withdrew their consent because they didn't want to have the
3 times weekly injections.

One has to appreciate that at the time of 3 initiation of this trial, it was not clear to the patients 4 what their potential benefit of this therapy would be, and 5 therefore the threshold, at least that was the risk a 6 priori -- the threshold for withdrawal from the trial would 7 be low. That has not materialized, fortunately, because 8 withdrawal in total -- and I'll get back to that later --9 was not considerable. 10

A little bit about demographics. As I said before, stratification by center was done, but not by the more relevant risk factors. However, with this number of patients, 499, it balanced out beautifully. Differences were very small. There was no statistical difference, for example, for the more powerful of the risk categories that we have used, which is Breslow thickness.

Further to Dr. Buzaid's presentation, you see 18 here the categories of Breslow tumor thickness. Our 19 patients in this stage II melanoma patient population 20 consisted of patients with tumor thickness of 1.5 21 millimeters and more. This should be looked at in 22 categories and not as a continuous variable because, 23 obviously, these subcategories follow in some ways 24 anatomical boundaries. 25

This is one of the busiest slides that I'm 1 going to show this afternoon, and it will take me some time 2 to guide you through it, but this is guite a crucial slide 3 for the message of the presentation. 4 This is the long-term analysis on eligible 5 patients for disease-free interval, and disease-free 6 interval, the time from initiation of therapy to relapse, 7 the difference remains significant. This analysis was done 8 when a median time to follow-up existed of 4.4 years. That 9 means that the first patients were up to 7 years in the 10 trial and the last patient entered 36 months. 11 The time to 25 percent relapse -- and I do not 12 show that on the slide here -- was 1.3 years in the 13 observation arm and 2.1 years in the Roferon arm, a rather 14 remarkable reduction of 25 percent, or 10 months. 15 The p value for the Kaplan-Meier estimates, as 16 you see here, is .035. 17 The number of relapses in the Roferon arm in 18 total was 100; in the observation arm, 119; a difference of 19 19. 20 Last but not least -- and that is perfectly 21 justified by the protocol -- if one would do a cutoff 22 analysis, something that most simple people like myself 23 would understand better, if one would do a cutoff at 3 24 years, then the percentage of withdrawals here would be 32 25

percent and 49 percent in the observation arm, a difference of 17 percent. With stratification by center, that carries a p value of .005.

Breslow thickness, as presented before by Dr. Buzaid, is a powerful risk parameter or prognostic factor. We show this slide here today of the Kaplan-Meier estimates for the specific subsets of Breslow thickness only to show that the impact, the effect, for all categories is similar.

9 I also need to inform you that there was no 10 interaction between this risk parameter and the outcome as 11 disease-free interval, nor was there any interaction 12 between age and sex and this outcome parameter.

Before I start explaining this slide, it's my task to bring across to you that this study was never designed to evaluate overall survival. I'll try and explain that.

A sequential analysis was performed and a 17 triangular design was used. That means that 18 discontinuation of recruitment into the trial was done at 19 the moment in time that there were enough events to answer 20 the guestion about disease-free interval. By nature of 21 22 things, there will always be more events such as relapses Therefore, it is a little bit unreasonable to 23 than death. expect that one would be able to show a difference for an 24 outcome parameter which has less events like death. 25

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

As it happens, we come close with a p value of 0.059. But the only thing we can conclude from that is that there is a strong trend.

However, as I said before, there is a robust
correlation between disease-free interval and overall
survival, and I will get back to that when I conclude this
talk.

8 There were 59 deaths in the Roferon arm in this 9 analysis and 76 deaths in the observation arm. It's 10 obvious that at 6 years, at the tail end of the curve, like 11 with the other curve, there are few patients in the 12 analysis simply because median follow-up time here as well 13 was 4.4 years.

Dr. Buzaid showed a slide in his presentation where he put together disease-free interval or time to relapse and overall survival. Sorry. This is disease-free interval obviously for both and here is overall survival.

I would like to show to you what the difference is between the two with regard to events. 100 relapses in the Roferon arm, 119 in the observation arm. 59 deaths in the Roferon arm, 76 in the observation arm. One difference of 19. One difference of 17.

I think that the crux of my argument for this afternoon is that if we manage to delay or prevent recurrence in this disease, it is possible that we may

1 delay death as an event. I think that that is an important
2 thing to keep in mind.

The shapes of these curves are similar, but that's the only thing I can say about them.

It's very important for a regimen that has to 5 be continued for 18 months that tolerability is more than 6 We have looked at the adverse event pattern of 7 acceptable. this dose used in this study, 3 million units 3 times a 8 week, and we have concluded that the pattern of adverse 9 events that we observed is not different from the pattern 10 of adverse events that we see with the use of this drug in 11 other indications. 12

There are no surprises and there are no events that suggest the sort of toxicity that one would relate to a higher dose of this drug that we have also seen in other studies with our drug in the past.

So, here you see the percentages of the
patients with flu-like symptoms, asthenia, headache,
nausea/vomiting, depression, and dizziness being the most
commonly reported adverse events in this trial.

If we then look at the percentage of patients with grade 3-4 toxicity, then these percentages are low. Again, this is a well-established safety profile that we know and have seen several times before with the use of this drug.

What is important to show, however, is that 1 there is a certain withdrawal rate, and this withdrawal 2 rate is 14 percent. 35 patients withdrew from treatment 3 over the course of 18 months. The majority of these 4 withdrawals happened around the 1-year time point. More 5 6 importantly, they were for events such as asthenia, flu-7 like symptoms, dizziness, depression, usually grade 1-2. 8 There were 9 patients, though, with grade 3-4 that withdrew, and you see them described here. There were 2 9 10 patients withdrawn for severe increases in liver enzymes.

I will now move on to discuss the study that 11 formed the supportive data for this application, the study 12 13 performed by the Austrian Melanoma Group. Recruitment took place between 1990 and 1994, roughly in parallel with the 14 15 French study. This was also a prospective, randomized, 16 multi-center trial. Patients had Breslow tumor thickness of 1.5 millimeters and more, in other words, clinically 17 node-negative patients, exactly the same patient population 18 19 as we had in the other study.

The primary efficacy parameter was also the same, disease-free interval, time from initiation of therapy to relapse.

The dose was the same, the regimen slightly different, and the treatment duration was different. 3 million units were given 5 times weekly, once daily for 5

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

days, for a duration of 3 weeks, sort of an induction
 regimen. The maintenance part was, however, the same as I
 described for the previous trial.

I base this part of the presentation on the publication database. The data that I've presented and present from the publication, this publication has a patient number of 311: 154 in the Roferon arm, 157 in the observation arm. There is currently a database that has 330 patients, as 19 CRFs were collected after the publication cutoff.

Demographics. Again, I show Breslow thickness as a risk parameter only, and here as well, whereas there was no stratification for this parameter, both arms are well balanced. There is certainly no statistically significant difference between the two. There are only small differences that are not clinically relevant.

These are the Kaplan-Meier estimates for this study, also for disease-free interval. Here you see the observation arm. Here you see the Roferon arm.

This analysis was done in September 1995 when patients had been in the study for at least 1 year and observed and followed up for at least 1 year. So, recruitment took 3 years, 154 here and 157 on the other side.

25

37 patients relapsed in the Roferon arm, 57 in

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

1 the observation arm. The p value was less than .05. 2 Here you see our overall conclusions. We have 3 seen parallel efficacy in two independent studies with 800 4 and more patients in these studies all together. The reduction in recurrence rates or time to 5 recurrence of 25 percent in our view is clinically 6 7 meaningful. This translates into prolongation of diseasefree interval of 9 to 10 months. 8 The time to 25 percent 9 relapse in the French study, in the pivotal study, was 1.3 10 years in the observation arm and 2.1 years in the Roferon 11 If we cut off at 3 years, 32 percent of patients have arm. relapsed in the Roferon arm and 44 percent in the 12 observation arm. 13 14 We have seen a strong trend towards increase in

overall survival that is properly correlated with the increase we have seen that is statistically significant for disease-free interval.

18 This drug has a well established safety 19 profile. The withdrawal rate over 18 months in this study 20 was low. It was 14 percent, but in view of the fact that patients did not know exactly what their advantage was 21 22 going to be, this was very reasonable. The drug was therefore well tolerated. Patients could continue with 23 24 work and lead an essentially normal life. This is 25 important for a prophylaxis regimen and a regimen that

relies on compliance and has to be maintained for 18
months.

3 We designed low dose Roferon-A for a situation whereby there's a low tumor burden and an intermediate to 4 high risk of recurrence. What this therapy does is it may 5 prevent or delay the dreadful moment of disease recurrence. 6 It may, therefore, delay death as visceral metastases 7 8 directly lead to death within 12 to 18 months. 9 We, therefore, recommend low dose interferon 10 alpha 2a, otherwise called Roferon-A, therapy as adjuvant 11 therapy of stage II melanoma patients. These are patients 12 with clinically node-negative melanoma. This translates 13 into a Breslow tumor thickness of more than 1.5 millimeters. We recommend a treatment duration of 18 14 15 months. This brings me to the end of my presentation. 16 17 Thank you. DR. SCHILSKY: Thank you very much. 18 Are there questions from the committee members 19 for the sponsor? Dr. Raghavan? 20 21 DR. RAGHAVAN: These are two quite large sets 22 of data and you're asking us to accept disease-free 23 interval as a good surrogate of overall survival. 24 The one thing that troubles me and puzzles me 25 is the time of recruitment to these two trials was for the

French trial January 1990 to December 1993, and the 1 Austrian trial sometime in 1990 to 1994. By my 2 calculations, you should have follow-up data conservatively 3 to 9 years and maybe to 10 years, and yet the survival 4 curves that you present show weak power out at 6 years. 5 So, effectively you're presenting old data that haven't 6 7 been updated and yet asking us to accept disease-free survival rather than overall survival. Could you clarify 8 why that is? 9

DR. HOOFTMAN: I would not immediately agree with that. With this proposal for this therapy in an indication of stage II melanoma, median time to death is 7 to 8 years. Our median follow-up is 4.4 years. We are, however, getting closer to the moment in time where we could produce longer follow-up data.

16 DR. RAGHAVAN: No. I'm sorry. I guess I asked 17 the question without clarity and I apologize.

I understand what you just said, but the 18 reality of the situation is that even your disease-free 19 survival curves, unless I'm misinterpreting them, don't go 20 out to the full time that would be eligible for the 21 duration of follow up. It looks to me like the data that 22 you've shown us, whether they're disease-free or total 23 survival, are old data. I can't understand if you had 24 patients entered in 1990 who you propose are still alive, 25

which I hope is the case, why the survival curves have so 1 2 few cases at 6 years that are still going. It doesn't make 3 sense to me. Why have you censored at 6 years? Why do the 4 5 curves not go out at least to the 9-year point? DR. SCHILSKY: Would you please identify 6 7 yourself? DR. WASSNER: I'm Elizabeth Wassner. 8 I'm 9 working in oncology in Basel. 10 The dossier has been submitted two years ago. These are the data that you reviewed. 11 12 Now, if we look at 5-year survival data, which is actually a reliable time point in the study, we've got a 13 14 p value of 0.021, which is even more significant than what 15 we've presented here. 16 DR. SCHILSKY: Can we just clarify that perhaps 17 by hearing a brief summary of the registration history? 18 You just said that the materials were submitted two years ago and that that's the data that we're reviewing today. 19 20 DR. WASSNER: Yes. DR. SCHILSKY: 21 Since you originally submitted the data two years ago, have you provided any update to 22 those data? 23 24 DR. WASSNER: We haven't been requested to do 25 that, but it is planned, of course, to look longer into

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

these data. But right now this is the data we have, and we're actually claiming overall disease-free survival and this is, I think, mature data. Overall survival, of course, would request 10-year follow-up in this population, and an end of recruitment, which is December 1993. 10-year data are still far away.

MS. da SILVA: Just to clarify the regulatory 7 8 history of the submission, we originally submitted our 9 application of September 1997 and the year time clock for 10 acting on that with FDA was in September of 1998 when we received questions and responses from them. We then took 11 into account their comments and resubmitted a response in 12 March of 1999, which included a second study with the 13 Austrian publication, and then we are here before you 14 today, of course. We were notified in July, so we have not 15 16 submitted an update as of yet.

DR. SCHILSKY: Thank you.

17

18

Other questions? Dr. Nerenstone.

DR. NERENSTONE: I'm not familiar at all with these clinical trials groups. We're usually given a little bit more information about frequency of follow-up or how patients are clinically staged. That's sort of important in a study where it's a disease-free interval difference that you're looking at. Can you tell me how often these patients are followed and what kind of tests are done,

1 whether liver function tests are done, CT scans, or 2 clinical, and how often that interval is? DR. HOOFTMAN: Can I please defer this guestion 3 4 to Professor Grob who was the lead investigator of this trial? 5 6 PROFESSOR GROB: Jean-Jock Grob, dermatology, 7 France. 8 Both groups were followed exactly in the same 9 way. People were examined every 3 months and they 10 underwent CT scan and x-ray explorations every 6 months, 11 exactly in the same way in the two groups. DR. NERENSTONE: And were laboratory 12 evaluations done as well at every 3-month follow-up? 13 14 PROFESSOR GROB: Yes. 15 DR. NERENSTONE: Were CNS relapses considered 16 relapse? 17 PROFESSOR GROB: Yes. DR. SCHILSKY: Could I just pursue that before 18 19 you sit down? Because, as I understand it, the follow-up was done for 36 months according to the protocol, and then 20 21 there was an effort made I guess by the company to then 22 ascertain again the clinical status of all the patients 23 sometime after the protocol-prescribed follow-up was completed. 24 25 So, can you tell us something about what the

follow-up of the patients was in that interval of time from when the protocol-specified follow-up ended until the data were collected again from all the participating sites? Did the investigators continue to follow the patients on the same schedule? Do we have a way of verifying in fact that they were followed on the same schedule with the same tests being done at the same intervals on both arms?

8 PROFESSOR GROB: Well, I would say that we were 9 out of the limits of the protocol, but most patients were 10 followed exactly in the same way and some were followed 11 more closely because the follow-up protocol is a little bit 12 less tight than the usual process in France. The only way 13 to check it would be to come back to the files because a 14 point was made after.

15 DR. SCHILSKY: Yes. It is a bit of a concern because the ascertainment of relapse status in a sense 16 could be very unbalanced in that interval of time when the 17 18 protocol was no longer necessarily being followed. Since that's the primary endpoint that we're looking at here, I 19 20 think we have some concern about whether in fact patients were followed exactly in the same way. It was an unblinded 21 There could have been biases in favor or against 22 study. 23 the treatment that were in the minds of the physicians or the patients. 24

25

Okay. Other questions from the committee? Dr.

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

1 Johnson?

2	DR. JOHNSON: I think I read and understood Dr.
3	Hooftman's presentation to say that the pivotal trial was
4	designed without consideration of the usual prognostic
5	factors being used for stratification purposes. I believe
6	that was correct. Is that correct?
7	DR. HOOFTMAN: I wouldn't say without
8	consideration, but there was no stratification for the more
9	powerful risk categories such as Breslow, nor for age or
10	sex. However, as I showed you on the slide, there was no
11	imbalance between the two.
12	DR. JOHNSON: I won't be too melodramatic, but
13	I'm very surprised that a study of this size undertaken at
14	the time that this was would have done that, to be honest.
15	I'm just very surprised. This is not new information
16	really. I just don't understand why a trial of this size
17	would be undertaken without proper consideration of known
18	prognostic factors.
19	What you showed us was a Breslow depth. You
20	haven't shown us the other prognostic factors I don't
21	believe.
22	DR. HOOFTMAN: Can we call up these? We have
23	some backup slides, with permission.
24	I can already start and answer the question.
25	There was no imbalance at all with regard to the risk

categories of Breslow tumor thickness, age, sex, location 1 of primary or pathology. 2 DR. JOHNSON: Do you have location? 3 4 DR. HOOFTMAN: Here you see depicted the sites of melanoma or location of primary. 5 DR. SCHILSKY: Anything else you want to see, 6 David? 7 Well, I want to ask a 8 DR. JOHNSON: Yes. 9 couple of other questions. You gave us the overall survival data and you 10 mentioned the number of deaths, but I don't recall. Were 11 all of those deaths due to melanoma? 12 DR. HOOFTMAN: No, they were not all due to 13 14 melanoma. DR. JOHNSON: Can you give us the causes of 15 16 death on the two arms? DR. HOOFTMAN: 4 deaths were not related to 17 melanoma, 2 in each arm. 18 DR. JOHNSON: The other question I have, I was 19 also surprised at the differences in the number of patients 20 not eligible on the treatment arm. I believe there were 9 21 patients, if I'm not mistaken, versus 1 on the observation 22 23 arm. DR. HOOFTMAN: That's correct. 24 DR. JOHNSON: The skeptic that I tend to be, if 25

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

all 9 of those patients had, in fact, progressed, what 1 2 would that have done to your DFI curves and the observation 3 arm had remained the same? Would it still be statistically 4 significantly different? 5 DR. HOOFTMAN: That is a perfectly reasonable 6 question. 7 DR. JOHNSON: I thought so. 8 (Laughter.) 9 DR. HOOFTMAN: Can I defer this to my 10 colleague, Sam Givens, the statistical expert? 11 DR. GIVENS: My name is Dr. Sam Givens. I'm a 12 statistician at Hoffmann-La Roche. 13 Yes, that is a good question. Let me start off 14 by answering it in one way, and that is that the sequential 15 analysis that was done, which was defined in the protocol 16 as the primary analysis to stop recruitment of the trial, 17 was done on all patients. There were no exclusions in that 18 analysis and that analysis was significant at the .038 19 level. 20 I think they naively did not include Breslow in 21 their anticipated statistical analysis for that sequential 22 stop. Their thought was that if they're balanced, they'll 23 be okay, and the other aspect was, when we followed the 24 patients longer, the expectation was to include that category into the final analysis. 25

As to the question of if all 9 of those 1 2 patients had died, I believe that reduces the difference in survival by 9 and would drop it from 19 to 10. My 3 expectation is certainly that that would have lost 4 5 significance. 6 DR. JOHNSON: I'm asking also DFI. This is I'm asking for DFI as well, which is the 7 overall survival. 8 only endpoint that you showed a statistically significant difference. 9 DR. GIVENS: So, now you're saying in the 10 hypothetical situation on DFI, if we had known all 9 of 11 those patients had had a relapse. 12 13 DR. JOHNSON: Correct. DR. GIVENS: Well, those 9 patients were 14 15 included in the analysis with what we knew about them, but 16 I think that had all 9 of those died that -- or had all 9 of those relapsed, I would anticipate that they would not 17 be significant. 18 19 DR. SCHILSKY: Dr. Lippman. 20 DR. LIPPMAN: Actually I had a comment and a 21 question, but before that, just following up on the last 22 point, all 9 patients were included in an intent-to-treat 23 analysis that was presented in terms of disease-free and overall survival? 24 25 The sequential analysis that was DR. GIVENS:

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

done included all patients. There were no patients who had 1 been eliminated at that time that led to the stopping of 2 3 the trial -- stopping of recruitment. Sorry. DR. LIPPMAN: So, I think that answers that 4 question, Dave, if they were included. 5 Well, actually I don't think 6 DR. JOHNSON: 7 that's what I heard. What I heard is that those 9 were not included in that analysis. Maybe in the stopping of the 8 9 trial but not in the analysis of the DFI. If I could clarify what I heard, it 10 DR. SIMON: 11 sounded like they were included at the interim analysis that led to the stopping of recruitment, but they were 12 13 excluded in the analysis based on further follow-up. DR. JOHNSON: That's right. That's what I 14 understood, and the numbers reflect that I think there. 15 16 DR. GIVENS: You are both correct with that 17 statement. Can I get a clarification? 18 DR. SIEGEL: Dr. Simon just referred to the analysis that led to the 19 20 stopping of the trial as an interim analysis. If I 21 understood the presentation, that's the analysis you 22 presented as the primary analysis with the .038. This 23 analysis is the analysis when everybody had 3 years of follow-up, which you presented as a secondary analysis, and 24 25 then additional follow-up beyond 3-year data -- you haven't

presented those data. Is that a correct understanding? 1 2 It's almost correct. DR. HOOFTMAN: The primary efficacy analysis was for disease-free interval. 3 4 It was at the same time the analysis that determined the 5 discontinuation of recruitment in the trial. You have to 6 set that apart from the long-term analysis that is an 7 exploratory type of analysis. 8 The third analysis was solely -- it was done 9 retrospectively, but to get more information with regard to 10 overall survival. The trial and the protocol as such was 11 written for a 36-month course. That means that the last patient entered reached 36 months and then the long-term 12 13 analysis was performed. 14 DR. SCHILSKY: Dr. Lippman. I just have to clarify one other 15 DR. LIPPMAN: 16 thing. Maybe I'm just missing the point. Hypothetically we assume what happened if they all progressed, and that's 17 18 a big concern when they're eliminated from an intent-to-

19 treat analysis. But we don't have to be hypothetical here.
20 Right? You have follow-up on those and they were included
21 in your analysis? We know as much as we know about those
22 patients?

DR. HOOFTMAN: These are the patients that were excluded from this long-term type of analysis. 5 of these patients never received an injection because they, so to

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

say, got cold feet and they didn't want to be in the study 1 once it was clear what was going to happen. 3 patients had 2 the wrong diagnosis. The patients that you see at the top 3 of the list had stage IV and died after a few days. The 4 second patient had a Clark level I tumor. The third 5 patient had lymphoma. The fourth patient had a previous 6 melanoma, which was also an exclusion criteria, and the 1 7 patient in the observation arm had a previous melanoma. 8

9 DR. LIPPMAN: So that that would add 3 10 relapses, if they were included in patients that had the 11 right eligibility criteria.

DR. JOHNSON: Well, no. I would say 5 at a minimum, the 5 who withdrew their consent. To me that's not an intent-to-treat analysis. That's a "I took out 5 people I didn't want to include" analysis.

DR. LIPPMAN: The question that I had actually 16 is this issue of disease-free interval and the importance 17 of that. Actually in the context of everything that we've 18 heard this afternoon, the first presentation by Dr. 19 Kirkwood and this, I actually was very disturbed by the 20 finding of 1690 and the explanations for that in which you 21 saw significant improvements in disease-free but absolutely 22 nothing, not even a trend in survival. In this case 23 there's a significant effect in disease-free survival and a 24 .056 which translate to 59 deaths, if I read the slide 25

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

correctly, in Roferon, and 76 in the observation arm. 1 So, 2 it's certainly consistent and in the right direction. But I want to get to the explanation that was 3 given by Dr. Kirkwood, at least that I asked earlier, that 4 the major aspect of that difference in survival he thought 5 could have been explained by salvage interferon. So, the 6 question here, have you looked at patients? Two issues. 7 One, on the observation arm, if there as a drop-in rate on 8 the interferon. Certainly it has been available and people 9 10 have been talking about interferon and melanoma for a long And two, at relapse, the differences between the 11 time. arms in terms of salvage interferon. 12 DR. HOOFTMAN: Would you please repeat the 13 question? 14 DR. LIPPMAN: So, the question is, on the 15 observation arm, of the patients that recurred, what was 16 the salvage therapy? Were a substantial number of the 17 recurrences on the observation arm treated with interferon 18 19 at recurrence? The only thing I can do in this 20 DR. HOOFTMAN: situation is ask Professor Grob to answer the question. I 21

think that the difference with what Dr. Kirkwood's group
has done is that we have not formally retrieved that
information in a retrospective fashion.

25 PROFESSOR GROB: If I understood you well, the

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

question is what kind of therapy did the patient receive after relapse. We do not have this information in our data. Of course, we can go to the files, but I think really that none of the therapy of metastatic disease, of distant metastatic disease, visceral metastases has shown any effect on the overall survival. So, this is my first answer.

8 And the second would be that it is highly 9 likely that the treatment after recurrence were well 10 balanced between the two groups. But the effect of the 11 treatment on the overall survival, I would be happy to get 12 one.

DR. LIPPMAN: The reason I bring that is up is 13 I was surprised also by the presentation of Dr. Kirkwood 14 that there as a major difference between the arms in terms 15 16 of who had gotten interferon, and that that was the best explanation at least that exists, as I understand, for the 17 fact that you see an improvement in disease-free survival 18 but nothing in terms of survival. If that was even a 19 potential confounder in this study, that might account for 20 why your p value is .056 instead of .049. Could that have 21 played an effect if what Dr. Kirkwood told us is correct? 22 23 PROFESSOR GROB: Well, this is an explanation and a hypothesis which was provided by Dr. Kirkwood. 24 Ι

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

would say I don't share this explanation because really I

don't think that either IL-2 or chemotherapy or interferon 1 can really change the overall survival. At least this has 2 3 not been established in the literature, neither in my experience. 4 DR. SCHILSKY: Dr. Simon? 5 DR. SIMON: I had a few questions. One is you 6 indicated there were 35 patients who withdrew from 7 treatment. How were they handled in the analysis? 8 DR. HOOFTMAN: You're asking a question about 9 the 35 patients --10 DR. SIMON: Yes. 11 DR. HOOFTMAN: -- the 14 percent who withdrew 12 from treatment? 13 14 DR. SIMON: Right. 15 DR. HOOFTMAN: As usual, they were all included. 16 Their follow-up continued as for DR. SIMON: 17 the patients who did not withdraw from treatment? 18 DR. HOOFTMAN: That's correct. 19 20 DR. SIMON: I would like to get some clarification about the database that was used for the 21 analysis, not for the interim analysis because my 22 experience is at a time of interim analysis, there are 23 delays in reporting and that's really not necessarily a 24 25 very accurate database, particularly in a multi-center

study with many centers involved and particularly when 1 2 you're using something like a triangular test in which the 3 protocol says you do analyses after every 20 recurrences. I don't really think that's practical in a multi-center 4 study, and I have questions about the accuracy of the 5 database in a situation like that. So, I would like 6 7 clarification. So, for me, that's really not the 8 definitive analysis.

