protocol is. If they don't adhere to the protocol, that actually is really bad, and you don't need to have somebody you don't need to have extra provision from the FDA saying that you have to it's okay to adhere to the protocol and make sure that the	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it is that's going to be acceptable to the regulatory agencies, unless I'm missing something. This goes back to Lee's point. We just can't run the risk of misleading people that something is acceptable when it might not be. MALE SPEAKER: I think we definitely need Sharon to weigh in on some of this. Usually, statisticians aren't asked for this type of level
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be able to know everything that won't be followed, but part of the job is to make sure they adhere to the protocol. That's what the protocol is. If they don't adhere to the protocol, that actually is really bad, and you don't need to have somebody you don't need to have extra provision from the FDA saying that you have to it's okay to adhere to the protocol and make sure that the sites and the patients adhere to the protocol.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it is that's going to be acceptable to the regulatory agencies, unless I'm missing something. This goes back to Lee's point. We just can't run the risk of misleading people that something is acceptable when it might not be. MALE SPEAKER: I think we definitely need Sharon to weigh in on some of this. Usually, statisticians aren't asked for this type of level of what's appropriate for a mid-trial correction.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be able to know everything that won't be followed, but part of the job is to make sure they adhere to the protocol. That's what the protocol is. If they don't adhere to the protocol, that actually is really bad, and you don't need to have somebody you don't need to have extra provision from the FDA saying that you have to it's okay to adhere to the protocol and make sure that the sites and the patients adhere to the protocol. That's what a protocol is.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it is that's going to be acceptable to the regulatory agencies, unless I'm missing something. This goes back to Lee's point. We just can't run the risk of misleading people that something is acceptable when it might not be. MALE SPEAKER: I think we definitely need Sharon to weigh in on some of this. Usually, statisticians aren't asked for this type of level of what's appropriate for a mid-trial correction. I think hitting the high points here have
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be able to know everything that won't be followed, but part of the job is to make sure they adhere to the protocol. That's what the protocol is. If they don't adhere to the protocol, that actually is really bad, and you don't need to have somebody you don't need to have extra provision from the FDA saying that you have to it's okay to adhere to the protocol and make sure that the sites and the patients adhere to the protocol. That's what a protocol is. What I would say is. under there rubric John	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it is that's going to be acceptable to the regulatory agencies, unless I'm missing something. This goes back to Lee's point. We just can't run the risk of misleading people that something is acceptable when it might not be. MALE SPEAKER: I think we definitely need Sharon to weigh in on some of this. Usually, statisticians aren't asked for this type of level of what's appropriate for a mid-trial correction. I think hitting the high points here have been we're more in the past, we've
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	changes." (Laughter.) MALE SPEAKER: I think John is right. I mean, everything you do the protocol is it. Everything needs to be in the protocol, but part of being in the protocol is that the study will be monitored. And part of monitoring a study is to ensure that things are followed. As you were just mentioning, you may not be able to know everything that won't be followed, but part of the job is to make sure they adhere to the protocol. That's what the protocol is. If they don't adhere to the protocol, that actually is really bad, and you don't need to have somebody you don't need to have extra provision from the FDA saying that you have to it's okay to adhere to the protocol and make sure that the sites and the patients adhere to the protocol. That's what a protocol is. What I would say is, under there rubric John mentioned even if you can't predict it	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	write. Just because you've anticipated some of it in the protocol, it doesn't mean what you say in the protocol was automatically right. If I write a protocol today saying I'm going to deal with missing data using LOCF, that doesn't mean I then I'm going to get a drug on the market using LOCF. So yeah, we have to put the best things we can in our design, but we need to make sure what it is that's going to be acceptable to the regulatory agencies, unless I'm missing something. This goes back to Lee's point. We just can't run the risk of misleading people that something is acceptable when it might not be. MALE SPEAKER: I think we definitely need Sharon to weigh in on some of this. Usually, statisticians aren't asked for this type of level of what's appropriate for a mid-trial correction. I think hitting the high points here have been we're more in the past, we've traditionally been much more focused on the site

Pain Assessment in Clinical Trials			June 5, 2015	
	Page 317		Page 319	
1	rather than the actual subject. So that might be	1	the impact or the type of corrections you're making	
2	something that needs to be discussed. How far do	2	in a study.	
3	we want to go in terms of interventions with	3	DR. DWORKIN: Other comments?	
4	subjects?	4	(No response.)	
5	I personally happen to agree that it's fine	5	DR. DWORKIN: Are we done early? Andrew?	
6	to remind somebody, you haven't been taking your	6	DR. RICE: It was just the issue of	
7	drug; you haven't been filling out something.	7	unannounced blood sampling as another measure of	
8	Going further saying, do you need some help filling	8	adherence.	
9	out your patient-reported outcome statement is a	9	DR. DWORKIN: Yes.	
10	little that's starting to stretch things, and	10	DR. RICE: We might ought to put that just	
11	it's going a little too far.	11	as a one-liner. You can reference David Simpson's	
12	DR. DWORKIN: Well, that's inevitable. What	12	study where we did it. He was the first author	
13	if they haven't completed it for three days? Can	13	under pros and we discussed the pros and cons of	
14	you remind them that they haven't completed it?	14	doing that.	
15	Trudy, I completely agree that so Dennis	15	MALE SPEAKER: Yes, and Bernard actually	
16	and I are doing a trial now on fibromyalgia. It's	16	referred to some data suggesting that they were	
17	NIH-funded. Of course, we would. All I'm saying	17	kind of dramatic important differences between what	
18	is I don't know with a hundred percent certainty	18	vou got when vou did announced versus unannounced.	
19	that Sharon would say of course. She might and	19	DR. DWORKIN: Phil?	
20	then we're all in agreement.	20	DR. CONAGHAN: Bob, I'm just a little	
21	I think we're beating a dead horse here.	21	concerned about the generic versus specific pain	
22	Are we beating a dead horse, Dr. Turk? Yes.	22	issues and almost the selling of this paper, as it	
			<b>3 1 1 1</b>	
	Page 318		Page 320	
1	DR. TURK: Yes.	1	were, how you make it related to pain.	
2	DR. DWORKIN: Rob?	2	A lot of the things we discussed are not	
3	ROB: Again, just to remind, in any trial,	3	just relevant to pain studies. They're relevant to	
4	you may uncover violations, or deviations or	4	lots of different trials. So to make this pertain	
5	errors. You can always, first of all, query. And	5	to a pain audience, I'm assuming some way you're	
6	as long as you're transparent in everything you do,	6	going to have to make examples that always relate	
7	you can identify. If you were to identify a	7	to a pain study when you're writing your	
8	patient who you thought was fraudulent, you could	8	manuscript.	
9	still transparently suspect that, put that patient	9	Is that what you've got in mind already?	
10	and their data into a separate list and say, look,	10	DR. DWORKIN: Yes, absolutely. I mean	
11	we suspect or we're worried about the data for some	11	that's right. A lot of this is very generic about	
12	reason. And you could analyze it separately.	12	clinical trials and not pain. Some of it is going	
13	Obviously, it's not the intent to treat.	13	to be very pain-related like training people how to	
14	But if you come with violators or deviators	14	do zero to 10 pain diaries, et cetera.	
15	of any soft because of urine drug screens or faulty	15	The issue you identified hasn't been a	
16	data, if you can document it and be transparent	16	problem with other IMMPACT papers that were	
17	about it, you can analyze it, do a sensitivity	17	100 percent generic. We have an IMMPACT paper with	
18	analysis. I think the FDA would welcome that.	18	recommendations for how to deal with multiple	
19	But as long as you're transparent about any	19	endpoints in a clinical trial, and it's really all	
20	errors and you can make mid-trial corrections as	20	about statistical approaches to multiplicity.	
21	long as you're transparent, I think, almost at any	21	I don't think there was anything specific	
	level But it may have implications depending on	22	about pain in that article. And I think those	

Pai	n Assessment in Clinical Trials		June 5, 2015
	Page 321		Page 323
1	articles are there haven't been many of	1	cited in over 600 different journals across the
2	them are largely generic or maybe 70 percent	2	entire spectrum. So somehow or other, even though
3	generic, are viewed by the reviewers and editors as	3	we're putting it in the Pain journal, it gets
4	educational. That's I guess the way we've thought	4	picked up much more broadly than we maybe
5	about it.	5	anticipated.
6	But this will have, I think, 25 to	6	DR. DWORKIN: Actually, that's the opposite
7	35 percent pain, specific material in pain	7	of what, I think, Phil was suggesting. If the
8	examples. So I don't know that it's a major	8	paper is 70 percent generic, it actually has a
9	problem.	9	larger audience than so that's actually an
10	DR. CONAGHAN: The other element that I	10	interesting kind of
11	think is part of good recommendation papers is to	11	DR. CONAGHAN: Those issues are really
12	highlight at least some of the priority research	12	important for all trials.
13	agenda, which you normally like to get in. And if	13	MALE SPEAKER: But my point was that even
14	you got some time now, I'm thinking of a couple of	14	though we're putting it in a Pain journal, it gets
15	things.	15	picked up.
16	For example, even the training issues you've	16	DR. DWORKIN: Yes. Other comments?
17	brought up to me are not well evidence-based. The	17	(No response.)
18	issues of training people to use VAS or NRS scores	18	Adjournment
19	or whatever, we need to see the evidence base to	19	DR. DWORKIN: All right. I wish I had one
20	just make some difference after you've	20	of these timers that counted down five seconds.
21	psychometrically adjusted these scales.	21	You will be hearing from us because the way this
22	That's just one example, but perhaps while	22	works, and many of you are very familiar with this,
	Page 322		Page 324
1	you've got people here, a quick thought of what the	1	is a manuscript will be drafted. Everyone who's
2	juice is for research recommendations would be	2	been here will be listed as a co-author. You are
2	anod	2	completely free to ask us to take your name off it
4	DR DWORKIN: Yes We'll definitely have a	4	and we're happy to do that If you don't you will
5	table with a research agenda that tends to kind of	5	be involved in multiple revisions of the paper
6	write itself, because as we're writing most of the	6	before it gets published as an article somewhere.
7	paper, there are all these places, as Mark was	7	Thank you very much. Valorie and Andrea for
8	saving, where we're going to saving the evidence is	8	coordinating a wonderful meeting. Thank you all.
9	minimal or lacking. And that then becomes an item	9	and especially the presenters, for your
10	in the research agenda.	10	participation, your ideas, your thoughts, and your
11	So there will be definitely be a research	11	terrific presentations, and have a good safe flight
12	agenda that's driven by the holes in the evidence	12	home.
13	underlying our recommendations or considerations.	13	(Applause.)
14	Dennis?	14	(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned.)
15	DR. TURK: I was going to respond to the	15	
16	first part of your question, which was about if	16	
17	it's broader than just the pain, will it get sort	17	
18	of seen or will it be picked up or observed or	18	
19	would that information get out there?	19	
20	In the past IMMPACT and ACTTION papers, all	20	
21	of which have 99 percent of which have appeared	21	
22	in the Pain journals, they've ended up getting	22	

	120 (1)	30 (4)	202:17	abuse-deterrent (1)
\$	113:6	67:21;113:8;248:6,14	70 (2)	118:2
	12-week (2)	3-0 (1)	321:2;323:8	academe (1)
<b>\$1 (1)</b>	236:12;237:1	99:20 <b>300</b> (4)	70s (1)	7:21
112:2	13 (1)	<b>300 (4)</b> 116.9.137.1.188.4.	<b>79</b> (1)	36.10.156.22
\$100,000 (1) 151.2	139 (2)	248:13	213:1	academic (44)
\$20 (1)	136:4;213:1	33 (1)		38:4;62:6;70:10;
116:11	14 (2)	81:22	8	72:11;74:18;87:13,20;
\$200,000 (1)	6:11;235:4	35 (2)		100:16;109:14,15,18,19,
151:3	141 (2)	157:13;321:7 <b>26</b> ( <b>4</b> )	8(2)	20;113:7,11,14,17;
\$400 (1)	150.5,215.1 <b>15 (4)</b>	266.3.268.5.312.3 10	202:10;247:20 80s (1)	120.13.124.11.131.12.
116:10	52:5;113:12;174:22;	<b>36-cell (1)</b>	6:10	136:12;137:18;139:10;
1	278:22	288:4	81 (1)	166:3,6;184:14,19,19,
L	<b>1990s</b> (1)	39 (1)	106:9	22;186:2,10,20;187:1;
[inaudible (2)	31:7	106:5	82 (1)	210:22;211:21;222:17,
207:11;308:7	<b>19-year-old (1)</b>	4	213:1 84 (1)	21;202:14;203:12;288:8
[Inaudible](1)	40.10		106:11	87:9
[indiscernible] (2)	2	4 (1)	100111	Academy (3)
246:1;279:10		266:2	9	8:16;24:1;72:16
	2 (12)	4:00 (2)		Academy's (1)
0	12:8;81:2;102:5;	261:6,11	9(3)	74:1 accelerant (1)
0.02 (1)	155:17:245:19:280:4:	<b>40</b> (3) 81·22·112·10·236·4	<b>9:00 (1)</b>	187:12
2/19:10	288:7;296:9,21	40,000-foot (1)	136:1	Accelerate (1)
0.08 (1)	20 (9)	76:13	90s (2)	189:19
249:10	48:11;52:6;86:4;	400 (2)	36:22;69:6	accept (1)
	117:20;138:3;174:22;	87:14;163:15	<b>97</b> (1)	93:3 accontable (12)
1	250:4,5;254:14	<b>400,000 (1)</b> 136.22	100:4 <b>98 (1)</b>	92.21.94.12.286.4 5
1 (11)	114:15;152:6;181:16	45 (1)	236:19	303:15;304:20;305:12;
8:8:12:7:22:21.22:	2002 (1)	63:9	99 (1)	308:5;309:16,19;316:10,
96:11;132:14;208:6;	277:21	_	322:21	13
245:19;278:16;296:9,21	<b>200-plus (1)</b>	5		accepted (1)
1:30 (1)	<b>22</b> (1)	5 (8)	A	0:5 access (11)
207:20	235:18	109:2.4:116:11:	ability (14)	32:1,7,15,15,20;33:15;
14.12.31.8.48.6	2400 (1)	250:19;281:18,20;	22:10;77:20;101:8;	51:18;257:14;258:3;
72:10;130:15;135:4,5,5,	105:16	282:7;296:9	113:5;138:18;145:14;	273:15;287:13
11;165:12;184:15;	25 (3)	50 (3)	146:20;162:21,22;	accessed (1)
247:20;248:1,10,11;	48:12;115:8;521:0 <b>260 (2)</b>	41:2;130:0;104:20 50-person (1)	214:13,20;231:17;	80:14 accompanied (1)
249:8;299:4;315:10;	129:8:131:8	132:3	able (27)	195:9
<b>10.30 (1)</b>	27 (1)	50s (1)	5:5;21:9;34:19;36:19;	accompanying (2)
96:1	189:8	6:10	45:1,3;62:2;74:4;85:16;	195:14,18
100 (11)	28 (1)	(	99:17;136:20;139:4;	accomplish (2)
36:1,1,3;37:11;38:3,	39:15 281 (1)	0	147:13;156:8,10;	9/:1/;99:1/
18;41:19;42:1,20;50:22;	106.2	6 (3)	208.5.209.21.226.6	97.5
320:17 101 (3)	2-minute (1)	178:17,18;281:17	242:2;269:5;292:6,7;	According (1)
71:11:79:8.15	108:13	60 (5)	298:6;314:10	6:6
10th (1)	3	112:11;114:16,16;	abrogated (1)	account (3)
132:7	3	129:7;236:3	62:9	26:15;67:13;116:13
11 (2)	3 (21)	323.1	148.18	88:19:188:1
40:15;114:14 <b>119 (3)</b>	102:4;107:2;132:2;	60s (1)	absolutely (8)	accredited (1)
109:21:112:5:187:5	141:9,10;153:3;155:16;	6:10	62:15;170:10;230:15;	80:6
12 (2)	160:15;210:7;234:6;		270:13;285:11;301:14;	accurate (3)
235:4;236:11	241:8;242:15;245:19;	7	308:20;320:10	45:4;170:7;254:10
12:00 (1)	249:18;251:17;252:3;	7 (1)	absurdity $(1)$	achieve (2) 36:1:110:22
3:10	200.7,9,290:9,21,310:2	/(1)	234.11	50.1,110.22

98:5

acknowledged (1) 87:16 acknowledging (1) 50:3 acquired (1) 218:6 **ACR** (1) 115:3 ACR20(4) 236:2,5,7,19 acronyms (3) 7:6.15:11:19 across (19) 16:18;43:22;85:3; 93:6;103:10;114:19; 119:22;157:16;160:18; 161:2;191:21;220:1; 222:6;227:9;234:2; acute (3) 252:9;257:7;266:5; 323:1 ad (4) act (4) 67:19;112:7;289:11; 298:8 adage (1) action (8) 25:4;75:7;89:13,19; 90:2,14;93:14,14 actionable (1) 293:14 actions (6) add (13) 25:1,2,4;77:13;89:6, 15 active (5) 108:9;156:2,3;275:8; 277:18 activity (3) 87:10;228:2,2 ACTTION (6) 79:12;212:12;213:5: 220:14;291:12;322:20 actual (7) 13:4,10;47:16;62:12; 139:13;147:11:317:1 actually (140) 6:12;7:3;10:17,22; 11:15,17;13:14;14:18; 16:9,22;17:12;19:9; 21:3,6,9,17;22:9,13; 25:10;26:9;27:13,18; 28:21;33:5,6;37:8;38:9, 20;43:19;44:6,13;45:4; 47:22;48:4,6;49:18,19; 50:1,2,8,14;57:19;58:2, 4,5;61:22;62:1;63:6; 67:18;68:20;71:13,17; 37:9 74:9,16;75:11;77:15; 78:1;79:22;81:8,13,15; 82:4;83:18;84:1;86:12; 88:22;91:21;94:19;95:6, adds (2) 7,10;97:19;98:2;99:12; 100:7;123:13,15,16; 134:20;139:5,20;143:6, 19;147:6,8,22;148:5; 151:7;154:9,20;155:2;

adhere (4) 156:8;171:21;176:7; 179:14:182:22:190:5.6. 314:11.13.17.18 adherence (21) 11;192:13;193:4,6,7; 196:16:211:11:213:12: 74:7;244:4;252:7; 258:17,21;259:1,6,8,14; 214:11,15;219:14; 235:21:236:9.16.20.21: 260:9;265:3;266:19; 240:6;241:1;251:20; 267:10;268:2;269:8,13; 254:20;264:9;266:9; 270:14,19;271:7,8;319:8 271:15;274:2;282:15; adhering (2) 292:20;294:18;295:3,9, 308:19:310:16 17;299:16;302:18; adjourned (1) 324:14 304:2;310:19,21,22; 313:12;314:14;319:15; Adjournment (1) 323:6.8.9 323:18 acupuncture (4) adjusted (1) 224:16;225:19; 321:21 229:12;262:6 administering (1) 13:20 administration (1) 16:3;80:21;183:3 114:3 79:10:130:7:177:9; administrative (2) 138:17;187:11 201:16 adult (2) 14:10,14 adaptations (1) adults (2) 173:17 42:13,21 adaptive (3) advantage (1) 155:6,8,10 210:5 advantages (1) 18:13:153:7:155:13; 131:13 176:16;183:11;188:7; adverse (13) 223:18:224:12:228:5: 12:1.2:17:9:74:21: 248:1;251:15;274:19; 95:3;105:19;138:12; 293:7 269:9;270:3,5,17,17,18 added (1) adversely (1) 264:4 61:13 advertising (6) adding (1) 147:9 34:14,19;35:5,14; addition (2) 39:6:130:1 217:18:269:18 advocate (4) additional (6) 150:1;153:2;172:17; 59:21;206:10;213:13; 253:3 224:13;225:1;256:21 AE (1) additions (1) 278:17 297:6 AEs (1) address (13) 16:21 33:7;86:13;133:10; affect (7) 120:10;264:4;276:16; 186:6;256:2;265:19; 266:12;274:12;291:20; 277:2;280:19;292:15,22 293:8;304:3,6,15 affected (1) addressed (5) 180:16 15:8;28:15;119:12; affecting (1) 280:15;296:11 13:7 addresses (1) affects (3) 66:10;132:15;141:17 addressing (3) affiliation (3) 203:4;232:10;266:5 186:6,7,8 afford (1) 38:19;213:13 38:4 adequacy (1) Affordable (1) 277:13 112:7 adequate (3) Africa (1) 25:18;203:17;235:22 262:16

afternoon (4) 4:9:95:16.20:261:5 afterwards (2) 58:14:265:20 again (52) 8:9;17:20;29:20; 35:20;50:12;52:5;53:20; 54:10:58:15:69:14: 70:18;103:7;104:19; 105:7;107:18;109:10; 116:3;118:10;119:16, 21;127:3;129:18; 131:14;132:9,10,17; 133:9,13:134:3:136:9; 137:20;138:15;142:2; 144:17;149:14;150:12, 13;161:11;162:7; 167:18;174:2;180:9; 186:22;207:14;208:3; 210:14,21;216:8;222:5; 237:1;289:21;318:3 against (5) 40:12;101:1;108:7; 244:22;255:13 age (2) 32:1;60:2 agencies (4) 7:20;51:18;311:13; 316:11 agency (3) 28:10:303:14:313:7 agenda (7) 95:15,20;126:2; 321:13;322:5,10,12 aggressive (1) 105:15 ago (15) 48:11,12;52:6;54:20; 70:7;72:17,19;128:18; 152:7;187:15;254:14; 264:5;267:15,18;274:21 agree (35) 34:1;35:22;38:2,5; 51:11,14;54:10;60:4; 63:22;180:16;201:14; 202:2,8;225:22;240:21; 260:7;268:16;272:1; 273:5;283:12;288:2,18; 290:6,15;294:9,19; 306:1,3;307:10;309:17; 312:2;315:6,17;317:5,15 agreed (2) 210:13;225:4 agreeing (1) 309:12 agreement (4) 222:14;246:14;310:8; 317:20 aha (1) 45:10 ahead (2) 31:17:159:2 aim (1)

#### June 5, 2015

70:12 Ajay (5) 28:12;136:9;197:19; 251:14:309:21 alcohol (1) 98:22 alerts (1) 170:17 algorithm (3) 9:18;147:3;162:20 aligned (1) 171:1 alike (1) 183:15 allayed (1) 56:4 allergies (2) 49:15;51:2 allocate (1) 257:20 allocation (4) 106:10;114:5;276:16; 277:2 allodynia (2) 84:14;105:6 allow (7) 48:17;62:11;63:12; 98:1;112:8;185:8;251:3 allowed (2) 109:6;122:20 allude (1) 16:7alluded (6) 12:14;14:22;21:1; 103:7;198:8;280:18 alluding (1) 20:9 allusion (1) 10:12 almost (15) 35:11;36:11;65:7; 67:10,15;112:3;116:9; 142:16;179:21;199:2; 240:16;251:19;253:10; 318:21;319:22 alone (1) 6:13 along (9) 9:5,15;15:8;113:22; 139:8;172:11;218:9; 220:20;221:1 altered (2) 135:1:249:16 alternative (2) 227:19;229:6 Although (7) 4:7;50:14;69:17; 77:22;90:3;186:9; 191:16 altruistic (1) 163:17 always (40) 13:18;18:12,14;26:3,

9:35:4:36:11,18:51:17; 57:12:58:11:84:11:86:9: 88:21;100:10;158:12; 164:15;165:4;169:1; 174:13:190:22:191:9: 193:15;203:15;215:2; 234:18;237:12;254:1,3; 258:22;262:7;269:19; 273:17;276:10,11; 278:18:307:17:313:17; 318:5;320:6 Alzheimer's (4) 147:16;177:17;253:1; 259:9 amazed (1) 55:10 amazing (2) 55:16;166:12 AMCP(1) 238:15 amend (1) 210:11 amended (1) 142:10 America (2) 165:14;287:18 American (1) ankle (1) 80:7 among (1) Ann (1) 173:21 amongst (1) 84:18 amount (15) 12:8:30:18:37:2: 64:18:105:17:106:17; 107:5;109:21;116:14; 117:11:119:4:188:17; 25:3 229:15;238:17,19 Amy (7) 18:7:21:1:30:12:95:2: 257:12:279:16:284:1 **Amy's (2)** 19:19:76:11 anal (1) 55:20 analgesic (8) 79:7,15;101:9,12; 124:5;138:19;181:5; 292:18 analgesics (1) 24:3 analog (1) 59:1 analogy (1) apnea (1) 180:18 analyses (5) 16:4;45:7;91:3;172:2; 210:7 analysis (28) 5:17;6:1;8:12,13;9:3, 4;16:10;72:21;105:20; 106:21;129:3;130:22; 161:22;177:5;180:6,9;

233:13:249:6:265:21; 268:3:289:13.13:300:2. 8,10,11;304:4;318:18 analyze (6) 75:3,17,19;91:14; 318:12.17 analyzed (1) 236:12 analyzing (1) 15:21 ancillary (2) 37:18;114:1 Andrea (5) 4:15;100:13;207:13, 15:324:7 Andrew (4) 283:2;286:9;288:18; 319:5 anecdotes (1) 12:11 anesthesia (1) 166:16 anesthesiologist (1) 166:15 Angeles (1) 248:3 230:12 230:3 announced (1) 319:18 annoved (2) 153:14.14 annual (2) 111:4;112:3 anomalies (1) anomaly (4) 20:12,14,22;23:19 answered (2) 136:1:195:3 antibiotic (1) 115:13 anticipate (3) 217:21;313:17,18 anticipated (2) 316:1;323:5 anxious (1) 135:13 anymore (8) 36:17:111:19.21: 169:14;176:16;183:11; 246:8,9 185:12 apologize (1) 58:15 appear (1) 190:22 appeared (1) 322:21 Applause (9)

5:1;24:7;96:3;139:2; 174:11:207:16:294:8. 19:324:13 applicable (3) 252:2;262:5,10 application (3) 10:18;128:3;224:16 applies (3) 213:22;251:20;269:7 apply (3) 75:21;76:12;224:12 appreciate (3) 58:19;59:6;139:1 approach (18) 6:17,20;8:20;19:15; 23:16;27:20;33:1,10; 40:21;41:11;76:14; 90:17;93:4;107:8; 131:11;212:3;230:17; 265:9 approached (1) 134:11 approaches (5) 23:16;52:11;267:9; 290:16;320:20 appropriate (13) 11:3;18:18;33:12; 60:16;89:8,20;212:2; 267:15,19;285:15; 311:11:315:20:316:18 appropriately (3) 81:11;98:8;150:16 approval (5) 223:6:239:18:240:21: 250:13:311:12 approve (2) 212:6;216:14 approved (14) 155:15;185:4;203:12. 17,21,22;204:1;205:21; 222:9.21:223:1.11: 234:14,22 arbitrariness (1) 123:19 arbitrary (1) 124:6 area (15) 8:7;15:11;28:6;47:1; 58:17;64:8;81:5;82:18; 89:17;118:5;145:1; 254:2:260:7,10,10 areas (13) 17:22;23:7;29:21; 75:15;78:22;79:2; 168:13;173:13;177:19; 184:19;253:20,22; 291:20 aren't (1) 230:16 arenas (1) 266:6 argue (10) 7:4;8:11;35:20;41:18;

88:20;206:17;217:2; 250:17:251:1:260:1 arguing (1) 250:1 argument (3) 43:2;141:11;261:12 arms (1) 77:22 around (16) 80:8;97:2;100:7; 128:16;130:10;137:3; 158:16:190:8:191:17: 208:4;215:15;220:16; 223:10;265:16;294:10, 11 arrangements (1) 261:7 arthritis (2) 81:7;236:2 article (16) 57:7,13:74:1:158:1; 218:17;255:8;261:19; 263:19;275:16;294:4; 297:3,4;305:18;309:15; 320:22;324:6 articles (3) 262:8;271:17;321:1 articulate (1) 23:4 artifact (1) 131:7 ascertain (1) 17:13 ascertaining (1) 17:3 ASCO(1) 150:22 aside (1) 82:22 asleep (1) 63:17 aspect (9) 13:19;44:1;50:3; 57:17,17;66:9;95:14; 202:5;273:13 aspects (6) 23:8;44:15;85:6; 252:5;266:6;300:5 aspirational (1) 22:16 assay (6) 77:18:120:10:280:10: 283:13,16;292:1 assay-sensitivity (1) 120:5 assess (10) 84:14;153:22;160:8; 169:15;171:20;202:4,5; 230:17;271:7,8 assessed (3) 164:5;257:11;280:8 assessing (3) 127:17;196:7;268:21

#### June 5, 2015

assessment (18) 19:8:193:5:195:15.17: 196:1,22:212:11; 257:11:258:18:274:13: 283:4,6,6,7,10,18; 284:18;293:6 assessments (3) 121:5;160:18;200:15 assigned (3) 270:16;273:19;274:6 assignment (1) 91:7 associated (11) 25:16;74:21;81:7; 105:6;151:5;153:8; 198:12;226:16;237:15; 270:18;283:16 Association (2) 80:7;246:2 assume (5) 11:19;51:1;139:6; 278:20:311:12 assumed (1) 61:20 assuming (5) 42:15;46:1;214:15; 270:22;320:5 assumption (1) 170:6 astute (1) 186:18 attaching (1) 209:5 attempt (3) 7:7;8:10;270:10 attempting (1) 7:5 attempts (1) 119:18 attending (1) 96:10 attention (7) 111:14;138:22;180:2; 225:20;231:19,21;276:7 attorney (2) 117:6;187:22 attorneys (1) 188:2 AU (1) 245:22 audience (4) 3:7;221:3;320:5;323:9 audit (3) 9:17;68:15;115:19 auditing (1) 58:5 augments (1) 278:12 AUs (1) 246:2 author (3) 87:16,18:319:12 autoimmune (1)

237.6	115.13	278-2-302-15	21.5.23.4 18.27.11.	biology (1)
237.0 automatically (2)	halance (6)	278.2,302.15 becomes (6)	52.21.5.4.7.55.14.	75.7
30.14.316.3	70.14 17.76.20.97.18	51:20:176:15:217:20	123.14.125.1.129.19	hiomarkers (1)
available (3)	103.4.258.13	269.17.279.19.322.9	122.14,122.1,122.17,	164:6
9.17.33.9.204.10	halanced (1)	becoming $(2)$	144.19.156.11 12.	hiomedical (1)
average (8)	102.3	110.2.156.18	157.18.159.22.162.2	189.21
192:1.2:234:4:281:8:	ballroom (1)	bedside (1)	163:14:165:11:168:9:	biopharm (1)
285:21:305:14:306:18:	126:5	192:15	178:14:182:14.14:	145:2
309:1	bang (1)	begin (1)	183:10:203:14:205:5:	biopharmaceutical (6)
Avoid (3)	40:11	3:17	206:12:214:12:216:16:	140:8:141:18:168:8:
8:21:169:16:281:1	banks (1)	beginning (8)	217:4;220:4,22;228:16,	173:22;191:4;299:11
avoidance (1)	157:7	79:6;88:14;93:21;	22;229:1;239:21;245:6,	biostatisticians (1)
92:13	barriers (1)	119:18;175:21;202:15;	7;258:18;260:8;272:4;	117:7
avoiding (1)	190:3	245:5;246:11	278:10,12;290:13,22;	<b>Biostatistics</b> (1)
250:16	base (1)	begins (3)	293:15;294:6;310:22;	33:2
aware (5)	321:19	148:11;172:22;260:19	313:7	birthday (2)
27:15;56:5;180:14;	based (16)	begun (2)	beyond (3)	98:20;120:2
218:8;286:12	3:21;66:6;91:6;	5:7;201:1	61:9;85:20;199:13	bit (46)
away (11)	143:18;147:9;162:19;	behalf (1)	bias (5)	5:22;9:10;15:7;16:8;
17:8;29:13;31:12;	163:1;164:5,6;165:11;	298:9	45:8;78:1;191:18;	21:20;36:20;43:15;
52:15;83:17;111:22;	177:4;221:14;247:17;	behavior (2)	287:6;296:4	59:10;80:11;98:15;
113:7;148:21;168:3;	271:16;296:12;302:22	237:14;262:6	biased (2)	101:15;111:5;126:18;
240:6;292:6	baseline (7)	behind (1)	92:6;155:4	127:13;131:16;134:9;
awfully (1)	65:18;66:4;108:3;	70:3	biases (1)	140:13,17,20;141:12,16;
249:4	147:4;197:12;209:18;	behooves (2)	131:22	144:5;146:6;158:17;
	292:16	243:3;253:12	biasing (1)	169:11;194:7;207:20;
В	basement (1)	belabor (2)	248:19	208:12;213:3;215:11;
	234:12	141:14;154:14	bicycling (1)	216:6;223:8;229:5;
baby (1)	basic (5)	belatedly (1)	226:18	240:16;243:6,10;
167:21	8:20;12:3;18:6;	98:20	bid (3)	245:18;250:15;251:4;
babysitter (1)	164:16;297:10	belief (1)	142:21;219:19;253:5	254:15;257:18;258:16;
167:22	Basically (32)	50:5	big (43)	259:6;265:1;281:9;
<b>back (54)</b>	10:7;11:3,21;22:2;	<b>belong</b> (2)	8:15;36:21;57:7;	30/:4
5:3;31:5;35:13,17;	23:21;38:22;40:16;54:7;	184:19;290:9	85:11;86:17;88:9;99:20;	$\frac{1}{200.14}$
30:0;39:3;40:7;42:1,13;	02:8;72:20;90:2;95:2;	Delow (1) 101.15	115:9;120:22;140:14;	309:14 hittor (1)
40.2,34.4,17,39.3,	104.13,100.2,107.10, 108.4,12,18.100.1.	191.13 honofit ( <b>8</b> )	141.10, 19, 22, 142.3, 0, 142.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.14.	202.13
00:22;09:2,0;79:3;82:7;	100.4, 12, 10, 109.1, 110.7, 14, 18, 114, 15,	22.18.84.6.144.22.	143.14,144.14,147.1,0, 149.12,21.151.9,152.0,	292.15 bizorro (1)
0.5.3, 00.19, 09.4, 99.10, 101.7.107.21.118.8 11.	170.7,14,10,114.15, 124.14.127.4.128.8.	$163 \cdot 16.04 \cdot 0.144 \cdot 22,$ $163 \cdot 16 \cdot 213 \cdot 12 \cdot 214 \cdot 11$	140.12,21,131.0,133.9, 154.5.170.13,15.171.5	310.19
134.10.137.10.154.12	164.17.167.20.180.15	18:217:13	18 18.172.15 17.177.19	black (3)
162.12.163.18.170.1	19.213.17.236.13	henefits (2)	191.9.193.16.194.16	303.19 21.311.14
185.6.197.17 21.203.6	hasis (9)	26.18.173.11	212:8:223:2:226:13:	blackball (1)
207.5 11 18 19.208.19	6.7.43.21.57.15	benzodiazepine (2)	227.13.233.2.238.3	289.20
210:19:217:17:218:21:	116:2:177:10:190:7:	225:8.9	253:3:294:10	blame (2)
220:13:223:16:225:7:	214:7:259:22:308:2	Bernard (10)	bigger (3)	5:21:309:9
227:14:236:11:260:4:	basket (1)	217:14:253:8.18:	28:17:126:5:135:8	blanche (1)
285:14;302:9;307:1;	173:14	258:17;259:12;265:3;	biggest (11)	302:14
316:12	battle (1)	267:4,5,22;319:15	91:13,14;157:22;	blended (2)
background (3)	160:14	Bernard's (2)	168:14;185:2;187:20;	23:16;252:5
9:14;14:5;240:16	bear (1)	244:4;267:13	188:5;190:1,11;226:14;	blind (4)
Backonja (1)	267:2	best (27)	240:9	65:17;78:5;91:1;
82:11	beat (2)	19:12;27:4,19,20;	Bill (1)	154:17
backs (1)	32:6;45:20	28:9;44:19;73:7;88:20;	262:15	blinded (5)
282:15	beating (2)	93:7;98:3;119:1,7;	billion (1)	77:15;78:6;91:5;
backtracked (1)	317:21,22	125:11;165:6;166:6;	112:2	170:21;274:14
307:3	beautifully (1)	195:22;196:20;198:1;	billions (1)	blinding (13)
bad (18)	244:8	201:12;202:22;250:3;	238:14	65:13;77:15,19;78:3,
29:19;50:8;59:18;	became (3)	254:21;279:17;284:2;	Biogen (1)	7;215:21,22;224:14;
99:4;166:9;182:20;	108:12;150:3;268:22	296:1;310:8;316:8	297:3	225:4,5,17;229:5;276:2
192:21;205:20;255:20;	become (13)	bet (3)	biologic (1)	blister (1)
272:8,8,9,11;300:18;	48:12,20;50:6;62:7,	144:19;235:11;249:16	125:15	269:15
301:1,20;311:21;314:14	11;63:13;82:8;87:7;	Detter (56)	Diologics (1)	DIOCK (5)
haa (1)	150,17,020,02,046,6	10.6.11 10 17 7 10 2	110.1	100.10.077.1.000.0

blocked (1) bought (1) 52:1 blood (5) 38:12;136:4;212:22; 263:12 bowel (1) 259:9:319:7 board (1) 65:20 93:6 box (6) Bob (51) 3:18;34:3;53:15; 65:12;70:6;71:2;85:19; **BPI** (1) 88:8;100:1;147:3; 200:19 197:19;198:4.6;200:14. break (7) 22;201:5,15;204:2,8,14, 19;220:12;243:20; 247:10,11;248:21; 307:4 249:18;250:9,12; 252:17;254:16,17; 16:3 256:9;257:5;266:7,8,17; Brett (1) 268:7,13,16,18;286:10; 84:16 297:6,7;298:17;300:17; 301:16,18;306:2;307:4; 319:20 briefly (1) **Bob's** (1) 84:3 168:15 bright (1) body (1) 144:3 236:19 boils (1) 22:3 bring (5) bolts (1) 121:2 bonus (1) 128:9 bonuses (1) brings (1) 128:7 313:1 books (1) broad (5) 120:21 bookstore (1) 120:19 **boot** (1) 79:12 broadly (3) bordering (1) 195:22 broken (1) bosses (1) 242:17 154:12 Boston (2) 42:16;291:13 **BTI**(1) both (30) 7:21;14:11;16:3; 193:20 27:11;43:15;56:1;58:16; bucks (1) 59:14;80:1;81:4;96:22; 163:15 117:15;126:14;161:2; buddy (1) 175:14,18;176:3,18; 235:20 195:3;214:20;222:6; budget (1) 241:16;243:14;246:12; 114:5 252:5;266:11,17; 292:12;297:5;302:18 120:22 Buffett (1) bothered (1) 191:14 129:12 bottles (1) build (3) 269:16 bottom (5) 60:14:116:6:155:13; 6:8 269:6;282:13 built (4)

236:16 boutique (1) 61:6:294:10,11; 303:19,21;311:15 3:11;96:1;126:21; 174:22;261:4;267:12; breakthrough (1) brewery (2) 120:22;121:1 brilliant (3) 273:8;275:11;300:19 20:20;27:22;75:14; 82:7;141:4 bringing (2) 189:19:266:17 72:8;116:17;242:12; 243:13:246:11 broader (2) 245:10;322:17 218:19:252:2:323:4 48:9 brought (7) 21:17,18;213:2,3; 267:2;280:21;321:17 **Budweiser** (1) 30:8:265:9:282:8 building (1)

6:15:150:11:177:13; 283:1 bullet (3) 10:5;58:8;126:11 bumps (1) 258:7 bunch (2) 25:21;243:2 **Bunionectomy** (7) 41:16;42:6;279:15; 280:2;283:3;284:8; 293:8 burden (4) 153:17;213:11; 221:16,19 buried (1) 48:19 **BURKE (15)** 63:22;195:6;197:9; 206:5;208:13,20;209:9; 210:17:237:18:241:14, 18;283:3;296:8,16; 311:16 Burke's (1) 202:2 burn (1) 143:5 business (2) 124:14;148:6 button (1) 137:3 buttoned (1) 136:2 buttoned-up (1) 181:12 buttonholed (1) 100:21 buv (3) 148:13;236:15;275:9 buy-in (1) С cadre (2) 100:6;254:5 calendar (2) 20:6;44:3 California (2) 189:15:247:18 call (16) 10:22:11:8:64:6:94:6: 100:16;115:14;166:7; 179:4;205:13;267:16; 288:21;303:9;304:20; 305:12;306:12,16 called (11) 10:8;70:8;80:7;88:10; 107:20;116:6;189:18; 221:8;236:2;238:5,7 calling (6) 11:16;17:16;23:18; 55:2;271:18;306:4

callouts (1) Canada (2) 226:5 calls (3) 17:14:101:4:300:20 came (19) 6:18;16:6;24:13;71:1; 121:12;134:15;136:10: 151:1;187:10;191:21; 194:8;205:16;218:9; 236:9,11:253:8:262:11; 279:17;286:12 camp (1) 79:12 Campbell (1) 128:19 campuses (1) 189:21 can (184) 3:11;4:12;5:16;8:4; 9:20;12:4,9;13:21; 14:18:16:1:18:13:19:3, 16;21:12;23:3,13;24:19; 28:6,7,8;30:8;33:6,8; 37:21;40:15;41:20;42:6; 51:12;53:8;62:8;63:6; 64:9;65:14,22;68:12; 72:8;73:13;76:1,5,18,21; 80:14;81:15;83:13; 85:20;88:4,19;90:4,5; 93:13:94:7.19.20:95:1. 16,17;98:4,8;100:7; 108:2;117:9,12;118:5; 122:20;123:6,17;126:10, 15,16;132:12;133:2,17, 18;135:3;136:7,21,22; 139:7;141:20;142:4,13; 143:6,12;145:18; 150:15;152:11;155:14, 20;156:3;160:13; 161:11,22;162:17; 163:1;165:6,9,15,21,22; 166:21:168:10:169:15, 16;170:22;171:2,4,20, 21,22;173:15;176:4; 177:21;178:2,7,7,8; 194:17;195:12;199:14; 203:19;204:17;208:3; 210:4,6;213:21;217:13, 21;219:22;223:2;229:6, 7;237:13,14;253:15; 258:2,2,4;262:21;263:4; 264:3,17;265:7,11,19; 266:4;268:2;270:5; 272:15;273:10;274:19; 275:16;281:8;282:9,14; 283:20;286:10,18; 287:14;288:11;296:6, 20;298:1;300:4;301:22; 304:5,8,9,10,11;305:5; 306:8;307:17;309:1,2, 17:312:13:316:9: 317:13:318:5,7,16,17, 20;319:11

81:13:287:17 canary (1) 248:16 cancer (4) 47:2;83:13;150:22; 152:12 candy (1) 156:21 capability (1) 137:6 capable (1) 62:1 capital (1) 274:22 capture (2) 30:16;274:16 capturing (2) 28:22;301:18 car (1) 169:18 card-carrying (1) 139:15 cardiac (3) 134:11,12,13 cardiovascular (1) 81:1 care (18) 4:13,18;34:10;35:8; 58:6:68:3:112:7:114:6: 136:19:137:17:159:7; 160:5:163:19:228:18: 240:14;257:17;283:10; 298:10 career (2) 134:15;156:17 careful (13) 153:7;169:12;213:4; 214:5;215:5;243:10; 260:8:303:2:304:7.13; 305:1;311:2,6 carefully (3) 74:12;182:11;298:13 carefully-controlled (1) 224:6 caregiver (1) 48:9 carelessness (2) 294:15;301:2 carried (2) 9:6:106:2 carry (6) 21:6,9;27:8;98:3; 140:16;289:9 carrying (1) 295:15 carte (1) 302:14 cartoon (1) 13:18 case (21) 14:18;18:18;25:5; 33:8;44:11;50:18;60:5;

