UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

In the Matter of:

Enrofloxacin for Poultry: Withdrawal of Approval of New Animal Drug Application NADA 140-828 FDA DOCKET: 00N-1571

Date: June 6, 2003

4 03

RESPONDENT BAYER CORPORATION'S PROPOSED CORRECTIONS IN THE TRANSCRIPT OF ORAL TESTIMONY

Pursuant to 21 CFR § 12.98(d) and Administrative Law Judge Davidson's Order dated May 9, 2003, Respondent Bayer Corporation hereby proposes corrections in the transcript of oral testimony as delineated on the attached "errata" sheets for each cross-examination witness. Each of the proposed corrections is for the purpose of correcting transcription errors. A proposed Order is attached.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Nicholas

James H. Sneed

Gregory A. Krauss

M. Miller Baker

McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY

JA. Krauss

600 Thirteenth Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 756-8000

Counsel for Bayer

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that an original and one copy of Respondent Bayer Corporation's Proposed Corrections in the Transcript of Oral Testimony was hand-delivered this 6th day of June, 2003 to:

Dockets Management Branch (HFA-305) Food and Drug Administration 5630 Fishers Lane (Room 1061) Rockville, MD 20852

I also certify that a copy of the foregoing Proposed Corrections in the Transcript of Oral Testimony was e-mailed this 6th day of June, 2003 to:

The Office of the Administrative Law Judge Food And Drug Administration Room 9-57, HF-3 5600 Fishers Lane Rockville, MD 20857

I also certify that a copy of the foregoing Proposed Corrections in the Transcript of Oral Testimony was e-mailed and mailed via first-class mail, postage pre-paid, 6th day of June, 2003 to:

Nadine Steinberg Counsel for the Center for Veterinary Medicine 5600 Fishers Lane (GCF-1) Rockville, MD 20857

Kent D. McClure Animal Health Institute 1325 G Street, N.W, Suite 700 Washington, D.C. 20005

Gregory A. Krauss Counsel for Bayer

egory A. Kraus

In Re: ENROFLOXACIN FOR POULTRY: WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL OF BAYER CORPORATION'S NEW ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATION (NADA) 140-828 (BAYTRIL)

CASE NO.: 00N-1571 DATE TAKEN: <u>April 28, 2003</u>

WITNESS: Linda Tollefson

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
27	19	Cerofloxacin	Sarafloxacin
28	15	fluoroquinolones;	fluoroquinolones";
36	7	Greg,	Gregg,
52	10	TOPES	Tauxe's
55	4	of ruse	for use
55	6	Freedman	Friedman
56	19	CVM BOSE	CVM/Vose
57	1	CVM BOSE	CVM/Vose
61	2	Dr. Freedman	Dr. Friedman
61	22	this come	this comes
62	5	"8 Chicken	. Ate chicken
63	6	Freedman	Friedman
64	14	Freedman	Friedman
66	22	Freedman	Friedman
67	17	Freedman's	Friedman's
70	13	Homberg	Holmberg
70	14	Taket	Tacket
70	14	Conan Talkes	Cohen and Tauxe
70	14	Bivey	Bibi
71	1	Homberg	Holmberg
71	10	Taket	Tacket
71	20	Conan Talkes	Cohen and Tauxe
72	2	Bivey	Bibi
75	11	bed	be
82	4	lori	lari
94	13	Minnick's	Minnich's
97	3	D-	В-
100	1	understanding	understand
107	9	from2000	from 2000
108	8	laundry	monitoring
120	5	non-typoid	non-typhoid
120	8	typing	typhi
120	9	non-typing	non-typhi
120	13	non-typing	non-typhi
121	8	One week	One per week

134	12	Which	Would
137	9	thank	to
137	22	the	that
140	18	founded	rounded
153	13	no	not
154	8	Glysson	Glisson
154	19	Glysson's	Glisson's
154	21	Glysson's	Glisson's
155	8	Glysson's	Glisson's
155	12	Glysson's	Glisson's
157	4	Glysson	Glisson
157	12	ADUCA	AMDUCA
159	9	ADUCA	AMDUCA
162	21	ops	authors
165	15	Dr. Freedman	Dr. Friedman
166	14	Dr. Freedman	Dr. Friedman
168	1	Freedman	Friedman
170	22	Guilliam-Barre	Guillain-Barre
171	2	lead	Mead
171	11	lead	Mead
182	1	Guilliam-Barre	Guillain-Barre
182	4	Guilliam-Barre	Guillain-Barre

In Re: ENROFLOXACIN FOR POULTRY: WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL OF BAYER CORPORATION'S NEW ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATION (NADA) 140-828 (BAYTRIL)

CASE NO.: <u>00N-1571</u> DATE TAKEN: <u>April 29, 2003</u>

WITNESS: Robert Walker

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
188	12	CVC	CDC
188	14	turnover	Tenover
189	4	proto-formula,	protocol
189	11	CVC	CDC
203	1	free agents	reagents
204	1	micro-organisms	microorganisms
204	12	micro-organisms	microorganisms
205	14	micro-organism	microorganism
207	15	Amacrolyte	macrolide
210	19	gastral enteritis	gastroenteritis
210	19	and	an
210	22	And is what's	And it is what's
217	9	am I offered it?	am I off of it?
217	12	Am I offered it?	Am I off of it?
222	9	CVC	CDC
222	10	CVC	CDC
236	5	enterobacteriosis,	Enterobacteriaceae
238	13	gastro-enteritis	gastroenteritis
238	18	pharmaco-kinetic	pharmaco-kinetics
243	20	whether that antimicrobial is	whether that an antimicrobial is