9 I would like clarification of what additional 10 follow-up was performed and what kind of auditing was done 11 and how long each patient was followed and what proportion 12 of the patients were lost to follow-up not for the interim 13 analysis but for the subsequent analysis.

DR. HOOFTMAN: I understand the question. Can I give the work to a statistical colleague who was intrinsically involved at the time?

DR. RAMISIO: My name is Dr. Maurizio Ramisio,
statistician, Hoffmann-La Roche, Basel.

The database that was used for the third sequential analysis is unfortunately not available anymore. We collected complete information on all the patients in the beginning of 1996 and, as Dr. Hooftman said, getting a new informed consent from all the patients. The follow-up analysis that has been presented is based on those data. The triangular test analysis that has been

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

presented is based on the data of the 1st of January 1994,
 which are not available any longer.

We have simulated an analysis at the time of the 1st of January 1994 by putting a cutoff, using the data that we have to date, but putting a cutoff on the 1st of January 1994. The result that we have got with this analysis is still significant, is 0.035 on the log rank test. But again, we are not able to reproduce the analysis of that time.

DR. SIMON: So, the .035 represents an estimated significance level at the time that that interim analysis was performed?

DR. RAMISIO: This is what I'm saying now. What has been presented by Dr. Hooftman is the result which was obtained by Professor Chastung at that time doing the third sequential analysis on the data which was available at that time.

DR. SIMON: Suppose we forget about sequential analysis. Can you just clarify what is the most complete data available?

DR. RAMISIO: All right. The most complete data available is the data that have been collected in the beginning of 1996, and this is the data that have been presented as follow-up analysis by Dr. Hooftman.

25

As I said before, if we do a cutoff on that set

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

of data, which has been quality controlled, and source documents verified, and we do the analysis as it would have been done on the 1st of January 1994. We get a log rank test with 0.035 percent.

5 DR. SIMON: Suppose you don't do a cutoff and 6 you just do the analysis with all of the data.

DR. RAMISIO: If we do the analysis with all of 7 the data -- I don't remember what was the significance. If 8 we do the analysis on disease-free interval, including all 9 the patients, so intent-to-treat, including all the 499 10 patients, we have to exclude 2 who had no follow-up visit 11 at all. They went into the study. They were randomized 12 but had no visit at all. So, if we analyze that -- I'm 13 I must find the right page. 14 sorry.

The disease-free interval -- the 15 Here. significance, stratifying by center, is 0.074. If we do 16 the analysis on the eligible patient population, so 17 excluding the 10 patients that we have discussed about 18 before, we get a p value, which is 0.035. This is 19 including all the data available up to the beginning of 20 1996. 21

If we do the analysis as it was prescribed by the protocol, we said an analysis will be performed at the end of the study, which could be interpreted as when all the patients will have had 3 years follow-up. The p value

1 | becomes 0.005.

2	Is this answering your question?
3	DR. SIMON: What was the last point? If you do
4	what?
5	DR. RAMISIO: The protocol prescribed a primary
6	analysis, which was the sequential, and said, unfortunately
7	a little bit unclearly, a further analysis will be
8	performed at the end of the study. So, it is a matter of
9	interpretation what is the end of that study.
10	In another place, the protocol says the
11	patients will have to be followed for 3 years. So, an
12	interpretation of the end of the study might be when all
13	the patients will have been followed for 3 years. So, if
14	we do an analysis cutting all the data following the 3
15	years, so treating is censored all the patients who had a
16	relapse after the 3 years, we obtain a log rank test with a
17	p value of 0.005.
18	If we do not do that, if we take all the data
19	considering a median follow-up of 4.4 years, where some
20	patients have been followed up for 3 years and some have
21	been followed up for 6 years and more, then we get, on the
22	eligible patients population, a p value of 0.035 and, on
23	the ITT population, a p value of 0.074.
24	DR. SIMON: One other question. You didn't
25	present any data on sites of recurrence, which ones were
•	

resectable, which weren't. Do you have that data? 1 2 DR. HOOFTMAN: Yes, we have that information. We just have to find it. 3 As you can see here, the recurrences were 4 mainly regional or local as opposed to visceral. 5 DR. SCHILSKY: Dr. Blayney. 6 DR. BLAYNEY: Thank you. I have three 7 questions. 8 As has been alluded to earlier, in an analysis 9 10 where you're looking at disease-free interval, there's a potential for bias introduced into the ascertainment of the 11 data points because patients may be lost to follow-up, the 12 ones that recur may die without knowledge of the 13 investigator. Without a prospective plan for follow-up, 14 this is of some concern in trying to interpret the data. I 15 quess I would have some more comfort if you could tell me 16 how many patients were lost to follow-up and how these were 17 18 handled in your analysis. DR. HOOFTMAN: Please bear with us until we 19 find that information. 20 Can I defer this question to Dr. Sam Givens? 21 DR. WASSNER: We only lost something like 6 22 patients to follow-up in the long-term follow-up in the no-23 treatment arm and 8 patients in the treatment arm over the 24 7 years of the trial. 25

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

1	DR. BLAYNEY: So, since those numbers are
2	equal, I'm understanding that there's probably a or
3	roughly equal, there's no bias, likely there would be no
4	follow-up bias in that.
5	DR. WASSNER: No. And less than 2 percent of
6	the patients have been lost to follow-up over this period.
7	DR. BLAYNEY: In your slide number 111, you
8	have a p value of .038. Now, maybe Dr. Simon's question
9	got to this issue, but is that p value adjusted for
10	multiple analyses?
11	DR. WASSNER: Yes. This value has been
12	adjusted only for that, only for the multiple analysis, not
13	for any prognostic factors.
14	DR. BLAYNEY: Thirdly, why did you choose or
15	why was it chosen to give patients 3 million units and not
16	adjust based on body surface area or some other measure of
17	size?
18	DR. HOOFTMAN: The decision by the clinicians
19	separately for the French study, as well as for the
20	Austrian they made that decision separately and not
21	knowing from each other what they exactly were going to do
22	was based on the fact that they were looking for the
23	dose that could be maintained for a long time and the lower
24	dose that was effective, which was 3 million units, as used
25	in other indications, for example, hairy cell leukemia, at
	•

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

1 | the time.

2	DR. SCHILSKY: Let me just make a comment to
3	the committee. I'm bound and determined to keep us on
4	schedule this afternoon because I know that some committee
5	members will have to be leaving. So, we have about 3
6	minutes left for questions. So, let me just ask you to
7	just keep your questions very focused.
8	Dr. Raghavan, do you have a question?
9	DR. RAGHAVAN: I just wanted clarification of
10	one quick thing. I think I understood somebody from the
11	sponsor to say the database is no longer available. What
12	does that mean and why?
13	DR. GIVENS: What that means is that they did
14	not save the database when they did the publication. They
15	kept adding to the database and making corrections. So,
16	the database as of today is the most up-to-date that we
17	have, but we don't have a copy of precisely what they used
18	when they did the sequential analysis, which is why we went
19	back and said, let's cut off all data that should have been
20	collected on visits up until the 1st of January and do the
21	analysis again.
22	DR. SCHILSKY: Dr. Nerenstone?
23	DR. NERENSTONE: Very briefly, first of all,
24	was there central pathologic review?
25	DR. HOOFTMAN: No, there was not.
	•

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

.

DR. NERENSTONE: We've heard about how many 1 patients were withdrawn because of adverse experiences. 2 However, you have no information about what actual dose was 3 given, what kind of delays there were in the patients who 4 were on treatment for specific toxicity or even for the 5 asthenia, depression, and flu-like symptoms. Do you have 6 any other data available about that? 7 DR. HOOFTMAN: Yes, we have. We have 8 information with regard to dose reductions. About 83 9 patients, 33 percent, in the Roferon arm had their dose 10 reduced temporarily. 11 DR. SCHILSKY: Any other questions from the 12 committee? 13 14 (No response.) DR. SCHILSKY: If there are none, then let's 15 break for about 14 minutes and reconvene promptly at 3:15. 16 Shorter if we can. 17 18 (Recess.) DR. SCHILSKY: We'd like to continue with the 19 20 FDA presentation. DR. CARDINALI: Good afternoon. My name is 21 I will introduce the FDA perspective on Massimo Cardinali. 22 23 this application. First, I would like to acknowledge the review 24 team that worked on this application. Dr. Neeman did the 25

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

bulk of the statistical review, and Dr. Tiwari also
participated in the review. Dr. Gupta in the last week or
so did some additional analysis.
This slide is to remind the approved indication

for this product. The indication for the hairy cell leukemia has the closest dosage to the one that the company is seeking for this application.

8 This is the indication that the company is 9 seeking for this product as presented in the submission.

I'll briefly go over the events that took 10 place. You see in white the company and in yellow the 11 The supplemental application was submitted in 12 agency. The company provided us with the translated protocol 1997. 13 and statistical plan and database for the Grob study, as 14 well as the available literature at the time on the subject 15 and an unpublished report. This was the study WHO 16, the 16 Cascinelli study. 17

We finished our review in March of '98, and Dr. Neeman asked the company for some additional information on the Grob study and that was received in May of that year. The monitoring of the French centers was

22 completed in May of '98.

We issued a complete review letter in August of that year. The database and data that the company provided was perceived to be not sufficient for approval by the

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

agency, and we requested a database for the other study with Roferon that was available, as well as some additional clarification on the Grob study. The information was provided in November of that year, and the paper for the Pehamberger study was submitted to the application in March of '99.

We received about a month ago the translated study protocol for the Pehamberger study and early this month the data set that Dr. Gupta analyzed.

10I will go briefly to the structure of the two11studies. The Grob study was conducted between 1990 and121994.

The inclusion criteria, essentially patients with AJCC stage II and no previous therapy was in the provision of the protocol. And the performance status was set as ECOG less than or equal to 2.

The endpoint specified in the protocol,
disease-free interval, and as secondary endpoints, overall
survival and tolerability of the treatment.

The dose administered was 3 million units 3 times per week subcutaneous for a total duration of 18 months.

The study conducted in Austria was started approximately at the same time and the same duration than the French study. The inclusion criteria were almost

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

identical in terms of the staging of the disease. There
was no systemic therapy within 3 months of inclusion in the
study and the performance status was a little more
stringent.

5 The material that we received did not specify 6 the endpoint, and there was no statistical plan in the 7 protocol.

Again, the studies are very similar. The difference that we can observe is the duration of the treatment. The study had an induction phase of a 3-week duration and then it was continued at 3 million units 3 times per week for a year.

I'll leave the floor to Dr. Lachenbruch that
will summarize the results and the statistical analysis.

DR. LACHENBRUCH: Thank you. I'm almost an imposter up here in that the primary analysis was done by Dr. Neeman at the FDA and then later Dr. Tiwari did this work.

19The study by Grob, M 23031, is the primary20trial that was submitted to the FDA. This trial was21planned to have sequential looks every 20 events. However,22the timing was not adhered to and three looks were done.23As you can see here in a triangular test, a24score Z is computed, and if the null hypothesis is true,25that will be around 0, and a variance V is also computed

which is proportional to the number of events at the time 1 of analysis. If the points exceed the upper boundary, the null hypothesis is rejected, as you see. On January 1st, '94 when the analysis was done, it did exceed the null hypothesis.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

During the FDA review, we requested that the sponsor submit more mature data from the additional followup that they have, and our analyses are all based on an intent-to-treat at this time of final analysis.

This is a graph you've seen before. The 10 medians are indicated. Because the number of relapses at 11 and before this time of the medians, the estimate of the 12 medians may be somewhat variable. This again is based on 13 the ITT population and not the per-protocol population. 14 This results in an additional 9 patients being added to the 15 overall population, and the significance level that we see 16 here is .095 as opposed to the .038 from the sponsor's 17 This is no doubt due to both the additional 18 analysis. data, more mature data, and the additional patients. 19

The overall survival is shown here, again with 20 the ITT population. We came up with a .09 p value. 21

We also decided to examine some additional 22 analyses which are exploratory, and these are, indeed, post 23 hoc but I think they are of some importance. This slide 24 shows the effect on relapse-free survival of the covariate 25

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809
alone, and that's important to realize. Thus, the Breslow
thickness has a p value of less than .001. That is for the
effect of Breslow thickness on survival. It is not a p
value for Roferon given Breslow thickness.

Among these data, the p value for Roferon is larger, i.e., less significant, than for any of the others. Also, I should point out that Dr. Neeman used the Breslow thickness as a continuous rather than as a categorical variable.

We also attempted to find a best model for 10 11 using the covariates, and in this case we found that Breslow thickness, age, and sex gave the best model. 12 Adding Roferon treatment to those three led to a p value 13 for Roferon of .25. The sponsor, Roche, did do a similar 14 analysis. They dichotomized age as greater than 50 or less 15 than 50. The differences may be due to more mature data, 16 the use of age, or the additional patients. 17

The results are marginal significance. The p
value at the time of the termination of the study is .038,
but after the data had matured, it was .095.

We received the Pehamberger data last week, and we have been unable to do a detailed and rigorous analysis of the results. We received a translation of the protocol about a week earlier.

25

We attempted to reproduce the analyses that

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

appeared in the article and will present some comments. 1 2 The inclusion criteria, of course, are essentially the same as for the Grob study. The analytic plan was not presented 3 in the protocol and endpoints were not specified. We used 4 relapse-free survival and overall survival, and we've also 5 done some adjustments for Breslow depth and did a 6 corresponding analysis including age and gender as we did 7 with the Grob study. 8

9 Here we see the relapse-free survival, and we 10 found a p value of .04 and median for controls is 4. The 11 Roferon group did not reach a median.

In doing the same proportional hazards model, we find quite similar results. Breslow thickness is highly significant; age, significant; sex, somewhat less; and Roferon as, of course, .04.

At the same time we did the adjustment for Breslow alone, which is what was reported in the Pehamberger article, and found a p value of .1, and if we adjust for Breslow thickness, age, and sex, we had a p value of .22, quite similar and comparable to the p of .25 that was seen in the Grob study.

Again, our conclusions seem to show that there was a moderate effect of Roferon by itself, which is the primary analyses that are presented by the company. However, adjusting for Breslow thickness and other

1

variables does seem to reduce the effect.

Based on this, we felt that it was appropriate 2 to begin planning an overview of the published literature. 3 So, we are doing this to combine the evidence. What we 4 want to do is substantiate the evidence of efficacy from 5 known studies of adjuvant interferon in melanoma, and for 6 this purpose, we will use studies of both Roferon and 7 Intron. These are exploratory and we want to emphasize 8 that the data support from Roche will be the only material 9 that is used in any decisions regarding this product. We 10 will be using relapse-free survival and overall survival, 11 as they are the generally accepted outcomes. And we are in 12 the process of obtaining data from investigators. 13 We will be looking at Roferon and Intron 14

15 trials. We want them to be randomized, concurrent 16 controlled trials, and so far all have an observational 17 control and are for adjuvant therapy.

We have searched a number of databases seen 18 The trials that we have identified and the studies here. 19 come from North America, Europe, Australia, and New 20 We will be looking to get estimates of the odds Zealand. 21 ratio by means of ratio of medians, and that's very nice if 22 you happen to have exponential survival. That's for the 23 statisticians. And the Peto method is basically a log rank 24 type method. 25

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

We will also be looking for estimates of 1 survival, either relapse-free or total survival at 3 years. 2 We'll be looking at Kaplan-Meier estimates, 95 percent 3 confidence intervals, and so forth. 4 So far the studies that we have found are those 5 from Dr. Creagan, Dr. Cascinelli, Dr. Grob, Dr. 6 7 Pehamberger, which all were using Roferon. We've seen five studies from Kokoschka, Kirkwood, Cornbleet, Rusciani, and 8 the Kirkwood ECOG 1690. 9 This slide provides estimates of the percent 10 improvement and confidence intervals for relapse-free 11 survival that we have seen thus far. A square is placed at 12 the estimate for the difference in proportions. The 13 whiskers are the 95 percent confidence intervals. Α 14 positive value is favorable for interferon. So, if the 15 whiskers cross the line, it is not possible to rule out a 16 difference of 0 between observation and interferon. 17 The size of the box, that is the area, is 18 proportional to the sample size. These generally indicate 19 a consistent improvement of about 8 to 9 percent over 20 observation. We don't have reliable 5-year data at the 21 present time to conduct a similar display. 22 In overall survival, we see the same picture. 23 As you can see, there's a bit less of an impressive 24 difference in these. We did not have the data from Dr.

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

Pehamberger for survival. The difference is around overall
 about 4 to 5 percent.

Our next steps will be to get individual data from studies and perform the analyses that we have indicated above. The information contained in the literature does not permit sufficiently detailed analyses.

To summarize, for relapse-free survival, all studies do point in the same direction. These are marginally significant or barely not significant, and there's a moderate early effect. But we don't have a lot of data for longer term effects.

For overall survival, there is a consistent trend toward improvement but evidence is not that strong, and I have in my notes, parentheses, "yet" with a question mark. We did not show it, but there do seem to be fairly similar results with high and low dose and with nodepositive and node-negative disease from the material that we've seen.

19

20

21

Thank you.

DR. SCHILSKY: Thank you very much.

Questions for the FDA? Dr. Raghavan?

DR. RAGHAVAN: I'm totally mystified as to why you went through that statistical exercise because the best data points come from a product that isn't even up for submission. So, I just wondered why you spent all your

1 | time doing this and what the point was.

-

DR. LACHENBRUCH: The purpose here was to
really look for evidence combining all of the Roferon data.
Over here, we see that there are four studies, and so what
we would like to do is be able to draw information from all
of these. So, what we see is overall there does seem to be
a significant improvement in 3-year survival.
DR. SCHILSKY: Other questions? Dr. Simon?
DR. SIMON: I guess I wouldn't put much
credence in a meta-analysis based on literature data.
There may be exclusions. There are all kinds of biases in
published reports. The fact that they're published may be
publication bias. If you're planning on doing an
individual case meta-analysis, I would say go ahead and do
it, but I don't find it useful to present a meta-analysis
based on publications.
DR. LACHENBRUCH: These are very preliminary
results, and we are trying to get the data at the present
time. So, I would agree with you.
DR. KEEGAN: I think to some extent the reason
why these data were presented was that up until very
recently, the only information we had was from a single
study. So, this was our attempt to see what other
information was available in support of this application.
We're not saying it's optimal information, but it was all

1 | that we had available.

DR. CARDINALI: As a note, the Pehamberger and 2 Grob study data is from the publication not from the data 3 set we have analyzed. 4 Dr. Simon. DR. SCHILSKY: 5 DR. SIMON: Do you have any insight for the 6 French study as to why the significance level, say, for 7 relapse-free survival, after adjustment for thickness, age, 8 and sex, changed so much? Were there any imbalances? 9 DR. LACHENBRUCH: No. For a covariate 10 analysis, as you know, the purpose is not necessarily to 11 adjust for imbalance, although that can be one use of it, 12 but these happen to be important prognostic factors for 13 So, what we're saying is we'd like to look at survival. 14 these after we have adjusted for these. 15 DR. SCHILSKY: Dr. Lippman. 16 DR. LIPPMAN: Just a guick clarification. In 17 your last conclusion slide, you said that there were 18 similar results with high and low dose. Is that what we 19 just saw from Dr. Kirkwood with Intron or is that with 20 Roferon? 21 I believe that was the for DR. LACHENBRUCH: 22 the Roferon, the study of Dr. Creagan and the Grob and --23 DR. SCHILSKY: Other questions from the 24 committee members? 25

(No response.) 1 DR. SCHILSKY: Okay, thank you. 2 Let me point out to the committee members that 3 there's a slightly different set of questions than the ones 4 that were in the blue folder, and those should have been 5 put at your place right after lunch. It looks like this. 6 It's a two-page thing. It has only one of these meta-7 analysis charts. I think the content of the questions is 8 largely the same, but these are the questions that we 9 should be focusing on at this point. 10 Before we get into the questions, actually I'd 11 like clarification of one point from the FDA because most 12 of these questions are posed in such a way that they ask us 13 to consider the results of the sponsor's data in 14 conjunction with the overview analysis that was just 15 presented. Now, I was quite sure I heard the FDA presenter 16 say that the overview analysis would not be taken into 17 consideration by FDA in assessment of the sponsor's 18 application. So, could we get some clarification on that? 19 What I said was no DR. LACHENBRUCH: Yes. 20 Intron data would be taken into account. 21 It's a little bit DR. SCHILSKY: I see. 22 difficult for us to sort out from those meta-analyses which 23 ones had Intron data and which ones had Roferon data. 24 DR. SIEGEL: Let me clarify something. First 25

of all, the Roferon data were the top part of all those 1 2 slides and are on the second page of the questions. The FDA has a policy regarding use of 3 literature in support of applications for new indications 4 for already approved drugs. The gist of the policy says 5 6 that literature data, especially if consistent and 7 compelling from multiple sites, can be important, but the value of the data is largely dependent on the ability to 8 substantiate it through finding protocols, data sets, 9 10 ensuring that there were intent-to-treat analyses, and the normal things. So, these are things I think that, as a 11 matter of policy and procedure, should not be ignored, but 12 I think that the weaknesses or concerns that have been 13 highlighted are important ones to take into account. 14 DR. SCHILSKY: Okay, thank you. 15 Maybe we'll just get on with the questions 16 17 then. Yes, Scott. I know that we're not considering DR. LIPPMAN: 18 19 Intron here, but I think the data are relevant in the sense that -- two issues. One is the biological plausibility 20 21 mechanism and the other is consistency within the committee 22 in terms of approval. Again, we talk about the fact that there's very 23 little data. So, we have one study of 500 patients which, 24 at least in the FDA presentation, we've talked about those 25

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

mysterious 9 cases and how that would affect. But at least 1 in the FDA presentation, it was significant. Every one of 2 the boxes is -- it's modest, but it's positive both in 3 terms of disease-free and overall survival, and the 4 whiskers come very close, just past the survival curve of 5 0, as opposed to another situation where we're using 6 interferon where it's approved and where you don't see that 7 pattern even with a very high dose in terms of survival. 8 And we've heard some explanations of that. It's really a 9 question of whether we should take that issue, the 10 consistency, the biology, the mechanism, into account in 11 some of these discussions. 12

DR. SCHILSKY: I don't think we should ignore the universe of information that we're aware of and we have available to us.

I just want to get clarification on this again. 16 First of all, the meta-analyses with respect to the Roferon 17 data, which is what's on our question sheet -- so, there 18 are four studies listed for disease-freed survival and 19 three listed for overall survival. Of those, only the Grob 20 study would appear to show a significant benefit with 21 respect to disease-free survival as it's listed here. 22 However, as the more detailed analysis of the study was 23 presented to us, there are questions as to, in fact, 24 whether even that study shows a significant difference in 25

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

disease-free interval. So, although the trend appears to 1 be in favor of interferon in each of these examples, 2 there's very little in the way of a statistically 3 significant benefit for interferon. 4 Further, it's fair to say that, I guess, in a 5 sense these are at best incomplete meta-analyses for the 6 reasons Dr. Simon mentioned, that this information is just 7 based upon data you could glean from published reports in 8 9 the literature, not from the actual patient data that's contained within those reports. Correct? Okay. 10 Scott? 11 Just to clarify, because with all 12 DR. LIPPMAN: the discussion, I guess I was sort of surprised when I look 13 at this. I'm not talking about the meta-analysis, just the 14 big box of 500 patients under Grob. It is significant, 15 doesn't cross the line. I haven't read the recent set of 16 questions, but one of them was should we recommend approval 17 based on one large randomized trial. So, I'd like to 18 clarify maybe from the FDA if they're going to stick with 19 In that case, that is statistically significant 20 this box.

and survival is close and the other studies corroborate
that. So, I'd just like to clarify.

DR. SIEGEL: Well, I guess a lot of people have addressed different parts of this question. I'll take my turn.

That box was an endpoint that was chosen in 1 part because it was, I think, the easiest endpoint to get 2 on all of the trials, and it's endpoint data truncated at 3 3 That's the endpoint that the Grob data looked the years. 4 best at because, in fact, the curves have maximal 5 separation at about 3 years and start coming together after 6 3 years. As noted, that studied had 3 years of planned and 7 prescheduled follow-up, so it's not an irrelevant time 8 period for that study. But at best, let's say that the 9 primary time for follow-up is ambiguous in the protocol and 10 difficult to determine. As we determine it, the intent-to-11 treat analysis of the most complete available data set was 12 at the .095 level and with covariate correction at the .25 13 level. 14

We'll stand behind that analysis. It's one of several analyses. We won't stand behind it as like the one that tells the story. I don't think, given the ambiguities of the protocol and the flaws and strengths of different analyses, that there's probably not one p value that you can hang your hat on and say this tells you the statistical significance of the trial.