June 5, 2015

77:14;88:11;101:9;	18:8,15,17;19:3,12;	311:1;312:15;314:1	226:13	137:13,13,21,22;141:2;
103:3,20;108:21;112:4;	23:14:52:10	changing (6)	churn (2)	143:18,19;145:13;
118.19.124.15.159.5.	centrally (1)	10.2.15.67.111.1.	142.3.191.8	146.22.147.12.12.
175.10.208.16.240.21	180.8	186.20.215.2	airolog(1)	149.10.140.16 18 20.
175.10,208.10,249.21,	107.0	180.20,313.3		140.10,149.10,18,20,
22	Cerner (1)	chapter (1)	54:12	150:7;152:16;154:16;
cases (9)	110:13	273:6	circumspect (1)	155:15;157:19;159:6,9;
12:8;17:16,17;19:14,	certain (17)	characteristics (3)	259:7	160:3;163:6,8;165:11;
16:51:22:77:4:95:6:	20:13:25:1:30:9:	202:18:264:14:265:4	circumstances (3)	168:14.19:173:8.9.12:
250.13	41.18.87.17.102.6	characterize (1)	13.20.242.11.305.11	188.15 17 18.189.19.
250.15	112.1.125.20.156.12	75.12	$r_{13.20,2+2.11,303.11}$	106.12 22.200.17
Casil (4)	112.1,123.20,130.12,	73.13		190.13,22,200.17,
5/:21;143:6,14,16	183:6,9;202:9;253:20;	chart (1)	2/2:3,6,/,10;2/3:6	203:10;206:13,15;
catch (3)	289:13;303:8;312:14,15	49:16	cited (1)	209:16,19;218:20;219:2,
18:14;62:8,8	certainly (25)	chat (3)	323:1	19;224:7;226:8,8,16;
category (5)	8.17.28.9.33.11.58.7	70.8 8 12	cities (1)	234.2.235.21.238.1 11.
225.14.288.10.	76.1 6.78.22.85.12 15	check (7)	110:5	239.20.241.781119
223.14,200.10,	70.1,0,78.22,85.12,15,	4.10.5.4.24.20.22	alaim (1)	239.20, 241.7, 0, 11, 19,
292:21;293:8;301:14	80:14;89:17;90:9,17;	4:10;5:4;24:20,22;	claim (1)	21;242:6;246:4,4;248:2;
catheter (1)	100:12;115:8;162:22;	60:22;139:7;172:18	68:18	251:13,18;252:4;
163:11	166:21;221:6;225:13;	checked (2)	clarify (1)	253:13;254:20;255:1,
Catholic (2)	254:8:260:4:269:14:	3:10:27:6	197:2	18:258:3:262:5.10.14:
121.15.191.19	289.3.291.5.313.3	checking (7)	class (2)	263.1 2 12 22.264.15.
121.13,171.17	209.5,291.5,515.5	5.2.24.22.42.17.61.2	(135)(2)	205.1, 2, 12, 22, 204.15, 277.11, 10.286.10.
	certainty (1)	5:5;24:22;45:17;01:2,	155:12,14	277.11,19,280.19;
/5:6	317:18	6;114:/;195:1	claudication (1)	288:14;289:21;292:13;
cause (1)	certificate (2)	checklist (1)	107:20	293:18,22;296:18;
93:8	79:3,19	73:22	clean (4)	298:6;308:8;310:13;
caused (2)	certification (5)	Checkout (1)	59:2:69:16:172:11.16	320:12.19
80.4.277.7	80.10.85.21.208.5 6	3.0	cleaners(1)	clinically (1)
80.4,277.7	80.10,85.21,208.5,0,	$\frac{3.7}{1}$		100.5.127.5.24C.17
causes (1)	237:21	cneckpoint (1)	11/:14	109:5;137:5;246:17;
41:1	certified (1)	151:2	clear (9)	298:6
caution (5)	63:13	checks (15)	60:3;74:2;76:9;79:1;	clinicaltrialsgov (3)
48:3:49:1:50:9:175:1:	certifying (1)	11:8.17.22:12:3:	200:14:241:15:272:21:	42:17:275:4:313:9
274.4	96.16	22.14.30.10 13 14.44.2	285.17.299.5	clinician (7)
(2) (2)	cotors (7)	58.4.76.5 5.115.18.	clearly (14)	31.20.34.10.35.16
$\frac{1}{2}$	Cetera(7)	125.5.172.9	(learly (14)	51.20, 54.10, 55.10,
98:6;182:9	27:6,7;262:15;268:5,	135:5;172:8	42:9;74:12;79:10;	36:9;99:13;111:18;
caveat (1)	14;297:6;320:14	chemical (1)	88:9;92:1;106:22;	196:8
313:19	chain (2)	235:19	155:10;165:16;272:17;	clinician-reported (1)
CCU (1)	52:14:54:3	chemotherapy (1)	285:19.22:295:20:	196:6
134.12	chair (1)	38.13	299.1.307.22	clinicians (2)
<b>CDED</b> (1)	49.21	abost (2)	2)).1,307.22	122.6.229.2
	40.21	cilest (2)	127.2	122.0,230.2
	challenge (4)	229:20;231:3	137:2	clinician's (1)
CDISC (5)	16:4;35:6;150:5;223:3	CHEUNG (2)	clinic (8)	42:20
7:18,18;8:7;11:15,22	challenges (6)	292:11;307:13	39:10,11;153:16;	close (5)
cell (2)	14:2:15:8:77:5:120:9:	chi (4)	169:19:236:22:262:19:	36:3:60:1:182:10:
3.7.70.4	134.17 18	227.13 15.231.16 18	278.22.289.14	231.8.287.3
colls (6)	challonging (0)	227.13,13,231.10,10	alinical (177)	251.0,207.5
	70.21.197.14.225.19	122.17	(15, 17, 20, 7, 0, 19)	
266:3;267:3,6;268:5;	/9:21;18/:14;225:18;	122:17	6:15,17,20;7:9,18;	144:8
312:3,10	229:6,7;298:19,19;	chime (1)	10:3;21:22;23:4,7,9;	closer (2)
censoring (1)	299:2;315:22	58:1	25:7;28:1;31:20;32:3;	211:1,2
92:7	chance (5)	China (3)	55:22:58:6.17:62:7.10.	CME (1)
Center (15)	208.16 17.211.5	237.467	11.64.3.9.14.65.13.	79.19
5.14.28.2 4.84.22	257:14:274:8	choice (6)	66.16.60.6 9.71.6 11 14	CMO(1)
J.14, J0. J, 4, 04.22,	257.14,274.8		15 72 10 72 2 14 75 9	
109:18,20;113:11,15,18;	change (26)	9:13,22;15:13;41:7;	15;72:10;73:2,14;75:8,	54:5
114:21;115:6;116:4;	89.3.109.6.113.13.	145:8;152:17	16;76:4;79:8,15,21;81:1,	CMS (1)
104 11 100 10 045 7	07.5,107.0,115.15,	,		
124:11;139:10;245:7	135:16;137:18;142:2;	choices (2)	4,8;85:11;87:10,19;	114:5
124:11;139:10;245:7 centers (9)	135:16;137:18;142:2; 148:3:161:22:187:2:	<b>choices (2)</b> 124:21:287:14	4,8;85:11;87:10,19; 89:5:92:20:93:20:96:11:	114:5 CNS (2)
124:11;139:10;245:7 centers (9) 112:5:113:7:127:9:	135:16;137:18;142:2; 148:3;161:22;187:2; 191:67:228:214:247:6;	choices (2) 124:21;287:14 choose (5)	4,8;85:11;87:10,19; 89:5;92:20;93:20;96:11; 97:14 19:98:4 14:99:9:	114:5 CNS (2) 205:13:247:20
124:11;139:10;245:7 centers (9) 112:5;113:7;127:9; 136:12:137:19:152:4:	135:16;137:18;142:2; 148:3;161:22;187:2; 191:6,7;228:2,14;247:6; 249:17:277:7.0:202:4	choices (2) 124:21;287:14 choose (5) 26:19:124:15 10 20:	4,8;85:11;87:10,19; 89:5;92:20;93:20;96:11; 97:14,19;98:4,14;99:9; 103:16:104:22:108:4	114:5 CNS (2) 205:13;247:20 coach (2)
<b>centers (9)</b> 112:5;113:7;127:9; 136:12;137:18;153:4;	135:16;137:18;142:2; 148:3;161:22;187:2; 191:6,7;228:2,14;247:6; 249:17;277:7,9;292:4;	choices (2) 124:21;287:14 choose (5) 26:19;124:15,19,20;	4,8;85:11;87:10,19; 89:5;92:20;93:20;96:11; 97:14,19;98:4,14;99:9; 103:16;104:22;108:4,8;	114:5 CNS (2) 205:13;247:20 coach (2)
124:11;139:10;245:7 centers (9) 112:5;113:7;127:9; 136:12;137:18;153:4; 187:2;222:21;227:10	135:16;137:18;142:2; 148:3;161:22;187:2; 191:6,7;228:2,14;247:6; 249:17;277:7,9;292:4; 306:20;309:6;311:3,20,	choices (2) 124:21;287:14 choose (5) 26:19;124:15,19,20; 125:22	4,8;85:11;87:10,19; 89:5;92:20;93:20;96:11; 97:14,19;98:4,14;99:9; 103:16;104:22;108:4,8; 109:14;111:6;113:5;	114:5 CNS (2) 205:13;247:20 coach (2) 123:13;191:16
124:11;139:10;245:7 centers (9) 112:5;113:7;127:9; 136:12;137:18;153:4; 187:2;222:21;227:10 central (15)	135:16;137:18;142:2; 148:3;161:22;187:2; 191:6,7;228:2,14;247:6; 249:17;277:7,9;292:4; 306:20;309:6;311:3,20, 20;313:10,12,13	choices (2) 124:21;287:14 choose (5) 26:19;124:15,19,20; 125:22 chosen (1)	4,8;85:11;87:10,19; 89:5;92:20;93:20;96:11; 97:14,19;98:4,14;99:9; 103:16;104:22;108:4,8; 109:14;111:6;113:5; 114:14,17;115:10,22;	114:5 CNS (2) 205:13;247:20 coach (2) 123:13;191:16 coaching (5)
124:11;139:10;245:7 centers (9) 112:5;113:7;127:9; 136:12;137:18;153:4; 187:2;222:21;227:10 central (15) 19:18;24:15,18;26:7;	135:16;137:18;142:2; 148:3;161:22;187:2; 191:6,7;228:2,14;247:6; 249:17;277:7,9;292:4; 306:20;309:6;311:3,20, 20;313:10,12,13 <b>changed (4)</b>	choices (2) 124:21;287:14 choose (5) 26:19;124:15,19,20; 125:22 chosen (1) 9:15	4,8;85:11;87:10,19; 89:5;92:20;93:20;96:11; 97:14,19;98:4,14;99:9; 103:16;104:22;108:4,8; 109:14;111:6;113:5; 114:14,17;115:10,22; 116:7;117:1;119:3;	114:5 <b>CNS (2)</b> 205:13;247:20 <b>coach (2)</b> 123:13;191:16 <b>coaching (5)</b> 67:3;191:20;308:10,
124:11;139:10;245:7 centers (9) 112:5;113:7;127:9; 136:12;137:18;153:4; 187:2;222:21;227:10 central (15) 19:18;24:15,18;26:7; 53:9;59:14:66:1.8:76:2:	135:16;137:18;142:2; 148:3;161:22;187:2; 191:6,7;228:2,14;247:6; 249:17;277:7,9;292:4; 306:20;309:6;311:3,20, 20;313:10,12,13 <b>changed (4)</b> 13:8;88:4:166:5:209:5	choices (2) 124:21;287:14 choose (5) 26:19;124:15,19,20; 125:22 chosen (1) 9:15 chronic (7)	4,8;85:11;87:10,19; 89:5;92:20;93:20;96:11; 97:14,19;98:4,14;99:9; 103:16;104:22;108:4,8; 109:14;111:6;113:5; 114:14,17;115:10,22; 116:7;117:1;119:3; 120:7,15,17:121:3:	114:5 <b>CNS (2)</b> 205:13;247:20 <b>coach (2)</b> 123:13;191:16 <b>coaching (5)</b> 67:3;191:20;308:10, 14;315:4
124:11;139:10;245:7 centers (9) 112:5;113:7;127:9; 136:12;137:18;153:4; 187:2;222:21;227:10 central (15) 19:18;24:15,18;26:7; 53:9;59:14;66:1,8;76:2; 89:4:138:2:177:22	135:16;137:18;142:2; 148:3;161:22;187:2; 191:6,7;228:2,14;247:6; 249:17;277:7,9;292:4; 306:20;309:6;311:3,20, 20;313:10,12,13 <b>changed (4)</b> 13:8;88:4;166:5;209:5 <b>changes (10)</b>	choices (2) 124:21;287:14 choose (5) 26:19;124:15,19,20; 125:22 chosen (1) 9:15 chronic (7) 16:3:42:12 21:49:11:	4,8;85:11;87:10,19; 89:5;92:20;93:20;96:11; 97:14,19;98:4,14;99:9; 103:16;104:22;108:4,8; 109:14;111:6;113:5; 114:14,17;115:10,22; 116:7;117:1;119:3; 120:7,15,17;121:3; 122:5:124:10.14:126:7	114:5 <b>CNS (2)</b> 205:13;247:20 <b>coach (2)</b> 123:13;191:16 <b>coaching (5)</b> 67:3;191:20;308:10, 14;315:4 <b>co-author (1)</b>
124:11;139:10;245:7 centers (9) 112:5;113:7;127:9; 136:12;137:18;153:4; 187:2;222:21;227:10 central (15) 19:18;24:15,18;26:7; 53:9;59:14;66:1,8;76:2; 89:4;138:2;177:22; 178:8:204:14:214:7	135:16;137:18;142:2; 148:3;161:22;187:2; 191:6,7;228:2,14;247:6; 249:17;277:7,9;292:4; 306:20;309:6;311:3,20, 20;313:10,12,13 <b>changed (4)</b> 13:8;88:4;166:5;209:5 <b>changes (10)</b> 87:21:187:6:100:10;	choices (2) 124:21;287:14 choose (5) 26:19;124:15,19,20; 125:22 chosen (1) 9:15 chronic (7) 16:3;42:12,21;49:11; 80:21 21:86:2	4,8;85:11;87:10,19; 89:5;92:20;93:20;96:11; 97:14,19;98:4,14;99:9; 103:16;104:22;108:4,8; 109:14;111:6;113:5; 114:14,17;115:10,22; 116:7;117:1;119:3; 120:7,15,17;121:3; 122:5;124:10,14;126:7, 22:130:2:132:10.	114:5 CNS (2) 205:13;247:20 coach (2) 123:13;191:16 coaching (5) 67:3;191:20;308:10, 14;315:4 co-author (1) 324:2
124:11;139:10;245:7 centers (9) 112:5;113:7;127:9; 136:12;137:18;153:4; 187:2;222:21;227:10 central (15) 19:18;24:15,18;26:7; 53:9;59:14;66:1,8;76:2; 89:4;138:2;177:22; 178:8;204:14;214:7	135:16;137:18;142:2; 148:3;161:22;187:2; 191:6,7;228:2,14;247:6; 249:17;277:7,9;292:4; 306:20;309:6;311:3,20, 20;313:10,12,13 <b>changed (4)</b> 13:8;88:4;166:5;209:5 <b>changes (10)</b> 87:21;187:6;190:19; 200:17:210.11.11.14	choices (2) 124:21;287:14 choose (5) 26:19;124:15,19,20; 125:22 chosen (1) 9:15 chronic (7) 16:3;42:12,21;49:11; 80:21,21;86:3 chronic (1)	4,8;85:11;87:10,19; 89:5;92:20;93:20;96:11; 97:14,19;98:4,14;99:9; 103:16;104:22;108:4,8; 109:14;111:6;113:5; 114:14,17;115:10,22; 116:7;117:1;119:3; 120:7,15,17;121:3; 122:5;124:10,14;126:7, 22;130:2;133:19; 124:19:10	114:5 CNS (2) 205:13;247:20 coach (2) 123:13;191:16 coaching (5) 67:3;191:20;308:10, 14;315:4 co-author (1) 324:2 coaching (1)

101:5 coded (1) 16:21 coffee (3) 3:11:96:1:261:4 cognitive (1) 262:6 cognizant (4) 48:22;214:18;251:8; 259:18 coherent (2) 20:15:44:15 collaborative (1) 173:21 collaboratively (1) 28:8 collate (1) 130:11 colleague (1) 24:5 colleagues (3) 24:2;30:6;285:14 collect (8) 33:21;37:18,19;74:10; 75:17,19;125:16;185:5 collected (3) 38:15;160:21;163:12 collecting (3) 27:21;37:3;155:2 collection (1) 282:21 colloquially (1) 102:10 collusion (1) 46:5 column (5) 298:19:299:3:302:10: 311:17:312:6 combat (1) 257:21 combination (3) 13:9:90:16:116:19 combinations (2) 108:22;241:4 combine (1) 296:21 combined (3) 140:6;156:3;283:8 combining (3) 227:18;308:11;312:7 comfortable (1) 134:5 coming (14) 23:10;31:10;32:19; 59:3;85:2;97:15;158:20; 184:22;185:6;211:1; 212:2;240:20;248:9; 252:12 comment (39) 30:1:31:16:55:10: 62:16:64:12.14:82:10. 21;87:1,2;88:7;89:18; 93:15;127:16;128:2;

136:11;146:14;181:22; 182:1.22:186:18:202:2: 203:7:208:18:210:12: 212:19:215:8:219:5.7. 12;222:13,15;233:20,21; 237:19;244:4;256:9; 285:8:287:2 comments (24) 5:3;52:7;54:19;66:14; 76:2;78:20;96:18;101:2; 183:11;201:20;203:9; 207:7;211:4,16;244:3; 251:18;252:1,21; 280:22:301:5:311:15: 313:15;319:3;323:16 commercial (8) 20:20;29:3,4,8;47:17; 111:6;140:9;147:20 committee (1) 96:16 committees (2) 48:5:171:15 common (5) 48:7;108:8;222:11; 247:4;273:4 communicated (1) 278:5 community (6) 34:16;59:6;63:10; 118:14:295:4.18 Como (1) 24:5 comorbid (1) 131:4 comorbidities (1) 164:1 companies (19) 20:20;32:5;53:1; 98:15;124:18;141:18, 20:142:12,15,17,21; 143:5:145:7:146:2: 149:8;184:17;189:11; 192:20;196:5 companion (1) 11:12 company (25) 48:13;54:5;98:15; 117:13;140:8;144:14; 145:2,2;147:8;148:12, 13;168:9;172:13;173:2, 22;179:20;185:11; 191:4;194:1;236:14,15; 299:6,11,16,16 comparative (8) 229:7;238:6;239:11; 240:2,15,22;243:21; 244:16 comparator (1) 225:10 compare (2) 224:17;251:4 compared (4) 63:9;104:3;201:9,9

comparing (1) 227:4 comparison (2) 44:6:115:8 compelling (2) 133:8;244:17 compensated (1) 65:7 compensation (3) 64:13:127:4,4 competing (1) 290:11 competition (1) 66:7 complain (1) 62:13 complaining (1) 144:11 complementary (3) 23:15;223:22;224:10 complete (5) 9:16;32:14;282:4; 304:22;306:5 completed (3) 286:6;317:13,14 completely (16) 51:13;63:22;64:18; 79:22;117:11;121:22; 202:2;206:17;240:21; 277:17,18:290:6:291:3: 312:17:317:15:324:3 completion (1) 63:2 complex (9) 142:6;144:3;152:21; 153:12,22;154:8;241:3, 4:281:10 complexity (7) 126:7,14;144:4; 153:10,21;154:2;224:13 Compliance (5) 33:3,5;34:1;117:15; 169:15 compliant (3) 94:5,7;115:20 complicated (4) 16:9;63:19;154:10; 177:21 complicating (1) 16:1 complication (1) 270:21 complications (1) 125:14 compliment (1) 183:14 comply (1) 27:4 component (5) 19:4;114:4;177:2; 187:11:214:21 components (2) 126:7;214:1

compound (3) 51:10:105:7:149:10 compounds (1) 108:7 comprehensive (1) 215:4 compromise (2) 215:2:311:4 compromises (1) 215:4 compulsion (1) 223:10 **Computational** (1) 11:14 computer (1) 63:17 computing (3) 5:13;21:5,9 con (1) 51:3 **CONAGHAN (3)** 319:20:321:10:323:11 concealment (2) 276:16;277:3 concept (10) 71:7;101:13;188:11, 13;211:21;221:9;242:6; 286:16;288:16;309:3 concepts (4) 70:12:103:5.6:163:18 concern (17) 10:1:19:2:58:18: 59:20:61:4:122:6:160:2. 6:163:22:169:2:175:7: 229:10:239:13:269:19. 22;276:15;298:15 concerned (12) 12:22:60:10:122:4: 123:19;135:3;158:2,12; 169:10;177:8;230:13; 231:14;319:21 concerning (1) 25:20 concerns (8) 8:14;28:15;33:6; 49:11;56:2;99:16;234:5; 273:17 conclusions (2) 6:3;22:18 concomitant (3) 13:7;16:13:131:4 condition (5) 42:4,5;159:7;258:1; 292:21 conditions (1) 131:5 conduct (7) 9:1;52:8;72:22;73:9; 93:20;301:8;307:13 conducted (4) 27:3;44:8;213:7; 279:19 conducting (1)

185:20 conference (2) 126:4:252:18 confidence (3) 108:19;133:22;210:3 confident (1) 83:20 confidentiality (1) 290:7 confines (1) 270:1 confirm (5) 221:9,14,17;222:7; 307:8 confirmatory (2) 102:4;107:2 confirming (1) 90:11 conflated (1) 15:5 confuse (1) 159:5 confused (1) 183:14 confusion (2) 41:1;206:7 conglomerate (1) 238:10 congratulate (1) 96:9 Congress (1) 152:2 connected (1) 89:12 connecting (1) 54:14 connotations (1) 20:13 cons(1) 319:13 consensus (3) 246:14:261:2:271:6 consent (4) 25:21;113:22;278:16, 21 consequence (2) 77:1;216:9 consequences (3) 77:13;78:11;91:8 **Consequently** (1) 148:20 consider (11) 14:21;41:7;58:8,9; 94:10;225:2,15;250:12; 269:1;281:21;291:10 consideration (2) 103:9;178:19 considerations (14) 3:20;26:14;109:17; 137:20;150:18;159:18; 261:21,22;271:18; 273:1;280:13;311:18,

19;322:13

considered (7) 9:7:46:21:87:9:94:12: 153:18:176:2:298:14 considering (1) 19:10 consistency (7) 102:13;160:11,17; 161:2;170:22;227:9; 272:14 consistent (2) 94:17;123:8 consistently (1) 235:13 consisting (1) 96:16 console (1) 110:12 consolidated (3) 110:15,17;137:17 **Consortium** (1) 7:19 constant (1) 228:7 constipation (1) 118:3 construct (4) 101:14;206:16;210:6; 293:17 constructed (1) 103:3 constructs (1) 101:19 consulting (1) 100:18 consuming (2) 18:12;80:11 consumption (1) 98:22 contact (1) 312:20 contacted (1) 303:15 contacts (2) 33:4,12 contain (2) 158:8,11 contend (1) 120:14 content (1) 10:8 contents (1) 5:16 context (8) 13:21;289:22;298:14; 310:1,2;311:7,7,9 contexts (1) 311:11 contingencies (1) 177:13 continued (1) 312:17 continuing (1) 197:6

continuous (1) 262:20:267:15 191:10 coordinators (22) contract (9) 140:5.5:144:5.7: 146:17;147:20;185:16; 81:5;82:15;88:14,17; 189:10;190:2 121:3;123:5;133:20; 145:12,19;175:18; contracted (2) 66:18,19 212:20:263:6 co-primaries (1) contracting (10) 66:14,15,17;67:14; 152:18 68:22;111:10,12; core (5) 187:15:188:3:189:5 117:6;119:13;127:3; contracts (8) 138:17;297:14 62:22;146:15,16; corner (1) 167:10;189:7,13;190:9; 117:14 191:2 corporate (1) contradict (1) 80:15 correction (10) 167:4 Contrary (2) 166:22;196:18 contrast (1) 7,14:316:18 139:9 corrections (7) contribution (1) 92:19;93:17;95:17; 255:12 control (12) 319:1 17:2,15;31:5;117:12; corrective (8) 146:9;213:11,12; 218:10;222:9;225:17; 93:14,14 227:21;228:8 correctly (7) controllable (2) 13:14:17:3:34:6; 218:11,13 106:9;178:1,3;274:8 controlled (6) correlate (1) 49:4;108:9;166:2; 206:15 correlated (1) 229:2:238:19:242:1 controlling (1) 171:2 228:1 correspond (1) conversation (3) 7:7 128:18:208:13:212:21 correspondence (1) conversations (5) 4:17corresponding (1) 3:21:59:16:146:8: 167:16;212:21 18:19 conversely (2) Corv (1) 20:3;203:21 238:14 convert (1) **cost** (9) 128:17 24:17;146:6;150:20, convince (1) 214:18;243:4 123:11 Costello (1) convinced (3) 238:15;259:7;274:2 230:3 cool(3)costly (2) 55:6;155:14;201:11 80:10:308:3 Cooner (1) costs (1) 24:331:11 cooperation (1) counted (1) 49:5 323:20 coordinated (1) countervailing (1) 4:16181:9 coordinating (2) countries (6) 84:22;324:8 25:11;51:19;156:12; coordinator (14) 160:3:287:5:288:1 5:14;53:11,12;54:3; country (4) 56:1,8,15;69:13;121:14; 288:5 122:5;134:16;153:13;

counts (1) 250:13 25:18:53:17:55:13.16. couple (16) 19:70:9:71:1.7:79:4.14: 3:3:26:14:72:17.19: 76:2;121:11;181:20; 191:13;213:5;240:9; 243:9;246:21;261:9; 290:20;295:7;321:14 course (41) 10:2;14:2,2,4;15:11; 25:14;30:9;36:2;45:7; 50:4;51:3;64:7,16;90:8; 91:8,10;95:17;110:7; 129:11;147:14,17;160:2, 5;171:19;172:18; 206:10;210:8;219:14; 254:2;264:21;265:2,11; 267:11,22;269:19; 92:15;182:21;267:19; 282:5;294:14;298:5; 297:21;298:2,20;304:3, 307:9;317:17,19 covariates (1) 279:21 cover (4) 298:13;313:6;318:20; 134:8;243:14;256:6; 288:22 covered (2) 89:6,13,15,19;90:2,14; 83:18;170:16 covering (1) 147:14 covert (1) 127:20 Cowan (1) 256:8 **COWS (3)** 133:15,16,19 **CRA** (6) 54:3;69:13;144:19; 182:9,12;184:1 **CRAs (9)** 52:17,21;86:21; 145:10.12.12.17.19: 170:14 crazy (2) 184:6;309:5 create (7) 17:20;62:10,22;63:11; 21;151:2;153:6;212:5; 68:22;83:11;196:7 created (4) 82:4,11;86:11;152:2 creates (1) 111:13 creating (4) 53:18;97:1;154:10; 177:7 creation (2) 102:20:103:1 creative (1) 191:15 creep (3) 181:18:253:21,22 creeping (1) 51:16:136:20:286:14; 287:7 CRFs (1)

June 5, 2015

74:2 crisis (2) 247:8;257:7 crisp (2) 181:12,18 criteria (20) 42:18;59:12,22;60:2, 3,6,7,18;61:7;62:2,17; 65:18,19;126:8;127:21; 154:19;162:14;171:7; 269:7;300:21 criterion (1) 257:10 critical (5) 19:7;45:11;239:7; 281:3;302:13 **CRO (34)** 34:18;48:13;49:10; 51:20;54:4;68:8,14; 80:15;139:22;140:15; 144:13,15:145:6,8; 146:12,15,21;156:20; 157:11;158:20;168:3,3, 8;173:11,22;184:14,20; 189:12;191:1,3;192:21; 193:3;210:22;302:4 **CROs (20)** 34:12;48:8;50:21; 53:21,22,22;98:14; 124:18;139:11;144:21; 171:6:189:12:192:13, 18:193:11:194:3:199:3: 289:3.3.20 cross (3) 93:6:133:7:223:10 crossover (4) 118:8,10;132:3;138:4 Crosstalk (7) 57:22;83:2;275:18; 305:9,15:306:9,21 crude (1) 260:10 CT (1) 231:4 CTSA (1) 112:20 **CTSI** (1) 112:20 cumbersome (1) 308:3 cumulatively (1) 274:7 curiosity (1) 304:16 curious (5) 31:13;37:12;56:20; 180:5,13 current (2) 68:5;196:5 currently (2) 140:4:215:19 curriculum (1) 64:2

ourres (1)	210.16	22.17.196.14	212.5	doct (1)
curve (1)	319:16	32:17;180:14	312:5	desk (1)
182:14	database (6)	Dean (1)	delivered (1)	207:10
customers ¹ (1)	33:9;48:20;91:4;	184:13	240:14	desperate (1)
150:14	95:18;300:1,14	decentralized (1)	delivery (1)	257:17
cut (1)	data's $(1)$	/9:9	118:15	Despite (3)
256:20	234:18	deception (1)	Deming (2)	236:14;237:9;257:3
cutaneous (1)	date (3)	257:5	6:6,9	detail (3)
104:18	12:1,2;82:7	decide (6)	demographics (1)	154:5;218:22;265:5
cutting (1)	dates (1)	40:4;76:8,16;126:1;	11:4	detailed (1)
31:11	44:3	148:15;215:3	demonstrate (4)	77:11
CVs (1)	dating (1)	decided (1)	156:8,10;242:7,16	details (8)
138:16	181:14	232:19	demonstrated (2)	19:6;102:15,18,22;
cycle (2)	Dave (10)	deciding (2)	109:1;139:4	105:11;114:6;175:2;
38:13;150:7	189:5;290:19,20;	62:14;77:6	demonstrating (2)	206:2
	291:11;299:4,5,14,19;	decision (5)	149:11;223:15	detect (9)
D	308:6,7	40:3;65:17;152:18;	Dennis (9)	76:21,22;77:20;101:9;
	David (29)	159:16;173:3	53:16;80:1;100:1;	108:13;138:18;214:20;
daily (3)	56:10,11;70:5;80:6,	decisions (5)	232:12;262:2;266:21;	242:2;243:5
192:1,3;281:5	17;122:3;124:19;	59:11;91:3;121:7;	311:14;317:15;322:14	detection (7)
damn (3)	139:14,16;175:3,19;	142:2,6	department (10)	19:22;20:12,22;23:19;
71:21;216:15;313:6	181:21;182:1;192:11;	deck (1)	114:11,13,13,13;	72:6;180:15;181:6
danced (1)	198:6;204:2;210:20;	184:10	117:8;118:14;185:7,13,	determine (4)
265:15	211:8;219:6;232:11;	decrease (2)	17;188:2	10:21;21:12;27:18;
dancer (1)	252:15;258:16;263:2;	153:16,17	departments (2)	90:5
227:1	269:10,11;270:5,14;	decreases (2)	114:15,20	devalue (1)
dangerous (1)	312:16;319:11	153:11;278:13	depend (1)	241:19
246:6	David's (3)	dedicated (4)	102:3	develop (8)
dangers (1)	263:5;299:20;300:4	86:18;116:12;160:19;	depending (4)	7:22;22:2;23:17;28:9;
133:3	dawns (1)	276:6	22:4;301:13;311:9;	102:6;125:1;189:10;
data (159)	302:20	deep (1)	318:22	216:19
3:21;5:16;6:1,4;7:18,	day (21)	311:22	depends (2)	developed (3)
22;8:1,4,6,13,14,21,21;	3:16;59:17;75:2;	deeper (1)	194:7;270:9	148:22;188:20;235:17
9:2,4,8;10:14;11:7,18,	115:12,15,17;121:7;	129:16	de-risking (2)	developer (1)
21;12:9;13:1;16:1;18:6;	125:2,8;127:6;136:3,5;	deeply (2)	149:8;150:13	47:21
19:7,9,20;20:5,12,14,16,	178:17,18;186:1;210:2;	104:20;273:21	described (2)	developers (1)
22;21:20,21;22:3,4,13,	225:7;239:8;262:21;	defend (1)	38:8;211:19	47:17
14;23:5,19;27:5,6,21;	303:6;308:16	150:21	describing (2)	developing (7)
28:21,22;30:16;32:20;	days (15)	defense (1)	34:5;224:5	19:11;136:13;150:20;
34:1;37:2,15;38:5,6,7,	27:18;39:15;75:16;	219:19	design (36)	196:6;287:12;297:10,18
15;43:10,17,18,19,22;	79:20;220:13;243:9;	defenses (1)	5:17;7:1;9:1;23:10;	development (12)
44:22;45:6,15;46:9;	244:3;254:19;255:4;	253:5	46:3;72:22;73:9;74:12;	8:18;20:21;44:16;
47:7;51:9,19,21;65:22;	261:18;263:16;264:12;	define (2)	107:18,19,19;108:6;	47:18;148:11;149:19;
67:17,18,22;69:12;72:7,	265:7;306:12;317:13	310:1;311:7	118:4;126:8;138:1;	150:7;221:7,12,16;
15,21,21;73:4,20;74:1,	day-to-day (1)	defines (1)	140:21;155:8,10;	222:7;277:7
10,14;75:4,5,8,17,19,22;	139:13	128:9	217:11;218:2;235:22;	develops (3)
77:17;90:1;92:5,12;	<b>DB</b> (1)	defining (1)	245:20;251:22;265:8;	133:13,18;278:10
93:1;106:7;109:16;	24:2	82:14	279:7;280:5,15;281:10;	deviate (1)
114:9;131:9;136:11;	de (2)	definitely (14)	282:16,20;285:2;293:4;	298:8
141:3;146:10;155:2;	50:6;303:3	5:4;22:19;47:2,9;	301:13;308:19;312:15;	deviations (2)
160:21;161:22;162:1;	dead (3)	131:22;132:1,16;	316:9	171:9;318:4
170:7;171:14;172:6,7,	31:15;317:21,22	140:18;155:18;182:7;	designation (1)	deviators (1)
10,17;179:17;180:14;	deafferented (1)	197:21;316:15;322:4,11	270:16	318:14
182:4;184:2,3;193:3;	105:4	definition (1)	designed (5)	device (3)
194:3;215:6;223:5,5;	deal (11)	266:11	8:22;108:17;236:8;	28:1;118:1;272:4
233:11,13,20;237:5;	16:17;36:21;73:6;	definitions (2)	299:13;312:14	devices (6)
238:16;247:8;249:19;	83:4;136:5,6;225:16;	261:14;297:2	designing (7)	28:3;55:1;230:4,6,8;
254:22;255:6;264:4;	250:17;282:10;316:4;	degree (2)	89:20;134:19;279:15;	295:5
268:2;269:8,8;272:4;	320:18	64:5,9	281:1;297:10,18;301:8	DEVINE (5)
281:2,4,5,6,17,21;282:4,	dealing (8)	delegated (1)	designs (8)	45:17,19;217:16;
6,6,9,20;285:4;292:3;	8:19;9:3;25:11;73:1;	25:20	152:16;155:6;173:8,	257:3;291:12
293:5;299:21;300:5,5;	86:8;133:13;167:20;	delegation (1)	10,12,14,14,18	Devine's (1)
302:19;306:20;315:3,7;	252:22	25:16	desire (1)	256:19
316:5;318:10,11,16;	dealt (2)	deleting (1)	70:14	diabetes (1)

81:2 diabetic (1) 42:14 diagnose (1) 76:18 diagnosis (1) 137:2 diagnostic (1) 76:17 diagram (3) 54:12;132:12;136:18 diaries (12) 169:11,13,14,17,20; 178:13;271:7;272:8,9, 11;286:7;320:14 diary (10) 94:6,8;162:22;272:5; 303:11;304:22;306:5; 307:19;308:16,17 dichotomy (1) 211:17 die (1) 17:8 Diego (1) 248:3 difference (17) 39:1;104:14;108:13; 123:22;124:2,3;193:16; diner (1) 197:3,3;222:17;227:5; 232:11:235:20:244:22; 308:9,22;321:20 differences (9) 20:10;77:20;141:17; 171:3.3:205:13:210:4: 222:12:319:17 different (96) 14:14:16:16,16:30:22; 39:7;59:7;66:2;72:3; 77:13;78:2,7;84:20; 99:6 102:8;103:10,15,18; 104:8,12;105:9;107:12; 110:1;113:15;114:12,18, dirty (1) 19;116:13;117:5,10,11; 126:2,6;127:8;130:18; 131:3,5;133:15;134:13; 137:22;140:13;142:14, 16;162:15,16;165:19,21; 182:6;194:17,17; 199:20;213:19;214:1,5; 43:4 217:1;221:20;224:4,19; 226:17,21;227:7,8; 229:14,15;230:8,18,20; 231:22;232:1;233:4; 238:10;241:12,13,16; 64:5 242:10,10,11;244:12,12, 13;247:14;253:2; 257:18;259:8;271:1; 280:6;281:12;286:22; 287:10,19;288:1;291:3, 5;305:19,20;308:18; 320:4:323:1 differential (7) 66:3,5,5;77:21;91:18;

discordance (5) 102:6:104:8 differentially (2) 200:5;263:21;264:20; 105:1.8 266:5.7differentiate (3) discordances (3) 111:20;112:13;214:13 264:8;265:8;281:22 differentiation (2) discover (1) 216:9;224:18 18:3 discovered (1) differently (7) 107:9;109:10;129:13; 95:19 130:1:132:8:196:13: discrepancies (1) 198:13 264:8 difficult (9) discrepancy (1) 9:20;29:15;34:15; 263:22 39:9;64:22;67:17;71:8; discrete (1) 148:19;309:3 23:9 discretionary (1) difficulties (2) 39:19;218:10 60:19 Digest (1) discuss (2) 70:12;220:15 143:3 **Dignity** (1) discussed (9) 189:22 71:12;94:19,21; diligence (1) 154:15;211:18;239:3; 236:13 317:2;319:13;320:2 dimension (2) discussing (2) 256:3;266:10 97:9;196:17 Discussion (20) diminished (1) 184:8 24:8;43:9;56:11; 67:11;70:20;72:5;97:11; 57:20 174:12,18;195:7; direct (2) 207:21;218:21;231:2; 121:10:128:13 232:5,22;256:22;261:2, directed (1) 12:266:21:288:13 192:11 discussions (5) direction (4) 96:6:97:3:184:13: 8:3,10:248:20:249:17 220:21;286:18 directly (2) disease (24) 40:5;41:7;46:12,22; 24:13:32:22 director (1) 117:4:145:4:147:17: 156:10,14;158:5;160:8, directors (1) 14:165:17:166:17; 13:17 169:22:177:17:193:21: 199:7.8.11:226:19; 69:13 237:6;252:22;264:15 disadvantage (1) diseases (1) 187:20 257:10 disagree (3) disengaging (1) 226:11;231:1;242:5 216:4 disorder (1) disappear (1) 46:17 disappeared (1) disposition (1) 236:11 269:9 disappears (1) disregard (1) 240:12 239:1 disciplines' (1) disrupt (1) 289:7 disclaimer (2) disseminate (2) 5:20;61:12 219:18;220:1 disclosures (1) disseminated (1) 140:3 220:22 disconnect (2) distance (1) 34:21:68:17 150:1 discontinued (1) distinct (3) 154:20 95:12;222:11;277:7

distinction (3) 14:11:73:17:197:7 distinguished (1) 33:22 distorted (1) 91:19 **Distribution** (1) 19:20 disturb (1) 135:7 disturbed (1) 253:17 diverse (2) 110:1;116:4 diversion (1) 269:21 diversity (2) 165:8,9 dividing (1) 27:16 division (2) 13:17;111:16 dizziness (3) 278:7,11,14 dizzy (1) 278:9 **DMC (2)** 48:21;90:17 **DMCs** (2) 48:5:171:14 doctor (2) 159:14:287:9 doctors (2) 56:6:287:6 document (8) 6:19;9:16;71:10; 137:9,16;240:3;287:22; 318:16 documentation (1) 134:10 documented (2) 44:21:299:1 documents (5) 6:13;10:18;33:22; 34:8;136:15 doesn't (1) 213:12 dog (1) 12:18 dollars (3) 188:13;238:14;253:15 domain (2) 11:4,5 domains (4) 11:4;13:7;23:9;266:7 dominant (1) 136:19 don't (1) 228:2 done (69) 4:11;27:13;37:19,20; 38:17;39:5;43:17;51:16; 56:20;57:14;68:20;83:8;

84:12:90:8,16:94:20; 95:16.18:98:11:104:2: 119:7:133:15.21:134:1; 145:5;146:7;154:3,3; 159:7;162:18;179:9; 180:6,9;184:7,18,21; 186:3;189:8;191:21; 194:5,21;198:18;199:9; 201:15;207:15;210:7; 217:11;218:3,4;222:20; 224:9;234:2;238:18; 239:10:247:12:259:15; 274:13;276:14;277:9; 287:11;288:11;289:11, 12:293:18:296:1; 297:12;308:14;310:9; 319:5 doomed (1) 233:10 door (2) 3:16;201:19 dose (3) 149:14;155:13;177:5 doses (1) 269:18 dosing (1) 105:15 dot (3) 116:5,5;223:10 double (1) 233:7 down (23) 22:3;44:21;60:14; 62:21;96:7;102:22; 113:4;116:5;119:9; 125:17;126:11;131:3; 137:14;163:11;178:17; 189:14;243:13;280:8; 294:17;297:1;306:13; 309:14:323:20 downsides (1) 28:2 downstream (1) 56:12 **DPN** (1) 204:3 **DR (286)** 5:11,20;7:14,17;20:8; 24:9;27:14,15;28:12; 29:2,4,7,15,20;30:2,3; 32:22;33:18;34:3,4; 35:3,11,19;36:6;38:20; 39:3;41:11,13,14,22; 42:2,3,8;43:2,7,8,20; 44:18;45:16,17,18,19; 47:14;48:2,3;50:10,12; 51:12;52:3;53:5;54:10, 17;56:10,22;57:2,11; 58:13;60:12;61:14,19; 63:21;66:12;67:15;69:2, 3;70:1,2;71:19,20;72:2; 78:14,15,19;80:4,17; 81:6;82:4,10,20,21;83:3;

84.3 22.87.1 2.88.6.	130.7.132.18	dunlicate (9)	279.13.319.5	214.20.223.5 15 16.
80.2 3 22.02.14 17.	drivon(2)	247.15.248.10 14 22.	279.13,319.3	232.4.20,223.5,15,10,
94.15.95.15 21.96.5 16	66:10:322:12	247.13,240.10,14,22,	119.6.260.21.286.18	232.4,242.10,244.3,7,
17.00.2 20 22.101.4	drives (1)	249.8,250.10,255.7,	119.0,200.21,200.10	243.8,231.10,232.0,
110.11.116.22.22	124.21	dunlicates (1)	288.14	270.7.275.6.310.20
121.20.122.17.127.16	$\frac{124.21}{\text{driving}(1)}$	2/7.21	200.14	efficient (6)
135.22.139.3 14 17	130.10	$\frac{2\pi7.21}{\text{duplicative (2)}}$	185.7.223.8.239.22	26.7 20.155.8.187.9
157.5.159.16.170.3	dron (2)	288.22.289.18	easily (1)	215:4:251:10
174.13.175.7.176.20	185:16:282:5	duration (1)	288.17	efficiently (2)
177.15.178.22.180.14	dropout (2)	126.10	Eastern (1)	26.16.242.19
181.21.182.2.16.21	105.17.18	during (12)	165.10	effort (15)
183.8 13 17 19.184.12	dropouts (1)	45:5:56:3:63:18:	easy (6)	17.12.26.11.29.5
13.186.17.188.7.189.4	205.12	80.13.82.6.90.7.197.18	42:22:57:9:65:1:	30.18.32.12.35.7.40.1
190.10.191.12 13.192.4	dropped (1)	206.15.219.14.285.10	235.6.249.4.289.2	76.7.88.9.92.9.189.15
6:193:10:195:5:197:2	63:8	16.19	eat (1)	193:14:213:13:227:13:
15:198:22:200:20:	drops (1)	DWORKIN (94)	228:15	262:3
201.3 13 17.202.1	182:8	34.4.35.11.42.8	ECG (1)	efforts (7)
203.6 9.204.7 11 16 21	Drug (63)	65.13.70.6.78.19.80.17	230:1	44.22:46.2.73.3
206.1.207.4 12 17	5.14.46.19.56.13	95:15:96:16:116:22:	echo (1)	92.12.117.11.190.7
210:13:211:9 15:219:7	70.16 16.107.3 14	162.4.192.4.243.20	51.12	207.14
232.15.235.9.239.15.	116.12.123.12.133.11	260.22.261.3.266.16	economic (3)	Efros $(4)$
232.13,233.9,239.13,	12 14.148.9.151.6	267:3:268:12 16:270:3	65:4:111:3:150:17	247.17.248.9.253.4
257.3.258.15.260.22	154.19 22.156.9 13	13 20:271:14:272:10 22:	editors (2)	290.8
261:3:266:16:267:3:	166.8.172.20.204.20	274.10.275.14 19	61.12.321.3	egregious (1)
268.12 16.270.3 13 20	205.15 18 19.216.14 17	277.22.278.20.279.3 10	educate (2)	48.15
21.271.14.272.10.22	19.221.7 12 16.222.7	12:281:16 20:282:3	158.22.260.6	eight (5)
274.10.275.14 19 21.	18.223.1 19 22.224.8	283.2 12.284.9 12 15	$\frac{130.22,200.0}{\text{educating (1)}}$	54.6.63.16.80.4
277.22.278.15 20.279.2	226.8.227.18.228.4 10	285.11 13.288.2.290.6	219.1	121:6:187:14
3 10 12:281:16 20:	220:0,227:10,220:1,10,	291.11 15.292.9.293.1	education (3)	either (25)
282.3.283.2 12.284.5 9	229:17,230:10,235:5,	291.11,15,292.9,295.1,	73.11.177.6 9	24.13.30.6.49.16
10 12 14 15 17 22:285:6	249.21.258.10.259.2	20:298:16 18:299:12 15:	educational (2)	52.21.60.21.69.20
11 12 13:286:10:288:2	270.1.274.3 16.275.8	300.6 11.301.3 12 22	73.12.321.4	75.10.87.22.90.10.91.7
12.290.6.291.11 15:	278.9 12.287.9.295.8	302.6.303.5 21.304.16	effect (23)	92.6 6.110.4.203.7
292.9 11.293.1 11.	10:316:6:317:7:318:15	305.10 16.306.3 14	104.5.158.3 13.161.8	211.4.214.14.245.4
292.9,11,293.1,11,	drugs (41)	307.6 10 22.309.9 12	162.7.165.15.169.7.8	273.14.278.21.281.17
12 20:298:16 18:299:12	57.10.59.2.81.20.20	311.8.312.2,509.9,12,	16:178:6:181:5:210:1:	287:15:291:8:303:17:
15:300:6 11 17:301:3	107.15.117.22 22	315.5 13 18.317.12.	214.13.238.9 10.242.3	309.19.312.5
11 12 22:302:6 9:303:5	125.4.148.21.149.2.20	318.2.319.3 5 9 19.	249.16.250.4 7.260.2	EKG (1)
19 21:304:16:305:10 16:	150.2 3 4 19 21.151.2	320.10.322.4.323.616	269.22.278.12.13	71.13
306:3.10.14.22:307:6	157:6.10:158:6:166:2:	19	effective (8)	EKGs (1)
10.13.22:309:9.12.22:	167:21:174:8:175:4:	Dworkin's (1)	4:20:13:16:149:2:	66:20
311.8.312.2.5.313.15	203.11 16 20 21.222.19	147.3	205.19.212.7.226.20	elaborate (1)
315.5 6 13 14 17 18	21.234.21.241.2	dyskinesias (1)	254.13.15	277.9
317.12.22.318.1.2	254.12.259.20.21	199.17	effectively (4)	electronic (19)
319.3 5 6 9 10 19 20.	260.1.262.7.269.15.20	dystrophy (1)	26.16.20.93.10	10.18.30.16.31.22
320:10:321:10:322:4	21:277:6	147:16	242:19	94:6.8:130:9:136:19:
15:323:6.11.16.19	drug's (3)	11,110	effectiveness (17)	162:22:169:14:178:13:
draft (2)	223:11:224:2:234:14	E	24:17:74:17.19:	240:8:267:9.13:271:22:
16:5:299:3	drum (1)		205:17:212:5:238:6:	272:2.4.9:274:15:307:19
drafted (3)	45:20	eager (1)	239:11.12:240:2.15.22:	electronically (2)
96.15.263.19.324.1	dry (1)	167.5	241.11.243.21.244.7	274.14.275.5
drafting (1)	117:14	earlier (13)	16:245:12:252:6	element (1)
305.17	DSMBs (2)	66.14.91.10.92.15	effects (9)	321.10
dramatic (2)	48:5:100:18	93:16:108:12:128:19:	105:19:152:11:224:3:	eligibility (3)
260:2:319:17	Duchenne (1)	130:5:136:10:146:13:	225:11:242:7:255:3.21:	269:7:282:15:300:21
drift (3)	147:16	207:13:211:10:221.18	268:22:275:3	eligible (1)
177:18:211:6:254:12	due (4)	257:12	efficacious (1)	98:21
drifting (1)	105:18:205:12:	early (17)	205:18	Eliminate (2)
176:14	236:13:290:21	11:1:27:18:97:13:	efficacy (29)	6:7:75:22
drill (1)	dump (1)	107:17:108:10:148:11	13:8;15:21:16:4:	else (11)
132:9	275:9	149:19;176:11:220:13:	17:10;74:17:149:15:	20:4;29:22:54:14:
Drive (5)	duopolies (1)	221:12;222:1;230:10:	155:18;170:19.20;	63:9;80:3;131:1:209:17:
128:22;129:1,10;	110:4	263:5;267:4;275:8;	171:20,22;200:15;	239:18;261:8;274:11;

