comfortable to increase up to 4-fold. So we contraindicatcd in this case only the potent inhibitors, but if the data are different, we could also contraindicate moderate inhibitors as well.

DR. DERENDORF: I guess what I was trying to say is if you have an inhibitor, it's not the inhibitor that decides if it's moderate or strong, it's the other partner.

DR. HUANG: Exact.ly.
DR. DERENDORF: You can have the same effect
that can be very relevant or not relevant at all.
DR. HUANG: Right, and that's why we say we need to come up with a list of sensitive substrates. So if it's a strong inhibitor -- there are a lot of sensitive substrates out there, but we may not contraindicate all of them. And you can see we have a differential -- we treat midazolam as a very sensitive substrate, but yet we do not contraindicate it for the second case because the drug can be titrated based on -- there are other information you can use. But for those drugs that prolong QT, we put it in the contraindication because we're sensitized with a lot of experience from the withdrawn drugs.

And coming back to your question about 4-fold, whether it's moderate or not, this is something we're discussing. In our open meeting, we actually had a lot of
questions. How do you determine that 4.4 -fold is a moderate, but yet 4.9 -fold, which may be rounded to 5 , is potent? How do you differentiate this to the only .9 -fold difference?

I've been thinking about this, and I think this could -- maybe you can equate to renal clearance where you said a patient was less than 30 or 20 mls per minute creatinine clearance is severely impaired. The moderate is between 30 to 50, 30 to 60. And you always have this patient at 32 versus 28 , but they're in two different categories.

I think the purpose of putting them into different systems is there would be precaution and we put it in the labeling. People will be aware of it. It's not that they are going to just give 15 and then not observe the patients at all. This is just to sensitize the prescribers, health care providers, or patients that we know.

There is always this debate on the numbers. Should you put 4 -fold? And then we debate 3.5 versus 4.5, or do we put in 5 and debate what is moderate?

DR. CAPPARELLI: Well, I think the key issue that you addressed earlier is really the linkage to the substrate, at least in the first example. It's helpful to have these working definitions, and whether or not 4 -fold
would be considered moderate in a controlled environment where you're sort of maximizing the effects, I think that's something that will evolve.

But I think your point as well in part is linking to the substrate that you're looking at the interaction, and that's where the importance comes. Taking it as a drug-by-drug basis, as you did there, I think is critical to the process.

The one other question -- and it may be sort of a minor question -- relating to this is -- maybe two questions. One is that there may be some differences between PO and IV administration, especially with druqs like midazolam, for instance, where you're seeing a huge effect in one area, and when it's given IV for short instances, the effect is not nearly so great. At least in our working with the pediatric population in HIV, having a very strong recommendation or a global one that doesn't take that consideration into account really puts us in a bind of what we can use safely or at least what information is given to the practitioner and what can be used, where we don't see a problem with having a large interaction as long as we recognize the route of administration as well.

DR. HUANG: Yes. The classification system right now is based on the oral midazolam to maximize the effect.

DR. JUSKO: Shiew-Mei, you've done a very admirable job over the years of managing a very confusing area of trying to make sense of drug interactions. Sometimes they don't make complete sense. Like yesterday, we saw an interaction where there was a 7-fold change with grapefruit juice. I don't see that particular one mentioned or part of this presentation. But my question is really something else.

Many pharmaceutical companies have implemented the in vitro screens for drug interactions, being able to focus on particular cytochrome systems as a way of anticipating whether to do in vivo studies or not. Have you had an opportunity to do a retrospective on how well that whole approach has been working?

And to follow up that, do you anticipate similar possible success in being able to do in vitro screens of transporters to anticipate which in vivo studies to do or not do?

DR. HUANG: Yes. As far as the in vitro system to predict in vivo, we did some cases that we looked at where we have in vitro information and in vivo. We did publish. This was early on in '99. And we did find cases where there are inconsistencies, and fexofenadine is one of the examples where you show no interaction, and yet when you give it with ketoconazole, you found a 2-fold increase.

Ard later on we found this possible involvement of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{gp}$. So there are a lot of exceptions. Many of them are because of the $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{gp}$ involvement.

However, there are also other involvement as far as I over Ki ratio. That's the one that we've been using from in vitro data to project whether there is an interaction or not. Right now we're just using the ratio to say okay, based on this one, the number is so small we don't think there will be an interaction. Or the sponsor would have done the I over Ki. So you have a rank order of different isozymes.

What we often observe is that even all of this I over Ki are very small, the sponsor still went ahead and did one study. And in that case actually that's used as a reference point. Most often they pick the most sensitive one, so the one with the highest I over Ki, and that one shows no interaction. Then we're comfortable with the others. And we have seen quite a few of those cases, though not all of them.

There are also other cases where I over Ki perhaps could not project the extent of interaction, but that's in the area where there's a possible interaction. Whether the in vitro system can accurately project, that's really not our concern because in our guidance that we provided to the sponsor, only when you don't see an
interaction, then you can stop right there.
But if you are projecting an interaction, then we recommend an in vivo study to quantitate it. So even there are discrepancies in the in vitro projection versus the in vivo observation, that is okay because the in vivo study always follows when you see there's a possible interaction.

Whether there's not a precise correlation, partly could be because the concentration in plasma may not represent a concentration in the liver. So what we are recommending in our reviewer guide is to use the most conservative approach. We use the total concentration in doing our projection. We don't use the free concentration. So we are more concerned if you use a much higher I in our calculation of I over Ki.

DR. FLOCKHART: I'd like to, first of all, to take a 10,000-foot view of this. I think that both you, Shiew-Mei, and the office in general and PhRMA have done a sterling piece of work here in terms of coming up with a classification scheme. In history $I$ think we have this huge problem with information overload about drug interactions, and a classification scheme is going to help.

And I remember talking about this three or four years ago and everybody just assumed this would be absolutely impossible. It is to PhRMA's great credit that
they managed to get together and put something together that wasn't terribly different from what the FDA came up with.

Personally I think that three categories is appropriate because of the contraindication issue, but I wouldn't go down burning on that. I think some form of classification is important.

To deal with the specific question of transporters, if I could, again looking from a fair height, the situation that we're in with cytochrome P 450 s in vitro is that we have pretty much all the important ones mapped and we have assays for them. We have specific substrates. We have specific inhibitors. We have genetic tests. This is absolutely not the case yet with transporters, and it's important because, as we're seeing with the fexofenadine example, we have good assays for $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{gp}$ in vitro. Nobody would debate that we can do that.

What we don't have is the full picture. So it's almost like we have 3 A but we don't have 2D6 and 2C19 and all the others. So it's hard at the moment to recommend at the level of substrates a screening for transporters for drugs in the same way as we screen for cytochrome P 450 s . It's hard to recommend that at the moment because we --

DR. HUANG: Are you talking about in vitro?

DR. FLOCKHART: I'm talking about in vitro.
DR. HUANG: Okay.
DR. FLOCKHART: On the other hand, at the level of inhibition -- and Steve Hall and I reviewed this recently for a review article -- outside digoxin it's very hard to find something that we believe is a transporterbased interaction that matters to anything. Now, we have digoxin. We have quinidine/digoxin is an important thing. We have clarithromycin/digoxin is an important thing. We have verapamil/digoxin is probably an important thing.

So if a drug comes along that is a potent inhibitor of $P$-gp, then if it's likely to be co-prescribed with digoxin specifically at the moment, I think it's a nobrainer to say that you ought to test in vitro, test for the ability of a drug to inhibit P-gp. That's at a minimum.

On the other hand, there may well be HIVrelated drugs, because of $P-g p$ and lymphocytes, where this is important also.

So I think the importance of measuring inhibition of $P-g p$ transport by drugs during development is increasing. Screening for substrates of transporters in general at the moment, I'm not there yet.

DR. HUANG: And as far as in vitro screening, you don't think that digoxin transport A2B/B2A with various
cell systems will be able to tell you whether it's a substrate?

DR. FLOCKHART: Oh, no, absolutely. I think you can tell whether something is a $P$-gp substrate, but what you can't tell -- I'm sorry. I didn't elaborate the example of fexofenadine -- is what other transporters it might also be a substrate for. So you don't have a full picture. You might have a very narrow picture. In the case of Cexofenadine, il's probably very significantly transported by OATP as well. So if you simply describe the P-gp story, you're going to get confused, and we have got confused. The grapefruit juice effect on fexofenadine comes from left field if you don't understand that there's more than transporter involved.

DR. SADEE: Yes. I wanted to actually bring up the same point. We have just completed a survey of many tissues and measured the transport home, if you wish. So all genes that encode transporters -- and there are 48 ABC transporters, of which $A B C B 1$ of P -gp is one. So we're looking at one out of 48, and there are several hundred SLC transporters. So the picture is relatively complex.

Neverthcless, it would appcar that $P$ gp does play a dominant role in many cases. The problem is that if one then relies on $P$-gp, sometimes it fits and it may just be fortuitous. It's because there are five other
transporters that have similar substrate affinities and you get the answer with just measuring $P-g p$ and you wouldn't know the difference. And that could be problematic because then you look at differences among individuals and you cannot explain them anymore. So there is a bit of caution.

On the other hand, I would agree that focusing on $P-g p$ at the present time is probably going to give you quite a bit of information in terms of what we have seen that each drug correlates. We not only have just looked at the expression of the transporters, but how does it relate to drug potency across the tissues. That gives you an ability to say, well, these and these and these transporters are relevant. Maybe I'll send you that paper, so you can have a look at it. But $P$ gp does play a prominent rolc.

DR. HUANG: Thank you.
DR. VENITZ: I'd like to echo what Dave said.
I think with the 3A4 inhibition, $I$ think you are there.
The classification with three categories makes sense to me because of the consequences that you would attach, either contraindication, dose modification, or monitoring. And that's a gradation in consequences, so it makes sense to grade your degree of inhibition by the same token, provided that you have exposure-response information on the NME as you had in your first example.

As far as the induction is concerned in your second question, I'm not sure whether we are there yet, whether the science is there to allow us to compare different inducers. One of the reasons why, for inhibitors, $I$ think it works, because we have this nice midazolam ranking that allows us to rank all of them on that scale. We don't have that for inducers, as far as $I$ know. So for inducers, I'd be very reluctant at this stage to categorize them, to rank them unless you have data to support for a known, very specific substrate what the degree of induction is for a whole bunch of different inducers.

As far as your last question is concerned, P-gp, again other than digoxin, $I$ don't know of a clinical significant drug interaction. So even if you did have that information in terms of inhibition is what I'm talking about right now, I'm not sure what a clinician would do with it. And the use of digoxin is going to go down, if anything at all. So unless, as David was saying, it's lixely that digoxin is going to be co-administered with that NME, well, then you may want to do a clinical study anyway, and the in vitro study would be irrelevant. But $I$ don't think the science is there yet to say from an in viたro $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{gp}$ substrate or inhibition experiment, that we know what the consequences are clinically.

DR. HUANG: As far as just the inducer, there's some data to show rifampin is more potent than rifabutin or rifapentine as far as the data with ritonavir, and there are several other ranking with ethinyl estradiol. That is the only information $I$ found and with $S t$. John's wort. Right now the labeling usually just says drugs that induce certain enzymes, like rifampin, rifabutin, St. John's wort. That's how we put it the labeling, "may affect" the drug disposition. But we also did put in the contraindication for rifampin in one case and say rifabutin can be used in that case. But we just don't have a system to say it's a potent inducer right now.

DR. VENITZ: And that's basically what I'm saying. You don't have a study where midazolam is used as a prodrug to compare different inducers, and until and unless you have something like that, I don't think you can categorize them other than on a case-by-case.