DR. SCHILSKY: Are we ready to go to the questions? Let me just read the first question. There's a two-paragraph summary. Then the question is, does the committee find that the results of a single multi-center,

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

1 randomized, controlled trial, in conjunction with the 2 overview analysis of the three randomized, controlled 3 trials of Roferon-A, provide substantial evidence that 4 Roferon-A prolongs the disease-free interval in patients 5 with surgically resected melanoma?

Is there discussion on that before we vote?Dr. Lippman.

B DR. LIPPMAN: I will just say that the real fundamental issue that I'm having a problem with is the floating p values. Given that we've heard a lot of discussion on this and still know real consensus, I don't think, in terms of what is either reasonable or meant or intended, that's going to fundamentally affect how I vote anyway on this.

DR. SCHILSKY: Well, I think we've seen the data as presented by the sponsor. We've seen the data as presented by the FDA with the adjustments to the p value, if you will, based upon the other covariate prognostic factors. We've seen, for what it's worth, the preliminary meta-analysis. So, is there anything else you would like to know before you vote on this?

DR. LIPPMAN: I think fundamentally if we knew exactly in the design what the primary endpoint was -- was it a 3-year? I think that's where the debate is.

25

DR. SCHILSKY: It appears that we don't know

1 that because it wasn't well specified.

That's correct. The protocol 2 DR. KEEGAN: 3 really is open to quite a bit of interpretation as to when 4 that final analysis was to have occurred and exactly what 5 it was to consist of. DR. SIMON: I will say, however, that my 6 7 experience is if you have an endpoint, that your most accurate analysis is the one based on the longest follow-up 8 9 and that's what you should hang your hat on and not one 10 that was simulated based on what might have happened some 11 So, anyway, I guess that's one issue. years ago. 12 The other issue is for myself I guess I just have some basic uncertainty about the quality of the data 13 14 from that trial, the potential biases in follow-up. It 15 looked like there was too much of an emphasis that the main analysis would have been the one that was essentially an 16 17 interim analysis that stopped the recruitment. Then there were sort of ad hoc attempts to increase follow-up. I just 18 am left with some uncertainty as to how accurate that 19 additional follow-up was. So, I myself, in addition to the 20 variable p values, just have some uncertainty in the 21 credibility of that data. 22 23 DR. SCHILSKY: Dr. Keegan. DR. KEEGAN: I would say that the protocol did 24 not specify what the continued follow-up should be after 36

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

25

months, and when we requested the additional data, it was necessary for the company to go back to the investigators, who then reconsented patients to get the information. From the monitoring inspections of some of the sites, it's clear that there wasn't a rigidly adhered to schedule for followup.

We did also ask the company to analyze the data 7 to determine whether or not there was a systematic bias in 8 terms of the follow-up, and it didn't appear that the 9 follow-up was systematically biased towards one or the 10 It was equally -- I won't characterize it as 11 other arm. haphazard, but definitely not done according to a rigid 12 schedule. But that seemed to be present in both arms. 13

One other point I'd like to make in terms of 14 the policy is that for a single study in support of 15 effectiveness, one of the criteria that FDA uses is that 16 the trial have a statistically significant result that's 17 fairly robust such that we would have confidence that the 18 result would be reproducible. At best, the p value here is 19 .04, and our concern at the time of even the review of the 20 data with the most up-to-date follow-up that we could get 21 through 1997 suggested to us that that result, although 22 statistically significant, would not meet that condition of 23 being so robust that we were convinced that it was a 24 reproducible result, which is why we encouraged the company 25

to go back and obtain additional study data. 1 2 DR. SCHILSKY: Dr. Johnson? 3 DR. JOHNSON: Yes. I didn't realize this was 4 going to take a lot of discussion, but since Scott seems conflicted, let me go through a number of reasons why I 5 6 think this is a poor study. 7 First of all, I'm not sure I accept the endpoint as one that's therapeutically efficacious. 8 DFI. 9 in the absence of a survival benefit, is of uncertain benefit in my view. We can debate that but there are 10 plenty of diseases where DFI can be prolonged and survival 11 is not. And we don't do the therapy that prolongs the DFI. 12 Small cell lung cancer immediately comes to mind. There 13 are 10 randomized trials out there showing DFI is 14 prolonged, survival is not. No one uses maintenance 15 16 chemotherapy in that disease. If they had shown me some quality of life 17 18 benefit to that DFI, that symptoms had improved or some other meaningful patient benefit, then perhaps I could have 19 accepted that as an endpoint of value, but I don't. And I 20 didn't see that data. 21 Thirdly, again, I find it shocking -- and I 22 think that's the word -- that a study of this size would be 23 undertaken without appropriate stratification for known 24 25 prognostic endpoints. That being said, even more

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

importantly, there was no quality control of pathology. 1 We 2 have no idea whether these patients were equally balanced other than what they tell us. There was no central review 3 of the patient pathology. They could have all been one 4 stage in the Roferon arm and quite another in the other, 5 6 just on the basis of that inequity. All we have is a 7 report. They've told us there was no central pathology review. 8

9 Candidly, I just think that the overall data 10 are highly questionable. I agree with Richard. I think 11 these are not the quality of data that we see come to this 12 agency that generates approval by this body. That's my 13 perspective on this, and personally I don't see how we can 14 vote anything other than no on this question.

DR. SCHILSKY: Dr. Raghavan?

15

16 DR. RAGHAVAN: Yes. I think I always feel sorry for the FDA because they're victims and they get 17 beaten up by everyone, but as a taxpayer I really have to 18 say that I don't think you've done as well as you usually 19 do this time. You've left it to the committee to identify 20 a whole series of very bad statistical concepts and poor 21 quality data. I shouldn't have to remind you: garbage in, 22 23 garbage out no matter what the p value. I just feel very disappointed that we've had to go through this exercise. 24 25 Dr. Lippman has tried very hard to be fair, and

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

I recognize and respect that. For those of us who are 1 2 crusty veterans who have seen outstandingly good data over 3 the years, this is not an example of that. And bending over backwards to bring in Intron data that were approved 4 5 based on good quality data and then tainting that 6 information based on very poor quality information with bad 7 follow-up sets up a precedent that that I think is kind of 8 disappointing. And I would hate people to leave here starting to question decisions made in the past based on 9 good data when we've now added a bunch of information 10 11 that's out-of-date, hard to quantify, irreproducible, et 12 cetera. 13 And I just felt I wanted to make that comment. I apologize for beating you up, but you deserve it. 14 15 (Laughter.) 16 DR. SIEGEL: Allow me to respond in part, although I don't want to take up too much time with this. 17 First of all, I think it's a 18 mischaracterization to suggest that it took the committee 19 to identify the flaws in this data. I don't think there 20 was a flaw discussed here that was not identified by the 21 The FDA did an intent-to-treat analysis from the 22 FDA. 23 beginning. We carefully inquired and investigated about the relevance of the follow-up data, the quality of the 24 25 follow-up data, and the choice of the endpoints, and made a

ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

presentation of the data, I think, that accurately reflects
our perception.

As to the question of why these data were 3 brought before the committee, perhaps this requires a bit 4 of understanding of time lines. At the time we need to 5 make a decision about scheduling a committee, it's usually 6 a couple months before the committee. As we have made 7 clear in the presentation, we had felt that based on the 8 Grob study alone, there was no reason to discuss or 9 consider approval of this application. 10

What we had available to us at the period two 11 months before this committee was a published report from 12 the Pehamberger study that showed a p value of .02 and new 13 information from the company that they were, in fact, going 14 Those, as to be able to get the data set and the protocol. 15 you've heard, I'm sure for a good reason, took longer than 16 anticipated to get. So, they arrived within the last week 17 18 or two. You've seen the preliminary analyses of those. The study did not look like what we expected it to look 19 like, but I think with that perspective, perhaps you can 20 better appreciate where we've come from. 21

DR. SCHILSKY: All right. Thank you. In the interest of time, I'm going to call for the vote. I think we're probably ready. Let me just restate briefly the question. Does the committee find that

> ASSOCIATED REPORTERS OF WASHINGTON (202) 543-4809

the results of a single multi-center, randomized, 1 controlled trial provides substantial evidence that 2 Roferon-A prolongs the disease-free interval in patients 3 with surgically resected melanoma? 4 All those who would vote yes, please raise your 5 hand. 6 7 (No response.) DR. SCHILSKY: That's 0 yes. 8 All those who would vote no? 9 (A show of hands.) 10 DR. SCHILSKY: 7 no. 11 Abstentions? 12 (A show of hands.) 13 DR. SCHILSKY: 1 abstention. Sorry. 2 14 abstentions. 15 DR. SIEGEL: I think we're done. 16 DR. SCHILSKY: That's what I was about to ask 17 because the second question says, assuming that the answer 18 to question 1 is yes, well, we know now what the answer to 19 question 1 is. So, I think that completes the committee's 20 Thank you all very much. 21 deliberations. (Whereupon, at 4:02 p.m., the committee was 22 adjourned.) 23 24 25

Reef integrated Systems

- 0 -0.005 228:17 0.021 211:14 0.035 226:7 227:4 227:19 228:22 0.074 227:16 228:23 0.11 103:17 0.31 103:23 0.56 100:18 0.63 104:4 0.72 103:16 0.74 105:22 0.76 188:15 0.78 41:19 105:21 0.83 103:22 0.88 193:19 0.92 104:3 0.93 100:18 0.99 193:19 000007 91:20 0001 68:4 001 68:4 171:19 171:25 172:19 237:2 004 164:16 177:23 005 203:3 007 91:24 0148 13:20 01 171:18 171:25 172:14 02 255:13 035 202:17 226:10 036 134:25 038 200:2 217:18 219:22 230:8 236:17 237:19 03 170:22 172:8 049 223:21 04 164:16 238:10 238:15 251:20 056 221:25 223:21 059 204:2 05 168:2 170:22 095 236:17 237:20 248:13 09 236:21

- 1 -

1,000 66:25 89:7 99:24 119:17 1,350 34:20 99:4 110:5 1,400 97:20 1,449 48:22 1,500 68:11 1,570 48:20 1,800 34:10 34:21 52:4 68:11 91:13 91:18 92:11 92:15 99:5 1,815 43:25 1,900 88:14

1-2 206:7 1-node-positive 168:25 1-year 38:12 122:9 122:14 122:16 206:5 1.09 168:3 171:7 1.21 173:5 1.23 173:8 1.28 167:25 170:20 1.3 202:13 208:9 1.46 169:2 1.5 184:22 186:14 188:15 188:15 190:11 194:15 201:21 206:17 209:13 1.64 173:13 1.8 174:18 1.92 169:9 10-plus 33:15 **10-year** 212:4 212:5 **10.5** 100:13 100 202:19 204:19 103 176:15 **104** 199:6 10:20 98:10 10 18:21 19:3 19:4 22:21 22:22 37:7 37:10 39:6 54:20 55:2 55:19 56:3 102:25 135:6 138:14 144:21 164:22 166:16 167:6 191:21 191:24 192:2 192:16 198:24 202:15 208:8 210:4 218:3 227:18 252:14 11.4 18:24 19:2 111 230:7 114 177:2 177:11 177:19 119 202:19 204:20 11 18:7 167:21 169:24 170:13 175:12 11th 22:21 120-day 79:3 79:9 81:2 121 177:4 177:12 177:21 **125** 66:5 129 87:17 12 18:6 19:3 102:24 109:22 209:8 12a-30 10:14 162:5 12th 22:22 134 199:21 13 177:3 13th 165:23 145 25:21 14 17:23 45:11 97:18 154:8 206:3 208:20 224:12 232:16 15-20 88:19 15-year 85:3 150 66:6 87:17 102:25 **154** 207:7 207:23 **157** 207:7 207:23 **15** 18:19 18:20 18:23 61:19 85:5 105:7 109:7

199:5 15th 35:9 91:10 162 179:13 1684 164:10 164:24 165:4 170:3 170:8 170:13 170:14 170:23 170:25 171:22 172:3 172:5 172:10 172:12 172:18 172:23 173:3 173:7 173:10 173:22 174:8 174:12 175:5 175:7 175:9 175:13 178:21 178:23 178:25 179:12 180:21 181:2 194:2 196:2 1690 165:2 165:13 166:6 170:2 170:8 170:12 170:14 170:15 171:22 172:4 172:5 172:7 172:10 172:13 172:17 172:22 173:3 173:6 173:9 173:18 173:20 173:21 174:3 174:9 174:13 174:16 174:20 175:6 175:8 175:10 175:13 175:15 176:5 178:23 179:16 179:24 180:19 180:23 181:3 181:5 181:20 181:24 182:6 182:23 196:2 221:21 240:9 **1694** 179:3 16 27:2 163:24 171:8 182:16 194:3 233:16 172 25:12 25:21 175 14:20 14:24 25:18 33:9 51:8 **17** 47:6 56:12 105:8 168:4 177:19 203:2 204:22 18.5 170:4 180 95:22 18952 179:7 **18** 10:4 10:18 109:22 161:24 184:25 197:7 197:22 198:8 200:14 205:6 206:4 208:19 209:8 209:14 234:21 190,000 88:15 192 102:23 1948 63:6 1979 36:17 **1990** 165:3 196:21 197:2 197:14 198:3 206:14 210:2 210:25 234:11 1991 21:20 165:6 1992 21:21 189:18 1993 212:5 1994 14:18 15:14 35:9 197:15 198:4 206:14 210:2 226:4 226:6 227:3 234:12 1995 165:6 165:7 175:17 207:20 1996 90:22 225:22

226:23 227:21 1997 15:14 35:10 91:10 212:9 233:13 251:22 1998 14:22 35:18 35:19 36:3 36:6 36:10 49:18 92:12 165:12 165:19 165:22 212:10 1999 36:7 140:7 166:2 166:5 176:11 212:13 19 63:18 202:20 204:22 207:9 218:3 1:00 159:2 1:03 160:2 1:30 180:14 181:7 1st 35:9 226:4 226:5 227:3 231:20 236:3

- 2 -

2,000 89:7 90:22 100:16 101:16 128:25 2-year 64:22 **2.1** 174:17 202:14 208:10 **2.2** 177:25 2.6 174:18 20,000 77:5 2000 186:8 200 36:16 96:3 165:14 208(a 10:18 208(b)(3 10:5 161:25 20 18:21 36:11 41:7 61:11 93:23 125:18 166:16 167:19 174:5 177:12 183:21 189:11 192:2 225:3 235:21 21 45:13 109:9 167:18 225 27:7 228 176:14 22 35:20 40:3 40:5 42:13 84:22 105:20 177:4 190:12 238:20 23031 235:19 23 45:13 45:13 45:15 **246** 198:6 24 17:19 18:23 33:19 253 198:7 25 34:6 41:7 63:7 84:16 167:17 170:15 175:13 188:24 199:17 199:23 202:12 202:15 208:6 208:8 237:14 238:20 248:13 262 179:13 **26** 12:16 35:21 39:17 40:3 40:5 42:14 84:22 105:21 170:10 176:7 176:16 287 164:12 **29** 56:13 2a 195:17 209:10 2b 162:17 164:11 164:24 165:8 169:12 179:23

provided by A.R.W.

	1	1	1
	45 93:2		171:6 188:25 199:5
2	<b>46</b> 47:7	0	<b>absolutely</b> 77:3 85:16
- 3 -	<b>409</b> 200.18 <b>499</b> 196:22 200:17	- 8 -	131:16 221:22
	201:14 227:10		abstention 256:14
<b>3,000-patient</b> 179:6	4:02 256:22	8,000 17:17	Abstentions 256:12
95:22 114:3 116:13		<b>8.2</b> 170:5	abstract 165:25
128:25	- 5 -	800 87:17 113:21	accept 13:22 62:14
<b>3,121</b> 35:2 35:6 <b>3 170</b> 15:13 34:24 70:25		208:3 80 166:13 175:14	115:16 129:21 209:22
<b>3-4</b> 44:16 205:22 206:8	5,000 112:5 187:12	190:13 194:6 199:22	acceptable 145:11
<b>3-grade</b> 46:14	188:11	81.2 101:4	152:14 152:16 154:19
<b>3-hour</b> 25:19 <b>3-month</b> 213:13	<b>5-year</b> 60:24 211:12	<b>81.6</b> 101:3	205:7
<b>3-week</b> 235:10	<b>50,000</b> 127:25	<b>82.7</b> 121:16	239:12 252:20
3-year 64:21 100:10	<b>500</b> 190:5 245:24	82 105:5 106:10	access 13:2
107:23 121:13 219:25	247:15 50 20:7 20:13 27:13	<b>83-7052</b> 178:24 <b>83</b> 167:6 232:9	accident 169:17
<b>3/grade</b> 47:6 47:8	58:19 58:19 63:18 67:4	84 32:17	accordance 10:4 33:4
<b>30,000</b> 117:7	67:5 74:14 81:13 94:16	851 179:5	161:24
<b>30.1</b> 102:22 <b>300</b> 78:13 82:4 82:9	237:15 237:16	<b>8541</b> 19:13 71:7 <b>86</b> 156:8	94:25 103:4 213:20
<b>30</b> 22:9 36:12 48:15	<b>55</b> 94:16 172:2 199:22	89 175:7	251:12
49:2 63:19 92:24 183:21	<b>56.8</b> 100:11	8:01 8:2	accordingly 135:7
<b>311</b> 207:7	<b>57</b> 207:25		244:21 245:14 246:11
<b>325</b> 43:9 43:12 104:12	<b>59-year</b> 63:18	- 9 -	accounted 177:2
<b>32</b> 108:24 109:11	<b>59</b> 199:16 204:8 204:20		accrual 27:22 28:21
<b>330</b> 207:9		9-year 211:5	92:2 99:6 133:10 181:2
<b>331</b> 176:13		900 34:20 99:4 109:22	accrue 28:21 32:10
<b>33</b> 232:10 <b>342</b> 36:16 102:22	- 6 -	110:5 90 25:22 26:10 32:4	34:9 accrued 15:13 34:24
<b>34</b> 109:11 166:23		32:22 33:5 39:3 40:9	104:13 176:16
167:18 199:16	<b>6,000</b> 18:11	40:15 52:11 52:25 79:13	accruing 27:2 27:17
<b>35</b> 7 176:12 <b>35</b> 170:11 206:3 224:7	<b>600</b> 19:20 26:8 38:19 68:13	172:3 198:24 92 38:7 48:23 199:16	28:10 accumulated 15:23
224:10	<b>60</b> 19:16 19:18 26:10	<b>9344</b> 12:24	accuracy 225:5
<b>36-month</b> 220:11	32:3 32:22 39:3 40:8	<b>93</b> 92:13 167:14 176:13	accurate 104:16 122:9
<b>36</b> 198:9 198:10 200:13	40:13 42:18 79:13	<b>94</b> 93:25 199:20 236:4	achieve 85:25 139:18
202:11 213:20 220:12	<b>624</b> 36:14 92:14	95 34:6 41:17 48:7	177:6
250:25 37 170:9 176:7 177:21	<b>642</b> 166:6 166:22	166:25 240:3 240:14 96 5 123:25	achieved 169:7
207:25	65-year-old 95:24	<b>96</b> 48:7 81:21	acknowledge 232:24
<b>38</b> 176:7	<b>65</b> 93:24 93:25 94:4	<b>97.7</b> 123:25	across 61:23 67:22
<b>399</b> 82:4 3•15 232•16	94:6 94:14 95:11 95:23	97 25:10 981 44·5	68:19 168:23 171:5 175:24 203:14
	<b>67.3</b> 100:11	<b>98</b> 121:19 121:21	ACT 81:21
		233:18 233:22	acting 9:9 212:10
- 4 -	- 7 -	<b>33</b> 32:14 133:4 234:6	active 21:24 22:4 30:17
		_	30:17 48:17
<b>4.34</b> 174:20	7 000 18:4	- A -	activity 14:12 17:3
228:19	70 189:15 191:19		actual 57:8 87:7 91:24
<b>40</b> 19:15 81:12 81:20	192:15	a.m 8:2	111:13 190:23 232:3
126:8 189:8 189:10	72,000 114:5 74 42:4	ability 60:2 90:2 245:8 ablation 63:5	247:9 actuarial 71:10
<b>42</b> 170:14	<b>75</b> 25:16 26:10 32:3	abnormalities 45:25	acute 95:10 97:10
<b>44</b> 169:20 170:11	32:22 33:5 40:9 79:13	about-face 118:2	acutely 105:11 106:12
208:12 450 34:20 35:13	109:25 175:8 186:8	absence 59:5-59:7 252:9	add 13:4 29:16 31:23
<b>452</b> 199:7	76 204:9 204:21	absolute 60:8 61:8	81:21 94:21 126:20
<b>453</b> 35:13 36:14	<b>78</b> 38:25 41:19	61:10 170:7 170:12	221:9
			ľ

### 

added 97:3 97:23 100:22 106:16 154:7 236:15 254:10 adding 39:4 40:13 41:3 49:7 49:8 49:13 76:9 231:15 237:13 addition 10:4 10:15 12:20 12:24 15:5 32:6 32:11 34:7 40:18 42:11 49:19 101:7 104:22 111:5 111:6 161:24 250:20 additional 17:24 18:7 45:16 98:4 101:12 104:10 105:2 106:9 106:17 107:12 115:9 115:16 134:11 219:25 225:9 233:3 233:19 234:2 236:7 236:15 236:18 236:19 236:22 237:17 250:20 additive 154:4 address 11:15 52:7 56:22 65:6 65:17 70:24 93:10 93:13 113:9 128:15 137:2 137:4 154:14 155:8 158:13 162:21 addressed 30:13 58:4 58:7 82:12 98:22 99:6 247:24 addresses 9:15 161:11 addressing 31:11 66:12 adequate 183:18 adhered 235:22 251:5 adjourn 158:24 adjourned 256:23 adjust 92:6 135:2 135:7 230:16 238:19 243:12 adjusted 230:9 230:12 243:15 adjusting 91:2 134:21 144:17 167:11 171:23 172:6 238:25 adjustment 199:9 199:10 238:16 243:8 adjustments 238:6 249:17 administered 12:9 33:10 51:5 53:9 79:17 234:20 administration 16:18 53:21 154:20 admit 120:24 Adriamycin-based 153:3 153:11 Adriamycin 19:14 25:6 79:17 114:11 114:25 115:2 152:25 153:5 154:12 ADRS 43:20 43:24 52:6 advance 97:25 advanced 21:13 advancement 12:23

advantage 18:2 21:2 39:4 42:7 69:2 103:15 130:23 130:25 208:21 advantages 15:20 16:20 30:15 67:7 adverse 46:16 52:14 104:14 104:17 191:12 205:7 205:9 205:11 205:20 232:2 advice 140:3 advise 138:22 140:5 advised 150:11 advising 95:24 140:10 advisory 184:14 advocate 12:12 117:6 137:24 150:7 Affairs 184:16 affect 80:20 93:17 128:11 140:23 249:13 affected 113:16 affiliated 131:4 afternoon 184:13 184:16 185:25 194:19 194:23 202:2 204:24 221:19 231:4 232:21 afterward 26:22 agency's 10:13 10:22 11:4 162:4 agency 10:19 50:8 54:9 95:3 100:7 100:17 101:2 101:25 103:15 105:24 112:4 233:12 253:12 agenda 9:19 11:9 161:15 162:7 163:5 163:11 agent 16:16 21:11 29:9 30:17 49:19 50:9 50:22 78:9 175:18 agents 16:15 17:25 21:3 21:4 21:23 29:7 53:8 aggregate 172:9 aggressive 25:17 agree 72:19 89:11 98:5 120:9 122:11 122:11 128:5 129:3 134:14 135:18 140:4 140:12 150:13 150:22 153:7 210:10 242:19 253:10 agreed 200:25 agreement 101:25 108:18 agrees 99:10 AJCC 234:14 al 28:17 Alabama 187:13 alive 191:21 191:24 210:25 allow 118:2 162:14 254:16 allowed 31:24 32:19 129:16 166:12 allowing 12:4 24:13 alluded 194:2 229:9

alopecia 45:24 97:21 alpha 162:17 164:11 164:24 165:8 169:12 179:22 195:17 198:23 209:10 altered 141:19 171:10 alternating 25:3 alternation 24:23 25:7 alternative 180:10 altogether 97:19 ambiguities 248:17 ambiguous 248:10 amendment 26:16 44:3 America 239:20 American 26:23 Americans 186:8 amongst 177:15 analytic 238:3 analyze 94:11 227:13 251:7 analyzed 40:2 87:8 100:15 168:24 173:18 176:11 234:9 243:4 analyzing 19:12 anaphylactic 53:13 118:19 anatomical 201:25 and/or 99:16 99:17 100:17 100:23 101:6 101:10 103:18 107:25 121:12 189:19 Anderson 8:25 160:25 185:6 190:4 anemia 47:9 Angeles 9:4 announce 89:16 92:3 162:24 announced 57:4 91:8 91:11 announcement 9:15 89:23 91:14 161:11 announcements 89:25 announcing 91:3 93:9 annual 17:11 17:15 17:18 18:7 19:7 42:15 49:12 61:21 61:22 62:17 63:2 63:3 66:23 113:20 answer 55:5 55:24 65:9 69:13 82:21 85:17 95:20 111:19 125:11 134:23 136:21 155:6 155:7 199:13 203:20 215:24 222:21 223:7 256:18 256:19 answering 217:14 228:2 answers 219:4 anthracycline-based 158:5anthracycline 14:17 16:22 16:24 18:3 19:2 20:25 22:6 22:7 22:14 26:12 30:17 49:7 155:25 156:2anthracyclines 18:6