275:4	ended (2)	160:20;161:6;164:11;	error (3)	240:13:245:6,6,7;
elsewhere (1)	108:10:322:22	172:8;174:6;303:15;	17:17;119:19;296:10	253:10:271:22:273:6;
42:16	endorse (3)	314:8	errors (5)	276:17;280:18;303:5;
EMA (2)	29:2;54:22;86:5	ensuring (3)	18:4:30:9:294:16;	306:15;314:21;321:16;
8:17;303:18	endorsements (1)	146:9;172:19;247:6	318:5,20	323:2,13
emails (1)	29:14	enter (3)	especially (5)	evening (1)
227:17	endpoint (5)	23:22;61:15;143:17	38:14;83:12;132:1;	12:17
embedded (2)	37:14;109:6;138:12;	entered (3)	233:2;324:9	event (12)
193:12;240:8	280:20;300:2	27:6;44:22;143:8	essence (1)	12:1,2;17:9;74:21;
embraced (1)	endpoints (8)	entering (2)	13:10	95:3;138:12;270:4,5,17,
6:22	23:11;37:18;75:18,19;	19:9;286:21	essential (3)	17,18;295:14
emerge (1)	152:19;164:9;200:17;	enterprise (3)	35:12;96:13;173:7	events (5)
12:9	320:19	6:16;113:18;297:20	essentially (5)	48:15;56:12;139:20;
Emersonian (1)	enemy (1)	enterprises (2)	22:2;65:7;73:3;218:5;	259:1;269:9
102:14	98:6	58:21;120:1	301:17	eventually (1)
Emory (1)	energized (1)	entertaining (1)	established (2)	96:14
36:18	100:10	70:21	221:22;222:1	everybody (21)
emphasis (2)	energy (1)	enthusiasm (4)	estimate (2)	56:5;63:17;79:16;
18:19;212:8	100:9	158:6,9,11;198:4	209:20;247:19	85:8;88:13;96:5;132:12;
emphasize (3)	engaged (1)	entire (9)	estimates (1)	160:11;165:3,5;194:18;
103:19;174:2;269:6	127:18	13:1;19:15;23:12;	209:15	196:12;210:2,17;
emphasized (2)	engagement (2)	43:21;95:11;117:1;	et (7)	222:14;227:12,15;
221:5;286:13	123:3;149:12	126:3;202:14;323:2	27:6,7;262:15;268:5,	228:3;233:2;235:14;
employ (1)	engines (1)	entirely (1)	14;297:6;320:14	282:4
173:17	111:3	76:9	ethical (6)	everybody's (2)
employed (1)	England (3)	entitle (1)	32:14;159:11,18;	37:13;228:7
13:15	72:18;73:22;290:21	232:19	225:13;255:15;256:2	everyone (14)
employee (1)	enhancing (1)	entity (1)	ethics (2)	3:2;20:4;45:20;54:13,
100:19	70:19	184:20	159:12;163:18	14;60:21;84:9,18;85:4;
employees (1)	enormous (4)	entry (4)	EU (I)	101:5;132:11;133:18;
110:17	32:11;/2:14;10/:5;	27:5;65:19;154:18;	24/:10	210:4;324:1
111.2	13/:8	257:17	Europe (8)	everywnere (1)
$\frac{111.5}{2}$	120.12	21.60.111.115.	35:18;30:4;87:4;	138.14 avidance (20)
12.12	130:13 enough (11)	21:0,9;111:1,13; 112:14:120:12:241:2	105:10;204:5;280:20;	27.2.05.18.100.1
15.15 EMD (1)	4.10.40.22.144.12.	115.14,120.12,241.2	207.1,200.15	27.2,93.10,109.1,
22.12	4.10,49.22,144.12, 146.11.161.5.162.8.	$241\cdot4$	204.8 10.287.5	109.20,198.11,250.15, 261.21.271.2,2,10,13
$\mathbf{FMR}_{\mathbf{c}}\left(2\right)$	140.11,101.5,102.0, 168.13.176.10.212.10.	271.7 environments (1)	204.0,19,207.3	10.272.13 16.273.24 0.
32.27	100.15,170.19,212.10,		evaluate (0)	
32.2,7	//1.0./41./1	117.16.117.10.	68.18.75.6.78.5 8.	321.19.322.8.12
enables (1)	221:0;241:21 enrich (1)	112:16;117:10; 238:11 12	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17:195:16	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6)
enables (1) 74.3	221:6;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14	112:16;117:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1)	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b>	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9:201:6:205:6:
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5)	enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1)	112:16;117:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14:13:8:18:9:19:13:	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20:294:21:321:17
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4.11:78:4:155:5:	221:0;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9	112:16;117:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Enic (3)	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21:77:12:107:8:	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2)
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17	221:0;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15)	112:16;117:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16:110:12:136:18	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20:302:15
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1)	221:0;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6:83:14:108:2:	112:16;117:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3)	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b>	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1)
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11	221:0;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2;	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1)	<b>enrich (1)</b> 162:14 <b>enriched (1)</b> 155:9 <b>enroll (15)</b> 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21:167:5;169:3;	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6)	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b>	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1)
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16	221:0;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10;	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10;	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b> 130:4	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37)	221:0;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b> 130:4 <b>EVANS (7)</b>	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2)
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2;	221:0;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 enrolled (6)	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1)	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b> 130:4 <b>EVANS (7)</b> 71:20;72:2;78:15;	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2; 25:6;39:18;62:8;68:10;	221:6;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 enrolled (6) 12:16;60:18;183:3,5,	112:16;117:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1) 71:15	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b> 130:4 <b>EVANS (7)</b> 71:20;72:2;78:15; 81:6;82:4;99:5;280:22	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22 exact (3)
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2; 25:6;39:18;62:8;68:10; 70:22;73:7;75:2;78:12;	221:6;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 enrolled (6) 12:16;60:18;183:3,5, 8;228:19	112:16;117:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equity (1)	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b> 130:4 <b>EVANS (7)</b> 71:20;72:2;78:15; 81:6;82:4;99:5;280:22 <b>even (56)</b>	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22 exact (3) 12:13;47:15;95:16
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2; 25:6;39:18;62:8;68:10; 70:22;73:7;75:2;78:12; 90:2;106:4;115:15;	221:6;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 enrolled (6) 12:16;60:18;183:3,5, 8;228:19 enroller (1)	112:16;117:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equity (1) 274:22	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b> 130:4 <b>EVANS (7)</b> 71:20;72:2;78:15; 81:6;82:4;99:5;280:22 <b>even (56)</b> 9:22;18:13,20;19:12;	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22 exact (3) 12:13;47:15;95:16 exactly (26)
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2; 25:6;39:18;62:8;68:10; 70:22;73:7;75:2;78:12; 90:2;106:4;115:15; 142:10;151:22;155:13;	221:6;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 enrolled (6) 12:16;60:18;183:3,5, 8;228:19 enroller (1) 61:5	112:16;117:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equity (1) 274:22 equivalent (1)	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b> 130:4 <b>EVANS (7)</b> 71:20;72:2;78:15; 81:6;82:4;99:5;280:22 <b>even (56)</b> 9:22;18:13,20;19:12; 28:16;32:13;36:3;41:20;	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22 exact (3) 12:13;47:15;95:16 exactly (26) 50:19;68:12;119:22;
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2; 25:6;39:18;62:8;68:10; 70:22;73:7;75:2;78:12; 90:2;106:4;115:15; 142:10;151:22;155:13; 172:12,16;185:16;	221:6;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 enrolled (6) 12:16;60:18;183:3,5, 8;228:19 enroller (1) 61:5 enrolling (5)	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equity (1) 274:22 equivalent (1) 56:16	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b> 130:4 <b>EVANS (7)</b> 71:20;72:2;78:15; 81:6;82:4;99:5;280:22 <b>even (56)</b> 9:22;18:13,20;19:12; 28:16;32:13;36:3;41:20; 53:2,11;54:20;62:21;	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22 exact (3) 12:13;47:15;95:16 exactly (26) 50:19;68:12;119:22; 132:13;147:8;183:18;
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2; 25:6;39:18;62:8;68:10; 70:22;73:7;75:2;78:12; 90:2;106:4;115:15; 142:10;151:22;155:13; 172:12,16;185:16; 210:2;232:18;239:8;	<b>enrich (1)</b> 162:14 <b>enriched (1)</b> 155:9 <b>enroll (15)</b> 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 <b>enrolled (6)</b> 12:16;60:18;183:3,5, 8;228:19 <b>enroller (1)</b> 61:5 <b>enrolling (5)</b> 77:17;128:6;144:12;	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equity (1) 274:22 equivalent (1) 56:16 Eric (9)	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b> 130:4 <b>EVANS (7)</b> 71:20;72:2;78:15; 81:6;82:4;99:5;280:22 <b>even (56)</b> 9:22;18:13,20;19:12; 28:16;32:13;36:3;41:20; 53:2,11;54:20;62:21; 75:1;77:2,3;81:21;82:1;	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22 exact (3) 12:13;47:15;95:16 exactly (26) 50:19;68:12;119:22; 132:13;147:8;183:18; 186:17;198:17;209:1;
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2; 25:6;39:18;62:8;68:10; 70:22;73:7;75:2;78:12; 90:2;106:4;115:15; 142:10;151:22;155:13; 172:12,16;185:16; 210:2;232:18;239:8; 241:2;246:11;260:18;	enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 enrolled (6) 12:16;60:18;183:3,5, 8;228:19 enroller (1) 61:5 enrolling (5) 77:17;128:6;144:12; 167:2;233:7	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equivalent (1) 56:16 Eric (9) 45:17,18;47:20;	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b> 130:4 <b>EVANS (7)</b> 71:20;72:2;78:15; 81:6;82:4;99:5;280:22 <b>even (56)</b> 9:22;18:13,20;19:12; 28:16;32:13;36:3;41:20; 53:2,11;54:20;62:21; 75:1;77:2,3;81:21;82:1; 86:10;87:18;111:11;	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22 exact (3) 12:13;47:15;95:16 exactly (26) 50:19;68:12;119:22; 132:13;147:8;183:18; 186:17;198:17;209:1; 216:12;224:11;227:2;
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2; 25:6;39:18;62:8;68:10; 70:22;73:7;75:2;78:12; 90:2;106:4;115:15; 142:10;151:22;155:13; 172:12,16;185:16; 210:2;232:18;239:8; 241:2;246:11;260:18; 269:3;271:16,17;	221:6;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 enrolled (6) 12:16;60:18;183:3,5, 8;228:19 enroller (1) 61:5 enrolling (5) 77:17;128:6;144:12; 167:2;233:7 enrollment (7)	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equivalent (1) 56:16 Eric (9) 45:17,18;47:20; 217:16;248:3;256:19;	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b> 130:4 <b>EVANS (7)</b> 71:20;72:2;78:15; 81:6;82:4;99:5;280:22 <b>even (56)</b> 9:22;18:13,20;19:12; 28:16;32:13;36:3;41:20; 53:2,11;54:20;62:21; 75:1;77:2,3;81:21;82:1; 86:10;87:18;111:11; 115:18;119:22;122:9;	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22 exact (3) 12:13;47:15;95:16 exactly (26) 50:19;68:12;119:22; 132:13;147:8;183:18; 186:17;198:17;209:1; 216:12;224:11;227:2; 241:14;245:16;248:11;
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2; 25:6;39:18;62:8;68:10; 70:22;73:7;75:2;78:12; 90:2;106:4;115:15; 142:10;151:22;155:13; 172:12,16;185:16; 210:2;232:18;239:8; 241:2;246:11;260:18; 269:3;271:16,17; 274:13;276:12,18;	221:6;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 enrolled (6) 12:16;60:18;183:3,5, 8;228:19 enroller (1) 61:5 enrolling (5) 77:17;128:6;144:12; 167:2;233:7 enrollment (7) 155:9;168:22;169:9;	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equivalent (1) 56:16 Eric (9) 45:17,18;47:20; 217:16;248:3;256:19; 257:1;291:12,15	68:18;75:6;78:5,8; 96:17;195:16 <b>Evaluation (8)</b> 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13; 20:21;77:12;107:8; 179:14 <b>evaluations (1)</b> 176:12 <b>evaluator (1)</b> 130:4 <b>EVANS (7)</b> 71:20;72:2;78:15; 81:6;82:4;99:5;280:22 <b>even (56)</b> 9:22;18:13,20;19:12; 28:16;32:13;36:3;41:20; 53:2,11;54:20;62:21; 75:1;77:2,3;81:21;82:1; 86:10;87:18;111:11; 115:18;119:22;122:9; 126:21;141:8;148:14;	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22 exact (3) 12:13;47:15;95:16 exactly (26) 50:19;68:12;119:22; 132:13;147:8;183:18; 186:17;198:17;209:1; 216:12;224:11;227:2; 241:14;245:16;248:11; 255:17;282:13,17;
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2; 25:6;39:18;62:8;68:10; 70:22;73:7;75:2;78:12; 90:2;106:4;115:15; 142:10;151:22;155:13; 172:12,16;185:16; 210:2;232:18;239:8; 241:2;246:11;260:18; 269:3;271:16,17; 274:13;276:12,18; 288:3;291:21;309:14;	221:6;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 enrolled (6) 12:16;60:18;183:3,5, 8;228:19 enroller (1) 61:5 enrolling (5) 77:17;128:6;144:12; 167:2;233:7 enrollment (7) 155:9;168:22;169:9; 184:1,6;257:15;312:18	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equivalent (1) 56:16 Eric (9) 45:17,18;47:20; 217:16;248:3;256:19; 257:1;291:12,15 Eric's (1)	$\begin{array}{l} 68:18;75:6;78:5,8;\\ 96:17;195:16\\ \hline {\bf Evaluation (8)}\\ 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13;\\ 20:21;77:12;107:8;\\ 179:14\\ \hline {\bf evaluations (1)}\\ 176:12\\ \hline {\bf evaluator (1)}\\ 130:4\\ \hline {\bf EVANS (7)}\\ 71:20;72:2;78:15;\\ 81:6;82:4;99:5;280:22\\ \hline {\bf even (56)}\\ 9:22;18:13,20;19:12;\\ 28:16;32:13;36:3;41:20;\\ 53:2,11;54:20;62:21;\\ 75:1;77:2,3;81:21;82:1;\\ 86:10;87:18;111:11;\\ 115:18;119:22;122:9;\\ 126:21;141:8;148:14;\\ 159:4;173:1;175:16;\\ \end{array}$	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22 exact (3) 12:13;47:15;95:16 exactly (26) 50:19;68:12;119:22; 132:13;147:8;183:18; 186:17;198:17;209:1; 216:12;224:11;227:2; 241:14;245:16;248:11; 255:17;282:13,17; 284:14;296:5;298:20;
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2; 25:6;39:18;62:8;68:10; 70:22;73:7;75:2;78:12; 90:2;106:4;115:15; 142:10;151:22;155:13; 172:12,16;185:16; 210:2;232:18;239:8; 241:2;246:11;260:18; 269:3;271:16,17; 274:13;276:12,18; 288:3;291:21;309:14; 312:3	221:6;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 enrolled (6) 12:16;60:18;183:3,5, 8;228:19 enroller (1) 61:5 enrolling (5) 77:17;128:6;144:12; 167:2;233:7 enrollment (7) 155:9;168:22;169:9; 184:1,6;257:15;312:18 ensure (14)	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equivolent (1) 56:16 Eric (9) 45:17,18;47:20; 217:16;248:3;256:19; 257:1;291:12,15 Eric's (1) 264:18	$\begin{array}{c} 68:18;75:6;78:5,8;\\ 96:17;195:16\\ \hline {\bf Evaluation (8)}\\ 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13;\\ 20:21;77:12;107:8;\\ 179:14\\ \hline {\bf evaluations (1)}\\ 176:12\\ \hline {\bf evaluator (1)}\\ 130:4\\ \hline {\bf EVANS (7)}\\ 71:20;72:2;78:15;\\ 81:6;82:4;99:5;280:22\\ \hline {\bf even (56)}\\ 9:22;18:13,20;19:12;\\ 28:16;32:13;36:3;41:20;\\ 53:2,11;54:20;62:21;\\ 75:1;77:2,3;81:21;82:1;\\ 86:10;87:18;111:11;\\ 115:18;119:22;122:9;\\ 126:21;141:8;148:14;\\ 159:4;173:1;175:16;\\ 177:10,17,21;178:4,13;\\ \end{array}$	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22 exact (3) 12:13;47:15;95:16 exactly (26) 50:19;68:12;119:22; 132:13;147:8;183:18; 186:17;198:17;209:1; 216:12;224:11;227:2; 241:14;245:16;248:11; 255:17;282:13,17; 284:14;296:5;298:20; 303:22;305:20;306:10;
enables (1) 74:3 encourage (5) 33:4,11;78:4;155:5; 312:17 encouraged (1) 61:11 encourages (1) 18:16 end (37) 3:12,15;10:17;12:2; 25:6;39:18;62:8;68:10; 70:22;73:7;75:2;78:12; 90:2;106:4;115:15; 142:10;151:22;155:13; 172:12,16;185:16; 210:2;232:18;239:8; 241:2;246:11;260:18; 269:3;271:16,17; 274:13;276:12,18; 288:3;291:21;309:14; 312:3 endeavor (1)	221:6;241:21 enrich (1) 162:14 enriched (1) 155:9 enroll (15) 46:6;83:14;108:2; 132:7;143:20;144:2; 166:21;167:5;169:3; 179:10;180:6,10; 181:11;184:5;284:19 enrolled (6) 12:16;60:18;183:3,5, 8;228:19 enroller (1) 61:5 enrolling (5) 77:17;128:6;144:12; 167:2;233:7 enrollment (7) 155:9;168:22;169:9; 184:1,6;257:15;312:18 ensure (14) 6:14;51:21;142:9;	112:16;11/:10; 238:11,12 envisioning (1) 54:12 Epic (3) 32:16;110:12;136:18 equal (3) 26:18;102:1;138:14 equally (6) 102:21,21;103:3,10; 138:7;158:15 equipoise (1) 71:15 equivolument (1) 56:16 Eric (9) 45:17,18;47:20; 217:16;248:3;256:19; 257:1;291:12,15 Eric's (1) 264:18 erosion (1)	$\begin{array}{c} 68:18;75:6;78:5,8;\\ 96:17;195:16\\ \hline {\bf Evaluation (8)}\\ 5:14;13:8;18:9;19:13;\\ 20:21;77:12;107:8;\\ 179:14\\ \hline {\bf evaluations (1)}\\ 176:12\\ \hline {\bf evaluator (1)}\\ 130:4\\ \hline {\bf EVANS (7)}\\ 71:20;72:2;78:15;\\ 81:6;82:4;99:5;280:22\\ \hline {\bf even (56)}\\ 9:22;18:13,20;19:12;\\ 28:16;32:13;36:3;41:20;\\ 53:2,11;54:20;62:21;\\ 75:1;77:2,3;81:21;82:1;\\ 86:10;87:18;111:11;\\ 115:18;119:22;122:9;\\ 126:21;141:8;148:14;\\ 159:4;173:1;175:16;\\ 177:10,17,21;178:4,13;\\ 180:6;196:1;204:22;\\ \hline {\bf even (26)}\\ \hline {\bf evaluation (26)}\\ \hline {\bf evaluatio$	321:19;322:8,12 evidence-based (6) 198:9;201:6;205:6; 271:20;294:21;321:17 evident (2) 48:20;302:15 evil (1) 65:3 evoked (1) 107:20 evolve (2) 27:20;186:22 exact (3) 12:13;47:15;95:16 exactly (26) 50:19;68:12;119:22; 132:13;147:8;183:18; 186:17;198:17;209:1; 216:12;224:11;227:2; 241:14;245:16;248:11; 255:17;282:13,17; 284:14;296:5;298:20; 303:22;305:20;306:10; 309:8;311:8

240.11	
240.11	
exaggeration (1)	ex
264:16	
ovom (6)	
81:11;82:12;104:22;	
178.1.260.20.20	ex
170.1,200.20,20	UA
examination (1)	
176:10	exe
exemine (2)	
examine (2)	
20:10;83:9	exe
example (35)	
10.14.15.14.05.10	
12:14;15:14;25:12;	ex
27:22:29:11:30:13:	
24.10.12.40.7.42.10.	
54:10,15,40:7,42:10,	ex
44:5;49:8;60:2;74:7;	
70.11.02.22.02.11.04.5	ovi
79.11,92.22,93.11,94.3,	СЛ
118:16;164:12,13;	
165.16.169.5.184.8.	
105.10,107.5,104.0,	
247:5;260:3;271:10;	ex
277:6:279:15:280:2.17:	
202.4.205.10.201.16.22	
283:4;285:18;321:16,22	ex
examples (7)	
47.6 16.150.4.226.19	0.77
47:0,10,150:4,220:18,	ex
310:7:320:6:321:8	
ovome (1)	
exams (1)	
125:19	ex
Excel (3)	
106 2 266 1 212 0	
126:3;266:1;312:9	ex]
except (4)	
02.19.146.2.262.17.	
95:18,140:2,205:17,	ex
278:16	
exception (1)	evi
	СЛ
4/3 1 1	
42:11	
42:11 exceptions (4)	ex
42:11 exceptions (4)	ex
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19;	ex]
42:11 <b>exceptions (4)</b> 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10	ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 exception (2)	ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2)	ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20:256:8	ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5)	ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5)	ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8;	ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3:211:12	ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 under 4 (7)	ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7)	ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21:60:10:77:9:	ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 01:15:02:1:162:1	ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1;	ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12	ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1)	ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1)	ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2	ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2)	ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2)	ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6	ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8)	ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 25:20:50:12.21:00.6	ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6,	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14.15;62:17;91:4	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1)	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1)	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3 exclusions (1)	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3 exclusions (1) 01:0	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3 exclusions (1) 91:9	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3 exclusions (1) 91:9 exclusive (1)	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3 exclusions (1) 91:9 exclusive (1) 23:15	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3 exclusions (1) 91:9 exclusive (1) 23:15	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3 exclusions (1) 91:9 exclusive (1) 23:15 exclusively (1)	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3 exclusions (1) 91:9 exclusive (1) 23:15 exclusively (1) 199:2	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3 exclusions (1) 91:9 exclusive (1) 23:15 exclusively (1) 199:2 (2)	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3 exclusions (1) 91:9 exclusive (1) 23:15 exclusively (1) 199:2 excuse (2)	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3 exclusions (1) 91:9 exclusive (1) 23:15 exclusively (1) 199:2 excuse (2) 268:9:297:15	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]
42:11 exceptions (4) 42:9;94:2;296:19; 304:10 excited (2) 172:20;256:8 exciting (5) 97:4;146:21;158:8; 159:3;211:12 exclude (7) 45:21;60:10;77:9; 91:15;92:1;163:1; 233:12 excluded (1) 13:2 excluding (2) 92:2,6 exclusion (8) 35:20;59:12,21;60:6, 14,15;62:17;91:4 exclusionary (1) 90:3 exclusions (1) 91:9 exclusive (1) 23:15 exclusively (1) 199:2 excuse (2) 268:9;297:15 excuse (2)	ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex] ex]

experts (2)
160:14;166:
explain (4)
184:16;192:
234:11 evplanatory (*
103.12.13
explicit (1)
128:1
explicitly (3)
198:9;273:1
exploratory (7
102:5;103:1
206:14;210:
explore (1)
221:11
explored (1)
15:19
expose (1)
57:13
exposure (1)
181:3
expressed (1)
extended (1)
164:17
extending (1)
189:1
extensively (1
299:1
extent (7)
6:2;28:20;30
290.2
external (1)
49:5
externally (1)
144:10
extra (3)
142:22;207:
40.16
49.10 extraction (5)
33:8.14:40:9
15
extraordinari
<b>extraordinari</b> 48:19
extraordinari 48:19 extraordinary
extraordinari 48:19 extraordinary 48:16;235:1
<b>extraordinari</b> 48:19 <b>extraordinary</b> 48:16;235:1 <b>extremely (4)</b>
extraordinari 48:19 extraordinary 48:16;235:1 extremely (4) 4:20;97:3;13 evenopening (
extraordinari 48:19 extraordinary 48:16;235:1 extremely (4) 4:20;97:3;13 eye-opening (1) 53:7:70:22
extraordinari 48:19 extraordinary 48:16;235:1 extremely (4) 4:20;97:3;13 eye-opening (2 53:7;70:22 eyes (5)
extraordinari 48:19 extraordinary 48:16;235:1 extremely (4) 4:20;97:3;13 eye-opening (2 53:7;70:22 eyes (5) 52:20;135:7
extraordinari 48:19 extraordinary 48:16;235:1 extremely (4) 4:20;97:3;13 eye-opening (2 53:7;70:22 eyes (5) 52:20;135:7 15;208:11
extraordinari 48:19 extraordinary 48:16;235:1 extremely (4) 4:20;97:3;13 eye-opening (2 53:7;70:22 eyes (5) 52:20;135:7 15;208:11
extraordinari 48:19 extraordinary 48:16;235:1 extremely (4) 4:20;97:3;13 eye-opening (2 53:7;70:22 eyes (5) 52:20;135:7 15;208:11 F
extraordinari 48:19 extraordinary 48:16;235:1 extremely (4) 4:20;97:3;13 eye-opening (2 53:7;70:22 eyes (5) 52:20;135:7 15;208:11 F
extraordinari 48:19 extraordinary 48:16;235:1 extremely (4) 4:20;97:3;13 eye-opening (1) 53:7;70:22 eyes (5) 52:20;135:7 15;208:11 F fabricated (1) 234:19

233:6 4:166:17 fabrication (8) 43:13;232:21;240:11; 247:1;257:5;294:3; 6;192:2;239:5; 296:22;297:2 face (4) atory (2) 25:14,15;98:7;131:15 face-to-face (3) 167:18;168:9;222:2 facility (1) 273:18;274:5 188:13 fact (29) tory (7) 3:7;4:12;8:11;21:1; 5;103:14;108:6; 4;210:7;212:1; 48:16;50:6;63:11;67:22; 81:18;82:9;85:9;108:15; 139:19;156:11;187:14; 188:20;193:13;205:13; 222:19;225:10;237:9; 241:22;249:6;251:8; 259:18;268:1;277:16; 286:18:296:17 factor (3) 16:2;181:9;286:11 factors (9) 19:10;163:1;266:12; 280:6,19;288:10; 292:19;293:12,12 factory (1) 120:16 vely (1) facts (1) 68:4 faculty (2) 8:20:30:21; 114:14,16 8;226:3;262:4; fail (1) 67:13 failed (7) 75:9;156:4,7,15,16; 292:13;295:12 failings (1) 168:14 2;207:20;314:15 failure (2) 232:21:233:10 fair (2) 30:17;106:17 14;40:9;283:14, fairly (7) 11:1,2;13:4;27:17; dinarily (1) 44:2;123:15,17 fake (1) dinary (2) 258:2 5;235:19 fall (4) 67:12;103:22;191:15; 225:14 97:3;130:6;256:8 false (6) ening (2) 21:13,13;76:16,22; 249:3,5 );135:7;145:15, falsification (3) 294:3;297:2;315:7 familiar (7) 12:12;19:19;22:6; 80:18;142:4;256:16; 323:22 family (1) 12:16 ting (1)

### 260:13;317:2,11 FARRAR (5) 82:10:174:15.15; 211:3;228:19 fascinating (2) 58:12;191:22 fashion (4) 22:6;44:16;69:19; 170:21 fast (3) 144:12;167:2,5 faster (1) 166:22 faulty (1) 318:15 favor (3) 159:17;243:6,8 favorite (1) 253:21 fax (1) 34:17 FDA (41) 5:14,15;6:16,22;7:3, 19;8:18;10:14;18:10,16; 20:21;21:8;31:21;32:17; 43:16,19:49:3:90:1: 151:20:152:1:155:16: 195:13:196:20:201:2; 203:12;209:8;248:13; 249:20;261:15;285:14; 293:17;302:11,12; 303:17;304:18;305:22; 310:2,5;314:16;315:8; 318:18 FDA's (1) 250:10 FDA-speak (1) 28:7 fears (1) 56:4 feasibility (2) 25:13;126:15 feasible (1) 138:4 feasibly (1) 98:8 features (1) 224:2 feedback (2) 53:17;219:3 feeding (1) 42:18

60:8;81:15;123:7;

125:9;214:17;272:19

feeds (1)

feel (6)

217:16

feeling (2)

28:4;88:3;97:6;113:4,

4;158:2;179:1;225:20;

fancy (1)

73:8

far (11)

June 5, 2015

59:18;213:19	300:3	189:21;217:3;224:18;	following (8)	foundation (1)
feelings (1)	finally (1)	293:12;323:20	52:6;90:12,13;122:11;	262:14
261:5	98:21	fix (3)	162:1;297:11;301:19,20	four (7)
feels (3)	financial (8)	36:14;161:21;162:1	follows (2)	23:21;153:15;217:3;
60:16:165:3:182:7	67:7;69:1;114:4;	flag (3)	78:20;121:21	232:20;266:5;267:3,6
fees (1)	126:18.19.20:151:4:	35:18.19:212:13	follow-up (8)	fourth (1)
64:16	287:12	flagged (1)	17:6.7.14:52:4:98:16:	301:13
feet (1)	financially (1)	18.22	125.18.179.8.269.8	four-week (1)
121:6	66.10	flags(2)	food (1)	82.16
fell (1)	find (17)	12.19.172.7	52.14	framed (2)
230:11	35.8.37.22.40.12.	flare (1)	foolish (1)	2/1/8 18
fellow (1)	53.0, 57.22, +0.12, 64.22.68.13.80.10.	65·21	102.13	277.0,10
60.12	04.22,00.13,07.10, 09.11.116.6.129.5.	$\frac{05.21}{\text{Flowbort}(1)}$	102.13	77.1
00.13	90.11,110.0,120.3,	102.18	1001 (1)	//.1 froud (24)
101 (4) 48:14:102:20:272:22	155:4,187:15,217:19,	102:18 floand (1)	100:14 footing (2)	1raud (24)
48:14;192:20;275:22;	257:15;255:7;272:15;	11aws (1)	100 (2)	20:15;45:15;72:0;
2/4:1	291:18;315:1	/3:9	102:1;138:14	/6:18;110:7,21;136:17;
FEMALE (2)	finding (2)	flexibility (3)	forbid (1)	13/:10;21/:15;232:20;
302:5;305:5	42:17;51:2	109:11;215:11;216:8	49:17	234:10;235:5,13;
Feng (1)	findings (3)	flexible (2)	forbidden (1)	236:21;237:12;240:10;
24:3	68:15;89:7;105:1	5:10;74:15	94:10	243:1;247:1;253:1,2;
fest (1)	finds (1)	flight (1)	for-cause (1)	291:2;293:19;296:18,22
290:13	158:11	324:11	94:11	fraudulent (5)
few (15)	fine (8)	flipside (1)	force (1)	46:9,10;60:9;293:17;
53:5;84:12;112:4;	176:13;191:2;202:12;	204:18	41:10	318:8
131:18;140:12;174:20;	277:12,19;308:16;	floor (2)	forces (1)	fraudulently (1)
182:4,12;189:16;210:9;	315:4;317:5	26:1;120:16	255:13	233:7
214:9;259:13,20;	fingers (1)	floors (1)	forever (2)	Freda (1)
263:15:278:6	93:7	55:21	31:21:185:14	24:3
fewer (2)	finish (4)	flow (1)	forget (3)	free (3)
91:11:312:3	5:7:172:18:208:17:	132:11	268:21:278:21:304:17	59:2:257:14:324:3
fiber (2)	261:11	fluent (1)	forgive (2)	FREEMAN (3)
104.19.105.4	finished (1)	86.10	265.22.289.14	70.2.191.13.192.6
fibromvalgia (1)	24:6	flux (1)	fork (2)	freeways (1)
317.16	finishes (1)	109.21	26.17.125.22	130.10
fidelity(5)	10.16	<b>FMDI</b> (1)	120.17,125.22	Fronch (1)
101.15.207.9.209.15.	$\begin{array}{c} 10.10 \\ \textbf{fineside} (1) \end{array}$	210.11	279.16 21.297.6	121.19
101.13,237.8,238.13,	70.9	510.11 foous (12)	278.10,21,287.0	$\frac{121.10}{\mathbf{Erequently}(1)}$
501.17,19 field (2)	/0.0	27.5.144.15.150.66	216.20.261.4	Prequency (1)
11etu (5) 29.6.100.7.196.15	11rewaii (1)	57.5,144.15,150.0,0,	210:20;201:4	$\frac{80.15}{\text{End}_{22}(3)}$
28:0;100:7;180:15	52.4 <b>f</b> ===== ( <b>50</b> )	158:2;187:1;211:7;	1000000000000000000000000000000000000	<b>Friday (5)</b>
<b>figure (6)</b>	first (50)	242:14;243:21;250:21;	3:4 6 (1)	4:9;12:17;246:18
/3:5;/6:18;119:11;	6:8;12:14;26:1,3;31:6;	251:9;268:8	former (1)	friends (1)
129:4;235:6;248:12	39:8;55:15,18;72:12;	tocused (11)	302:11	210:14
figuring (2)	87:18;99:22;122:21;	38:1;56:7;72:5;89:17;	forms (2)	front (5)
217:5;224:15	123:20;129:8;132:6;	150:8;232:3;241:9;	312:18,19	26:5;32:12;70:8;
file (3)	143:7;145:3;169:6;	247:15;264:6;266:21;	formulation (1)	110:12;176:22
32:15,16;43:19	179:11,14,16,18,21;	316:21	235:16	frustrating (1)
fileable (1)	180:3,7;181:10,19;	focusing (3)	formulations (1)	187:16
11:1	182:5,12,17,17,19;	19:5;37:16;270:7	118:2	frustration (2)
fill (6)	183:21;184:11;197:4,	folks (11)	forth (8)	136:7;213:13
128:4;169:17;267:5;	11;198:7;200:7;203:6;	28:6;32:9;86:8,9;	9:19;30:10;31:12;	fudge (1)
303:10;308:15,17	222:16;246:13;257:2;	89:18;114:22;126:19;	32:16;59:3;77:21;207:5;	20:5
filled (4)	262:20;278:6;280:4;	129:10;130:2;167:3;	285:14	full (1)
169:21,22;270:22;	294:2;300:6;318:5;	183:1	forward (18)	83:3
306:11	319:12;322:16	follow (17)	9:6;22:8;26:10;27:2;	fully (2)
filling (8)	fit (6)	12:10:36:7:69:21;	53:16;86:20;97:6;100:8;	51:11:96:12
175:12;178:16;266:2:	14:6;29:9:149:14;	74:6,10;92:17:105:21:	106:2;148:16,17;149:7:	fun (5)
307:19;312:18.19:317:7.	221:6;257:1:285:3	125:14;176:12:200:1:	152:22;213:4:218:2:	157:10,11:175:3:
8	fits (3)	202:1:229:17:232:1	242:9:252:14:292:3	260:19:315:15
filter (1)	245:19:246:4:281:2	246:16:274:19:299:20	found (13)	function (1)
21:13	fitting (1)	306:13	12:20:39:22:70.6	104:19
filtered (1)	281.13	followed (4)	104.1.105.10 11.122.1	fund (3)
54.7	five (8)	171.8.303.13.314.8	130.3.197.10.248.4.	190.6.210.10.291.12
final (1)	117.18.145.5.184.5	10	277.19.310.16.312.15	fundamental $(2)$
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10	<i></i>	

		220.1.1		225 15 215 10
292:5;297:20	20:1;26:21;29:6,16,	229:1,1	grasp (1)	235:17;247:18
fundamentally (2)	18;64:15;79:7;93:5,12,	goals (2)	288:17	guys (8)
298:12;311:3	17;144:9;158:10;	22:1;217:2	greased (1)	32:18;72:2;78:15;
fundamentals (1)	162:16:211:16:226:4:	God (6)	180:1	161:9:166:10:193:7:
73.13	252.10 17.313.20	49.17.82.1.102.17	great (21)	198.14.289.6
funded (3)	generalizability (1)	122.10 21.237.7	11.6.26.5.33.13.	<b>CYP</b> (1)
20.5.199.12.220.16	01.17	122.19,21,237.7	11.0,20.3,33.13,	7.6
29.3,188.12,239.10	91.17	gues (17)	42:10;57:15;07:21;94:2,	7.0
runding (9)	generalizable (1)	10:19;57:20;62:21;	21;95:13;122:3;124:17;	
22:5;28:18;112:3,3,	91:16	74:20;79:5;85:14;93:18;	128:2;145:17;147:13;	H
18;113:13;116:10;	generalize (1)	113:21;116:3;120:19;	148:20;151:2;205:16;	
119:2;238:14	61:10	159:15;199:13,14;	207:5;250:17;254:2;	half (8)
funds (1)	generally (3)	205:8;218:21;223:16;	279:5	40:21;59:17;169:6,7;
185:5	33:3;262:9;287:4	316:11	greater (1)	261:10;278:6,7;284:2
funky (3)	generated (3)	gold (3)	18:17	halfway (1)
95:19:248:7:265:18	188:17.18:238:20	77:2.3.4	greatest (3)	313.10
funny (1)	generic $(7)$	Good (80)	54.22.160.13.205.9	hand (12)
160.15	80.10.310.21.320.11	3.2.7.5 0 10 11.0.7.	grid (1)	$145 \cdot 1 \cdot 170 \cdot 6 \cdot 182 \cdot 10$
funther (15)	17.221.2 2.222.9	5.2, 7.5, 9, 10, 11, 9.7, 14, 12, 17, 6, 20, 2, 22, 4, 5, 14, 12, 17, 6, 20, 2, 22, 4, 5, 14, 12, 17, 6, 20, 2, 22, 4, 5, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14, 14	266.2	145.1,177.0,102.10, 180.2,107.20.212.10,
15.10.42.0.52.1.15	17,321.2,3,323.8		200.2	189:5;197:20;215:10;
15:19;43:9;52:1,15,	genesis (1)	28:21;29:19;33:18;43:5,	ground (3)	232:14;237:17;252:21;
15;94:19;106:8;107:7,7;	65:10	10;44:12;45:5,8;50:16;	122:10;145:15;189:17	256:19;296:7;310:4
112:13;195:7;199:6;	gentlemen (2)	51:21;54:20;56:6,8;	group (25)	handle (4)
211:18;289:10;317:8	203:7;261:1	65:15;69:8;71:9;79:11;	48:10,18;59:6;70:9;	9:7;14:19;74:15;77:6
furthermore (2)	geographic (1)	85:16,19;86:16;96:19;	88:4;105:13,14;116:22;	handled (2)
63:4:81:19	165:8	98:7:101:6:109:8:125:3:	117:4:121:14:124:13:	86:7:249:20
futility (3)	geriatric (1)	133:16.19.20:140:22:	131:6.6:147:15:158:21:	handling (2)
171.22.232.21.233.11	231.12	148.18.152.13 14 15:	185.22.188.5.193.12	132.8.134.6
future $(10)$	gorm (1)	152:5:156:0 20:161:10:	220.2.237.22.150.3,175.12,	hands (2)
22.17.100.1(.112.1)	$\frac{21}{21}$	1,5,5,1,5,0,9,20,101,10,	220.2,237.22,232.14,	1100 (2)
25:17;109:10;115:1;	210:5		209:4;274:0;294:1;	80:4;194:17
131:12;170:5;189:2;	germane (1)	182:3,15;190:12;195:2,	303:8	hands-on (1)
244:20;245:5,21;304:6	144:13	21;197:1;201:4,4,7;	groups (9)	81:9
fuzzy (1)	get-go (2)	204:11,16;205:3,22;	49:5,7;88:2;187:21;	hang (1)
70.18	203:2:206:19	226.22.228.20.232.16	$210 \cdot 4 \cdot 220 \cdot 3 \cdot 225 \cdot 17$	115.12
/0.10	=00.1,=00.17	220.22,220.20,232.10,	210.4,220.5,225.17,	115.15
	gets (21)	238:1;261:13;271:9,11;	247:14;274:22	Hanks (2)
G	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17;	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6;	247:14;274:22 guess (21)	Hanks (2) 263:4,5
G	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14;	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17:321:11:322:3;	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16:26:4;30:7;	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7)
G gabapentin (1)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9:150:11:191:3;	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11	247:14;274:22 <b>guess (21)</b> 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17:59:5.9:84:16;	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6:84:1:234:17:
G gabapentin (1)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19 21:228:3:240:3:	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1)	247:14;274:22 <b>guess (21)</b> 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6:123:12:203:9:	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20 21:286:20:317:5
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3:300:1120:323:3	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22	247:14;274:22 <b>guess (21)</b> 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17:242:7:254:4:	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8)
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21:214:10:	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14:324:6	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Covernment (4)	247:14;274:22 <b>guess (21)</b> 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12:271:16:280:3:	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22:139:20:140:2:
<b>G</b> gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13 13	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14:13:22:100:10;	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14:202:18:202:3:	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:2 18:210:21;
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 2111:60	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19;	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 2014	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21;
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 275:22	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1)	210:4,220:3,223:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1)	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6)
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6)	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2	210:4,220:3,223:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1;
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8;	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1)	210:4,220:3,223:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1)	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11	210:4,220:3,223:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10)
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3)	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1)	210:4,220:3,223:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17)	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18;
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18	210:4,220:3,225:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11;	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7;
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6:257:15	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9)	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1)	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10,	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13:186:13:300:13
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10:109:14:167:21;	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16:19:6;28:5;38:21;	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 hanny (7)
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2:226:18:247.7;	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1)	210:4,220:3,225:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18:89:14:196:19:20:	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20:158:19:192:4:
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Cotes (1)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13:260:2:287:7	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1) 191:20	210:4,220:5,225:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16:253:16:295:10;
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 gived (1)	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1) 191:20 graduates (1)	210:4,220:5,225:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3)	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;2253:16;295:10; 224:4
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 22:10	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1) 191:20 grains (1) 2114:0	210:4,220:3,225:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3) 7:6:02:21:27:1	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;253:16;295:10; 324:4
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15 gave (3)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 33:19 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 33:19	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduate (1) 191:20 grains (1) 214:9	210:4,220:3,225:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3) 7:6;23:21;27:1	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;253:16;295:10; 324:4 hard (19)
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15 gave (3) 44:5;100:22;124:17	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 33:19 globally (1)	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduate (1) 191:20 grains (1) 214:9 grant (1)	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3) 7:6;23:21;27:1 guided (1)	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;253:16;295:10; 324:4 hard (19) 39:14,14;47:5;92:10;
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15 gave (3) 44:5;100:22;124:17 GCP (3)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 33:19 globally (1) 191:21	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1) 191:20 grains (1) 214:9 grant (1) 80:9	210:4,220:5,225:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3) 7:6;23:21;27:1 guided (1) 182:11	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;253:16;295:10; 324:4 hard (19) 39:14,14;47:5;92:10; 105:21;153:4;158:8,11;
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15 gave (3) 44:5;100:22;124:17 GCP (3) 7:9;85:8,10	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 33:19 globally (1) 191:21 GLP (1)	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1) 191:20 grains (1) 214:9 grant (1) 80:9 granted (1)	210:4,220:3,223:17, 247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3) 7:6;23:21;27:1 guided (1) 182:11 guru (1)	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;253:16;295:10; 324:4 hard (19) 39:14,14;47:5;92:10; 105:21;153:4;158:8,11; 167:6;170:20;189:9;
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15 gave (3) 44:5;100:22;124:17 GCP (3) 7:9;85:8,10 gears (1)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 33:19 globally (1) 191:21 GLP (1) 7:12	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1) 191:20 grains (1) 214:9 grant (1) 80:9 granted (1) 71:16	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3) 7:6;23:21;27:1 guided (1) 182:11 guru (1) 6:9	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20,317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;253:16;295:10; 324:4 hard (19) 39:14,14;47:5;92:10; 105:21;153:4;158:8,11; 167:6;170:20;189:9; 190:5;196:4;223:1;
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15 gave (3) 44:5;100:22;124:17 GCP (3) 7:9;85:8,10 gears (1) 59:10	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 33:19 globally (1) 191:21 GLP (1) 7:12 GMP (1)	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1) 191:20 grains (1) 214:9 grant (1) 80:9 granted (1) 71:16 grants (2)	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3) 7:6;23:21;27:1 guided (1) 182:11 guru (1) 6:9 gut (1)	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happening (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;253:16;295:10; 324:4 hard (19) 39:14,14;47:5;92:10; 105:21;153:4;158:8,11; 167:6;170:20;189:9; 190:5;196:4;223:1; 248:21;249:2;261:6;
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15 gave (3) 44:5;100:22;124:17 GCP (3) 7:9;85:8,10 gears (1) 59:10 Gee (1)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 33:19 globally (1) 191:21 GLP (1) 7:12 GMP (1) 7:10	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1) 191:20 grains (1) 214:9 grant (1) 80:9 granted (1) 71:16 grants (2) 113:3,9	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3) 7:6;23:21;27:1 guided (1) 182:11 guru (1) 6:9 gut (1) 60:10	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20,317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happenig (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;253:16;295:10; 324:4 hard (19) 39:14,14;47:5;92:10; 105:21;153:4;158:8,11; 167:6;170:20;189:9; 190:5;196:4;223:1; 248:21;249:2;261:6; 263:4;290:16
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15 gave (3) 44:5;100:22;124:17 GCP (3) 7:9;85:8,10 gears (1) 59:10 Gee (1) 256:9	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 33:19 globally (1) 191:21 GLP (1) 7:10 goal (15)	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1) 191:20 grains (1) 214:9 grant (1) 80:9 granted (1) 71:16 grants (2) 113:3,9 graph (1)	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3) 7:6;23:21;27:1 guided (1) 182:11 guru (1) 6:9 gut (1) 60:10 guts (1)	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happenig (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;253:16;295:10; 324:4 hard (19) 39:14,14;47:5;92:10; 105:21;153:4;158:8,11; 167:6;170:20;189:9; 190:5;196:4;223:1; 248:21;249:2;261:6; 263:4;290:16 hardcore (1)
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15 gave (3) 44:5;100:22;124:17 GCP (3) 7:9;85:8,10 gears (1) 59:10 Gee (1) 256:9 Gemini (1)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 33:19 globally (1) 191:21 GLP (1) 7:10 goal (15) 103:13,14,15:124:7:	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1) 191:20 grains (1) 214:9 grant (1) 80:9 granted (1) 71:16 grants (2) 113:3,9 graph (1) 130:17	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3) 7:6;23:21;27:1 guided (1) 182:11 guru (1) 6:9 gut (1) 60:10 guts (1) 121:9	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20,317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happenig (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;253:16;295:10; 324:4 hard (19) 39:14,14;47:5;92:10; 105:21;153:4;158:8,11; 167:6;170:20;189:9; 190:5;196:4;223:1; 248:21;249:2;261:6; 263:4;290:16 hardcore (1) 131:9
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15 gave (3) 44:5;100:22;124:17 GCP (3) 7:9;85:8,10 gears (1) 59:10 Gee (1) 256:9 Gemini (1) 120:3	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 33:19 globally (1) 191:21 GLP (1) 7:10 goal (15) 103:13,14,15;124:7; 137:12:143:10:149:15:	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1) 191:20 grains (1) 214:9 grant (1) 80:9 granted (1) 71:16 grants (2) 113:3,9 graph (1) 130:17 granbs (1)	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3) 7:6;23:21;27:1 guided (1) 182:11 guru (1) 6:9 gut (1) 60:10 guts (1) 121:9 guy (5)	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20,317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happenig (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;253:16;295:10; 324:4 hard (19) 39:14,14;47:5;92:10; 105:21;153:4;158:8,11; 167:6;170:20;189:9; 190:5;196:4;223:1; 248:21;249:2;261:6; 263:4;290:16 hardcore (1) 131:9 harder (9)
G gabapentin (1) 137:1 gain (4) 118:21;214:10; 287:13,13 gaining (1) 217:18 game (2) 165:4,5 gamed (1) 46:4 gaming (2) 178:6;257:15 gamish (1) 14:12 Gates (1) 262:15 gave (3) 44:5;100:22;124:17 GCP (3) 7:9;85:8,10 gears (1) 59:10 Gee (1) 256:9 Gemini (1) 120:3 general (18)	gets (21) 18:5;27:6;54:6;74:17; 88:13;111:12;135:14; 141:9;150:11;191:3; 220:19,21;228:3;240:3; 264:3;300:1,1,20;323:3, 14;324:6 Gilron (6) 211:3,9,15;275:21; 278:15;279:2 given (6) 6:5;41:3;69:15;98:4,8; 200:19 gives (3) 133:22;220:11;282:4 giving (9) 42:10;109:14;167:21; 216:2;226:18;247:7; 252:13;260:2;287:7 glad (1) 33:19 globally (1) 191:21 GLP (1) 7:12 GMP (1) 7:12 GMP (1) 7:12;143:10;149:1,5; 216:13,14,15;124:7; 137:12;143:10;149:1,5; 216:13,13,17,22:29:20:	238:1;261:13;271:9,11; 276:8;294:13;298:6; 310:6,17;321:11;322:3; 324:11 Google (1) 23:22 Government (4) 7:14;13:22;100:19; 112:21 GPs (1) 246:2 GPVP (1) 7:11 grader (1) 277:18 graduate (1) 21:19 graduates (1) 191:20 grains (1) 214:9 grant (1) 80:9 granted (1) 71:16 grants (2) 113:3,9 graph (1) 130:17 graphs (1) 129:3	247:14;274:22 guess (21) 24:16;26:4;30:7; 54:17;59:5,9;84:16; 86:6;123:12;203:9; 204:12,17;242:7;254:4; 266:12;271:16;280:3; 287:14;292:18;302:3; 321:4 guessed (1) 106:10 guessing (1) 274:7 guidance (17) 6:12;7:4;8:18;9:11; 10:9;14:8;16:5;18:10, 16;19:6;28:5;38:21; 53:18;89:14;196:19,20; 212:2 guidances (3) 7:6;23:21;27:1 guided (1) 182:11 guru (1) 6:9 gut (1) 101 102:10 guts (1) 121:9 guy (5) 70:4:134:5:102:21;	Hanks (2) 263:4,5 happen (7) 41:6;84:1;234:17; 236:20,21;286:20;317:5 happened (8) 36:22;139:20;140:2; 204:3,18;219:21; 246:20;264:9 happenig (6) 115:13,20,21;116:1; 187:6;308:10 happens (10) 10:17;15:12;56:18; 57:10;62:16;63:15;90:7; 174:13;186:13;300:13 happy (7) 98:20;158:19;192:4; 233:16;253:16;295:10; 324:4 hard (19) 39:14,14;47:5;92:10; 105:21;153:4;158:8,11; 167:6;170:20;189:9; 190:5;196:4;223:1; 248:21;249:2;261:6; 263:4;290:16 hardcore (1) 131:9 harder (9) 67:2,2:110:22,22;

June 5, 2015	June	5,	201	5
--------------	------	----	-----	---

111:10,10,15;214:10; 251:13	helps (1) 273-19	<b>histories (2)</b>	101:1 hour (2)	195:21;197:1;206:12; 232:8:233:1:235:19:
hardest (1)	hemorrhage (1)	history (6)	261:10;284:2	237:20;239:3;255:19,
239:15	135:2	49:10,12,15,18;50:21;	hours (2)	21;269:12;291:16;
hard-pressed (1)	herky-jerky (1)	51:2	63:16;153:15	311:21
315:1	22:5	hit (6)	house (2)	ideal (1)
hard-put (1)	hermeneutics (1)	150:19;152:3;164:2,3;	7:3;234:12	97:16
272:3 harm (2)	121:17 hernetic (1)	1/2:4,0	3.4.175.2	10eally (2) 280:15:208:21
155:19.20	125:20	141:8	HTA (1)	ideas (7)
harp (1)	Hertz (1)	hitting (1)	238:15	20:12;22:12;31:3;
17:21	175:9	316:19	huge (27)	213:5;238:8;239:5;
hate (2)	hesitant (1)	Hmm (1)	12:8;37:3;68:17;	324:10
85:9;312:8	48:12	95:3	85:22,22;112:21;	identification (3)
naven't(1)	HEWITT (25) 60.2.70.5.120.15 16	$\frac{102012}{102012}$	14/:11;154:1,4;155:21;	119:20;26/:8;29/:21
head (4)	17.157.5.159.16.170.3	102.15 hoc (5)	157.21,101.5,107.18, 169.7.170.19.171.15.	34·13·47·8·77·7·
40:11:215:15:246:14:	177:15:182:2:183:19:	79:10:177:9:201:16:	177:15:190:14.17:198:7.	265:18:315:11.20:
289:22	190:10;193:10;197:2;	249:8;268:2	21;201:5;238:3;247:22;	320:15
health (9)	198:22;200:20;201:3,	hold (4)	248:16;250:20;289:6	identify (12)
59:2;136:19;137:17;	13;203:9;204:7,11,16,	88:19;207:4;234:13;	hugely (4)	19:7;62:18;82:12;
150:17;189:7,22;212:4;	21;210:20;219:7	238:13	145:20;146:18;	176:21;177:2;199:15;
216:9;240:8	Hewitt's (1)	holes (1)	189:13;294:21	265:12;282:10;298:1;
<b>nealthcare (9)</b> 39:11:58:3 10:190:1:	203:2 hev (4)	322:12 home (5)	numan (2) 266:14:298:7	315:/;318:/,/ identifying (3)
257.14.286.14.287.11	67·1·305·12·307·1·	79.18.136.2.253.16	$h_{1} = 200.14,290.7$	137.10.267.10.290.14
13.20	315:9	261:3:324:12	163:15	ignore (1)
healthy (3)	hide (1)	honest (5)	hunch (1)	275:20
40:16;228:13,14	225:11	46:20;63:18;149:18;	60:9	II (1)
hear (12)	hiding (1)	205:2;276:13	hundred (1)	24:2
34:12;43:15;50:17;	264:17	Honestly (1)	317:18	ill (1)
71:4;88:18;121:12;	hierarchical $(3)$	313:8 head (3)	hundreds $(2)$	1/5:11 Wegel (1)
124:19;192:2;229:9; 241:18:243:11:287:6	101:20;102:10;142:7	169.16 17.272.13	21:2;131:5 hunger (1)	296.15
heard (26)	21:4.5.8:28:22:95:20:	hoons (1)	208:11	illustrating (1)
26:12;34:21;52:16;	105:18;121:15;130:14,	229:15	Huntington's (1)	104:14
59:9,14;72:2;92:22;	15;152:4;191:19;257:4;	hop (1)	117:4	illustration (1)
93:16;98:15;99:4,15;	263:16;316:19	227:4	hurt (4)	103:17
106:20;131:15;175:18;	higher (3)	hope (9)	77:18,20;91:16;261:5	IM (1)
211:1,4,8;217:15;	18:1;141:8,10	68:3;93:7;106:3;	hybrid (3)	84:8
257.19,242.22,255.9, 17:256:8:279:6:294:18:	131.18.138.13	220.0,202.8,292.9, 304.22.309.17.312.2	hvnersensitivity (1)	60.5.117.9.118.5.
298:22	highlight (1)	honefully (8)	84:15	201:8:248:21:249:3.4:
hearing (4)	321:12	3:17;4:21;72:10;	hypnosis (1)	256:7;266:4;290:17;
50:2;97:1;301:9;	highly (2)	174:7;220:22;227:12;	262:7	303:6
323:21	55:13;188:12	256:21;266:4	hypothesis (4)	imagined (1)
heart (1)	high-quality (4)	horizon (1)	105:7;138:19;215:18;	47:13
134:14 Heineken (1)	69:10;1/1:10;224:/; 254:22	13/:1/ horrondomos (1)	216:3	$\operatorname{Imaging}_{154,2}(1)$
120·22	2.34.22 hinted (?)	246.19	T	134.2 imagining (1)
hell (1)	84:3:179:10	horrible (1)	-	311:14
69:15	hip (1)	166:8	i2B2 (1)	IMI (1)
help (16)	227:4	horse (2)	136:20	247:16
5:5;28:6;75:22;78:10;	HIPAA (4)	317:21,22	Ian (4)	Immediate (1)
87:5;90:4,5;103:18;	32:5;34:1;251:3;290:7	hoses (1)	211:3;232:8;275:20;	266:8
125:5;135:15;209:15;	<b>nire (1)</b>	120:20 hospital (2)	277:22 ICU (1)	immediately (1)
228:21;200:5;295:14; 297:22:317:8	140:2 hired (1)	<b>105pital (2)</b> 58-22-110-16	134.22	200:5 IMMPACT (0)
helpful (5)	48:8	hospitals $(2)$	idea (26)	96:13:151:14:213:5:
4:20;127:2;134:3;	historical (1)	168:17;189:9	10:9;19:5;36:19;	220:14;232:9;262:8;
171:4;187:11	292:3	host (1)	41:19,20;47:20;65:15;	320:16,17;322:20
helping (1)	historically (3)	213:19	71:9;86:5;104:16;	immunologic (1)
123:8	18:19;149:1;152:6	hostile (1)	144:16;149:4;184:4;	125:14

impact (13)	244.10.252.12.262.2	inclusion (2)	171.5 18.172.15.	61.6
72.9 14.120.9.126.18	244.10,232.12,202.2, 263.8 10.288.12	59.12.21	187.10.190.6.210.22	in-office (1)
141.6.142.5.164.1	203.0,10,200.12,	inclusion/exclusion (5)	229.16.234.3.293.18	131.6
165:22:168:22:195:14:	309:22:319:17:323:12	42:18:126:8:127:21:	inentitude (1)	input (3)
198:19:271:17:319:1	importantly (4)	162:14:171:6	17:18	24:5;96:20;142:7
impactful (2)	59:15;100:20;174:1;	income (1)	inevitable (1)	inputting (1)
165:21;269:17	288:6	286:19	317:12	27:21
impacts (3)	impose (3)	incompetence (2)	inexperienced (3)	inquiring (1)
127:11;142:19;190:15	215:10;214:19;251:12	1/:18;294:10	32.18,140.1,3	2/3.2
105.5	1111000000000000000000000000000000000	255·20	65·1	39·11
impedes (1)	impossibly (1)	incorporate (1)	inflict (1)	insight (1)
256:1	34:14	271:3	78:17	39:8
impediments (1)	impression (2)	incorporated (2)	influence (2)	insightful (2)
190:11	93:22;247:8	14:20;283:21	67:12;143:12	128:2;276:6
imperatives (1)	improper (1)	incorrectly (1)	influences $(3)$	nsist(2)
$\frac{112:0}{\text{important}(1)}$	282:20	10:21 increase (7)	00:1/;99:10;21/:12	84:9;189:12
77.3	21.11.23.13.108.22.	35.6.41.0.43.14.		nispect (1)
imnersonal (1)	132.20.138.18.214.19	124.5.170.7.178.6	informal (1)	inspection (3)
53·20	217.17.237.13 14.	292.1	232.18	6·7·52·2·95·7
implement (5)	293:21	increases (2)	information (20)	inspections (1)
23:18:26:13:206:8;	improved (1)	153:6:169:9	3:18;4:18;14:20;55:4;	12:6
290:17;312:14	187:13	increasing (2)	68:19:75:14:89:15;	inspectors (1)
implementation (1)	improvement (3)	111:16;158:13	130:12;148:18,19;	90:6
279:5	22:20;198:11;202:21	increasingly (1)	217:18,20;220:1,16,19;	inspiring (1)
implementing (2)	improves (1)	32:6	238:18,20;241:21;	102:21
196:1;214:22	181:3	incredible (6)	278:17;322:19	instance (9)
implication (1)	improving (5)	109:21;122:1;130:3;	informative (3)	12:13;82:13;162:20;
137:12	3:20;21:15;212:13;	134:16;139:5;198:16	92:7;155:7,14	185:10;194:8,10;252:7;
implications (10)	247:7;293:15	incredibly (6)	informed (1)	310:13;315:2
74:11;110:6;111:7;	inability (1)	52:10;100:6;122:2;	25:21	instances (1)
136:14,16;137:9;151:4;	266:1	123:5;18/:10,16	<b>infrastructure</b> (7)	82:13
2/0.21;292:2;318:22	10.9.62.4	11:0	03:12;112:19,22;	<b>Instead</b> (2) 172:11:202:10
$\frac{1}{217\cdot7}$	40:0;03:4	indonondont (5)	115:0;117:2;150:12;	1/2.11,295.19
importance (5)	277·11	120.19.124.13.	inherited (1)	112.12 20.116.9
156.1.171.13.226.7	inadvertently (1)	171.14 19.277.17	36.17	128.15.185.1346819
266:12:270:11	282:7	independently (1)	inhibitors (1)	186:1.4.8.10:187:7.20.
important (100)	inappropriate (2)	80:1	151:2	22
6:19;13:21;19:3;37:4,	48:7;289:10	India (3)	in-house (1)	institutions (5)
4,17;38:5,10;41:17;	Inasmuch (1)	160:6;234:20;237:3	117:6	87:18;112:1;116:1;
51:20;52:10,12,17;59:5;	248:17	indicated (2)	initial (3)	166:4,6
64:14;69:22;73:16;	<b>INC</b> (1)	40:19;51:13	180:16;263:18,18	instructing (1)
74:11;78:4;86:22;90:20;	198:15	indicating (1)	initially (3)	79:17
91:2;101:21;102:16,20;	incentive (2)	271:12	118:21;176:14;211:7	instructor (1)
106:13,16;109:7;110:6;	126:20;128:10	indications (2)	initiated (1)	227:1
122:13;123:5,6,18;	<b>incentives</b> (5)	125:7;133:12	28:14	<b>instrument (19)</b>
124:9,10;127:2,5;133:1;	51:4;120:19;128:5;		$\begin{array}{c} \text{Initiation} (2) \\ 85.12.15 \end{array}$	9:15,15,22;10:10;
130.14, 10, 130.9, 130.10, 141.7, 142.10, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 100.14, 10	133.4,207.22 incident (1)	40.9 individual (10)	03.12,13	14.3,0,13.4,13,170.3, 104.7,105.0,202.3,14
143.16.145.20.146.18	12.15	15.1.21.3.23.9.24.21	237.22.247.16	18 20:203:18:206:22:
147:7:150:3:151:9.15	include (10)	45:12.12:61:22:84:19:	initiatives (1)	209:4.12
20:152:5:153:2.18.21:	22:13:59:19:60:1:	188:3:316:22	20:18	instrumentation (1)
154:1,13:155:6,18;	92:3;242:18;258:20,21;	induce (2)	injectable (1)	17:19
158:15,17;160:17;	275:15;282:17;299:6	108:2;191:18	81:20	instruments (6)
164:15;165:7;166:20;	included (3)	induced (1)	injections (1)	93:9;134:2;193:19,20,
167:14;170:18;172:1;	17:11;70:14;236:9	118:3	83:10	21;203:1
173:19;176:15;178:11,	includes (1)	industry (22)	injury (1)	insurance (1)
20;191:11;192:8;	287:17	31:5;43:16;52:14;	104:9	101:1
198:10;202:5,6;214:8;	including (4)	110:16,16;119:7;126:4;	inlier (1)	intact (1)
215:12;217:6;223:17;	92:6;173:13;268:11;	139:11;140:15;156:22;	19:22	248:22
227:4;239:5,6,19;241:1;	295:11	157:9;165:12;167:3;	inner (1)	intangibles (1)