DR. CAPPARELLI: One other point, at least on the transporter issues -- and I'm in agreement with, I think, what's been said here in terms of need for clinical information and the fact that we really have an incomplete picture. The clinical information that we look at may be qualitatively a bit different than what we have focused in on on standard drug interaction studies because one of the issues is it's not just systemic exposure that's going to
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change, but it's also going to potentially be the change between systemic exposure and exposure in various tissues. So one area where you may see a lot of exposure is the fexofenadine, and one of the reasons we don't have sedation may have to do with some of these transporters. So when you're dealing with interactions at those levels, the studies really need to be designed not only from the standard PK standpoint but really evaluating the dynamic exposure-response relationship as well.

DR. HUANG: Yes. Thal's a good point because it's about the brain penetration and for drugs that have CNS toxicity, I think that's a very importanl issue.

DR. RELLING: In your case 1, the new molecular entity that -- you ended up saying, do not lake with potent CYP3A inhibitors. So was there life-threatening toxicity from that new molecular entity, or was it simply the potency of the inhibitors and the likelihood of a drug interaction that made you say do not take instead of take with caution or consider a dosage decrease?

DR. HUANG: There is severe but rare clinical consequences. For that class of drug, we put it right in front of information for patients. So there is significant conscquenccs, although that clinical endpoint was not studied in the exposure responsc.

DR. RELLING: Right, but that's your criteria
for making a contraindication, is the clinical consequence of overdose. Is that correct? You never make it be that there is a contraindication or do not take simply based on the potency of the interaction?

DR. HUANG: Well, for this one, we are particularly concerned with one clinical endpoint, and that's why the sponsor was asked to conduct an exposure response to see exactly how the concentration response will affect where we actually study the drug's concentration when you gave ketoconazole at that level. I was trying to tell you the endpoint without telling you what the drug is. I probably cannot do that. But it is severe enough that there's a concern.

DR. RELLING: I'm just trying to understand is that your general principle because I'm a little bit worried about some labeling coming out with very strong, what sound like contraindications. They're either labeled as contraindications or they say do not take. And I'm surprised that that would be the case unless there were a very life-threatening adverse event that would be possible like torsade de pointes or something like that because -DR. HUANG: Yes. We just say do not take. DR. RELLING: I guess that was the only thing I was unclear about as you were going through your slides. It does seem to me it is informative to give prescribers an
idea of the strength of the drug interaction, but $I$ would be careful about translating that wording into contraindication or do not take. Treating childhood leukemia, there are only so many drugs we can use, and vincristine is going to be affected by every $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{gp}$ substrate and $3 A$ substrate, but our alternative is not to say do not take vincristine. It is to use with caution or dose adjust.

DR. HUANG: The decision was that the clinical outcome was such that we want to say do not take. But in some instances, we actually also put a time period there. We say do not take within this certain time.

DR. RELLING: which also may not be helpful to the prescriber in some situations. So I would be cautious about putting in such strongly worded statements about not taking medications together when there may be few alternatives for the prescriber. And you accomplish your task in many cases just as well by just putting in the data. This is a very high likelihood of a very potent drug interaction that could have as much as a 6-fold or 8-fold or 10 -fold effect on the exposure to the drug, and that gives the clinician an idea of how serious the drug interaction is.

DR. HUANG: Yes. To go back to your question, we don't do it always this case. Sometimes we put in
precaution. for example, I think some of the grapefruit juice interaction, we are not sure about the outcome. we just say -- well, we did say do not take, but it's not in the contraindication section. It's in the precaution section.

Actually $I$ was going to ask health care providers, do you see a difference wher you say do not take or contraindicated? Do you see a difference? We do have different labeling languages in our --

DR. RELLING: We have had this come up in
recent submissions to our protocol review commitlee. It's very confusing. No, there is not a significant difference Lhere. To the clinician, that means the same thing. So il's confusing when something says there's no contraindication, but another section says do not take. It doesn't make sense.

DR. HUANG: To the sponsors, they make a diEference.

DR. LESKO: Just a comment on the general question. I don't think we have a link between the potency of the inhibition and what it says in the label. I think that gets to what Hartmut asked earlier, and that is there's a second step to making that decision, which is to evaluate the potency or whether it's potent, moderate, or woak in the context of the exposure-response relationship.

And then that actually drives where it goes in the label.
But in the specific example number 1, there's also another consideration, and that is the area under curve increase in exposure exceeded by far the exposure that we had seen with the approved doses. So if people were exposed to this exposure, there's no clinical experience with it in terms of it being safe. It just wasn't studied at a high enough dose in the clinical trials to have safety information. I think that was in her example. 30 milligrams was the upper dose, but the exposure in the interaction may have been equivalent to 120 milligrams. And $I$ think that drives where the information goes in the label as well.

DR. RELLING: But an alternative to saying do not take or contraindication would be to suggest the possibility for dose reductions in that situation. I'm sure it depends on the overall utility of the new drug entity to clinical carc, but therc aro some drug entities that arc so critical that wo use, it would not be helpful if the labeling tied the hands of the prescriber to not allow them to use a critical agent just because of a drug interaction that might not be avoidable.

DR. HUANG: One of the things that we really couldn't say because for this particular case, there are only 15 and 30 available. If there's an 8 milligram or 7.5
milligram available, then we could say take the 7.5 milligram dose to start with. Sometimes we have the choices, but the majority of the time we do not have that choice. So we either have to make the dosing regimen change, like instead of b.i.d., give q.d. if it's possible. Occasionally we have that kind of recommendation. A lot of times we don't.

DR. RELLING: The idca that the dosage formulations available would be what would tic your hands sounds a little silly for people who work in pediatrics. We never get to use the formulations that are available. We always have to cut things down. So there are alternatives.

DR. HUANG: That's a good point. These are for adult use and we don't have the pediatric for that particular case. I think that's a very good point.

DR. DERENDORF: I'd like to follow up what Ed said earlier that we're focusing in the whole session on systemic exposure really as the major piece of information. But there's more to a drug interaction, and one area that we're not talking about at all is pharmacodynamic interactions. I know that the data situation is not very good, but I think that's an area that needs to be explored in the future much more.

DR. HUANG: A lot more population
pharmacokinetic study -- we have more chances of seeing pharmacodynamic interaction that was evaluated in that way from the sponsor. So we do have cases where pharmacodynamic interaction was evaluated in that setting. And you are correct. 90 percent of the interactions are pharmacokinetic based.

DR. FLOCKHART: Just two things which are really just filling in gaps. I think the cytochrome P450 interactions -- I think we largely have it figured out. I think with $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{gp}$ or with transporters, we're slowly getting there.

The reason we're not there with inducers I think relates to an important thing, and that is that these are pleiotropic. Nearly all of them have multiple cffccts. Wc don't have specific inducers. I happen to believe we don't havc a lot of specific inhibitors either.

Induction is really a big thing. So we published a paper a year or so ago showing that RNA levels are changed by rifampin for a whole bunch of transporters, 10 of the ABC transporters, a bunch of the SLC transporters, glutathione-S-transferase, UGTs, sulfotransferases, cytochrome P450s, a number of other enzymes, and also that you can't actually go into to an individual enzyme system and say rifampin is going to turn on all of these because it's specific within them.

So the inducers have very complex effects, and it follows that something that is a potent inducer for 3 A like rifampin would turn on midazolam potently, but you can't translate that to a bunch of other drugs very easily. So saying broadly that it's a potent inducer unfortunately is not an accurate statement. It has to be tempered in a drug-specific way. That's inducers. So really there's not a good system for inducers at all.

I think one last point, and this is something that hasn't come up yet, but it's something that I did bring up at the ASCPT meeting and have said multiple times, and I know that a number of people disagree with me about this. But I think in these studies, once we're beyond in vitro and we're in the clinic doing drug interaction studies, we're in an environment right now where the availability of surrogates is blossoming, the availability of proteomic surrogate markers, the availability of a large number of possible surrogates. And while people are resistant to including them in these kinds of studies, I'm a strong advocate for including them absolutely whencver possiblc bccause that makes the whole drug development process actually I think a lot more efficient if you have good information about the markers you're going to use in phase III and beyond early on. A relatively small investment for a lot of payback.
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DR. VENITZ: One more thing that I'd like to add that we didn't discuss either, and that's related to all the discussion focused on changes in parent drug exposure. One thing that obviously has to be kept in mind is that by the time that you inhibit, you're going to change the metabolic profile. By the time that you induce, you're changing the metabolic profile of circulating metabolites. That has to be considered when you make those decisions because those metabolites may contribute to safety and efficacy issues. Like in your first example, you mentioned, well, we don't have any data at the 120 milligram dose. Well, giving a 120 milligram dose may not be the same as giving a 30 milligram dose and a strong inhibitor because your metabolic profile may be different, which could have safety consequences.

So part of whatever the considerations are in the review team has to focus on do we know what those metabolites are, do we know what activity they may or may not carry, and is it sufficient. Just to look at dose limited toxicity from a phase I, is that the same as inhibiting or inducing.

DR. DERENDORF: To follow up, the same is true about the quantification of interaction with a simple 3.fold, 4-fold, 6-fold. I think that's concentrationdependent frequently on either partner. So it's dangerous
to come up with a constant number for that.
DR. LESKO: That's going to be a complication because if you go to the second step of the assessment of cxposure response, we're really by default talking about the parcnt compound exposurc response being realistic relationships betwecn metabolite and response are going to be, in most cases, not available.

DR. VENITZ: But as opposed to requiring the company to give 120 milligram dose, you could tell them give a 60 milligram dose and an inhibitor because then you're mimicking what you're concerned about which is inhibition, or the inhibition is going to push your systemic exposure of the parent and change the metabolic pattern. But just giving a higher dose, you're not going to change the metabolic pattern. Yes, you're going to achieve higher systemic exposure of the parent, but you don't know what happened to the metabolites that you're shutting off and the metabolites that are going to be formed by --

DR. HUANG: Yes, that's a very good point. There's a concept paper on QT evaluation, and we actually talk about the drug, if it's a substrate of 3 A , then it's expected that you want to study it with ketoconazole, again as a standard approach so that we can evaluate the highest exposure that you may see when you give it with other drugs
and what would affect the QT. We have discussed that, although we did discuss whether this is a better approach than giving a higher dose. If we know ketoconazole is 4fold, is it better to study the 4 -fold dose or just study this drug with ketoconazole?

DR. VENITZ: In Your first example, I would say that it's belter to study ketoconazole in a high dose because that mimics what you're concerned about, not only in lerms of mimicking your exposures that you haven't seen the response related to, but you're also going to look at any change of metabolites it may impact on.

DR. HUANG: Just to get back to Dr. Jusko's question. You mentioned about grapefruit juice. I guess that's probably the only study that we see the highest change, the one that was presented yesterday on drug $A$ where grapefruit juice increased AUC 7-fold. And you say why we didn't include it in the potent inhibitors. Because a lot of times the fold change, while we did see some fold change of 20 -fold with some of the statins, I think that's a fluid statement on grapefruit juice. It depends on what brand you use, how many times you dose it, did you dose it 2 hours before, at the same time, one-half hour, 2 hours. So the results are going to be variable.

But I think we need to consider where to put grapefruit juice, but understanding that it's very
variable. I think once we put a precaution in the labeling, I think the patients and health care providers hopefully will get the message that with grapefruit juice, you could expect anything that could happen.

DR. VENITZ: Any further questions or comments by the committee members?

DR. SADEE: I just have a general comment on this. I look at drug-drug interaction as sort of a phenocopy of the genotype situation, so the two are intricately linked, and the phenomena you observe can be interpreted with knowledge that they're really that closely related. So I think that helps to look at it that way. DR. VENITZ: Thank you again, Shiew-Mei. That gets us to our concluding remarks. Larry? DR. LESKO: Thanks, Jurgen. My concluding remarks are going to be very brief and represent an expression of appreciation and gratitude to the committee. I think we all feel from the agency that the last two days have demonstrated the commitment and engagement of the committee members in the discussion of clinical pharmacology issues. I think we're all looking to a common goal and that is to advance clinical pharmacology not only into regulatory decision making and policy but also into the drug development process. I feel that this committee has succeeded in
achieving that goal of advancement.
So I can't really express my appreciation enough for the work of the committee over the last day and a half. Besides, it was just a lot of fun. There was a lot of intellectual discussion and I enjoyed it immensely.