30:22 anti-her2 29:11 antibody 21:16 29:11 anticipate 218:17 anticipated 165:13 180:4 217:21 255:17 antigens 164:7 antitumor 164:5 Antonio 185:2 185:23 anybody 56:25 179:25 anymore 225:20 anyway 65:8 116:11 128:4 134:8 249:14 250:11 apart 24:6 220:6 apologize 195:25 210:17 254:14 apparent 99:25 141:19 180:24 appeal 193:13 appealed 22:23 appear 55:23 94:18 125:23 246:21 251:9 **appearance** 9:17 9:23 10:18 42:7 45:9 102:9 161:13 161:19 appears 41:24 67:11 79:16 102:5 106:21 249:25 applicable 32:13 applicant's 99:10 applicant 98:24 application 13:14 125:14 163:15 165:8 194:24 195:2 196:17 206:12 212:9 232:23 232:25 233:7 233:12 234:5 242:24 244:19 255:10 applications 245:4 applied 18:17 197:24 applies 46:19 68:19 74:16 apply 21:6 applying 25:8 appreciable 100:25 101:22 103:19 appreciate 98:2 201:3 255:21 appreciative 82:13 approach 21:8 21:23 23:11 30:14 30:15 30:25 112:8 139:23 approaches 13:17 17:7 74:14 96:25 appropriate 36:19 60:23 60:25 68:25 69:2 69:11 109:25 134:19 137:7 142:6 156:25 157:2 157:5 239:2 252:24 appropriately 43:13 90.7 approval 12:7 13:3 14:19 29:10 29:12 50:9 107:18 111:14 119:19

### Reef Integrated Bystems

138:24 164:11 175:17 233:25 245:22 247:17 253:12 255:10 approvals 111:10 143:21 approve 129:2 140:6 147:12 approved 14:23 15:24 21:12 33:11 117:8 137:18 139:7 139:8 141:9 143:17 147:16 152:4 152:14 154:23 155:25 164:3 165:9 176:24 233:4 245:5 246:7 254:4 approximately 37:25 112:23 163:24 234:24 April 15:14 35:9 36:7 91:10 166:2 176:10 199:18 Aredia 141:18 aren't 52:3 59:10 110:24 arena 140:3 argue 68:9 argument 112:12 140:18 204:23 arise 135:13 174:25 Arizona 8:15 160:15 arrange 145:21 arrangements 13:25 arrived 118:4 255:17 arriving 14:4 arthralgia 46:9 47:21 arthralgias/myalgias 104:25 article 238:18 ascertain 213:22 ascertainment 214:16 229:11 ASCO 25:10 34:18 35:19 36:9 36:16 36:23 40:3 49:18 57:13 57:18 69:23 70:18 166:4 asking 29:23 29:24 32:21 69:5 69:13 78:4 108:11 123:15 137:25 209:22 210:7 218:6 218:7 224:9 asks 139:6 aspect 217:23 222:5 aspirin 127:14 assess 32:3 32:5 assessed 48:19 assesses 78:10 assessment 244:18 assigned 89:5 132:3 associated 46:8 46:11 47:19 104:9 104:23 169:9 169:22 assume 122:4 220:17 assumed 34:5 34:9 assuming 92:20 256:18 assumption 89:4 92:18 148:11 assumptions 34:8

122:3 198:25 asthenia 205:18 206:6 232:6astrology 127:16 astronomical 80:2 ATC 28:3 28:16 attempt 242:23 attempted 237:10 237:25 attempts 192:21 250:18 attend 162:25 attention 49:23 108:2 144:7 147:24 148:15 attitude 70:7 112:21 113:2 attractive 21:19 attributed 105:15 auditing 225:10 audits 165:20 176:15 augmented 28:17 augments 30:18 August 79:2 94:22 233:23 Australia 239:20 Austria 196:18 234:23 Austrian 196:25 206:13 210:2 212:14 230:20 average 18:19 75:17 138:4 170:2 182:11 averaged 71:15 avoid 53:20 120:22 aware 11:11 72:22 72:23 77:9 126:2 155:16 155:17 162:9 163:23 164:21 184:3 246:14 awareness 12:14 **axilla** 192:6 axillary 24:21 axillas 192:7 - B -B-22 19:19 25:14 B-28 26:25 back 55:24 58:5 62:15 63:5 64:16 67:16 82:14 98:10 110:5 121:10 123:24 128:19 138:14 145:18 156:19 157:7 165:17 168:7 169:6 175:17 176:10 192:5 192:8 195:24 197:25 198:5 201:9 204:6 214:13 231:19 251:2 background 16:7 163:22 backup 215:23 backwards 254:4 bad 75:8 108:20 118:21 120:5 253:21 254:6 balanced 133:2 201:14 207:14 217:22 223:10 253:2

bar 85:22 174:10

barely 70:15 83:24 241:9 base 138:5 207:4 Basel 211:9 225:18 baseline 80:5 basically 76:18 83:12 154:18 155:11 186:15 186:17 189:18 189:22 194:6 239:24 basin 189:25 191:13 191:14 192:10 192:11 basing 108:22 109:12 158:2 Bavesian 92:19 **BCG** 193:4 193:10 bear 229:19 beaten 253:18 beating 254:14 beautifully 201:14 becomes 80:18 96:21 127:5 136:25 becoming 74:2 beforehand 174:23 begin 98:16 160:5 239ॅ:3 **begun** 33:18 behalf 12:5 behaved 171:3 behavior 53:25 believed 137:24 believing 100:21 below 87:15 109:14 bending 254:3 beneficial 99:25 103:8 106:19 benefits 42:21 94:3 benefitted 129:7 Berry's 134:11 Berry 14:2 56:22 56:23 57:12 69:18 70:3 73:4 86:8 86:25 88:24 89:11 90:5 90:8 92:19 96:9 109:22 122:18 122:22 122:25 123:22 128:14 134:13 144:16 beta 198:24 bias 148:13 156:21 229:11 230:3 230:4 242:13 251:8 biased 251:10 biases 214:22 242:11 250:14 big 220:18 247:15 bigger 72:12 72:14 119:13 138:3 biggest 182:23 biochemotherapy 176:19 177:10 177:11 177:16 183:5 biologic 140:13 140:14 140:18 158:3 biological 21:3 23:3 29:7 29:9 31:2 124:19 129:5 129:9 176:18 245:20 biologically 93:14

biology 130:15 139:23 139:23 246:11 biopsv 189:18 biostatistician 9:2 bit 41:15 75:15 75:16 83:2 84:10 85:8 90:8 120:8 128:22 129:4 130:12 150:5 188:7 192:6 201:11 203:23 212:21 214:11 214:15 228:7 240:24 244:22 250:3 255:4 black 125:15 BLAYNEY 8:18 8:18 53:2 53:12 53:19 54:12 85:9 93:22 93:23 95:9 95:20 95:21 96:14 139:21 139:22 149:13 149:17 149:23 150:7 151:3 151:4 160:18 160:18 180:18 180:19 181:4 229:6 229:7 230:7 230:14 blessing 118:3 blinded 90:18 blocker 53:9 blood 45:8 47:12 blue 19:4 40:9 104:16 168:11 174:9 178:8 178:11 188:16 189:19 189:22 244:5 BMS 36:3 board 34:15 34:23 35:14 67:22 68:20 90:3 Bob 9:9 148:5 154:21 body 196:4 230:16 253:12 bolus 33:8 Bonadonna 24:20 bone 37:14 Bonferronize 144:21 borderline 17:22 bottom 174:9 bound 231:3 boundaries 91:25 201:25 boundary 236:2 bounds 153:20 box 240:18 247:15 247:20 **boxes** 246:3 brain 49:4 105:12 Brazil 185:4 break 87:22 87:23 98:9 232:16 breakdown 81:17 Breslow 166:11 184:21 186:14 187:14 187:18 187:20 190:11 190:20 190:21 201:17 201:19 203:4 203:7 206:16 207:11 209:13 215:9 215:19 217:20 237:3 237:4 237:7 237:12 238:6 238:13 238:17 238:19 238:25



brief 211:17 briefing 93:23 briefly 59:15 166:4 186:4 231:23 233:10 234:10 255:25 brings 209:16 Bristol-myers 12:3 13:12 13:21 35:23 90:6 113:19 **Bristol** 12:18 broad 27:12 32:13 broaden 158:4 broader 118:9 153:17 Building 10:14 20:19 162:5 bunch 254:10 burden 187:4 187:8 209:4 business 124:4 buy 115:2 buys 113:19 Buzaid's 201:18 Buzaid 185:2 185:24 185:25 195:9 203:5 204:14 Buzzoni 24:20

- C -

CAF 156:15 calculate 62:23 calculated 103:21 calculates 71:7 calculation 92:20 calculations 34:5 91:6 100:20 210:3 CALGB 12:24 14:5 14:10 15:8 19:13 20:25 25:8 27:20 28:5 30:2 36:3 43:14 43:15 71:6 90:4 California 8:17 8:19 9:2 160:17 160:19 cancers 189:17 191:9 candidates 94:5 Candidly 130:10 157:20 253:9 Canetta 13:21 49:24 51:22 52:7 52:22 53:7 53:15 53:23 55:5 56:22 58:9 72:19 73:19 78:21 80:25 81:8 81:11 82:20 85:20 86:6 90:3 94:9 95:13 97:7 109:24 capecitabine 21:15 carbazine 192:25 carcinoma 50:10 cardiac 30:8 46:17 48:18 78:7 78:11 78:17 78:21 79:5 79:11 79:15 80:7 81:6 81:19 81:20 82:2 82:8 96:20 97:12 156:16 **CARDINALI** 161:3

161:3 232:21 232:22 243:2 cardiotoxicities 80:16 cardiotoxicity 33:7 cardiovascular 45:23 109:10 careful 44:12 62:16 carefully 24:23 43:8 43:22 55:9 61:24 138:11 254:23 cares 138:16 carries 203:2 carry 182:3 Cascinelli 196:6 233:17 240:6 castigated 118:3 categorical 237:8 categories 36:21 46:15 201:16 201:19 201:23 203:8 215:9 category 28:22 48:14 63:25 76:21 168:24 186:23 217:25 caused 132:24 causes 118:18 216:15 causing 24:16 caution 53:20 105:24 111:10 151:16 cautioning 111:15 caveat 140:7 140:8 145:9 153:8 caveats 138:25 156:25 **CBCS** 43:9 CBER 161:5 161:7 celebrate 112:25 cell 28:19 45:8 187:22 230:25 233:5 252:13 cells 22:19 22:20 22:21 22:22 24:4 24:6 24:7 24:15 82:25 189:20 censored 211:4 228:15 Center 8:25 9:22 14:6 22:11 160:25 161:18 185:3 185:6 190:4 197:24 201:12 203:2 227:16 centers 233:21 Central 15:11 29:19 30:5 31:14 34:11 43:17 69:16 75:21 194:2 194:7 231:24 253:3 253:7cerebrovascular 169:17 cetera 70:12 85:14 92:22 146:15 254:12 Chair's 51:16 chair 14:8 14:10 chaired 31:6 **Chairman** 185:25 chances 190:8 changed 26:16 145:13 150:3 243:9 chapters 12:16 characteristic 89:2 characteristics 36:25 characterize 251:11

Charlotte 90:13 **chart** 102:16 charts 244:8 Chastung 226:15 check 51:22 214:13 checked 55:9 checking 80:12 chemo 64:8 chemotherapeutic 21:11 50:9 chemotherapies 164:19 Chicago 160:21 chiefly 97:15 choose 115:13 230:14 chosen 230:15 chronic 95:11 97:11 chronology 165:7 180:25 **City** 9:4 claiming 183:13 212:2 clarification 51:17 51:24 57:8 133:14 134:11 144:16 180:17 219:18 224:21 225:7 225:9 231:9 234:3 243:17 244:12 244:19 246:16 clarify 75:3 92:17 157:11 182:20 182:22 210:8 211:16 212:7 219:10 220:15 226:19 244:25 247:12 247:19 247:22 clarity 210:17 Clark 187:17 221:5 class 53:8 164:7 164:7 classic 156:14 classical 51:8 clear 32:16 68:5 78:12 85:6 138:22 157:17 182:5 201:4 221:2 251:4 255:8 clearer 67:15 clinic 124:7 clinical/pharm 111:23 clinical 13:12 56:20 111:20 128:9 136:4 136:14 141:23 141:24 142:21 143:4 143:8 145:25 146:6 146:8 146:13 146:19 146:23 147:12 147:19 148:13 148:15 148:25 149:18 150:19 151:10 151:11 158:13 161:5 180:13 185:7 186:13 190:6 194:14 195:4 197:18 197:19 212:20 213:2 213:22 clinically 52:17 166:14 184:23 194:15 195:4 197:20 206:17 207:16 208:6 209:12 212:22 clinician 69:12 129:25 198:16 clinicians 120:22

230:18 clock 212:9 closely 23:23 57:23 101:19 214:11 closer 23:17 210:14 closest 121:9 233:6 closure 27:20 165:13 cluttered 142:3 CMF 16:23 17:16 18:4 18:23 24:22 24:23 25:6 69:3 83:13 153:13 154:4 154:6 156:10 CNS 213:15 cohort 104:15 collaboration 35:23 colleague 217:10 225:15 colleagues 24:20 collect 43:3 43:25 198:17 collected 43:11 44:5 44:6 110:12 163:25 166:4 199:13 207:9 214:3 225:21 226:22 231:20 collection 43:21 43:24 colon 112:5 112:7 colors 71:5 columns 44:15 48:6 combination 12:10 14:23 17:16 30:21 32:4 42:11 49:20 51:5 54:7 107:2 107:19 116:19 152:5 combinations 16:22 16:24 18:3 116:22 combine 193:9 239:4 combining 242:3 comfort 96:2 229:16 comfortable 94:6 95:23 96:5 109:15 109:17 114:15 139:3 153:11 153:22 158:7 comfortably 138:2 comforting 50:5 50:18 commenced 163:22 commensurate 183:12 comment 11:17 81:25 88:24 96:9 96:17 121:2 126:14 139:3 142:25 143:16 147:23 154:3 154:12 162:23 218:20 231:2 254:13 commented 126:16 comments 117:21 134:11 136:17 139:21 141:2 142:10 151:3 152:8 157:10 162:15 212:12 committee's 10:11 256:20 commonly 33:11 46:8 205:20 communicate 108:13 community 33:12 131:11

### Reef Integrated Bystems

companies 113:19 142:2 149:21 Company 12:19 108:8 112:21 141:25 145:16 153:16 213:21 233:6 233:8 233:11 233:13 233:19 233:24 238:24 251:2 251:7 251:25 255:14 comparable 102:24 104:7 164:2 164:18 238:20 compare 94:14 123:25 compared 27:23 39:12 39:23 49:21 64:22 79:6 100:11 101:23 103:20 121:16 132:24 132:25 171:22 172:23 173:7 173:9 173:10 173:14 185:18 194:10 200:5 **compares** 103:12 comparing 28:18 39:3 79:20 170:7 173:3 173:16 173:24 174:8 comparison 23:15 29:4 29:4 38:25 50:11 71:10 105:7 167:12 183:13 comparisons 40:21 71:11 76:16 compelling 72:4 110:4 116:15 152:25 245:7 competing 88:10 completed 28:21 34:21 48:7 48:23 91:9 110:3 110:7 114:10 179:5 179:11 181:2 213:24 233:22 completes 256:20 completing 48:24 completion 33:22 38:17 complicated 20:2 component 181:16 183:4 composed 99:24 compound 95:8 comprised 106:23 179:14 compromise 153:3 computed 235:24 235:25 conceded 118:22 concentrated 31:20 43:2 concentrating 185:8 concept 22:23 25:9 26:12 58:7 189:21 concepts 253:21 concern 10:21 11:4 142:6 142:22 156:12 156:13 214:15 214:20 220:18 229:15 251:20 concerning 10:3 10:8 10:24 78:24 120:10 134:14 161:23 162:2 186:12 195:2

concerns 33:7 245:13 conclude 42:10 204:2 204:6 concluded 205:9 concluding 13:22 49:25 conclusion 49:6 67:10 74:25 243:18 conclusions 76:18 170:18 171:15 178:19 179:20 208:2 238:22 **Concomitant 27:10** 65:14 concurrent 239:15 condemn 125:19 condition 251:23 conduct 240:22 conducted 17:2 29:14 34:12 36:6 165:5 179:8 180:9 181:8 194:4 196:18 197:13 198:21 198:22 234:11 234:23 conference 36:18 confers 100:22 confidence 41:18 41:23 56:18 59:21 59:25 60:10 64:21 66:20 75:12 75:22 75:23 76:13 77:2 77:12 83:18 83:24 84:17 87:9 88:17 118:9 118:12 121:22 122:5 123:7 123:10 123:14 135:14 135:16 240:4 240:11 240:14 251:18 confident 61:15 72:17 84:12 confines 153:15 confirm 54:18 conflict 9:12 9:15 9:24 10:19 161:9 161:11 161:20 conflicted 252:5 confounded 40:21 confounder 223:20 confounding 33:20 confused 118:6 conjunction 244:15 **Connecticut** 8:21 160:9connection 12:18 connections 12:3 connotations 177:15 consciously 32:7 consensus 36:18 44:4 249:11 consent 34:25 198:16 221:13 225:23 consequence 24:9 26:3conservative 91:21 138:20 conservatively 210:3 considerable 30:22 42:6 201:10 considerably 38:20 consideration 20:21 21:8 92:5 94:19 131:17

132:15 180:6 215:4 215:8 215:17 244:18 considering 39:24 228:19 245:18 consist 250:5 consisted 97:15 100:16 101:15 104:12 197:17 200:18 201:21 consistency 49:16 124:24 143:15 168:22 172:2 245:21 246:11 consistent 15:23 42:22 50:24 68:7 72:24 73:4 81:4 86:4 88:18 95:6 103:16 154:2 168:11 170:23 171:4 173:5 173:20 173:20 179:23 222:2 240:20 241:12 245:6 consistently 46:19 67:22 171:3 173:8 consists 195:18 constant 33:2 61:23 63:4 63:7 constitute 10:17 constituted 176:12 constitutes 45:13 constrain 180:9 consultants 13:24 consulting 162:17 consumer 160:15 contained 81:9 241:5 247:10 containing 49:8 178:17 contains 174:5 content 244:8 context 16:8 26:23 54:24 89:18 147:7 163:15 221:18 continue 13:9 90:24 91:19 92:15 208:23 214:4 232:19 continues 28:21 78:25 continuing 43:23 90:23 continuous 116:5 170:21 178:22 201:23 237:8 continuously 170:10 contrasted 177:21 178:17 contrasts 167:20 contribute 145:20 control 100:12 101:24 239:17 controlled 239:16 249:2 256:2 controls 238:10 controversial 193:6 controversy 62:5 conversation 146:25 Conversely 175:11 convey 151:4 convinced 251:24 convincing 133:18 136:23 150:2 cooperative 15:9 15:10

provided by A.R.W.

26:23 131:25 coordinated 28:14 28:23 coordinating 15:8 29:20 30:6 copy 10:12 162:3 231:17 core 16:10 99:12 Combleet 240:8 corollary 78:16 correct 57:14 70:3 86:25 138:19 215:6 215:6 216:24 218:13 219:16 220:2 223:22 224:19 247:10 250:2 corrected 172:3 correction 248:13 corrections 231:15 correlated 208:15 correlation 187:23 188:20 189:24 190:7 195:21 204:5 corresponding 70:16 70:21 103:17 103:22 238:7 corroborate 247:21 corroborated 22:2 165:20 corroborating 22:11 cost 79:25 132:20 132:24 164:17 costs 80:2 80:2 counsels 94:2 country 193:7 counts 52:10 couple 55:15 77:25 134:2 216:9 255:7 course 21:14 29:6 29:10 35:3 37:22 38:8 52:16 73:9 75:13 91:19 96:10 119:4 119:22 121:3 154:17 206:4 211:25 212:4 212:15 220:11 223:3 238:2 238:15 courses 37:25 38:2 38:9 48:8 51:10 107:12 covariate 236:25 243:10 248:13 249:18 covariates 70:11 134:21 237:11 cover 114:20 158:15 Cox 38:23 39:16 57:15 70:10 70:21 134:20 167:10 170:22 171:8 171:23 172:8 179:14 **Craig** 13:19 14:8 19:9 26:6 31:5 49:24 60:13 Creagan 240:6 243:23 create 10:18 12:13 credence 242:10 credibility 99:21 250:22 credible 126:13 127:11 144:8 **CRFS** 207:9 criteria 200:23 221:7

Reef integrate	d Systems
----------------	-----------

**.** . . .

221:11 234:13 234:25 238:2 251:16 critical 30:12 82:10 91:15 cross-resistant 31:22 cross 120:14 121:14 121:17 240:16 247:16 crossed 26:13 121:14 crossing 168:4 crossover 29:21 crossovers 91:6 crucial 202:3 crusty 254:2 crux 137:13 204:23 CT 187:8 213:10 **CTEP** 165:23 cumulative 79:21 curable 196:14 **curative** 120:23 cure 109:16 145:11 167:7 current 11:15 13:17 23:24 54:2 92:14 106:18 108:14 131:24 162:21 currently 107:16 132:5 156:8 179:6 186:11 195:10 207:8 curve 18:20 22:17 71:3 83:19 186:24 187:9 190:23 190:25 204:10 204:11 246:5 curves 18:15 19:8 40:8 71:2 75:10 100:9 100:13 101:23 114:12 114:12 114:14 119:8 120:13 120:14 120:15 132:18 132:20 138:16 169:9 188:12 191:2 191:6 191:18 205:3 210:5 210:20 211:5 217:2 248:5curvilinear 22:16 cutaneous 166:10 cutoff 202:22 202:24 207:10 226:4 226:5 226:25 227:5 cutting 228:14 cycle 17:10 23:19 23:19 cycles 16:17 25:15 25:18 32:24 32:25 82:14 82:16 82:25 83:12 83:12 101:7 103:25 104:10 104:20 106:9 106:17 108:21 154:7 156:14 156:14 157:3 157:18 157:21 158:5 158:12 cyclo/adria 32:25 33:23 33:24 69:3 69:3 69:3 69:9

15:6 cyclophosphamide 12:22 19:20 25:14 26:7 26:9 28:2 31:19 32:5 32:6 43:4 107:2 107:20

152:6 cvtotoxic 50:22 154:22 Cytoxan 114:11 153:5 154:8 - D da 184:13 184:15 212:7 daily 154:7 170:2 206:25 damage 138:4 138:6 damned 115:5 danger 75:5 77:9 dashed 188:17 database 36:5 43:12 86:15 95:16 165:21 187:13 190:15 207:5 207:8 224:21 224:25 225:6 225:19 231:11 231:14 231:15 231:16 233:14 233:24 databases 43:6 187:12 190:3 239:18 date 178:23 193:15 226:5daughter 129:20 Dave's 157:11 Dave 138:15 219:5 David 8:10 10:5 13:11 160:10 216:7 dead 192:16 dealing 75:24 76:5 77:4 88:14 88:14 95:11 death 17:11 17:23 18:7 22:22 42:14 49:3 49:12 51:19 61:9 61:20 61:22 66:23 84:23 93:3 102:10 102:21 105:21 203:23 203:25 209:7 209:8 210:12 216:16 deaths 49:2 102:22 102:23 165:14 169:15 169:16 204:8 204:9 204:20 216:11 216:12 216:17 221:25 debate 249:24 252:10 December 36:6 90:22 212:5decide 67:17 96:22 131:2 132:22 decided 35:14 36:4 36:18 38:5 79:12 132:16 132:16 133:3 165:15 236:22 decides 158:8 deciding 137:18 decision 89:16 89:22 cyclophosphamide/doxorubitint 109:19 117:15 131:20 132:21 137:5 156:24 167:4 230:18 230:20 255:6 decisions 35:17 110:12 117:13 120:6 131:19

167:3 239:10 254:9 declare 68:15 decline 82:6 declined 37:15 decrease 12:13 34:7 105:3 decreasing 102:14 102:17 decrement 18:7 174:6 deepest 187:21 default 43:25 defense 122:9 defer 213:3 217:9 229:21 deficient 154:23 defined 65:13 99:13 102:9 217:15 definitely 111:22 115:10 193:7 251:12 definition 102:20 definitions 32:11 definitive 175:2 225:8 degree 44:24 **delay** 169:23 204:24 209:6 209:7 delayed 91:14 delays 224:24 232:4 deliberate 138:9 deliberated 181:24 deliberations 90:9 90:10 90:12 140:22 180:22 256:21 delighted 163:18 delivered 170:2 170:3 Demetri 25:10 demographic 125:18 166:24 174:25 demographics 175:5 201:11 207:11 demography 167:16 demonstrate 30:23 50:12 182:6 demonstrated 21:19 102:14 107:6 111:17 121:21 172:2 178:20 200:3 demonstrates 15:20 22:15 denied 91:14 denominator 52:13 dense 21:9 24:12 24:14 24:16 24:18 27:25 29:2 30:14 density 21:8 23:17 24:8 28:4 28:7 deny 151:17 denying 77:7 120:23 dependent 63:8 245:8 depending 75:7 192:20 depends 126:8 depicted 216:4 depression 205:19 206:7 232:6 depth 166:11 186:14 187:14 187:19 190:11 190:20 190:21 215:19

provided by A.R.W.