53:7	206:12	invariably (1)	20:17:22:12:26:11:	120:13:127:15:137:3:
integrating (1)	interpretable (1)	36:12	32:22;54:13:84:9:99:8;	138:11,15,17;144:6;
16:18	255:22	invasive (1)	140:7.8:157:15:176:9:	146:18:151:1:157:19:
integrity (3)	interpretation (4)	229:22	192:13.18:204:4:	159:11:165:14:167:10.
59:14:141:3:266:13	209:15.22:300:9.12	invented (2)	212:12:220:13:295:7:	11:168:2:171:5:186:12:
intellectual (1)	interpreted (1)	55:1;295:6	324:5	190:21;198:21;217:15,
111:9	89:9	invention (1)	involving (1)	15;218:10;221:17;
intended (3)	interrupt (2)	70:4	264:20	225:2;226:15;229:14;
148:5;264:1,2	204:2;232:2	inVentive (5)	<b>IOM</b> (1)	230:16,22;231:15,22;
intensity (2)	interval (1)	69:21;140:4,6;190:18;	248:12	238:10;240:5,9;241:13;
108:14;162:20	108:19	198:14	Iowa (1)	242:20;258:21;259:8;
intensive (1)	intervene (1)	inventor (2)	185:10	269:14;279:7;282:20;
130:14	191:15	295:8,10	iPad (1)	283:20,22;286:8;287:15,
intent (6)	intervention (7)	invest (1)	133:17	18,19;290:7,7;293:9;
74:5;77:8;142:15;	90:10;95:4;162:2;	143:15	IRB (9)	302:15;305:19,20;
173:2;264:8;318:13	308:4,5;311:10;315:2	invested (2)	113:20;115:19;	319:22;321:16,18;
<b>Intention (4)</b> $74.4.2(5.12.281.22)$	interventions (1)	182:16;295:14	128:13;137:3;185:3,14,	323:11
74:4;265:12;281:22;	31/:3	<b>Investigated</b> (2)	19;187:9;190:2	100.16.145.10
202.5 intentional (7)	<b>1110 (87)</b> 2.5.6.8 15.10.10.	130:10,248:14	1) 286.9	100.10,145.10
264.22.268.0 18 20.	12.22.18.20.20.20.	158.7	200.0 irritable (3)	322.0
20 <del>4</del> .22,200.7,10,20, 269.2.773.13 1 <i>1</i>	13.22,10.20,20.20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20,	Investigation (A)	104.16.105.13.106.5	122.9
intent-to-treat (1)	30.8 18.32.13.42.19	12.5.21.16.24.19.90.6	irritated (1)	23.2.44.4
161.21	49.19.55.15.57.9.20	Investigations (1)	164.12	iterative (7)
interaction (8)	61:15.17:62:15:71:10:	6:20	ISCOR (1)	80:14:219:13.14.16:
105:13:106:6:124:7.8:	82:22:86:15:97:12.21:	investigative (1)	196:21	310:2.9.22
132:15;168:5;241:3;	101:13;104:20;105:11;	65:10	Island (1)	IV (2)
277:14	107:3;110:4;120:11;	investigator (37)	247:17	117:22;125:13
interactions (2)	123:14;128:17;132:21;	17:17;25:14;39:5;	Israeli (1)	
178:5;241:5	139:22;141:9;143:18,	46:6;53:10;55:5;60:15,	247:16	J
Interchange (1)	20;146:8;147:12;	22;63:16;70:7;71:10;	issue (97)	
7:19	149:14;150:14;152:5,12,	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16,	J&J (2)
7:19 interest (6)	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11;	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4;	<b>J&amp;J (2)</b> 140:18;199:2
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4;	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17;	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10;	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1)
7:19 <b>interest (6)</b> 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 <b>interest d (12)</b>	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11;	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 79:2,7:92:11:95:11;	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4
7:19 <b>interest (6)</b> 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 <b>interested (13)</b> 47:15:58:11:124:22	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 109:6:20210111:206:2	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10:164:22:167:0	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 26:13:22:90:401:212	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22:22:8
7:19 <b>interest (6)</b> 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 <b>interested (13)</b> 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22:125:9:120:11 17:	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22:224:5:225:14;	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 10:180:1:100:15;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13:14:05:116:110:11;	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Janson (3)
7:19 <b>interest (6)</b> 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 <b>interested (13)</b> 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18:141:1:223:20:	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3:231:13:233.5;	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13:221:22:264:19:	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17:119:13:122:19:	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20:258:15:270:21
7:19 <b>interest (6)</b> 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 <b>interested (13)</b> 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5:266:19:295:2	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21:240:2,11:	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16:132:17:133:8	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1)
7:19 <b>interest (6)</b> 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 <b>interested (13)</b> 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 <b>interesting (28)</b>	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15:255:7,18;	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 investigator- (1)	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10:138:17:144:12:	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3:36:8:47:3.	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10:269:16:277:10;	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator- (1)</b> 28:13	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8:154:13:158:17.	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1)
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4;	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5;	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 investigator- (1) 28:13 investigator-initiated (6)	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7;	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10;	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1;	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator- (1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3,	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12)
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1;	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator- (1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9;	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21;
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16;	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1)	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-(1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b>	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16;	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20;
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22;	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 <b>intolerable (1)</b> 125:4	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-(1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6,	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13;
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21;	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1)	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-(1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13,	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9;	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7;	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-(1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14,14;83:7,18;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16,	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1)
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7; 323:10	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20 intracranial (1)	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator- (1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14,14;83:7,18; 85:9;87:14;88:15,18;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16, 19;255:16;258:16;	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1) 54:8
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7; 323:10 interests (2)	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20 intracranial (1) 135:2	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14,14;83:7,18; 85:9;87:14;88:15,18; 111:18;113:1;114:16;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16, 19;255:16;258:16; 259:5,19,22;267:11;	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1) 54:8 John (52) 26:450,16,00,67
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7; 323:10 interests (2) 111:6;227:16	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20 intracranial (1) 135:2 intra-rater (2) 100 21 200 2	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator- (1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator- initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14,14;83:7,18; 85:9;87:14;88:15,18; 111:18;113:1;114:16; 116:17;118:9;164:21;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16, 19;255:16;258:16; 259:5,19,22;267:11; 269:14;270:14;280:21;	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1) 54:8 John (52) 26:3,4;50:16;88:6,7; 20:0.000 5 5 11 400
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7; 323:10 interests (2) 111:6;227:16 interface (1)	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20 intracranial (1) 135:2 intra-rater (2) 199:21;200:3	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-(1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14;14;83:7,18; 85:9;87:14;88:15,18; 111:18;113:1;114:16; 116:17;118:9;164:21; 169:2;185:21;188:4; 204:0212:16:2102;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16, 19;255:16;258:16; 259:5,19,22;267:11; 269:14;270:14;280:21; 281:113;282:16;284:17,	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1) 54:8 John (52) 26:3,4;50:16;88:6,7; 98:19,20;99:3,5,11,18, 100:55:120;25
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7; 323:10 interests (2) 111:6;227:16 interface (1) 56:18 interim (1)	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20 intracranial (1) 135:2 intra-rater (2) 199:21;200:3 introduce (3) 5:12:09:18:130.14	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14,14;83:7,18; 85:9;87:14;88:15,18; 111:18;113:1;114:16; 116:17;118:9;164:21; 169:2;185:21;188:4; 204:9;213:16;219:2; 222:3;228:2;264:2;	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16, 19;255:16;258:16; 259:5,19,22;267:11; 269:14;270:14;280:21; 281:1,13;282:16;284:17, 18;285:7;286:11,13; 289:14:205:0;	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1) 54:8 John (52) 26:3,4;50:16;88:6,7; 98:19,20;99:3,5,11,18, 19;120:5,5;139:3; 145:11:164:11:172:15:
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7; 323:10 interests (2) 111:6;227:16 interface (1) 56:18 interim (1) 172:2	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20 intracranial (1) 135:2 intra-rater (2) 199:21;200:3 introduce (3) 5:12;98:18;139:14 intoduced (2)	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14,14;83:7,18; 85:9;87:14;88:15,18; 111:18;113:1;114:16; 116:17;118:9;164:21; 169:2;185:21;188:4; 204:9;213:16;219:2; 222:3;238:2;264:2; 274:9:293:16:304:10	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16, 19;255:16;258:16; 259:5,19,22;267:11; 269:14;270:14;280:21; 281:1,13;282:16;284:17, 18;285:7;286:11,13; 288:14;295:13;302:9; 315:18;10:310:6:220:15	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1) 54:8 John (52) 26:3,4;50:16;88:6,7; 98:19,20;99:3,5,11,18, 19;120:5,5;139:3; 145:11;164:11;173:15; 174:15:15:170:7;
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7; 323:10 interests (2) 111:6;227:16 interface (1) 56:18 interim (1) 172:2 internal (2)	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20 intracranial (1) 135:2 intra-rater (2) 199:21;200:3 introduce (3) 5:12;98:18;139:14 intoduced (2) 101:10:192:15	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-(1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14,14;83:7,18; 85:9;87:14;88:15,18; 111:18;113:1;114:16; 116:17;118:9;164:21; 169:2;185:21;188:4; 204:9;213:16;219:2; 222:3;238:2;264:2; 274:9;293:16;304:19 <b>invitation (1)</b>	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16, 19;255:16;258:16; 259:5,19,22;267:11; 269:14;270:14;280:21; 281:1,13;282:16;284:17, 18;285:7;286:11,13; 288:14;295:13;302:9; 315:18,19;319:6;320:15 <b>issues (82)</b>	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1) 54:8 John (52) 26:3,4;50:16;88:6,7; 98:19,20;99:3,5,11,18, 19;120:5,5;139:3; 145:11;164:11;173:15; 174:15,15;179:7; 188:20:210:20:211:2.8
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7; 323:10 interests (2) 111:6;227:16 interface (1) 56:18 interim (1) 172:2 internal (2) 49:6:61:1	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20 intracranial (1) 135:2 intra-rater (2) 199:21;200:3 introduce (3) 5:12;98:18;139:14 introduced (2) 101:10;192:15 introducing (1)	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-(1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator-(1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator-(1)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14,14;83:7,18; 85:9;87:14;88:15,18; 111:18;113:1;114:16; 116:17;118:9;164:21; 169:2;185:21;188:4; 204:9;213:16;219:2; 222:3;238:2;264:2; 274:9;293:16;304:19 <b>invitation (1)</b> 138:22	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16, 19;255:16;258:16; 259:5,19,22;267:11; 269:14;270:14;280:21; 281:1,13;282:16;284:17, 18;285:7;286:11,13; 288:14;295:13;302:9; 315:18,19;319:6;320:15 <b>issues (82)</b> 5:17:10:13:12:9:16:8	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1) 54:8 John (52) 26:3,4;50:16;88:6,7; 98:19,20;99:3,5,11,18, 19;120:5,5;139:3; 145:11;164:11;173:15; 174:15,15;179:7; 188:20;210:20;211:3,8, 9 18 19:212:17 18 10:
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7; 323:10 interests (2) 111:6;227:16 interface (1) 56:18 interim (1) 172:2 internal (2) 49:6;61:1 internally (2)	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20 intracranial (1) 135:2 intra-rater (2) 199:21;200:3 introduce (3) 5:12;98:18;139:14 introduced (2) 101:10;192:15 introducing (1) 177:10	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14,14;83:7,18; 85:9;87:14;88:15,18; 111:18;113:1;114:16; 116:17;118:9;164:21; 169:2;185:21;188:4; 204:9;213:16;219:2; 222:3;238:2;264:2; 274:9;293:16;304:19 <b>invitation (1)</b> 138:22 <b>invite (1)</b>	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16, 19;255:16;258:16; 259:5,19,22;267:11; 269:14;270:14;280:21; 281:1,13;282:16;284:17, 18;285:7;286:11,13; 288:14;295:13;302:9; 315:18,19;319:6;320:15 <b>issues (82)</b> 5:17;10:13;12:9;16:8, 19,21:17:20:18:21:20:4	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1) 54:8 John (52) 26:3,4;50:16;88:6,7; 98:19,20;99:3,5,11,18, 19;120:5,5;139:3; 145:11;164:11;173:15; 174:15,15;179:7; 188:20;210:20;211:3,8, 9,18,19;212:17,18,19; 215:8 10:224:9 11:
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7; 323:10 interests (2) 111:6;227:16 interface (1) 56:18 interim (1) 172:2 internal (2) 49:6;61:1 internally (2) 144:10:185:14	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20 intracranial (1) 135:2 intra-rater (2) 199:21;200:3 introduce (3) 5:12;98:18;139:14 introduced (2) 101:10;192:15 introducing (1) 177:10 introduction (2)	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14,14;83:7,18; 85:9;87:14;88:15,18; 111:18;113:1;114:16; 116:17;118:9;164:21; 169:2;185:21;188:4; 204:9;213:16;219:2; 222:3;238:2;264:2; 274:9;293:16;304:19 <b>invitation (1)</b> 138:22 <b>invite (1)</b> 24:9	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16, 19;255:16;258:16; 259:5,19,22;267:11; 269:14;270:14;280:21; 281:1,13;282:16;284:17, 18;285:7;286:11,13; 288:14;295:13;302:9; 315:18,19;319:6;320:15 <b>issues (82)</b> 5:17;10:13;12:9;16:8, 19,21;17:20;18:21;20:4, 17:24:5,16.20:25:6,13	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1) 54:8 John (52) 26:3,4;50:16;88:6,7; 98:19,20;99:3,5,11,18, 19;120:5,5;139:3; 145:11;164:11;173:15; 174:15,15;179:7; 188:20;210:20;211:3,8, 9,18,19;212:17,18,19; 215:8,10;224:9,11; 225:22:240:18:262:18;
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7; 323:10 interests (2) 111:6;227:16 interface (1) 56:18 interim (1) 172:2 internal (2) 49:6;61:1 internally (2) 144:10;185:14 international (3)	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20 intracranial (1) 135:2 intra-rater (2) 199:21;200:3 introduce (3) 5:12;98:18;139:14 introduced (2) 101:10;192:15 introducing (1) 177:10 introduction (2) 79:7,14	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator- (1)</b> 28:13 <b>investigator- initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14,14;83:7,18; 85:9;87:14;88:15,18; 111:18;113:1;114:16; 116:17;118:9;164:21; 169:2;185:21;188:4; 204:9;213:16;219:2; 222:3;238:2;264:2; 274:9;293:16;304:19 <b>invitation (1)</b> 138:22 <b>invite (1)</b> 24:9 <b>inviting (2)</b>	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16, 19;255:16;258:16; 259:5,19,22;267:11; 269:14;270:14;280:21; 281:1,13;282:16;284:17, 18;285:7;286:11,13; 288:14;295:13;302:9; 315:18,19;319:6;320:15 <b>issues (82)</b> 5:17;10:13;12:9;16:8, 19,21;17:20;18:21;20:4, 17;24:5,16,20;25:6,13, 16,20;28:3;49:15:75:22:	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1) 54:8 John (52) 26:3,4;50:16;88:6,7; 98:19,20;99:3,5,11,18, 19;120:5,5;139:3; 145:11;164:11;173:15; 174:15,15;179:7; 188:20;210:20;211:3,8, 9,18,19;212:17,18,19; 215:8,10;224:9,11; 225:22;240:18;262:18; 276:5:279:3,4,11:
7:19 interest (6) 31:14;139:22;198:4; 227:20;238:21;256:15 interested (13) 47:15;58:11;124:22, 22;125:9;129:11,17; 132:18;141:1;223:20; 230:5;266:19;295:2 interesting (28) 25:8;31:3;36:8;47:3, 10;56:19;61:19;71:4; 97:4;104:1;105:10; 147:18;148:2;149:1; 163:13;164:8;173:9,16; 179:13;181:6;198:22; 286:17;287:2,21; 291:22;292:8;299:7; 323:10 interests (2) 111:6;227:16 interface (1) 56:18 interim (1) 172:2 internal (2) 49:6;61:1 internally (2) 144:10;185:14 international (3) 86:8;117:3;156:6	149:14;150:14;152:5,12, 17;156:22;157:8,11; 159:12;160:14;162:17; 164:22;176:1,2;179:11; 183:7;191:3;193:14; 199:6;202:10,11;206:2; 218:22;224:5;225:14; 228:3;231:13;233:5; 238:21;240:2,11; 246:15;255:7,18; 265:10;269:16;277:10; 282:8;283:21;285:5; 289:7,21;290:13;300:1; 318:10 intolerable (1) 125:4 intra-articular (1) 81:20 intracranial (1) 135:2 intra-rater (2) 199:21;200:3 introduce (3) 5:12;98:18;139:14 introduced (2) 101:10;192:15 introducing (1) 177:10 introduction (2) 79:7,14 intuitive (1)	80:13;84:5;85:14;88:12; 90:12;96:11;99:13; 114:14;116:19;117:19; 118:7;119:9;141:12; 153:13;154:17;158:6; 160:10;164:22;167:9, 19;180:1;190:15; 194:13;221:22;264:19; 316:22 <b>investigator-initiated (6)</b> 116:7,21;117:3; 137:21;138:8,20 <b>investigators (37)</b> 25:17;50:21;61:22; 66:18;70:9,10;79:4,6,13, 13;81:4,14,14;83:7,18; 85:9;87:14;88:15,18; 111:18;113:1;114:16; 116:17;118:9;164:21; 169:2;185:21;188:4; 204:9;213:16;219:2; 222:3;238:2;264:2; 274:9;293:16;304:19 <b>invitation (1)</b> 138:22 <b>invite (1)</b> 24:9 <b>inviting (2)</b> 139:17;290:9	8:2;9:12;15:5;17:2,16, 22;32:21;37:9,22;39:4; 40:9;54:1,6;73:10; 74:16;76:3;77:7,12; 78:3,7;83:11;85:11; 86:13,22;89:4;91:2,12, 13,14;95:1,16;110:11; 118:17;119:13;122:19; 128:16;132:17;133:8, 10;138:17;144:12; 151:8;154:13;158:17, 18;160:6;161:3;167:7; 170:11,19;172:15;177:3, 8,19;184:17;185:9; 191:9,10;194:16; 215:21;229:5,6,9;230:6, 13;233:2;234:7,8,9; 247:11;250:2;251:16, 19;255:16;258:16; 259:5,19,22;267:11; 269:14;270:14;280:21; 281:1,13;282:16;284:17, 18;285:7;286:11,13; 288:14;295:13;302:9; 315:18,19;319:6;320:15 <b>issues (82)</b> 5:17;10:13;12:9;16:8, 19,21;17:20;18:21;20:4, 17;24:5,16,20;25:6,13, 16,20;28:3;49:15;75:22; 79:21;88:12;97:10;	J&J (2) 140:18;199:2 James (1) 24:4 Janus (2) 21:22;22:8 Jensen (3) 256:20;258:15;270:21 Jim (1) 128:18 Jimmy (1) 129:11 job (12) 42:10;52:21;67:21; 96:19;134:1;158:20; 186:1;228:20;294:13; 302:1,2;314:11 jobs (1) 54:8 John (52) 26:3,4;50:16;88:6,7; 98:19,20;99:3,5,11,18, 19;120:5,5;139:3; 145:11;164:11;173:15; 174:15,15;179:7; 188:20;210:20;211:3,8, 9,18,19;212:17,18,19; 215:8,10;224:9,11; 225:22;240:18;262:18; 276:5;279:3,4,11; 280:17;281:19;282:2.

312:11,12;314:3,20	313:14	151:10	301:5	63:13;67:11;93:21;
Johns (1)	Keystone (1)	KOLs (2)	lastly (1)	105:21;112:11;118:21;
120:4	81:12	151:11;160:7	112:14	139:6;140:1;157:15;
John's (3)	kicked (1)		late (4)	187:11;201:7;211:7;
191:19;215:10;223:7	61:16	L	31:7;36:22;69:6;303:6	225:1;226:7;259:19;
Johnson (2)	killed (2)		lately (1)	263:18;277:20;281:7;
140:10,11	158:4;204:19	Lab (6)	252:22	289:21;308:22;321:12
joined (1)	killer (1)	17:15;154:3;164:16;	later (8)	leave (5)
159:4	146:16	170:17;229:19;231:4	45:5,7;67:1;74:14;	100:10;198:2;228:10;
Joint (1)	kind (89)	label (2)	134:15;176:5,13;182:6	267:4;279:13
82:1	10:16;11:20;22:5,7,8;	118:3;221:15	Latin (1)	leaving (2)
$\frac{\text{Joints}(I)}{81.16}$	28:15;31:19;34:14;3/:8;	$\begin{array}{c} \text{labeled (1)} \\ 22.2 \end{array}$	105:14 Loughton (22)	2/8:22;2/9:14
1.10 Jones (1)	50.7,42.0,45.17,45.5,	23.3 Jahor (2)	A-6-7-16-20-7-33-17-	105.10 20.130.22.
303.10	16.79.2 7 9 14.81.3	111.17.130.14	55.7.57.1 4.72.1.78.18	154.1
journal (8)	84.7.85.7.103.4.115.8	laboratory (2)	82.3.83.1.99.1 21.	Lee (19)
4:2.4:61:11:72:18:	127:9:131:10:132:11:	59.1.118.18	101:3:121:19:129:15:	24:3:50:19:51:11.14:
73:22:277:21:323:3.14	143:16:147:18:148:6:	laborious (3)	157:4:170:2:175:6:	58:13:61:18:70:3:71:5:
iournalistic (1)	150:8:154:11:155:13:	130:6.7:187:16	183:16:204:15:209:7:	78:20:82:14:87:1:
57:17	156:21;158:16;160:15;	lack (5)	210:15;231:11;233:18;	119:12:235:8:247:2;
journals (2)	164:8;173:16;176:1;	10:6;17:9;21:4;265:3;	275:17:289:17:291:14,	295:1;302:8;305:21;
322:22;323:1	184:14,15;198:11;	272:14	17;307:11;309:11;	309:9,12
joy (1)	200:12;203:13;211:11;	lacking (1)	312:4;314:2	Lee's (6)
147:11	215:21;216:7;219:11,	322:9	Laurie (16)	52:6;55:9;64:13;
judgment (2)	20;237:5;240:4;247:20;	lady (1)	63:21;195:5;202:1;	82:21;237:19;316:12
122:7,10	248:15;252:1,16;262:9;	256:13	206:3;208:13,15;	left (9)
Juge (2)	263:15,18;264:7;266:3;	lag (1)	210:16;237:17;239:13;	91:15,19;146:4;
184:13,13	267:18;269:13;273:8;	115:21	240:19;283:2;293:7;	156:22;236:22;254:4,
juice (1)	274:15;275:1;278:8;	language (6)	296:7;302:10;311:15;	18;261:11;280:12
322:2	279:15;283:22;288:8,	74:7;86:10,21;262:1;	313:1	leftover (1)
jump (3)	19;290:13;295:22;	311:9,13	Laurie's (2)	302:11
11:16;51:12;229:16	296:15,22;299:7;	languages (1)	198:10;244:9	legal (1)
Junior (1)	300:22;303:2,14;308:2;	86:16	110.2	20:13
/9:13	510:0,17;511:8,15;	lapse (1)	110:3 Journa (4)	<i>legiumate (2)</i>
$\frac{14.16}{14}$	519:17;522:5;525:10	28:7	1ayers (4) 52.8.52.20.54.1 6	43:19;308:20
14.10	30.0 13.07.0.11/.10.	arge (21)	52.8,55.20,54.1,0	05.18.265.10
К	120.12.190.6.201.1	107.2.1,99.8,105.17, 107.2.110.9,14.111.17.	237.22.239.17.282.20	95.16,205.19 legs (1)
	214.5 19.225.20	132.2.136.19.140.7	leading $(2)$	107.21
Kate (1)	247:12:281:12	147:14:153:3.9:156:5:	79:10:117:2	lengthy (1)
24:4	kingpin (2)	164:19:166:20:187:1:	leads (5)	256:22
<b>KATZ</b> (7)	56:13,14	234:6,6;242:14;251:20	63:2,4;65:5;159:17;	lens (1)
89:3;92:17;182:21;	kingpins (2)	largely (2)	171:8	252:13
183:8;202:1;208:14;	42:16;43:1	118:10;321:2	leaning (1)	less (27)
210:13	kinks (1)	larger (9)	41:19	18:19;33:21;61:4;
keep (13)	180:4	108:19;118:14;127:1,	learn (17)	65:20;103:19;112:15,
3:4;32:4;49:2;58:22;	KIRKWOOD (2)	7;187:21;259:12;263:3,	63:12;106:8;108:18;	17;124:6;138:9;143:22;
59:3;126:16,21;159:10;	38:2;46:20	13;323:9	119:8;125:11,11,13,16,	144:2;154:7;155:3;
177:20;223:19;229:2;	knee (1)	largess (1)	21;179:15;217:12,16;	181:18;216:21;223:9,9,
234:11;241:9	82:2	112:21	218:1;221:1,9,11;222:6	9;239:1,22;254:12,15;
keeping (5)	1(2)	largest $(2)$	<b>learned (13)</b>	261:16;285:21;305:13;
19:8;27:12;216:22;	103:13;295:9	12:21;111:3	62:12;106:14;108:18;	306:18;307:20
242:20;231:17	MIUWIIIg (3)	1ast (33) 0.6.10.5.16.7.45.2.	119.1,14,122.8,170.11;	152.12.210.17.20
205·21	223.20,233.10;297:11 knowledge (3)	7.0,10.3,10.7,43.2, /8.6.50.15.57.13.10.	217.17,21,221:10; 232.10.275.22.280.5	152.12,219.17,20 lets (1)
Kerns (2)	63·20·64·1·100·8	59·17·67·16·07·11·	learning (7)	300.20
301.16.18	knowledgeable (3)	103.22.106.1.117.18	46:17:62.7.79.20	letting (1)
Kerns' (1)	63:14:98:9.263.1	165.12.168.11.173.20.	179:12:180.17.182.14	304:9
127:16	known (1)	179:2:184:15:206:3	219:3	level (39)
Kettering (1)	154:9	243:9;244:3:254:18:	learns (1)	21:7;30:22:33:1:
151:7	knows (3)	256:18;258:14:259:4:	278:6	50:22;90:8;92:19;93:2.
key (4)	45:20;196:12;259:12	263:16,17;264:12;	least (26)	13,14,16,17;94:1,4,11,
19:7;66:9;219:11;	KOL (1)	265:6;279:10;294:1;	8:3,9;19:14;22:4;51:5;	14;95:10;108:16;

June 5, 2015

111.11 12 12.112.20.	15.45.1.50.10.70.10.	67.20.103.1 2.106.6	122-2-125-22-127-15-	
111.11,12,13,113.20, 114.11.119.20,20,21.	15,45.1,59.10,79.19, 95·4·101·15·102·13·	07.20,105.1,2,100.0, 113.15.120.21.135.12.	125.5, 125.22, 127.15, 129.17.131.7.133.12.	M
127.12.14.18 19	111.5 15.116.5 5.118.7	136.21 22.147.21 22.	129.17,131.7,135.1,2, 134.7.135.14.140.916.	N
181.2.208.6.215.16	120.10.126.18.127.13	152.11.161.1.162.4	1/1.13 22.1/2.11 21.	
228.3.257.4.268.13	130.17.131.16.133.17	164.9.170.22.171.2.6	145.18.149.11 19 20.	machine (1)
271.12.291.2.296.15	134.9.140.13 17 20.	177.22.180.8.183.10	150.10 11 17 20.151.10	180:15
316:17:318:22	141:12.16:142:22:	15:184:2:186:5:188:15:	11.16:152:8.9.12.17.22:	macrophages (1)
levels (2)	144:5:146:6:169:10.11:	190:10:201:1:215:9:	153:4:156:12:158:1:	105:12 magic (1)
28:15:271:2	177:12;191:14;194:7;	221:17;225:6;243:3;	160:7,22;161:16;163:6;	133.6
leverage (2)	207:20;213:3;215:11;	254:13;256:10,16;	165:9;166:15,22;	magnitude (1)
67:7;69:1	216:4,6;223:8;225:9,11;	257:22;259:13;263:4;	167:15;170:9;171:7;	117.5
liability (1)	229:5;230:8;232:15;	265:22;268:3;297:4;	172:4,16;177:18;	$\mathbf{Mail}(1)$
277:4	240:16;243:6,10;	310:14,21;318:10	178:12;179:10;180:21;	263.7
liars (1)	249:16;250:15;251:4;	looked (9)	184:18;187:8;191:7;	main (2)
139:6	254:15;257:18;258:9,	47:12;56:16;129:8,9;	193:14,18;198:3;199:3;	118:20:310:15
lies (2)	15;259:6;265:1;281:9;	142:11;175:8;182:4;	200:3;203:10,11;	major (10)
71:21,21	289:1,14;307:3;317:10,	260:11;277:10	205:11;220:3;228:1;	58:18;68:15;110:4;
life (4)	11;319:20	looking (57)	229:21;234:1,2,16,17;	143:1;163:21;170:3;
112:9;126:22;150:7;	live (3)	8:22;10:19;13:9;	238:13;239:10;243:1,8;	171:9;189:11,20;321:8
196:5	112:9;120:6;161:9	15:20;16:9,14,15,17;	252:18,22;253:13,14;	majority (2)
light (1)	lives (3)	19:21;20:11;21:8,11,15,	256:6;261:21;265:16,	112:5;252:3
135:6	78:16;120:6;141:6	21;23:16;38:7;39:2;	17;266:22;267:8,22;	makes (20)
lightheartedly (1)	living (2)	44:12;56:12;76:8,9;	2/5:12;2/6:7;285:14;	57:12;64:21;111:9,10,
168:1	81:17;112:7	104:5;108:16;119:10;	286:4,1/;288:15,20;	14;124:2;126:22;
liked (1)	$\begin{array}{c} \text{local (5)} \\ 57.9.112.(.192.10) \end{array}$	121:21,21;122:18;	293:19;294:1;302:6;	142:16;159:15;193:16;
191:19	5/:8;112:0;182:19;	126:13,14,15,17;127:22;	304:11,12;320:2,11	213:8;246:9;250:17;
111111111111111111111111111111111111	210:5;298:5	129:17;130:15;150:17;	1015(0) 29.7.52.20.99.10 11.	253:20;254:7,17;
20:20;45:17;144:1;	11.11	138:10,179:18,195:5;	38.7,35.20,88.10,11,	275:12;293:22;302:5,6
257:15;200:4 Limbough (1)	$\mathbf{I}\mathbf{I}\mathbf{I}\mathbf{I}\mathbf{I}\mathbf{I}\mathbf{I}\mathbf{I}\mathbf{I}\mathbf{I}$	199:0;200:5;212:5; 214:4:226:17:230:1;	180:7;237:7;277:20;	making (21)
129.12	106:20:316:57	214.4, 220.17, 230.1, 231.5.238.9, 9.239.19.	520.4 loud (1)	14:11;22:19;42:22;
limitations (1)	lock (2)	231.3,238.3,239.19,	88.8	44:22;59:11;83:19;
231.16	95.18.172.10	273.16.284.11.293.20	Louisiana (1)	85:19;90:11;91:3;114:8;
limited (3)	locked (1)	310:10:311:4	235:18	125:4;159:20;177:12;
45:1:64:1:245:8	300:14	looks (7)	love (1)	102.10,219.17,223.17, 225.5.206.1,3.308.18.
limits (1)	locks (2)	46:12;126:6;199:11,	192:2	319.1
143:14	172:9,17	21;291:15;293:19;	low (14)	MALAMUT (16)
line (3)	logic (1)	303:10	35:12;40:7;41:22;	35:3.19:41:11.14:
205:16;257:2;309:15	30:13	lopsided (1)	42:13;105:19;107:21;	42:2:43:2:44:18:50:12:
lines (3)	logical (2)	297:4	109:2;118:8,11;131:17,	53:5:54:10:57:2.11:
15:9;27:16;128:13	76:5;286:1	lopsidedness (1)	20;132:16;169:6;257:16	60:12;67:15;84:3;98:16
list (2)	logistics (1)	65:4	lower (2)	malaria (1)
60:14;318:10	4:18	Los (1)	135:8;188:19	262:16
listed (3)	London (1)	248:3	Luckily (1)	MALE (92)
16:6;293:13;324:2	291:12	lose (3)	151:11	3:2;4:1,3,7;5:2;7:13;
<b>listen</b> (1)	long (19)	/3:20;91:11;143:/	<b>Iuncn (17)</b>	31:18;33:13;36:7;52:4;
210:10 listened (1)	31:13;39:3;83:14; 101·/·121·7·167·2	105111g (1) 13.5	97:7,0,174:19,22;	53:6;54:19;55:8;57:5,
130.5	168.11.185.3.100.0.	45.5 Lost (3)	192.3,197.10,201.18,19,	12,16,18;58:1,15;61:11;
listening (5)	103.11,105.5,190.9,	17.5.40.1.140.17	21,207.0,11,10,10, 208.11.210.20.284.2.	64:12;66:13;68:4;85:6;
34.20.97.2.129.11 12	247.17.250.16.251.5	lot $(151)$	200.11,210.20,204.2,	86:6,12;90:20;183:7;
14	315:3:318:6 19 21	8.5.22.20.25.9 19	luncheon (1)	192:4;209:8;210:18;
lists (1)	longer (2)	26:11:28:13.15.22:	207:22	210:11;219:10;222:15;
58:22	167:7:221:8	30:11.15:31:3.5.8.9:	lunchtime (1)	15 21.221.2 20.222.2
literal (1)	long-QT (1)	37:10,17,22;39:6;40:1;	3:12	13,21,231.3,20,232.2;
231:7	230:2	41:1;44:21;45:4;46:11;	lungs (2)	233.22,240.19,241.17, 242.4.240.19,241.17, 242.4.240.19,241.17,
literally (2)	long-term (3)	49:14;53:7;56:12;65:11;	163:12,13	246:16:248:17:249:11
116:1;187:17	22:1,3;118:3	69:7,7,17;83:8,13,19;	lurches (1)	250:1.11.14:252:16
literature (3)	look (59)	85:13;89:14;103:22;	22:7	255:15,17.18:259:3.5:
14:5;129:22;296:13	8:17;12:12;14:13;	104:3;106:14;108:7;	lying (2)	270:6,9;272:7,12;
little (70)	19:19;20:1,5;23:6;38:8;	112:12,15;113:1,6,21,	233:5;280:8	275:11,12;284:20;
5:22;9:10;16:8;19:21;	43:22;44:15;45:6,11;	22;114:4,7,21;118:6,9,		285:1;288:18;289:18;
21:20;36:20;41:15;43:8,	47:3,10;52:2;66:8;	15;120:13,14;122:8;		291:18;296:4;299:20;

	1			
300:10:301:2.4.16:	mark (7)	232:15:237:2:240:13:	meaning (2)	meds (3)
305:3.7:306:2.6.19:	209:1:236:12:237:2:	266:11:269:5.20:	212:5:255:22	16:13:51:3:233:5
307.3 9.309.8.313.16	256.19.258.14.270.20	272.18.273.20.277.12	meaningful (1)	meet (5)
314.3.315.15.316.15	322.7	287.10.291.21.303.3	124.8	53.10.148.7.166.10
319.15.323.13	markers (1)	311.5 10 21.312.12	meaningless (1)	185.15.300.21
malfeasance (3)	214.4	314.9.318.4.22	87·19	meeting $(40)$
72.6.77.16.91.21	market (8)	Maybe $(64)$	means (7)	3.12.4.16.45.19
malfeasant (1)	107.16.141.4.147.22	20.8.24.12.41.17	88.10.109.19.110.7	46.21.47.13.52.16
50.5	1/8.5.152.3.182.10	42.1.43.4 5.46.5.50.16	113.12.186.20.108.3	53:12:50:12:60:1:63:16:
malingaring (2)	146.5, 152.5, 162.17, 240.21.216.6	42.1, 43.4, 5, 40.5, 50.10, 51.0.52.15.59.9, 17.	115.12,180.20,198.5,	70.7.71.11 12.70.6 18.
16.16 19	249.21,310.0	50.6 10.60.1 9.69.2	277.0 moont (1)	/0./,/1.11,12,/9.0,10,
40.10,18	149.4	<i>39.0,10,00.1,0,06.2,</i> <i>74.22.70.5.82.21.84.20</i>	200.14	00:14;85:18;84:5;85:15; 06:10:146:4:150:22;
17(-21-177-C	140:4 Mariana (19)	74:22;79:5;82:21;84:20;	200.14	90:10;140:4;130:22;
1/0:21;1//:0	<b>Markman (18)</b>	89:18;92:17;94:19;95:6;	$\begin{array}{c} \text{measure (14)} \\ 22.11.(7.4.(9.0)) \end{array}$	101:18;107:10;190:15;
management (4)	98:19;99:3,6,19,20,22;	99:14;102:7;111:8;	25:11;07:4;08:9;	194:14;207:15;219:21;
0:1/;/4:1;119:21;		131:13;140:17;145:4;	154:1;178:11;206:9,11;	221:22;232:3,9;242:14;
150:8	135:22;174:15;176:20;	147:3;161:13,14;	209:14;213:17;245:12;	255:2;264:7;286:8;
manager (1)	180:14;182:16;186:17;	1/3:15;1/5:15;1//:12;	281:5,5,6;319:7	290:10,12;300:13;324:8,
54:4	210:21;212:19;276:5	189:6;202:16;214:6;	measurement (9)	14
manages (1)	Markman's (1)	218:18,21;221:5;223:9;	64:8,10;195:8,15,16;	meetings (14)
191:2	262:19	225:6;227:17;231:5;	206:21;207:1;209:11;	25:14;34:11;68:7;
managing (2)	Mark's (1)	254:7;255:20;257:1;	245:12	81:14;83:7;88:13;94:20;
117:9;134:4	264:21	258:10;259:14;268:7;	measurements (2)	100:2,10;119:9;164:22;
mandated (2)	mass (1)	275:3;279:8;283:6;	38:12;75:1	167:19;180:2;220:15
39:21;41:14	6:7	292:5,21;297:7,9;	measures (9)	meets (3)
maneuvers (1)	master (1)	298:17;301:5;321:2;	37:18;38:11;148:3;	60:7,17;145:13
227:20	189:10	323:4	153:10;160:9;161:2;	Meg (1)
Manhattan (1)	material (2)	McDERMOTT (50)	193:5;196:6;206:16	262:19
82:2	261:19;321:7	5:11;24:9;27:14;30:3;	mechanical (1)	meld (1)
manipulate (1)	materials (7)	34:3;36:6;43:7;45:16,	84:14	213:5
302:15	83:8;86:11,14,15;	18;48:2;50:10;52:3;	mechanism (1)	Melinda (1)
manner (2)	117:7;161:7;239:4	54:17;56:10,22;58:13;	310:14	262:15
13:15;120:18	mathematical (1)	61:14;63:21;66:12;69:2;	mechanisms (3)	members (1)
manual (4)	5:12	70:1;71:19;78:14;80:4;	75:7;158:7;173:3	12:16
195:9,13;197:10;	Matt (1)	82:20;84:22;87:1;88:6;	medial (1)	membership (1)
209:6	66:12	89:2;92:14;95:21;96:5;	112:5	87:6
manufacturing (3)	matter (7)	99:2;116:22;139:3;	medical (50)	mental (1)
7:2,10;23:8	13:21;44:16;102:2;	174:13;175:7;178:22;	32:1;34:9,17,22;35:2,	135:1
manuscript (11)	127:10;193:13;219:18;	181:21;184:12;188:7;	15;36:11,18,20;39:4,9,	montion (0)
62:18;96:14,18;				mention ())
105 01 106 0 000 10	235:11	191:12;195:5;197:15;	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1,	91:9;155:22;162:7;
105:21;106:9;220:18;	235:11 matters (3)	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1;	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14,	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21;
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8;	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17;	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1)	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 MDs (1)	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9;	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31)
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 many (42)	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18;	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19;
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 many (42) 12:8;21:3;28:14;	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1)	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 MDs (1) 170:15 Meaker (1)	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14;	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9;
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 <b>many (42)</b> 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13:52:8;54:1:65:20;	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 MDs (1) 170:15 Meaker (1) 24:4	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9;	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6;
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 <b>many (42)</b> 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16;	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1)	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 MDs (1) 170:15 Meaker (1) 24:4 mean (60)	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11;	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2;
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 <b>many (42)</b> 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7;	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 MDs (1) 170:15 Meaker (1) 24:4 mean (60) 13:13:23:4,6;31:4;	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18,	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1,
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 <b>many (42)</b> 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11;	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73)	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19:33:19;34:9;35:3;	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7;
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 <b>many (42)</b> 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14;	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17:15:17:19:1;	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15:38:6;39:4;42:22;	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 medication (23)	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16;
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 <b>many (42)</b> 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18:155:9:160:5;	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13:48:20:50:18;	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5:50:12:53:11.21;	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17:15:20:74:16.22;	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17:259:17:266:22;
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 <b>many (42)</b> 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11:213:15.21:	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4:58:3:63:16:72:2:	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5;50:12;53:11,21; 60:18:61:9,15:69:13;	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5:224:3:241:3,4;	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21:301:16:314:21
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 <b>many (42)</b> 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11;213:15,21; 225:13;233:10,11:253:4.	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4;58:3;63:16;72:2; 74:14:78:10:84:1.5;	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5;50:12;53:11,21; 60:18;61:9,15;69:13; 73:19:81:16:87:13;	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5;224:3;241:3,4; 244:4:249:1,2:260:14.	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21;301:16;314:21 mentioning (3)
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 <b>many (42)</b> 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11;213:15,21; 225:13;233:10,11;253:4, 5.5:259:2,20:260:13;	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4;58:3;63:16;72:2; 74:14;78:10;84:1,5; 99:16:112:4:119:21;	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5;50:12;53:11,21; 60:18;61:9,15;69:13; 73:19;81:16;87:13; 108:17:130:15:194:12:	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5;224:3;241:3,4; 244:4;249:1,2;260:14, 15:265:3:266:19:267:6	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21;301:16;314:21 mentioning (3) 16:20:279:22:314:9
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 <b>many (42)</b> 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11;213:15,21; 225:13;233:10,11;253:4, 5,5;259:2,20;260:13; 274:5:287:4:304:17.18:	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4;58:3;63:16;72:2; 74:14;78:10;84:1,5; 99:16;112:4;119:21; 127:10,10:137:16;	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5;50:12;53:11,21; 60:18;61:9,15;69:13; 73:19;81:16;87:13; 108:17;130:15;194:12; 198:17:200:11:201:3:	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5;224:3;241:3,4; 244:4;249:1,2;260:14, 15;265:3;266:19;267:6, 10,14,17:268:4:286:6;	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21;301:16;314:21 mentioning (3) 16:20;279:22;314:9 Merck (11)
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 <b>many (42)</b> 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11;213:15,21; 225:13;233:10,11;253:4, 5,5;259:2,20;260:13; 274:5;287:4;304:17,18; 308:1 8:321:1:323:22	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4;58:3;63:16;72:2; 74:14;78:10;84:1,5; 99:16;112:4;119:21; 127:10,10;137:16; 138:17:143:19:145:3 6;	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5;50:12;53:11,21; 60:18;61:9,15;69:13; 73:19;81:16;87:13; 108:17;130:15;194:12; 198:17;200:11;201:3; 204:12:205:2 9:216:1	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5;224:3;241:3,4; 244:4;249:1,2;260:14, 15;265:3;266:19;267:6, 10,14,17;268:4;286:6; 303:11:307:18	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21;301:16;314:21 mentioning (3) 16:20;279:22;314:9 Merck (11) 54:21:139:19:20:
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 many (42) 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11;213:15,21; 225:13;233:10,11;253:4, 5,5;259:2,20;260:13; 274:5;287:4;304:17,18; 308:1,8;321:1;323:22 man (1)	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4;58:3;63:16;72:2; 74:14;78:10;84:1,5; 99:16;112:4;119:21; 127:10,10;137:16; 138:17;143:19;145:3,6; 148:3,22:151:12:160:4	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5;50:12;53:11,21; 60:18;61:9,15;69:13; 73:19;81:16;87:13; 108:17;130:15;194:12; 198:17;200:11;201:3; 204:12;205:2,9;216:1; 218:7:221:7 10:225:6;	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5;224:3;241:3,4; 244:4;249:1,2;260:14, 15;265:3;266:19;267:6, 10,14,17;268:4;286:6; 303:11;307:18 <b>medications (8)</b>	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21;301:16;314:21 mentioning (3) 16:20;279:22;314:9 Merck (11) 54:21;139:19,20; 140:10 16 18:154:9 9:
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 many (42) 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11;213:15,21; 225:13;233:10,11;253:4, 5,5;259:2,20;260:13; 274:5;287:4;304:17,18; 308:1,8;321:1;323:22 map (1) 200:18	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4;58:3;63:16;72:2; 74:14;78:10;84:1,5; 99:16;112:4;119:21; 127:10,10;137:16; 138:17;143:19;145:3,6; 148:3,22;151:12;160:4; 165:1:169:3:172:14:	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5;50:12;53:11,21; 60:18;61:9,15;69:13; 73:19;81:16;87:13; 108:17;130:15;194:12; 198:17;200:11;201:3; 204:12;205:2,9;216:1; 218:7;221:7,10;225:6; 227:10:230:7;21:233:9.	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5;224:3;241:3,4; 244:4;249:1,2;260:14, 15;265:3;266:19;267:6, 10,14,17;268:4;286:6; 303:11;307:18 <b>medications (8)</b> 13:67:15:21:16:213	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21;301:16;314:21 mentioning (3) 16:20;279:22;314:9 Merck (11) 54:21;139:19,20; 140:10,16,18;154:9,9; 156:19:190:18:109:2
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 many (42) 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11;213:15,21; 225:13;233:10,11;253:4, 5,5;259:2,20;260:13; 274:5;287:4;304:17,18; 308:1,8;321:1;323:22 map (1) 200:18 manning (1)	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4;58:3;63:16;72:2; 74:14;78:10;84:1,5; 99:16;112:4;119:21; 127:10,10;137:16; 138:17;143:19;145:3,6; 148:3,22;151:12;160:4; 165:1;169:3;172:14; 175:22:179:3:182:8:10	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5;50:12;53:11,21; 60:18;61:9,15;69:13; 73:19;81:16;87:13; 108:17;130:15;194:12; 198:17;200:11;201:3; 204:12;205:2,9;216:1; 218:7;221:7,10;225:6; 227:10;230:7,21;233:9; 243:14:248:18:252:21:	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5;224:3;241:3,4; 244:4;249:1,2;260:14, 15;265:3;266:19;267:6, 10,14,17;268:4;286:6; 303:11;307:18 <b>medications (8)</b> 13:6,7;15:21;16:2,13, 15:42:4:131:4	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21;301:16;314:21 mentioning (3) 16:20;279:22;314:9 Merck (11) 54:21;139:19,20; 140:10,16,18;154:9,9; 156:19;190:18;199:2 merit (2)
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 many (42) 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11;213:15,21; 225:13;233:10,11;253:4, 5,5;259:2,20;260:13; 274:5;287:4;304:17,18; 308:1,8;321:1;323:22 map (1) 200:18 mapping (1) 83:10	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4;58:3;63:16;72:2; 74:14;78:10;84:1,5; 99:16;112:4;119:21; 127:10,10;137:16; 138:17;143:19;145:3,6; 148:3,22;151:12;160:4; 165:1;169:3;172:14; 175:22;179:3;182:8,10; 184:16:187:14:190:22	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5;50:12;53:11,21; 60:18;61:9,15;69:13; 73:19;81:16;87:13; 108:17;130:15;194:12; 198:17;200:11;201:3; 204:12;205:2,9;216:1; 218:7;221:7,10;225:6; 227:10;230:7,21;233:9; 243:14;248:18;252:21; 255:15:278:15 17:	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5;224:3;241:3,4; 244:4;249:1,2;260:14, 15;265:3;266:19;267:6, 10,14,17;268:4;286:6; 303:11;307:18 <b>medications (8)</b> 13:6,7;15:21;16:2,13, 15;42:4;131:4 <b>Medicine (13)</b>	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21;301:16;314:21 mentioning (3) 16:20;279:22;314:9 Merck (11) 54:21;139:19,20; 140:10,16,18;154:9,9; 156:19;190:18;199:2 merit (2) 114:12 18
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 many (42) 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11;213:15,21; 225:13;233:10,11;253:4, 5,5;259:2,20;260:13; 274:5;287:4;304:17,18; 308:1,8;321:1;323:22 map (1) 200:18 mapping (1) 83:10 marginally (1)	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4;58:3;63:16;72:2; 74:14;78:10;84:1,5; 99:16;112:4;119:21; 127:10,10;137:16; 138:17;143:19;145:3,6; 148:3,22;151:12;160:4; 165:1;169:3;172:14; 175:22;179:3;182:8,10; 184:16;187:14;190:22; 199:5:205:17 10:206:7	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5;50:12;53:11,21; 60:18;61:9,15;69:13; 73:19;81:16;87:13; 108:17;130:15;194:12; 198:17;200:11;201:3; 204:12;205:2,9;216:1; 218:7;221:7,10;225:6; 227:10;230:7,21;233:9; 243:14;248:18;252:21; 255:15;278:15,17; 282:18:28:12:201:3; 60:	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5;224:3;241:3,4; 244:4;249:1,2;260:14, 15;265:3;266:19;267:6, 10,14,17;268:4;286:6; 303:11;307:18 <b>medications (8)</b> 13:6,7;15:21;16:2,13, 15;42:4;131:4 <b>Medicine (13)</b> 72:18:73:7 22:74:18:	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21;301:16;314:21 mentioning (3) 16:20;279:22;314:9 Merck (11) 54:21;139:19,20; 140:10,16,18;154:9,9; 156:19;190:18;199:2 merit (2) 114:12,18 message (7)
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 many (42) 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11;213:15,21; 225:13;233:10,11;253:4, 5,5;259:2,20;260:13; 274:5;287:4;304:17,18; 308:1,8;321:1;323:22 map (1) 200:18 mapping (1) 83:10 marginally (1) 212:6	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4;58:3;63:16;72:2; 74:14;78:10;84:1,5; 99:16;112:4;119:21; 127:10,10;137:16; 138:17;143:19;145:3,6; 148:3,22;151:12;160:4; 165:1;169:3;172:14; 175:22;179:3;182:8,10; 184:16;187:14;190:22; 199:5;205:17,19;206:7; 208:12 22:218:11 12:	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5;50:12;53:11,21; 60:18;61:9,15;69:13; 73:19;81:16;87:13; 108:17;130:15;194:12; 198:17;200:11;201:3; 204:12;205:2,9;216:1; 218:7;221:7,10;225:6; 227:10;230:7,21;233:9; 243:14;248:18;252:21; 255:15;278:15,17; 282:18;283:12;291:3,6; 29:4:297:15:306:10:	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5;224:3;241:3,4; 244:4;249:1,2;260:14, 15;265:3;266:19;267:6, 10,14,17;268:4;286:6; 303:11;307:18 <b>medications (8)</b> 13:6,7;15:21;16:2,13, 15;42:4;131:4 <b>Medicine (13)</b> 72:18;73:7,22;74:18; 75:8:134:18:180:22:	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21;301:16;314:21 mentioning (3) 16:20;279:22;314:9 Merck (11) 54:21;139:19,20; 140:10,16,18;154:9,9; 156:19;190:18;199:2 merit (2) 114:12,18 message (7) 72:20,22:73:12:92:11;
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 many (42) 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11;213:15,21; 225:13;233:10,11;253:4, 5,5;259:2,20;260:13; 274:5;287:4;304:17,18; 308:1,8;321:1;323:22 map (1) 200:18 mapping (1) 83:10 marginally (1) 212:6 Maria (2)	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4;58:3;63:16;72:2; 74:14;78:10;84:1,5; 99:16;112:4;119:21; 127:10,10;137:16; 138:17;143:19;145:3,6; 148:3,22;151:12;160:4; 165:1;169:3;172:14; 175:22;179:3;182:8,10; 184:16;187:14;190:22; 199:5;205:17,19;206:7; 208:12,22;218:11,12; 222:6,11,11:224:21;	191:12;195:5;197:15; 201:17;203:6;206:1; 207:4,12,17 <b>MDs (1)</b> 170:15 <b>Meaker (1)</b> 24:4 <b>mean (60)</b> 13:13;23:4,6;31:4; 32:19;33:19;34:9;35:3; 36:15;38:6;39:4;42:22; 43:5;50:12;53:11,21; 60:18;61:9,15;69:13; 73:19;81:16;87:13; 108:17;130:15;194:12; 198:17;200:11;201:3; 204:12;205:2,9;216:1; 218:7;221:7,10;225:6; 227:10;230:7,21;233:9; 243:14;248:18;252:21; 255:15;278:15,17; 282:18;283:12;291:3,6; 292:4;297:15;306:10; 312:616:314:4:216:25;	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5;224:3;241:3,4; 244:4;249:1,2;260:14, 15;265:3;266:19;267:6, 10,14,17;268:4;286:6; 303:11;307:18 <b>medications (8)</b> 13:6,7;15:21;16:2,13, 15;42:4;131:4 <b>Medicine (13)</b> 72:18;73:7,22;74:18; 75:8;134:18;180:22; 181:1:224:110:230:20;	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21;301:16;314:21 mentioning (3) 16:20;279:22;314:9 Merck (11) 54:21;139:19,20; 140:10,16,18;154:9,9; 156:19;190:18;199:2 merit (2) 114:12,18 message (7) 72:20,22;73:12;92:11; 93:3 10:104:10
105:21;106:9;220:18; 288:3;299:3;312:8; 320:8;324:1 many (42) 12:8;21:3;28:14; 30:13;52:8;54:1;65:20; 68:16;77:4;79:16; 110:18;111:18;116:7; 118:9;134:14;142:11; 146:16;148:20;152:14; 154:18;155:9;160:5; 193:11;213:15,21; 225:13;233:10,11;253:4, 5,5;259:2,20;260:13; 274:5;287:4;304:17,18; 308:1,8;321:1;323:22 map (1) 200:18 mapping (1) 83:10 marginally (1) 212:6 Maria (2) 122:13:123:20	235:11 matters (3) 127:11;132:22;160:10 mature (1) 49:22 Max (1) 275:21 Maxwell (1) 254:14 may (73) 14:17;15:17;19:1; 45:5,13;48:20;50:18; 51:4;58:3;63:16;72:2; 74:14;78:10;84:1,5; 99:16;112:4;119:21; 127:10,10;137:16; 138:17;143:19;145:3,6; 148:3,22;151:12;160:4; 165:1;169:3;172:14; 175:22;179:3;182:8,10; 184:16;187:14;190:22; 199:5;205:17,19;206:7; 208:12,22;218:11,12; 222:6,11,11;224:21; 225:15 17:228:5	$\begin{array}{c} 191:12; 195:5; 197:15;\\ 201:17; 203:6; 206:1;\\ 207:4, 12, 17\\ \mbox{MDs (1)}\\ 170:15\\ \mbox{Meaker (1)}\\ 24:4\\ \mbox{mean (60)}\\ 13:13; 23:4, 6; 31:4;\\ 32:19; 33:19; 34:9; 35:3;\\ 36:15; 38:6; 39:4; 42:22;\\ 43:5; 50:12; 53:11, 21;\\ 60:18; 61:9, 15; 69:13;\\ 73:19; 81:16; 87:13;\\ 108:17; 130:15; 194:12;\\ 198:17; 200:11; 201:3;\\ 204:12; 205:2, 9; 216:1;\\ 218:7; 221:7, 10; 225:6;\\ 227:10; 230:7, 21; 233:9;\\ 243:14; 248:18; 252:21;\\ 255:15; 278:15, 17;\\ 282:18; 283:12; 291:3, 6;\\ 292:4; 297:15; 306:10;\\ 312:6, 16; 314:4; 316:2, 5;\\ 320:10\\ \end{array}$	17;40:5,11,12;46:2;86:1, 2,3;109:18,20;110:9,14, 19;113:7,11,14,17; 116:4;124:11;130:9; 136:12,15,20;137:18; 139:10;144:18;157:14; 160:4;161:19;163:9; 170:14;187:1;196:11; 221:21;234:11;300:18, 19;301:1;308:8 <b>medication (23)</b> 12:17;15:20;74:16,22; 162:5;224:3;241:3,4; 244:4;249:1,2;260:14, 15;265:3;266:19;267:6, 10,14,17;268:4;286:6; 303:11;307:18 <b>medications (8)</b> 13:6,7;15:21;16:2,13, 15;42:4;131:4 <b>Medicine (13)</b> 72:18;73:7,22;74:18; 75:8;134:18;180:22; 181:1;224:1,10;239:20; 252:5:290:22	91:9;155:22;162:7; 167:12;168:12,21; 175:18;252:11;269:11 mentioned (31) 7:1;18:3;35:16;47:19; 63:6;76:4;90:21;136:9; 143:17;146:13;154:6; 158:4;163:20;166:2; 167:11,13;172:21;175:1, 19;176:18,20;179:7; 187:21;188:12;227:16; 258:17;259:17;266:22; 268:21;301:16;314:21 mentioning (3) 16:20;279:22;314:9 Merck (11) 54:21;139:19,20; 140:10,16,18;154:9,9; 156:19;190:18;199:2 merit (2) 114:12,18 message (7) 72:20,22;73:12;92:11; 93:3,10;104:10 messages (1)