In Re: ENROFLOXACIN FOR POULTRY: WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL OF BAYER CORPORATION'S NEW ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATION (NADA) 140-828 (BAYTRIL)

CASE NO.: <u>00N-1571</u> DATE TAKEN: <u>April 30, 2003</u>

WITNESS: Frederick Angulo

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
267	10	attachment.	attachments.
268	16	jejune	jejuni
269	22	offer	author
271	22	till	until
272	2	till	until
279	11	date versus	data versus
279	11	date which	data which
285	1	apriority	a priori
289	15	fluoroquinolone Campylobacter	fluoroquinolone resistant Campylobacter
293	16	grahms	gram
294	2	Chicatoxin	shiga toxin
294	5	Chagilla	Shigella
294	17	Chagilla	Shigella
296	16	Campyl	Campylobacter
306	4	Hard Net	Hardnett
306	16	site	cite
309	1	HardNet	Hardnett
310	3	Hard Net	Hardnett
322	7	call	all
322	8	venting	vetting
338	1	or E. coli	or coli
344	19	grahms	grams
345	12	juni	jejuni
345	17	to juni	jejuni
345	18	coli so we	coli we
346	4	isolate	isolates
348	16	milligrams	micrograms
349	1	resistant	resistance
351	21	or	for
353	11	had an effective	had ineffective
360	3	aggression	regression
362	12	is approximation	is an approximation
374	22	juni	jejuni
395	13	1, 028	1,028

395	15	was89	was 89
399	9	as	is
404	10	controlled	control
414	20	Alteri	poultry
431	20	MR. NICHOLAS	MR. SPILLER
433	1	899	A-99
448	17	medium	median
449	22	resistance	resistant
450	15	whether you know whether you controlled	Smith controlled
461	2	apriority	a priori
462	10	apriority	a priori
462	12	apriority	a priori
463	5	apriority	a priori

In Re: ENROFLOXACIN FOR POULTRY: WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL OF BAYER CORPORATION'S NEW ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATION (NADA) 140-828 (BAYTRIL)

CASE NO.: 00N-1571 DATE TAKEN: May 1, 2003

WITNESS: Kirk Smith

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
483	7	of the corporation.	of the Bayer Corporation.
484	3	norms	NARMS
484	7	scan.	scheme.
488	19	conducting cross examination.	conducting the cross-examination.
491	21	jurist?	reviewer?
492	12	review	reviewer
494	6	former	formal
494	18	methods analytical	methods and analytical
494	20	that was you	that you
494	21	all of those defined	all of those been defined
497	4	Embry,	Emery,
498	5-6	what information he got	what information the witness got
498	6	he	they
503	2	Pyddic, Gunn,	Piddock, Gaunt,
503	3	Thruolphal,	Threlfall,
503	4	Thruolphal	Threlfall
504	5	Pro crit	purpose
505	11	there prospective as	this prospective, as
505	12	got control	got a control
505	16	there	it
507	11	using nalidixic	using a nalidixic
508	1	genes.	genus.
508	2	genes?	genus?
513	8	with	were
516	19	TCR	PCR
521	5	flore-typing	fla typing
521	14	great.	correct.
523	11	to	as
524	14-15	sources in poultry	sources in particular poultry
530	19	forms	subtypes
536	2	flaw	fla
536	5	flaw-typing	fla typing
536	8	Nachompkin	Nachampkin
536	10	following in the	following the
536	11	Nachompkin	Nachampkin

536	15	flaw	fla
536	20	Flaw	Fla
536	20	F-L-A-W.	F-L-A.
536	21	Flaw	Fla
538	7	But wouldn't you consider	But you wouldn't consider
538	20	detection	detected
547	7	we can die of variables	we can divide variables
547	9	flawed	fla
556	6	FLAG	FLA

In Re: ENROFLOXACIN FOR POULTRY: WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL OF BAYER CORPORATION'S NEW ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATION (NADA) 140-828 (BAYTRIL)

CASE NO.: 00N-1571 DATE TAKEN: May 2, 2003

WITNESS: Heidi Kassenborg

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
567	17	packaging	pathogens
572	2	CBM's	CVM's
573	5	draft	direct
578	13	infectious diseases	Infectious Diseases
579	1	chagella	Shigella
589	6	read	lead
589	18	here do you	here is do you
590	6	purposes today	purposes of today
597	2	final	find a
605	10	There is	There are
606	11	look	looked
609	5	CDD	CDC
616	7	time you think	time do you think

In Re: ENROFLOXACIN FOR POULTRY: WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL OF BAYER CORPORATION'S NEW ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATION (NADA) 140-828 (BAYTRIL)