As you can see us writing very vigorously here, all of us on this side of the table, $w e^{\prime} v e ~ c a r e f u l l y$ recorded the opinions, recommendations, and advice that this committee has provided us. I often felt that the comments and advice worc likc putting a microscopc and looking at a slide of the issues and they slowly came into clear focus. As we go forward with this committee, we'd like to maybe spend time at our next committee meeting reflecting on the advice given at this committee meeting and talk about a little bit how we've utilized the information that came out of the committee to try to keep some continuum to our discussions.

So with that, $I$ think $I$ just want to say again, thanks to the committee and thanks to Dr. Venitz for his great job as chair. I hope we all made it easy for him.

We look forward to the next meeting. I know we have talked about some tentative dates that Dr. Venitz may discuss.

I also understand from a break that coincident with this discussion of the committee meeting on
pharmacogenetics, there was also a broadcast on National Public Radio, which I wasn't aware of. So I hope I can get a transcript. One of our own advisory committee members was involved in that, as I undcrstand it, Dr. Flockhart. Is that correct, David?

DR. FLOCKHART: Yes.
DR. LESKO: So there you go.
(Laughter.)
DR. LESKO: So our next step is a public
broadcast production of pharmacogenetics and drug development. I'm just kidding about that.

Anyway, let me close with saying thanks very much and all of you have a safe trip from Rockville back to your home, wherever you're going.

DR. VENITZ: Before we adjourn, just one thing for the record that I forgot to mention. We didn't have anybody sign up for the open public hearing. That's why we didn't have any problems in running over as far as time is concerned.

As Larry indicated, we are looking right now tentatively at October 8 th and 9 th, which is a Tuesday and a Wednesday, as the follow-up meeting for this committee.

DR. DERENDORF: 7th and 8th.
DR. VENITZ: I'm sorry. 7 th and 8 th, right. Tuesday, Wednesday, the first week of October I quess.

We'll get in touch with you to confirm that and put an agenda together.

Then lastly, I agree with Larry about not only having a lot of fun over the past day and a half, but also this being a very productive meeting, and $I$ hope we can continue next time we meet.

DR. FLOCKHART: And thanks to the chair, excellent chairing.

DR. VENITZ: I just found out that our Executive Secretary who's responsible for the logistics and for the smooth running of this operation, Kathleen, is going to retire.

MS. REEDY: No. I'm going to another division.
DR. VENITZ: She is going to transfer out of the Advisors and Consultants Staff, and I really want to officially appreciate what she's done.

MS. REEDY: Thank you.
DR. VENITZ: Thank you, Kathleen.
(Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.)

ASSOCLA'IED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON
(202) 543-4809

Reef integrated systems

acknowledges 7:19 acquired 69:10 across 33:16 49:2 62:7 71:25 110:11 activated 42:5 42:21
active 42:7
activity 12:15 12:16
17:10 27:13 27:14 42:14
58:24 68:3 69:25 121:18
actual 52:15
acute 12:4 73:23
acutely 95:2
add 40:15 49:6 56:15 121:2
added 73:12
addendum 61:13 97:15 adding 56:12
addition 7:10 42:19 61:13 77:23 78:19 98:11
additional 78:6 address 8:4 17:5 76:22
77:21 79:10 81:24 97:14 addressed 35:20 79:9 102:23
addresses 6:14 51:9 adherence 33:19 adjourn 126:15 adjourned 127:20 adjust 115:8 adjusting 67:19 69:21 adjustment 59:8 Administration 7:2 18:11 94:14 103:12 103:22
admirable 104:2 admissions 75:3
ADR 74:12
ADRS 74:13
adult 118:15
adults 12:4
advance 13:24 15:13
124:22
advances $35: 8$
adverse 13:18 23:8
23:21 24:12 26:9 38:5
38:7 41:11 59:19 60:21
74:7 74:9 98:25 114:20
advice 28:6 125:8
125:10 125:14
Advisors 127:15
advisory 5:20 6:12
10:23 126:3
advocate 120:20
affect 28:15 46:3 85:17
85:21 86:11 93:2 95:16 112:8 114:9
affected 13:25 115:5
affecting 74:2
affects 45:22 93:9
afraid 55:15
African 50:4 50:6 50:15
50:19 54:13 54:23 54:25
55:7 55:13
ageney's 7:8
agency-wide 9:2 40:6
agency 9:11 10:8 22:7

22:24 24:16 40:12 46:6 65:4 66:22 78:4 85:2 124:19
agenda 5:6 7:24 98:12
127:2
agent 23:13 61:22
117:21
agents 39:14 39:15
aggravating 42:23
agree 36:16 37:3 40:13
40:19 41:22 46:16 49:8
49:9 52:23 55:3 58:2
98:22 110:6 127:3
agreement 112:19
aimed 31:14
alerts 71:19 72:10
algorithm 69:25
allele 12:25 17:10 24:15 27:17
alleles 12:24 16:6 27:12
27:16 31:3 31:8 48:8
allelic 31:6 31:19
allogenic 42:5
allow 23:12 34:10 63:8
111:3 117:21
allows 16:25 111:6
alosetron 73:24
alprazolam 85:20
alter 14:25 36:15
altered 87:13
alternate 99:11
alternative 115:6
117:14
Alternatively 42:13 alternatives 115:17
118:13
American 50:19 50:19
50:20 50:20 54:13 54:23
55:13 87:4 87:6
Americans 50:5 50:6
50:16 50:22 51:15 51:16 54:25
amplified 52:5 52:10
analogous 53:5
analysis 20:16 20:18
61:21 62:5
analytic 14:14 25:17
analytical $15: 8 \quad 35: 23$
ancillary 46:18
and/or 99:22
animal 69:13
anion 75:25 95:10
anniversary 9:21 10:10
10:16
announced 9:4
announcement 6:14
10:2
annual $87: 7$
answer 81:5 110:2
anticipate 12:19 104:15 104:17
anticipating 104:12
antidepressants 59:21 antigen 30:8 antihypertensive 59:7
anybody 126:17
anymore 38:11 91:14

## $110: 5$

anytime $76: 17$
anyway 111:22 126:12
anywhere 66:10
apparent 28:2 63:12
appear 28:3 109:22
appearance 6:16
appeared $90: 22$
appears 15:16 17:3
23:5 23:5 23:6 42:7
applicability 6:19 6:21
application 29:4 29:8
98:23
applications 22:16
applied 29:13 29:15
30:20 45:20 46:13 68:3 69:5 85:7
applies 8:14 45:12
apply 6:24 7:17 24:6
26:13 26:14 27:9 45:13
appreciate 18:6 127:16
appreciation 124:17 125:2
approach 14:5 77:22
79:9 80:5 81:13 82:14
83:7 83:15 83:16 84:22
90:10 97:5 104:14
106:12 122:24 123:2
approaches $77: 12$
appropriate 16:12
27:20 31:13 52:21 64:17
66:22 68:2 72:15 88:11
107:5
approval 9:11 65:25
65:25 73:20
approve 88:20 92:22
approved 11:15 22:24
23:17 25:19 65:4 73:13
73:19 78:21 88:23
117:5
approving 98:19
April 6:12 9:19 9:19
21:22 93:6 95:7
aren't 35:13 55:4 65:17
arguments 60:23
arthritis 11:20
article 62:2 63:11 75:4
75:15 76:3 93:6 108:5
articles 20:17
ASCPT 92:18 94:11 120:11
Asian 50:20 51:16
54:13
asking 37:24
aspect 43:6 65:10 67:6
aspects $8: 21$
assay 62:25 70:21
assays 107:12 107:16
assess 49:17 62:6
assessing 15:7 70:3
assessment 25:21
122:3
assign 51:13
associated 16:19 27:14
43:7 73:18

Association 87:4
associations 37:23
assume 69:8
assumed 106:24
assuming 19:3 76:5
astemizole 73:16
atomoxetine 22:23
atorvastatin $91: 9$
attach 110:21
attendance 87:8
attention 9:16 22:22
48:23
attributable 24:5
AUC 77:8 82:19 83:22
88:7 90:12 90:13 90:21
94:7 94:23 96:5 100:5
100:8 123:16
AUCS 88:4
August 22:9
autoimmune 11:20
automatically $42: 15$
availability $31: 16 \quad 52: 19$
60:5 64:23 65:6 67:2
120:16 120:16 120:17
average 16:11
avoid 49:24
avoidable 117:22
avoided 23:25
aware 102:14 126:2
awareness 20:23

## - B -

b.i.d 118:5
back 10:21 13:5 15:14
18:23 19:8 21:17 32:25
42:3 45:10 47:18 62:15
71:11 93:7 95:20 100:24
101:23 115:24 123:12
126:13
bacteria 75:12
bad 33:24 33:24 49:18 67:21
ball 30:13 45:10
basically $32: 9$ 44:4
112:13
beast $66: 25$
becomes 51:11 69:10
100:11
bedside 24:24 25:8
29:3
begin 19:21 $28: 23$
59:2
begun 26:8 27:19
belief 10:17
below 62:15
benefit 21:13 30:11
38:23 51:10 51:20 72:5
Besides 125:4
beta 59:5 59:22
big 34:4 42:17 49:4
58:9 60:20 119:17
bind 103:19
binding 96:22
bioavailability 83:20
biochemical 62:24
Biopharmaceutics 73:4 76:25
bit 20:3 44:6 65:2 67:4
69:12 70:11 110:5
110:8 112:23 114:15
125:15
black 29:18
blocker 59:5
blockers 59:22 99:2
blood 67:11 67:12
67:18 67:23 69:22
blossoming 120:16
Board 79:23
body 26:12
bombarded 9:21
bother 49:3
bottom 22:17 45:17
Boulder 5:18
boundaries $84: 2$
bowel 11:19
box 12:16 16:20 56:19
boxes 12:18 12:20
brain 113:11
brainer 108:14
brand 123:21
BRCA 30:14
break 72:20 72:23
125:24
breakdown 74:18
breaks 22:12
breast 30:15 52:3 52:5
bridges 64:15
brief 124:17
briefly 17:22 19:18
20:14 80:14 93:4
brings 10:16 13:5 23:14
36:14 48:20 67:15
broad 6:18 6:20 14:7
21:6 21:10 46:21
Broadcast 9:25 126:10
broader 45:8 58:17
broadly 14:2 $120: 5$
bromphenac 73:23
budesonide 92:8
Buffalo 5:25
Building 7:9
bunch 111:11 119:19
119:20 120:4
burden 48:11
burning 107:6
buspirone 81:18

```
- C -
```

calculation 106:15
California 5:13
calling 58:9
Canada 75:6
canceled 94:17
cancer 30:8 30:15
43:11 52:3 52:5 52:11
candidates 26:10