246.6	261.11.277
messing (1)	288.1 6.202
100.9	200.1,0,272
190.8	307:0,20;308
met (2)	1/;316:14;3
61:7;264:10	319:10
method (2)	migraine (8)
27:18;168:4	155:12;234
methodologies (4)	253:22;254
170:21:220:7:227:8:	Mike (12)
244.13	5.6.76.4.79
methodology (2)	189.3.239.1
62:10:147:12	272.11 12.2
02.10,147.15	275.11,12,2
methods (7)	2/5:15;2/7
11:10;21:12;27:20;	Mike! (1)
30:20;38:7;73:8;297:13	301:3
methotrexate (1)	Mike's (2)
235:17	233:21;276
metric (1)	mild (1)
67:6	108:3
metrics (2)	milligrams (2
69:17 22	105.16.137
$M_{otro}(1)$	million(2)
22.7	11000(2)
22:1	110:10,11
MI (1)	millions (3)
259:1	107:3,4;216
mic (1)	mills (2)
183:7	166:8,8
mic] (1)	mind (19)
308:7	3:4:19:9:24
Michael (2)	72.12.102.1
Michael (2)	72.12,102.1
13.7.232.13	183.13.203
43:7;232:13	183:13;203
43:7;232:13 micro (1)	183:13;203 216:22;242:
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1)	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 <b>minds (3)</b>
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1)	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 <b>minds (3)</b> 102:14;209
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5)
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1)	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121 190:12;250
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2)	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121 190:12;250 minimal (1)
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16:265:20	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121 190:12;250 minimal (1) 322:9
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1)	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121 190:12;250 minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8)
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121 190:12;250 minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1:73:4:11
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3)	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121 190:12;250 minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11 155:20:248:
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 05:17:208:20:211:20	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121 190:12;250 minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11 155:20;248: 270:16 18
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121 190:12;250 minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11 155:20;248: 279:16,18
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12)	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121 190:12;250 minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1)
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10,	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121 190:12;250 minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17,	183:13;203 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121 190:12;250 minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1)
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250: minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61)	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250: minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1)
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1;	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250: minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1; 37:11;39:2;47:5;84:18;	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250: minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20 minor (3)
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1; 37:11;39:2;47:5;84:18; 87:16;102:3;120:9,10;	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250: minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20 minor (3) 248:15;268
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1; 37:11;39:2;47:5;84:18; 87:16;102:3;120:9,10; 122:4:127:18:130:1;	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250: minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20 minor (3) 248:15;268 minorities (1)
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1; 37:11;39:2;47:5;84:18; 87:16;102:3;120:9,10; 122:4;127:18;130:1; 135:2:143:17:148:8:	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250 minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20 minor (3) 248:15;268 minorities (1) 168:18
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1; 37:11;39:2;47:5;84:18; 87:16;102:3;120:9,10; 122:4;127:18;130:1; 135:2;143:17;148:8; 158:13:164:10:167:3:	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250: minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20 minor (3) 248:15;268 minorities (1) 168:18 minority (1)
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1; 37:11;39:2;47:5;84:18; 87:16;102:3;120:9,10; 122:4;127:18;130:1; 135:2;143:17;148:8; 158:13;164:10;167:3; 177:7 9 10:178:17 18:	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250: minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20 minor (3) 248:15;268 minorities (1) 168:18 minority (1) 168:13
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1; 37:11;39:2;47:5;84:18; 87:16;102:3;120:9,10; 122:4;127:18;130:1; 135:2;143:17;148:8; 158:13;164:10;167:3; 177:7,9,10;178:17,18; 181:19:182:10:182:9	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250: minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20 minor (3) 248:15;268 minorities (1) 168:18 minority (1) 168:13 minuses (1)
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1; 37:11;39:2;47:5;84:18; 87:16;102:3;120:9,10; 122:4;127:18;130:1; 135:2;143:17;148:8; 158:13;164:10;167:3; 177:7,9,10;178:17,18; 181:19;182:10;188:8; 200:15:205:19:200:10.	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250: minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20 minor (3) 248:15;268 minorities (1) 168:13 minuses (1) 142:0
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1; 37:11;39:2;47:5;84:18; 87:16;102:3;120:9,10; 122:4;127:18;130:1; 135:2;143:17;148:8; 158:13;164:10;167:3; 177:7,9,10;178:17,18; 181:19;182:10;188:8; 202:15;205:18;209:10;	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250: minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20 minor (3) 248:15;268 minorities (1) 168:13 minuses (1) 142:9
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1; 37:11;39:2;47:5;84:18; 87:16;102:3;120:9,10; 122:4;127:18;130:1; 135:2;143:17;148:8; 158:13;164:10;167:3; 177:7,9,10;178:17,18; 181:19;182:10;188:8; 202:15;205:18;209:10; 211:6;214:19;216:18, 102:3;205:126:9;27:1; 37:12;205:18;209:10; 211:6;214:19;216:18, 102:3;205:12;205:18;209:10; 211:6;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;214:19;216:18, 102:3;214:19;214:19;216	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250: minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20 minor (3) 248:15;268 minorities (1) 168:13 minuses (1) 142:9 minute (3)
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1; 37:11;39:2;47:5;84:18; 87:16;102:3;120:9,10; 122:4;127:18;130:1; 135:2;143:17;148:8; 158:13;164:10;167:3; 177:7,9,10;178:17,18; 181:19;182:10;188:8; 202:15;205:18;209:10; 211:6;214:19;216:18, 19;217:2;221:21;225:2;	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250 minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20 minor (3) 248:15;268 minorities (1) 168:13 minuses (1) 142:9 minute (3) 81:17;102:2
43:7;232:13 micro (1) 120:21 microphone (1) 3:5 microphone] (1) 207:11 midcourse (1) 267:19 middle (2) 67:16;265:20 middling (1) 44:10 midstream (3) 95:17;298:20;311:20 mid-trial (12) 285:9;298:12;302:10, 16;304:3,7,14;311:17, 18;313:6;316:18;318:20 might (61) 18:20;25:1;26:9;27:1; 37:11;39:2;47:5;84:18; 87:16;102:3;120:9,10; 122:4;127:18;130:1; 135:2;143:17;148:8; 158:13;164:10;167:3; 177:7,9,10;178:17,18; 181:19;182:10;188:8; 202:15;205:18;209:10; 211:6;214:19;216:18, 19;217:2;221:21;225:2; 228:17;231:6;239:22;	183:13;203: 216:22;242: 256:3;264:3 298:7,8;320 minds (3) 102:14;209 mine (5) 116:18;121: 190:12;250 minimal (1) 322:9 minimize (8) 9:1;73:4;11: 155:20;248: 279:16,18 minimizes (1) 155:19 minimum (1) 209:17 mining (1) 21:20 minor (3) 248:15;268 minorities (1) 168:13 minuses (1) 142:9 minute (3) 81:17;102:2 minutes (9)

261:11;277:2;285:5;	174:20,22;278:22
288:1,6;292:4;303:12;	minute-to-minute (1)
307:6,20;308:5;311:16,	116:2
17;316:14;317:1,19;	minutiae (1)
319:10	56:7
igraine (8)	mis-adherence (1)
155:12;234:21,22;	267:7
253:22;254:1,1,7,13	misclassification (1)
like (12)	13:5
5:6;/6:4;/9:16;82:20;	misclassified (2)
189:3;239:10;240:21;	13:6;16:12
2/3:11,12;2/4:19;	misconception (2)
2/5:15;2//:0	158:16,22
<b>1Ke:</b> (1)	18.4.20.14.51.22.
301.3	16.4,20.14,31.22,
1KC S (2) 222-21-276-15	2/5.1/,200.21,290.22,
233.21,270.13	515.10 Micha (1)
108.3	82·11
illigrams (2)	misleading (2)
105.16.137.1	51:11:316:13
(2)	mismanaged (1)
116.10.11	48·8
illions (3)	mismatches (2)
107:3.4:216:15	263:22:265:12
ills (2)	miss $(1)$
166:8,8	81:22
ind (19)	missed (1)
3:4;19:9;24:14;37:4;	37:11
72:12;102:17;142:20;	missing (39)
183:13;203:13;213:2;	8:4,14,21,21;9:2,4,7;
216:22;242:20;251:17;	12:4;15:10,12,18;16:1;
256:3;264:3;266:9;	17:21,21;72:15,21;73:4;
298:7,8;320:9	74:14;75:4,5,8,12,22;
inds (3)	92:12;179:17;249:19;
102:14;209:1;286:4	269:18;281:2,9,17,21;
ine (5)	282:6,6,9;283:10;285:4;
116:18;121:6;163:22;	293:5;316:5,11
190:12;250:8	missingness (1)
$\frac{1}{2}$	63:3
322:9	$\frac{\text{mission}\left(1\right)}{2.14}$
$\frac{1111112e(0)}{0.1.72.4.110.10}$	5.14 mistoleos (1)
<i>5.1,75.4,115.15,</i> <i>155.20.248.18.252.20.</i>	170.16
279.16.18	misunderstanding (2)
inimizes (1)	231.6.294.16
155:19	Mitchell (3)
inimum (1)	247:16:253:4:275:21
209:17	modality (1)
ining (1)	228:6
21:20	mode (1)
inor (3)	130:22
248:15;268:7,8	model (5)
inorities (1)	11:22;216:18;283:17,
168:18	19;293:3
inority (1)	modeling (1)
168:13	10:4
inuses (1)	models (1)
142:9	186:21
inute (3)	moderate (2)
81:17;102:22;135:4	108:2,14
inutes (9)	<b>MODERATOR (40)</b>
109:2,3,4;135:5,5,11;	208:2;210:11,16,19;

211:13:212:17:215:8; 217:6:219:9:220:11: 222:13;223:18;224:9; 225:17:226:1.12:229:4: 230:3,9,20;231:1,8,12; 232:13;233:14,19; 235:8;237:17;239:9; 240:18:243:12:246:13: 247:10;251:14;252:15; 256:4:258:13:259:4; 260:8;268:19 moderators (1) 288:10 modernism (1) 121:18 modification (1) 174:17 modified (1) 243:17 modify (2) 206:21:231:17 modifying (1) 174:14 module (3) 195:10,14;196:8 modules (1) 195:18 molar (2) 40:9;283:14 molars (1) 40:15 molecule (4) 149:10:150:2,15; 173:1 molecules (2) 117:22;173:4 moment (6) 4:5:100:14:103:17: 122:11,12;264:5 moments (1) 100:4 moment-to-moment (2) 115:5,9 money (16) 64:18;116:14;142:19, 19,22;143:7,11;150:20; 157:8;163:10;238:21; 258:1,10;286:19;291:6,8 monitor (18) 32:12;49:9;51:8;68:9; 110:12;115:14;144:18; 157:14:161:19.20: 170:20;300:18,19;301:1, 20;302:1,2;312:14 monitored (1) 314:7 monitoring (51) 6:2,13,21;18:5,6,8,11, 15,17,20;19:3,4,12,14, 16,18;23:14;24:15,18, 18;25:10;26:7,8,19; 31:13;32:19;37:7;45:2; 46:8;52:11,20;53:9;

#### June 5, 2015

54:15:66:2,9:76:3,3: 89:8.14:138:3:170:13. 20;171:14;172:3;214:6, 7;243:7;250:15;251:4; 308:8:314:7 monitors (6) 32:1,6;53:17;119:10; 170:15:304:9 month (4) 161:14:231:4:232:18; 233:16 monthly (2) 281:5,7 months (5) 69:15;161:15;176:13; 187:17;309:14 mooted (1) 22:12 more (130) 8:5;9:5,8;15:22;16:8; 17:12,14;19:17;22:16; 26:6,16,16,19,20;28:17; 33:21;35:6;38:8,10; 41:15;43:15,20;44:15; 48:6;52:7,8;57:16;59:4, 4;61:4;65:12;67:5; 70:15,15;74:19;76:10, 13,21,22;77:11;89:4; 92:1,18;93:9,12;94:7; 97:9:101:15,21:102:9: 103:19:109:2:110:16, 17:118:18:120:18: 123:7:124:8:127:13; 130:7;132:20;134:5; 137:7,7;140:21;143:21; 144:1,5;146:6;148:14; 151:18:155:3:162:8; 166:19;170:6;173:6; 175:16;177:12,21; 179:16,17:180:12; 182:9;183:5,8;188:22; 196:16:197:15:198:2; 204:14;210:3;211:20; 212:15;218:19,22; 225:18;229:6,7,17; 230:22;233:16,20; 237:13,14,15;238:22; 245:6,10;246:10,11; 256:4,5;260:13;261:16; 263:17;266:22;272:19; 274:7;276:11;277:13; 283:9;285:22;287:8; 293:14;294:5;305:1; 308:3;316:20,21;323:4 morning (8) 3:2;43:9;97:13; 120:19;246:19;261:15; 262:12;264:22 most (39) 7:9:15:16:17:4:49:8:

52:17,18;58:3;60:13;

67:22;72:8;81:9,21;

84:16;100:3,20,21;

102:22;122:13;140:11; 15:17:42:4:56:3.3; 77:21:94:15:152:6; 130:4;182:22;183:11; 47:21 64:4.4:133:11:140:7: 155:15:205:9:224:8: 200:22:292:12:293:10: night (3) 146:21:149:7:174:1: 50:15:57:19:136:1 190:22;191:6;208:21; 144:22;146:7;149:5; 234:10;252:2;307:15 294:9:297:5 222:20,22;229:20; 212:21;320:18;324:5 necessary (7) Neil's (1) nightmare (1) 244:2;250:12;253:9; multiplicity (1) 12:3;15:22;18:13; 201:10 63:3 287:1;290:3;293:16; 320:20 38:19;65:3;89:1;210:10 nerve (1) nights (1) 298:18,19;299:2; multi-regional (2) need (129) 104:9 246:22 315:22;322:6 51:15:86:9 6:7:13:14:14:13:17:6. network (3) **NIH (4)** 67:8;73:3;258:4 mostly (1) multisite (1) 11;18:3;19:14;20:15; 28:17;29:5,18;119:3 117:20 288:9 23:17:27:3:35:21:37:5. networks (3) NIH-funded (1) motivation (2) muscular (1) 15;40:5,16;46:17;47:6; 110:2;166:11;187:2 317:17 124:10;127:8 147:16 50:20;52:12;53:16;64:7; neuralgia (1) nine (1) motivations (2) must (5) 75:13;76:8;77:10,11; 83:9 266:6 291:3,6 6:15;10:21;41:8;61:8; 84:20;86:16;89:5,21; neuro (2) Ninety-eight (1) 134:22;135:4 motives (2) 162:5 93:2;96:19;97:16,17; 236:6 286:21;287:10 muster (1) 98:5;101:18;117:12; neurogenic (1) NNTs (1) mouths (1) 304:14 122:2;125:8;140:21; 107:20 104:13 neurologist (5) Nobody (9) 58:17 mutually (1) 142:10;145:8,17,21; move (12) 23:15 147:22;149:17;151:16, 99:4,6;139:8,15; 41:1;50:4;115:12; 17:8;26:6;31:12;96:8; myself (8) 17,18;153:7;154:16; 166:14 194:21;234:22;235:1,1, 100:7;148:16,16; 56:20:119:10:120:17; neurologists (3) 3:295:20 159:12,19:160:10,19,20; 71:22;99:5;139:4 164:14;213:4;218:4; 163:5,7;181:7;228:18; 161:13;165:13;166:15; nociceptor (5) 289:15;298:6 312:9 168:5,20;171:19;173:6; neurology (1) 104:16;105:3,13; moved (2) 174:9;175:15;184:10; 166:14 106:5;164:13 Ν 30:16;83:17 192:9,9;194:17;197:11; neuromodulation (1) nociceptors (1) 104:18 movement (1) 199:16,18;200:8,11,13; 118:1 neuropathic (9) nodding (2) 238:4 name (2) 206:1,4,5;207:6;212:14; movements (1) 179:3;324:3 213:4,20;214:8,17; 82:12;102:7;104:6,11; 222:14:246:14 65:20 narcotic (1) 215:3,7;218:10,14; 117:21;137:2;145:4,5; noise (3) moves (1) 258:6 222:10;225:20;227:2; 205:3 212:15;279:18;280:14 22:8 231:19,22;238:16; neuropathy (1) non-bioavailable (1) narrow (2) 42:14 moving (3) 243:12:252:13 241:9:242:6.18:245:6. 236:17 97:6;112:18;292:3 Nat (29) 10,13,17;246:10;250:20; neurosciences (1) non-clinical (1) 7:2;18:21;31:4;89:2; **Mrs** (2) 251:8,8;255:7;256:9; 177:19 238:16 162:4;181:15 non-clinician (1) 95:20;101:7;179:9; 258:12;259:6;271:3,14; neurosis (1) 180:9;181:22;183:14; 282:19;285:22;288:2; much (67) 223:9 36:21 6:4;19:21;26:12; 294:6,6,19,20,20; neutral (1) none (2) 197:19;198:5;200:22; 163:17;201:15 38:10,22;52:1,7;54:7; 201:17,20,22;206:5; 296:10;307:15;308:17, 123:15 55:3;66:16;68:8;72:5; 208:14,18;210:11; 20;313:12;314:14,15; new (20) non-industry (1) 92:8:93:5:96:21:115:4: 211:17:254:4:261:14: 316:9,15:317:8:321:19 13:3:31:4,22:34:5: 115:7 125:5;128:12;130:7; needed (1) 70:16;72:17;73:2,22; noninferiority (1) 279:12,12,16;280:12; 134:19;143:18;154:7; 284:1:292:19 21:6 85:2;120:21;130:10; 78:1 161:3;162:2,15;165:8, National (5) needing (3) 158:20;170:3;188:10; non-inferiority (1) 207:1;209:11;212:2; 8:16;24:1;72:16;87:3, 4:12;73:17,18 10;182:5;183:15;185:5, 78:2 235:16;247:17;287:9 non-irritable (1) 22 6;188:16;196:16;199:4; needle (1) 216:1,8;217:4;218:22; Nat's (9) 82:1 new-new (1) 105:3 226:21;229:2,14,17; 27:9;69:10;146:13; needs (22) non-provisional (1) 239:17 230:22;233:11;240:1; 191:14;201:8;209:3; 9:16;14:16;15:18; news (4) 96:12 243:7;247:19;249:1; 279:22;292:11;293:8 30:18,19;33:7;37:19,20; 72:14;99:4;274:20; non-regulatory (1) 259:22;261:10;263:3, 56:8;106:15;148:7; 286:17 262:13 naturalist (1) 13:265:9:266:21; 237:8 150:14;152:4;153:17; next (21) nonsense (1) 270:15;273:10;283:15; nature (7) 154:2.3:187:17:196:15: 27:9;67:15,19;68:2, 77:17 289:19;291:7;293:19; 50:7;51:10;62:14; 197:12;303:14;314:5; 20;69:20;89:10;96:8; nonsensical (1) 294:2;296:18;302:22; 70:20;71:13;77:12; 317:2 98:18;99:2;113:4,12; 93:1 308:3;316:21;323:4; 90:22 negative (8) 136:5;197:18;215:17; non-specific (1) 43:13;144:9;190:17; 324:7 navigate (2) 216:3;217:22;218:4; 89:16 multicenter (1) 204:6;249:5,13;250:3,6 232:17;261:10;263:9 non-statistically (1) 244:21;245:3 117:2 navigating (1) negatively (1) nice (5) 289:8 multi-leveled (1) 246:8 168:22 58:5;155:8,12;164:12; non-statisticians (1) 281:11 near (1) negatives (1) 287:9 20:16 multinational (1) 170:4 21:14 nicely (2) nonverbally (1) 288:8 necessarily (13) Neil (11) 97:12;280:22 278:4 19:1;22:22;29:11,12; 42:9;120:8;124:11; niche (1) multiple (14) normally (1)

June 5, 2015

321:13	65:21:117:21	189:17:202:19:207:11:	104:13:106:10:107:11.	140:14:149:21:160:21:
North (1)	object (1)	208.17.211.6.218.4	15.110.8 8.111.1	169.21.180.10.183.3.
287.17	312.21	230:11:231:10:232:7	112.16.114.10.14	103.13.107.11.208.6
207.17 Nastlassa (1)	312.21	250.11,251.10,252.7,	112.10,114.10,14,	175.15,177.11,208.0,
Northwestern (1)	objective (2)	15;237:7;256:20;270:6;	118:8;119:14;121:5;	212:6;213:21;220:14;
287:1	6:15;257:12	280:12;282:13;308:7;	128:20;131:14;132:18;	226:2;252:7;255:8;
note (2)	objectives (1)	324:3	133:9;134:17,17;136:5;	256:5;259:3;261:9;
48:3;50:9	264:2	offer (3)	138:10;139:21;141:19;	266:18;282:14;302:11;
noted (1)	obligation (1)	127:6;152:8,9	143:21;144:17;145:9;	306:6;313:16
182:5	87:5	Office (14)	149:21:150:18:151:1:	onset (1)
noteworthy (1)	observation (6)	11.11 13 14.12.5	152.18.155.9.156.22	108.13
14.5	0.6.52.5.106.1.177.5	21.16.33.1 2 5.00.6	157.1 5 14 21.158.10	onsite (8)
44.3	9.0,52.5,100.1,177.5,	21.10, 55.1, 2, 5, 90.0, 120, 6, 121, 5, 120, 10,	157.1,5,14,21,158.19,	19.(11,20,10,14,16)
nouce (4)	205:8;210:2	120:0;121:3;129:10;	101:13,103:3,104:9,	18:0,11,20,19:14,10;
207:10;285:20;	observations (4)	130:21;189:8	165:2;167:3,12;168:1,	23:14;27:16;52:20
292:11;311:22	46:11;215:19;216:5;	offices (1)	12,14;169:5,21;170:3,	on-state (2)
noticed (2)	272:13	83:3	22;171:5,16;172:8;	199:12,15
31:7;267:17	observed (3)	off-state (2)	173:10;174:1;175:14;	on-the-job (1)
notification (1)	92:20:181:7:322:18	199:12.16	179:7.19:180:5.7.11:	119:14
308.17	Observer-reported (1)	often (12)	183.19.188.5 7.189.8	onus (2)
noting(1)	14.17	24.21.78.4 5 8.84.5	100.10 21.101.1 10.	211.22.200.8
257.10	14.17 abcompone (1)	24.21,70.4,5,0,04.5, 142.10,151.12,159.7.	190.10,21,191.1,10, 102.5,12,105.7,109.0	211.22,299.0
237.19		145.10,151.15,150.7,	195.5,15,195.7,196.9,	open (4)
notion (5)	163:3	161:12;2/3:9;28/:6;	18;199:20;200:5;201:7;	26:1;55:17;118:3;
103:8;104:15;186:19;	observing (1)	306:10	203:7,9,12;205:7;212:4;	221:3
193:2;216:7	174:5	oftentimes (1)	213:6,21;215:16;	opening (1)
notions (1)	obviated (1)	105:5	216:12;217:2,19;218:17,	137:19
101:10	302:21	<b>OIC</b> (1)	17:221:6:222:15.16:	operating (1)
novel (3)	obvious (7)	65.19	223.18.227.22.230.11	246.18
107.19 10.159.7	8.5.52.4.02.10.	$\operatorname{ald}(2)$	18.221.0.227.22,230.11,	operation (1)
107.10,19,130.7	0.5, 52.4, 55.15, 102, 17, 200, 12, 207, 9, 102, 17, 200, 12, 207, 9, 102, 102, 102, 102, 102, 102, 102, 102	72:14:09:5	16,231.9,232.10,234.4,	
nowadays (1)	192:17;200:12;297:8;	72:14;98:5	21;235:14;240:15;	202:22
8:15	312:13	older (1)	244:2;248:10;249:11,	operational (2)
nowhere (1)	obviously (55)	9:10	20;251:15;253:21;	22:17;126:13
295:16	26:10;27:12;32:4,11;	omen (1)	254:18;256:7,19;260:1,	operationalize (1)
NRS (1)	37:15,17,20;53:8;54:10;	182:20	16;261:15;262:21;	71:8
321:18	71:7:88:21:104:21:	omission (1)	263:5.17:265:6:266:10:	operations (2)
number (35)	106.20.109.9.113.21	301.15	267.12.268.7 20.	139.13.263.12
9.18.22.9.24.16	118.4.126.17 20.132.4	omissions (1)	269.11.274.12.277.20.	nine(1)
50.16.65.1.60.19.71.1.	122.2.127.11.129.10.	207.6	209.11,274.12,277.20,	201.22
39:10:03:1;09:18;71:1;	155:5;157:11;158:10;	297:0	279.9,281.21,283.17,	291:22
73:21;80:9;99:9;132:13,	144:6;152:17;153:1,20;	omitted (1)	18;286:10;289:10,12;	opinion (6)
14;133:6;138:1;142:13;	154:4;160:7;170:13;	282:6	290:20;291:9,20;	37:13;133:8;211:14;
153:9;157:16;166:20;	173:6;177:15;192:8;	onboard (1)	293:11;295:2;296:20,	232:11;293:13;294:6
179:20;183:3;190:8;	193:11;197:5;205:7;	85:3	21;321:22;323:19	opinions (3)
192:15;213:22;245:9;	212:19,22;213:7;218:7;	once (11)	one-half (1)	50:14;100:22;211:10
247:22:251:6:256:7:	231:18:232:4:233:19:	11:7:57:10:159:15:	119:2	opioid (2)
260.11 16 17.279.6	258.13.263.3.265.8	161.14.175.21.202.10	one-liner (1)	118.2.260.10
281.17 18 20.282.7	267.4 5.276.5.286.7	200.4.217.10.221.202.10,	310.11	$anioid_{-}(1)$
201.17,10,20,202.7	207.4, 5, 270.5, 200.7,	209.4,217.10,221.22,	519.11 omonous ( <b>2</b> )	119.2
12.14.201.12.257.4.5	290.20,299.21,508.5,	225.4,205.17	00.11.251.11	110.2
43:14;221:13;257:4,5;	310:1,8;318:13	oncology (3)	80:11;251:11	opiolas (6)
292:6;302:17	occasions (1)	157:17;173:13;257:12	ones (6)	16:12;40:8;42:3;
numeracy (1)	56:3	one (213)	8:15;43:4;80:18;91:3;	134:4;225:8;260:13
20:9	occur (2)	6:11,12;8:15;9:11;	146:9;275:7	opportunities (4)
nurse (2)	65:16;98:10	13:17;14:2,9;15:10;	one's (1)	68:21;112:15,17;
34:15:134:12	occurred (1)	16:14.19:17:5.22:18:2.2:	38:14	307:14
nurses (1)	79.22	19.20.20.4.22.1 12.	ongoing (5)	opportunity (8)
55:20	occurring (1)	23.2.24.16 20.25.12	161.17.197.5.214.7	62.18.90.9.97.8
55.20 numing (1)	265.14	25.2,24.10,20,20.5	202.16.215.21	169.19.174.20.107.22.
125.4	203.14	20.17,27.20,30:3,0;	502.10,515.21	100.10,1/4.20,19/:22;
135:4	occurs(2)	31:2,21;33:8,10;37:1,6,	online (2)	208:21;218:1
nurturing (1)	1:2;298:3	10;43:11;44:/,/;4/:20,	85:17;290:14	opposed (3)
70:18	o'clock (1)	20;54:22;55:9,14;57:14;	only (43)	33:2;124:13;302:12
nuts (1)	3:10	59:8;64:2,10,12;65:12;	35:19;42:16;45:13;	opposite (3)
121:2	off (32)	68:12;78:4;83:6,11,17;	48:17;49:12;63:8;66:19;	269:13;310:4;323:6
	5:7,8;20:3:73:17.18	84:17:85:19:87:3.6.14	78:19;106:4:108:2:	optimally (1)
0	19:74:20 22:75:10:	15:88:7 12:89:9:91:2 9	112:22:116:10:119:6	210:8
<b>`</b>	88.14.95.4.115.2	12 14.93.11.05.2.00.6	121.5.122.21.128.5.	ontimize (1)
OA(2)	120.20.175.12.102.0	100.3.101.10.102.14	121.9,122.21,120.9,	137.15
UA (4)	120.20,173.13,102.0;	100.5,101.10,105.14;	131.0,130.14,137.0,9;	137.13

optimum (1)	16:5,6;17:14;18:21;	17;161:11,11,11;165:12;	64:15,17;65:9	67:11;243:15;311:19
149:13	21:6,10,13;28:7;31:10;	169:9;170:12;172:5;	pain (103)	parameters (1)
option (1)	32:10;33:4,12,14;35:8;	182:8,15;197:6,13;	12:17;14:19;16:3,3;	310:3
15:15	42:17;43:5,12;45:3;	200:5,18;203:11;213:1,	17:22;35:13,17;36:16;	parentheses (1)
options (1)	47:11;51:2,17;52:22;	1;234:3;243:9;250:22;	40:7;42:1,12,13,21;45:3,	300:8
156:18	53:3;58:16;61:16,21;	265:6;278:5;280:9;	4;46:18;49:12;67:4;	Parkinson's (18)
oral (1)	63:8;67:22;72:16;73:5;	284:2;287:3;296:14;	75:3;78:16;79:1;80:20,	117:4;145:3;147:17;
117:22	/6:18;81:9,21;88:8;	300:15;323:1	21,21;82:12;86:4;99:7,	156:10,14;158:5;160:8,
$\begin{array}{c} \text{orally} (1) \\ 226.18 \end{array}$	95:1;98:3;100:5;109:4;	overall $(5)$	10;102:7;104:6,9,11;	14;165:17;166:17,17;
230:18 and an (10)	110.13,19,110.0,	10:9;10:17;25:5;52:2;	105:4;107:21;108:5,5,	109:22;195:21;199:7,8,
12.15.75.18.117.5.	119.11,120.20,121.0, 125.17.128.4.120.4.	1/2.22	14,109.2,117.21,110.0, 11,11,14,16,125,1,20,	11,220.19,232.22 norsed (1)
140.13.105.16.206.22	120.0 16.147.5.140.20.	$6 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 208 \cdot 1 \cdot 1$	11,11,14,10,125,1,20, 131.5.137.2.145.45.	101.13
207.9.242.2 6.276.14	162.16 19.169.12 17 21	overboard (1)	147.4 17.152.10 13.	nart (60)
organization (14)	22:175:15:178:16	311.3	160.8.162.19.163.21	8.22.17.12.20.8
11:13:79:11:80:6:	180:4.8:184:1:189:1.1:	overburdening (1)	173:18:177:16:183:3:	22:14:32:12:35:7:37:12:
83:12.21:114:9:116:16:	190:3:193:8:196:21:	74:2	192:1.3:193:20:199:5.	40:4:46:5:73:2:75:11:
121:2;140:6;147:20;	201:19;202:9;215:18;	overdose (4)	14;205:4;228:5;252:4;	80:15;95:7;127:1;
185:9,20;186:9;220:1	217:5,19;220:17;	269:12,18;270:3,12	253:2;258:6;259:8,14;	140:13;143:16;146:4,
organization/commercial (1)	222:19;223:22;224:15;	overdoses (1)	260:10;262:19;278:9;	21;153:18;154:8;
140:5	235:6;238:18;239:3;	270:16	285:21,22;292:16,20;	159:22;160:15;161:19;
organizational (1)	252:21;253:4;254:18;	over-emphasizing (1)	294:14;295:4;304:22;	164:21;165:2;168:7;
115:2	261:6;262:11;264:12;	243:10	305:13,14;306:17,18;	170:13,15;179:5;
organizations (6)	269:15;275:6;279:14;	overkill (1)	309:1,1,1;319:21;320:1,	185:21;189:16;192:13;
84:2;144:6,7;189:20;	282:5;286:8;291:18;	311:16	3,5,7,12,14,22;321:7,7;	195:10;196:11;199:13;
190:1;220:4	292:19;293:7,16;	overlap (2)	322:17,22;323:3,14	205:10;211:22;212:16;
organized (1)	295:15;297:1,5;303:10;	134:7;227:1	pain-related (1)	222:20,22;226:14;
97:22	304:16;305:22;306:11;	overnight (1)	320:13	239:15;252:8;258:7;
oriented (1)	307:19;308:16,17;	135:3	Palatka (1)	260:19;273:14;277:8;
140:19	310:17;312:18,19;317:7,	overseeing (4)	256:13	283:4,4,7;291:19;299:2;
original (1)	9;322:19	25:18;49:6;301:7,8	pales (1)	307:17;308:7;314:5,7,
223:6	outcome (21)	oversight (7)	115:8	11;315:22;321:11;
0 $108.17.204.0$	38:11;57:11;75:11;	0:13,19;48:8;50:11; 201,14,202.5 6	$\frac{\text{pattry}(\mathbf{I})}{110.2}$	322:10
100.17,294.9 orthopedic (2)	116.13,124.4,133.10, 17.153.10.178.11.	501.14,502.5,0	119.3 Panel (15)	7.7.280.17.282.14
295.4 18	17,155.10,178.11,	52.10	24.8.30.4.70.16.	7.7,200.17,202.14 narticinate (1)
orthonedist (1)	269.8.270.12.281.10	overuse (1)	89.18.97.11.174.12.18	125.20.130.19.163.6
81·21	283.6 18.310.15.311.4	260.14	207.21.208.9 19	171.16
OSI (2)	317:9	overwhelming (1)	210:19:233:1:237:19:	participated (1)
12:6,22	outcomes (15)	234:8	239:9:280:22	163:8
osteoarthritis (1)	9:11;14:1,17;15:2;	own (21)	panelists (3)	participating (4)
42:14	75:13;81:9;218:8;	24:14;27:22;28:3;	24:10;26:21;221:4	238:3;248:2;255:11;
others (12)	224:17;232:4,6,10;	62:13;67:8;117:6;	paper (35)	290:5
18:2;27:17;30:3;	270:8;310:10,11,21	118:22;120:15;122:7,	3:20;47:20;53:19;	participation (5)
50:17;53:2;81:12;112:4;	outlier (4)	10;126:4;131:22;132:6;	57:8;58:8;67:11;87:16;	59:13;159:6;285:20;
115:3;119:12;131:18;	19:22;76:15,18;205:4	135:19;154:8;163:3;	152:5;169:13,16;	286:19;324:10
151:14;272:20	outliers (2)	187:7,20,22;189:13;	196:15;203:5;208:8;	particular (24)
other's (1)	72:6;76:21	261:16	212:14;218:17;242:10;	4:4;9:14;14:5;25:5;
219:6	outline (3)	oxcarbazepine (4)	243:18;246:15;258:20;	29:13;30:12;46:12;50:3;
<b>Otherwise</b> $(7)$	5:22;19:6;39:1	104:6,8;105:2,8	259:17;271:6,13,22;	77:7;82:17;88:11;103:2,
42:22;51:9;05:7;08:0;	outified (1)	0xymorphone (1)	2/2:5,7,11;291:19;	20;104:20,22;139:21;
07.11,120.11,245.20	27.1	100.21	302.13,513.10,22,	209.13,211.3,224.2,14;
26.14.223.7.251.2	111.6.174.7	Р	373.8.324.5	251.5,240.5,248.20,
271.5.312.22.3.1,231.2,	outside (11)	<b>▲</b>	naners (7)	narticularly (18)
ours (1)	44:8:51:16:184:20	packs (1)	31:9:196:21:226:4	20:22:51:14.20:99.9
193:11	185:7,19.20.22:186:3:	269:16	272:15:320:16:321:11:	104:1;142:16:167:9.16:
ourselves (7)	262:18;270:1:279:1	PACT (1)	322:20	178:10;182:9,15;
52:22;62:6;70:6;	over (44)	189:18	par (2)	190:14;210:3;228:4;
154:11;203:16,19;214:9	5:6;7:6;10:2;27:19;	page (1)	102:1,16	244:17;253:12;269:20;
out (119)	32:9;41:2,6;44:9,10;	260:22	paradigm (3)	295:5
3:11,16;5:3;7:4;8:6;	46:11;58:13;59:16;67:7;	paid (7)	7:1;108:1;176:21	partly (9)
9:9:11:21:12:21:14:7:	113:12;117:18;144:17,	49:20;50:1;63:1,1;	paragraph (3)	78:19;273:19;284:12,

13 14 15 16:203:6:313:2	0.10.14.1.317.0	nav-to-nlav (1)	188.13.234.4	210.21
13,14,13,10,293.0,313.2	9.10,14.1,317.9	70.11	100.13,234.4	210.21
150.8 21.174.2	24.8 12 10.25.21 21.		12.8.26.1 + 2.27.11	320·4
159.0,21,174.2, 254.21	34.0, 13, 13, 33.21, 21, 20, 67, 10, 10, 11, 40, 1, 9, 10, 10, 11, 40, 1, 9, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10	29.17	12.0,30.1,1,3,37.11,	520.4
234.21	<i>4</i> 1·21· <i>4</i> 2·10· <i>4</i> 2·2 6·	20.17 podiatric (2)	50.5,10,41.2,19,42.1,20, 50.22.81.22.106.0,11.	22.8.287.18
180.1	41.21,42.19,45.5,0,	14.10 14	50.22,81.22,100.9,11, 112.10,11.116.11.	<b>Dom</b> (2)
107.1 nortnors (3)	47.7,59.1,05.4,05.2,19,	14.10,14 nediatrician (1)	112.10,11,110.11,	235.20.236.1
123.4 6.162.8	74.3 6.75.17 20.77.17		$247 \cdot 20 \cdot 248 \cdot 161011$	233.20,230.1
123.4,0,102.8	74.5,0,75.17,20,77.17,	40.14	247.20,240.1,0,10,11, 250.10.217.18.220.17.	$235\cdot10$
168.6.173.21.17 <i>A</i> . <i>A</i> .	05.4,9,14,91.12,100.9, 107.4,21.109.1.120.11.	250.8	250.19,517.10,520.17, 221.2,7.222.21.223.8	233.10
180.18	107.4,21,108.1,120.11,	230.0	521.2,7,522.21,525.0	17·5·250·8
norts (1)	127.17 22.128.6.120.4	17.5	257.6	Pfizer (2)
11/.8	0 18 10 22:130:4 5 6 16	nenalize (1)	nerfect (6)	183.1.221.8
nas (1)	18.131.3 8.132.5 21.	290.2	8.1 0.14.3.08.6.215.1	nharma (7)
143.2	133.3.138.3.143.18.20	Penn (1)	265.11	140.14.141.22.142.4
nass(1)	144.2.148.8.151.18.	82.16	nerfectly (2)	6 15:143:14:148:22
82.9	152.3 8 13 15.155.21	Pennev (1)	123.21.303.9	Pharmaceutical (13)
nasses (1)	156.7.158.12.159.5 11	256.8	nerform (1)	80.7.141.19.142.12
304.14	161.17.162.8.9.11.	neonle (156)	130.1	145.2.148.12.149.8
nassing (1)	163.6 21.164.2 4 5	4·16·5·21·7·9·11·19·	nerformance (5)	157.9.172.13.173.2
81·18	165.20.167.6.169.3	-10, 5.21, 7.9, 11.19, 20.4.25.10.30.15.31.7.	21.5 8.92.20.201.12.	197.20.222.13,173.2,
nast (7)	174.9.176.6.178.21	37.18 21 22.41.17	202.17	229.16
35.17.131.17.185.12	179.10.180.7 8 11 12	45.21.48.11.52.17.18	nerforming (1)	nharmacoeconomics (1)
253.6.262.1.316.20	182.5 6 12.183.4 6 9 22.	53.10.54.13.55.3.56.4	81·7	238.7
322.20	182.5,0,12,185.4,0,9,22,	58.3.59.16.60.1.61.21	nerhans $(12)$	nharmacology (1)
nathways (1)	186:10:192:8:196:7:	62.4 11 13 22.63.8 12	6·9·8·15·15·2·23·3·	149·12
75.6	224.14.225.11.236.4.6	64.3 9.68.18.69.7	26.18.71.9.76.11.88.4	nharmacovigilance (1)
natient (138)	240:6:245:9:247:15 20:	73.13 16.74.5 18.77.16	128.1.192.20.295.18	7·11
14.18.35.8 12 13.	248.1 6 13 22.249.8	78.4 8.79.15 17.81.1 12	321.22	nhase (29)
36.5 10 16 16.39.16	250:16:253:7:254:3.6	82:7:85:7 21:86:13:	period (9)	96·11·102·4 5·107·2
40:10:45:2:49:11.19:	255:10.12:258:18:	87:15:91:2.5:97:2.18:	31:15:39:15:41:9:	9:108:4:132:2:141:9.10:
51.1 4.56.17.57.9.60.9	259:10:260:4:264:14	98.1.100.6 21.103.22	66.4.106.10 11.143.12	153.3.155.16 17.210.7
16 17:67:2:74:8 20:	268.21.269.3.275.1	112.8.113.2.114.16	162:21:169:15	222:7:234:6:241:8:
75.9.86.15.92.19.20	277.3.278.5 6 6 8 11 18	120.20.122.10.11.20.22	periods (1)	242:15:245:19 19 19:
93:1.2.9.13:94:4.7.11:	20:282:5:285:1:286:18	124:7:125:3:127:2:	74:14	249:18:251:17:252:3:
110:6:115:11:123:3.11:	21:287:5.7:290:14:	134:20:136:22:141:5:	peripheral (4)	278:16:280:4:288:7.7.9:
132:13.13.14:134:22:	292:7.20:295:9:296:1:	144:3:146:3.6:147:5.15:	42:14:104:6.9.11	310:2
135:3.6.9.13.14.16:	300:20:304:10:308:3:	151:10.12.13:152:22:	person (18)	phases (2)
137:5:141:9:143:7:	314:18:315:9	155:5:157:13:160:4:	21:18:47:20:59:19:	221:20:257:7
151:21:153:14,15,17;	patient's (8)	161:11;162:19;164:21;	60:7:94:16:121:16;	phenotpying (1)
154:17:159:9,13,15;	32:15:35:15:94:5;	167:5;169:17;170:8;	132:7;149:21;181:16;	118:12
162:9,16;163:16;	135:7;202:6;213:18;	171:16,17;172:20;	182:19;188:1;227:2;	phenotype (7)
164:10;175:16;178:15;	256:10;306:17	177:20;178:1,2;181:16;	242:5;256:11;273:5;	102:7;104:12,14,16;
179:11,14,16,18,22;	patients' (2)	182:8,14;184:5;193:8,	289:20;295:6,15	105:3,12;106:6
180:3,16,17;181:10,12,	172:10;298:7	17;194:15;198:2;200:2,	personal (3)	phenotypes (2)
13,18,19;182:17,17;	pattern (2)	7;202:6,11;203:3;	52:7;131:22;222:3	104:9;105:9
188:21;190:16;191:20;	46:14;108:8	205:10;207:8;210:9;	personally (1)	Phil (2)
199:11,15,16;200:19;	patterns (4)	216:15;218:8;219:1,4,	317:5	319:19;323:7
202:4;209:21;214:6;	38:8;45:11;46:8;	15;221:1;230:11;	personnel (2)	phone (6)
236:8;237:7;243:2;	165:19	231:13,15;233:4,5;	85:2;277:15	17:14;55:2;70:4;
246:3;254:20;259:19;	<b>Paul (10)</b>	234:11;235:4;238:4;	person's (1)	101:4;130:13;168:9
264:13;266:6;267:14,	5:9,12,19;25:6;27:14;	240:11;241:18;255:9;	59:11	phones (2)
16;268:4;274:15;275:2;	72:15;93:15,17;298:22;	257:13,15,17;260:12,12,	perspective (32)	3:7;55:5
276:12,21;280:7;	315:18	17;272:13;276:1;	5:16;15:3;27:11,13;	photograph (1)
281:20;282:8,22;	Paul's (1)	288:15;290:3,18;	43:16;44:17;46:8;72:8,	262:18
285:19;286:5,11,15,16;	26:22	295:19;301:6,10,19;	13;90:3;93:22;97:14;	phrase (2)
287:15;288:13,20,21,22;	pay (7)	302:11,12;303:2;304:17,	98:13,14,16;99:12;	23:20;29:7
289:5,11,15,18;290:2,5;	64:22;68:22;180:2;	18;307:18;309:3;	100:16;117:18;139:9,	physical (8)
294:13;298:9;299:9,22;	225:20;231:19,21;276:6	312:19;316:13;320:13;	10;140:13;151:18;	81:10;176:10;178:1;
301:5;303:9;304:21;	paying (4)	321:18;322:1	187:19;211:19,21;	225:19;227:19;228:6;
306:4,11,17;315:4;	65:8;143:21,21;258:1	people's (3)	221:11;230:5;240:20;	229:11;235:19
318:8,9	pays (1)	97:3;136:15;209:1	254:19;256:10,15;259:7	physicals (1)
patient-reported (3)	143:19	per (2)	perspectives (1)	66:21