CASE NO.: <u>00N-1571</u> DATE TAKEN: <u>May 5, 2003</u>

WITNESS: Marja-Liisa Hanninen

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
652	21-22	the enrofloxacin	their infection
663	4	indicate	indicated
666	1	norfloxacine	norfloxacin
666	2	ciprofloxacine	ciprofloxacin
666	5	ciprofloxacine	ciprofloxacin
670	1	inhuman	in human
670	16	cerafloxacin	sarafloxacin
672	9	statement	statements
673	8	flock	flocks
673	14	quite extensive	quite an extensive
675	11	so, if you think	so. I would think
675	12	those response.	dose/response.
675	14	those response.	dose/response.
676	4	there is difference	there is a difference
676	13	Your analysis	In your analysis
676	18	fluoroquinolone	fluoroquinolones
677	18	placed	based
678	1	end of '90s	end of the 90's
686	13	ciprofloxacine	ciprofloxacin
691	20	short on Sweden.	short follow-up on Sweden.
694	8	that	then
699	1	looking ahead	looking at that
699	5	seat	stipulations
700	12	spacial	spatial
700	13	Han Deneeling	Han deNeeling
700	21	Diana	Diane
703	2	Not	No
714	7	acid in chemotherapeutic agents	acid resistance in Campylobacters
		isolated	isolated
718	13	not same	not the same

In Re: ENROFLOXACIN FOR POULTRY: WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL OF BAYER CORPORATION'S NEW ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATION (NADA) 140-828 (BAYTRIL)

CASE NO.: 00N-1571 DATE TAKEN: May 6, 2003

WITNESS: Mary Bartholomew

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
730	7	firm in Washington address	firm's Washington address
730	13-14	courts, Registry of Commonwealth.	courts in the District of Columbia.
738	19	stateholders	stakeholders
739	12	KPK	CVM
740	3	fluoroquinolone	fluoroquinolone-resistant
740	9	campylobacterial	campylobacter
740	10	eating chickens that were	eating chickens, that were
740	11	fluoroquinolone campylobacterial infection that	fluoroquinolones, campylobacter infections that
740	13	people who	people, who
740	14	provider and	provider, and
741	21	chicken that	chicken, that
742	17	discussed, were	discussed, would
742	18	in m questions	in my questions
746	3	attachment	catchment
746	9	when one wants to	then one wants a
747	1	welcomed	welcome
747	6	the ideal	the "ideal
747	7	incident	incidence
747	8	knowledge and	knowledge of the
747	10	diseases.	disease."
747	15	representatives	representativeness
748	5	detachment	the catchment
751	15	determinate	determinant
753	7	"multi - varied	"multivariate
753	8-9	population, attributable fractions, Campylobacteriosis case control study, 1998, 1999."	population attributable fractions, Campylobacter case control study, 1998-1999."
753	10	population, attributable	population attributable
754	6	population, attributable	population attributable
754	9	There's "A," undercooked or pink chicken.	There's "Ate undercooked or pink chicken."
754	10	"A" chicken prepared at home	"Ate chicken prepared at home"
754	14	"A," undercooked or pink	"Ate undercooked or pink

		chicken,	chicken",
754	22	do with this	do this
755	21	FoodNet in	FoodNet population in
756	12	question	questions
757	15	rate	rates
763	11-12	on the evidence cause.	in evidence law.
763	18	Registrar	Register
763	21	important considering	important, considering
763	22	outside home	outside the home
764	2-3	their dollars	their food dollars
764	11	rely.	rely on.
768	16	limitation is	limitation of
768	17	risks	risk
768	18-19	fraction."	fraction is that those cases that
		Is it those cases that were	were
768	20	interest even	interest, even
768	21	been a cause of the disease,	been the cause of the disease,
		could	would
768	22	risk thereby	risk, thereby
769	1	risk?	risk".
769	22	fraction but	fraction, but
770	3	ACRIORI	a priori
772	16	reduction	fraction
774	4	the "A" chicken prepared in	the "Ate chicken prepared at a
774	5	the restaurant has	restaurant" has
774	6	44	24
774	9	says, " 'A' chicken	says, "Ate chicken
775	5	respond, yes	respond, "yes
775	6	home would	home "would
775	8	said yes	said "yes
775	9	home than	home" than
775	13	cases for disease more	cases get disease more frequently
		frequently from exposure to	from exposure than do
776	7	awfully	awful
779	4	attachment 29	attachment 1
782	22	Schmidt	Schmid
783	3	Schmidt, et al in	Schmid, et al Study in
787	1	ill less	ill persons were less
787	7	set of controls."	set of controls"
787	10	I said, more	I said, " more
787	11	undercooked.	undercooked."
788	18	Schmitz study in Debuque	Schmid study in Dubuque
789	4	Debuque	Dubuque
790	10	here. You're	here. You
790	16	as the question.	ask the question.