238:6 Derek 8:16 120:8 129:3 130:3 160:16 derived 100:18 103:14 106:21 dermatology 213:6 describe 64:20 146:23 155:2 describes 16:9 describing 122:13 deserve 254:14 deserved 35:17 designated 152:2 desperately 114:7 despite 53:17 detail 26:19 141:17 167:14 176:22 179:16 detailed 150:19 237:22 241:6 246:23 details 52:23 detect 34:6 183:16 detectable 184:23 determination 78:11 132:12 determine 248:11 248:11 251:8 develop 196:12 196:13 developing 78:17 deviation 17:21 83:16 deviations 17:22 devil's 137:24 dexrazoxane 30:9 DFI 217:2 218:6 218:7 218:11 219:9 252:8 252:11 252:12 252:14 252:18 diagnosed 114:5 diagnosis 72:3 186:8 186:19 221:3 diarrhea 45:24 dichotomized 237:15 die 189:15 191:18 191:19 229:13 died 48:15 51:18 53:12 105:11 105:14 105:14 106:12 189:3 191:3 191:4 218:2 218:16 221:4 differ 171:18 178:4 differed 171:13 171:14 differences 36:9 38:11 38:22 59:25 64:21 72:14 125:23 146:5 171:16 172:9 177:2 185:16 201:14 207:16 216:20 222:11 237:16 different 19:13 29:5 44:4 45:9 56:12 57:23 61:18 62:9 63:17 64:4 64:5 64:13 71:13 71:14 81:10 81:18 85:7 87:22 87:23 89:14 96:23 96:25 106:4 111:9 115:7 116:21 116:22 119:12 121:7 136:24 136:25 141:19 144:13 144:17

### Reef Integrated Systems

154:9 160:6 160:7 186:20 194:9 194:10 205:10 206:24 206:24 217:4 244:4 247:24 248:18 differential 116:18 differently 131:14 directed 21:16 54:11 147:3 Director 9:10 14:5 184:15 185:3 185:5 185:6 185:11 directors 194:21 disadvantage 130:25 disagree 128:8 disappointed 253:24 disappointing 254:8 discerned 107:14 disclose 10:15 162:15 disclosure 111:21 discontinuation 203:19 220:5 discontinued 105:6 106:11 discounted 105:2 discrepancy 172:20 173:22 discuss 13:17 16:4 31:9 90:5 90:8 94:9 124:23 151:12 165:17 168:7 195:7 196:15 197:12 206:11 255:9 discussant 163:2 discussed 74:21 128:16 194:11 194:12 227:18 254:21 discussing 184:17 185:7 discussion 10:2 10:11 10:24 11:7 43:23 99:12 108:7 115:14 117:10 117:21 118:5 119:14 120:17 128:20 135:24 136:6 137:14 137:22 138:12 138:13 139:2 139:24 142:8 143:4 153:16 153:21 156:3 158:16 161:23 194:25 247:13 249:6 249:11 252:4discussions 11:8 156:22 162:6 246:12 disease-freed 246:19 diseases 51:3 252:11 display 79:12 176:4 240:22 Displayed 174:17 176:21 dissected 175:14 dissection 32:18 166:12 174:4 181:5 190:9 distant 102:10 102:12 102:15 102:18 186:17 223:5 distinct 195:13 distinction 110:14

166:13 distributed 43:13 distribution 99:7 175:22 disturbed 221:20 diverge 138:16 divided 71:8 dividing 86:18 Division 9:9 161:4 dizziness 205:19 206:7 doable 63:2 docetaxel 21:14 29:2 doctor 62:22 115:14 117:9 117:11 131:2 doctors 62:23 document 93:24 documentation 184:6 documented 183:10 documents 227:2 domain 21:17 Don 14:2 56:22 dosage 15:19 26:14 51:7 51:8 53:10 54:2 79:14 79:17 154:20 164:11 169:13 233:6 dosages 50:25 96:7 179:9 doses 19:14 19:15 19:20 22:18 23:9 23:22 24:5 24:24 25:20 28:17 32:3 42:18 154:5 154:16 dossier 211:10 dotted 172:10 172:18 178:9doubt 77:3 111:17 236:18 Doug 8:18 160:18 doxorubicin-based 155:20 156:9 158:4 doxorubicin-containing 153:23 157:7 157:13 157:16 doxorubicin 12:22 15:4 18:5 19:15 24:22 24:23 25:16 26:9 30:9 31:12 31:18 31:20 31:21 32:3 32:23 32:23 33:2 33:6 34:2 34:3 39:2 39:19 40:7 40:14 40:15 40:17 42:18 42:20 43:4 43:7 49:14 51:20 52:25 68:7 78:10 79:12 79:21 82:5 107:2 107:19 152:6 154:16 154:17 155:3 155:17 157:9 dozen 135:6 drain 189:20 dramatic 34:22 99:25 draw 171:15 178:19 179:20 179:21 242:5 dreadful 209:6 drew 54:15 170:18 driven 103:8 106:7 driving 14:3 drop-in 222:8

drop 35:8 48:3 48:10 186:25 218:3 dropout 37:24 38:9 47:25 48:6 dropped 35:2 48:2 97:17 97:19 drops 187:9 drove 90:13 Drs 10:5 85:9 drug-related 105:7 106:11 106:12 Drug 9:22 13:14 17:10 21:7 21:16 22:12 23:18 24:4 31:23 47:20 50:21 105:16 111:10 118:18 118:18 124:25 138:5 143:17 155:11 161:18 192:24 205:11 205:15 205:16 205:25 208:18 208:22 drugs 21:3 23:16 43:5 245:5 **DSMB** 90:6 90:9 90:9 90:11 90:11 90:18 90:24 92:10 **DTIC** 193:10 dual 191:13 192:11 Duke 188:11 Duluth 8:9 durable 164:21 duration 24:25 33:19 33:19 64:24 83:15 84:2 84:13 85:7 197:7 198:8 206:24 209:14 210:22 234:21 234:24 235:9 235:11 durations 16:21 Dutcher 162:25 dwell 176:22 dye 189:19 dying 39:22 39:22 - E -E1684 165:11 166:13 167:12 167:21 168:15 168:18 169:14 170:11 E1690 163:19 165:18 easiest 248:2 easily 119:6 Eastern 15:10 ECOG 28:23 31:14 43:15 165:21 194:5 196:2 234:16 240:9 education 12:17 educational 113:14 effectively 210:6 effectiveness 183:11 251:16 efficacious 23:19 252:8 efficacy 17:14 18:2 23:18 30:9 30:19 42:10 94:9 102:6 102:14

provided by A.R.W.

164:18 198:3 198:18 198:20 199:18 200:6 200:9 200:10 206:20 208:3 220:3 239:5 ejection 81:8 82:6 elderly 96:6 elected 35:7 elective 190:9 element 165:6 189:4 eligibility 27:11 166:10 22Ī:11 eligible 200:16 200:17 202:5 210:21 216:21 227:17 228:22 eliminated 219:2 220:18 Elizabeth 211:8 elsewhere 120:3 150:18 emerged 65:13 emerges 103:6 emotions 128:3 emphasis 250:15 emphasize 44:14 75:4 186:21 194:4 195:10 239:8 emphasizing 64:23 employed 192:24 empowerment 12:15 encourage 62:23 encouraged 96:22 251:25 ended 198:7 214:2 endpoint 27:8 27:17 82:7 125:8 126:18 167:2 185:19 198:18 200:10 214:19 218:8 234:17 235:6 248:2 248:3 248:4 249:23 250:7 252:8 252:20 endpoints 50:13 102:6 180:5 180:13 200:10 234:18 238:4 252:25 254:25 England 17:3 enrolled 37:12 37:21 ensues 119:14 ensure 12:14 ensuring 245:10 enter 131:13 entered 91:10 166:14 166:19 166:23 172:12 173:16 174:3 175:7 202:11 210:25 220:12 entering 167:16 enthusiasm 153:18 enthusiastic 59:11 entirely 88:18 entry 174:22 174:25 175:12 175:16 181:11 envious 115:22 environment 89:15 enzymes 206:10 EOŘTC 179:7 epidermis 187:21 epirubicin 83:14 154:24 155:25 157:6

## Reef integrated Systems

157:8 equal 99:7 104:7 230:2 230:3 234:16 equally 251:11 253:2 equipoise 138:23 equivalence 121:20 121:21 128:24 equivalent 169:3 169:13 174:13 ER/PR 102:3 116:7 116:8 116:20 116:21 116:24 120:12 129:6 129:11 130:10 130:23 133:8 era 180:10 eradicate 139:25 eradicating 82:24 eradication 23:21 24:16 ERP/PRP 108:21 escalate 22:25 escalated 25:13 escalating 20:24 43:6 escalation 15:4 26:12 31:20 essentially 71:22 72:2 87:3 87:5 92:22 92:25 93:5 123:23 144:20 208:24 234:13 238:2 250:16 estimate 61:3 62:25 65:25 122:6 123:19 236:12 240:13 estimated 63:21 100:7 100:10 226:11 estimates 59:16 59:21 100:8 101:2 107:24 123:11 123:13 202:16 203:6 207:17 239:21 240:3 240:10 estrogen 19:24 19:25 20:8 20:9 26:15 39:20 59:6 66:13 69:21 93:15 94:4 99:14 99:16 106:23 107:4 115:20 115:22 116:2 130:24 133:16 134:23 et 28:17 70:12 85:14 92:22 146:15 254:11 ethical 132:15 180:20 ethics 91:7 Europe 179:8 239:20 European 165:25 evaluate 31:25 90:2 102:8 162:14 203:15 evaluated 193:22 evaluating 37:14 Evaluation 9:22 40:16 59:12 73:13 161:18 evaluations 213:13 event 11:8 17:15 18:15 18:15 19:8 53:13 110:6 162:6 205:7 events 34:21 35:13 35:13 36:13 36:15 36:21 46:16 52:14 67:14 80:8 82:4 91:13 91:18 92:12

92:14 92:15 97:12 99:4 99:4 99:5 99:21 104:14 104:17 104:25 106:2 110:5 110:5 110:9 120:19 129:13 165:16 203:20 203:22 203:25 204:19 205:10 205:11 205:13 205:20 206:6 233:10 235:21 eventual 23:5 23:6 eventually 22:21 189:15 191:18 everybody 8:4 110:23 117:23 118:11 118:22 122:15 124:3 124:16 128:2 131:18 133:4 148:10 158:23 188:22 191:3 219:23 everyone 98:7 98:9 120:24 128:22 136:12 163:23 184:14 253:18 evidence 39:19 40:6 40:11 40:16 42:17 42:19 50:20 55:24 101:5 102:3 103:24 106:14 106:25 107:11 107:17 108:22 136:3 136:14 136:23 137:8 137:8 183:11 239:4 239:5 241:13 242:3 249:3 256:2 evident 129:13 evinced 101:7 exact 77:6 80:12 84:5 181:22 exactly 23:22 24:24 24:25 42:16 50:25 64:9 65:16 71:23 72:5 77:20 88:16 96:12 132:15 134:19 146:10 146:11 151:21 206:18 208:21 213:8 213:11 214:10 214:21 230:21 249:23 250:4 examine 236:22 examined 213:9 example 17:16 18:16 39:3 40:13 43:10 45:10 52:18 56:4 58:23 64:22 67:25 78:14 80:4 115:25 141:18 201:16 230:25 254:3examples 247:2 exceed 236:2 236:4 exceeding 16:21 exceeds 38:19 exception 41:8 61:24 168:25 169:14 exceptional 112:25 exceptions 9:25 161:21 exclude 11:11 156:10 162:9 227:11 excluded 10:2 161:22 200:21 219:13 220:24 excluding 227:18 exclusion 11:12 162:10

200:22 200:23 221:7 exclusions 217:17 242:11 Excuse 73:23 123:22 Executive 8:22 160:22 185:3 exercise 241:23 253:24 exerting 50:21 existed 199:16 202:9 exists 223:17 expand 84:9 expectation 217:24 218:4 experienced 104:21 105:13 experiences 232:2 experiment 30:3 expert 217:10 experts 82:18 108:8 120:2 explain 23:8 93:20 93:20 203:16 explained 189:13 222:6explaining 203:13 explains 189:5 explanation 93:13 174:6 183:2 183.6 222:3 223:17 223:23 223:25 explanations 221:21 246:9 explorations 213:10 exploratory 125:20 200:9 220:7 236:23 239:8 exponential 239:23 exposure 16:18 16:19 29:25 33:20 express 12:6 expressed 17:14 expressing 110:21 112:21 extant 93:13 extended 150:5 extends 71:4 extension 191:12 192:2 extensive 22:4 22:9 43:4 external 13:24 165:20 extra 80:19 extracellular 21:17 extranodal 191:12 192:2 extraordinary 13:25 extreme 148:18 extremely 23:7 57:23 91:21 eyeballing 55:23 120:15 - F -

faced 137:6 faces 12:15 125:13 factor 33:20 64:9 187:18 190:17 190:20 190:22 191:11 193:5 203:5factorial 28:9 30:3 91:4 92:6 factors 186:3 187:14 197:25 201:13 215:5 215:18 215:20 230:13 243:13 249:19 facts 129:9 failed 14:17 177:19 177:21 failure 22:7 48:18 48:19 102:11 102:13 failures 177:3 177:12 177:13 178:6 fair 89:4 127:8 150:10 150:10 158:22 247:5 253:25 fairly 47:9 60:6 60:25 123:10 123:12 241:15 251:18 fairness 11:15 162:21 false 74:13 familiar 17:4 18:14 65:2 98:21 150:4 212:19 family 98:5 famous 127:13 fare 192:9 fares 192:6 fashion 22:16 24:13 29:18 33:8 187:6 222:24 faster 118:5 fault 92:7 favor 71:18 73:3 100:6 117:10 138:20 177:10 214:22 247:2 favorable 175:12 191:6 240:15 favors 119:19 FDA'S 108:14 162:12 feasible 176:3 feature 29:25 features 21:20 29:21 febrile 95:9 February 165:5 176:10 197:2 feed 137:12 feels 105:24 fees 162:17 162:18 162:18 fever 45:7 45:19 45:19 47:11 figured 180:21 filed 79:2 files 214:13 223:3 financial 9:20 10:17 11:10 11:16 12:3 12:18 161:16 162:8 162:22 finding 86:4 95:7 128:6 155:3 221:21 245:9

FAC 156:14

face 95:10

### Reef Integrated Systems

15

findings 101:10 102:2 106:7 147:9 179:23 finish 32:12 65:18 finished 27:17 233:18 finishes 198:14 firm 11:16 67:10 162:22 firms 9:22 11:9 161:18 162:7 first-line 14:25 Fischler 130:18 fit 122:5 fits 55:3 fixed 32:4 flag 143:9 151:6 flat-out 22:7 flattens 188:3 flaw 254:21 flaws 248:18 254:20 flexibility 156:23 floating 249:10 flu-like 205:18 232:6 flu 206:6 fluke 87:13 flushed 153:18 focus 99:12 104:9 164:7 166:25 186:2 187:10 188:7 focused 231:7 focuses 180:7 focusing 185:14 244:10 folder 244:5 follow 30:6 35:7 50:3 80:10 93:6 145:21 201:24 210:22 214:4 236:7 251:5 follows 197:12 footsteps 50:3 forever 181:25 forget 226:18 forgotten 68:12 formal 59:3 59:7 59:12 formally 222:23 format 69:16 formed 206:12 forth 128:19 240:4 fortunately 201:8 fourth 63:25 221:6 fraction 81:9 82:6 144:5 144:9 167:25 169:24 175:25 181:9 France 196:18 197:13 213:7 214:12 Francisco 9:2 frankly 87:13 fraught 168:22 free 18:22 100:8 134:25 170:9 170:10 188:18 193:8 193:12 208:8 Freedom 10:13 162:4 French 196:20 196:20 197:13 206:15 208:9 230:19 233:21 234:25 243:7 frequency 104:7 212:21 frequent 78:15 175:15 fulfilling 144:3

fully 10:23 97:22 150:13 functions 168:18 fundamental 249:9 fundamentally 249:13 249:22 Furthermore 106:9 future 35:17 107:25 120:16 131:19 131:24 180:5 - G -G-csf 25:15 26:11 28:4 28:9 33:3 33:4 33:4 gala 113:20 gamma 193:5 ganglioside 179:4 193:20 garbage 253:22 253:23 Gemini 127:19 127:22 gender 238:7 generalized 175:24 generate 67:24 generated 62:10 74:4 74:7 74:24 generates 253:12 generation 128:7 generically 118:10 gentlemen 98:13 Ĭ84:14 194:20 George 14:5 25:10 gets 23:4 115:23 123:7 gist 245:5 Givens 217:10 217:11 217:11 218:10 218:14 218:25 219:16 229:21 231:13 giving 16:7 23:16 24:12 34:25 40:15 76:23 78:19 84:25 115:4 119:25 glad 51:11 145:22 glean 247:8 global 26:23 **GM2** 179:4 goal 167:5 goals 35:10 167:2 goes 18:20 58:5 67:14 83:20 130:15 135:24 156:18 186:24 190:25 gotten 48:16 115:3 122:10 223:16 government 10:20 11:3 grabs 112:18 113:3 134:16 grade 25:24 25:25 43:12 44:5 44:6 44:16 45:20 45:20 46:14 47:4 47:4 47:6 47:7 52:5 52:11 104:14 104:18 104:19 108:25 109:4 205:22 206:7 206:8 graded 187:25

grades 94:15 Gradishar 10:6 11:20 Grant 9:7 117:25 130:3 142:13 143:11 granted 10:5 10:9 161:25 grants 162:17 granular 187:21 granulocytopenia 44:23 47:8 52:10 52:11 94:15 109:9 graph 56:18 100:5 100:24 101:21 103:10 103:10 103:12 236:10 graphic 191:15 graphical 176:4 graphically 174:8 177:25 graphs 18:25 85:22 103:11 149:2 greatest 46:4 116:3 Ĩ16:7 173:12 grief 90:20 Grob 196:22 213:4 213:6 213:6 213:14 213:17 214:8 222:21 222:25 223:23 233:14 233:20 234:3 234:11 235:19 238:3 238:8 238:21 240:6 243:3 243:23 246:20 247:15 248:4 255:9 grossly 24:9 154:23 grouped 124:13 groupings 173:19 groups 15:9 26:23 33:14 41:2 41:4 41:12 43:22 55:22 56:2 56:12 56:14 58:18 63:16 63:20 72:15 85:16 87:6 88:22 104:20 111:6 121:6 131:25 168:23 171:5 173:15 174:9 174:10 174:15 174:19 175:12 175:24 181:14 188:15 212:20 213:8 213:11 223:10 grow 24:14 59:25 grows 77:14 growth 129:11 guess 54:14 56:8 56:15 65:6 71:5 78:10 82:7 85:13 86:18 108:24 122:2 125:5 127:14 136:18 143:18 144:10 145:6 145:18 150:13 210:16 213:21 229:16 242:9 247:5 247:13 247:23 250:11 250:12 guest 162:12 guide 140:25 147:19 202:3guided 117:11 guidelines 156:25 guides 129:24 guiding 131:19

provided by A.R.W.

I

#### Reef integrated Systems

Henderson 13:19 14:8 26:6 31:5 31:8 51:25 52:8 54:15 54:23 55:5 55:6 58:10 58:11 59:3 60:14 60:17 61:6 61:17 63:24 64:15 65:17 73:19 73:21 73:24 79:19 85:20 114:3 123:5 HER2 14:25 21:17 29:15 29:18 62:4 68:12 93:15 93:16 Herceptin 14:23 29:11 29:13 29:17 29:22 29:23 29:23 29:25 30:10 30:11 31:2 53:22 54:7 54:9 54:11 heroic 14:2 hesitant 130:12 heterogeneous 174:4 highest 33:2 114:20 114:22 highlighted 245:14 highly 38:22 39:16 39:18 70:19 92:23 136:2 144:12 223:8 238:13 253:10 histologic 190:18 historically 112:14 history 211:17 212:8 hit 80:9 151:20 181:18 hoc 236:24 250:18 Hoffmann-la 184:16 185:11 194:22 217:12 225:18 holds 69:22 honest 215:14 Hooftman's 215:3 Hooftman 185:10 194:17 194:19 194:21 210:10 213:3 215:7 215:22 216:4 216:13 216:17 216:24 217:5 217:9 220:2 220:23 222:13 222:20 224:9 224:12 224:15 224:19 225:14 225:22 226:14 226:24 229:2 229:19 230:18 231:25 232:8 hopes 110:23 hormonal 111:7 hormone 26:14 27:10 27:12 27:14 87:11 93:12 99:13 101:12 104:2 106:22 107:9 116:19 133:4 141:20 Hospital 185:3 Hospitalization 46:16 Houston 14:3 Hudis 28:17 huge 43:5 77:5 119:2 132:10 148:10 hunch 138:15 hundreds 22:2 hypersensitivity 46:10 47:21 49:3 53:17 97:19 104:24 105:13

hypothesis 62:9 62:10 67:24 74:4 74:7 74:9 128:7 128:12 199:24 223:24 235:24 236:3 236:5 hypothetical 218:11 220:19 Hypothetically 220:16 - I **i.e** 237:6 I/ii 196:10 I/phase 183:22 183:24 idea 55:13 82:9 88:21 125:2 148:21 253:2 identical 40:3 114:13 135:11 190:9 identified 101:15 103:4 105:25 117:23 121:4 172:20 239:19 254:21 identify 54:23 211:6 253:20 254:20 ignore 91:24 246:13 ignored 245:12 **II** 14:15 24:20 25:9 25:13 28:16 133:11 183:22 183:24 184:17 184:21 185:9 185:13 185:17 186:4 186:11 186:13 186:19 186:21 186:23 187:3 187:11 194:14 195:3 195:4 195:11 195:15 195:18 196:2 196:11 197:9 197:18 201:20 209:11 210:12 234:14 **IIB** 196:3 III 56:17 185:9 185:17 186:4 186:14 186:21 186:25 187:7 192:23 192:24 195:15 196:4 196:6 196:12 IIIA 25:13 28:16 **IIIB** 30:3 illogical 88:9 illustrated 168:9 168:16 177:24 178:17 imagine 40:22 58:5 69:2Ž 85:5 110:23 193:19 imaging 187:4 imbalance 215:11 215:25 243:12 imbalances 243:9 immediate 155:2 immunomodulatory 164:6 impact 12:13 20:6 20:7 20:9 20:14 20:16 20:17 54:22 76:19 111:6 119:5 164:16 164:21 164:24 165:4

168:3 168:15 168:23 170:7 170:8 171:21 172:5 175:23 177:6 177:23 178:11 178:21 178:22 179:15 180:3 180:24 182:10 182:11 183:17 184:3 193:2 193:7 193:21 203:8 impacted 168:6 impede 30:9 implications 179:21 implies 74:6 imply 110:20 implying 152:12 152:16 importance 125:6 125:7 221:17 236:24 important 18:9 29:6 29:25 32:9 32:11 35:15 42:25 50:13 52:17 53:23 59:20 64:23 72:21 74:2 79:19 80:14 92:10 94:21 131:6 136:3 139:11 148:25 152:24 165:6 166:9 186:21 187:14 188:13 194:3 195:7 195:22 196:9 205:5 208:25 212:22 243:13 245:7 245:14 importantly 206:6 impossible 182:3 imposter 235:16 impression 82:17 impressive 76:12 85:13 86:2 86:15 114:11 240:24 improve 20:20 22:24 improved 165:17 170:21 252:18 improvement 107:5 164:17 167:25 172:14 173:5 173:11 173:12 173:20 174:11 223:18 240:11 240:20 241:13 242:7 improvements 164:15 221:22 improves 16:14 170:20 improving 29:8 **in-transit** 186:16 192:13 inappropriate 60:5 131:19 incidence 44:23 45:11 46:12 46:23 52:11 52:19 79:5 79:8 94:15 94:17 95:14 104:17 186:6 197:8 included 32:14 52:13 57:16 100:24 164:12 164:21 166:6 166:16 166:22 167:17 180:19 212:13 218:15 218:22 219:5 219:8 219:11 220:20 221:10 224:16 includes 94:8 inclusion 234:13

provided by A.R.W. 234:25 235:2 238:2 incomplete 247:6 incorrect 52:4 increases 50:6 206:10

incorrect 52:4 increases 50:6 206:10 increasing 177:10 increasingly 32:9 incredibly 70:23 increment 170:12 170:14 incremental 18:5 30:21 30:23 30:24 114:9 115:8 115:15 115:17 116:11 independent 34:14 71:12 71:17 208:3 indicate 240:19 indicated 16:2 51:6 104:11 146:18 224:7 236:11 241:5 indicates 91:20 indication 15:25 34:16 98:20 111:13 129:2 137:18 141:9 146:7 147:17 150:9 151:14 151:18 151:22 151:25 153:17 157:12 184:19 210:12 233:4 233:5 233:8 indications 111:22 141:22 142:2 142:8 142:20 142:23 145:24 146:2 146:12 146:22 147:21 148:24 149:18 150:8 151:9 151:13 155:9 205:12 230:25 245:4 indicators 180:12 individually 40:12 induced 97:15 induction 28:18 169:20 170:4 235:10 ineligible 166:24 inequity 253:6 infarct 105:12 infarction 49:4 169:18 infection 45:7 45:11 45:12 45:16 47:11 52:18 94:17 infections 45:14 **inferior** 19:16 inflation 89:20 influenced 119:2 131:11 inform 203:9 Information 10:14 12:14 27:19 43:10 57:11 73:10 80:7 95:4 110:25 114:18 121:10 128:9 131:22 140:21 140:25 148:25 149:19 151:24 162:5 163:19 180:17 190:18 190:21 212:21 215:15 220:9 222:24 223:2 225:21 229:2 229:20 232:3 232:9 233:19 234:3 241:5