(26) partner - physicals
1 • • (4)	222.7	10.01	8 2 21 22 22 15 25 7	156.12
physician (4)	322:7	18:21	8:2;21:22;22:15;25:7;	156:13
35:9;48:9;122:4;237:8	plan (9)	points (7)	46:1;49:15;78:11;90:14;	Premier (1)
physicians (5)	8:12;9:3;19:4,11;	6:11;54:11;126:11;	111:9;125:14;214:4;	198:15
34:15;55:22;110:17;	23:10;150:7;176:2,7;	141:14;167:12;263:16;	217:2;220:9;231:15;	premise (2)
176:12;189:9	306:8	316:19	240:10;278:18	297:10,20
physiological (3)	planned (2)	police (2)	potentially (10)	prerogative (1)
310:10,21;311:5	176:1,6	294:4,5	14:15;91:6;114:2;	231:9
physiology (1)	planning (1)	policy (3)	131:13;141:6;148:8;	prescribed (1)
310:14	299:6	34:6;35:1;101:1	155:3;176:4;217:12;	260:13
PI (7)	platform (4)	poor (4)	228:21	presence (1)
49:17;82:8;83:15,20;	28:21;29:19;30:7;	91:22,22;92:2;294:15	poured (1)	84:14
128:6;154:7;162:3	108:5	pop (1)	238:21	present (1)
pick (14)	platforms' (1)	23:22	power (8)	250:4
46:8,14;48:18;53:8;	29:13	populated (1)	91:11;105:19;157:2,2;	Presentation (10)
66:14;69:9,14;70:2;	play (2)	11:4	159:13;190:19;194:2;	5:19;13:18;25:9;
72:4;165:13;208:9;	61:17;191:5	population (10)	292:4	99:19;139:16;212:18;
222:16:252:17:275:6	played (2)	74:13:133:11:162:15,	powerful (2)	253:11;261:16;264:22;
picked (9)	122:16:135:21	15:171:11:209:21:	102:21:123:2	266:20
47:11:191:22:197:18:	plays (1)	245:11:257:18:259:12.	practical (2)	presentations (8)
220:20:236:9:289:4:	216:7	19	31:19:32:21	24:11.14:59:15:211:5:
322.18.323.4 15	Please (5)	nonulations (1)	practicality (1)	220.21.232.5.279.6
nicking (4)	3.5.24.10.96.6.208.2	125.7	41·5	324.11
55.2 9.71.5.73.11	278.27	nortable (1)	nractice (23)	nresented (4)
55.2, 9, 71.5, 75.11	$n\log(2)$	30.20	7.10.10.11.23.7.25.8	170.4.217.1.247.12
105.24	5.11.120.14	portfolio (2)	7.10,10,11,25.7,25.8,	170.4,217.1,247.15,
103.2,4	5.11,139.14	149.1214	52.5,4,9,50.9,75.21,	200.3
pie (1)	pienty(2)	146:12,14		174-21-224-0
110:15	200:1/;2/2:12	poses (1)	125:2,8;165:19;180:22;	1/4:21;324:9
piece (7)	Plus (2)	10:4	195:22;196:21;233:17;	presenting (2)
/3:11;/4:1/;101:16;	252:3;258:9	<b>position (3)</b>	238:1;240:7;298:7	131:9;1/8:3
1//:1;215:22;283:11;	pluses (1)	32:18;1/3:11;189:6	practices (9)	preserved (1)
304:3	142:8	positive (12)	12:20;18:17;23:5,5;	104:19
pieces (3)	pocket (1)	43:12;45:14;92:1;	28:9;74:2;119:1,7;	president (1)
84:19;184:14;285:4	27:5	123:17;144:8;169:6;	125:11	246:1
piggyback (1)	poignant (1)	204:4;205:8;249:3,13;	practitioners (1)	prespecified (6)
64:13	121:8	269:22;287:8	34:16	8:12;109:6;177:7;
pills (3)	point (82)	positives (2)	pragmatic (11)	298:21;305:7;306:13
225:6;260:5;277:10	15:17;18:13;37:1;	21:13;76:22	41:11,16,20;103:14;	prespecify (1)
pilot (4)	51:8;52:9;55:8,14;58:8;	possibilities (1)	137:13;240:4,17;	313:20
113:2;179:20,22;	59:8,11;65:12;69:10;	43:11	241:20;242:2;251:16,20	pressure (7)
216:20	70:3;72:4,15;83:6;	possibility (1)	preamble (4)	61:15;63:5;65:5;
<b>PIs</b> (2)	85:18;86:16;99:15;	90:18	101.17.109.13.	07 10 110 10 100 4
160:7;184:19	106.19.121.16.122.3		101.17,107.12,	8/:12;112:12;136:4;
	100.17,121.10,122.5,	possible (19)	113:16;192:7	87:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9
<b>PI's</b> (1)	130:5;132:12;137:19;	<b>possible (19)</b> 33:10;39:20;46:7;	113:16;192:7 precaution (1)	87:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9 pressures (2)
<b>PI's (1)</b> 237:14	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16;	<b>possible (19)</b> 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3;	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22	8/:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15;213:1
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1)	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15;	<b>possible (19)</b> 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22;	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1)	8/:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15;213:1 presumably (1)
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16;20;179:4;190:12,	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8;	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2	8/:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15;213:1 presumably (1) 290:11
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9)	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16;20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10;	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8; 252:11;262:4,13;	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2)	8/:12:112:12:136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15:213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1)
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10;	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16;20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8;	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8; 252:11;262:4,13; 265:10;266:11;285:9	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22	8/:12:112:12:136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15:213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7;	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22;	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8; 252:11;262:4,13; 265:10;266:11;285:9 possibly (2)	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1)	8/:12:112:12:136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15:213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1)
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16:261:13	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11:216;7.11;	<pre>possible (19)</pre>	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21	8/:12:112:12:136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15:213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35)	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6:223:7,12,14,16;	<pre>possible (19)</pre>	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1)	8/:12:112:12:136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15:213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1)
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35) 70:13.19:106:6:108:9:	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16;20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6;223:7,12,14,16; 227:6:234:16:239:8;	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8; 252:11;262:4,13; 265:10;266:11;285:9 possibly (2) 156:18;212:7 post (3) 64:1:249:8:268:2	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1) 241:8	8/:12:112:12:136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15:213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1) 274:22
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35) 70:13,19;106:6;108:9; 120:5:129:14:156:2.2.3.	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16;20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6;223:7,12,14,16; 227:6;234:16;239:8; 241:6,14:244:9:249:12;	<pre>possible (19)</pre>	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1) 241:8 prefer (1)	8/:12:112:12:136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15:213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1) 274:22 pretty (17)
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35) 70:13,19;106:6;108:9; 120:5;129:14;156:2,2,3, 3,11,12:158:3,13:161:8	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6;223:7,12,14,16; 227:6;234:16;239:8; 241:6,14;244:9;249:12; 250:14:254:4:256:21;	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8; 252:11;262:4,13; 265:10;266:11;285:9 possibly (2) 156:18;212:7 post (3) 64:1;249:8;268:2 post-approval (1) 222:8	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1) 241:8 prefer (1) 154:7	8/:12:112:12:136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15:213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1) 274:22 pretty (17) 6:4:28:21:38:22:55:6
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35) 70:13,19;106:6;108:9; 120:5;129:14;156:2,2,3, 3,11,12;158:3,13;161:8, 13:162:7:165:15:169:7	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6;223:7,12,14,16; 227:6;234:16;239:8; 241:6,14;244:9;249:12; 250:14;254:4;256:21; 262:2,17:272:1,21;	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8; 252:11;262:4,13; 265:10;266:11;285:9 possibly (2) 156:18;212:7 post (3) 64:1;249:8;268:2 post-approval (1) 222:8 poster (1)	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1) 241:8 prefer (1) 154:7 preferable (1)	8/:12:112:12:136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15:213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1) 274:22 pretty (17) 6:4;28:21;38:22;55:6; 56:6:85:16:95:20:
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35) 70:13,19;106:6;108:9; 120:5;129:14;156:2,2,3, 3,11,12;158:3,13;161:8, 13;162:7;165:15;169:7, 8:178:6:183:5 10;	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6;223:7,12,14,16; 227:6;234:16;239:8; 241:6,14;244:9;249:12; 250:14;254:4;256:21; 262:2,17;272:1,21; 282:18,19:293:11:	<pre>possible (19)</pre>	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1) 241:8 prefer (1) 154:7 preferable (1) 272:2	8/:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15;213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1) 274:22 pretty (17) 6:4;28:21;38:22;55:6; 56:6;85:16;95:20; 152:14:157:10:170:16;
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35) 70:13,19;106:6;108:9; 120:5;129:14;156:2,2,3, 3,11,12;158:3,13;161:8, 13;162:7;165:15;169:7, 8;178:6;183:5,10; 2,14:15:217:14:225:9:	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6;223:7,12,14,16; 227:6;234:16;239:8; 241:6,14;244:9;249:12; 250:14;254:4;256:21; 262:2,17;272:1,21; 282:18,19;293:11; 299:21:300:4:301:18:	<pre>possible (19)</pre>	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1) 241:8 prefer (1) 154:7 preferable (1) 272:2 preferences (1)	8/:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15;213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1) 274:22 pretty (17) 6:4;28:21;38:22;55:6; 56:6;85:16;95:20; 152:14;157:10;170:16; 187:8:199:7:247:19
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35) 70:13,19;106:6;108:9; 120:5;129:14;156:2,2,3, 3,11,12;158:3,13;161:8, 13;162:7;165:15;169:7, 8;178:6;183:5,10; 214:15;217:14;225:9; 235:1:245:1:253:21,22	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6;223:7,12,14,16; 227:6;234:16;239:8; 241:6,14;244:9;249:12; 250:14;254:4;256:21; 262:2,17;272:1,21; 282:18,19;293:11; 299:21;300:4;301:18; 312:13:313:113;	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8; 252:11;262:4,13; 265:10;266:11;285:9 possibly (2) 156:18;212:7 post (3) 64:1;249:8;268:2 post-approval (1) 222:8 poster (1) 165:17 postherpetic (1) 83:9	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1) 241:8 prefer (1) 154:7 preferable (1) 272:2 preferences (1) 129:14	8/:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15;213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1) 274:22 pretty (17) 6:4;28:21;38:22;55:6; 56:6;85:16;95:20; 152:14;157:10;170:16; 187:8;199:7;247:19; 254:10:271:9:280-19:
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35) 70:13,19;106:6;108:9; 120:5;129:14;156:2,2,3, 3,11,12;158:3,13;161:8, 13;162:7;165:15;169:7, 8;178:6;183:5,10; 214:15;217:14;225:9; 235:1;245:1;253:21,22; 254:12:255:4:274:17:	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6;223:7,12,14,16; 227:6;234:16;239:8; 241:6,14;244:9;249:12; 250:14;254:4;256:21; 262:2,17;272:1,21; 282:18,19;293:11; 299:21;300:4;301:18; 312:13;313:1,13; 314:22:316:12:323:13	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8; 252:11;262:4,13; 265:10;266:11;285:9 possibly (2) 156:18;212:7 post (3) 64:1;249:8;268:2 post-approval (1) 222:8 poster (1) 165:17 postherpetic (1) 83:9 post-on (1)	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1) 241:8 prefer (1) 154:7 preferable (1) 272:2 preferences (1) 129:14 preferentially (1)	8/:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15;213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1) 274:22 pretty (17) 6:4;28:21;38:22;55:6; 56:6;85:16;95:20; 152:14;157:10;170:16; 187:8;199:7;247:19; 254:10;271:9;289:19; 290:3
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35) 70:13,19;106:6;108:9; 120:5;129:14;156:2,2,3, 3,11,12;158:3,13;161:8, 13;162:7;165:15;169:7, 8;178:6;183:5,10; 214:15;217:14;225:9; 235:1;245:1;253:21,22; 254:12;255:4;274:17; 278:13:295:12	100:15;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6;223:7,12,14,16; 227:6;234:16;239:8; 241:6,14;244:9;249:12; 250:14;254:4;256:21; 262:2,17;272:1,21; 282:18,19;293:11; 299:21;300:4;301:18; 312:13;313:1,13; 314:22;316:12;323:13 pointed (6)	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8; 252:11;262:4,13; 265:10;266:11;285:9 possibly (2) 156:18;212:7 post (3) 64:1;249:8;268:2 post-approval (1) 222:8 poster (1) 165:17 postherpetic (1) 83:9 post-op (1) 292:14	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1) 241:8 prefer (1) 154:7 preferable (1) 272:2 preferences (1) 129:14 preferentially (1) 143:20	8/:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15;213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1) 274:22 pretty (17) 6:4;28:21;38:22;55:6; 56:6;85:16;95:20; 152:14;157:10;170:16; 187:8;199:7;247:19; 254:10;271:9;289:19; 290:3 prevent (8)
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35) 70:13,19;106:6;108:9; 120:5;129:14;156:2,2,3, 3,11,12;158:3,13;161:8, 13;162:7;165:15;169:7, 8;178:6;183:5,10; 214:15;217:14;225:9; 235:1;245:1;253:21,22; 254:12;255:4;274:17; 278:13;295:12 places (7)	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6;223:7,12,14,16; 227:6;234:16;239:8; 241:6,14;244:9;249:12; 250:14;254:4;256:21; 262:2,17;272:1,21; 282:18,19;293:11; 299:21;300:4;301:18; 312:13;313:1,13; 314:22;316:12;323:13 <b>pointed (6)</b>	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8; 252:11;262:4,13; 265:10;266:11;285:9 possibly (2) 156:18;212:7 post (3) 64:1;249:8;268:2 post-approval (1) 222:8 poster (1) 165:17 postherpetic (1) 83:9 post-op (1) 292:14 post-operative (1)	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1) 241:8 prefer (1) 154:7 preferable (1) 272:2 preferences (1) 129:14 preferentially (1) 143:20 pregabalin (4)	8/:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15;213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1) 274:22 pretty (17) 6:4;28:21;38:22;55:6; 56:6;85:16;95:20; 152:14;157:10;170:16; 187:8;199:7;247:19; 254:10;271:9;289:19; 290:3 prevent (8) 15:22:30:9:72:5;
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35) 70:13,19;106:6;108:9; 120:5;129:14;156:2,2,3, 3,11,12;158:3,13;161:8, 13;162:7;165:15;169:7, 8;178:6;183:5,10; 214:15;217:14;225:9; 235:1;245:1;253:21,22; 254:12;255:4;274:17; 278:13;295:12 places (7) 112:19:113:0:165:10;	130:5;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6;223:7,12,14,16; 227:6;234:16;239:8; 241:6,14;244:9;249:12; 250:14;254:4;256:21; 262:2,17;272:1,21; 282:18,19;293:11; 299:21;300:4;301:18; 312:13;313:1,13; 314:22;316:12;323:13 <b>pointed (6)</b> 51:16;121:8;175:14; 299:21:9:202:7:207:5	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8; 252:11;262:4,13; 265:10;266:11;285:9 possibly (2) 156:18;212:7 post (3) 64:1;249:8;268:2 post-approval (1) 222:8 poster (1) 165:17 postherpetic (1) 83:9 post-op (1) 292:14 post-operative (1) 292:18	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1) 241:8 prefer (1) 154:7 preferable (1) 272:2 preferences (1) 129:14 preferentially (1) 143:20 pregabalin (4) 183:2:4:10:260:2	8/:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15;213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1) 274:22 pretty (17) 6:4;28:21;38:22;55:6; 56:6;85:16;95:20; 152:14;157:10;170:16; 187:8;199:7;247:19; 254:10;271:9;289:19; 290:3 prevent (8) 15:22;30:9;73:5; 176:21:217:22:265:7;
PI's (1) 237:14 pivotal (1) 253:14 place (9) 6:9;7:7;11:9;22:10; 64:8;156:20;200:7; 241:16;261:13 placebo (35) 70:13,19;106:6;108:9; 120:5;129:14;156:2,2,3, 3,11,12;158:3,13;161:8, 13;162:7;165:15;169:7, 8;178:6;183:5,10; 214:15;217:14;225:9; 235:1;245:1;253:21,22; 254:12;255:4;274:17; 278:13;295:12 places (7) 112:19;113:9;165:10; 166:18:211:6:227:5;	100:15;132:12;137:19; 142:18;145:11;151:16; 154:14;166:1;168:15; 173:16,20;179:4;190:12, 12;192:6;195:2;198:10; 199:1;201:4,4;202:8; 204:11,16;205:6,22; 209:3;215:11;216:7,11; 217:6;223:7,12,14,16; 227:6;234:16;239:8; 241:6,14;244:9;249:12; 250:14;254:4;256:21; 262:2,17;272:1,21; 282:18,19;293:11; 299:21;300:4;301:18; 312:13;313:1,13; 314:22;316:12;323:13 <b>pointed (6)</b> 51:16;121:8;175:14; 292:19;293:7;297:5	possible (19) 33:10;39:20;46:7; 84:11;89:15;93:6;98:3; 118:4;154:18;219:22; 226:3;229:3;245:8; 252:11;262:4,13; 265:10;266:11;285:9 possibly (2) 156:18;212:7 post (3) 64:1;249:8;268:2 post-approval (1) 222:8 poster (1) 165:17 postherpetic (1) 83:9 post-op (1) 292:14 post-operative (1) 292:18 potomial (16)	113:16;192:7 precaution (1) 178:22 precipitate (1) 25:2 precisely (2) 35:21;314:22 predict (1) 314:21 predominantly (1) 241:8 prefer (1) 154:7 preferable (1) 272:2 preferences (1) 129:14 preferentially (1) 143:20 pregabalin (4) 183:2,4,10;260:3 predominantly (1)	8/:12;112:12;136:4; 259:9 pressures (2) 61:15;213:1 presumably (1) 290:11 presumed (1) 51:3 pretended (1) 57:8 pretending (1) 274:22 pretty (17) 6:4;28:21;38:22;55:6; 56:6;85:16;95:20; 152:14;157:10;170:16; 187:8;199:7;247:19; 254:10;271:9;289:19; 290:3 prevent (8) 15:22;30:9;73:5; 176:21;217:22;265:7; 282:90:207:10

(27) physician - prevent

June 5, 2015

				250.22
prevention (9)	problem (55)	professional (16)	proposals (1)	258:22
73:1,7,10;92:13;	9:12;13:4;16:12;	45:21;46:4,15;47:1,8;	253:6	public (5)
119:21;177:1;267:6;	18:14;32:21;36:13;	59:1;60:9;87:3,8;88:1;	propose (2)	117:13;143:11;212:4;
268:14,15	49:14;53:22;54:2;61:20;	164:3;243:2;254:6;	9:3;80:12	216:9;239:4
prevents (1)	66:6;72:21,22;75:4,5,8;	286:16;287:15;288:13	proposing (1)	publication (1)
299:13	76:17.19:78:2:87:8:	professionalize (1)	84:7	31:6
previous (5)	92:5.7.10.12:107:19:	87:7	propoxyphene-acetaminophen (1)	publications (1)
49.13.271.16.279.13	108.11.156.16.161.19	professionalized (1)	108.21	296.13
280.12.283.21	165.9.167.2.176.7	87.6	$\operatorname{pros}(2)$	nublish (3)
$\frac{200.12,203.21}{200.12}$	106.14.205.11.234.10	professionally (1)	310.13 13	57.7.87.13.307.8
1/2·17·170·16	235.0 12.237.10 11.	100.4	nrosportivoly (1)	nublished (5)
143.17,170.10	233.9,12,237.10,11, 244.20.246.18.247.4.	nuclescons (2)	170.1	9.7.57.14.107.12.
166.12	244.20,240.18,247.4,	117.1.219.16	170.1	0.7,57.14,107.12,
100.12 mrided (1)	240.10, 10, 250.20,	11/.1,210.10	266.14.208.8	232.4,324.0
154.10	250.11,257.21,259.21,		200.14,298.8	107.16
134:10	2/0:17;295:5;300:4,22;	80.10	<b>protocol</b> (70)	10/:10
primarily (2)	307:21;308:1;320:16;	profile (1)	9:2;17:12;34:18;	pulmonary (1)
185:2;310:20	321:9	221:21	71:12;73:5;83:22;90:13,	185:13
primary (15)	problematic (4)	profound (2)	13;94:17;132:6,7;	pupil (2)
34:10;35:8;37:14;	169:8;228:9;303:17;	105:4;235:2	140:22;142:10;147:7,9,	135:8,12
38:11;86:11;117:19;	304:4	program (17)	21;153:20,22;171:8,9;	purpose (6)
138:11;152:19;159:6;	problems (20)	81:3;82:17;172:18;	173:7,7;176:2,3;177:1;	14:6;26:9;89:12;
160:4;163:19;236:3;	14:9;15:11;16:14;	175:8;201:8,9,10;	264:1,9;265:10,13;	127:7:242:13:243:17
270:12:280:19:311:4	17:1.20:59:3:65:11:	202:13.15:206:8:209:5:	282:1.3:284:13.14.15:	purposes (1)
nrincinal (3)	81.6.92.19.98.10.125.2	218.18 20.221.16	285.2.288.9.297.11 18	17.13
61·21·70· <i>A</i> ·185·21	171.10.198.8.214.5	230.11.231.14.312.1	200.2,200.9,297.11,10,	$\frac{17.13}{1}$
nringinlo (3)	218.0.242.4.251.0.	250.11,251.14,512.1	22,290.9,299.10, 200.10.201.17,10,20,21.	12.2.48.1.172.4
74.5 (-207.15	210.9,243.4,231.9,	219.15	300:19;301:17,19,20,21;	13.2,40.1,173.4
74:5,6;297:15	297:19;298:1;313:18	218:15	302:3;304:10;305:4,6,8;	purview (1)
principles (2)	Procedural (2)	programmed (1)	306:6,7,16;308:19;	48:14
224:12;243:16	224:12;225:14	300:1	312:22;313:10;314:4,5,	push (5)
print (2)	procedure (11)	programming (2)	6,12,12,13,17,18,19,22;	42:8;149:6;173:4;
32:10;274:11	180:20;188:21;	30:18;172:7	316:2,3,4	214:21;229:4
priori (1)	224.14.280.7.284.78	nrograms (10)	nrotocolized (1)	nuched (1)
Priori (1)	221.11,200.7,201.7,0,	programs (10)	protocolized (1)	pusited (1)
40:4	11;292:15,17,22;293:5	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18;	276:14	154:11
40:4 priorities (2)	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5)	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7;	276:14 protocols (6)	154:11 pushing (7)
40:4 <b>priorities (2)</b> 116:16;187:3	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9;	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13;	154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1)	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 <b>procedures (5)</b> 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1)	276:14 <b>protocols (6)</b> 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7;	<b>pushed (1)</b> 154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6; 169:1,1,1;226:2
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1)	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19	276:14 <b>protocols (6)</b> 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8	154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6; 169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b>
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2)	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4)	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1)	<b>pushed (1)</b> 154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6; 169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9:22:10:24:17:
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13:321:12	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30)	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4:127:1:144:21:	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12	<b>pushed (1)</b> 154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6; 169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9;22:10;24:17; 27:2:53:8:56:17:72:16:
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privey (1)	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15:11:3:12:10:	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12)	<b>pushed (1)</b> 154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6; 169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9;22:10;24:17; 27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16; 79:12:81:13:84:7.15:
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 24:1	<b>procedures (5)</b> 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 <b>proceeded (1)</b> 22:9 <b>process (30)</b> 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:12:20:17:62:6:62:11	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2)	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15:20:8:41:15:	<b>pushed (1)</b> 154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11:108:1:124:20;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (2)	<b>procedures (5)</b> 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 <b>proceeded (1)</b> 22:9 <b>process (30)</b> 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 10:62:272:11:72:10;	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:2,17	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 201:15:106:7	pushed (1)         154:11         pushing (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2         put (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:2:150:12:14;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 26.0.122.2.166.2	<b>procedures (5)</b> 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 <b>proceeded (1)</b> 22:9 <b>process (30)</b> 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10;	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 16:17-212-12:15 (	<b>pushed (1)</b> 154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:14:12:01
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3	<b>proceeded (1)</b> 22:9 <b>process (30)</b> 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18;	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1)	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:129	<b>pushed (1)</b> 154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         11:02:11:100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;11;100:12;110;11;100:12;1100:12;110;110;11;100:12;110:12;110;110;11;100:12;110
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2)	<b>procedures (5)</b> 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 <b>proceeded (1)</b> 22:9 <b>process (30)</b> 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12;	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18	pushed (1)         154:11         pushing (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2         put (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14;	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1)	protocollect (1) 276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1)	pushed (1)         154:11         pushing (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2         put (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1)	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13;	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15	protocols (f) 276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21	pushed (1)         154:11         pushing (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2         put (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21;	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1)	protocols (f) 276:14 protocols (f) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2)	pushed (1)         154:11         pushing (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2         put (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6)	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1) 239:2	protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8	pushed (1)         154:11         pushing (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2         put (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5;	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7)	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1) 239:2 promoting (1)	protocols (f) 276:14 protocols (f) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2)	pushed (1)         154:11         pushing (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2         put (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20;	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1) 239:2 promoting (1) 218:16	protocols (f) 276:14 protocols (f) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1	pushed (1)         154:11         pushing (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2         put (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1)	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1) 239:2 promoting (1) 218:16 promotion (1)	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2)	pushed (1)         154:11         pushing (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2         put (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1) 48:12	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20 produce (1)	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1) 239:2 promoting (1) 218:16 promotion (1) 87:20	protocols (f) 276:14 protocols (f) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2) 28:2;314:15	pushed (1)         154:11         pushing (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2         put (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;         300:1,17;316:8;318:9;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1) 48:12 probably (37)	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20 produce (1) 266:14	programs (10)         21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18;         81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7;         201:11         progress (1)         22:19         project (4)         54:4;127:1;144:21;         282:16         projects (2)         114:3,17         promise(1)         275:15         promoting (1)         239:2         promoting (1)         218:16         promotion (1)         87:20         proof (3)	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2) 28:2;314:15 provisional (2)	pushed (1)         154:11         pushing (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2         put (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;         300:1,17;316:8;318:9;         319:10
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1) 48:12 probably (37) 28:5:40:8,10,17:	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20 produce (1) 266:14 produced (1)	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1) 239:2 promoting (1) 218:16 promotion (1) 87:20 proof (3) 38:18:149:12:211:20	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2) 28:2;314:15 provisional (2) 208:7:260:21	<b>pushed</b> (1)         154:11 <b>pushing</b> (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;         300:1,17;316:8;318:9;         319:10 <b>puts (1)</b>
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1) 48:12 probably (37) 28:5;40:8,10,17; 53:11,16,21:69:5:72:14:	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20 produce (1) 266:14 produced (1) 30:14	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1) 239:2 promoting (1) 218:16 promotion (1) 87:20 proof (3) 38:18;149:12;211:20 proner (2)	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2) 28:2;314:15 provisional (2) 208:7;260:21 provocative (1)	<b>pushed</b> (1)         154:11 <b>pushing</b> (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;         300:1,17;316:8;318:9;         319:10 <b>puts (1)</b> 40:21
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1) 48:12 probably (37) 28:5;40:8,10,17; 53:11,16,21;69:5;72:14; 88:8:91:13:94:9:113:19:	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20 produce (1) 266:14 produced (1) 30:14 producing (2)	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1) 239:2 promoting (1) 218:16 promotion (1) 87:20 proof (3) 38:18;149:12;211:20 proper (2) 17:18:50:21	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2) 28:2;314:15 provocative (1) 244:3	pushed (1)         154:11         pushing (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2         put (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;         300:1,17;316:8;318:9;         319:10         puts (1)         40:21         putting (11)
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1) 48:12 probably (37) 28:5;40:8,10,17; 53:11,16,21;69:5;72:14; 88:8;91:13;94:9;113:19; 117:20:126:4:135:16:	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20 produce (1) 266:14 produced (1) 30:14 producing (2) 239:4:297:13	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1) 239:2 promoting (1) 218:16 promotion (1) 87:20 proof (3) 38:18;149:12;211:20 proper (2) 17:18;50:21 pronerties (5)	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2) 28:2;314:15 provisional (2) 208:7;260:21 provocative (1) 244:3 psych (1)	<b>pushed</b> (1)         154:11 <b>pushing</b> (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put</b> (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;         300:1,17;316:8;318:9;         319:10 <b>putting (11)</b> 3:17:22:14:103:3:
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1) 48:12 probably (37) 28:5;40:8,10,17; 53:11,16,21;69:5;72:14; 88:8;91:13;94:9;113:19; 117:20;126:4;135:16; 139:20:170:10:175:22:	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20 produce (1) 266:14 produced (1) 30:14 producing (2) 239:4;297:13 product (14)	programs (1)         21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18;         81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7;         201:11         progress (1)         22:19         project (4)         54:4;127:1;144:21;         282:16         projects (2)         114:3,17         promise (1)         262:9         promise (1)         239:2         promoting (1)         218:16         promotion (1)         87:20         proof (3)         38:18;149:12;211:20         proper (2)         17:18;50:21         properties (5)         195:15 16:206:21:	protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2) 28:2;314:15 provocative (1) 244:3 psych (1) 185:17	<b>pushed</b> (1)         154:11 <b>pushing</b> (7)         75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put</b> (52)         11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;         300:1,17;316:8;318:9;         319:10 <b>putting (11)</b> 3:17;22:14;193:3;         225:9:231:13:232:3:
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1) 48:12 probably (37) 28:5;40:8,10,17; 53:11,16,21;69:5;72:14; 88:8;91:13;94:9;113:19; 117:20;126:4;135:16; 139:20;170:10;175:22; 104:12:12,14:109:1.	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20 produce (1) 266:14 produced (1) 30:14 producing (2) 239:4;297:13 product (14) 6:8:13:010,10:20:2,4	programs (1)         21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18;         81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7;         201:11         progress (1)         22:19         project (4)         54:4;127:1;144:21;         282:16         projects (2)         114:3,17         promise(0)         262:9         promise (1)         275:15         promoting (1)         218:16         promotion (1)         87:20         proper (2)         17:18;50:21         properties (5)         195:15,16;206:21;         207:1:200:11	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2) 28:2;314:15 provisional (2) 208:7;260:21 provocative (1) 244:3 psych (1) 185:17 psychiate: (1)	<b>pushed (1)</b> 154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;         300:1,17;316:8;318:9;         319:10 <b>putting (11)</b> 3:17;22:14;193:3;         225:9;231:13;233:3;         225:9;231:13;233:3;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1) 48:12 probably (37) 28:5;40:8,10,17; 53:11,16,21;69:5;72:14; 88:8;91:13;94:9;113:19; 117:20;126:4;135:16; 139:20;170:10;175:22; 194:12,13,14;198:1; 205:20:228:4,225:12	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20 produce (1) 266:14 produced (1) 30:14 producing (2) 239:4;297:13 product (14) 6:8;13:9,10,10;29:3,4, 0:47231:1414.4 195 10	programs (1)         21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18;         81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7;         201:11         progress (1)         22:19         project (4)         54:4;127:1;144:21;         282:16         projects (2)         114:3,17         promise(0)         262:9         promise (1)         275:15         promoting (1)         218:16         promoting (1)         218:16         promotion (1)         87:20         project (2)         17:18;50:21         propert(2)         17:18;50:21         properties (5)         195:15,16;206:21;         207:1;209:11	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2) 28:2;314:15 provisional (2) 208:7;260:21 provocative (1) 244:3 psych (1) 185:17 psychiatry (1) 120:22	<b>pushed (1)</b> 154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;         300:1,17;316:8;318:9;         319:10 <b>putting (11)</b> 3:17;22:14;193:3;         225:9;231:13;233:3;         255:3;288:4;299:8;         232:2:24:14;233:9;
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1) 48:12 probably (37) 28:5;40:8,10,17; 53:11,16,21;69:5;72:14; 88:8;91:13;94:9;113:19; 117:20;126:4;135:16; 139:20;170:10;175:22; 194:12,13,14;198:1; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 205:20;228:4;255:20;255:20;255:20;255;255;255;255;255;255;255;255;255;2	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20 produce (1) 266:14 produced (1) 30:14 producing (2) 239:4;297:13 product (14) 6:8;13:9,10,10;29:3,4, 9;47:21;141:4;185:18;	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5;6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1) 239:2 promoting (1) 218:16 promotion (1) 87:20 proof (3) 38:18;149:12;211:20 proper (2) 17:18;50:21 properties (5) 195:15,16;206:21; 207:1;209:11 property (2)	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2) 28:2;314:15 provisional (2) 208:7;260:21 provocative (1) 244:3 psych (1) 185:17 psychiatry (1) 129:22	<b>pushed (1)</b> 154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;         300:1,17;316:8;318:9;         319:10 <b>putting (11)</b> 3:17;22:14;193:3;         225:9;231:13;233:3;         25:9;231:13;233:3;         25:3;288:4;299:8;         323:3,14
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1) 48:12 probably (37) 28:5;40:8,10,17; 53:11,16,21;69:5;72:14; 88:8;91:13;94:9;113:19; 117:20;126:4;135:16; 139:20;170:10;175:22; 194:12,13,14;198:1; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 236:21;237:12;243:13;	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20 produce (1) 266:14 produced (1) 30:14 produced (1) 30:14 pr	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1) 239:2 promoting (1) 218:16 promotion (1) 87:20 proper (2) 17:18;50:21 properties (5) 195:15,16;206:21; 207:1;209:11 property (2) 111:9;235:20	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2) 28:2;314:15 provisional (2) 208:7;260:21 provocative (1) 244:3 psych (1) 185:17 psychiatry (1) 129:22 psychometrically (1)	<b>pushed (1)</b> 154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;         300:1,17;316:8;318:9;         319:10 <b>putting (11)</b> 3:17;22:14;193:3;         225:9;231:13;233:3;         255:3;288:4;299:8;         323:3,14 <b>p-value (1)</b>
40:4 priorities (2) 116:16;187:3 prioritized (1) 138:7 priority (2) 138:13;321:12 privacy (1) 34:1 private (3) 36:9;133:2;166:3 privilege (2) 100:11,12 privileged (1) 101:22 PRO (6) 13:17;14:1,7,14;24:5; 196:18 proactive (1) 48:12 probably (37) 28:5;40:8,10,17; 53:11,16,21;69:5;72:14; 88:8;91:13;94:9;113:19; 117:20;126:4;135:16; 139:20;170:10;175:22; 194:12,13,14;198:1; 205:20;228:4;235:13; 236:21;237:12;243:13; 249:1;253:1,9;271:7,15; 2000	11;292:15,17,22;293:5 procedures (5) 66:19;126:9;176:9; 277:9;280:10 proceeded (1) 22:9 process (30) 10:15;11:3;12:10; 23:13;29:17;62:6;63:11, 19;68:22;72:11;73:10; 80:10;95:12;114:18; 119:14;142:7;150:12; 188:6;189:5;192:14; 206:20;213:14;219:13; 221:7;223:6;273:21; 283:1,10;300:5;310:9 processes (7) 19:8,10;67:14;229:20; 293:15;310:3;311:20 produce (1) 266:14 produced (1) 30:14 produced (1) 30:14 pr	21:2;64:6;79:3;80:18; 81:13;82:5,6,15;99:7; 201:11 progress (1) 22:19 project (4) 54:4;127:1;144:21; 282:16 projects (2) 114:3,17 promiscuously (1) 262:9 promise (1) 275:15 promote (1) 239:2 promoting (1) 218:16 promotion (1) 87:20 proper (2) 17:18;50:21 properties (5) 195:15,16;206:21; 207:1;209:11 property (2) 111:9;235:20 proportion (2)	276:14 protocols (6) 119:10;134:13; 154:10;157:16;186:7; 193:8 prove (1) 204:12 provide (12) 11:15;39:8;41:15; 89:1;93:5;100:15;106:7; 161:7;212:1;215:6; 254:21;261:18 provided (1) 191:21 provides (2) 11:17;213:8 providing (2) 93:1;109:1 Provision (2) 28:2;314:15 provisional (2) 208:7;260:21 provocative (1) 244:3 psych (1) 185:17 psychiatry (1) 129:22 psychometrically (1) 321:21	<b>pushed (1)</b> 154:11 <b>pushing (7)</b> 75:15;162:6;167:6;         169:1,1,1;226:2 <b>put (52)</b> 11:9;22:10;24:17;         27:2;53:8;56:17;72:16;         79:12;81:13;84:7,15;         102:11;108:1;134:20;         148:3;150:13,14;         151:16;152:4,10,12,21;         163:11,11;168:19;         178:17;184:9;193:14;         196:21;202:16,17;         223:22;224:1;233:9;         240:2;242:9;246:15;         261:14;274:1;284:3,6;         285:4;286:10;293:4;         294:11;296:6;297:1;         300:1,17;316:8;318:9;         319:10 <b>putting (11)</b> 3:17;22:14;193:3;         225:9;231:13;233:3;         255:3;288:4;299:8;         323:3,14 <b>p-value (1)</b> 249:9

	67.5.60.10.16.10	264 17 260 4 272 7		200 14 201 10 202 10
	6/:5;69:12,16,18;	264:17;269:4;273:7;	ready (1)	200:14;201:10;202:19;
Q	146:15	2/4:16	190:16	203:14;205:3;206:9;
	query (5)	randomizes (1)	real (27)	212:1,4;214:17;215:15;
Q&A (2)	115:15,16;134:/;	64:19	26:10;28:4;34:21;	216:1,2;218:5,14;
24:8;174:12	136:1;318:5	randomness (1)	42:22;58:1;63:19;77:5;	219:11,13,20;220:9;
QST (8)	querying (1)	123:19	78:3;82:18;87:12;92:4,	221:16;223:15;225:12;
164:6;192:15;194:8,9,	2/3:21	range (3)	7,10;101:1;113:13;	228:9,19;229:21;232:6;
16,20,22;310:11	questionable (1)	30:10;76:5;116:17	115:14,21,21;158:3,3;	233:1,2;238:8,12;
qualification (3)	12:20	rap (1)	160:19;187:12;210:5;	239:18;240:3,14;242:14,
64:5;196:19;260:22	question-and- (1)	131:15	214:13;234:5;242:1;	15;244:6;246:20;247:2;
qualified (4)	198:1	rapidly (1)	245:2	248:8;252:1,19;253:12,
96:10,12;169:4;219:2	questionnaire (1)	110:2	realistic (1)	14,16,17,17;256:9;
qualifiers (1)	281:11	rare (1)	296:2	257:21;261:9,18;263:4,
272:17	questionnaires (3)	242:22	realities (1)	10,17,20;264:5,11;
qualify (2)	78:9;276:2;277:5	rasagiline (2)	98:4	266:1,20;268:10;
61:8;64:3	quick (10)	156:8,13	reality (4)	271:20;272:2;273:13,15,
qualitative (1)	28:12;58:2;82:10;	rate (3)	49:21;98:7;113:3;	16;275:7;277:8,13;
161:2	86:6;88:7;182:21;	44:9,10;95:3	115:4	279:22;280:5;284:6;
quality (137)	249:11;274:19;293:11;	rate-limiting (1)	realize (4)	286:1,13;287:21;294:5;
3:21;5:17;6:1,1,4,6,8,	322:1	188:6	73:16;174:3;208:10;	296:9;297:14,17,19;
9,14,14,16;7:1;8:13,13,	quickly (5)	rater (11)	218:8	298:13;299:8,9;300:3,
14;10:14;12:9;17:2,15;	24:12;46:7;67:5;	143:1,2;157:20;	realized (1)	13,21;302:2,12;303:1,1;
25:13;28:22;31:4;32:20;	143:6;254:9	158:21;159:22;160:20,	13:22	309:5,22;311:6;313:14;
43:22;57:17;58:4;66:17,	quiet (3)	22;177:18;193:12,14,18	realizing (2)	314:14;320:19;323:11
19;67:6,12,18;68:10,19,	78:12;96:7;246:22	raters (1)	215:1;220:8	real-world (3)
22;72:7;73:14;89:9;	quieted (1)	177:22	really (273)	238:8,16;241:20
96:17:97:14:101:8.11,	78:14	rates (2)	13:8;14:4;23:1;28:6;	reason (17)
14;103:9,19;106:17,20;	Quintiles (1)	16:16;66:3	30:22;31:7;32:20;34:9;	17:3,6;60:15;118:20;
107:1.6.8:109:8.9.16:	198:16	Rather (10)	36:8;37:16;38:1;40:16;	145:6;146:5;162:17;
114:7:117:9.12:118:17:	quite (6)	6:14;13:10;16:13;	41:18;42:19;43:21;46:3,	179:1;187:17;220:10;
119:17;120:10,13;	15:7;19:1;50:8;59:7;	38:9;123:10;174:19;	6;47:6,13;50:17;52:12,	226:2;237:20;244:14;
127:11:131:21:132:17.	102:15;285:19	271:18;296:19,22;317:1	20;53:6;54:19;55:13,18,	252:7;290:17;311:21;
20:133:7:137:20:	quote (1)	rating (2)	20;56:1,8;59:9,13,18,21;	318:12
138:11,15:139:21;	18:15	177:4;310:18	60:19;61:2,8,19;64:8,14;	reasonable (10)
140:20,22;141:2,3,8,10,		rats (1)	67:1;68:14;69:11,12;	3:13;4:21;58:7;269:1,
18:142:5.19:144:16:	R	164:16	71:3,7,9,17;73:10,12;	3;273:5;285:15;303:9;
146:10;148:10;149:3,6,		Rauck (1)	76:17;77:10,19;83:21;	304:20;312:17
9,16;150:6;151:9,17;	Rabinowitz (3)	110:11	85:19,21;88:17;97:1,6,8,	reasons (13)
152:1,4;153:11,16,18;	248:8;249:7;290:8	raw (2)	11,15,16;102:19;108:20;	15:17;32:5;36:4;
160:20;164:11;165:6;	Rabinowitz' (1)	11:21;261:18	111:18,21;112:8;	112:16;130:18;131:2;
166:3,13;168:22;170:8;	247:16	Raymond (2)	116:11;118:17;119:1,6,	132:18;157:1,1;185:1,2;
172:9,22;173:21;174:6,	radio (6)	292:10;307:12	13;127:17;128:11,14;	192:17;282:21
7,8;179:17;181:2;182:8;	128:22;129:1;130:7,	reach (4)	139:18;141:1,3;142:5;	recalibrated (1)
183:20;184:3,8;186:13;	20;131:6;132:19	33:4,12;100:9;250:5	143:8,11;145:7,17;	187:4
190:13;194:2;202:22;	raise (2)	reached (2)	146:9,10;148:2,6,7,11,	recalibration (2)
212:10,15;223:14;	33:20;119:18	246:13;253:4	18,19,19;149:2,9,13,14,	175:20;176:8
227:9:232:3.6:237:13;	raised (5)	reaching (1)	22;150:1,2,9,11,18,20;	recall (1)
247:9;261:14;264:4;	12:19;25:6,9,22;28:16	17:14	151:17,20,22;152:21;	204:5
265:8;266:11;269:14;	raises (6)	reacting (1)	153:4,13,21;154:12,16,	receipt (1)
272:4;276:8;293:15,20,	61:20;106:12,16;	296:16	19;155:6,13;156:15,16;	132:9
21;297:9,15;299:10;	177:3;203:13;286:3	reaction (1)	157:17,22;158:8,17,19;	receive (1)
300:5	raising (3)	266:8	159:3,8,20;160:6,10;	128:7
quantification (1)	70:16;110:11;239:13	read (6)	161:10;162:5;163:14,17,	receiving (1)
10:7	ran (1)	105:22;106:8;111:4;	17,19;164:15;166:9,16;	274:3
quantitative (2)	179:20	275:8;278:21;309:15	167:20;168:5,10,18,20,	recent (2)
153:1,5	randomization (4)	Reader's (1)	22;169:3,6,8;171:6,11;	84:17;179:19
quantitatively (1)	65:5;66:11;209:19;	143:3	172:10,10,11;173:2,9,	recently (7)
161:3	277:2	reading (2)	16,20;174:4,6;175:15;	49:8;53:4;55:1;81:6;
quarterbacks (1)	randomize (3)	47:19;53:19	177:19;178:2,19;182:3,	107:11;122:14;212:22
53:14	64:17;65:5,9	re-administered (1)	10;183:21;186:2;188:1;	receptionist (1)
quarterly (1)	randomized (10)	197:13	189:17;190:2;192:11;	162:4
281:6	39:16;64:21;65:15;	reads (1)	194:1,3,7,16;195:2,8,21;	recess (2)
queries (5)	106:4;238:18;242:1;	302:13	196:1,4,15;199:14;	96:4;207:22

recognition (1) 18:11 recognize (1) 295:19 recognized (3) 87:17;159:12;177:18 recognizing (2) 149:19;202:10 recommend (4) 193:15;194:22;195:1; 303:7 recommendation (8) 3:20;138:5;195:20; 273:1,3;303:16;309:13; 321:11 recommendations (20) 196:18;261:19,20; 262:3,9,12;263:11; 271:1,3,19,21;272:18, 19;273:11;299:4; 305:22;309:18;320:18; 322:2.13 recommended (1) 261:22 recommending (1) 37:8 recommends (1) 6:16 recompense (1) 62:21 reconciled (1) 114:10 reconciliation (1) 114:6 reconsider (1) 142:1 reconvene (1) 96:2 record (14) 36:18,20;42:20;51:1; 58:6:130:9:136:20: 137:14;175:5;178:2,7; 231:18;240:8;242:17 recorded (1) 17:3 recording (3) 122:16;135:21;294:16 records (25) 32:8;34:9,17,22;35:2, 7,10,15,22;36:11;39:4,9, 13,17;40:6,11,12;41:15; 43:3:46:3:110:9.15: 125:18;130:8;234:12 recreational (1) 258:10 recruit (9) 61:16;62:2;63:6; 70:15;128:17;129:3,9; 130:4;133:2 recruited (8) 39:10;49:19;63:5; 67:20:68:16:130:1; 286:15;295:9

recruiting (7) 35:12;67:21;128:19; 131:19;132:4,16;137:4 recruitment (16) 23:12;25:13;63:1; 67:2;127:14,14;128:7,9, 16;129:7;131:1,17,21; 133:10:137:11.15 recruits (1) 39:6 rectified (1) 69:19 recycling (1) 254:3 red (5) 12:19;35:18,19; 294:10,11 redacted (1) 126:11 **REDcap**(8) 28:14,14,20;29:17; 30:3,7,15,16 redo (2) 184:10;291:12 reduce (3) 74:14;78:16;190:8 reduced (1) 19:16 reducing (1) 251:5 reenrolled (1) 315:9 refer (3) 20:14:226:5.5 reference (5) 275:15,16;277:20; 307:16:319:11 referenced (1) 23:21 references (1) 16:6 referencing (1) 257:6 referred (3) 95:2;295:3;319:16 referring (5) 48:15;151:12,13; 159:10;309:7 reflect (1) 51:10 reflected (1) 6:12 reflections (1) 99:15 refractory (1) 163:21 refrain (1) 78:8 refuse (1) 78:8 regard (5) 84:12;104:22;194:4; 205:20;239:1

regarding (5) 5:3:49:10:65:13: 244:4:293:12 regardless (1) 74:6 regards (2) 26:22;287:20 regimen (1) 292:18 regimens (1) 74:15 region (4) 111:4;112:7;288:5,9 regional (4) 110:2;165:16;171:3; 190:7 regions (1) 45:12 register (1) 57:21 registering (1) 313:7 registration (4) 150:9;303:13;310:5; 313:5 regular (2) 259:22;308:2 regularly (1) 260:6 regulations (2) 251:3.12 regulatory (20) 7:20;48:18;51:18; 101:14.22:103:9: 106:19;107:1;109:9; 146:19;212:3;213:11; 221:15;223:6;229:14; 239:18;303:14;311:11, 13:316:10 rehabilitation (3) 224:1;229:11;230:10 rehabilitative (1) 229:20 reimbursement (2) 257:13;258:9 reinforcing (1) 269:22 reinvent (1) 220:6 relate (3) 131:21;138:11;320:6 related (21) 8:13;15:2,13;24:16; 70:13;78:19;99:9; 104:17;118:15;125:6; 137:22;138:15;139:21; 188:8;206:16;218:20; 259:14;268:14;279:7; 293:9;320:1 relationship (8) 101:20:102:11:132:1: 159:13,15;181:1;268:3; 287:4

relationships (5) 69:4:100:17:168:10. 10:222:3 relative (5) 101:22;105:14; 212:20,22;243:3 relatively (4) 104:2;113:19;116:14; 143:11 release (2) 22:22;35:9 relevant (7) 19:1;109:5;243:16; 262:13;263:11;320:3,3 reliability (8) 15:5;139:7;192:17; 199:21;200:4;206:11; 207:2;209:13 reliable (3) 10:11;196:3;266:14 relief (1) 258:6 reluctance (2) 192:12;193:1 rely (4) 87:22;88:3;130:12; 267:5 remain (1) 63:7 re-measure (1) 207:3 remediated (1) 177:2remember (6) 3:5,14:199:4:208:7: 263:9;280:3 remind (7) 4:8:213:20:301:5: 307:18;317:6,14;318:3 reminded (1) 213:15 reminder (2) 82:6;95:7 reminders (1) 3:3 remote (3) 18:9;19:13;37:6 removed (2) 54:6;249:7 Removing (1) 296:4 repeat (1) 279:1 rephrase (1) 29:16 replace (1) 285:9 replacement (1) 134:14 replicable (1) 297:13 replicate (1) 9:21