790	19	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
791	5	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
791	17	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
791	20	chicken," other than nor	chicken other than in restaurants
1			nor
791	21	kitchen practices. We	kitchen hygiene practices." We
792	18	Schmitz	Schmid
792	20	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
794	3	epidemial	endemic
794	22	contamination	contaminated
797	4	CVC	CDC
799	20	separating out. This is	separating out this is
800	8	At if	And if
802	8	slip of	flip of
802	18	indication	etiologic
803	9	CVC	CDC
803	21	CVC	CDC
804	13	Floraquinolone	fluoroquinolone
805	18	Predence	Friedman
805	19	Predence	Friedman
805	20	CVC	CDC
806	8-9	Drank untreated water from a	"Drank untreated water from a
		lake, river, or stream.	lake, river, or stream."
806	19	Floraquinolone	fluoroquinolone
808	4	solution	sewage
809	11	Norm's	NARM's
810	14	proposition trivial	population attributable
812	2	know	known
812	6	resistant	resistance
812	18	talked maybe	talked about how maybe
817	7	come of	come out of
819	19	resistant of chicken	resistant from chicken
821	13	Ciprofloxacin	ciprofloxacin
822	2	it says number of	it says "number of
822	3	that indicated of	with indicated pathogen" of
822	4	Ciprofloxacin 27; and it says	ciprofloxacin 37"; and it says
822	9	had one of the patients	had among patients
822	21	"Of the	"Among
822	22	patients affected with	patients who had only
		campylobacter	campylobacter
823	1	isolate"	isolated"
823	4	Ciprofloxacin	ciprofloxacin
824	7	see. One of these patients, the	see. "One of these patients"the
824	8	for 7 days, having on	"for 7 days", having "on
824	9	resistant. The same isolate	resistant" The "same isolate

824	10	2 days after Ciprofloxacin therapy was initiated. And	10 days after ciprofloxacin therapy was initiated. A
824	11	Ciprofloxacin-susceptible species was isolated	ciprofloxacin-susceptiblespecies was isolated
824	12	at admission. That	at admission; that
824	13	four days.	four days"
825	10	Aithromycin	azithromycin
825	11	Ciprofloxacin	ciprofloxacin
825	20	"Recovery	"Recovered
826	1	Azithromycin	azithromycin
826	2	Azithromycin	azithromycin
826	3	Ciprofloxacin	ciprofloxacin
830	18	Exhibit 9433.	Exhibit G-953.
830	21	Table 1.2?	Table I.2?
831	4_	I think it's 1.2,	I think it's I.2,
832	20	MR. SPILLER:	MR. NICHOLAS:

In Re: ENROFLOXACIN FOR POULTRY: WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL OF BAYER CORPORATION'S NEW ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATION (NADA) 140-828 (BAYTRIL)

CASE NO.: <u>00N-1571</u> DATE TAKEN: <u>May 6, 2003</u>

WITNESS: Louis Cox, Jr.

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
726	4	Louie Cox, Jr.	Louis Cox, Jr.
834	22	Louie Anthony Cox, Jr.	Louis Anthony Cox, Jr.
841	10	her	him
849	22	checking consumption	chicken consumption
850	14-15	what are the causes of the	what are the causes of the
		associations.	associations?
853	10	core six.	course six.
854	9	none exist.	none exists.
856	18	I rush to say	I blush to say
866	3	might tackle the approach	might tackle the problem
867	9	thought keys	thought piece
869	3-5	yet the probability that exactly	"yet the probability that exactly
		one person will become ill may	one person will become ill may
		be less than the probably that	be less than the probably that
		two or more will become ill,	two or more will become ill,
		right?	right?"
869	14-15	I did say this seems to me to be	I did say, "This seems to me to
		a very practical, sound	be a very practical, sound
		approach. I have no remaining	approach. I have no remaining
		concern.	concerns."
870	3-4	They can be spacial clusters.	There can be spacial clusters.
870	5	Let me just say, not necessarily.	Let me just say: not
			necessarily.
870 -	22 -	if several people in the same	if several people in the same
871	1	family get sick, it's an outbreak.	family get sick, is it an
			outbreak?
875 -	20 -	It's the page on which the first	It's the page on which the first
876	5	complete sentence is, I mean	complete sentence is, I mean
		like 10, it the study, the	like 10, "It the study, the
		model it has to make a few	model it has to make a few
		baroque assumptions, K being	baroque assumptions, K being
		the big one, to get across big	the big one, to get across big
		data gaps, but it is very explicit	data gaps, but it is very explicit
		about that. So all in all, I think	about that. So all in all, I think
		that is a job well done. I want to	that is a job well done. I want
	<u> </u>	invite you to critically examine	to invite you to critically

			100.11
		a few assumptions if you share	examine a few assumptions to
		that conclusion.	see if you share that
			conclusion."
877	20-21	the model says risk is equal to	the model says risk is equal to
		big K exposure	big K times exposure
878	18-19	where you try to say is this	where you try to say, "Is this
		model correct and useful.	model correct and useful?"
878	20-21	saying do its consequences	Saying, "Do its consequences
		follow from its premises,	follow from its premises?",
878	22	empirically valid.	
878 -	22-		empirically valid?
1		So these comments are directed	So these comments are directed
879	3	at a logical matter, if you would	at a logical matter. If you
		make the big K model work, a	could make the big K model
		lot of little factors, that would be	work, a lot of little factors, that
		a terrific thing to do.	would be a terrific thing to do.
879	7	On that, a somewhat	Oh, that's a somewhat
		imponderable question.	imponderable question.
880	19	Virginia Misen	Virginiamycin
883	20-21	And that refers to the number of	And that refers to a number of
		contracts.	contracts.
888	9-12	I've I don't know. It's not in	I've I don't know. It's not, in
		deadline, I can tell you that. I	my mind, I can tell you that. I
		don't think it was. And again, I	don't think it was. And again,
		tend to have some area of	it's outside my area of
		expertise. I think Bayer helped	
		to Bayer, with some of the	expertise. I think Bayer helped
		1	out Bayer, with some of the
890	14	production costs.	production costs.
		progression models	regression models
892	1-3	This is a reference for the	This is a reference for the
		rather-than-chicken assumption,	"rather-than-chicken
		per se, portion, not for the	consumption, per se" portion,
		restaurant dining portion.	not for the "restaurant dining"
			portion.
893	17	And thirdly, the relation that	And thirdly, if the relation that
		you're referring to is	you're referring to is
894	10-12	showing up as being	showing up as being
		significant don't be impressed	significant. Don't be impressed
		by big odds ratio because of the	by big odds ratio because of the
		logarithm scale that goes as low	logarithmic scale that goes as
		as zero but as high as 70.	low as zero but as high as 70.
895	1	I love that data step.	I love that data set.
895	9	Dr. Angelo's	Dr. Angulo's
895	111	Dr. Angelo's	Dr. Angulo's
898	14-15	This finding supports not the	
370	17-13		This finding supports not the
		restaurant dining, but the not	"restaurant dining", but the
		chicken per se point.	"not chicken per se" point.