CAP 65:25
capability $43: 3$
CAPPARELLI 5:12 5:12
7:4 68:21 69:11 102:22
112:18
cardio-renal 96:25
careful 38:17 41:19
46:16 82:13 86:20
115:2
carefully 30:2 43:2
43:2 44:8 55:10 55:16
55:20 58:4 58:6 67:3
97:25 125:7
carry 44:20 121:19
case-by-case 21:4
21:5 21:12 112:17
catch 86:12
categories 102:11
107:4 110:19
categorize 111:9 112:17
category $20: 3$
caucasian 54:14
caucasians 54:25
caused 10:12
causes 24:15
causing 20:10
caution 110:5 113:19
115:7
cautionary 61:18
cautious 44:18 115:14
CDER 80:2 87:2
CDRH 9:7
celebrations 9:21
Center 9:6
centers 29:6 31:3
central 23:14 29:4
cervistatin 73:17
cetera 42:2 61:25
chair 125:20 127:7
chairing 127:8
challenge 25:18 66:4
challenges 25:9 73:8
changed 87:14 119:19
changing 37:20 52:22
121:7
chart 16:3 87:24
cheapest $56: 5$
check 23:3
childhood 115:3
children $12: 5$
Chinese 50:19 choices 52:2 118:3
cholesterol 58:8
chronically 95:3
chunk 71:10
cimetidine 96:14 96:16
circulating 121:7
circumstantial 15:12
24:20
cisapride 73:16 90:16
cited 24:12
clarithromycin/digoxin
108:9
clarithromycin 75:9
76:9 93:5
class 113:21
classes 69:6
classification 76:21
83:14 84:10 84:21 86:5
86:6 88:4 88:7 97:16
97:18 98:14 98:22 98:24
99:13 100:3 103:23
106:20 106:22 107:7
110:19
classified 88:6
classify 86:15 86:21
clause 43:12 43:13
clear 17:2 20:15 29:19
36:18 41:3 41:5 42:4
42:7 45:11 46:8 46:9
58:23 125:12
clearance $82: 982: 9$
91:12 102:6 102:8
CLIA 65:24
clinic 120:14
clinically $16: 13 \quad 30: 18$
41:10 44:5 100:6 111:25
clinician's 52:24
clinician 29:12 $37: 12$
66:9 111:17 115:22 116:13
clinicians 29:16 38:10
38:14 47:16 57:12 65:19
65:23 66:4 66:7 66:17
70:5
closely 69:18 69:21
124:11
cluster 63:2 63:3
Cmax 77:9 88:4 88:8
88:10 88:11 90:13 90:16
90:16 94:8 96:5
CNS 113:12
co-administered 46:10
81:23 90:7 111:20
co-administration
75:5 92:6 96:18 97:7
99:11
co-prescribed 108:12
codeine 42:4 42:10
42:19 45:12
cognizant 31:11 56:17
62:5
coincident 125:24
colitis 73:25
College 10:11
Collins 10:3
color-coded 17:9
Colorado 5:19
combination 10:14
10:18 94:24
combinations 41:8
75:15 99:15
combining 48:12
comfort 93:15
comfortable 88:23
100:19 100:20 100:22 105:17
comment 8:6 40:19
92:19 116:19 124:7 comments 8:12 28:9
45:20 46:16 63:11 72:19 99:23 124:5 125:10
commitment 124:20
committee 5:20 6:12
6:19 7:21 8:21 10:23
$\begin{array}{llll}14: 2 & 18: 24 & 19: 8 & 19: 9\end{array}$
19:20 20:14 20:22 28:5 28:9 30:16 35:6 64:11
77:13 77:23 79:7 87:10 93:7 116:11 124:6
124:18 124:20 124:25
125:3 125:9 125:12
125:13 125:14 125:16 125:19 125:25 126:3 126:22
commonly 10:17 10:18
46:10 81:23 84:14
Commonwealth 5:23
communicate 31:4
communicated 78:13
communicating 78:2
community $36: 8 \quad 40: 2$
65:4
comorbid 46:25
companies 9:10 29:7
31:2 65:22 104:9
company 122:9
compare 111:3 112:15
compared 30:12 51:20
55:7 93:24
comparison 10:19
94:25
compiling 91:18 92:10
completed 109:16
completes 18:22
completion 10:3
complex 39:13 56:21
109:21
complexity $46: 25$
complicated $45: 3$
complication 122:2
component 33:5 33:23
51:6 67:14 69:12
components 33:14
35:14 50:17 98:7
compound 85:14 87:24
122:5
compromising 39:20
computer 76:15 92:13

## 99:14

conceivably $18: 10$
concentration 60:15
95:25 106:9 106:10
106:12 106:13 114:8
114:9 121:24
concentrations 60:20
61:8
concept 34:20 122:21
conceptual $58: 6$ 58:8
concern 12:13 30:16
31:9 31:9 31:21 32:2
32:19 32:21 38:6 43:23
88:21 105:24 114:13
concerns 67:2 85:8
85:12 86:22 86:22 86:25 92:15 97:9
concluding 124:14
124:16
concurrent 20:7
conduct 93:16 114:7
conducted $25: 17$
conflict 6:9 6:15
conflicts 7:17 7:20 7:22
confused 109:11 109:12
confusing 104:2 116:12
116:14
congratulate $35: 18$
40:8
congratulating 40:14
conjunction 70:3
connected 29:6
consensus 37:23
consequence $43: 24$
48:2 49:11 50:8
consequences 44:16
48:3 18:10 49:10 110:20
110:22 111:25 113:21
113:23 121:15
conservative 106:12
considerable 19:10
19:12 60:7
considerably $45: 2$
consideration 9:11
21:3 28:23 55:24 103:18 117:3
considerations 21:13
121:16
considering 36:1 40:6
constant 69:15
constantly $52: 22$
constipation 73:25
consult 31:25
consultant 7:18
Consultants 127:15
contain 22:8
contained 25:5 27:23
contaminates 61:15
context 8:25 15:10
30:19 36:10 45:21 58:16
59:16 64:22 70:13 70:14 116:25
continue 22:18 71:15
81:22 82:6 83:3 84:19
97:6 127:6
continuum 125:17
contraindicate 79:15
92:24 99:10 101:3
101:15 101:18
contraindicated 91:2
92:5 100:23 101:2 116:8
contraindication 98:21
101:21 107:5 110:21
112:9 114:3 115:3
116:4 116:15 117:15
contraindications
114:17 114:18
contrast 11:16 24:18
59:5
contribute 121:9
contributed 75:9 75:13
contributes 33:24
contribution 78:15
91:11

dynamic 113:8 dysfunction 46:24 46:24

## - E

easily 59:8 59:13 61:6
66:9 120:4
East 55:7
echo 46:15 110:17
economic 74:11
economically $30: 2$
30:18 56:10
Ed 118:17
edge 29:8
edition 23:22
Edmund 5:12 7:4
educated $64: 6$
education 46:5 72:13
effectiveness 14:19
16:2 16:8 51:18 52:18 64:18
efficacy 21:13 41:11
48:3 59:3 62:20 121:10
efficient 77:25 120:22
elaborate 109:5
elderly 74:21 75:7
86:8
element 58:18
elsewhere 56:23
elucidate $78: 14$
embedded 56:2
emergency 75:2
emphases $10: 5$
employees 6:23
encode 109:18
encompass 62:10 64:10
encounter 18:18
encourage 71:13
encouraged 71:9
ended 113:14
endpoint $35: 2 \quad 35: 3$
113:23 114:6 114:11
endpoints $52: 3$
energies $51: 21$
energized 40:12
engagement 124:20
engender 43:3
England 23:23 59:18
enhances $61: 15$
enjoyed 125:5
enormous 56:24
enthusiasm 19:10
entirely $41: 17$
entities 73:10 78:18
117:18
entitled 9:7
entity 79:14 80:18
81:8 87:18 89:25 90:4
96:10 113:14 113:16
117:18
environment $61: 3$
120:15
environmental 33:22

35:13 62:8
enzyme 11:24 13:15
24:15 24:17 27:13 28:21
47:23 48:5 78:19 80:19 119:24
enzymes 13:9 14:8
17:16 26:24 38:2 43:7
73:2 76:2 78:15 80:5
80:7 80:20 85:13 93:2 98:2 98:9 98:25 112:7 119:23
epigenetic 61:24
equate 102:6
equivalent 117:11
era 41:17
error 59:15 59:15 72:6 erythromycin 88:12
89:23 94:6
estate 27:25
estradiol 112:4
et $42: 2$ 61:25
ethinyl 112:4
ethnic 49:20 50:12
50:25 5l:2 51:8 54:7
ethnicities 49:22 ethnicity 51:5 51:14 54:17
European 50:19
evaluate 77:2 77:10
78:17 78:19 78:25 81:2
82:10 93:12 94:22 97:10 116:24 122:24
evaluated 37:25 50:18 50:21 50:22 55:4 55:10 77:4 87:21 90:2 96:10 97:9 119:2 119:4 evaluating 94:3 113:8 evaluation 38:5 52:4 73:9 75:5 79:8 93:9 99:19 122:21
evaluations 25:25
event-free 16:23
event 7:23 82:12
114:20
events 13:18 26:9 38:5
38:7 38:11 38:12 41:11
74:7 98:25
eventually 79:18 85:21
everybody 6:7 106:24
everyday $29: 16$
everyone 8:11 10:21
11:15
evidence 15:10 15:23
16:8 17:6 17:17 17:24
22:25 23:15 24:10 24:20
25:12 25:13 25:21 25:23
26:2 26:12 26:15 26:25
29:13 38:8 47:25
evolution 58:14 62:7
evolve 103:3
evolved $80: 3$
exact 18:14
exactly $36: 3$ 41:20
45:14 101:9 114:8
examined 44:9
examples 13:18 14:11

28:18 33:13 33:16 37:10
38:21 38:22 39:6 45:12
48:24 60:11 70:7 85:6
94:5 104:24
excceded 117:4
excellent 127:8
exception 53:17
exceptions 105:2
excited $41: 15$
exclude 22:16
excuse 50:14
executive 5:21 6:8
127:10
exhibited $39: 4$
existing 8:15 8:25 9:15
10:24 11:13 13:12 17:18 23:16 23:19 26:16 37:20
expand 28:18
expecting 77:4 85:15
expensive 56:12
experiment 111:24
experts $85: 11$
explain 32:23 110:5
explanation 96:20
explore 77:11 80:12
explored 118:23
exposed 117:6
exposure-response
77:11 80:11 87:22 88:14
90:5 100:24 110:24
113:9 116:25
exposure 13:25 44:4
69:5 69:14 88:22 89:19
100:4 100:18 112:25
113:2 113:2 113:3
113:24 114:7 115:21
117:4 117:4 117:6
117:11 118:19 121:4
122:4 122:5 122:13
122:16 122:25
exposures 123:9
express 125:2
expressed 80:19
Expression 9:8 53:12
61:20 62:11 62:19
110:10 124:17
extend 43:9
extension 83:16
extensive $23: 9$
external $85: 1 \mathrm{I}$
extraction 83:21
extreme 13:20 13:22
54:7 54:24 58:22
extremely $56: 12$
extremes 70:22

- F -
face $16: 2459: 13$
facilitate 87:11 92:13 99:13
factor 24:21 24:21
24:21 57:3
factors 26:4 64:20

70:11 72:3 87:10 98:13
failure $73: 23$
fair 22:9 67:10 107:9
fairly $42: 4 \quad 42: 7 \quad 49: 5$
fairness $8: 4$
falling 55:5
falls 20:2
false 15:19 47:13 47:13
familial 34:4
familiar 32:12 32:13
family $10: 25$
fashion 45:18
fast $56: 7$
FDA'S 32:19
FDA-APPROVED 30:25
30:25 65:14 65:18
FDA 6:5 6:6 7:19 7:25
21:18 22:2 26:8 36:4
38:5 38:13 39:24 50:11
52:17 57:15 66:5 79:23
107:2
feedback 92:18 97:17
feels $60: 18$
fexofenadine $94: 3$
94:6 94:22 95:9 95:14
104:23 107:15 109:6
109:9 109:12 113:4
figured 119:9
filling 119:8
finalize 98:6 98:9
financial 6:24 7:13 7:25
8:5
finding 57:24
findings 82:11
firm 8:5
firms 7:14 7:24
first 10:22 29:2 30:16
33:4 39:3 39:8 39:12
40:19 43:12 50:13 60:5
62:2 71:18 83:18 87:15
87:18 94:5 100:14
102:24 106:16 110:25
121:10 123:6 126:25
fit 62:22 97:25
fits 109:24
flaws 63:24
FLOCKHART 5:14 5:14
7:11 40:8 43:17 48:15
53:24 55:18 60:3 66:19
68:4 87:7 106:16 108:3
109:3 119:7 126:4
126:6 127:7
flood 57:8
Florida 5:11
fluid 123:20
focus 47:20 50:18 83:8
100:4 104:11 121:17
125:12
focused 9:14 78:9
112:23 121:3
focuses 100:5
focusing 110:6 118:18
fold 44:4 84:4 85:24
86:18-88:13 89:19 90:21
121:24 123:4 123:18
123:18
follow-up 126:22
follow 46:11 47:6 60:24
63:10 90:10 104:15
118:17 121:22
follows 44:21 106:6
120:2
forget 50:14
forgot 126:16
formal 84:21
formed 122:19
formulations 118:9
118:11
fortuitous 109:25
forum 87:3
fourth $9: 3$
fraction 23:2 78:15
framework 34:2 35:7
62:9 62:22 63:4 63:8
Francis 10:2
frankly 32:22
free 106:13
Freedom 7:8
frequencies 49:23
51:13
frequency 27:17 48:19 48:21 49:3 49:16 49:19 50:10 51:11 55:9 55:14 59:21
frequent 54:4 54:5
frequently 18:18 24:12
25:12 52:4 121:25
fully $41: 22$
fun 125:4 127:4
future 9:9 9:10 20:21
22:18 55:22 62:19 63:7 118:24