June 5, 2015

replicated (1) 106:15 reply (1) 57:2 report (12) 8:5,16,18;14:18;24:1; 72:17,18,20;74:1;136:4; 248:12:278:11 reported (2) 12:15:230:14 reporter (1) 195:10 reporting (12) 95:3;114:5;138:12; 142:8;157:13;212:11, 13;264:21;274:21: 283:7,9;294:13 reports (3) 58:12;111:4;123:8 repository (2) 22:1,15 representative (1) 245:2 representatives (1) 7:20 reprioritized (1) 111:5 reproducibility (1) 192:16 reputable (1) 4:4require (8) 21:2;48:9;49:4;76:10; 81:8;176:10;201:2; 203:1 required (6) 34:17:195:11.11.12; 208:6:237:15 requirement (1) 221:15 requirements (1) 216:21 requires (3) 40:3;63:19;249:20 requisite (1) 21:7 rescreen (1) 39:18 Rescue (9) 13:6;15:20;16:2,13, 15;73:9;74:16;75:11; 259:20 rescuing (1) 90:18 Research (57) 5:15;20:21;32:4,9; 47:18;57:6;58:21;61:5; 82:22;83:5,21;84:1; 100:18;112:10;113:6, 18;116:15,20;120:7; 123:4.6:124:13:127:9: 128:6:140:5:144:5.7; 159:9;164:16;166:3;

Min-U-Script®

184:20;185:9;187:3;	91:21	<b>RICE</b> (4)	Rob's (1)	Rush (1)
188:12:189:20:218:15.	results (22)	286:10:288:12:319:6.	182:22	129:12
18 20:238:6:239:12 12	9.21.10.11.16.18.	10	robust (2)	rushing (1)
14.240.2 16.241.11.	20.21,10.11,10.10, 20.2,15.01.22,22.02.2.	Richard (1)	113.5.137.7	208.10
17,270,2,10,271,111, 252,4,257,7,276,2,6,11	108.20.164.2.170.8	51.12	<b>Dochostor</b> (3)	<b>Dvon</b> (1)
252:4;257:7;270:5;0,11,	108.20,104.2,170.8,	J1.13	<b>NOTICES (3)</b> $00.8.1(2.0.227.12)$	$\mathbf{Kyan}\left(\mathbf{I}\right)$
20;287:21;321:12;	206:13;209:16;213:9;	richer (1)	99:8;163:9;227:13	262:19
322:2,5,10,11	227:3;248:19;249:5;	126:22	rogue (1)	q
researcher (1)	255:21;266:14;292:22;	<b>Rick</b> (11)	301:22	S
111:18	297:14;300:3	25:9;34:4;39:21;	role (1)	
researchers (1)	retention (1)	50:10;52:9;53:3;54:9;	159:22	sacrosanct (1)
304:19	70:17	98:16;124:17;304:1,2	room (22)	159:14
research-sponsor (1)	retentive (1)	<b>Rick's</b> (2)	3:9;4:8;22:19;50:4;	safe (4)
116:8	55:20	131:16:136:10	60:4.21:78:14:79:17:	149:2:216:16:223:12:
reserve (1)	rethink (1)	ridiculous (2)	97.2.100.5 21.104.13	324.11
313.22	142:1	63.18.81.18	167.1.179.3 5.235.15	safaguards (1)
rosolvo (1)	rotroin (5)	riding(1)	242.5.246.18.270.1	265.10
222.11	122.20.101.16.204.0	11ullig (1)	242.3,240.18,279.1,	203.10
232:11	122:20;191:10;304:9,	22:1	290:4;304:17,19	saler (1)
resolved (2)	11,11	right (84)	rounds (1)	239:22
67:5;290:8	retrained (2)	8:3,10;13:15;14:13;	246:18	safety (36)
resonates (1)	192:9,10	15:15;26:9;27:3;35:4;	routinely (3)	15:21;37:20;38:15;
179:8	retraining (6)	36:5;39:17;41:16,21;	43:18;276:1,2	149:13;154:1;155:19;
resources (3)	93:8;192:14;194:2;	43:20;44:1,13,19;45:10;	row (2)	170:13;171:20;212:8,11.
129:5:250:22:257:21	219:15:308:2:311:10	62:19:67:16:82:14:	267:3:312:6	13:214:20:221:17:
respect $(4)$	re-training (1)	86:17 20:93:18:115:16:	ROWBOTHAM (10)	223.5 12.226.14 15 15
159.19.212.11 15.	178.12	120.6.124.1 1.133.16	13.8.82.21.83.3.	15 15:220:0 10 15 17:
109.19,212.11,10, 200.21	1/0.12 motrographicaly (1)	120.0, 124.1, 1, 155.10, 21.127.2.142.21.150.9.	190.2 4.222.14 15	13,13,229,9,10,13,17, 220,6,12,16,17,17,22,
290.21	retrospectively (1)	21;157:2;142:21;150:8;	109.3,4,252.14,13,	230.0,12,10,17,17,22,
respond (11)	169:21	155:16;165:13;168:15;	239:10,15;240:22	231:15,22;232:1,6,10;
15:15;96:14;105:1,8;	revalidate (3)	1/3:10,11;180:21;	rows (1)	264:6
146:14;186:15;206:4,5;	202:14;206:19;209:4	181:12,14,15;188:9,9;	312:7	sale (1)
239:10;258:15;322:15	revalidated (1)	195:6;199:5;200:20;	Roy (3)	182:19
responded (3)	203:2	201:15;215:6;216:12;	70:1;79:5;191:12	salt (1)
234:22;235:1,1	revalidation (2)	220:5;223:5;224:11;	rubber (2)	214:9
responding (4)	206:6,7	237:18;244:14;254:5;	145:13:264:10	same (34)
96:15:237:18:272:14:	revenue (2)	257:1:269:13:270:13	rubric (1)	8:6:12:13.16:14:16:
295.11	188.16.18	20.276.9.282.13	314.20	47.15.51.7.58.21.59.6
responds (1)	reverse (1)	284.13.285.5.293.14	rudimentary (4)	88.18.94.13.120.7.12
225.2	75.18	10.205.20.206.14	$11.2 \times 17.44.2$	$122 \cdot 14 \cdot 122 \cdot 1112$
255.5 magnanga ( <b>22</b> )	75.18 morieur (0)	19,295.20,290.14, 209.16,200.12,19,	11.2,0,17,44.2	132.14,133.11,12, 124.2.145.1.160.12.
14:0 10:70:12 10:	10:21:12:10:24:2:	290.10,299.15,10,	rug (1)	154.2, 145.1, 100.12,
44:9,10;70:15,19;	10:21;12:10;24:5;	300:0;302:20;303:3;	245:22	101:0;185:18;18/:5;
89:7;93:8;94:11;102:6;	49:10;111:13;113:21;	307:7;308:10,13;311:2;	rule (1)	194:18;199:22;224:11;
104:7;152:14,15;	114:17;195:11;302:16	313:17,22,22;314:3;	60:17	225:6;227:3,15;229:3;
170:22;182:22;197:7;	reviewed (1)	316:3;320:11;323:19	rule-bound (2)	247:19;248:2,9;276:2;
236:5,19;237:2;239:13;	185:4	rigor (3)	121:22;122:2	289:19;294:3
276:19;295:11;319:4;	reviewer (3)	223:9;230:20;239:5	rule-oriented (1)	sample (1)
323:17	6:2;12:15;178:8	rigueur (2)	121:16	131:8
responses (3)	reviewers (3)	50:6:303:3	rules (7)	samples (1)
15:7:96:18:274:18	16:20:18:2:321:3	risk (13)	93:19:101:15:121:22:	125:16
responsibilities (4)	reviews (2)	6.16.19.8 10.60.20.	122.11.185.8.234.14	sampling (1)
25.17.54.16.62.9	17.5.114.1	102.12.114.1.149.6	296.19	319.7
221.10	17.3,117.1	$2/2 \cdot 12 \cdot 11 + \cdot 11 \cdot 11 + 10 \cdot 01 \cdot 01 \cdot 01 \cdot $	(11)	$S_{2}(1)$
221.17	147.69	243.4,233.3,278.1,	102.12.144.22.	San (1)
responsibility (4)	14/.0,8	290:4;299:10;510:12	102:12;144:22;	240:5
48:17;49:22;50:20;	revisions (1)	Risk-Based (6)	1/9:21;18/:9;201:19;	SAS (1)
212:4	324:5	6:20;19:4,5;38:21;	202:10,11;217:11;	29:11
responsible (4)	revisited (1)	89:14;172:3	222:6;235:12;316:12	satisfied (1)
213:7;249:4;299:16;	106:15	risks (1)	run-in (3)	33:19
301:7	rewarding (1)	153:8	74:13;162:21;169:15	satisfy (1)
rest (3)	100:4	road (4)	running (10)	33:16
3:14,15;220:12	rheumatoid (2)	26:17;137:14;145:13;	77:14;78:6;113:18;	save (1)
restating (1)	81:7;236:2	264:10	120:21:121:4:157:14:	174:19
298:17	rheumatologist (1)	Rob (12)	167:9:168:16:169:12.	saw (14)
restricted (1)	81:22	57:19:121.8.157.7.	235:11	15:8:27:22:122:17
242.12	rheumatologists (1)	167.13.170.6 7.221.4 5.	runs (1)	123.20.158.12.17,
result (1)	81·10	280.5.210.12.218.22	101.4	180.3.107.20.215.0.
1 coult (1)	01.10	200.2,210.12,210.2,3	101.7	107.3,177.20,213.7,

232:14;246:14;257:4;	196:2;221:14	seem (8)	284:3,20;318:10	shapes (1)
308:12;309:4	scientists (2)	20:5;38:18;176:22;	separately (5)	130:19
saying (43)	20:16;80:8	232:15;254:12;278:7;	245:18;277:17,18;	share (1)
8:9,20;15:14;34:7;	Scirex (1)	290:16;296:15	290:11;318:12	235:14
41:22;50:19;61:7;71:21;	280:4	seemed (2)	Sequester (1)	sharing (1)
78:21;88:8;95:8;96:19;	score (4)	95:4;242:13	22:9	270:1
102:12,19;200:21;	45:3,4;307:2;313:9	seems (14)	serendipitous (1)	Sharon (17)
201:13;230:16;231:6,20,	scores (1)	33:15;35:11,15,17;	216:2	12:13;15:14;44:5;
21;243:15;246:17;	321:18	94:9;95:3;192:12;	serious (8)	51:17;93:4;175:9;
250:2;252:9;259:17;	scoring (2)	248:16;254:14;256:7;	13:4,19;40:9;42:4;	285:16,18;286:1;
260:9;271:5;272:17;	9:18;126:3	263:20;264:12;265:6;	55:9;59:20;166:18;	298:22;305:10,19;
278:8;285:19;295:21;	Scott (6)	290:1	289:19	306:15;309:7;313:3;
306:4,14;307:1,7;	24:5;71:19;78:20;	segue (2)	seriously (1)	316:16;317:19
312:16;313:2;314:16;	79:16:99:5:280:22	97:12:232:16	248:7	sheet (1)
316:4;317:8,17;322:8,8	scrape (1)	select (2)	serve (5)	126:3
scaffolding (1)	136:21	149:13:162:19	26:9:48:4;100:18;	shelf (1)
263:19	scratch (1)	selected (1)	168:17,18	237:8
scale (4)	206:18	68:2	served (1)	shepherding (1)
14:12:20:3:122:20:	screen (3)	selecting (2)	100:19	100:13
263:3	64:15:65:2:130:13	25:11:91:17	service (6)	shifting (1)
scales (5)	screened (5)	selection (4)	11:16:58:12:118:15:	59:10
14.10.171.1.200.16	65.1 14.106.3.130.16	21.16.173.1.284.22	289.6.297.7.13	shine (1)
310.18.321.21	181.16	285.6	services (3)	135.6
scans (1)	screening (10)	selective (3)	46.17.86.19.89.1	shocking (1)
231.4	39.15.41.9.64.16	244.21.245.6.246.10	serving (3)	66·16
scarv (1)	65.7 8.126.9.127.17	self-disclosure (1)	49.8.61.21.112.6	shon (4)
247.2	130.5 6.289.4	230.10	session (6)	$104 \cdot 2 \cdot 117 \cdot 14 \cdot 131 \cdot 11 \cdot 11$
schedule (2)	screenings $(1)$	selling (3)	3.15.5.7.96.8.97.7.	263.2
105:16:174:14	127.20	70.15.258.11.319.22	98.12.260.18	shopper (4)
schemes (1)	screens (3)	send $(10)$	sessions (2)	56.17.57.3.58.2.12
53.9	118.16.129.8.318.15	32.9.90.5.115.2.	178.7.198.2	short (4)
Schering-Plough (1)	screw (2)	125.17 17.165.17	set (18)	33.10.45.6.67.12
148·14	220.9.10	178.8.189.12.275.14.16	47.7.79.19.103.6	143.12
schizonhrenia (3)	scrutiny $(1)$	sending $(1)$	107.12.110.3.111.21	short-circuited (1)
248.12.249.9 19	111.11	102.9	118.22.110.5.127.20.	
210.12,219.9,19	111.11	1910	118.77.119.3.177.70	208.12
	SDTM (2)	195.0 senior (1)	118:22;119:3;127:20;	208:12 shorthand (1)
87·10	<b>SDTM (2)</b> 11:18:22:4	<b>senior (1)</b> 79:13	118:22;119:3;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13:265:4:280:13:	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9
87:10 school (5)	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4)	senior (1) 79:13	118:22,119:5,127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22:302:19	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1)
87:10 school (5) 121:15:163:9:168:16:	<b>SDTM (2)</b> 11:18;22:4 <b>SDV (4)</b> 37:11 22:38:3 19	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13:17:1:20:2:28:19:	118:22;119:3;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18
87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19:196:12	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1)	<b>senior (1)</b> 79:13 <b>sense (34)</b> 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6 17 18:44:6:59:17:	118:22;119:3;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12:240:7:286:14	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2)
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3)	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21:66:17:72:775:12:	118:22;119:3;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6)	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5 22
87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1 2 3	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2)	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20:88:16:92:14;	118:22;119:3;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13:14:287:11:19	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11)
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18)	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7:208:2	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18:107:1 1:120:3:	118:22;119:3;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20:303:8	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4 12:84:10:95:8:
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12 19 20:7:14 17:	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7)	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2:213:8:217:9	118:22;119:3;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1)	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22:199:10:244:22
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20.8:27:15:29:2.7.20;	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13:103:6:115:17:	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12:250:17:252:10:	118:22;119:3;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22:245:8:262:17:272:10
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22:33:18:38:20;	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 160:7:229:4:280:18:	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7:972:1:273:4;	118:22;119:3;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3)	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5)
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20:47:14:51:12:	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13:293:22:302:5 7:	118.22;119:5;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15:105:22:128:18	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7:183:2:250:7:
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22:94:15	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3)	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2	118.22;119:5;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1)	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5:292:12
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6)	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19:200:16:268:2	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8)	118.22;119:5;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4)
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10:152:21:217:17:	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1)	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20:77:18:120:11;	118.22;119:5;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1)	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7:262:20:263:4;
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5:310:0:313:18	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 109:13	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11:283:13.17;	118.22;119:5;127:20; 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5;310:9;313:18 Sciences (5)	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 198:13 seconds (1)	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11;283:13,17; 200:1:218:17	118.22,119.5,127.20, 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10 Shoevitz (3)	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3 show (1)
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5;310:9;313:18 Sciences (5) 81:16:11:12:14:14;	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 198:13 seconds (1) 223:20	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11;283:13,17; 292:1;318:17 conscitaction (1)	118.22,119:5,127:20, 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10 Shaevitz (3) 247:18:248:0:200:0	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3 shown (1) 226:20
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5;310:9;313:18 Sciences (5) 8:16;11:12,14,14; 72:16	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 198:13 seconds (1) 323:20 second (6)	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11;283:13,17; 292:1;318:17 sensitization (1) 104:17	118.22,119:5,127:20, 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10 Shaevitz (3) 247:18;248:9;290:9 shaling (1)	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3 shown (1) 226:20 showe (2)
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5;310:9;313:18 Sciences (5) 8:16;11:12,14,14; 72:16 Sciences' (1)	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 198:13 seconds (1) 323:20 secret (6) 56:16:57:2.6:58:2 11;	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11;283:13,17; 292:1;318:17 sensitization (1) 104:17	118.22,119:5,127:20, 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10 Shaevitz (3) 247:18;248:9;290:9 shaking (1) 280:22	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3 shown (1) 226:20 shows (2) 844:250.4
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5;310:9;313:18 Sciences (5) 8:16;11:12,14,14; 72:16 Sciences' (1) 24:1	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 198:13 seconds (1) 323:20 secret (6) 56:16;57:3,6;58:2,11; 128:21	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11;283:13,17; 292:1;318:17 sensitization (1) 104:17 sensory (3) 93:10:152:15	118.22,119.5,127.20, 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10 Shaevitz (3) 247:18;248:9;290:9 shaking (1) 289:22 shall (1)	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3 shown (1) 226:20 shows (2) 84:4;250:4 side (13)
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5;310:9;313:18 Sciences (5) 8:16;11:12,14,14; 72:16 Sciences' (1) 24:1 scientific (17)	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 198:13 seconds (1) 323:20 secret (6) 56:16;57:3,6;58:2,11; 128:21 second (2)	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11;283:13,17; 292:1;318:17 sensitization (1) 104:17 sensory (3) 83:10;153:1,5 sent (3)	118.22,119.5,127.20, 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10 Shaevitz (3) 247:18;248:9;290:9 shaking (1) 289:22 shall (1) 00:18	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3 shown (1) 226:20 shows (2) 84:4;250:4 side (13) 7:3:50:8:07.18:09.15
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5;310:9;313:18 Sciences (5) 8:16;11:12,14,14; 72:16 Sciences' (1) 24:1 scientific (17) 5:12:12:510:221:16;	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 198:13 seconds (1) 323:20 secret (6) 56:16;57:3,6;58:2,11; 128:21 section (6) 73:4:220:17:258:14;	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11;283:13,17; 292:1;318:17 sensitization (1) 104:17 sensory (3) 83:10;153:1,5 sent (3)	118.22,119.5,127.20, 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10 Shaevitz (3) 247:18;248:9;290:9 shaking (1) 289:22 shall (1) 90:18 chalt (1)	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3 shown (1) 226:20 shows (2) 84:4;250:4 side (13) 7:3;50:8;97:18;98:1; 105:10:152:10:224:2;
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5;310:9;313:18 Sciences (5) 8:16;11:12,14,14; 72:16 Sciences' (1) 24:1 scientific (17) 5:13;12:5;19:2;21:16; 00:6:101:11:21:102:11	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 198:13 seconds (1) 323:20 secret (6) 56:16;57:3,6;58:2,11; 128:21 section (6) 73:4;232:17;258:14; 284:21:204:12:210:1	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11;283:13,17; 292:1;318:17 sensitization (1) 104:17 sensory (3) 83:10;153:1,5 sent (3) 43:18;279:12,13	118.22,119.5,127.20, 159:18:162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10 Shaevitz (3) 247:18;248:9;290:9 shaking (1) 289:22 shall (1) 90:18 shalt (1) 41:14	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3 shown (1) 226:20 shows (2) 84:4;250:4 side (13) 7:3;50:8;97:18;98:1; 105:19;152:10;224:3; 225:11:255:2,20:
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5;310:9;313:18 Sciences (5) 8:16;11:12,14,14; 72:16 Sciences' (1) 24:1 scientific (17) 5:13;12:5;19:2;21:16; 90:6;101:11,21;102:11, 20:102:8:10;10:12;11,	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 198:13 seconds (1) 323:20 secret (6) 56:16;57:3,6;58:2,11; 128:21 section (6) 73:4;232:17;258:14; 284:21;304:13;310:1 secime (2)	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11;283:13,17; 292:1;318:17 sensitization (1) 104:17 sensory (3) 83:10;153:1,5 sent (3) 43:18;279:12,13 sentence (2)	118.22,119.5,127.20, 159:18;162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10 Shaevitz (3) 247:18;248:9;290:9 shaking (1) 289:22 shall (1) 90:18 shalt (1) 41:14 shart (1)	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3 shown (1) 226:20 shows (2) 84:4;250:4 side (13) 7:3;50:8;97:18;98:1; 105:19;152:10;224:3; 225:11;255:3,20; 258:11:268:20:275.2
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5;310:9;313:18 Sciences (5) 8:16;11:12,14,14; 72:16 Sciences' (1) 24:1 scientific (17) 5:13;12:5;19:2;21:16; 90:6;101:11,21;102:11, 20;103:8,10;106:17; 107:6:100:8114:12:10	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 198:13 seconds (1) 323:20 secret (6) 56:16;57:3,6;58:2,11; 128:21 section (6) 73:4;232:17;258:14; 284:21;304:13;310:1 seeing (2) 6717;198:0	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11;283:13,17; 292:1;318:17 sensitization (1) 104:17 sensory (3) 83:10;153:1,5 sent (3) 43:18;279:12,13 sentence (2) 103:2;243:15	118.22,119.5,127.20, 159:18:162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10 Shaevitz (3) 247:18;248:9;290:9 shaking (1) 289:22 shall (1) 90:18 shalt (1) 41:14 sham (1) 56:17	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3 shown (1) 226:20 shows (2) 84:4;250:4 side (13) 7:3;50:8;97:18;98:1; 105:19;152:10;224:3; 225:11;268:22;275:2 sidehear (2)
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5;310:9;313:18 Sciences (5) 8:16;11:12,14,14; 72:16 Sciences' (1) 24:1 scientific (17) 5:13;12:5;19:2;21:16; 90:6;101:11,21;102:11, 20;103:8,10;106:17; 107:6;109:8;114:12,18; 211:02	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 198:13 seconds (1) 323:20 secret (6) 56:16;57:3,6;58:2,11; 128:21 section (6) 73:4;232:17;258:14; 284:21;304:13;310:1 seeing (2) 67:17;188:9 condition (1)	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11;283:13,17; 292:1;318:17 sensitization (1) 104:17 sensory (3) 83:10;153:1,5 sent (3) 43:18;279:12,13 sentence (2) 103:2;243:15 separate (9) 2119:05:12:120:12	118.22,119.5,127.20, 159:18:162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10 Shaevitz (3) 247:18;248:9;290:9 shaking (1) 289:22 shall (1) 90:18 shalt (1) 41:14 sham (1) 56:17 	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3 shown (1) 226:20 shows (2) 84:4;250:4 side (13) 7:3;50:8;97:18;98:1; 105:19;152:10;224:3; 225:11;255:3,20; 258:11;268:22;275:2 sidebar (3) 50:16:128:15:10;215:15
scholarly (1) 87:10 school (5) 121:15;163:9;168:16; 191:19;196:12 schools (3) 86:1,2,3 Schuette (18) 5:12,19,20;7:14,17; 20:8;27:15;29:2,7,20; 32:22;33:18;38:20; 43:20;47:14;51:12; 89:22;94:15 science (6) 88:10;152:21;217:17; 238:5;310:9;313:18 Sciences (5) 8:16;11:12,14,14; 72:16 Sciences' (1) 24:1 scientific (17) 5:13;12:5;19:2;21:16; 90:6;101:11,21;102:11, 20;103:8,10;106:17; 107:6;109:8;114:12,18; 211:22	SDTM (2) 11:18;22:4 SDV (4) 37:11,22;38:3,19 searching (1) 181:13 seats (2) 96:7;208:2 second (7) 101:13;103:6;115:17; 169:7;229:4;280:18; 313:1 secondary (3) 152:19;200:16;268:2 Secondly (1) 198:13 seconds (1) 323:20 secret (6) 56:16;57:3,6;58:2,11; 128:21 section (6) 73:4;232:17;258:14; 284:21;304:13;310:1 seeing (2) 67:17;188:9 seeking (1) 162:19	senior (1) 79:13 sense (34) 8:13;17:1;20:2;28:19; 29:6,17,18;44:6;59:17; 64:21;66:17;72:7;75:12; 76:20;88:16;92:14; 102:18;107:1,1;120:3; 193:2;213:8;217:9; 220:12;250:17;252:10; 254:7;272:1;273:4; 275:13;293:22;302:5,7; 303:2 sensitivity (8) 76:20;77:18;120:11; 280:11;283:13,17; 292:1;318:17 sensitization (1) 104:17 sensory (3) 83:10;153:1,5 sent (3) 43:18;279:12,13 sentence (2) 103:2;243:15 separate (9) 31:18;95:12;129:13; 100:120:25	118.22,119.5,127.20, 159:18:162:12;198:21; 241:13;265:4;280:13; 283:20,22;302:19 setting (3) 23:12;240:7;286:14 settings (6) 262:13,14;287:11,19, 20;303:8 seven (1) 82:11 several (3) 12:15;105:22;128:18 severe (1) 228:5 shaded (1) 145:10 Shaevitz (3) 247:18;248:9;290:9 shaking (1) 289:22 shall (1) 90:18 shalt (1) 41:14 sham (1) 56:17 shape (1)	208:12 shorthand (1) 250:9 shortly (1) 220:18 shots (2) 149:5,22 show (11) 68:4,12;84:10;95:8; 122:22;199:10;244:22, 22;245:8;262:17;272:10 showed (5) 118:7;183:2;250:7; 276:5;292:12 showing (4) 249:7;262:20;263:4; 272:3 shown (1) 226:20 shows (2) 84:4;250:4 side (13) 7:3;50:8;97:18;98:1; 105:19;152:10;224:3; 225:11;255:3,20; 258:11;268:22;275:2 sidebar (3) 59:16;128:18;138:10 ide: (2)

		/->		
58:16;302:18	44:7;46:9;49:17,20;	skill (3)	sold (1)	113:4;114:7;115:4,6;
sidewalks (1)	51:22;52:9;53:3;54:21;	118:21;119:5;162:12	143:10	117:13;120:4;124:6;
120:20	56:3:61:17:65:10:66:22:	skills (1)	solution (2)	126:1:127:3.3.18:
Sigma (1)	67.20.68.1 2 10.69.10	113.2	80:12.16	136.11.174.14.176.20.
210.12	14.82.8.84.5.85.12.15	skin (2)	solutions (1)	177.1.178.5.170.3
219.12	14,02.0,04.3,05.12,15,	165.4.5		177.1,170.3,179.3, 191.14.192.19.197.12.
Sign (5)	87.13,90.12,93.14,10, 17.04.1 14.05.2 7.	103.4,3	222.3	101.14, 102.10, 107.12, 208.4, 10.210, 21.
55:9;115:12;202:19	17;94:1,14;95:2,7;	skip (2)	somebody (18)	208:4,10,210:21;
signal (5)	111:11;114:21;115:1,	1/0:12;1/2:5	50:14;54:20;62:14;	212:12;216:6;217:7;
101:9,12;124:5;	19;127:22;131:16,19;	sleep (4)	63:9;87:12;145:22;	237:21;242:14;252:4;
138:19;181:5	171:2;174:1;175:17;	135:7,10;185:12;	158:10;163:11;188:11;	257:15;275:3;283:1,13;
signature (1)	176:3;179:15,22,22;	228:15	194:9;200:9;205:17;	289:12,14;322:17
104:22	180:10,11;183:22,22;	sleepy (1)	230:1;242:21;308:12;	sorts (4)
signatures (1)	190:14.15:191:4:202:4:	225:11	313:10:314:15:317:6	38:16:61:17:114:6:
138.15	215.21.216.4.258.5 5	slide (17)	somebody's (1)	186.21
significance (1)	264.13.265.4.266.6	184.10.263.9 10 14	36.13	sound (1)
250.5	267.16.272.14 16.	17,265,22,266,2,269,6	50.15 comohow (11)	242.17
230:5	207:10;275:14,10;	17;205:22;200:3;208:0;	somenow (11)	242:17
significant (13)	2/4:1/;2//:14;282:22;	279:10,22;280:1,13;	101:21;102:15;	sounded (1)
102:20;105:12;142:1,	284:6;285:1,6;293:12;	283:21;284:3;292:12;	137:21;192:18;202:16;	34:9
7;150:12,13;161:7;	295:8;296:9;298:5;	293:3;300:7	255:7;276:16,19;278:4,	sounds (2)
171:8;229:18;249:14,	299:9,22;301:6;316:21	slides (1)	12;323:2	36:20;38:22
15:289:7.8	sites (78)	261:9	someone (14)	source (11)
significantly (2)	12.7.20.11.23.12.	slight (2)	13.12.17.7.46.16 18.	18.6.33.22 22.34.8
153.6.17	43:14:44:20:45:12:46:2:	48.3.174.17	72.9.120.18.121.17.21	39.4.41.15.54.2.130.8
signa (1)	52.12 15.52.2.55.17	-10.5,17+.17	120.10 21.127.0	126.14.127.0 15
$\operatorname{signs}(1)$	52:15,15;55:2;55:17;	singing (5)	180:19,21,187:9;	150:14;157:9,15
214:4	01:5,22;04:15;05:14;	5:8;107:12;224:19	211:20;267:15;510:16	sources (8)
silenced (1)	66:2,15;67:8,9;69:4,4,8;	suppery (1)	someone's (1)	119:19;245:13;
3:8	70:11;90:19;109:14;	60:11	65:22	263:21;264:11,13,13,20;
silent (1)	115:5;116:18,18;120:13,	Sloan (1)	something's (1)	280:14
315:19	14;124:19,20;131:12;	151:7	310:19	Southern (1)
similar (5)	133:2;141:13;143:17;	slope (1)	sometimes (18)	247:18
46:16:113:20:133:12:	146:12.17:160:18:	60:11	9:12.20:14:9:22:6:	SP (1)
284.7.297.9	161:6:164:14 14 20:	slows (1)	39:22:55:16:61:14:66:4:	312.2
SIMON (7)	165.8 12.166.11 20 21.	180.12	82.7.152.12 20.152.20	512.2 space (6)
49.2.(1.10.71.5.97.2.	103.8, 13, 100.11, 20, 21,	107.13	65.7,152.15,20,155.20, 164.20,167.9,192.0,	120.77.199.15 17 19.
48:3;61:19;71:5;87:2;	107:8,14,14,15,10;	siug (1)	104:20;107:8;182:9;	120:7,7;188:15,17,18;
235:9;295:2;302:9	168:13,17;179:9;180:6,	290:13	234:10;238:5,6	292:14
simple (2)	12;182:15;183:3,5,8;	small (27)	somewhat (6)	speak (8)
113:16;190:22	184:6;186:13;191:5,6;	12:6;53:1;54:5;104:2,	56:4;97:15;98:13;	3:5;14:1;60:12;86:21;
simply (2)	192:9;193:4,8;199:22;	2,18;105:4;111:8,11;	216:21;245:1;259:11	100:12;148:6;171:13;
96:19;259:17	221:13,22;233:6;234:4,	116:14;117:21;118:9;	somewhere (4)	194:3
Simpson's (1)	9:284:7:293:14:314:18	119:3:131:8:140:7:	60:14:295:22:296:6:	SPEAKER (96)
319:11	sits (1)	141:19:142:12.15.16:	324:6	3:2:4:1.3.7:5:2:7:13:
simulated (1)	299.10	1/13:5:1/15:7:1/7:1:	soon (3)	31.18.33.13.36.7.52.4
21.4	sitting (6)	192.2.221.12.242.15	110.0.210.21.245.9	52.6.54.10.55.9.57.5
21.4	2(.4.90.2.110.0.	165.5,221.15,245.15,	110.7,217.21,245.8	12 16 19 59 1 15 (1.11)
	20:4;80:2;119:9;	202:21;205:11	sooner (1)	
10:5	1/9:2;21/:8;280:8	smaller (4)	261:11	64:12;66:13;68:4;85:6;
SINGLA (9)	situation (2)	113:4;215:16;251:10;	sophisticated (1)	86:6,12;90:20;98:18;
39:3;41:13,22;42:3;	40:17,22	292:6	262:22	99:2;183:7;192:4;209:8;
120:8;124:11;183:13,	situations (4)	small-ish (1)	SOPs (2)	210:18;216:11;219:10;
17;293:11	88:11;225:12;242:11;	210:3	49:10;302:4	222:15;226:11,13;
Singla's (1)	263:13	smart-alecky (1)	sorry (8)	229:13;230:7,15,21;
183:1	six (7)	29:22	29:15:45:18:58:2:	231:3.20:232:2:233:22:
single (7)	133.15.134.1.153.15	Smith (3)	205.9.226.10.241.15	240.19.241.17.242.4
45·20·116·19·190·1 2·	184.6.219.12.309.14	267.16.304.21.305.12	$274 \cdot 20 \cdot 299 \cdot 14$	244.2.245.16.246.16
+5.20,110.17,170.1,2, 102,15,246,2,251,10	212.1	207.10,304.21,303.12	277.20,277.17	244.2,249.10,240.10,
195.15,240.5,251.19	512.1		SOL (70)	248:17;249:11;230:1,11,
single-dose (2)	six-nour (1)	11/:1/	9:16;15:5;19:5,15;	14;252:16;255:15,17,18;
107:19;108:6	40.18	snippet (1)	23:7,8;25:8,15;31:2,13,	259:3,5;2/0:6,9;2/2:7,
single-site (2)	40.10	110 5		
	Sixty (1)	118:7	15;38:6;44:2;56:11,16,	12;275:11,12;284:20;
118:6;288:7	<b>Sixty (1)</b> 236:4	118:7 societies (2)	15;38:6;44:2;56:11,16, 17;72:5;73:10;76:13;	12;275:11,12;284:20; 285:1;288:18;289:18;
118:6;288:7 sit (3)	Sixty (1) 236:4 size (4)	118:7 societies (2) 87:4;88:1	15;38:6;44:2;56:11,16, 17;72:5;73:10;76:13; 80:9,13;89:3;90:16,17;	12;275:11,12;284:20; 285:1;288:18;289:18; 291:18;296:4;299:20;
118:6;288:7 sit (3) 32:12;110:12;196:9	Sixty (1) 236:4 size (4) 82:2;221:6;249:16;	118:7 societies (2) 87:4;88:1 soft (3)	15;38:6;44:2;56:11,16, 17;72:5;73:10;76:13; 80:9,13;89:3;90:16,17; 93:5,18,19;98:1;100:8;	12;275:11,12;284:20; 285:1;288:18;289:18; 291:18;296:4;299:20; 300:10;301:2,4,16;
118:6;288:7 sit (3) 32:12;110:12;196:9 site (85)	Sixty (1) 236:4 size (4) 82:2;221:6;249:16; 284:18	118:7 societies (2) 87:4;88:1 soft (3) 172:9,17;318:15	15;38:6;44:2;56:11,16, 17;72:5;73:10;76:13; 80:9,13;89:3;90:16,17; 93:5,18,19;98:1;100:8; 101:13,17;102:12,14.17:	12;275:11,12;284:20; 285:1;288:18;289:18; 291:18;296:4;299:20; 300:10;301:2,4,16; 302:5;305:3.5,7;306:2.6.
118:6;288:7 sit (3) 32:12;110:12;196:9 site (85) 12:21,22:13:1:21:16:	Sixty (1) 236:4 size (4) 82:2;221:6;249:16; 284:18 skewed (1)	118:7 societies (2) 87:4;88:1 soft (3) 172:9,17;318:15 software (3)	15;38:6;44:2;56:11,16, 17;72:5;73:10;76:13; 80:9,13;89:3;90:16,17; 93:5,18,19;98:1;100:8; 101:13,17;102:12,14,17; 105:2;106:15:108:15:	12;275:11,12;284:20; 285:1;288:18;289:18; 291:18;296:4;299:20; 300:10;301:2,4,16; 302:5;305:3,5,7;306:2,6, 19;307:3.9:309:8:
118:6;288:7 sit (3) 32:12;110:12;196:9 site (85) 12:21,22;13:1;21:16; 25:10;26:8:34:7:37:14:	Sixty (1) 236:4 size (4) 82:2;221:6;249:16; 284:18 skewed (1) 64:18	118:7 societies (2) 87:4;88:1 soft (3) 172:9,17;318:15 software (3) 20:20:22:21:289:2	15;38:6;44:2;56:11,16, 17;72:5;73:10;76:13; 80:9,13;89:3;90:16,17; 93:5,18,19;98:1;100:8; 101:13,17;102:12,14,17; 105:2;106:15;108:15; 111:19:112:13,18:	12;275:11,12;284:20; 285:1;288:18;289:18; 291:18;296:4;299:20; 300:10;301:2,4,16; 302:5;305:3,5,7;306:2,6, 19;307:3,9;309:8; 313:16:314:3:315:15:

			1	
316.15.319.15.323.13	snoken (1)	standpoint (1)	19.7.126.9.214.22	stress (4)
speakers (5)	129:20	92:9	stick (2)	146:10:151:15:161:5:
15.1.24.10.96.22	sponsor (23)	stands (1)	197.14.303.16	178.20
97.5.268.20	10.16.13.2 4.40.20.	7.18	stickies (1)	stressful (1)
sneaking (1)	41.3 8.51.21.54.5.68.9	Stanford (1)	193.4	143.8
33.3	79.10.85.11.90.8.95.8	189.22	stickler (1)	stretch (2)
sneaks (1)	118.20.145.14.146.5	stare (1)	219.20	261:4:317:10
269.14	173.22.182.11.187.8	125.3	stifle (1)	strict (1)
special (2)	194.4.289.3.299.7	start (23)	202.21	300.22
100.10.150.14	300.14	3.3 10.10.10.11.16.	still (21)	strikes (1)
specialists (1)	sponsored (1)	$12 \cdot 1 \cdot 24 \cdot 12 \cdot 103 \cdot 21$	10.13.22.11.27.17	31.2
	112.3.114.22.116.10	12.1,24.12,105.21, 160.2.172.17.175.12.	19.13,22.11,27.17,	striking (1)
134.4 specialize (1)	112.3,114.22,110.10,	109.5, 175.17, 175.15, 176.14.206.18.211.3	41.19,44.10,00.8,74.9,	246·3
7:15	20	170.14,200.18,211.3, 16.219.5.222.5.229.14	161.21.165.12 14.	240.3
(1.13)	180.11	10,210.3,222.3,220.14, 20,222,2,261,12,274,8,	101.21,103.13,14, 220.8.220.4.221.22.	26.1
20.0.20.10.20.20.	107.11 sponsons ( <b>8</b> )	20,233.3,201.13,274.8,	225.5.245.1 10.256.22	50.1
29.9,50.19,60.20,	7,21,24,12,50,20,	2/0.5, 202.15	255:5;245:1,19;250:22;	50.14.106.16.272.2
01.3, 02.13, 17, 04.19, 02.19, 162, 11, 224, 2, 02, 18, 162, 11, 224, 2, 02, 02, 02, 02, 02, 02, 02, 02, 02,	7.21,34.12,30.20,	01.10.07.21.101.7.	stimulated (1)	50.14,190.10,275.5
92.10,102.11,224.2, 226.5.210.21,220.21,	00:15;04:20;88:1;147:1;	91.19,97.21,101.7,		41.19.214.17.271.4.
220:3;519:21;520:21;	104.17	100.20.208.2.211.17	90:0	41:18;214:17;271:4;
321:7	sponsor s $(1)$	190:20;208:3;211:17;	sumulating (1)	2/2:19
specifically (6)	40:4	230:10;280:4	9/:4	
19:17;26:22;128:12;	spreadsneet (3)	starting (4)	STOCK (2)	248:8
192:14;258:19;292:14	126:6,12;312:9	20:19;97:12;301:9;	2/5:9,10	structure (1)
specificity (1)	square (1)	317:10	stop (8)	142:8
/6:20	188:14	starts (2)	15:16;41:3;138:21;	structures (2)
specifics (1)	SRO(I)	23:10;64:4	151:12;171:21,22;	113:20;117:16
252:11	198:13	startup (2)	247:3;261:6	struggle (2)
specified (4)	stab (1)	165:21;190:14	stopped (3)	283:20;284:1
9:5;82:5;302:3,3	7:12	state (3)	155:2;267:14,17	student (1)
specifies (1)	Stacey (1)	189:21;196:22;202:6	stopping (1)	21:19
9:18	84:16	statement (2)	149:18	studied (5)
specifying (1)	staff (18)	280:18;317:9	stops (3)	40:5;81:12;107:7;
9:13	10:18;90:13;135:4;	States (6)	22:7;183:22;210:17	121:17;198:19
Speckin (1)	162:3;1/5:1/;1/8:5;	55:11;87:11;98:22;	store (2)	studies (76)
4:15	222:4;273:20;274:14,	109:22;153:3;291:8	125:17;156:21	13:3;27:2;38:17;
spectrum (2)	17;276:3,6,11,20;	stating (1)	stories (2)	39:21;49:6;53:15;60:13;
109:13;323:2	277:19;278:2,5,10	297:8	243:1,11	84:13,20;114:22;116:8,
speechless (1)	stage (3)	statistical (21)	story (2)	20;118:1,3,4,13;131:18;
253:11	92:15;201:6;221:12	8:12,14;9:3;21:12;	193:9;235:14	140:8;150:10;152:20;
speed (3)	stakeholders (1)	24:15,18;52:11;53:9;	straight (1)	153:3;154:8;155:16;
144:16;168:21;184:7	142:13	66:9;72:13;73:8;76:3;	18:16	157:12,15;166:16,18,21;
speeds (1)	stand (2)	92:5,9;131:9;138:2;	straightforward (1)	167:2;168:6;171:21,22;
169:10	29:10;182:20	15/:2;17/:4;250:5;	290:16	1/3:18;1/4:6;1/9:20;
spelled (1)	stand-alone (1)	300:2;320:20	straight-shooting (1)	182:4,7;183:2;184:7,18;
14:/	210:9	statistically (2)	255:11	186:3,5;192:16;194:19;
spells (1)	standard (10)	249:14,15	strange (1)	199:3;205:1,5;206:2;
7:4	5:20;8:8;15:10;73:4;	statistician (2)	25:3	215:5;222:17,18;
spend (11)	77:2,3,4;85:3;195:8;	5:13;171:20	stranger (1)	223:20;224:10,12;
83:19;97:9;142:22;	196:18	statisticians (3)	16/:22	227:18;229:11;230:9;
145:18;149:11;153:15;	Standardization (3)	78:17;300:14;316:17	stratification (1)	233:6;234:6,6;247:13;
1/2:16;191:/;200:3;	284:9,10;292:15	Statistics (2)	164:6	253:14;254:9;257:10;
288:20;308:21	standardize (2)	19:18;71:20	stratified (1)	259:12,13;260:9,11;
spending (2)	224:15;292:17	status (1)	104:11	2/4:9;292:4,7;295:12;
58:19;129:5	standardized (4)	135:1	stratify (1)	304:6;310:12;312:13;
spent (5)	177:13;195:19;280:9;	stay (4)	84:13	320:3
79:20;129:17;212:10;	294:20	29:13;74:4;135:22;	streamline (1)	study (195)
235:18;255:4	standardizing (1)	174:15	190:3	9:1,1;10:16;24:21;
splash (1)	293:5	stealing (1)	streamlining (1)	35:5,13;36:5;40:18;
57:7	Standards (6)	57:21	190:7	41:16,21;42:15;43:1,6,
splitting (1)	7:19,22;8:1;13:13,15;	step (7)	street (2)	13;44:20;45:13,14,22;
297:1	25:7	8:3;26:10;27:9;83:17;	258:8;277:21	46:3;48:13;51:3;52:8;
spoke (1)	standing (1)	188:6;195:7;289:10	strength (5)	54:13;55:13,15,19;56:1,
123:20	107:22	steps (3)	271:2;273:1,2,8,10	8,14,14,16;57:9;59:13,

14.10.65.01.67.16.16	0.57.6.64.17.01.00.65.0			4-1 (1)
14,19;65:21;67:16,16,	8;57:6;64:17,21,22;65:9,	summarize (3)	surprised (3)	takers (1)
19;68:2,10,18,20;69:13,	14;70:15;106:3,5;	3:18;24:12;263:15	55:3,19;289:1	56:22
20;70:9,16,17;71:1,6;	123:14;138:1;162:11;	summary (4)	surveillance (5)	talented (2)
73:17,20;74:4,22;79:3,	233:6,12;258:1;266:15;	72:18;183:17;263:18;	89:5,7,12;135:15;	100:6;212:20
14;82:12;84:9;102:5;	273:18;274:5;275:5;	264:11	230:22	talk (66)
104:5,10;105:18;106:13,	277:8;317:4	summer (1)	survey (1)	6:1;19:19;27:1;34:20;
14,18,21;107:9,15,17;	subjects' (1)	21:20	15:16	37:11,21;52:16;56:13
108:10;115:1;117:4;	276:19	super (1)	survived (1)	58:16;65:12;93:13;
126:8,9,10;129:8;141:9,	submission (6)	181:11	149:21	100:20,22;101:17;
10;143:21;144:2,10,15;	10:14,22;16:17,19;	superficial (1)	suspect (8)	109:12,13,15,15,16,19;
145:3,5,11,19;150:9;	37:16;43:22	50:7	30:21;31:11;36:20;	124:9,17;127:13;
153:6,10,12,13;154:19;	submit (4)	superior (1)	286:22;287:7,10;318:9,	131:16;134:9;140:12,
155:9,12;156:4,6,6,15,	4:1;10:17;13:3;114:9	101:21		20;141:12,16;146:5;
16;158:4;159:8,17,21;	submitted (1)	supervision (4)	Sutter (2)	151:10,17;154:4;
161:20;162:11;163:13;	4:3	25:19;50:7;115:5,9	189:7,22	157:20;161:15;165:4,
164:11;165:18,22;	sub-PI (1)	supervisory (1)	Sutton (1)	15;167:15;169:11;
166:14;16/:5;169:4,5,	56:1	48:10	157:7	173:15;176:4;178:4;
22;170:8;172:22;174:2;	subscribe (1)	supplier (1)	sweep (1)	183:7;192:5;195:12;
175:22;180:4;183:1,18;	101:19	289:15	243:22	199:16,18;210:17;
185:11,12,18;186:6,9;	subsection (1)	support (5)	swollen (1)	217:21;218:15;225:7;
189:12;193:15;199:9;	296:21	28:11;29:8,11;113:5;	81:16	226:7;232:17,18;
200:7,9;201:8;205:4,7,	subsequent (1)	237:20	symptomatic (3)	233:15;246:19;247:1;
11;210:9;216:20;	277:3	supporting (1)	42:21;247:21;259:10	250:2,6;267:1;287:15;
217:19,22;218:2,2,3,4;	subsequently (1)	113:1	symptoms (1)	294:1;304:5;307:14;
219:14;222:4;223:2;	290:5	supports (2)	264:16	310:17;313:7
225:18,19,19;228:4,7,	subsets (2)	112:22;169:20	sync (1)	talked (48)
12,19;231:12;233:6;	164:5;296:10	suppose (1)	95:1	23:2;30:12;31:4;36:4;
234:5,20;235:21;	substantially (1)	10:15	syndrome (2)	77:8;101:8;106:21;
236:16;249:12;254:14;	188:19	supposed (4)	118:12;230:2	112:14;123:3;126:18;
257:4,9,15,22;258:7;	succeed (2)	10:10;50:6;234:13;	syndromes (1)	158:16;161:1,18;
262:20;263:6;264:1,3,	35:14;45:14	2/3:16	104:10	162:13;166:2;170:11;
18;265:13;266:13;	succeeded (1)	supposedly (2)	system (21)	172:1,3,19;173:8;
2/0:2;2/4:14;2/6:12,	45:13	49:6;260:12	27:5;30:8;32:16;	1/5:16,17;176:19;
19;278:2;288:8;291:1,4,	success (3)	sure (64)	39:12;52:19;55:12;61:1;	190:17,18;194:19;214:1,
13;292:1;295:6,8;	/8:5;91:1;152:11	3:7;4:9;27:5;38:10;	68:5;81:19;101:9;	3;217:14;222:8;223:21;
297:10;299:13;301:7;	successful (3)	43:18;44:22;51:5;53:12;	110:13;112:8;126:19,	225:4;227:22;233:4;
30/:14;312:16;314:6,/;	35:4;45:9;154:16	70:5;83:19;86:20;90:12;	20;136:19;137:17;	238:13;240:5,10;243:9;
319:2,12;320:7	sudden (6)	114:8;115:20;135:14;	1/8:6;191:16;23/:11;	251:19;258:17,19;265:1,
studying (7)	31:9,14;75:3;183:9;	142:4;160:10;165:3;	267:13;290:14	3;267:8,12,22;279:0;
156:14;1/1:11,12;	228:12;280:10	1/0:9;1/1:1;1/5:4;	systematic (2)	301:18
228:10;262:15;264:15;	suddenly (1)	1//:22;189:16;194:11,	296:10,14	taiking (42)
295:16	302:19	18;200:4,6,11,13;	systematically (2)	3:17;11:20;12:7;18:7;
<b>Stull (8)</b>	suffer (1)	208:20;216:16;219:9,	198:19;248:19	42:12;51:14;55:4;57:19
48:19;85:10;85:14;	255:19	17;220:19;224:22;	systemic (1)	58:19;59:22;65:22;66:1;
229:22;234:13;241:20;	sufficient (4)	227:14;228:20;242:13;	3/:13	60:19;95:10;97:10; 102:22:104:4:114:0
248:3;270:8	95:5,9;90:15;1/5:22	244:15;247:7;252:20;	systems (7)	105:22;104:4;114:9;
<b>Stullieu (1)</b> 253-10	sufficiently $(1)$	207.1,20;208:17,19;	10:19;50:17;58:3;	120:0;121:0;124:12,18;
233.10 sub I (2)	202.10	2/0.1/,21,2//:4,22;	09:21;110:19,20;111:1/	145.19,152:1,101:9;
Sub-1 (2) 82.20.21	suggest (5)	201.2,202.10,207.10, 200.22,201.7,206.1,		1/2.14, 1/7.10, 10, 211, 16, 17, 212, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10
o5.20,21 sub invostigators (1)	49.1,130.13,512.0	290.22,291.7,290.1, 204.5.208.10.22.	110.9	211.10,17,212.10, 217.0.220.17.223.10.
	47.21.108.20.180.10	304.3,308.19,22,	Т	217.9,220.17,225.19,
03.14 subject ( <b>73</b> )	47.21,108.20,180.10,	509:18;515:5,15;514:11, 17:316:0	1	223.21,239.0,241.7,0,
15.2 A.26.9.46.5 10	233.0,293.2,312.7	17,510.9	tabla (12)	255:5;201:17;205:20,21
13.3,4,50.6,40.3,10, 12.15.64,10.90,4,120,2.	suggesting(7)	124.11	$\begin{array}{c} \text{(12)} \\ 222.7.252.15.270.7 \end{array}$	26.5.01.10.106.1020
15,15,04,19,69,4,150,2,	41.12,102.17,213.13, 250.16.201.11.210.16.	134.11	232.7,233.13,270.7,	20.3,91.10,190.19,20, 200.8.256.14
137.0,17,21,174.2,	209.10,291.11,019.10;	224.18 20	22,271:4,13;279:4,5,13;	207.0,230.14 tell (1)
177.11,11,233.1,209.9;	SLS. 1 suggestion (1)	224.10,20	200.4,302.19,322.3	76.11
213.22,22,211.14; 208.7.317.1	206.16	AU-10-115-12-124-12-	101 (4) 227.12 15.221.16 10	10.11 tangential (1)
270./,31/.1 subjective (2)	270.10	40.17,113.12,134.13, 180.18.220.12	227.13,13,231.10,18	216.6
65.18.257.11	suggesuve (1) 80.16	100.10,229.12 Surgical (1)	117.14	210.0 tango (1)
subjects (26)	07.10 suggests (7)	AU-0-224-12-222	11/.14 take-home (1)	226.18.227.1 2 A
28.2.25.5.45.77.47.7	248.4.250.7	+0.9,224.17,223.13, 18	104.10	220.10, 227.1, 2, 4
20.5,55.5,45.22,47.2,	240.4,230.7	10	104.10	tabe (1)