898	17-18	My point is, why.	My point is, Why?
899	13-14	indicates that chicken at home	indicates that chicken at
		I admit we haven't gotten	home I admit, we haven't
	:	down to business yet,	gotten down to business yet
903	14-19	The Eberhart-Phillips	The Eberhart-Phillips
		conclusion that you just	conclusion that you just
		mentioned uses common causes.	mentioned uses "common
		Campylobacteriosis is a	causes". "Campylobacteriosis
		common disease with a number	is a common disease with a
		of common causes, the most	number of common causes, the
		important being, at least for	most important being, [at least
		campylobacteriosis in New	for campylobacteriosis in New
		Zealand, the most important	Zealand], the most important
		being the consumption of	being the consumption of
		undercooked chicken.	undercooked chicken."
903 -	22 -	She is drawing a conclusion	She is not drawing a conclusion
904	1	about causes.	about causes.
904	15-16	I think there is probably a host	I think there is probably a host-
		of these interactions.	disease interaction.
905	7-10	Let's see. There was no	Let's see. "There was no
		statistically significant risk	statistically significant risk
		associated with consumption of	associated with consumption of
		chicken other than in	chicken other than in
		restaurants, nor with reported	restaurants, nor with reported
		domestic kitchen hygiene factor.	domestic kitchen hygiene
			factor."
906	13	logistic progression	logistic regression
907	14-17	Absolutely not. If you'll look at	Absolutely not. If you'll look
		table 1 of Effler, you'll see on	at table 1 of Effler you'll see
		that on that page 3 of this	that on page 3 of this exhibit
		exhibit you just handed me,	you just handed me from a
		from a restaurant there's an	restaurant there's an association
 		association in this model.	in this model.
908	15	math odds ratio	matched odds ratio
910	11-14	I state that he used a particular	I state that he used a particular
		model conditional logistic	modelconditional logistic
		progression without reporting	regression without reporting
		the standard model diagnostics	the standard model diagnostics
		and tests that would roughly	and tests that would roughly
		correspond to what I just said.	correspond to what I just said.
910	16	how variable testing was done.	how variable selection was
010	10		done.
912	19	No, it's seem to support.	No, it's "seem to support".

In Re: ENROFLOXACIN FOR POULTRY: WITHDRAWAL OF APPROVAL OF BAYER CORPORATION'S NEW ANIMAL DRUG APPLICATION (NADA) 140-828 (BAYTRIL)

CASE NO.: <u>00N-1571</u> DATE TAKEN: <u>May 7, 2003</u>

WITNESS: Louis Cox, Jr.

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
925	3	Louie Cox, Jr.	Louis Cox, Jr.
925	6	LOUIE COX, JR.	LOUIS COX, JR.
930	9	Michael Bond	Michael Vaughn
931	1	Dr. DeGrouth.	Dr. DeGroot.
931	19	Dr. DeGrouth	Dr. DeGroot
932	14	Dr. DeGrouth	Dr. DeGroot
937	5, 10	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
941	20	Louie Cox, Jr.	Louis Cox, Jr.
946	1	reduction stage.	production stage.
951	16	Of course, minor effect	Of course: "minor effect
		demonstrates.	demonstrate(s)".
955	4	I continued through, for example	I continued through, "For
		oh, here's where the log 10 comes	example". Oh, here's where the
		in. For example, a reduction of	log 10 comes in: "For example, a
		three log 10 colony forming units	reduction of three log 10 colony
		per chicken.	forming units per chicken"
956	11	What I show is not a quote but	What I show is not a quote, but
		which is pertinent and reflects the	which is pertinent and reflects the
		point there is that the effect of such	point there is that the effect of
		a decrease in the number it's a	such a decrease in the number (it's
		pretty large decrease in the number	a pretty large decrease in the
		of campylobacter would not have	number of campylobacters) would
		been detected by the what he	not have been detected by the
		refers to as "qualitative methods,"	what he refers to as "qualitative
		meaning the prevalence metric.	methods," meaning the prevalence
			metric.
962	4	represents using	represents, using
966	11	several things on here	several things going on here
967	6	In all of the cases, if I'm not	In all of the cases, if I'm not
		referring to figures, specialized to	referring to figures (specialized to
		the context such as 7(a) and 7(b)	the context, such as 7(a) and 7(b),
		and something that I pull out, or if	and something that I pull out); or
	1	a reference, for example, a number	if a reference for example, a
		is given, reference 17, that's not	number is given, reference 17,
	}	pertinent to the content, I would	that's not pertinent to the content -
		not feel obliged to repeat those	- I would not feel obliged to