- G -

G6pd 57:4
G6pdh 58:8 66:24
gaps 119:8
gate $57: 8$
gender 29:22 52:7
gene 12:23 34:5 42:21
6I:19 61:24 62:10 62:19
generalize $21: 2$
generate 97:23
generating 99:14
genes 33:24 33:25
35:12 63:2 109:18
genetically $33: 21$
genetics 15:2 23:18
26:2 26:17
genome 10:3 10:18
genomic 27:4 38•16 50:3
genomics 10:6 25:6 genotype 14:21 16:25 21:7 27:19 33:18 34:3 37:18 43:10 48:4 48:21 48:25 55:6 58:24 62:10 63:5 124:9
genotyped 42:14
genotypes 12:12 15:16
genotypic 37:6 37:7
genotypically 23:11
genotyping 18:3 22:3
22:6 22:10 22:15 51:12
57:23 67:16 68:14 68:14
68:22 69:13 71:19 72:10
72:15 72:17
George 95:6
gets 26:18 29:3 29:17
30:21 30:23 40:18 46:4
58:18 60:14 68:25 71:3
116:22 124:14
GI 11:8 11:18
Gilbert's 57:4
giving 53:7 73:4 121:12
121:13 122:14 123:3
global 103:17
glucuronidation 85:21
glutathione-s-transferase
119:21
glyburide $75: 20$
goal 34:9 34:9 35:9
35:15 35:17 36:19 36:19
36:25 124:22
goes 15:16 16:9 17:21
41:20 47:4 47:10 117:13
government 6:23
gradation 110:22
grade 110:23
granted 7:2
grapefruit 95:7 96:6
104:6 109:12 123:13
123:16 123:20 123:25
124:3
gratitude 124:18
gray 29:18 53:20
Gregory 7:5
gross $32: 2$
group 52:6 74:20 80:2
85:9 92:11 97:22
groups 50:12 50:15
50:19 50:25 51:2 51:8
55:4 55:10
growth 11:7
guess 11:12 15:18
51:4 55:11 59:11 65:12
65:20 101:5 114:23
123:13 126:25
guidance 9:5 9:7 9:12
13:8 64:9 78:13 79:3
79:5 79:7 79:8 79:12
80:6 80:12 81:16 82:23
84:7 91:10 96:9 97:12
97:13 97:17 105:24
guide 53:25 78:6 84:11
106:11
guidelines 36:21 37:24

> - H -

Hall's 94:12
hallmark 18:21
hand 6:25 16:6 16:10
16:16 44:12 94:21
108:3 108:17 110:6
handles 66:12
hands 24:6 117:20
118:9
haplotype 62:10
happen $32: 3$ 49:17
60:17 71:15 119:15
124:4
happening 67:21 67:22
happens 34:14 49:18
harm 74:11
Hartmut 5:10 7:10
116:22
headache 49:11
health 11:14 14:24
24:9 27:2 29:9 12:2
51:22 64:19 65:13 70:9
74:11 102:17 116:6 124:2
heartily $58: 2$
heavily 44:13
height 107:9
helical 9:22
Helicobacter 44:7
helpful 38:3 102:24
115:13 117:19
helps 44:6 65:20 124:12
hepatocytes 81:2
hepatotoxicity 73:23
HER-2/NEU 53:2 53:8
53:13
HER-2 20:4 52:3 52:9
52:15
herbs $74: 18$
herceptin 20:3 52:13
heritage 55:7
heterogenous 50:21
heterozygotes 12:15
heterozygous 17:3
highest 105:16 122:24
123:14
highlight 78:4
highly 64:6
Hispanic 50:21
histone 61:25
history $25: 3 \quad 32: 5$
106:20
hits 36:17
HIV 67:4 68:11 68:13
68:21 103:16 108:17
homozygotes 12:14
homozygous-deficient 15:20
homozygous 17:2
17:10 33:9 33:17
hopefully $23: 12$ 60:9
124:3
Hospital 6:2 75:3 76:16
92:14
Howard's 68:8
Howard 5:16 7:5 54:7
54:18
Huang 8:23 73:2 73:6
100:14 101:9 101:12

103:23 104:19 107:25
108:2 108:24 110:16
113:10 113:20 114:5
114:22 115:9 115:24
116:17 117:23 118:14
118:25 122:20 123:12
huge 12:6 41:2 44:3
50:22 54:3 103:13
106:21
human 10:3 23:5 24:7
28:14 80:18 81:2
hundreds 57:24
hurdle 66:13
hyperkalemia 75:17
hypertension 59:6
hypoglycemic 75:21

## - I -

i.e $33: 23$

IC50 93:22
idea 18:19 57:6 68:15
115:22 118:8
identified 25:4
identify 18:20 21:23
identifying 14:16 16:14
ignore 64:19
II 80:6 98:8
III 120:24
ilk 62:25
illustrated 12:16
illustrates 12:3
illustrative 60:12
imagine 18:2 86:6
immediate 59:2 59:7
immensely 125:5
impact 7:15 9:12 9:14
11:14 28:3 30:6 62:8 123:11
impaired 45:24 46:3
102:8
implement 51:19
implemented 104:9
implementing 87:11
98:13
implication 42:17
implications 29:9 41:25
42:11 45:8 46:21 46:23
53:9 56:14 62:17 67:16 70:8
imply 42:12
importance 103:6
108:20
importantly 63:16
impossible 39:17 41:6
106:25
impractical 30:4
impressive 16:5
improve 13:11 13:24
14:25
improved 11:14 14:24
18:2 23:17 26:10
improving 8:15 8:25
9:15 10:24 17:17 26:16

27:2 28:4 59:12 60:2
imputed 7:13
inappropriate 53:11 incidence 16:1 54:2
54:25 63:18
included 23:7 27:4
30:22 38:17 38:24 50:3
54:17 79:25
incomplete 112:21
inconsistencies 104:23
inconsistency 100:7
incorporate 57:16
incorporated 18:5
increases 20:23
increasing 11:10 22:5
22:7 108:22
incumbent $31: 2$
IND 22:4 91:15
independent 100:5
index 90:24 91:20
92:5
Indian 55:8
Indiana 5:14 94:12
indicate 13:16 16:20
22:5 22:6 37:17 45:24
52:14 67:9
indicated 16:6 27:10
99:6 126:20
indicates 23:23 40:11
indicating 75:16 92:20
indications 11:767:8
individualize 46:19
individualized 37:17
37:18
individuals 5:8 74:16
85:9 85:9 110:4
INDS 22:10
induce 112:6 121:6
induced 94:13 95:4
99:8
inducer 78:24 80:22
81:6 81:15 82:24 83:4
99:6 112:12 120:2 120:5
inducers 96:11 99:5
111:4 111:7 111:8
111:12 112:15 119:12
119:15 120:7 120:8
inducing 121:21
induction 81:3 85:21
94:22 96:4 98:8 111:11
119:17
industrial 6:21
industry 71:14 84:22
inefficient 56:10
infancy 10:19
inflammatory 11:19
influence $46: 2,58: 13$
influencing 26:5
informally $99: 5$ 99:12
informative 27:7 27:16
114:25
informed 79:19 79:20
informs 10:15
ingredient 42:7
inhibit 93:14 93:21

94:15 108:15 121:5
inhibited 82:19 94:13
95:2
inhibiting 75:12 95:10
95:12 121:21
inhibition 83:25 86:23
93:23 $98: 8 \quad 108: 4 \quad 108: 21$
110:18 110:23 111:16
111:24 116:21 122:12
122:12
inhibitor 75:22 78:23
80:21 80:25 81:5 81:15
81:20 82:24 83:3 83:11
83:23 83:23 84:3 84:5
84:5 84:8 84:16 85:5
85:15 85:17 86:10 88:3
90:5 90:8 90:17 90:22
91:23 91:24 92:2 92:4
92:12 92:21 92:21 92:22
93:13 93:19 95:8 96:11
96:17 98:19 101:6
101:6 101:14 108:12
121:14 122:10
inhibitors 75:17 76:22
81:22 83:24 85:12 86:11
86:12 86:13 88:6 89:5
89:8 89:16 89:18 89:21
93:14 93:21 97:24 97:24
98:14 98:24 99:4 100:23
101:2 101:4 107:13
111:5 113:15 113:17
119:16 123:17
initial 69:5
initially 69:8 71:23
80:17 84:24 88:17 93:15
94:14
initiated 69:2
initiating 55:23
initiation 20:8 39:20
57:2
initiative $9: 3$ 21:19
78:4
initiatives 9:2
input 21:10 28:6 87:15
INR 59:10 60:25
INRS 61:8
insert 27:20 27:24
instance 43:7 43:10
103:13
instances 103:15
115:11
instantaneously 56:8
institutions 6:22 7:16
instruct 79:13
instrumentation 14:15
intake 95:11
integrate 29:20 29:24
integrating 26:2
integration 18:2 26:10
intellectual 125:5
intended 19:20 28:4
intensity $16: 22 \quad 17: 13$
intensive 68:13
interacting 79:18
interactions 8:20 32:14
44:25 63:14 63:15 73:15

75:16 76:8 76:15 77:2
77:6 77:8 77:21 78:5
78:22 87:21 87:23 89:3
93:8 93:10 94:17 96:15
96:20 99:25 104:3
104:10 106:22 113:6
118:22 119:5 119:9
interest 6:9 6:15 7:17
7:20 7:25 8:4 10:8 17:7
51:8 94:19
interested 94:18
interesting 9:18 10:5
11:5 22:19 76:3 95:5
Interestingly 20:17
interests 6:24 7:13
intermediate 12:16
internal 85:10 89:22
98:12
internally $87: 16$ 92:17
Internet 65:20
interplay 97:4
interpret 49:14 70:25
77:7 80:10
interpretation 70:21
71:4 71:12
interpreted 69:20 70:5
124:11
interpreting 48:11
67:12
interrupting 16:20
intervention 19:19
interventions 70:10
intestinal 83:21
intranet $80: 8$
intricately 124:10
introduce 5:8 43:2
43:12
introduced 77:19
introduction 8:9 8:17
introductory $8: 12$
13:8
investigated 27:12
investigations 25:17
investment 120:25
involve 6:21 7.23
involvement 8:5 96:23
105:3 105:4
involving 32:13
irrelevant 44:5 45:13
111:22
ischemic 73:24
isozymes 105:11
issues 6:18 6:19 6:20
13:11 15:12 16:19 19:14
20:13 26:23 33:2 33:18
35:20 35:20 36:4 36:20
37:5 56:24 58:6 73:8
74:12 79:10 97:14
112:19 112:25 121:10
124:21 125:11
items 5:7
itraconazole 84:15
89:14 92:9 94:9
IV 103:12 103:14