82:11	tension (1)	therapeutic (7)	24:11;35:17;63:8;	together (16)
tapes (1)	149:17	8:7;78:22;79:2;81:5;	69:15;79:20;110:14;	3:18;14:12;28:8;
84:16	term (5)	89:17;158:15,22	157:15;176:13;183:2,	79:12;81:13;84:15,21;
target (6)	10:4,6;21:5;279:17;	therapies (1)	21;184:11;201:11;	88:13;89:1;174:5;
5:8;125:7;149:12;	313:20	227:19	204:5,19;205:5;217:1;	189:20;211:2;233:3,9;
250:18,18,19	terminated (1)	therapy (6)	247:13;290:9,15;294:2;	253:19;274:2
targeted (7)	107:16	75:10;225:19;227:19;	317:13	told (6)
19:17;294:12,12,15;	terminating (2)	228:6;229:11;262:6	three-day (1)	8:19;50:15;96:1;99:4;
308:4,4;311:10	108:10,11	therefore (9)	79:12	236:14;237:9
tasks (1)	terms (40)	61:8;63:2;74:22;	three-letter (1)	tolerability (1)
25:20	21:20;24:15;26:18;	81:11;92:11;206:22;	7:15	107:14
taste (2)	37:2,16;60:2;68:18;	209:20;286:21;295:12	threshold (5)	Tom (2)
205:12;277:8	93:8;100:17;111:14;	therein (1)	108:16;133:7;183:6,9;	263:4,5
taught (2)	140:3;149:16;152:9,10,	285:3	191:15	took (7)
62:5;122:6	16;165:7;170:17;172:2;	There'll (2)	throughout (4)	4:18;185:14;223:22;
taxi (3)	194:2,6;195:3;197:14;	237:12;261:21	12:9;29:18;58:10;	236:22,22;260:5;262:18
4:12;207:9;261:7	199:7;209:5;214:4;	thinkers (1)	197:13	tool (5)
taxis (2)	219:16;221:10;227:8;	190:8	throw (1)	21:17;195:15,17;
4:8,10	228:11;237:22;238:17;	thinking (26)	147:5	196:2;283:6
<b>TBI</b> (1)	240:10;241:1;251:11;	57:16,18;61:9;74:12;	thrown (1)	tools (7)
185:17	267:9;271:9;279:5;	77:5;78:15;90:4;100:5;	67:22	18:3;23:18;90:5;
teach (3)	292:3;297:21;317:3	102:9;157:18;161:6;	thunder (1)	118:2;133:18;193:5;
86:3,3;227:2	terrible (1)	215:17;217:7,9;218:19;	237:7	196:7
teaching (4)	135:9	225:1;234:1;239:11;	tidbit (1)	top (2)
63:20;72:9;238:1;	terrific (4)	251:21;254:19;277:1;	275:20	38:15;102:11
260:7	24:11;96:5;266:9;	279:4;280:16;284:5;	tier (1)	Topamax (4)
team (15)	324:11	300:4;321:14	113:4	205:14,21;234:21;
24:3;48:21;88:10,22;	terrifying (5)	third (8)	tight (1)	235:2
117:7;118:22;125:10,	248:5;252:19;253:9;	40:9,15;197:20;214:6;	310:3	topamine (1)
15;128:7;144:21;	255:8,9	283:14;293:2,7;301:12	tightens (1)	150:2
164:17,19,22;165:2;	test (7)	Thompson (2)	206:9	topic (3)
181:8	7:17;13:21;81:18;	4:15;207:9	tighter (3)	18:10;38:21;232:16
teams (2)	108:7;138:19;200:2;	thou (1)	237:16,16,16	topics (1)
10:21;160:19	277:12	41:14	timeframe (1)	70:13
technical (1)	test/retest (3)	though (18)	185:15	topiramate (4)
55:1	206:11;207:2;209:13	41:20;90:7;92:16;	timely (1)	204:3,9;205:3,10
techniques (1)	tested (1)	115:18;131:15;134:5;	69:19	total(2)
224:20	81:15	165:7;178:13;181:10,	timers (1)	116:15;122:6
technology (1)	testing (8)	1/;182:1/;183:20;	323:20	<b>totally (6)</b>
1/2:21	51:11;155:1,5;209:18;	230:8;232:8;250:18;	umes (12) 84.12.105.22.142.11	54:22;201:10;250:17;
121.10.211.0.250.11	210:0;210:20;225:7;	2/3:0;323:2,14	84:15;105:22;142:11;	280:17;515:0,17
151:10;211:9;259:11	510:20	25.9.50.16.50.7.64.7.	140:7;131:10;103:22;	127.15.156.1.161.4
243.20	21,2,260,12	25:8;50:10;59:7;04:7;	1/1.7, 1/8.13, 10, 233.3, 202, 17, 215, 10	12/:15;150:1;101:4
245.20	21.3,200.12	71.3, 70.7, 10, 13, 97.22, 106.12, 111.1, 2, 127.16	502.17,515.10	127.5
76:6:105:5	16Va (2) 35·1·156·0	100.15,111.1,2,127.10, 128.2.122.10.156.20.	5.10	137.3 tough (1)
70.0,103.3	55.1,150.9 Toyo's (1)	120.2, 132.19, 130.20, 168.2.171.11.211.2.	j.10 titillating (1)	02.4
100.2	34.5	$215\cdot10\ 20\cdot244\cdot2\ 7\ 17\cdot$	275.10	52.4 toward (2)
tomplates (1)	thenked (1)	213.10,20,244.2,7,17,	275.19	30.16.78.1
189.10	207.13	263.15.273.20.274.10	247.6	towards (7)
tempted (1)	Thanks (6)	203.13,273.20,274.10,	247.0 titles (1)	3.19.26.6.40.21
233.14	30.2.33.13.50.16	290.9.292.8.298.4	23.22	41.19.44.22.212.2
tempting (1)	78.12.139.3.275.21	318.8.321.4.322.1	TLAs(1)	250.13
258.9	that'll $(1)$	thoughtful (1)	7.15	tox(1)
tend (5)	249.3	273.5	today (17)	118.16
28:10:118:9:125:6.9:	THC (1)	thoughts (4)	3:15:52:16:96:22:	toxicity (5)
181:18	289:14	54:9:166:22:180:13	104:4:120:2:124:22	73:18.19:74:21:151.5
tender (1)	theme (1)	324:10	139:18:150:19:161:4:	5
81:16	252:17	thousands (2)	162:5:175:11:205:17	track (2)
tends (3)	themes (1)	21:2;156:7	214:2;224:22:244:20:	27:12:58:5
7:14;181:11:322:5	265:6	threads (1)	267:21:316:4	tradeoff (1)
tens (1)	theoretically (1)	222:11	today's (1)	43:6
107:4	48:21	three (21)	289:2	tradition (1)
	1		D. C.	

June 5, 2015

75.16	transnaranov (1)	14.217.1.210.2 10.	262.1.270.11.276.1.	202.14.215.15.224.17.
/J.10 traditional (2)	$312\cdot14$	14,217,1,219,2,19, 224,7,16,225,5,226,16,	205.1,270.11,270.1,	203.14,213.13,224.17,
24.17.21.12	515.14	224.7,10,223.3,220.10,	277.11,200.20,22,	223.6,232.10,239.1, 241.10,11.242.15.
24.17,51.15	209.2 21.206.9.212.4	227.3, 229.2, 230.10, 225.11.226.19.10.	207.11,292.15,295.10, 22.205.4,7.202.14.	241.10, 11, 242.13, 242.4.250.22.251.10.
216.21	298.5,21,500.8,515.4,	233.11,230.1,0,10, 237.244610,239.16.	22,293.4,7,303.14,	243.4,230.22,231.10, 252.10.255.12.275.6
510.21	516.0, 10, 19, 21	257.5,4,4,0,10,258.10, 240.12.242.1.244.6.	308:8;510:3,0;520:4,12;	252.10, 255.12, 275.0, 202.21.210.21.215.1.
0.17 17	318.0	240.12,242.1,244.0, $246.4.248.2 \in 12.240.0$	525.12 tried (7)	295.21,510.21,515.1,
7.17,17	510.7 tron (1)	240.4,248.2,0,13,249.9, 10 21,250,4 4 6,251,16,	51.7.115.11.110.17	510.22 tubo (1)
172.12.00.22.110.22.	202.0	19,21,250.4,4,0,251.10,	186.10.262.14.260.6	162.11
/5.15,00.22,110.22,	202.9 Trovis (1)	254.20,255.1,257.15,	180.19,205.14,209.0,	103.11
102.3, 192.1, 194.10, 200.9, 202.6, 229.4,	24.4	259.9,202.5,205.2,12,	2/9.10	125.22
200.8,202.0,238.4,	24.4	204.1,13,203.20,209.3,	25.1	125.22 Tourle (5)
245:7;259:1;509:2;	108.1	270:10,11;275:7;	23:1 trianalias (1)	1 UFK (5) 06:17:202:10:217:22:
510.22	108:1 treat (4)	2/4:13;2/8:10;2/9:10,	110.4	90:17;505:19;517:22;
55.13.56.7.83.15.	71.4 6.77.8.318.13	19,200.14,201.1,202.0, 285.10,16,20.288.14.	110.4	510.1,522.15
104.15.106.11.107.4	74.4,0,77.0,310.13	285.10, 10, 20, 288.14, 280.5, 7, 7, 8, 10, 21.	5.2	<b>5</b> ,6,76,6,121,2,221,0,
194.13,190.11,197.4, 200.8,12.204.0.275.22	240.6	207.3,7,7,0,17,21, 200.10.205.15.206.18.	J.J. triple (1)	3.0,70.0,131.3,231.9, 280.7,200.13
200.8, 15, 204.9, 275.22	240.0	290.19,293.13,290.18,	111.21	209.7,290.15
104.6 10	75.20.165.20	297.10,290.13,302.21,	111.21 trinton (1)	100.2
194.0,10	73.20,103.20	310.2,13,313.3,313.21,	254.0	109.3 tunning (1)
102.7	72.18.74.0 15 20.	517.10,518.5,520.19	234.9	110-2
195.7	/5:18;/4:9,15,20;	42.21	$\begin{array}{c} \text{(fouble (4)} \\ 0.2, 2, 101, 2, 224, 12, 15 \end{array}$	110:5 Turna (4)
15.2 4.17.10.20.0.	91:7,18;105:12;106:10;	43:21	92:3;191:3;224:13,15	10,21,81,0 21,205,22
15:5,4;17:19;20:9;	209:22;210:4;214:14,14,	49.11.(2.7.97.9.0(.12)		12:21;81:9,21;505:22
25:15,21;07:5;79:5;	15;238:9;242:3;273:18;	48:11;02:7;87:8;90:13	205:2	$1 \vee (1)$ 24:14
80:13;81:3,13,19;82:3,	2/4:0;2/0:18	(2,11,(4,2,71,(.91,1	100:17 18	54:14
15,10,84:0,8,10,12,15,	$125 \cdot 1 \cdot 212 \cdot 2 \cdot (-214 \cdot 14)$	02:11;04:3;71:0;81:1,	199:17,18 True des (5)	174.14.202.2
19;85:1,8,10,13,10,17;		4	<b>1 rudy (5)</b>	1/4:14;505:5
80:11;90:11;93:5;	229:7;202:10;204:18	$\frac{102}{5}$	284:4;300:16;306:14;	<b>twice (3)</b>
112:15,17,22;114:22;	tremendous (1)	5:18;6:17;16:16,19;	315:5;317:15	202:10;220:10;249:1
122:9,14;143:1,2;	158:5	22:1;28:1,14,17;31:20;	true (15)	twin (1)
15/:20;158:21;160:1,20,	trencnes (4)	42:18,19;44:8;47:2;	20:3;43:11;44:12;	101:10
22;101:17;175:10,17;	69:11;97:19;98:2,13	50:8;51:15;55:22;58:17;	45:5;51:10;53:13;76:16;	
1/6:3,11;1//:20;	trend (1)	59:1,4;62:10;66:16;	146:2;170:10;194:4;	230:12
1/8:12;192:/,18;193:4,	20:1	69:6,8;72:10;73:2,14;	204:17,21,22;286:22;	Twitter (1)
12,14,18;195:10,14;	trial (193)	/5:16;/6:4;/8:6;/9:8,	293:20	131:1
196:8;197:6,10,14;	6:16;10:3;12:17,22;	15,21;81:2,8;82:9;	truly (2)	two (63)
198:6,12,17;199:9,13,	13:1;16:4;17:8;22:14;	83:13;86:9;89:5;97:15,	166:12;169:4	4:16;18:5;32:5;63:8;
19,20,20;200:15,18;	23:5,10;25:7,20;28:9;	19;98:11;99:9,14;	trust $(3)$	90:1;101:10,19;105:9;
201:8,9,10,11;202:12,	30:20;41:2;43:12;44:7,	103:16,18;104:3;107:2;	246:4,7,9	106:11;114:8;117:10;
12,15;203:18;206:8;	/;46:13;4/:/;48:22;	115:/;116:12,21;11/:3,	truth (1)	119:22;120:4,6;122:1;
209:5;227:9;237:21;	49:9,12,17;61:16;62:15;	20;118:7,10,11,21,22;	51:5	157:1,15;161:14;
258:18,20;2/1:9;283:5;	63:/;64:10,14;65:14;	119:3,6,8;120:18;121:3,	try (36)	1/4:21;1/5:18;1/6:13;
284:12,16,17;293:6;	/1:11,14;//:15;/8:1;	4;122:8;124:10,14,20;	3:12;7:21;27:10;	1/9:11,18;180:7,11,20;
294:12,12,14,15,20,20,	82:7;85:11;87:10,19;	125:6,10,12;128:20;	29:13;33:21;36:2;37:8;	183:21;184:11,14;
21;295:13;307:15,17;	92:21;93:20;98:4;	130:19;132:2;133:11,	38:9;45:10,12;47:17;	185:2;197:15,18;198:7;
308:9,15;320:13;321:16,	101:16;102:4;103:12,12,	16;134:2,19;137:13,21;	66:22;74:18;98:3;	199:19;214:14;221:20;
18	13,21;104:2,15;107:6,	138:14;143:18;145:1,	100:15;103:4;133:9,10;	234:4,15;244:3,21;
trainings (2)	10,11;108:4;111:7,8,12;	14;146:22;148:10;	140:1;1/4:18;189:10;	245:3,18;254:18;255:4;
115:1,2	11/:1;118:8;119:14;	149:20;155:15;160:3;	190:2,7;211:7;215:5;	256:4,5,18;260:5,17;
trains (3)	122:5;124:4,5,15;	163:7;165:11;168:14,	217:22;226:3;227:11;	261:14,18;263:16;
83:20;193:6;194:6	125:13,21;126:7;	19;187:8;188:19;	240:1;242:9;244:20,21;	264:12;265:6;266:9;
transcribed (1)	127:18;129:2,4;132:3,	189:19;196:22;203:10;	245:2;253:7;287:22;	287:14;294:1,10;301:5;
175:3	21,22;134:21;138:1,3,4,	204:5,19;211:20;213:7,	311:17	305:18,20;306:12;
transcript (1)	8,20;139:22;141:2,13;	11;215:17;217:10,12;	trying (52)	308:11
279:2	143:19;147:12,12;	218:20;220:22;221:18;	11:9;22:2,11;26:6,13;	two- (1)
transferred (1)	149:17,18;152:16;	222:9;225:3;226:8,9;	29:21;31:12;33:20;	/9:12
36:10	154:16;157:19;159:6;	230:19;233:10;234:3;	40:12;41:3;43:14;49:1;	two-thirds (1)
translated (2)	163:8;1/3:8,10,12,19;	238:1,19;240:4,17,22;	50:13;67:12;69:15;75:6;	1/9:2
86:14,15	1/9:11;191:22;196:14;	241:7,9,19,22;242:6,15;	76:17;86:2;93:12;98:2;	type (17)
translation (4)	200:17;204:4,8;206:13,	246:5,7;247:21;250:3;	108:5,7;111:7;119:11;	16:10;17:11;22:6;
86:17,19,19;170:11	15;209:16,19;210:7;	251:13,18,20;252:3,5;	123:12;125:1;128:4;	28:1,22;39:1;70:11;
Translational (2)	213:12,22;214:12;	253:13;255:9,18;258:3;	149:6;150:5;152:21;	71:11;81:2;89:13;93:7;
11:12,13	215:17,19;216:10,10,13,	259:2,8;262:10,15;	172:12,16;197:7;	231:13;238:4;239:14;

Min-U-Script®

283:14:316:17:319:1	underreported (1)	106:4:108:10:112:7:	used (26)	134:14
types (25)	108.12	130.19.132.12.135.6	10.4.14.6.28.16.20.	Vanderhilt (1)
10.12.12.2 2.16.9	underseers (1)	11,126,2 10,151,1	20.25.21.1.55.12.59.4	20.5
10:12;12:2,5;10:8;	underscore (1)	11,150:2,10,151:1;	30:3,5;31:1;55:12;58:4,	29:5
18:6;39:7;44:3;51:19;	175:15	152:10;167:8;168:16;	9;69:5,5;106:1;107:22;	VANHOVE (14)
89:19;90:1;94:22;99:14;	understood (3)	169:10;172:11,16;	149:4;150:15;166:5,7;	284:5,10,14,17,22;
103:10.15.18:117:10:	34:6:278:1:306:15	174:16:176:13.22:	169:13:205:22:216:15:	285:6.12:300:17:
119.22.134.13.138.6.	underuse (1)	179.6.186.6.189.3	218.15.234.20.241.2	301.11.306.10 22.315.6
188:10:100:20:210:5:	260:14	104.8.107.18 20.	245:20:261:22	1/ 17
100.19,199.20,210.3,	200.14	194.0, 197.10, 20, 200.7, 0	2+3.20,201.22	14,17
238:11,19;244:10	underutilize (1)	205:16;206:9;208:7,9;	userui (4)	variability (9)
typically (6)	260:18	212:2;213:3;216:2;	155:16;166:21;	15:1;177:11;198:17;
7:2;31:1;39:15;62:22;	unfortunately (8)	218:9;220:9,10,20;	169:14;207:15	199:4;200:1;201:5,7;
85:4;236:3	9:22;11:2;29:21;	221:3;228:10;236:9;	user (3)	209:14,20
	87:21:99:3:156:7:159:1:	237:17:241:2:247:19:	195:9.13:209:6	variation (3)
T	175.10	248.9.252.17.253.8.	uses (1)	19.21 22.112.11
E	uniform(1)	256:10:258:7:261:14:	20.17	$v_{0} = (1)$
		250.19,258.7,201.14,	29.17	200.19
ubiquitous (3)	199:8	262:20;263:5;271:16,	using (17)	200:18
235:10;295:3,18	uninformative (1)	17;274:19;279:17,17;	21:8;58:6;90:4;	variety (1)
UC (1)	255:6	280:8,11,21;282:15;	122:10;147:3;173:10;	282:21
189:21	unintentional (2)	288:3.19:289:4:295:16.	185:19:188:2.3.4.11:	various (3)
$\mathbf{I}\mathbf{K}(1)$	268.9.11	22.296.5 7.297.8.	224.18.250.9.253.6	28.2.214.22.224.20
287.4	unintentionally (1)	200.20.302.15.303.0	205:5:316:5.6	vory (2)
207.4		299.20,302.13,303.9,	295.5,510.5,0	valy(2)
ultimate (1)	2/8:4	309:14;312:3;313:21;	usual (1)	288:5,6
312:8	Union (1)	321:17;322:18,22;323:4,	240:7	VAS (1)
ultimately (3)	245:22	15	usually (4)	321:18
105:20:137:11:142:14	unique (1)	update (1)	12:6;211:10;311:21;	vast (2)
umbrella (1)	224:1	115:12	316:16	112:5:252:3
173.14	United (5)	UPDRS (1)	utilize (2)	vaults (1)
175.14	55.11.97.11.100.22	102.22	68.10.202.4	1/9.21
	35.11,87.11,109.22,	193.22	08.19,202.4	140.21
286:2;309:19	153:3;291:8	upfront (2)		velled (1)
unannounced (2)	university (9)	73:1;313:4	v	50:13
319:7,18	71:5,6;99:7;112:2;	upon (4)		vendor (1)
unhaliavahla (?)	128:11:163:9:185:10:	87.22.134.20.164.23	vamely (?)	50.11
	12011,10019,100110,	07.22,151.20,101.2,5	vaguely (2)	50.11
44:9;235:14	188:10;235:18	UPS (1)	12:12;19:19	vendors (1)
44:9;235:14 unblind (2)	188:10;235:18 unless (15)	<b>UPS (1)</b> 160:15	12:12;19:19 Valerie (4)	vendors (1) 51:7
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20:274:8	188:10;235:18 unless (15) 62:10:67:8:82:9:	UPS (1) 160:15 unset (3)	Valerie (4) 100:13:134:10 11:	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1)
44:9;235:14 <b>unblind (2)</b> 273:20;274:8 <b>unblinded (4)</b>	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12:113:13:121:14	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2:287:9:313:11	Vagury (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 27//:21
44:9;235:14 <b>unblind (2)</b> 273:20;274:8 <b>unblinded (4)</b> 269:22:27(:11):278:2	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15:172:12:21:21:4	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 ungide (1)	Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 venification (2)
44:9;235:14 <b>unblind (2)</b> 273:20;274:8 <b>unblinded (4)</b> 268:22;276:11;278:2,	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3;	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1)	Valeti (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3)	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3)
44:9;235:14 <b>unblind (2)</b> 273:20;274:8 <b>unblinded (4)</b> 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11,	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5	Valguly (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8)	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1)	Valeti (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1)	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7)
44:9;235:14 <b>unblind (2)</b> 273:20;274:8 <b>unblinded (4)</b> 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 <b>unblinding (8)</b> 93:18;265:1;268:10,	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b>	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2	Valeti (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3;
44:9;235:14 <b>unblind (2)</b> 273:20;274:8 <b>unblinded (4)</b> 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 <b>unblinding (8)</b> 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20;	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1)	Valeti (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2)	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9
44:9;235:14 <b>unblind (2)</b> 273:20;274:8 <b>unblinded (4)</b> 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 <b>unblinding (8)</b> 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4.12	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmvelinated (1)</b>	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16	Valeti (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4.10	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1)
44:9;235:14 <b>unblind (2)</b> 273:20;274:8 <b>unblinded (4)</b> 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 <b>unblinding (8)</b> 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 <b>uncertainty (2)</b>	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5)	Valgaciy (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6)	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6
44:9;235:14 <b>unblind (2)</b> 273:20;274:8 <b>unblinded (4)</b> 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 <b>unblinding (8)</b> 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 <b>uncertainty (2)</b> 10:7:132:15	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unresconable (1)</b>	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16:260:12:	Valgaciy (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6 8:14:3 3:18:7:	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9)
44:9;235:14 <b>unblind (2)</b> 273:20;274:8 <b>unblinded (4)</b> 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 <b>unblinding (8)</b> 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 <b>uncertainty (2)</b> 10:7;132:15 <b>uncertainty (1)</b>	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 106:0	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 280:13 12:218:15	Valgaciy (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210.6	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8:0:18:10:2:22:21
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 219.4	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15	Valeti (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 20.20,20,20,18,143,2,20
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b>	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1)	Valeti (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3)	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3;
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13)	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17	Valeti (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22;	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b>	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1)	Valerie (4) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validly (1)	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1)
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8;	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19:259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13	Valerie (4) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validly (1) 242:19	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6:286:11:288:20;	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19:259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b>	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1)	Valeti (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validly (1) 242:19 Valorie (7)	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27)
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9 9:314:20:319:13	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b> 4:4	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22	Valeti (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validly (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13 15:201:20 21:	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18:25:13 15:27:17:
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1)	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b> 4:4 <b>untrained (1)</b>	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37)	Valetiy (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validly (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207.7 12:324.7	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15 17:74:17:95:17;
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1) 57:20	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b> 4:4 <b>untrained (1)</b> 200:0	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37) 11:10:14:10:16:2;	Valeti (2) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validi (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207:7,12;324:7 valia (1)	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15,17;74:17;95:17; 10:21:12:14:17:12;
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1) 57:20	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b> 4:4 <b>untrained (1)</b> 200:9 (120)	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37) 11:19;14:10;16:2;	Valerie (4) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validly (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207:7,12;324:7 valuable (1)	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15,17;74:17;95:17; 103:1,13,14;117:13; 120:10:4:117:13;
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1) 57:20 underinsured (1)	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b> 4:4 <b>untrained (1)</b> 200:9 <b>up (120)</b>	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37) 11:19;14:10;16:2; 18:17;24:19;27:5;28:14;	Valerie (4) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validity (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207:7,12;324:7 valuable (1) 55:3	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15,17;74:17;95:17; 103:1,13,14;117:13; 129:10,14;131:6;
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1) 57:20 underinsured (1) 160:3	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b> 4:4 <b>untrained (1)</b> 200:9 <b>up (120)</b> 23:11,12,22;24:10,13;	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37) 11:19;14:10;16:2; 18:17;24:19;27:5;28:14; 29:9,12;38:14;58:10;	Valerie (4) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validly (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207:7,12;324:7 valuable (1) 55:3 value (11)	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15,17;74:17;95:17; 103:1,13,14;117:13; 129:10,14;131:6; 152:18;166:3;197:5;
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1) 57:20 underinsured (1) 160:3 underlined (1)	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b> 4:4 <b>untrained (1)</b> 200:9 <b>up (120)</b> 23:11,12,22;24:10,13; 26:1,5;32:6;36:7;37:10;	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37) 11:19;14:10;16:2; 18:17;24:19;27:5;28:14; 29:9,12;38:14;58:10; 62:13;69:17;93:9;122:6;	Valerie (4) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validly (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207:7,12;324:7 valuable (1) 55:3 value (11) 15:12;17:22;145:6;	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15,17;74:17;95:17; 103:1,13,14;117:13; 129:10,14;131:6; 152:18;166:3;197:5; 213:1;216:10;227:4;
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1) 57:20 underinsured (1) 160:3 underlined (1) 145:9	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b> 4:4 <b>untrained (1)</b> 200:9 <b>up (120)</b> 23:11,12,22;24:10,13; 26:1,5;32:6;36:7;37:10; 41:3;46:8,14;48:18;	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37) 11:19;14:10;16:2; 18:17;24:19;27:5;28:14; 29:9,12;38:14;58:10; 62:13;69:17;93:9;122:6; 125:21;134:2;145:8;	Valerie (4) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validly (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207:7,12;324:7 valuable (1) 55:3 value (11) 15:12;17:22;145:6; 148:1;167:18:214:18:	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15,17;74:17;95:17; 103:1,13,14;117:13; 129:10,14;131:6; 152:18;166:3;197:5; 213:1;216:10;227:4; 251:16;257:11;271:22;
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1) 57:20 underinsured (1) 160:3 underlined (1) 145:9 underlying (1)	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b> 4:4 <b>untrained (1)</b> 200:9 <b>up (120)</b> 23:11,12,22;24:10,13; 26:1,5;32:6;36:7;37:10; 41:3;46:8,14;48:18; 52:6,14:53:8;54:3:55:2	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37) 11:19;14:10;16:2; 18:17;24:19;27:5;28:14; 29:9,12;38:14;58:10; 62:13;69:17;93:9;122:6; 125:21;134:2;145:8; 170:22:172:7,9:185:13:	Valerie (4) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validly (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207:7,12;324:7 valuable (1) 55:3 value (11) 15:12;17:22;145:6; 148:1;167:18;214:18; 224:21.22:241:21:	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15,17;74:17;95:17; 103:1,13,14;117:13; 129:10,14;131:6; 152:18;166:3;197:5; 213:1;216:10;227:4; 251:16;257:11;271:22; 285:16;319:18.21
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1) 57:20 underinsured (1) 160:3 underlined (1) 145:9 underlying (1) 322:13	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b> 4:4 <b>untrained (1)</b> 200:9 <b>up (120)</b> 23:11,12,22;24:10,13; 26:1,5;32:6;36:7;37:10; 41:3;46:8,14;48:18; 52:6,14;53:8;54:3;55:2, 9 18:66:14:68:13:69:16:	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37) 11:19;14:10;16:2; 18:17;24:19;27:5;28:14; 29:9,12;38:14;58:10; 62:13;69:17;93:9;122:6; 125:21;134:2;145:8; 170:22;172:7,9;185:13; 18:77:202:12 19:	Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validity (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207:7,12;324:7 valuable (1) 55:3 value (11) 15:12;17:22;145:6; 148:1;167:18;214:18; 224:21,22;241:21; 258:8:207:15	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15,17;74:17;95:17; 103:1,13,14;117:13; 129:10,14;131:6; 152:18;166:3;197:5; 213:1;216:10;227:4; 251:16;257:11;271:22; 285:16;319:18,21 viability (1)
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1) 57:20 underinsured (1) 160:3 underlined (1) 145:9 underlying (1) 322:13 underovei (2)	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> $62:10;67:8;82:9;$ $89:12;113:13;121:14,$ $15;172:13;219:5;231:3;$ $243:19;259:11;313:11,$ $20;316:11$ <b>unmet (1)</b> $125:8$ <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> $104:17$ <b>unreasonable (1)</b> $196:9$ <b>unsafe (1)</b> $125:5$ <b>unsolicited (2)</b> $211:10,13$ <b>unspecified (1)</b> $4:4$ <b>untrained (1)</b> $200:9$ <b>up (120)</b> $23:11,12,22;24:10,13;$ $26:1,5;32:6;36:7;37:10;$ $41:3;46:8,14;48:18;$ $52:6,14;53:8;54:3;55:2,$ $9,18:66:14;68:13;69:16;$ $70:2:71:15:72:4:72:11$	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37) 11:19;14:10;16:2; 18:17;24:19;27:5;28:14; 29:9,12;38:14;58:10; 62:13;69:17;93:9;122:6; 125:21;134:2;145:8; 170:22;172:7,9;185:13; 187:7;202:12,19; 209:21:216:19:217:22:	Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validity (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207:7,12;324:7 valuable (1) 55:3 value (11) 15:12;17:22;145:6; 148:1;167:18;214:18; 224:21,22;241:21; 258:8;297:15 value (6)	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15,17;74:17;95:17; 103:1,13,14;117:13; 129:10,14;131:6; 152:18;166:3;197:5; 213:1;216:10;227:4; 251:16;257:11;271:22; 285:16;319:18,21 viability (1) 245:13
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1) 57:20 underinsured (1) 160:3 underlined (1) 145:9 underlying (1) 322:13 underpaid (2) 146:1.2	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> $62:10;67:8;82:9;$ $89:12;113:13;121:14,$ $15;172:13;219:5;231:3;$ $243:19;259:11;313:11,$ $20;316:11$ <b>unmet (1)</b> $125:8$ <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> $104:17$ <b>unreasonable (1)</b> $196:9$ <b>unsafe (1)</b> $125:5$ <b>unsolicited (2)</b> $211:10,13$ <b>unspecified (1)</b> $4:4$ <b>untrained (1)</b> $200:9$ <b>up (120)</b> $23:11,12,22;24:10,13;$ $26:1,5;32:6;36:7;37:10;$ $41:3;46:8,14;48:18;$ $52:6,14;53:8;54:3;55:2,$ $9,18;66:14;68:13;69:16;$ $70:2;71:1,5;72:4;73:11,$ $15:76:78:70:70:10:71:15;72:4;73:11,$	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37) 11:19;14:10;16:2; 18:17;24:19;27:5;28:14; 29:9,12;38:14;58:10; 62:13;69:17;93:9;122:6; 125:21;134:2;145:8; 170:22;172:7,9;185:13; 187:7;202:12,19; 209:21;216:18;217:22; 225:8,226:1125:61;	Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validity (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207:7,12;324:7 valuable (1) 55:3 value (11) 15:12;17:22;145:6; 148:1;167:18;214:18; 224:21,22;241:21; 258:8;297:15 values (6) 15:10,18:17,15,21	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15,17;74:17;95:17; 103:1,13,14;117:13; 129:10,14;131:6; 152:18;166:3;197:5; 213:1;216:10;227:4; 251:16;257:11;271:22; 285:16;319:18,21 viability (1) 245:13 video (6)
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1) 57:20 underinsured (1) 160:3 underlined (1) 145:9 underlying (1) 322:13 underpaid (2) 146:1,3	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19;259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b> 4:4 <b>untrained (1)</b> 200:9 <b>up (120)</b> 23:11,12,22;24:10,13; 26:1,5;32:6;36:7;37:10; 41:3;46:8,14;48:18; 52:6,14;53:8;54:3;55:2, 9,18;66:14;68:13;69:16; 70:2;71:1,5;72:4;73:11, 15;76:6;78:20;79:10,19; 200:7	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37) 11:19;14:10;16:2; 18:17;24:19;27:5;28:14; 29:9,12;38:14;58:10; 62:13;69:17;93:9;122:6; 125:21;134:2;145:8; 170:22;172:7,9;185:13; 187:7;202:12,19; 209:21;216:18;217:22; 225:8;236:1;256:12; 25:8:236:1;256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10:12,256:12; 25:9:10; 25:9:10; 25:9:10; 25:9:10; 25:9:10;	Valerie (4) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validity (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207:7,12;324:7 valuable (1) 55:3 value (11) 15:12;17:22;145:6; 148:1;167:18;214:18; 224:21,22;241:21; 258:8;297:15 values (6) 15:10,18;17:15,21; 17:22;145:21; 15:22;123:22;24:22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22;24:22;24:22; 25:23;22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:22;24:	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15,17;74:17;95:17; 103:1,13,14;117:13; 129:10,14;131:6; 152:18;166:3;197:5; 213:1;216:10;227:4; 251:16;257:11;271:22; 285:16;319:18,21 viability (1) 245:13 video (6)
44:9;235:14 unblind (2) 273:20;274:8 unblinded (4) 268:22;276:11;278:2, 19 unblinding (8) 93:18;265:1;268:10, 10;273:13;276:20; 277:4,12 uncertainty (2) 10:7;132:15 uncover (1) 318:4 under (13) 19:2;168:17;243:22; 279:8;281:20;282:8; 284:6;286:11;288:20; 296:9,9;314:20;319:13 undercover (1) 57:20 underlined (1) 160:3 underlined (1) 145:9 underlying (1) 322:13 underpowered (4)	188:10;235:18 <b>unless (15)</b> 62:10;67:8;82:9; 89:12;113:13;121:14, 15;172:13;219:5;231:3; 243:19:259:11;313:11, 20;316:11 <b>unmet (1)</b> 125:8 <b>unmyelinated (1)</b> 104:17 <b>unreasonable (1)</b> 196:9 <b>unsafe (1)</b> 125:5 <b>unsolicited (2)</b> 211:10,13 <b>unspecified (1)</b> 4:4 <b>untrained (1)</b> 200:9 <b>up (120)</b> 23:11,12,22;24:10,13; 26:1,5;32:6;36:7;37:10; 41:3;46:8,14;48:18; 52:6,14;53:8;54:3;55:2, 9,18;66:14;68:13;69:16; 70:2;71:1,5;72:4;73:11, 15;76:6;78:20;79:10,19; 80:5;82:7;83:12;84:4,	UPS (1) 160:15 upset (3) 255:2;287:9;313:11 upside (1) 133:5 upsides (1) 28:2 up-to-date (1) 138:16 urine (5) 118:16;260:12; 289:13,13;318:15 USA (1) 287:17 usable (1) 233:13 USC (1) 189:22 use (37) 11:19;14:10;16:2; 18:17;24:19;27:5;28:14; 29:9,12;38:14;58:10; 62:13;69:17;93:9;122:6; 125:21;134:2;145:8; 170:22;172:7,9;185:13; 187:7;202:12,19; 209:21;216:18;217:22; 225:8;236:1;256:12; 258:10,11;259:1;	Valerie (4) 12:12;19:19 Valerie (4) 100:13;134:10,11; 135:18 valid (3) 196:2;213:8;254:22 validate (1) 108:5 validated (2) 58:4,10 validation (6) 10:6,8;14:3,3;18:7; 210:6 validity (3) 13:1;206:16;210:6 validity (1) 242:19 Valorie (7) 4:13,15;201:20,21; 207:7,12;324:7 valuable (1) 55:3 value (11) 15:12;17:22;145:6; 148:1;167:18;214:18; 224:21,22;241:21; 258:8;297:15 values (6) 15:10,18;17:15,21; 170:17;229:19	vendors (1) 51:7 venture (1) 274:21 verification (3) 10:6;137:10,16 verify (7) 42:5,6;44:19;45:3; 130:12;143:6;164:9 verse (1) 273:6 version (9) 8:8;9:18;10:2;22:21, 22;72:3;92:18;143:3; 300:6 versions (1) 186:22 versus (27) 24:18;25:13,15;27:17; 70:15,17;74:17;95:17; 103:1,13,14;117:13; 129:10,14;131:6; 152:18;166:3;197:5; 213:1;216:10;227:4; 251:16;257:11;271:22; 285:16;319:18,21 viability (1) 245:13 video (6) 122:16,18,22;135:21;

videos (6)	210:17;238:2	websites (1)	283:9;285:13;293:17;	wondered (2)
84:19;159:1;161:8,10;	warehouse (1)	275:2	300:12;312:1	26:21;308:1
177:22;199:10	22:3	weeds (2)	whomever (1)	wonderful (2)
videotape (1)	warm (1) $70.19$	76:11;104:21	228:11	162:5;324:8
1/8:/ view (11)	/0:18 warning (3)	<b>Week (0)</b> 70:7:116:6:209:18:	<b>WID S (9)</b> 5.6.25.18.57.20.72.9	<b>wondering (ð)</b> 27.8.56.15.175.10.
91:19:102:14:106:19:	303:20.21:311:15	246:20:267:14.18	84:9:235:11:247:17:	186:15:212:9.14:247:5:
140:16,18;144:9;166:5;	Wasan (7)	weekly (2)	254:20;324:1	281:14
205:6;223:13,14;310:4	28:12,12;29:4,15;	281:4,6	who've (2)	word (10)
viewed (1)	30:2;251:15;309:22	weeks (3)	55:20;220:12	20:12;44:19;206:4;
321:3	<b>Washington</b> $(2)$	121:11;129:7;236:11	widely $(2)$	223:22;258:14;259:4;
104·12	watch (3)	103·10·316·16	00.4,5 wiggle (1)	209.1,279.20,297.8, 300.7
vine (1)	160:16:161:11.12	weighing (1)	60:4	words (2)
237:7	wave (1)	238:17	willful (1)	65:16;232:20
violations (2)	189:2	weight (1)	289:11	work (46)
93:19;318:4	waving (1)	102:8	willing (6)	5:22;17:4;26:20;
violators $(1)$	212:12 way ( <b>0</b> 4)	welcome (1)	5:9;26:8;47:22;	27:11;28:8;47:1;50:1;
516:14 virtual (1)	way (94) 6.6.8.6.9.6 7.15.15	510.10 welcomed (2)	149:22,152:10,249:15 Willy (1)	02:22;09:20;87:10;89:1; 97·20·98·3·102·21·
142:17	20:3.3:23:20:26:15:	303:3.4	157:7	103:7:111:15:113:2:
virtually (1)	27:4,8,11,20;29:8,10;	well-controlled (1)	wing (1)	114:13;115:10;123:18;
94:1	31:5;39:22;44:12;46:12;	235:22	58:22	127:6;128:8;134:22;
vis-à-vis (1)	48:2;52:5;54:17;55:10,	well-designed (1)	winner-take-all (1)	136:8;140:9;144:7;
215:21	12;58:4;62:19;69:2;	224:6	112:18 WIDD (2)	151:13;154:3,7;165:6;
VISIL (4) 53:3:85:12:167:14:	102.3 0.104.13.110.6	224.6	128.3 0.187.7	100:13;1/4:4;1/9:9; 180:4:180:0:100:8:
184:11	121:13:132:14.19:	well-known (1)	wisdom (1)	206:14:220:4:221:13:
visiting (1)	135:20;152:6;159:2;	218:17	220:20	231:4;235:19;245:14,
214:6	160:4,12;161:7;164:18;	weren't (1)	wish (1)	15;262:20;263:5;266:1
visits (5)	172:22;177:7,14;187:5;	43:4	323:19	worked (13)
54:21;56:3;66:20,20;	190:4;191:17,20;195:1;	West (1)	withdraw (2) $74.80$	7:21;11:15;53:21,22;
83:13 volume (1)	196:2;199:22;202:22; 205:8:209:9:213:8:	121:15 whatever's (1)	74:0,9 withdrawal (1)	78:7,9;88:5;154:12; 140:10:185:11:199:123
133:5	218:9:219:22:220:20:	219:21	17:4	working (18)
VRIJENS (2)	223:4;227:3,14,15;	what's (28)	withdrawn (1)	3:19;20:19;21:18,19;
244:19;245:17	228:15;230:17;236:8;	9:21;17:13;28:19;	269:2	27:10;47:16;55:21;68:5;
vulnerability (4)	240:15;243:7;245:21;	29:18;44:21;48:22;	withdrew (1)	140:4;153:21;162:6;
257:8,22;258:8,12 vulnoroble (1)	24/:15;248:11;249:20;	68:20;75:21;76:16;88:9; 00:11:01:15:110:7:	1/:/ withoring (1)	191:10;196:5;213:6;
46.4	258.2.264.3.271.12	122.13.124.10.128.21	148·21	works (10)
	274:12;277:9;279:18;	148:2;216:13;218:18,	within (22)	77:15;129:1;156:9;
$\mathbf{W}$	281:7;285:5;292:5;	19;237:15;267:18;	3:12;11:11,13;20:11;	178:9;216:18;230:4;
	294:3;306:15;320:5;	270:10;280:12;308:10;	62:18;63:7;68:21;85:7;	235:4;236:6;313:9;
wait (3)	321:4;323:21	315:15,19;316:18	124:11;142:3;147:14;	323:22
81:10;170:7;229:4	ways (22) 21.12.31.3.47.17.	220.6	1//:19;185:15;180:1; 193·12·222·20·230·6	<b>WOFIG (18)</b> 10:5:37:5:55:11:
61:18:143:7:169:18:	59:7:73:5:87:7:90:21:	whereas (6)	240:7.8:251:3:278:22:	100:7:120:4:130:10:
233:19;260:20	91:5;92:4;98:11;116:13;	42:5;102:16;115:22;	289:22	140:16,18;199:5;205:8;
wake (1)	127:15;133:9;155:11;	124:15;183:5;212:3	without (5)	226:19;242:1;244:15,
135:6	181:17,20;191:17;	Whereupon (5)	14:11;47:5;67:17;	16;245:2;287:12;289:2;
walk (2)	244:11;266:5;271:8;	96:4;122:16;135:21;	93:7;311:12	296:19
/9:18;231:17 walking (2)	270:7;298:20 weak (1)	207:22;324:14 wherewithal (1)	<b>WOKEN (1)</b> 135.11	<b>WOFIDS (1)</b> 88.21
107:22:109:2	273:3	100:9	woman (1)	world's (1)
wall (3)	Web-based (1)	Whipple (1)	123:20	160:13
40:12;132:12;277:21	221:21	180:20	women (1)	worldwide (2)
wander (1)	webinar (1)	whole (20)	122:1	156:6;204:7
261:0 wondering (1)	85:1 webiners (1)	51:8;51:5;55:11; 73:10:78:7:102:1:	wonder (12) 37:21:67:10:70:16:	worried (1) 318-11
208:4	25:15	111:13:117.5.127.20	87:3:89:18.123.11	worry (3)
wants (6)	website (2)	159:18;160:16;206:20;	179:21;203:3;253:20.	25:12;224:3;238:22
13:2;46:6;74:8;185:4;	80:15;256:13	241:12;264:6;265:17;	20;266:18;286:10	worrying (1)

26:7	30:12;43:10;50:11,13,
worse (1)	19;51:8,17;54:11;59:9;
129:19	65:13;84:4;92:22;93:4,
worst (4)	10;96:22;97:13;98:20;
285:21;305:13;	100:3;122:9,19;124:12,
500:17;509:1 worth (12)	17,151.15,158.10,
40.2.64.5.67.10.88.8.	177.8.191.14.207.19
178.19.179.18.199.6	213.3.219.12.247.13
202:10:203:4:249:10:	261:15:264:22:267:9:
251:1:291:4	280:3:285:18:298:22:
wow (2)	303:11,12;304:21;
36:21;57:3	305:11,13;306:15;
write (8)	309:5;313:3
44:21;226:4;304:13;	yield (3)
305:5;307:7;316:1,3;	129:9;130:14,15
322:6	yoga (3)
writer (1)	220:17;227:19;202:5
writing (3)	101K(2) 130.11.247.17
315.16.320.7.322.6	vou-all (1)
written (4)	29:1
305:3:306:12,16;	voung (2)
312:22	55:22;213:15
wrong (5)	younger (1)
204:13;304:5;307:16;	41:17
308:13;309:6	7
wrote (1)	L
309:4 Wyoth (2)	zoro (5)
221.8 8	14.12.250.18.21.
221.0,0	251.7.320.14
	20111,02011
Χ	zero-to-10 (1)
X	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16
X XP (1)	zero-to-10 (1) 200:16 Zhou (1)
X XP (1) 7:5	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X may (2)	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21:231:4	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1)	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9)	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20;	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3;	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21 years (31)	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21 years (31) 31:8;35:17;41:6;48:6,	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21 years (31) 31:8;35:17;41:6;48:6, 11,12;52:6;53:5;55:21; 70,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,107,510,100,100,100,100,100,100,100,100,100	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21 years (31) 31:8;35:17;41:6;48:6, 11,12;52:6;53:5;55:21; 72:10,17,19;80:9;82:11; 86:(4,112):12:117:10;	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21 years (31) 31:8;35:17;41:6;48:6, 11,12;52:6;53:5;55:21; 72:10,17,19;80:9;82:11; 86:4;113:12;117:19; 128:19:14:14:145:55;	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21 years (31) 31:8;35:17;41:6;48:6, 11,12;52:6;53:5;55:21; 72:10,17,19;80:9;82:11; 86:4;113:12;117:19; 128:18;134:14;145:5; 152:7:16:5:12:184:15;	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21 years (31) 31:8;35:17;41:6;48:6, 11,12;52:6;53:5;55:21; 72:10,17,19;80:9;82:11; 86:4;113:12;117:19; 128:18;134:14;145:5; 152:7;165:12;184:15; 187:14:189:16:203:11:	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21 years (31) 31:8;35:17;41:6;48:6, 11,12;52:6;53:5;55:21; 72:10,17,19;80:9;82:11; 86:4;113:12;117:19; 128:18;134:14;145:5; 152:7;165:12;184:15; 187:14;189:16;203:11; 234:3,15:235:18:	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21 years (31) 31:8;35:17;41:6;48:6, 11,12;52:6;53:5;55:21; 72:10,17,19;80:9;82:11; 86:4;113:12;117:19; 128:18;134:14;145:5; 152:7;165:12;184:15; 187:14;189:16;203:11; 234:3,15;235:18; 254:14:274:21	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21 years (31) 31:8;35:17;41:6;48:6, 11,12;52:6;53:5;55:21; 72:10,17,19;80:9;82:11; 86:4;113:12;117:19; 128:18;134:14;145:5; 152:7;165:12;184:15; 187:14;189:16;203:11; 234:3,15;235:18; 254:14;274:21 yellow (2)	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21 years (31) 31:8;35:17;41:6;48:6, 11,12;52:6;53:5;55:21; 72:10,17,19;80:9;82:11; 86:4;113:12;117:19; 128:18;134:14;145:5; 152:7;165:12;184:15; 187:14;189:16;203:11; 234:3,15;235:18; 254:14;274:21 yellow (2) 116:5;193:3	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4
X XP (1) 7:5 X-ray (1) 40:15 X-rays (2) 229:21;231:4 Y Yan (1) 24:4 year (9) 16:7;49:13;54:20; 100:4;140:15;151:3; 180:20,22;194:21 years (31) 31:8;35:17;41:6;48:6, 11,12;52:6;53:5;55:21; 72:10,17,19;80:9;82:11; 86:4;113:12;117:19; 128:18;134:14;145:5; 152:7;165:12;184:15; 187:14;189:16;203:11; 234:3,15;235:18; 254:14;274:21 yellow (2) 116:5;193:3 yesterday (51)	<b>zero-to-10 (1)</b> 200:16 <b>Zhou (1)</b> 24:4