		typographical marks in the quoted section for example, in a journal article.	repeat those typographical marks in the quoted section, for example, in a journal article.
968	8	I think that correcting the punctuation and putting in the S I think that's fair. The how to deal with the sentence break around the deleted figure reference, in light of our long discussion, I question in my own mind whether it would have been useful to have quoted the entire thing either though that would be duplicating material already in there.	I think that correcting the punctuation and putting in the S, I think that's fair. The how to deal with the sentence break around the deleted figure reference In light of our long discussion, I question in my own mind whether it would have been useful to have quoted the entire thing, either, though that would be duplicating material already in there.
969	11	looks to me that this	looks to me like this
970	11	as a form for	as a farm-to-fork
971	1	and that Rosenquist demonstrates is not linear is	and that Rosenquist demonstrates is not linear is
971	4	microbial lode	microbial load
971	10	Prevalence says not how many microbes is this chicken carrying; prevalence says what fraction of flocks in this case have at least some campylobacter present.	Prevalence says not, "How many microbes is this chicken carrying?" Prevalence says, "What fraction of flocks in this case have at least some campylobacter present?"
972	16	microbial load has held constant	microbial load is held constant
972	18	microbial load, such as all the situations I'm looking at where Enrofloxacin use is contemplated.	microbial load such as all the situations I'm looking at, where Enrofloxacin use is contemplated.
973	21	So for you to say that CVM incorporates an important component is to leave out everything important which is in simulation runs where microbial load doesn't change, for example, because there's no manipulation of Enrofloxacin use.	So for you to say that "CVM incorporates an important component" is to leave out everything important which is in simulation runs where microbial load doesn't change for example, because there's no manipulation of Enrofloxacin use.
975	21	A An approximately linear relationship for these simulations. The reason I'm saying that is it's not a general relationship. It's a relationship conditioned on what we just talked about, which is holding microbial load constant. Actually, not necessarily, but	A An approximately linear relationship for <i>these</i> simulations. The reason I'm saying that is, it's not a <i>general</i> relationship. It's a relationship conditioned on what we just talked about which is holding microbial load constant. Actually, not necessarily. But

		you're falling into I think just the perhaps confusion that I was trying to clarify which is these are not general relationships. These are plots of perhaps 8 different simulation run outputs.	you're falling into I think just the, perhaps, confusion that I was trying to clarify, which is: these are <i>not</i> general relationships. These are plots of perhaps 8 different simulation run outputs.
		To that, you're trying to attach a general rule which is that human illness is proportional to flock prevalence. I'm telling you that general rule is an incorrect generalization because in general, microbial loads are not held constant as they are in these simulations.	To that, you're trying to attach a general rule, which is that human illness is proportional to flock prevalence. I'm telling you: that general rule is an incorrect generalization because, in general, microbial loads are <i>not</i> held constant as they are in these simulations.
980	1	I was hung up on which of the many assumptions, some explicit, some subsequently described, by CVM as being implicit but not explicitly stated you were thinking of.	I was hung up on which of the many assumptions some explicit, some subsequently described, by CVM, as being implicit but not explicitly stated you were thinking of.
981	2	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
982	16, 16, 21	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
982	20	Almost. The demonstrably is only partially covered. I'd say for Rodriguez it's suggested.	Almost. The "demonstrably" is only partly covered. I'd say for Rodrigues, it's suggested.
983	3, 4, 19	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
984	13, 14, 20	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
984	14	I cite Rodriguez to support the idea travel abroad and consumption of chicken in a restaurant are associated with being a cause,	I cite Rodriguesz to support the idea that travel abroad and consumption of chicken in a restaurant are associated with being a case,
985	1	Well, again, what Rodriguez says, being careful to exactly quote his words, in the abstract on page 1, fourth line, sentence starting at the end of that line, where travel, he says two things two main things. Travel abroad and consumption of	Well, again, what Rodriguez says (being careful to exactly quote his words), in the abstract on page 1, fourth line, sentence starting at the end of that line, where travel - he says two things two main things: Travel abroad, and