- J-

JAMA 24:11 59:18
75:4 93:6
John's 94:23 95:2 95:3
96:5 112:5 112:7
Journal 23:23 59:18
83:13
journals 25:22
juice 95:7 96:6 104:6
109:12 116:2 123:13
123:16 123:20 123:25
124:3
jumps 22:13
Jurgen 5:22 73:6
124:15
Jusko's 123:12
JUSKO 5:24 5:24 7:4

- K -

Kathleen 5:20 6:8 8:7
127:11 127:18
Kearns 7:5
Keeping 22:20
ketoconazole 82:18
84:15 84:16 86:15 88:3
88:11 89:13 92:9 93:15
93:17 94:6 100:16
104:25 114:10 122:23
123:3 123:5 123:7
key 78:15 79:24 80:19
102:22
Ki 105:5 105:10 105:13
105:16 105:20 106:15
kidding 126:11
Kim 95:6
kinds 120:19
kinetic 88:22
kinetics 47:24
kits 9:11 9:13
knocked 44:14
knowing 45:7 48:22
49:10 93:13
knowledge 23:18 42:20
46:3 124:11
knowledgeable 10:15
27:16
known 10:9 13:15
38:9 38:14 42:13 52:4
77:4 78:11 82:6 111:10

- L -
lab 36:19 36:22 66:11
66:11 70:22 71:10
labeled 85:14 114:17 labeling 19:16 38:24 39:24 52:13 52:25 66:18 73:9 76:9 76:10 76:14 76:19 76:23 77:19 77:24
78:3 78:5 78:8 78:9
79:19.79:21 81:6 82:3
82:10 84:25 85:5 87:14
89:4 89:13 90:25 91:23

91:25 92:2 92:9 92:12
92:24 94:5 98:14 98:18
99:3 99:13 102:14
112:6 112:8 114:16 116:9 117:20 124:2
labels 13:19 15:13
19:22 25:5 25:13 25:24
27:8 31:10 31:12 37:20 38:19 41:20 44:25 50:2 57:8 57:17 67:7 67:9 67:14
laboratories 65:5
laboratory 23:10 46:18
47:4 58:12 65:9 65:16
70:6
labs 69:19 71:5
language 19:3 19:6
31:14 33:3 34:8 55:18
55:19 64:10 64:12 89:4
100:8 100:11 100:21
languages 116:9
large-fold 81:19
largely 119:9
Larry 6:5 8:9 8:9 28:8
35:19 36:16 40:9 41:19 47:18 58:4 78:3 124:14
126:20 127:3
lastly $127: 3$
lasts 39:19
Laughter 126:8
leads 48:13
learn 10:20
LEE 6:6 6:6
left-hand 16:3
Leiden 57:3
lenton 75:12
LESKO 6:5 6:5 8:9 8:10
19:2 19:7 58:16 64:7
67:6 79:23 80:13 116:19
122:2 124:15 126:7
126:9
lessens 16:22
let's 15:15 22:20 38:20 51:15 63:18 65:6 72:25
leukemia 12:4 115:4
level 27:3 34:19 39:25
40:11 50:3 67:11 67:19
67:23 71:22 77:20 95:13
107:21 108:3 114:10
levels 67:12 69:22
72:5 94:16 95:9 95:21
96:6 113:6 119:18
Lew 71:25
Lewis 7:6
life-threatening 33:10
113:15 114:20
likelihood 14:23 96:18
97:7 113:17 115:19
limit 38:20 51:10
limitations 47:11
limited 51:22 52:12
99:17 121:20
linear 88:21
link 27:16 116:20
linkage 12:25 70:20 102:23
linked 69:18 69:21 124:10
linking 69:13 103:5
listed 60:21
literature 17:14 17:16
20:19 24:13 37:22 38:10
38:14 86:18 94:2 94:4
95:19 97:25
liver 34:14 34:16 34:23
34:25 35:3 46:24 73:23
83:21 106:10
location 27:24 27:25
31:5
locked 72:9
logical 19:16
logistics 127:10
looks 15:5 40:6 49:12
66:15
loss 41:11
Lots 49:10 53:15
lovastatin 91:9
luck 71:6
lung 13:11 52:11
lymphatic 12:4
lymphocytes 108:18

## - M -

macrolide $75: 11$ magnitude 49:16 main 63:19 78:22 mainly $91: 4$
maintaining 17:12
major 12:12 12:23
51:19 82:7 82:9 82:21
87:25 91:16 118:19
majority 28:19 28:20
65:15 68:5 69:4 118:3
managing 104:2
mandate 29:19
mandatory $20: 15$
manifested 83:25
Manual 79:12 98:5
98:7
manufacturer 38:13
manufacturing 14:15
MAPP 79:12 97:8
mapped 107:11
Marc 5:18 7:11
marked 54:8
Markers 9:8 120:17
120:23
market 37:25 73:12
73:20 74:5 77:14 77:20
78:21 91:14 91:17
marketing 26:9 71:8
marketplace 15:2
Mary's 68:9
Mary 7:11 40:13 58:2 70:19
matters 6:11 7:2 7:12 108:7
maximize 103:24
maximizing 103:2

Mcclellan 21:19
Mcleod's 46:15
Mcleod 5:16 5:16 7:5
32:25 36:8 45:19 48:19
50:9 51:24 55:3 62:9
70:17
meanings 10:17
meant 36:15
measure 67:23 70:23
71:5 71:11 71:23
measured 59:8 59:14
109:17
measuring 60:19 72:4
108:20 110:2
mechanisms 95:10
medical 29:25 51:6
61:3
medication 25:19 53:9 78:6
medications 69:22
115:16
medicine 10:7 14:9
23:23 24:24 25:8 29:3
30:6 33:20 33:23 36:19
36:23 53:11 53.23 59:18 70:22
medicines 46:19 53:19
meeting 5:3 5:6 6:15
6:17 6:18 10:22 17:19
19:8 19:11 20:20 20:21
64:9 87:5 87:7 92:18
94:11 95:7 97:19 98:12
101:25 120:11 125:13
125:14 125:21 125:25
126:22 127:5
meetings 87:3 99:18
Mei 8:23
Memphis 6:2
mention 9:3 32:20
45:23 49:22 52:19 80:14 83:15 92:3 92:15 126:16 mentioned 8:19 9:2
13:7 22:10 38:4 38:15 52:6 52:12 58:17 59:17 60:12 63:11 63:15 66:18
76:11 77:24 78:3 78:21
80:13 87:19 91:20 99:24 104:7 121:I1 123:13
mentioning 57:7
mercaptopurine 33:11 34:13 39:16
message 124:3
metabolic 12:21 35:11
78:14 79:6 121:6 121:7 121:14 122:13 122:15
metabolism 8:19 11:23
12:22 24:15 28:15 38:16 38:20 43:23 56:3 60:16
74:2 75:13 80:3 82:19
83:9 94:7 97:13 99:9
metabolite 122:6
metabolites 121:8
121:9 121:18 122:17
122:18 123:11
metabolize $42: 6$
metabolized 1314

24:14 24:17 24:19 59:23
78:16 82:8 91:4
metabolizer 42:12
44:11 44:20 44:21 48:2b 55:6 82:16
metabolizers 13:17
23:9 23:9 27:5 27:6
82:18
metabolizing 16:25
38:2 73:2 80:6 98:2
98:9
methodology 79:6
methylation 62:12 methylene 38:25
methyltransferase 11:24
metoprolol 59:6
Mexican 51:15
mibefradil 73:16
microorganism 75:12
76:11
microscope 125:10
midazolam 81:17 83:19
84:3 85:15 90:11 90:20
91:8 92:7 101:17 103:13
103:24 111:6 112:14
120:3
mild 39:8 84:7 92:22
milestone 10:11
milestones 9:20
milligram 117:25
118:2 121:12 121:12
121:13 122:9 122:10
milligrams 117:10
117:12
million $74: 8$
millions $13: 23$
mimicking 122:11
123:9
mimics 123:8
mind 14:14 17:7 22:20
33:4 34:9 34:24 35:10
50:15 121:4
mindful 82:13
minimal 94:7
minimize $72: 2$
minimum 108:16
minor 103:10
minority $30: 14 \quad 72: 17$
minute 102:7
missed 81:11
missing 55:12
mitigated 7:22
mls 102:7
modeled 88:16
moderate 84:6 86:10
86:11 88:6 89:16 89:18 89:21 92:3 92:21 97:24
$\begin{array}{llll}99: 7 & 100: 5 & 100: 9 & 100: 11\end{array}$
100:17 100:23 101:4
101:7 101:24 102:2
102:8 102:21 116:24
modification 110:21
modify 76:6
modulate $85: 12$
modulated 81:8
modulating 78:20 78:23 83:9
modulator 90:4 93:13
molecular 62:24 73:10
78:18 79:14 80:18 81:8 87:18 89:25 90:4 96:10 113:13 113:16
molecule 28:22
money 60:22
monitor 76:4
monitored 92:7
monitoring 61:766:11
67:11 67:18 67:24 68:2
68:6 69:19 69:20 70:2
70:6 70:12 70:13 70:18
71:23 110:22
month 9:19 75:4 83:12
months 39:19
morning's 21:15
mostly 96:17
moves 13:7
MS 5:20 6:10 127:13
127:17
MTHFR 57:4
multiple 11:21 37:13
41:25 43:24 85:22 85:24
86:7 94:25 119:14
120:11
Multiplex 9:7
mutant 12:24 16:6
17:10
mutation 27:17
Mutations 9:8 33:9 myelosuppression 39:17 39:18 39:19 myelosuppressive 39:14

$$
-\mathbf{N}-
$$

named 91:10
narcotics 53:18
narrow 90:24 91:5
91:19 92:5 96:18 109:8
NDA 22:4 78:10 79:25
87:12
NDAS 22:10 26:6
necessarily 14:6 19:19
22:5 46:13 61:20 64:6
67:23 72:9
needing 32:22 38:19
negative 47:14 53:12
81:20 82:25
negatives 15:19 47:13
nervous 58:9
nevertheless 12:8
42:21 109:22
newly $12: 3$
nice 58:5 60:8 111:5
night 9:23
NME 110:25 111:21
Nobody 107:16
non-methylation 62:12
non-mutations 28:14
non-silencing 62:12 non-specialized 65:14
none 12:14 42:8 65:3 nonspecific $34: 23$
96:17
normally $60: 24$
notable 54:16
notice 44:10

## - 0 -

OATP 75:24 95:10
95:16 97:4 109:10
objective $34: 11$
obliged 42:15
observation 106:5
observations 29:11
observe $39: 9$ 102:15
105:12 124:10
observed $37: 6$
obtained 7:7
obviate 83:7
obvious 28:16 44:12
44:24
Occasionally 118:6
occur 41:12
occurring $71: 9$
October 10:22 11:2
17:19 17:25 20:20 64:8
126:21 126:25
off-label 11:7 11:18
12:9
offers 34:22
office's 80:14
Office 7:9 73:3 76:24
106:18
officially $127: 16$
Ohio 6:3
older 25:14
omeprazole 44:4 44:9
oncology 11:9 11:16
one-half 123:22
Ontario 75:6
onto 70:23
opening 57:8
opens 41:17
operator 76:16
opinion 27:21 51:7
60:4 66:19 67:25
opinions $25: 25$ 68:9
125:8
opportunity 104:13
opposed 122:8
opposing 85:18
optimal 23:12 78:10
optimize 21:16
option 19:24 20:6
options 27:11
oral 103:24
ordered 34:16 51:25
66:9
orders 66:12
organic 75:25 95:10
organized 40:12
otherwise 33:6 34:3
46:12
ought 26:16 45:4 45:10
108:14
ourselves 38:20
outcome 14:20 14:20
14:24 33:8 33:25 37:8
80:11 115:10 116:2
outcomes 42:2
output 86:5
outrun 55:25
outstanding 35:19
overall 51:21 117:17
overcome 66:14
overdose 114:2
overexpression 20:4
overfeeding 49:13
overkill 31:8
overlap 70:12
overload 76:14 106:21
overnight 57:13
overreact 57:6
override 62:2
overrides 76:17
overt 20:9
overwhelming 57:14
oxycodone 42:19 42:22