# Reef Integrated Systems

242:5 242:22 242:24 242:25 246:14 247:7 251:3 254:6 254:6 254:10 255:14 informative 66:4 informed 34:25 117:16 225:23 infrequently 47:17 infusion 25:19 initial 13:16 14:19 38:15initially 142:11 200:24 initiated 28:14 198:2 initiation 198:20 201:4 202:7 206:21 inject 189:19 injection 12:8 189:22 200:24 220:25 injections 201:2 inoperable 30:4 inquired 254:23 insert 33:5 54:2 54:9 54:11 95:3 111:15 117:11 117:11 129:24 138:25 139:15 140:21 141:14 141:18 142:19 145:4 145:12 149:14 inserts 148:3 149:18 insight 243:6 inspections 251:4 instance 53:21 72:15 81:16 149:23 instances 123:20 Institute 36:18 institutions 176:15 instrumental 98:17 instruments 97:8 insufficient 102:5 INT-0148 15:3 integrate 21:5 21:10 integrated 21:23 integrates 30:16 integrating 21:2 integration 29:7 29:13 31:2 integrity 10:21 11:4 intended 249:13 intense 44:9 44:22 80:3 intensely 43:21 52:9 80:23 82:3 intensification 115:2 intensity 23:14 37:5 intensively 52:20 52:20 83:4 intent-to-treat 200:19 218:22 221:14 227:10 236:9 245:10 254:22 intent-to 220:18 248:11 intention-to-treat 166:22 interaction 34:2 40:17 42:19 57:9 57:15 57:17 58:16 58:23 59:4 59:4 59:8 62:8 62:11 62:13 69:19 69:21 69:24 70:14

70:21 70:23 86:13 87:2 93:20 93:21 124:6 130:17 134:22 134:24 152:25 172:2 203:10 203:11 interactions 35:25 62:25 91:5 interest 9:13 9:15 9:24 10:16 10:17 10:20 11:10 11:15 151:10 161:9 161:11 161:20 162:8 162:16 162:21 255:23 interested 40:23 54:18 110:11 155:12 interesting 23:3 82:8 97:3 144:5 144:25 interestingly 41:4 interests 9:20 9:21 10:20 11:2 11:3 161:16 161:17 interferons 193:25 **Intergroup** 13:20 15:3 20:22 26:4 27:3 28:5 28:14 28:23 29:20 31:11 133:3 163:19 interim 34:19 35:12 44:10 89:18 91:2 91:24 98:25 99:2 99:3 100:20 106:13 106:18 107:10 107:17 107:25 109:20 109:25 110:10 110:19 176:24 199:15 199:19 219:11 219:20 224:22 224:23 225:12 226:11 250:17 interleukin-2 164:3 176:24 177:4 177:5 intermediate 168:19 179:8 182:11 209:4 internal 165:20 interpret 89:14 103:5 121:23 140:23 157:5 229:15 interpretation 89:9 97:10 228:9 228:12 250:3 interpreted 89:17 227:24 interval 118:9 121:22 122:6 123:7 135:16 174:11 174:12 185:18 185:19 195:17 195:21 198:19 200:4 202:6 202:7 203:11 203:21 204:5 204:15 204:17 206:21 207:18 208:8 208:17 209:23 212:23 213:2 214:17 220:3 221:17 227:9 227:15 229:10 234:18 249:4 256:3intervals 41:18 41:23 59:21 59:25 60:7 60:11 64:21 66:21 84:17 118:13 123:10 123:12 123:14 135:15 214:7

240:4 240:11 240:14 intradermal 192:12 intravenously 51:9 intriguing 128:6 intrinsically 225:16 introduce 16:7 151:16 232:22 introduced 229:11 introducing 8:6 introduction 160:5 Intron 239:8 239:14 243:20 244:21 244:24 245:19 254:4 intuitive 24:3 invasion 187:17 investigated 254:23 investigator 105:15 196:22 197:2 213:4 229:14 investigators 17:4 44:8 197:3 214:4 239:13 251:2 invited 113:18 113:21 162:12 163:12 involve 11:8 22:13 29:15 144:8 162:6 involvement 11:12 11:16 162:10 162:22 179:13 involvements 162:13 involves 21:21 involving 17:10 18:11 19:2 24:22 25:12 25:15 27:12 29:21 132:7 irrelevant 248:8 irreproducible 254:11 issued 233:23 issues 68:22 68:23 98:5 105:17 109:2 111:21 115:10 137:19 150:17 222:7 245:20 items 180:17 ITT 200:19 228:23 236:14 236:21 IV 21:25 25:24 25:25 186:17 221:4 - J -James 9:5 10:25 98:13 Janice 162:24 January 196:21 197:14 197:15 198:2 198:3 199:20 226:4 226:6 227:3 231:20 236:3 Jay 161:6 Jean-jock 213:6 Jim 8:8 113:3 Jody 8:14 160:14 John 162:15 163:13 180:15 181:19 184:11 186:15 193:25 Journal 190:6 judgment 121:6 124:8

July 165:7 175:17 199:15 212:15 jump 69:7 149:15 188:6 jumped 130:22 June 165:6 jury 138:23 JUSTICE 9:9 9:9 111:18 111:19 158:12 justification 100:21 justified 34:23 80:3 202:22 justify 106:16

- K -

Kaplan-meier 59:16 190:23 191:15 202:16 203:6 207:17 240:3 Kaplan 100:8 Karen 8:22 160:22 161:9 163:4 163:12 Kathleen 10:6 **KEEGAN** 161:4 161:4 163:17 242:20 250:2 250:23 250:24 Kelsen 10:6 108:16 108:17 109:8 111:24 111:25 131:8 131:9 143:13 145:2 145:3 145:23 152:8 152:9 153:21 153:22 Kenneth 160:12 kernel 16:10 key 17:9 17:12 109:2 166:13 180:5 185:14 Kim's 156:13 Kim 9:3 10:9 153:11 157:7 161:22 kinds 81:18 85:4 242:11 kinetic 23:10 77:13 77:19 140:17 kinetics 129:12 Kirkwood's 222:22 Kirkwood 162:15 163:13 163:16 163:17 180:23 181:6 181:22 182:8 182:15 182:18 182:25 183:4 183:14 183:21 183:24 184:2 184:7 184:10 193:25 221:20 222:4 223:14 223:22 223:24 240:8 240:9 243:20 knock 134:18 knocks 134:16 135:9 knowing 230:21 knowledge 16:10 93:13 138:5 182:4 229:13 known 47:19 93:17 104:23 127:24 129:9 215:17 218:11 239:6 252:24

Reef Integrated Systems

knows 88:3 124:3 143:11 Kokoschka 240:8 Krook's 10:25 Krook 8:7 8:8 8:8 11:5

- L -

label 33:4 154:19 155:8 155:11 155:13 labeled 155:4 labeling 53:5 126:22 154:17 154:22 155:4 laboratories 93:10 laboratory 213:12 Lachenbruch 235:13 235:15 242:2 242:17 243:10 243:22 244:20 ladies 98:13 184:14 194:19 Lamborn's 93:14 Lamborn 10:7 57:7 70:4 70:13 73:6 73:7 73:23 85:9 89:12 89:13 92:17 121:2 121:3 122:12 122:19 122:21 122:24 123:3 123:16 134:9 134:10 134:20 136:17 136:18 151:19 151:20 language 157:7 largely 16:19 244:9 245.8 largest 15:15 50:8 82:3 172:20 187:12 188:10 190:3 Larry 13:17 14:10 16:4 31:17 41:13 118:6 131:11 Lastly 28:22 30:2 lately 23:8 Laughter 78:2 78:5 112:13 113:23 122:20 127:18 127:21 129:18 130:6 138:17 143:6 148:4 148:7 149:16 217:8 254:15 law 79:3 layer 187:21 leader 9:8 leads 191:7 leaves 18:24 leaving 19:3 22:19 35:2 231:5 Lee 190:4 leg 14:4 legs 181:7 lends 99:21 Leon 185:10 194:21 lesions 188:4 lesser 88:13 let's 64:16 68:16 74:3 74:4 74:24 75:9 82:24 112:4 127:3 128:24

132:16 132:17 136:8 187:10 188:7 231:19 232:15 248:9 letting 138:6 Leukemia 31:13 34:12 35:4 36:2 41:12 230:25 233:6 leukopenia 44:23 47:7 109:8 levamisole 193:5 level 54:17 54:24 92:6 94:19 124:13 142:6 187:17 187:17 217:19 221:5 226:11 236:16 243:7 248:13 248:14 levels 19:14 111:9 Libra 127:22 license 194:24 195:2 196:17 life 96:18 96:24 97:2 97:5 97:8 97:10 98:3 105:4 113:17 115:10 164:17 208:24 252:17 lifesaving 77:8 light 19:3 78:8 121:23 **lighter** 174:10 likelihood 120:18 **limit** 111:12 limitation 111:10 **limited** 10:10 limits 75:13 75:22 75:23 76:13 77:2 77:12 83:18 83:24 87:9 88:17 214:9 linear 188:2 188:2 lines 178:6 178:8 180:12 255:5 Lippman's 72:20 129:23 135:10 LIPPMAN 8:24 8:24 10:16 10:23 56:5 56:6 72:7 72:8 124:21 124:22 126:14 128:5 140:11 140:12 143:12 143:14 144:15 150:12 150:13 153:24 153:25 157:10 157:11 157:24 157:25 160:24 160:24 182:19 182:20 218:19 218:20 219:4 220:14 220:15 221:9 221:16 222:15 223:13 243:16 243:17 245:18 247:12 249:7 249:8 249:22 253:25 listed 163:5 200:22 246:19 246:20 246:22 **listened** 118:15 listening 118:5 130:21 literature 61:20 188:9 224:3 233:15 239:3 241:6 242:10 245:4 245:6 247:9 liver 32:20 45:25 206:10 lives 115:13 132:21 133:3

locally 30:3 location 187:15 216:3 216:5log 167:9 170:22 171:7 226:7 227:3 228:16 239:24 logarithmic 22:17 logic 73:11 logical 31:23 77:19 long-term 80:14 117:4 138:2 195:22 198:17 200:7 200:15 200:21 202:5 220:6 220:12 220:24 229:23 longer-term 95:12 longest 63:4 250:8 Loni 184:15 looks 58:3 71:23 87:22 87:23 125:3 128:2 135:2 145:17 145:19 210:22 235:21 235:22 244:6 Los 9:4 lowest 154:19 lucky 112:5 lumpectomy 32:18 lunch 244:6 lung 252:13 LVEF 81:11 lymph 24:22 28:15 55:2 114:2 117:3 166:12 166:17 166:18 166:20 181:5 184:23 192:5 197:19 lymphoma 221:6 - M -M.d 8:25 160:25 185:6 190:4 magenta 18:25 magnitude 50:6 76:10 77:6 84:4 84:15 magnitudes 85:4 main 196:3 199:18 200:6 250:15 mainly 133:15 229:5 maintain 53:10 maintained 54:3 230:23Maintenance 169:22 170:6 207:2 252:15 major 12:22 15:9 16:20 25:23 27:5 43:13 66:5 108:17 118:25 119:5 131:17 171:16 189:4 189:12 222:5 223:15 majority 97:16 189:14 191:5 206:4 malignancies 46:21 46:25 79:9 97:13 malignant 184:17 184:21 185:7 185:13 manage 204:24

management 34:11 35:24 72:16 mandated 79:3 manifest 80:17 80:18 140:2 140:16 manipulation 28:5 mapping 181:10 189:16 190:4 190:16 March 35:18 166:2 212:13 233:18 234:5 Margaret 11:24 marginal 69:2 69:4 237:18 marginally 241:9 margins 32:16 Margolin's 129:23 131:7 **MARGOLIN** 9:3 9:3 10:9 110:18 111:2 124:2 124:3 133:13 133:14 139:12 139:13 142:10 142:12 142:17 148:22 148:23 150:21 150:22 152:18 152:19 155:15 155:16 161:22 Marissa 113:9 113:11 mark 241:15 marked 66:20 markedly 186:7 marker 82:7 97:9 marrow 37:14 Massimo 161:3 232:22 mastectomy 37:18 material 189:19 235:5 239:9 241:17 materialized 201:8 materials 211:18 mathematical 23:12 matters 10:8 78:10 162:2 mature 212:3 236:7 236:19 237:16 matured 237:20 Maurizio 225:17 maximal 248:5 maximized 28:4 maximum 79:20 80:22 Mcdonough 160:12 160:12 meaningful 66:7 208:7 252:19 meaningless 150:23 meant 110:20 151:4 249:12 measure 116:12 230:16 **measured** 187:20 measuring 124:5 mechanism 158:3 245:21 246:11 mechanisms 154:2 median 34:4 36:10 75:20 102:22 167:8 170:5 202:9 204:12 210:12 210:13 228:19 238:10 238:11 medians 236:11 236:12

### 

236:13 239:22 medical 8:8 8:10 8:16 8:18 8:20 8:24 9:3 9:5 9:7 49:21 73:11 121:6 126:9 137:20 160:8 160:10 160:16 160:18 160:20 160:24 165:25 185:5 188:9 medically 106:3 medicines 53:19 meeting 9:16 9:18 9:19 9:24 11:20 11:23 36:4 36:23 124:24 124:24 124:25 126:15 161:12 161:14 161:15 161:20 Meier 100:9 melanomas 166:11 melodramatic 215:12 melphalan-based 153:2 Memorial 22:10 27:25 193:20 menopausal 39:24 41:5 70:12 76:25 135:5 mention 55:10 93:9 148:16 151:9 mentioned 69:18 140:22 163:12 170:15 171:25 179:12 179:16 216:11 247:7 mere 95:14 merit 144:14 message 202:4 messages 188:13 195:7 meta-analyses 244:23 246:17 247:6 meta-analysis 242:10 242:14 242:15 247:14 249:20 meta 244:7 metastases 102:10 102:12 166:17 184:23 186:16 186:17 189:13 190:13 191:8 191:9 191:11 191:17 191:21 192:13 192:13 192:15 209:7 223:5 metastasis 189:8 189:9 metastasize 189:21 192:21 metastatic 14:13 14:15 14:20 54:4 164:4 166:20 196:13 223:4 223:5 meter 14:21 14:24 19:15 19:17 19:18 19:21 25:16 25:19 26:8 26:11 27:7 32:22 33:5 33:9 40:10 40:14 40:15 42:18 51:9 79:14 79:22 80:21 82:5 170:4 **MHC** 164:6 microscope 187:22 microscopic 187:4 187:8 190:8 190:12

midpoint 87:15 milligrams 14:21 14:24 19:15 19:17 19:18 19:20 25:16 25:19 26:8 26:10 27:7 33:9 40:13 51:8 52:25 79:14 82:4 millimeter 187:24 188:5 190:11 millimeters 166:11 184:22 186:14 187:25 188:3 188:3 188:16 194:15 201:22 206:17 209:14 million 170:4 181:25 184:24 197:6 197:21 205:8 206:25 230:15 230:24 234:20 235:11 mind 19:9 29:7 43:19 72:21 124:7 130:3 130:4 205:2 252:13 minds 214:23 minimal 133:2 minimize 30:8 30:24 30:24 minimizes 30:20 minimum 221:13 Minnesota 8:9 minor 156:13 156:17 minus 62:19 64:8 133:10 minute 58:21 170:23 mischaracterization 254:19 misinterpreting 210:20 misleading 151:2 misled 77:7 144:3 misreading 109:4 missing 176:17 220:16 mission 12:12 113:16 mistake 60:19 mistaken 216:22 mixed 48:14 128:2 model 25:4 26:5 38:23 38:24 39:16 39:17 55:22 57:15 134:21 171:23 172:8 237:10 237:12 238:12 modeling 23:12 122:3 models 77:16 moderate 238:23 241:10 modest 23:7 46:15 193:21 246:3 modification 95:3 modified 37:18 Moffit 190:4 moments 44:25 monitor 52:19 52:20 91:20 92:15 monitored 43:8 46:18 52:9 80:10 82:3 monitoring 34:14 34:22 35:14 44:13 74:20 78:25 80:3 90:3 91:4 97:11 165:15 167:3 233:21 251:4

monochemotherapy 16:17 monoclonal 21:16 monotherapy 83:2 193:4 month 169:20 234:7 234:9 months 16:21 27:2 33:24 33:25 34:19 36:11 36:12 38:16 71:12 71:12 83:10 83:11 102:22 105:2 109:23 115:10 169:24 179:15 184:25 197:7 197:22 198:8 198:9 198:10 200:13 200:14 202:11 202:15 205:6 206:4 208:8 208:19 209:2 209:8 209:15 213:9 213:10 213:20 220:12 234:22 235:2 255:7 255:12 moot 138:21 morbidity 105:3 mortality 35:21 40:4 84:6 84:7 moves 75:25 87:10 87:12 MS 8:12 10:7 11:25 130:18 130:19 133:15 139:5 139:6 184:13 212:7MUGA 78:14 80:5 80:13 multi-center 196:16 206:16 224:25 225:4 248:25 multi-variate 190:19 multiple 16:15 16:17 22:11 40:21 72:23 88:20 89:19 121:24 135:2 135:3 191:25 192:21 230:10 230:12 245:7 multiplicity 50:17 multiply 79:25 multivariate 38:23 myalgia 47:21 myalgias 46:9 Myers 12:19 myocardial 169:18 mystified 241:22 - N -NO 167:18 naively 217:20 name 98:13 113:11 194:20 217:11 225:17 232:21 namely 134:20 narrow 87:9 123:10 narrower 122:6 National 11:24 12:2

12:6 12:11 36:18 113:15

nationally 117:7

nationwide 12:16

nausea/vomiting 205:19 nausea 45:24 109:11 NCCTG 178:24 179:12 NCI 22:10 NDA 14:7 79:4 81:5 94:23 necessarily 40:20 97:4 114:18 155:8 214:18 224:24 243:11 Neeman 232:25 233:19 235:17 237:7 negative/er 75:14 negative/pr 103:9 119:17 negative/tamoxifen 66:3 negativity 116:20 neoplasm 79:2 neoplastic 48:19 net 106:19 neuromotor 45:23 neuropathies 46:9 neurosensory 46:9 47:20 97:16 104:25 neurotoxicity 97:18 neutropenia 25:24 95:9 154:5 Nevertheless 18:3 130:12 news 115:23 nice 239:22 nicely 31:17 night 14:3 14:3 nil 49:11 no-effect 83:19 no-tamoxifen 85:16 nodal 33:14 72:15 168:24 172:6 179:13 186:16 189:8 189:9 189:25 190:12 191:9 191:11 191:13 191:14 191:17 191:21 192:10 192:11 192:15 node-negative 71:25 166:15 167:22 171:3 174:2 181:12 190:14 195:4 197:20 206:18 209:12 241:17 node-positive 12:8 12:21 13:15 15:7 16:3 25:11 25:12 32:16 36:20 41:2 42:12 51:6 71:21 71:24 71:25 101:8 107:3 107:20 136:4 136:15 137:15 138:24 140:6 141:8 143:3 146:18 147:15 147:16 148:12 152:11 152:12 169:2 169:4 169:8 171:2 172:21 173:22 175:6 194:5 194:8 node 32:18 37:8 50:9 55:2 72:2 73:15 85:23 147:17 166:12 166:14 166:17 166:20 167:17

### Reef Integrated Systems

167:18 172:22 174:3 181:5 181:10 181:14 181:14 181:15 184:23 189:16 189:18 189:20 189:22 189:23 189:24 189:25 190:3 190:9 190:16 190:18 190:21 191:5 191:6 191:23 192:8 194:6 194:8 194:15 196:4 241:16 nodes 24:22 28:15 37:7 37:11 39:6 39:20 54:20 55:19 70:12 85:14 86:12 87:2 114:2 114:6 114:21 117:3 130:10 135:4 143:18 166:18 167:19 167:20 173:18 174:5 181:15 187:16 190:8 191:10 191:23 191:25 192:5 192:10 192:11 197:19 nominal 91:23 169:7 non-estrogen 108:19 non-hematologic 44:7 45:22 47:14 47:18 104:21 109:5 non-informative 92:20 non-interferon 178:16 non-significant 57:9 non-statistical 120:15 non-statistician 72:8 non-surgical 32:19 non-taxol 152:13 None 154:25 171:9 183:16 223:4 232:15 nonetheless 59:11 189:14 nonprofit 12:12 113:13 nonrandomized 183:13 nonsense 125:20 nonsignificant 171:8 nonvisceral 175:25 180:2 normally 119:23 158:14 200:23 Norton's 135:17 140:17 Norton 13:17 14:10 16:4 16:6 41:13 49:10 73:19 75:3 82:12 82:20 82:22 84:19 87:7 88:2 88:12 118:6 131:16 132:5 notable 99:20 104:24 106:2 noted 11:12 162:10 248:7 notes 241:14 noteworthy 100:13 103:8 notice 37:2 38:12 131:23 **notified** 212:15 notwithstanding 10:19 11:2 119:9 novel 189:16 **November** 165:24