		chicken in a restaurant were statistically associated with being a	consumption of chicken in a restaurant, were statistically
=		cause so yes, he talks about chicken in a restaurant.	associated with being a cause. So yes, he talks about chicken in a
		omeren in a restaurant.	restaurant.
985	1	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
986	1		
980	1	And as I said, I cited myself and	And as I said, I cited myself and
		my own causal analysis for the	my own causal analysis for the
006	107	demonstrably part	"demonstrably" part
986	6, 7,	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
007	8, 17	7.1.	D 1:
987	18	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
992	6	This article doesn't discuss or this	This article doesn't discuss (or this
		abstract doesn't discuss whether	abstract doesn't discuss) whether
		the design is prospective, saying if	the design is <i>prospective</i> saying
		you have poor kitchen hygiene are	if you have poor kitchen hygiene,
		you more likely to get	are you more likely to get
		campylobacteriosis or whether it's	campylobacteriosis? or whether
		retrospective, meaning if you got	it's retrospective, meaning: if you
		campylobacteriosis, it's more	got campylobacteriosis, it's more
		likely that you had poor kitchen	likely that you had poor kitchen
		hygiene.	hygiene.
992	15	This may be showing if you ask	This may be showing, if you ask
		people who are sick, hey, did you	people who are sick, "Hey, did
		wash your hands, more of them	you wash your hands?", more of
		will say no, which is the point	them will say no which is the
		the distinction I was aiming at	point, the distinction, I was
		before.	aiming at before.
993	10	What it could be showing is that	What it could be showing is that
		people who are asked, after they	people who are asked, after they
		become cases, did you wash your	become cases, "Did you wash
		cutting board, are more likely to	your cutting board?" are more
		respond no.	likely to respond "No".
994	15	I don't think that's correct, but	I don't think that's correct. But
		and the reason is what exactly does	and the reason is, what exactly
	1	"unattributed" mean here. you	does "unattributed" mean here?
		know, is it unattributed because	You know, is it "unattributed"
		there was no evidence that this was	because there was no evidence
		the source?	that this was the source?
999	4	I didn't say which I interpreted.	I didn't say "which I interpreted".
	"	Which I know, as I sit here,	Which I now, as I sit here,
			l · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		interpret as an average, yes, per capita.	interpret as an average yes, per
999	17	NOO page.	capita. NOOH.
22 7	1'	noo page.	NOON.
1000	1	You man the risk sesses and	Van en ann tha mini
1000	1	You mean the risk assessment	You mean the risk assessment

		itself or the CVM assessment?	itself or what CVM said about its risk assessment?
1000	6	represents their use of what they meant about it.	represents their use, i.e., what they meant about it.
1001	13	No. I'm not looking for those words. I am looking for these words: human health impact, lamda, is equal to some constant, k-res, times the pounds of chicken consumed with Fluoroquinoloneresistant campylobacter. And my point is that this is describing risks to a typical on average a representative consumer.	No. I'm not looking for those words. I am looking for these words: human health impact, lambda, is equal to some constant, k-res, times the pounds of chicken consumed with Fluoroquinolone-resistant campylobacter. And my point is that this is describing risks to a typical or average or representative consumer.
1001	20	I know that's been stated and, you know, what's not here is what is the distribution of exposures for different people.	I know that's been stated. And, you know, what's <i>not</i> here is: What is the distribution of exposures for different people?
1003	13	Yes. For example, you could say this is a, quote, hypothetical. It wouldn't have to be that somebody actually said that	Yes. For example, you could say this is a, quote, "hypothetical". It wouldn't have to be that somebody actually said that
1006	11	And that does not establish a relation between them, again, quoting from all the written discussion on this, in any meaningful or useful sense.	And that does not "establish" a "relation" between them, again quoting from all the written discussion on this, in any meaningful or useful sense.
1006	21	I believe that the examples are I attempt to suggest that the aggregate I'm sorry the ratio of aggregate level of campylobacteriosis cases to the aggregate level of chicken consumption has not been shown to have any stronger causal connection than other ratios, including manifestly ridiculous ones.	I believe that the examples are. I attempt to suggest that the aggregateI'm sorry. The ratio of aggregate level of campylobacteriosis cases to the aggregate level of chicken consumption has not been shown to have any stronger causal connection than other ratios, including manifestly ridiculous ones.
1008	4	A When I reviewed this model in 1999, was I not when I reviewed the risk assessment I certainly read what was written about the design.	A When I reviewed this model in 1999, was I not? When I reviewed the risk assessment I certainly read what was written about the design.
1010	10	As you will I'm sorry and you will notice that the big assumption is that the incidence of bad	"As you will" I'm sorry. "And you will notice that the big assumption is that the incidence

r 			
		outcomes more formally in	of bad outcomes [more formally,
		response that we don't want is	of response] that we don't want is
		proportional to the volume of	proportional to the volume of
		outgoing chicken informally the	outgoing chicken [informally the
		exposure, or something	exposure, or something
		proportional to exposure.	proportional to exposure].
		Right. It's exposure and	Right. It's "exposure" and
	1	undesirable or bad effect, not dose	"undesirable (or bad) effect", not
		response.	"dose" and "response".
1014	14	I spoke informally of munging	I spoke informally of "munging
		together different parameters, said	together different parameters" and
		this was something that needed to	said this was something that
		be checked out.	needed to be checked out.
1015	3	First thing is to be correct.	The first thing is to be correct.
1015	10	making it open and inspectable and	making it open and inspectable
1013	1.0	documenting the assumptions is all	and documenting the assumptions
		good things.	
1024	3		are all good things.
1024	3	When you say your model, this is	When you say "your model", this
1024	12	an early version.	is an early version.
1024	13	It depends if you're referring to	It depends. If you're referring to
		Cox 2002, then it was the 2002	Cox 2002, then it was the 2002
1000	1	model.	model.
1028	11	my statement that sensitivity	my statement that "Sensitivity
		analysis provides partial solution	analysis provides a partial
		to the problem of unknown	solution to the problem of
		variable dose response relations.	unknown and variable dose
			response relations."
1031	1	What I was not relying on as I	What I was <i>not</i> relying on, as I
		have clearly written is any	have clearly written, is any
		assumption that there can't be any	assumption that there can't be any
		risk below 500 CFUs. And as I've	risk below 500 CFUs. And, as
		written in Exhibit B-1629 on page	I've written in Exhibit B-1629 on
		36, any dose response relation with	page 36, any dose response
		these qualitative features that are	relation with these qualitative
		discussed tends to produce similar	features (that are discussed) tends
		expected number of CB cases from	to produce similar expected
		given population frequency	number of CP cases from a given
		distribution microbial loads.	population frequency distribution
			of microbial loads.
1034	3,	Tunis	Teunis
1	15,		
	22		
1035	14,	Tunis	Teunis
	22		
1037	1	Tunis	Teunis
1039	11,	Tunis	Teunis
			1 001110