- P -

P-gp-based 98:3
P-gp 75:10 76: 10 78:24
80:7 86:2 86:4 93:3
93:4 93:8 93:13 93:14
93:17 93:21 94:3 94:13
94:15 94:20 95:2 95:4
95:8 95:14 96:3 96:11
96:22 97:4 97:5 97:8
98:2 98:8 105:3 107:16
108:12 108:15 108:18
108:21 109:4 109:11
109:19 109:22 109:24
110:2 110:7 110:14
111:14 111:24 115:5
119:10
P450 28:12 76:2 77:3
78:12 78:15 78:24 80:5
80:19 3i:7 83:8 85:13
86:2 96:12 97:4 119:8
P450s 28:13 107:10
107:23 119:22
package 18:22 27:20
27:23 66:18 71:3
page 22:13
pain 42:23
pairs 99:14
Pakistani 55:8
Pandora's 56:19
panel 34:15 87:7 98:10
paper 75:9 83:17 89:12
89:22 110:13 119:18 122:21
paradigm 14:9 14:12
15:4 21:6 21:11 40:20

58:17 80:15
paradigms 83:5
parameter 90:13
parent 121:3 122:5
122:13 122:16
park 30:13
Parklawn 7:9
parlance 33:6
participants 7:25 8:3
participate 7:3
participated 87:8
parties 68:18
partly 31:9 106:9
partner 101:8 121:25
path 83:3
pathology 66:11
pathway 12:21 82:6
82:7 82:8 82:9 82:21
90:17
pathways 35:12 78:14
78:16 85:13 85:18 87:25
patient's 29:21 29:22
29:22 29:23 51:8 54:10 70:4
patient 15:20 17:3
18:15 18:20 29:21 31:14
32:8 39:4 39:9 39:12
39:15 44:9 44:13 45:9
53:11 53:22 56:9 57:14
63:3 67:19 69:13 70:12
70:13 71:3 71:20 81:10
100:3 102:7 102:10
patients 12:4 12:4
$\begin{array}{lllll}12: 11 & 12: 19 & 16: 7 & 16: 12\end{array}$
16:14 16:23 17:8 $19: 4$
19:24 21:24 23:24 27:8
30:12 $30: 15$ 32:22 $32: 24$
39:3 39:22 41:17 42:6
46:19 53:3 57:13 60:18
62:19 66:4 66:7 68:25
71:9 74:11 74:15 75:7
75:17 75:20 76:4 76:7
78:3 78:6 102:16 102:17
113:22 124:2
Patterns 9:8
pause 99:20
payback 120:25
PDR 24:25 67:7 94:5
pediatric 103:16 118:15
pediatrics 118:10
peer-reviewed 25:22
37:22
penetrance 33:6 35:21
36:6
penetration 113:11
percent 12:17 13:14
16:7 17:7 23:24 23:25 24:14 24:17 24:19 33:12
35:9 35:15 35:25 36:9
36:9 36:12 42:16 45:12 45:13 48:23 48:25 49:5
50:15 54:4 54:4 54:15 54:24 54:25 68:12 74:22 74:23-77:8 83:20 84:2 84:2 84:4 84:9 86:9 96:7 119:5

providers 102:17
116:7 124:2
provides 23:18
providing 57:12
prudent 7:16
PSA 30:7 30:13 51:25
PSC833 93:24
psychologists 61:l1
publication 96:2
publicly 87:13
publish 104:22
published 79:4 79:6
80:8 83:12 95:6 119:18
purine 34:17
purposes 19:23 21:8 25:11
push 122:12
puts 103:18
putting 40:9 40:14 43:23 46:22 48:11 48:16 50:7 50:8 50:12 102:12 115:15 115:18 125:10 - Q -
q.d 118:5

QT 73:21 101:20 122:21
QTC 91:6 91:16
qualitative $35: 3$
qualitatively 112:23
quality 30:23 65:8
66:2 68:16 76:25
quantification 121:23
quantitate 106:3
quantitative 28:20
34:11 77:12
quantitatively $48: 10$
quantum 29:15
question 19:20 23:14
24:4 26:6 26:22 27:3
27:22 30:21 37:8 40:18
43:8 47:18 55:18 59:11
59:17 67:15 80:21 80:23
81:4 82:7 95:14 97:3
101:23 103:9 103:10
104:7 107:8 111:2
1'13 115:24 116:20
123:13
questions 13:10 17:4
21:6 28:5 40:16 77:2
79:24 87:20 93:7 98:10
98: 11 99:22 99:23
103:11 124:5
quickly $43: 5$
quinidine/digoxin
108:8
quinidine $95: 20$

- R -
race $54: 9$
raise 61:17
raised 85:9
raises 24:4
randomly 24:18
ranges 67:8 86:18
ranging 11:20
rank 105:10 111:6
111:9
ranking 111:6 112:4
ranks 74:9
rapid 48:25
rapidly 56:18 58:3
rare 18:17 18:17 50:5
113:20
ratio 83:22 84:9 94:23
105:5 105:7
ratios 93:22
react $59: 7$
reactions 23:8 23:21
59:19
readily $46: 2 \quad 47: 17$
59:16
realistic 122:5
realistically 34:9
reasons 43:25 44:24
50:13 72:11 73:12 74:14
111:4 113:4
receive 19:25 39:15
receives 39:12
receiving 19:25 39:3
receptor 28:22 47:23
48:5
receptors $38: 22$ 38:23
Recess 72:24
recite $7: 16$
recognition 61:19
recognize 11:15 103:22
recognizing 27:7
recommend 67:10
81:15 97:5 99:18 106:3
107:21 107:23
recommendation 80:4
103:17 118:6
recommendations
87:14 125:8
recommended 53:21
80:16 82:23 84:24
recommending 84:13
106:11
reconyene $72: 23$
recorded 125:8
recovering 16:21
reduce 16:15 95:12
reducing 24:7
reductase 38:25
reduction 16:4 16:13
16:24 95:13
reductions $117: 16$
REEDY 5:20 5:20 6:8
6:10 127:13 127:17
refer 14:18 $38: 19$
reference 105:15
reflect 10:12 51:3 reflecting 33:22 125:14 reflects 22:25 52:15 64:3
regard 19:15 20:14

26:20
regardless 62:23
regards 99:23
regimen 20:12 39:9
39:13 39:21 76:6 86:20
118:4
regimens 39:12 39:22
regions 28:21
regular 61:3
regulating 68:17
regulation 61:20
regulatory $28: 20$ 61:22
85:2 124:23
reimburse 68:18
reimbursed 68:15
reimbursement 67:17
69:17
relate $16: 2383: 11$
110:10
related 6:10 9:20 22:14
22:16 23:8 24:2 33:19
38:16 43:19 57:14 61:20
74:9 74:12 75:19 75:24
76:20 76:22 83:15
108:18 121:2 123:10 124:12
relates 9:6 9:13 21:18
27:22 31:7 119:13
relating 103:10
relation 31:22
relationship 77:11
80:11 87:23 88:16
113:9 116:25
relationships 122:6
relatively $13: 21 \quad 15: 9$
17:11 19:18 20:13 23:11
30:9 30:10 32:4 32:4
39:8 50:5 65:21 69:15
109:21 120:24
released 9:5
relevance 21:18 100:2
relevant 40:18 49:12
52:25 56:2 57:7 100:9
101:11 101:11 110:13
reliable 15:17
relies 109:24
Relling 7:11 35:18
37:3 46:15 52:16 57:22 65:11 69.! ( $113: 13$
113:25 114:14 114:23
115:13 116:10 117:14
118:8
reluctant 111:8
rely 15:18
remain 17:4 89:10
remaining 12:25 19:14
remarkable 30:12
40:22
remarks 13:8 124:14
124:16
remind 18:23 19:9
renal 45:24 45:25 46:3
46:20 46:23 62:15 82:8
102:6
reportable 38:11
reporting $21: 21$
reports $26: 9$ 38:5 59:20
74:8 75:10 93:11
represent 17:23 18:11
106:10 124:17
representative $15: 25$
64:12
request $7: 8$
requests 35:24
require 7:12
requirement 29:13
requiring $122: 8$
resistance 69:9
resistant 120:19
respective 73:13
respond 40:16 42:11
59:4
responds $53: 22$
response 59:2 59:7
59:16 72:21 88:10 88:16
100:18 113:24 114:8
114:8 122:4 122:5
122:6 123:10
responses 88:15
responsibility $43: 9$ 66:5
responsible 127:10
resulting 23:3
retire 127:12
retrospective $13: 16$
15:11 104:13
review 73:10 76:25
79:16 79:22 79:25 80:15
80:16 84:22 87:19
108:5 116:11 121:17
reviewed 73:21 108:4
reviewer's 79:12
reviewer 106:11
reviewers 79:13 80:8
80:16 97:8
revise 97:12
revising $41: 2$
revision 10:10 97:15
revolves 59:11
rhabdomyolysis 73:25
rheumatoid 11:20
rich 23:11
Richard 95:6
Rifabutin 99:6 99:10
112:2 112:7 112:10
rifampin 94:23 96:4
$\begin{array}{llll}99: 6 & 99: 8 & 112: 2 & 112: 7\end{array}$
112:10 119:19 119:24
120:3
rifapentine 99:7 $112: 3$
right-hand 16:10
rightfully 99:25
risk-benefit $26: 5$
risk 12:13 13:2 13:18
21:12 36:11 36:14 43:10
60:15 62:20 63:3 70:10
72:2 77:20
risks 70:9
ritonavir 85:19 112:3
RNA 119:18
robust 49:6 50:7 50:24
62:21

Rockville 126:13
role 18:9 51:19 109:23
110:15
roof $60: 17$
room 7:9 75:2
rounded 102:2
rounds $85: 10$ 87:2
87:16 92:17
route 103:22
routine 99:19
rubric 58:5

- S -

SADEE 6:3 6:3 7:5
18:25 19:5 28:10 38:17
41:14 45:6 49:19 51:9
55:21 57:18 61:17 68:11
69:7 71:16 109:15
124:7
safe 88:19 88:25 117:7
126:13
safeguarded 56:22
safely 103:19
safety/efficacy 77:10
safety 59:3 73:12 84:18
89:2 89:7 89:20 117:9
121:10 121:15
San 5:13
saturate 60:16
save $53: 11$
scale 111:7
schedule 61:6
scheduled 72:23
scheme 106:20 106:22
Science 6:12 13:7 13:24
24:24 29:3 64:3 79:23
87:4 111:3 111:23
scientific 19:14 38:9
85:10 87:2 87:15 92:17
sclerosis 11:21
screen 50:2 107:22
screened 6:24 81:11
screening 15:15 17:21
19:19 67:23 68:2 68:10
107:21 108:22 108:24
screens 104:10 104:17
se $18: 14$
sea 57:14 57:18 57:20
58:10 58:15
search 24:25
searched 67:7
searches 26:4
Secretary 6:8 127:10
sections 37:13
sedation 113:4
seeing 53:22 56:19
85:23 94:18 96:12
103:13 107:15
segue 21:8
selected 22:22 24:18 26:9
selectivity $36: 13$
send 71:10 71:11