234:4 NSABP 19:19 26:25 29:14 124:11 133:7 155:18 nu 93:15 93:16 nuanced 127:7 nuances 149:11 null 199:24 235:24 236:3 236:4 numerous 12:16 nurse 8:14 160:14 - 0 -O'brien-fleming 91:17 91:25 o'clock 158:24 O'leary 9:5 9:5 98:12 98:13 109:6 109:20 110:21 obey 92:8 **Objective** 102:7 102:20 163:23 objectively 162:14 objectives 32:2 observational 239:16 observe 235:9 observed 164:14 165:5 168:17 169:16 177:23 205:10 207:22 observing 129:15 obtain 228:16 obtained 10:12 43:9 162:3 176:14 226:15 obtaining 239:13 obvious 52:9 204:10 occur 47:3 53:17 109:21 occurred 44:24 46:21 47:12 82:4 99:5 102:23 104:7 174:24 250:4 occurrence 102:11 occurrences 34:10 71:13 occurring 79:5 99:21 106:2 occurs 47:16 71:16 71:21 October 36:3 165:23 **ODAC** 40:22 152:2 odd 155:10 odds 17:11 17:15 17:19 18:7 19:7 42:15 49:11 49:12 61:20 61:21 61:22 61:22 62:9 62:17 62:21 63:2 63:4 63:6 66:23 102:15 102:17 239:21 off-protocol 176:2 offer 49:25 offered 37:13 offering 175:15 offers 114:10 Office 10:14 161:6 162:5

official 10:8 oftentimes 43:22 147:6olaxafene 150:16 older 20:13 20:13 20:18 39:25 64:3 64:6 66:15 66:19 68:22 76:20 94:14 94:17 95:6 95:15 95:25 96:20 omit 35:4 on-site 176:14 oncologist 8:8 8:11 8:17 8:18 8:21 8:25 80:24 113:12 160:17 160:18 160:21 160:25 oncologists 49:22 oncology 8:14 9:3 13:12 15:10 15:11 160:9 160:11 160:14 185:3 185:11 190:6 191:9 193:10 194:21 211:9 oncolysate 193:18 one-liner 120:4 one-third 65:5 ongoing 179:7 193:24 operable 32:14 178:12 operations 10:22 11:5 opinion 154:16 opponent 138:2 opportunity 163:18 175:15 176:8 opposed 170:5 170:11 173:21 178:7 178:9 229:5 236:17 246:6 optimal 242:25 option 13:4 111:11 115:18 130:13 131:6 options 13:3 96:23 130:21 orange 188:16 Organization 11:25 12:2 12:6 12:11 12:12 113:14 113:15 117:8 original 43:18 43:19 89:24 175:19 originally 28:17 73:12 211:21 212:8 otherwise 62:15 112:16 126:19 186:20 209:10 ought 129:21 155:13 157:22 out-of-date 254:11 outcome 23:6 106:19 119:5 173:21 174:8 177:2 177:8 182:4 187:24 195:22 203:10 203:12 203:25 outcomes 49:17 124:12 167:23 171:18 171:18 239:12 outlier 87:13 169:4 outlined 188:12 outstanding 12:17 outstandingly 254:2 outweighs 10:21 11:3

ovarian 63:5 overcome 24:11 144:22 overlap 41:24 42:7 66:20 83:19 84:17 overlapping 168:12 overlaps 56:18 66:9 overlay 191:15 oversimplifying 118:16 overview 17:2 19:23 41:13 42:23 55:12 58:4 58:13 58:16 58:19 63:17 66:14 67:13 71:23 76:5 76:17 77:22 82:12 83:6 84:19 88:16 88:22 102:20 125:16 127:9 182:16 185:7 186:3 239:3 244:15 244:17 249:2 overwhelm 65:7 overwhelming 127:5 145:19 Oxford 17:2 - P p.m 159:2 160:2 256:22 **PA** 160:13 package 54:2 54:8 54:11 95:3 111:14 117:10 117:11 129:24 138:25 139:15 140:21 141:14 141:18 142:19 145:4 145:12 148:3 149:14 paclitaxel 19:10 21:14 21:22 21:24 22:8 25:18 25:21 25:23 26:13 27:7 28:2 28:25 29:2 29:22 29:22 29:23 30:5 30:10 30:12 30:16 40:17 41:4 43:5 47:20 48:23 49:14 53:4 53:6 53:21 page 93:23 130:22 227:14 245:2 palpable 197:19 panel 40:22 paper 55:10 234:4 parallel 114:12 206:14 208:3 parameter 195:22 195:22 203:5 203:10 203:12 203:25 206:20 207:12 207:13 Pardon 60:14 parentheses 146:19 157:14 177:20 241:14 park 18:2 Parklawn 10:14 162:5 participant 11:10 162:8

participants 9:21 11:11

11:14 43:14 161:17

162:9 162:14 162:20

participate 10:8 10:10

### Reef inlegrated Bystems

10:23 11:6 37:15 200:25 participated 14:6 15:9 233:2 participating 10:2 35:16 161:22 214:3 participation 10:21 11:3 31:14 37:13 partly 137:24 137:25 144:7 parvum 193:4 pass 194:17 passes 141:7 pathologic 187:16 231:24 pathologically 166:15 pathology 189:23 216:2 253:4 253:7 patient's 130:20 Patricia 161:4 Paulo 185:4 peer 12:15 Pehamberger 197:3 234:5 234:8 237:21 238:18 240:7 243:2 255:13 PELUSI 8:14 8:14 96:15 96:17 98:2 160:14 160:14 Pending 179:3 179:17 per-protocol 236:14 perceived 233:25 percentage 27:15 46:14 52:2 53:18 62:20 156:10 170:12 202:25 205:21 percentages 81:3 205:17 205:22 perception 255:2 perfectly 202:21 217:5 perform 98:18 101:11 110:9 241:4 performance 234:15 235:3 performed 98:25 101:2 101:19 196:20 196:25 199:8 199:10 199:15 199:19 200:7 200:11 203:17 206:13 220:13 225:10 226:12 227:23 228:8 performing 90:19 perioperative 16:19 permission 215:23 permit 10:7 241:6 permits 10:10 permitted 11:6 permitting 28:4 personally 68:16 148:6 157:6 158:8 253:13 perspective 36:17 96:2 113:25 232:22 253:13 255:20 persuaded 128:4 130:7persuasive 110:24 140:5

pertain 186:12 pertaining 190:10 pertains 191:22 pertinent 94:10 Peto 59:13 127:11 239:24 pharmacologic 53:25 phase 14:15 53:7 56:17 97:15 170:4 170:6 183:22 183:24 192:23 235:10 phenomenon 23:3 86:21 175:2 Philadelphia 113:15 Phoenix 8:15 160:15 phrase 150:9 physician 113:12 117:6 139:10 147:3 156:23 physicians 40:22 53:20 74:23 140:10 151:7 157:4 157:19 157:22 157:23 214:23 **PI** 34:16 pick 61:4 167:6 picture 67:15 93:4 240:23 pilot 25:9 25:12 26:4 **pin** 125:20 Pittsburgh 160:13 163:13 pivotal 13:20 14:9 15:2 15:14 27:3 27:20 28:13 28:24 29:16 31:6 50:7 94:23 164:10 196:17 196:19 197:12 198:2 208:9 215:3 planned 34:8 34:21 35:11 40:20 41:10 74:21 89:24 112:3 132:5 150:14 211:25 235:21 248:7 plateau 114:14 platelet 45:7 47:12 plausibility 126:9 129:6 137:20 140:13 140:14 140:19 158:3 245:20 plausible 106:3 126:4 126:7 144:2 144:23 played 183:5 223:22 plead 70:6 please 24:11 64:25 66:11 66:22 67:9 76:15 123:25 136:17 211:6 213:3 222:13 229:19 256:5pleasure 31:9 194:23 plenty 89:8 252:11 plot 22:17 173:18 173:19 178:5 178:15 plots 168:8 168:12 168:20 plotted 100:4 **plunge** 120:8 plus 17:24 33:24 37:24

38:7 38:11 39:16 44:17 45:5 45:12 46:3 46:6 46:22 48:5 48:21 55:2 59:17 64:8 69:3 71:2 94:13 101:4 103:13 103:21 105:6 105:9 106:20 121:16 133:10 137:17 193:10 pointed 192:4 pointing 146:13 polychemotherapy 16:15 17:9 20:6 20:7 Pomona 8:19 160:19 pooling 125:17 poops 145:17 popped 55:15 populations 59:14 65:19 106:3 169:3 171:3 171:13 171:17 172:9 173:2 portion 105:10 portrayed 175:6 posed 136:19 244:13 positive/non-receptor 86:20 positive/pr 147:25 positive/tamoxifen 66:2 positives 119:21 positivity 54:25 116:20 124:5 124:14 133:5 181:15 possession 54:6 possibilities 20:20 139:10 possibility 29:8 55:10 176:2 possibly 120:23 140:24 post-menopausal 39:10 39:23 64:2 76:25 124:6 post-relapse 174:14 174:18 175:3 177:14 177:25 potential 9:23 12:7 57:11 77:9 87:2 91:5 91:15 115:15 133:3 161:19 201:5 223:20 229:11 250:14 potentially 75:6 118:19 powered 54:23 powerful 127:12 129:22 187:18 190:17 190:22 191:10 201:16 203:5 215:9 PR 76:24 99:18 100:17 100:23 101:6 101:10 103:18 109:13 116:4 121:12 124:5 124:13 132:3 practical 225:4 practice 157:20 157:21 181:16 practicing 62:22 80:24 151:7 practitioner 8:15

provided by A.R.W.

120:9 160:15 pre-snda 36:4 pre 39:9 39:23 64:2 76:24 124:6 preamble 135:24 precedent 143:15 254:7 preceding 19:5 precise 44:12 precisely 93:10 231:17 preclude 9:17 161:13 predefined 199:13 199:14 predicted 25:4 91:6 91:12 114:7 179:25 prediction 130:14 predictive 92:9 predictor 185:20 prednisone 17:25 preference 129:16 preliminarily 193:23 preliminary 146:15 242:17 249:19 255:18 premature 61:2 63:12 premedication 53:5 53:8 53:11 53:14 53:16 53:18 premedications 53:3 premenopausal 36:20 37:3 preparation 14:6 25:8 preparations 80:5 prepared 58:12 68:9 preplanned 35:12 prerogative 51:16 prescheduled 248:8 prescribed 227:22 228:5 presence 59:5 59:7 191:12 presentation 13:10 13:16 36:9 36:11 44:2 47:25 49:18 49:18 56:9 56:16 57:13 78:8 108:9 108:25 121:11 163:14 184:12 186:13 190:11 195:8 201:18 202:4 204:14 207:4 209:16 215:3 219:21 221:19 223:14 232:20 245:25 246:2 255:8 presented 15:3 17:8 25:10 26:19 27:23 29:16 31:3 31:16 34:18 35:19 50:7 81:4 90:17 137:9 138:10 140:4 141:15 144:17 153:9 153:15 153:17 165:23 165:25 166:4 166:19 168:12 186:15 203:4 207:5 211:15 218:23 219:22 219:24 225:24 226:14 226:24 233:9 238:3 238:24 242:21 244:16 246:24 249:16 249:17 presenter 244:16
### Reef integrated Systems

presenting 20:22 30:16 31:6 98:14 166:17 185:12 210:6 presently 183:6 presents 19:9 prespecified 56:14 56:16 98:25 prestratified 150:24 Presumably 146:3 pretreated 14:16 pretreatment 36:25 pretty 56:19 89:4 109:16 115:25 119:7 121:19 123:20 139:3 149:11 182:21 prevalent 37:9 prevent 204:24 209:6 prevention 184:20 previous 11:16 20:25 71:6 162:22 207:3 221:6 221:8 234:14 previously 38:4 38:6 **4**7:8 101:15 185:15 primarily 191:8 194:5 primary 125:8 126:17 166:10 166:18 167:5 185:19 186:12 187:10 187:15 188:10 189:4 189:7 192:5 192:8 194:15 198:3 198:18 198:20 200:9 206:20 214:19 216:2 216:5 217:16 219:22 220:3 228:5 235:16 235:19 238:24 248:10 249:23 prime 115:12 prior 22:4 22:9 51:20 74:22 92:20 121:6 priori 201:7 privately 74:25 privileges 10:11 11:7 probabilities 91:6 91:12 92:9 probability 74:13 92:13 problematic 56:23 procedural 111:25 procedure 181:13 181:15 245:12 procedures 34:13 proceed 117:16 184:12 proceeded 90:4 proceeding 94:7 produce 210:15 product 33:5 129:2 156:7 233:5 233:9 239:10 241:24 **Professor** 196:22 197:3 213:4 213:6 213:14 213:17 214:8 222:21 222:25 223:23 226:15 profile 15:22 50:24 104:16 104:22 154:8 185:22 205:23 208:19 progesterone 26:16 99:15 99:16 106:23

107:4 108:20 116:2 prognosis 29:9 165:17 186:20 187:10 191:8 192:14 192:20 195:14 prognostic 167:11 180:11 186:3 190:17 190:22 191:11 203:5 215:4 215:18 215:20 230:13 243:13 249:18 252:25 progressed 220:17 progresses 129:11 progression 48:14 94:2 94:7 105:16 prolongation 167:24 208:7 prolonged 17:9 154:5 185:17 200:4 252:11 252:15 prolongs 195:17 249:4 252:12 256:3 prominent 147:21 prominently 111:14 prompted 101:11 promptly 232:16 pronounced 103:25 proof 111:15 proper 215:17 **properly** 208:15 prophecy 131:21 144:3 prophylaxis 208:25 proportion 196:3 196:10 196:11 196:12 225:11 proportional 63:16 63:17 63:20 134:20 238:12 240:19 proportions 240:13 proposal 210:11 propose 15:25 51:4 53:5 210:25 proposed 53:5 53:10 91:25 98:20 184:19 prospective 62:16 198:8 198:13 206:15 229:14 prospectively 24:19 124:15 132:2 197:5 protocol-prescribed 213:23 protocol-specified 214:2 protocol 44:3 44:10 53:3 92:5 92:8 102:21 104:13 106:4 107:9 110:2 110:5 110:6 110:7 110:8 128:15 175:18 194:3 198:9 200:24 202:22 213:20 214:9 214:11 214:18 217:15 220:10 225:3 227:23 228:5 228:10 233:13 234:8 234:15 234:17 235:7 237:23 238:4 248:10 248:18

250:2 250:24 255:15 protocols 245:9 prove 130:13 proven 62:15 149:4 provider 95:5 providers 54:10 provides 240:10 256:2 provision 234:15 proviso 131:7 publication 34:23 207:5 207:6 207:6 207:10 212:14 231:14 242:13 243:3 publications 12:17 242:16 publish 93:18 **published** 17:5 68:2 140:20 149:24 164:23 190:5 239:3 242:12 242:12 247:8 255:12 **pull** 86:6 pulled 65:16 87:8 pulling 23:16 126:9 150:20 pulls 76:13 pure 62:12 **purely** 23:9 purposes 196:24 215:5pursue 213:18 puts 17:4 putting 17:13 113:24 128:9 140:21 147:20 150:8 226:4 226:5 puzzles 209:24 -Qqualitative 62:12 62:24 quality 96:18 96:24 97:5 97:8 97:9 98:3 105:4 113:17 115:10 164:17 250:13 252:17 253:11 253:22 254:5 254:6 254:24 quantify 254:11 quantitative 62:13 quarter 25:24 queries 176:15 questionable 253:10 questioned 10:22 11:5 quick 102:19 231:10 243:17 quickly 23:5 182:21 quote 65:10 - R -**R&d** 194:21 Radiation 33:21 radical 37:18 172:25 radioactive 189:19

radiotherapy 30:6 Raghavan's 56:7 **RAGHAVAN** 8:16 8:16 54:13 54:14 85:9 93:22 117:22 117:23 137:22 137:23 138:18 140:4 153:6 153:7 160:16 160:16 209:20 209:21 210:16 231:8 231:9 241:21 241:22 253:15 253:16 raise 72:17 138:8 256:5 raised 70:13 70:25 108:18 139:2 **RAMISIO 225:17** 225:17 226:13 226:21 227:7 228:5 random 88:7 135:15 randomization 34:11 38:16 54:18 132:13 132:14 133:8 134:8 randomizations 30:7 randomize 133:10 134:5 randomizes 28:25 randomizing 79:24 randomly 89:5 132:3 ranging 41:7 rank 167:9 170:22 171:8 226:7 227:3 228:16 239:24 rapid 22:20 186:25 rapidly 26:2 28:10 187:9 191:3 rates 12:25 14:15 21:25 22:9 102:18 208:5 ratio 38:25 41:17 42:4 61:5 61:6 71:15 85:22 100:18 101:18 103:16 103:22 104:3 105:20 105:22 107:22 112:23 121:18 167:24 168:4 169:2 169:9 170:20 171:7 173:8 173:13 182:8 239:22 239:22 ration 119:19 rational 24:3 rationale 31:16 ratios 41:16 85:14 88:23 103:15 168:12 173:4 reach 20:2 84:21 91:21 238:11 reactions 46:10 104:25 118:20 reads 142:14 reality 118:17 119:16 210:19 realize 252:3 reanalysis 94:22 reanalyzed 94:24 reasonable 22:12 62:16 76:16 80:24 86:16 90:24 132:10 195:25 208:22 217:5 249:12

reasonably 187:9 195:6reasons 57:4 77:13 77:19 93:9 169:21 200:21 247:7 252:5 reassuring 50:18 52:17 recall 174:3 175:16 216:11 receive 48:22 53:13 53:15 58:3 78:14 106:5 106:5 107:13 111:16 132:3 132:4 136:16 137:17 139:17 177:17 178:10 received 25:18 26:17 27:15 33:3 33:4 33:6 33:8 34:25 35:2 51:20 57:25 63:18 63:22 64:7 64:10 79:6 79:7 99:18 101:13 104:3 107:10 132:25 139:20 162:17 177:3 177:4 178:7 178:9 178:16 212:11 220:25 233:20 234:7 235:5 237:21 237:23 receives 78:18 **receiving** 45:14 45:15 47:3 77:3 91:15 96:7 149:5 156:8 receptor-positive 136:15 receptor/pr 134:23 receptors 65:19 107:4 **Recess** 98:11 232:18 recessed 159:2 recipients 177:16 177:20 recognition 89:19 recognize 57:10 98:16 133:15 recognized 151:5 165:4 167:12 195:10 recommend 36:19 51:7 107:18 209:9 209:14 247:17 recommendation 107:5 107:21 108:10 108:19 109:12 124:9 124:23 151:18 recommendations 56:21 recommends 111:21 reconsented 251:3 reconvene 158:24 159:2 232:16 recording 52:5 recovered 26:2 recruited 196:22 197:15 198:4 200:17 recruitment 199:11 203:19 206:13 207:23 209:25 212:5 217:16 219:3 219:12 220:5 250:17 recur 114:7 187:2 187:6 187:6 189:7

189:9 189:14 229:13 recurred 104:19 189:3 222:16 recurrence-free 84:20 recurrence 17:11 17:19 18:6 18:16 18:24 22:21 35:21 40:4 42:13 42:15 49:12 61:14 61:21 61:23 63:21 100:2 102:9 102:13 102:15 102:15 102:17 102:18 105:19 105:20 114:4 184:20 192:22 197:8 204:25 208:5 208:6 209:5 209:6 222:19 223:9 228:25 recurrences 71:8 179:24 192:17 222:18 225:3 229:4 recurrent 166:19 175:8 183:12 reduce 192:22 reduced 17:23 26:7 76:11 105:19 105:21 232:11 reduces 18:23 19:2 42:13 42:13 218:2 reducing 17:11 reduction 17:15 17:18 35:20 35:21 39:18 40:4 49:11 49:12 54:16 54:17 56:13 61:21 61:22 62:9 62:17 62:21 63:3 63:6 63:16 63:17 63:20 66:23 73:14 81:11 81:13 83:15 84:23 93:3 100:2 123:23 123:25 169:19 169:23 171:7 202:15 208:5 reductions 19:7 61:20 61:21 232:9 refer 54:4 54:8 143:17 reference 121:10 referred 219:19 referring 141:22 142:20 158:14 refers 54:4 151:10 reflect 104:4 141:14 219:15 reflecting 37:8 43:16 refractory 22:6 refuted 171:2 regard 9:16 16:8 16:16 132:11 161:12 204:19 215:25 220:9 232:9 regarded 26:3 regarding 12:7 56:7 57:21 94:2 239:10 245:3 regardless 27:13 33:17 61:14 133:4 regimen 15:6 16:23 27:22 28:6 28:6 28:7 28:16 28:24 49:2 53:5 105:9 152:14 153:23 156:9 165:10 205:5 206:23 207:2 208:25

208:25 regimens 18:10 18:10 18:13 83:8 83:8 83:11 153:2 153:2 153:4 153:12 region 93:5 157:20 regional 166:12 166:17 166:18 175:25 176:4 178:4 178:5 178:6 178:12 189:13 191:8 229:5 regionally 187:17 189:7 registration 211:17 regression 22:6 22:18 23:2 55:22 70:11 regressions 70:21 regrows 23:4 regrowth 22:7 22:19 22:20 23:5 regulated 9:22 161:18 regulatory 140:3 184:15 212:7 reiteration 139:13 rejected 200:2 236:3 **relapse-free** 23:6 25:5 164:15 165:3 167:4 167:8 167:23 168:8 170:20 170:21 171:19 171:25 172:11 172:15 173:5 174:11 174:12 178:20 178:22 236:25 238:5 238:9 239:11 240:2 240:11 241:7 243:8 relapse 77:18 80:19 102:8 102:21 167:25 167:25 168:16 169:21 170:8 171:7 174:15 174:21 175:20 177:9 198:20 202:7 202:12 204:16 206:22 208:9 213:16 214:16 218:12 222:11 223:2 228:16 relapsed 199:3 207:25 208:12 218:17 relapses 165:14 175:22 175:25 176:5 176:7 176:7 176:12 178:8 178:10 199:6 199:16 199:21 202:18 203:22 204:19 213:15 221:10 236:11 relapsing 18:19 relate 23:24 153:14 205:14 related 51:19 56:6 57:24 79:16 79:16 92:21 101:19 105:16 130:15 153:18 216:17 relates 54:22 relationship 26:20 57:4 93:15 93:16 relative 61:10 61:14 67:12 141:15 143:8 170:7 170:14

provided by A.R.W.

relatively 46:15 54:21 145:11 149:8 156:17 188:2 191:2 193:16 release 35:15 released 74:20 relevance 254:24 relevant 19:12 83:10 83:18 95:24 127:23 201:13 207:16 245:19 reliability 114:15 reliable 136:3 211:13 240:21 remain 153:19 remainder 163:11 remained 217:3 remaining 189:24 remains 202:8 remarkable 202:15 remarks 13:22 49:25 remind 11:19 31:17 200:14 233:4 253:22 reminding 145:16 remove 32:15 removed 145:10 renal 45:25 rendering 19:21 **Renzo** 13:20 reopen 113:8 Rep 8:13 130:19 160:15 repeat 104:8 222:13 repeatedly 55:24 156:21 **replaces** 133:20 replenishment 22:20 reporting 44:9 52:6 104:14 224:24 reports 242:12 247:8 247:10 represent 44:12 48:6 99:19 104:16 106:3 115:18 Representative 160:13 represented 100:12 representing 113:13 **represents** 12:22 99:2 101:14 226:10 reproduce 226:8 237:25 reproducible 251:19 251:25 request 10:13 48:25 162:4 212:4 requested 48:9 163:6 211:24 236:6 require 27:9 80:6 requirement 45:7 45:8 47:12 169:22 requirements 125:13 requires 255:4 requiring 26:11 28:19 rescue 84:11 resectable 180:2 resected 184:21 249:5 256:4 residual 18:24 resistance 93:19

### 

resistant 67:21 112:19 144:12 resolved 139:4 respectively 196:18 respiratory 48:18 105:14 respond 254:16 responding 22:18 response 13:8 14:15 21:25 22:7 22:8 22:9 31:18 42:17 81:24 113:6 135:21 136:7 141:4 158:17 163:9 164:21 180:11 212:12 232:14 256:7 responses 163:24 212:11 responsible 70:5 responsive 24:2 26:15 26:15 restate 255:25 restrict 86:9 86:11 resubmitted 212:12 retain 53:10 retrieved 222:23 retrospective 124:12 198:14 222:24 retrospectively 220:9 returns 71:24 revealed 168:11 reversible 97:18 97:22 review 53:4 98:14 98:17 98:18 163:18 166:3 171:10 231:24 232:24 233:2 233:18 233:23 236:6 251:20 253:3 253:8 reviewed 51:25 211:11 reviewer 9:5 reviewing 211:19 rhetoric 119:15 **Rich** 180:14 181:6 Richard 59:12 127:11 160:20 253:10 right-hand 103:2 rigid 152:22 251:12 rigidly 251:5 rigorous 23:13 151:6 237:22 risks 63:9 robust 59:10 195:20 204:4 251:18 251:24 robustness 49:15 Roche 162:19 184:16 185:11 194:22 217:12 225:18 237:14 239:9 Roferon-a 184:17 184:24 185:12 185:22 195:2 198:7 199:4 200:3 209:3 209:10 249:3 249:4 256:3 Roferon 161:23 162:2 199:17 199:22 202:14 202:18 204:8 204:20 204:21 207:7 207:19 207:25 208:10 208:12

232:10 234:2 237:4 237:5 237:13 237:14 238:11 238:15 238:23 239:7 239:14 240:7 242:3 243:21 243:23 244:24 246:17 253:5 **Rogers** 175:2 role 163:2 179:22 room 10:14 113:25 114:24 162:5 163:7 roughly 206:14 230:3 routes 176:9 routinely 33:3 44:7 rule 37:9 89:24 125:25 126:11 126:12 240:16 ruled 31:19 rules 110:2 127:7 Rusciani 240:8

# - S -

safety 15:22 34:14 34:19 34:22 35:14 42:24 42:25 43:4 43:5 43:10 44:13 50:23 74:19 79:3 79:9 81:2 90:3 94:19 94:25 165:14 185:22 200:11 205:23 208:18 Salim 65:10 salvage 112:15 166:3 167:13 175:3 175:16 176:8 176:18 176:19 177:18 178:4 179:24 180:8 182:24 183:6 188:22 189:9 222:6 222:12 222:17 salvageable 176:5 178:12 Sam 217:10 217:11 229:21 sample 118:9 118:12 135:14 199:9 199:10 240:19 San 9:2 Sandra 8:12 10:7 sanity 153:20 Sao 185:4 save 174:15 231:14 saving 133:3 scale 196:16 scan 213:10 scans 78:14 187:9 scatter 118:11 scenario 73:25 74:5 74:5 74:16 scenarios 73:25 schedule 15:24 21:7 29:4 51:7 54:3 96:8 214:5 214:6 231:4 251:5 251:13 scheduled 99:3 165:14 scheduling 255:6 **scheme** 55:3 Schering-plough's

162:16 Schering 162:18 scientifically 139:23 scientists 74:23 score 235:24 Scott 8:24 10:16 160:24 161:25 245:17 247:11 252:4 se 130:17 searched 239:18 seats 113:20 second-line 14:19 Secondary 46:21 72:10 72:18 79:8 97:12 150:14 200:10 219:24 234:18 Secondly 37:12 41:6 44:21 54:20 55:8 170:25 195:13 Secretary 8:23 160:23 sections 149:14 seeing 23:8 40:23 84:4 85:4 85:6 183:17 seeking 184:19 233:7 233:9 selenium 150:16 self-fulfilling 131:21 semi 22:16 send 189:23 sensitive 82:25 sensitivity 93:18 93:19 sentence 111:13 147:18 150:20 sentiment 141:16 sentinel 181:5 181:10 181:13 181:15 189:16 189:18 189:21 190:3 190:16 190:18 190:21 191:5separate 31:25 44:15 84:18 120:16 132:18 132:20 separately 58:12 66:16 200:6 230:19 230:20 separation 248:6 sepsis 49:5 105:12 September 207:20 212:9 212:10 septic 51:19 sequelae 26:2 45:6 47:11 sequence 26:14 69:11 sequential 21:9 24:17 25:2 25:6 27:25 30:14 30:25 31:24 32:5 51:5 78:20 78:25 100:22 102:16 103:14 103:24 107:19 130:11 198:21 198:22 199:8 199:9 199:18 199:20 203:17 217:14 217:21 218:25 225:20 226:16 226:18 228:6 231:18 235:21 sequentially 12:9 24:22 session 90:10 sessions 160:7 sets 209:21 245:9