110:13
sensitive $36: 23$ 45:15
81:16 81:19 81:24 83:11
90:9 90:11 90:23 91:3
91:8 91:11 91:18 92:6
92:23 98:16 101:13
101:14 101:17 105:15
sensitivities $44: 22$
sensitivity $30: 10 \quad 36: 9$
68:24 68:24
sensitize 102:16
sensitized 101:21
separate $30: 2432: 17$
47:7 63:13
separating 35:22 37:5 41:7
sequence $14: 17$
sequences 10:19
seriously 29:10
session 21:15 118:18
setting 55:21 56:25
119:4
severe 33:10 39:16
113:20 114:12
severely $102: 8$
SGES 7:3
share 9:24 11:2 96:8
Sheiner 7:6 71:25
Shiew-mei 73:2 73:5
99:21 106:18 124:13
Shiew 8:22
shot $32: 23$
showing 74:14 75:23
89:18 93:20 94:12 94:19
95:8 96:5 96:7 119:18
shows 16:3 16:11 16:12
17:7 74:25 105:17
shutting 122:18
sign 126:17
signaling 28:22
significance 77:7 77:9
87:22 90:3 90:14
significant 9:12 25:4
41:10 49:9 111:15
113:22 116:12
significantly 109:9
signs 20:9
sildenafil $92: 8$
silencing 61:24 62:12
silly 118:10
similarly 24:16 85:25
simpler 19:5
simplistically 34:24
simvastatin 90:15
91:9
sites 65:7
situations 54:6 54:17
68:5 68:7 70:19 71:2
115:14
skewed 41:4
SLC 109:20 119:20
slew 56:15
slide 11:5 11:17 12:2
12:2 35:22 63:9 125:11
slides 58:17 114:24
smaller 22:17
smell 66:25
smoking 43:11
smooth 127:11
SNP 61:21 62:5
SNPS 12:23 56:2 56:7
56:13 57:24 61:23
so-called 13:17 79:11
Society 87:6
softly $91: 6$
somehow 35:6
someone 32:7 36:11
36:13 48:23 50:13
sorry 109:5 126:24
sorted 34:6
sounds 36:3 118:10
speakers 79:10
speaking 23:11
specialized $65: 13$
specifically $8: 14 \quad 14: 11$
37:24 48:8 48:9 50:2
54:12 108:13
specificity/sensitivity 36:20
specificity $30: 1036: 10$
36:13
spectrum 70:18
spend 125:13
spoken 15:20
sponsor 79:18 90:10
90:18 93:16 96:25 99:8
105:9 105:13 105:25
114:7 119:3
sponsors 6:21 78:14
95:19 96:19 116:17
standardized 80:4
standards 26:15 30:17
30:19 30:19
standpoint 113:8
star 28:17
starting 5:8 26:24
78:7
starts 55:5 56:24
stated 76:8 76:10
statement 6:9 37:4
44:19 120:6 123:20
States 50:10 54:20
61:4
statins 81:18 123:19
station 9:25
status 29:22 70:4
steady $95: 22$
sterling 106:19
Steve 94:12 108:4
stick 62:25
stops 70:23
straightforward 15:9
strategies 21:15
Straterra 22:23
stratification 13:2
strike $67: 22$
strikes $67: 24$
strongly 115:15
structure 9:22 14:10
studied 30:2 48:8 54:19
55:20 96:15 96:24 97:6
113:24 117:8
studies 63:17 75:23
82:17 83:8 84:12 86:17
86:17 94:3 94:24 104:12
104:17 $112: 24113: 7$
120:13 120:15 120:19
stuff 36:21 71:5 71:11
sub-ethnic 54:19
Subcommittee 5:6 6:11 127:19
subjects 55:13
submission 23:16 78:11
submissions 22:7 22:14
116:11
submit 79:20
submitted 26:6 65:3
submitting 7:8
subsequent 8:18 99:18
substrate 22:24 59:9
80:21 80:25 81:25 82:5
82:15 82:15 82:17 83:11
83:20 83:22 84:13 85:20
86:2 86:2 87:18 87:25
88:2 90:12 90:24 90:24
92:23 93:16 93:17 94:3
94:4 95:15 95:17 96:3
96:11 100:15 101:17
102:24 103:5 109:2
109:4 109:7 111:10
111:24 115:5 115:6
122:22
substrates 26:23 81:16
81:24 85:5 85:16 85:23
85:25 85:25 86:3 86:3
86:23 86:24 90:3 90:9
90:23 90:25 91:4 91:8
91:11 91:19 91:19 92:6
92:8 98:17 98:17 99:2
99:4 101:13 101:15
107:12 107:21 108:22
succeeded 124:25
success 104:16
suffering 24:8
sufficient 17:16 54:14
54:15 72:6 97:6 121:19
sufficiently 66:25
suggest 47:25 72:3
72:22 117:15
suggestions $36: 18$
97:20
suitable 64:11 91:10 95:16
sulfotransferases
119:22
summarized 20:14
36:16
summarizing $35: 20$
summary $19: 11$
supplement $81: 9$
supplemental 82:4
supplements 74:18
79:20
support 84:18 88:19
89:2 111:10
supporting 89:10
surprise 60:20
surprised 114:19
surrogate $120: 17$
surrogates 120:16
120:18
survey 109:16
surveys 96:8 96:13
survival 16:23
susceptibility 43:8
susceptible 74:20
SWADENER 5:18 5:18 7:11
synthase $38: 24$
system 45:16 45:17
76:21 83:14 84:21 84:25
86:6 86:14 86:15 86:21
88:4 88:7 92:14 93:25
97:16 97:18 98:14 98:23
98:24 99:13 99:14
100:4 103:23 104:19
105:23 112:11 119:24
120:8
systematic 25:21 26:22
systemic $63: 24$ 112:25
113:2 118:19 122:13
122:16
systems 76:16 97:20
102:13 104:11

## - T -

takes 39:2 59:3 60:7
talked 11:22 17:21
21:14 21:20 35:22 37:19
87:3 99:8 125:22
talking 19:13 30:11
32:7 35:11 35:21 37:22
44:24 46:4 47:9 62:10
62:21 63:5 63:6 65:10
79:5 90:3 106:23 107:25
111:16 118:21 122:4
talks 31:16 31:17 79:24
taped 9:24
target 13:21
targets $38: 23$
task 13:3 115:18
team 70:24 79:17
121:17
technology 55:2.5
telling 114:11
tells 18:16 18:18 47:10
tempered 120:6
template 28:24
tend 96:19
tens 57:24
tentative 125:22
tentatively $126: 21$
Terfenadine 73:15
terminology 68:3
terribly $107: 2$
terrific 9:23 40:5
tested 31:8 53:3
testing 19:22 20:15
20:18 30:14 30:23 31:4
34:4 34:13 34:18 34:21
34:24 35:15 36:3 36:8

39:10 47:15 52:18 52:19 53:2 53:6 53:8 53:8 53:15 53:15 53:20 57:2 57:16 58:7 63:12 65:5 65:6 65:22 66:8 66:14 66:15 69:18 69:25
Tests 9:7 13:6 15:2
15:21 19:12 21:23 23:10 29:15 30:4 30:7 30:11 30:13 30:19 30:20 30:25 31:16 32:5 33:5 34:10 34:16 34:23 35:4 35:24 36:22 47:17 57:2 58:11 58:12 58:13 60:9 62:24 63:22 64:12 65:3 65:13 65:14 65:16 65:17 66:15 67:2 68:16 69:22 70:4 70:8 107:13
tetrahydrofolate 38:25
text 10:14
texts 10:14
Thank 6:7 8:7 8:10
28:8 99:21 110:16
124:13 127:17 127:18
thankfully $71: 8$
Thanks 28:7 73:6
124:15 125:19 125:19
126:12 127:7
theophylline 67:24
90:19
therapeutic 10:7 23:13
60:14 60:17 61:6 66:11
67:8 67:13 67:18 67:20
68:6 69:19 70:5 70:17
90:24 91:5 91:19 92:5
96:18 97:2
therapeutics 13:24
21:16 26:3 26:10 27:2 58:21 87:6
therapies 8:15 9:15
$\begin{array}{lllll}10: 24 & 11: 13 & 13: 12 & 17: 18\end{array}$
21:22 23:16 23:19 26:16
therapist 39:6
therapy $16: 21 \quad 17: 13$
20:8 23:20 36:15 39:20
40:4 57:19 59:2 59:13
60:2 68:11 68:13 68:23
68:25 69:7 69:21 70:13
70:11
thiopurine 10:25 11:23
39:13 58:23
thiopurines 33:17
34:21
thorough 38:4
though 33:21 36:8
44:8 52:9 105:19
thoughtful 70:20 71:4
thoughts $65: 9$
thousand 25:5
three-fourths 22:15
threshold 62:15
throw 54:9
thymidylate $38: 24$
tie 118:9
tied 117:20
timed 61:6
tissue 71:10 96:21
tissues 80:19 109:17
110:11 113:2
titrated 101:19
titrating 59:24 59:25
titrator 59:14
today's 8:9 9:17
token 110:24
tolerated 17:8
toleration 17:1.1
tolterodine 82:17
tomorrow 63:6
tool 24:6
tools 62:23
topic 8:9 8:13 8:17 8:18
10:23 19:7 21:18 72:23
73:8
topics 6:18 6:25 7:15
26:18
Toronto 87:5 97:19
torsade 73:19 114:21
totally $36: 16$ 40:13
towards 24:7 24:20
31:12
toxic 21:25
toxicity $12: 13 \quad 16: 5$
16:7 $16: 1416: 22 \quad 20: 9$
21:14 24:4 33:10 33:18
33:20 33:22 36:11 39:4
39:10 62:20 73:22 75:8
113:12 113:15 121:20
TPMT-DEFICIENT
39:14
TPMT 11:24 12:15
13:21 14:13 15:15 17:10
18:9 19:10 20:18 20:23
33:8 33:16 34:22 34:24
36:14 38:12 39:10 44:20
48:21 53:5 53:14 58:23
66:14 69:24
transcript 18:23 126:3
transfer 127:14
transition 65:2
translatable 25:7
translate 120:4
translated 63:20
translating 14:9 24:23
29:2 115:2
translation 10:6
transport 35:12 94:15
108:21 108:25 109:17
transported 109:10
transporter-based 8:20
99:16
transporter 47:24
48:5 93:3 95:11 95:11
108:6 109:14 112:19
transporters 38:2 38:22
76:2 80:7 81:11 85:14
93:2 94:20 104:17
107:9 107:14 107:22
108:22 109:6 109:18
109:19 109:21 110:10
110:13 113:5 119:10
119:19 119:20 119:21
transporting 75:25
treat 46:17 57:13 95:3
101:16
treating 44:7 115:3
treatment 14:25 16:22
39:5 48:14 95:23 95:24
tremendous 74:7
trend 22:4 55:23
trends 11:10
trial 27:13 59:15 59:15
trials 13:16 32:13 69:2
117:8
triazolam 91:8
trip 126:13
trivial 56:13 76:15
troglitazone 73:24
true 15:22 21:4 45:20
121:22
Tuesday 126:21 126:25
tumor 52:7 52:10
two-drug 39:8
typical 28:12
typically $59: 22$

- U -
U.s 50:11 50:17 51:2

73:11 74:10
UGT1A1 57:1
UGT 93:2
UGTS 119:21
ultra 48:24 55:5
unattainable $30: 18$
uncertainties 64:4
unclear 114:24
uncomplicated 39:8
uncovered 22:4
underlined 91:7 91:13
underpin 15:6
unexpected 82:11
unfortunately 120:5
uniform 57:15
unique 10:13
University 5:10 5:12
5:15 5:17 5:23 5:24 6:4
unless 111:9 111:19
112:16 114:19
Unlike 6:19 21:14
96:11
unrealistic 35:10 36:10
unusual 28:16 71:21
update $99: 17$
updated 76:13
upper 117:10
usage 22:5
useful 34:25 36:24
37:9 37:11 37:14 40:23
44:6 50:12 50:13 54:18
54:22 55:15 57:12 62:13
63:4 71:13
useless $60: 7$
user 18:22
uses 10:16 11:7
usual 16:7 36:19 45:8
utility $14: 22 \quad 15: 8 \quad 15: 9$