254:7 setting 13:4 15:22 18:18 19:10 25:9 29:13 30:10 30:19 38:21 50:14 50:24 54:8 61:16 62:6 80:18 143:15 152:23 187:5 settings 14:13 severe 52:15 53:16 206:10 sex 187:17 203:12 215:10 237:12 238:14 238:19 243:9 shape 114:12 shapes 205:3 share 90:20 131:3 223:25 sheet 246:18 shocking 252:22 shockingly 78:7 **shorter** 18:10 18:13 83:8 83:9 83:9 83:20 180:12 232:17 shortly 26:6 showing 16:8 18:2 26:20 30:18 40:16 93:18 93:18 107:24 127:13 252:14 shows 18:4 23:14 24:17 38:10 38:24 39:17 40:7 70:16 84:5 84:6 100:5 100:25 102:16 168:14 173:11 178:6 185:17 236:25 246:25 shrink 77:2 shrunk 83:25 sided 167:9 sides 115:17 Sidney 187:13 SIEGEL 161:6 161:6 219:18 244:25 247:23 254:16 256:16 sign 97:23 127:17 significance 17:22 20:3 83:17 84:21 91:2 91:13 92:6 92:13 92:16 107:23 164:16 169:7 169:10 171:19 172:14 177:6 218:5 226:11 227:8 227:16 236:16 237:18 243:7 248:21 significantly 30:18 45:9 94:20 181:9 200:4 217:4 signs 127:15 SILVA 184:13 184:15 212:7 similarly 93:2 Simon's 230:8 Simon 183:9 183:10 183:19 183:23 184:5 184:8 219:10 219:19 224:5 224:6 224:11 224:14 224:17 224:20 226:10 226:18 227:5 228:3 228:24 242:8

242:9 243:5 243:6 247:7 250:6 simulated 18:16 226:3 250:10 simulation 22:15 23:15 23:21 23:25 24:11 24:17 25:2 simulations 24:13 simultaneous 29:25 Sirio-libanes 185:4 sit 119:8 131:2 213:19 site 102:10 192:10 sites 175:20 214:3 216:4 228:25 245:7 251:4 sitting 74:10 158:23 **sizable** 101:15 skeptic 127:12 127:24 216:25 skeptical 112:14 113:2 126:12 127:4 skeptically 125:3 Skin 185:6 192:19 skip 98:19 135:23 sleep 90:14 90:15 90:20 slide 16:9 23:13 23:14 60:18 64:16 64:17 64:25 66:11 67:9 70:15 70:25 75:25 76:2 76:4 76:15 80:25 84:6 88:6 98:19 98:23 108:24 121:11 169:10 191:16 195:25 202:3 202:13 203:6 203:13 204:14 215:10 221:25 230:7 233:4 236:24 240:10 243:18 slides 51:25 58:9 58:12 109:11 181:8 215:23 245:2 slight 52:16 83:21 84:3 slightly 16:22 35:10 43:16 61:17 109:14 121:14 123:11 123:12 136:25 206:23 244:4 Sloan-kettering 22:10 193:20 Sloan 27:25 slope 186:24 slow 140:17 slower 187:6 **slowing** 165:16 smaller 23:4 23:20 37:8 39:8 43:16 43:16 45:2 60:10 67:12 77:11 118:8 119:6 172:24 snapshot 186:5 192:18 snda 36:6 36:10 so-called 16:15 22:17 **society** 37:9 165:25 **socks** 134:17 134:18 135:9 solely 220:8 solid 50:20 112:2 164:19 172:10 172:17 178:6 178:8 178:8

188:17 solution 154:25 someone 125:10 137:5 143:10 Somers 8:22 9:12 160:22 sometime 210:2 213:23 somewhere 155:14 sooner 23:20 Sorry 60:19 204:16 210:16 219:3 227:14 253:17 256:14 sorted 68:6 78:23 sounded 147:11 219:11 Southern 8:17 160:17 Southwest 15:11 speaker 11:23 31:5 185:2speakers 13:7 185:2 speaking 91:22 92:7 162:18 162:18 specialist 131:10 specializing 113:12 specifically 46:7 47:2 47:15 58:4 58:7 64:9 82:15 123:16 185:9 185:14 185:16 specified 48:11 81:17 104:13 106:4 167:9 234:17 238:4 specify 53:2 157:13 235:5 250:25 spectrum 116:6 116:18 124:19 spend 179:18 spent 153:8 241:25 split 33:7 splits 83:7 sponsor's 100:19 100:24 101:21 103:11 104:3 108:25 163:15 184:12 236:17 244:14 244:18 sponsor 13:10 51:15 98:8 98:20 98:22 99:6 100:5 101:20 103:15 103:16 103:21 104:11 109:21 122:8 125:13 145:21 147:2 209:20 231:11 236:7 237:14 249:16 spontaneous 127:7 spreading 24:5 squared 14:21 14:24 19:16 19:17 19:18 19:21 25:16 25:19 26:8 26:11 27:8 32:22 33:6 33:9 40:10 40:14 40:15 42:18 79:22 80:21 82:5 170:4 Squibb 12:3 12:19 13:12 13:21 35:23 90:6 Stacy 8:20 10:6 160:8 staged 212:22 stages 50:5 95:16 186:11 186:11 187:11 192:23

staging 172:6 185:9 186:10 stagings 185:16 STĂMP 28:20 28:20 stance 124:14 standing 160:4 stands 17:24 starting 8:4 26:15 116:6 116:20 141:8 254:9starts 76:20 198:15 statement 9:13 12:5 57:15 57:22 63:15 72:20 78:24 94:10 108:5 110:24 118:8 118:10 135:17 141:22 142:3 142:7 142:19 146:12 146:13 146:22 149:3 149:9 150:8 150:10 161:9 163:7 219:17 States 37:11 Statistical 14:6 20:2 55:8 59:10 62:7 63:13 74:3 83:17 84:12 84:21 87:13 92:13 92:16 100:20 107:23 120:17 165:22 201:15 217:10 217:21 225:15 233:14 235:6 235:14 241:23 248:20 253:21 statistically 17:20 18:11 20:11 20:12 39:7 67:2 70:15 70:17 81:10 81:22 84:23 85:2 87:5 91:23 92:11 92:23 126:19 135:8 136:3 144:19 151:5 182:13 182:15 200:4 207:14 208:16 217:3 218:8 247:3 247:20 251:17 251:23 statistician 161:2 217:12 225:18 statisticians 55:20 56:10 81:23 84:10 239:24 statistics 139:22 status 27:14 41:5 41:17 54:19 55:7 57:16 57:23 58:2 62:12 65:14 70:12 70:14 72:13 87:22 89:3 91:4 93:12 93:15 99:13 134:5 134:23 135:5 148:17 151:11 190:19 213:22 214:16 234:15 235:3 statuses 134:6 steep 31:19 stem 28:19 Stephen 14:5 steroid 53:9 stick 116:9 116:23 145:24 158:10 247:19 stomatitis 45:24 46:4 stopping 89:24 91:3 110:2 219:2 219:3

provided by A.R.W.

219:8 219:12 219:20 stratification 33:14 55:7 133:9 168:23 172:6 173:15 175:12 197:24 201:12 203:2 207:13 215:5 215:8 252:24 stratified 54:19 134:4 134:6 stratifying 227:16 strengths 248:18 stress 80:19 strictly 91:22 92:7 striking 65:3 107:5 143:23 144:2 144:13 stringent 235:4 stronger 58:16 70:2 70:22 70:23 strongly 150:22 struck 114:9 structure 234:10 struggling 119:4 studied 16:23 63:23 99:11 171:5 172:10 190:24 192:25 193:2 196:8 197:5 248:7 studies 22:2 22:12 31:22 57:3 63:3 97:2 124:13 124:15 131:11 131:15 164:8 171:14 171:15 172:4 172:15 172:25 173:3 173:11 173:17 179:3 187:5 192:23 193:17 194:4 194:9 194:13 196:2 196:6 197:5 205:16 208:3 208:4 234:11 235:8 239:6 239:7 239:19 240:5 240:8 241:4 241:8 242:4 246:19 247:21 stuff 151:13 stunned 148:2 148:2 style 117:13 sub-adequately 24:10 sub-lines 24:9 sub 23:25 subcategories 201:24 subcomment 139:16 subcutaneous 192:12 234:21 subcutaneously 184:24 197:22 subdivide 75:12 75:19 subdivided 75:15 subgroup 99:19 100:15 101:14 101:17 106:5 107:7 112:3 112:7 112:15 126:22 137:20 141:7 subgroups 57:22 61:23 99:13 103:4 103:6 106:2 112:6 subjective 144:23 submission 36:6 100:24 103:11 212:8 233:9

241:25 submit 12:4 44:9 236:7submitted 9:19 15:16 50:8 94:22 95:2 100:5 161:15 211:10 211:18 211:21 212:8 212:16 233:12 234:5 235:20 submitting 10:13 125:13 162:4 subpopulation 24:16 110:23 subsequent 49:4 68:4 82:7 103:10 104:20 105:12 152:5 169:24 176:2 176:8 176:8 176:14 225:13 subsequently 164:3 subsets 42:21 42:22 58:24 62:15 62:25 66:5 66:9 74:13 76:17 85:23 85:24 86:2 86:16 86:21 86:23 87:16 87:17 87:18 87:18 121:8 125:18 125:25 126:7 126:8 134:15 135:3 135:3 135:7 143:19 144:21 144:24 173:17 173:17 203:7 substantial 31:13 41:7 56:14 100:6 103:14 118:23 222:17 249:3 256:2 substantially 41:24 43:7 73:15 115:6 substantiate 239:5 245:9 subtle 85:7 subtypes 133:25 suffered 105:3 suffers 94:19 sufficient 90:20 106:25 107:17 134:5 233:25 sufficiently 134:6 241:6 suggest 137:4 148:23 157:8 173:4 180:2 205:14 254:19 suggested 134:20 148:17 251:22 suggesting 74:6 120:15 149:24 suggestion 129:23 142:11 144:12 156:13 suggestive 101:17 suggests 147:23 summarily 156:10 summarize 42:9 235:14 241:7 summarized 40:23 77:21 165:24 summary 17:8 60:4 101:25 106:18 175:20 211:17 248:24 summer 165:19 Sunbelt 179:6

superior 16:16 16:18 16:24 19:21 superiority 25:4 supplants 133:20 supplement 98:14 supplemental 13:14 233:12 support 12:15 28:20 127:15 127:16 138:24 149:22 239:9 242:24 245:4 251:15 supported 49:16 supportive 196:17 196:24 206:12 supports 96:5 Suppose 226:18 227:5 supposed 58:3 surgery 30:6 32:18 49:9 175:2 189:6 189:10 189:13 197:24 surgical 175:16 176:8 178:4 181:16 surgically 176:5 184:21 249:5 256:4 surmised 176:25 surprise 168:5 surprised 215:13 215:15 216:20 223:14 247:13 surprises 205:13 surprising 39:24 46:10 79:18 surrogate 82:7 97:9 178:13 209:23 survey 156:6 survivals 170:16 177:15 survivors 103:2 suspect 130:14 sway 119:15 sweeps 176:14 SWOG 28:15 31:14 43:15 sympathetic 138:7 symptoms 205:18 206:7 232:6 252:18 systematic 251:8 systematically 251:10 systemic 176:9 176:18 178:5 178:8 178:10 235:2 - T -**T4** 167:21 175:11 tables 149:2 tail 119:23 204:10 tainting 254:5 take-home 40:25 44:11 60:2

takers 120:7

talked 91:5 118:6

128:6 173:23 180:13

155:2

takes 28:23 77:17 77:18

245:25 talking 71:15 73:5 84:22 87:16 88:22 89:2 89:6 97:24 117:2 117:3 120:3 121:20 122:22 122:25 129:19 142:3 153:8 154:22 156:7 222:10 247:14 task 186:2 203:14 taxane 131:23 taxanes 29:5 30:22 132:7 Taxol-containing 131:15 taxpayer 253:18 team's 108:8 team 9:7 98:17 108:6 232:25 technique 189:16 191:16 tells 248:17 248:20 Temple's 70:8 119:11 154:15 TEMPLE 60:12 60:15 64:12 70:20 85:9 85:10 85:11 85:23 86:9 86:14 87:20 88:20 110:17 110:19 112:10 112:11 112:14 125:11 125:12 127:3 127:19 127:22 132:6 133:22 133:23 134:14 142:24 143:7 143:9 143:22 144:20 145:14 146:6 146:10 148:8 148:9 149:8 149:20 150:2 151:8 154:21 155:10 **TEMPLETON-SOMERS** 8:22 9:14 160:22 161:10 temporarily 232:11 tend 72:8 72:19 216:25 termed 23:17 termination 237:19 terrific 86:22 118:24 terrifically 118:17 tested 24:19 171:9 184:3 testicular 188:22 testing 91:2 128:12 175:19 179:8 tests 58:23 59:7 167:9 212:25 214:6 Texas 160:25 thank 8:4 9:11 11:18 11:21 12:4 13:5 13:6 13:11 16:6 31:4 31:8 49:23 49:24 51:13 54:12 96:14 98:7 98:10 108:2 108:3 108:15 113:7 117:17 117:18 134:12 134:13 135:19 158:23 158:24 161:8 163:3 163:4 180:15 184:11 184:13 194:17 209:17 209:18 212:17 229:7 235:15 241:19 241:20

244:2 245:15 255:22 256:21 thanks 160:3 182:17 theme 112:17 therapeutic 17:7 168:6 therapeutically 252:8 Therapeutics 161:7 therapies 31:2 164:18 164:19 166:3 167:13 175:3 176:19 176:19 180:10 182:24 thereafter 26:17 34:10 thereof 196:13 they'll 60:20 147:7 148:20 217:22 thick 188:4 thickness 184:22 187:15 187:23 188:15 190:7 201:17 201:19 201:21 203:4 203:7 206:16 207:11 209:13 237:2 237:3 237:4 237:8 237:12 238:13 238:19 238:25 243:8 Thirdly 195:16 230:14 252:22 thirds 37:3 189:11 though 41:23 44:9 55:22 65:3 82:10 82:11 88:7 91:23 94:21 101:14 138:3 145:10 152:22 154:11 172:24 206:8 thoughts 56:9 82:18 125:2 128:20 three-by-two 32:21 33:13 threshold 201:6 201:7 thrombocytopenia 25:25 47:9 throw 144:11 tight 60:6 123:12 214:12 timing 235:22 tiny 139:14 title 98:21 Tiwari 235:17 today's 10:2 10:23 11:6 161:23 token 79:7 tolerability 205:6 234:19 tolerate 131:5 tolerated 49:21 208:23 topic 16:7 89:14 191:7 totally 68:7 138:7 241:22 tough 86:5 108:13 toughest 119:24 152:20 towards 138:23 185:21 208:14 251:10 toxic 169:15 169:16 toxicities 25:24 45:23 46:8 46:14 47:2 47:4 48:13 52:18 96:20 97:4 97:5 97:14 97:21 104:6

#### C Reef Integrated Bystems

104:21 104:23 104:24 109:2 109:5 145:10 154:4 156:15 156:16 traditionally 41:11 transfer 193:5 transfusions 45:8 45:8 47:12 translate 18:14 97:5 221:25 translated 233:13 234:7 translates 19:8 208:7 209:12 translation 237:23 trastuzumab 29:10 53:21 travel 11:20 13:25 treacheries 65:2 treat 220:19 248:12 treatability 178:14 treated 24:10 35:6 37:17 85:16 85:19 86:10 86:19 86:20 86:24 87:24 100:7 100:10 101:4 101:5 101:6 101:21 101:23 102:4 102:24 102:25 103:13 103:14 103:20 103:21 104:4 106:8 106:16 106:20 131:14 132:8 141:20 141:21 144:6 147:25 163:25 173:12 174:19 178:2 178:15 222:18 treating 124:8 156:24 157:4 228:15 treatments 89:5 114:8 171:9 tremendous 188:5 188:6 193:13 trend 20:3 56:3 101:17 107:22 179:2 185:20 204:3 208:14 221:23 241:13 trends 34:17 109:14 trepidation 105:24 trialists 111:4 triangular 198:23 203:18 225:2 225:25 235:23 trivial 138:10 trivialize 138:13 troubled 118:8 troubles 209:24 true 45:18 62:4 118:10 118:10 144:21 145:7 145:20 182:25 184:10 235:24 truly 30:24 truncated 248:3 trust 115:13 143:22 148:6 **TUCK** 13:11 13:12 52:22 52:24 81:15 81:22 tumor 22:15 23:4 23:20 24:4 24:14 24:15 32:15 39:20 41:4 85:14 85:24

94:24 95:17 129:11 129:12 130:16 135:5 139:25 164:19 184:22 187:4 187:8 187:15 187:23 188:15 190:7 201:19 201:21 206:16 209:4 209:13 221:5 tumors 39:8 39:8 41:9 99:15 99:17 99:18 99:24 100:17 100:23 101:7 101:13 103:19 104:2 106:15 106:22 107:3 107:8 112:2 121:13 129:14 137:16 137:17 139:16 149:5 149:6 turns 132:23 181:11 twice 43:10 52:10 110:15 two-and-a-half-fold 39:12 two-by-two-by 30:2 two-by-two 28:9 two-page 244:7 two-paragraph 248:24 two-thirds 37:17 37:19 65:4 65:12 107:8 112:22 189:6 194:7 twofold 39:5 - U -U.s.c 10:4 10:18 161:24 U.s 15:9 186:7 ulceration 187:15 unable 162:25 237:22 unadjusted 100:8 unbalanced 214:17 unbelievable 143:5 unblind 165:15 167:4 unblinded 90:21 214:21 uncertain 252:9 uncertainty 250:13 250:19 250:21 unclearly 228:7 uncommon 47:9 uncorrected 172:3 underestimate 52:16 undergo 80:19 underscore 36:24 58:21 understandable 37:4 understood 73:17 133:24 150:17 215:2 219:15 219:21 222:25 231:10 undertaken 215:13 215:17 252:24 underway 131:12 underwent 190:16 213:10 **undue** 96:6 unfavorable 191:14 unfolding 176:25 unfortunate 53:16 **Unfortunately 97:7** 

97:21 225:20 228:6 45:22 81:18 164:5 164:8 176:9 179:9 unheard 174:22 unique 47:20 vast 97:16 **Unit** 185:5 187:13 ventricular 81:8 82:5 verified 227:2 units 170:4 181:25 184:24 197:6 197:21 verifying 214:5 205:8 206:25 230:15 versus 15:5 17:17 18:3 18:10 18:12 20:6 25:6 32:24 39:17 41:9 49:11 230:24 234:20 235:11 unity 107:22 109:14 universally 22:2 76:23 50:11 56:3 63:19 63:22 77:16 77:21 64:8 64:11 66:19 76:8 81:13 83:7 83:10 83:12 universe 246:14 **University 8:11 8:17** 83:19 91:3 91:7 92:12 9:2 160:11 160:17 160:21 160:25 163:13 187:12 188:11 unless 109:4 144:8 148:20 210:20 unlike 80:9 unplanned 55:11 56:24 67:20 72:18 88:4 137:20 148:16 150:9 150:14 150:23 unpublished 17:6 233:16 unreasonable 203:23 untreated 172:22 173:13 unusual 144:4 144:14 up-front 117:9 up-regulation 164:6 up-to-date 231:16 251:21 update 36:4 79:3 79:9 81:2 99:2 211:22 212:16 12:2 updated 163:19 164:25 210:7 upper 236:2 urge 127:5 127:6 useful 118:18 151:7 242:15 256:9 usefulness 197:6 uses 251:16 252:15 usual 33:8 35:3 69:16 70:11 126:21 214:12 215:4 224:15 - V vaccine 193:18 193:23 Vaccines 193:13 vagaries 72:22 135:11 validity 125:7 125:7 126:18 valuable 13:4 96:21 Vanderbilt 8:11 160:11 vantage 179:10 variable 87:19 201:23 236:13 237:9 250:21 variables 167:11 172:7 variance 235:25 variation 143:7 155:22 varieties 163:25

93:11 93:11 103:13 121:7 123:25 133:2 141:20 179:4 188:6 191:13 192:11 216:22 veterans 254:2 victims 253:17 view 23:12 44:4 61:18 72:9 90:25 137:24 139:22 208:6 208:20 252:10 views 105:23 vincristine 17:25 violations 200:22 vis-a-vis 53:25 142:13 visceral 180:3 209:7 223:5 229:5 visit 227:11 227:13 visits 231:20 **vitro** 164:5 VMO 193:18 Volpe 11:24 11:25 vomiting 45:24 109:11 vote 10:2 10:24 129:17 138:16 158:18 161:23 249:6 249:13 249:21 253:14 255:24 256:5 voted 141:16 152:4 voting 10:11 11:7 136:12 - W wait 68:16 waiver 10:10 10:12 161:25 162:3 waivers 10:5 warning 145:9 150:10 WASSNER 211:8 211:8 211:20 211:24 229:22 230:5 230:11 wave 181:17 weak 210:5 weaknesses 245:13 wearing 119:24 wears 132:19 weather 11:21 162:25 web 165:24 wee 90:14 week 33:19 52:10

variety 14:13 29:2

#### Reef Integrated Systems

113:20 197:7 197:22 205:9 233:2 234:21 235:12 237:21 237:24 255:17 weekly 29:3 30:4 43:10 184:25 201:2 206:25 weeks 25:20 28:3 28:6 28:8 28:8 29:3 32:25 34:17 51:9 179:5 197:23 weight 116:17 weighted 119:6 Weiss 113:9 113:11 113:12 113:24 117:19 118:15 welcome 13:23 well-controlled 197:14 well-established 205:23 weren't 43:14 55:13 87:25 130:25 whatsoever 40:7 whereas 207:12 whereby 209:4 Whereupon 256:22 whichever 137:8 whiskers 240:14 240:16 246:5 who's 115:22 117:2 130:10 whoever 138:4 widely 192:25 widen 75:22 75:23 118:13 wider 75:12 77:12 123:7 123:7 123:14 William 10:6 WILLIAMS 9:7 9:7 57:19 57:21 60:22 61:8 63:15 64:6 69:15 70:18 70:25 88:6 92:21 108:4 108:5 110:8 126:20 137:3 137:4 141:17 142:16 142:18 146:11 146:20 147:5 147:17 154:15 155:7 155:23 155:24 158:20 willing 156:20 wishes 163:7 withdraw 224:18 withdrawal 201:7 201:9 206:2 206:2 208:19 withdrawals 202:25 206:5 withdrawn 206:10 232:2 withdrew 105:8 105:9 206:3 206:9 221:13 224:7 224:12 withhold 109:15 withholding 138:5 woman 115:22 119:22 women 12:21 36:20 37:3 37:6 61:3 61:9 61:13 64:4 66:15 66:15 66:18 66:19 66:24 66:25 67:4 68:22 91:14 94:3

94:5 95:11 95:25 104:20 105:3 113:16 114:2 114:5 114:5 114:8 114:10 114:21 115:3 115:6 115:11 115:12 116:4 117:2 125:15 130:23 130:24 131:3 131:4 131:5 132:2 132:20 137:6 140:10 152:11 152:12 156:8 wonder 109:25 111:12 142:5 145:5 wondered 178:3 178:13 241:25 wondering 130:3 wording 148:24 work 29:9 127:14 127:20 149:3 152:24 153:15 153:19 193:9 193:9 208:24 225:15 235:18 worked 232:25 working 62:3 131:3 211:9 world's 16:23 17:13 worldwide 17:2 17:12 19:23 22:11 36:22 42:23 76:5 76:23 77:22 83:6 88:19 186:7 worry 144:4 144:10 180:7 worse 192:9 worst 104:18 104:19 worth 69:5 125:12 125:22 249:19 wow 121:21 wrong 110:20 117:25 118:7 138:15 145:10 221.3 wrote 110:5 - X x-ray 213:10 - Y -**Y-me** 11:24 12:2 12:6 12:11 12:18 Yale 185:5 year-olds 140:9 yellow 17:20 18:17 38:12 39:15 40:9 168:10 168:16 174:10 178:8 178:9 233:11 veses 136:11 yesterday's 78:8 yesterday 79:20 80:4 81:25 121:20 128:18 130:4 156:6 156:11 you'd 126:3 126:7 152:10

You'II 38:12 59:24 131:23 134:7 144:22 145:6 181:23 you've 50:7 74:9 84:14 108:18 117:12 121:7 136:22 137:9 149:20 149:21 151:20 210:23 236:10 253:19 253:20 255:16 255:18 younger 64:3 64:6 66:15 66:17 66:24 68:22 76:20 94:14 94:16 95:15 96:12 Yusef 65:10

## - Z -

Zealand 239:21 Zinecard 30:7 80:5 zodiacal 127:15 ZOOK-FISCHLER 8:12 8:12 10:7 130:19 133:15 139:5 139:6