	14		
1040	17	Tunis	Teunis
1042	13,	Tunis	Teunis
	16		
1042	18	You know, I could find myself	You know, I confined myself to
		with a range of data.	the range of the data.
1043	14,	Tunis	Teunis
	18		
1044	7	Tunis	Teunis
1044	12	My model states or my	Well, no. My model states (or my
		description and discussion of	description and discussion of
		exactly this issue in my model	exactly this issue in my model
		states that risks are low or zero.	states) that risks are low or zero.
		They don't have to be zero, they	They don't have to be zero. They
		can be low for sufficiently small	can be low for sufficiently small
		doses, e.g., less than 500 CFUs,	doses, e.g., less than 500 CFUs
		doesn't have to be 500 CFUs, and	it doesn't have to be 500 CFUs.
		illness probability increases	And illness probability increases
		rapidly as a function of dose	rapidly as a function of dose,
		reaching an approximate plateau	reaching an approximate plateau.
		this is now describing why I deal	This is now describing how I deal
		with this model in my model it	with this model in my model it
		reaches an approximate plateau of	reaches an approximate plateau of
		about .2 for CFU levels of about a	about .2 for CFU levels of about a
		thousand to 10,000 CFUs.	thousand to 10,000 CFUs.
		What I've said is by	What I've said is: by
		doing sensitivity analyses, I've	doing sensitivity analyses, I've
		found that any dose response	found that any dose response
		model that captures the rough	model that captures the rough
		qualitative features of the data will	qualitative features of the data
1045		suffice.	will suffice.
1045	13	Popkin	Popken
1046	1	Tunis	Teunis
1047	11	If you look at those data, you'll see	If you look at those data, you'll
		that assuming that there's zero	see that, assuming that there's
		response to zero dose, the pattern	zero response to zero dose, the
		as far as we know is that not much	pattern as far as we know is that
		happens and I don't believe that	not much happens (and I don't
	1	there are data for humans below	believe that there are data for
		about 500 CFUs. Well, not in this	humans below about 500 CFUs
		experiment. Basically, not much	well, not in this experiment)
		happens until you get up to a few	basically, not much happens until
		hundred CFUs, then about 20	you get up to a few hundred CFUs. Then about 20 percent of
		percent of people get sick. So I	people get sick. So, I think that
		think that these data from one	these data from one feeding study
L	L	unita that these data from one	ulese data from one feeding study

		feeding study it's hard to know	it's hard to know what to make
		what to make of them but they're	of them, but they're consistent
		consistent with the idea that there's	with the idea that there's a higher
		a higher response probability when	response probability when you
		you have several hundred, several	have several hundred, several
		thousand CFUs. And we don't	thousand CFUs. And we don't
		really know what happens in the	really know what happens in the
		low dose range.	low-dose range.
1048	12	Tunis	Teunis
1051	4	and there has subsequently been	and that has subsequently been
1001	•	peer review to published.	peer reviewed and published.
1052	5	are extremely robust, the	are extremely robust to the
1032		assumptions.	assumptions.
1053	21		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	$\frac{ 21 }{2}$	a bilinear probability	a binomial probability
1054	2	For the next one down, another	For the next one down, another
4054	 	bilinear distribution,	binomial distribution,
1054	4	For the surface microbial load	For the surface microbial load
		which starts to get exciting from a	(which starts to get exciting from
		cause and effect point of view, as	a cause-and-effect point of view),
	,	specified, a triangular distribution	as specified, a triangular
		for the lot of 10 of the values.	distribution for the log of 10 of
			the values.
1055	11	And there's a substantial	And there's a substantial
		framework that these piece by	framework that these piece-by-
		piece steps get into to justify that	piece steps fit into to justify that
	ļ	dual role and that is the framework	dual role. And that is the
		outlined in the exhibit that I just	framework outlined in the exhibit
		referred to, the B-1020 in my	that I just referred to, the B-1020 -
		book.	- in my book.
1056	22	In this role of the table, yes.	In this row of the table, yes.
1060	4	This is a matter of what the	This is a matter of the operational
		operational definition of the	definition of what the numbers
		numbers mean. My operational, I	mean. By "operational" I mean,
		mean what measurement	what measurement procedures are
		procedures are we using.	we using?
1063	10	The point there is that mean	The point there is that the mean
1000		variance for each step in a process	and variance for each step in a
		where a number of factors are	process where a number of factors
		being multiplied is sufficient when	are being multiplied is sufficient
		there are a large number of steps,	(when there are a large number of
		as there are here, fully characterize	steps, as there are here) to fully
		the distribution, the meaning of the	characterize the distribution, the
		variance for the overall process.	mean and variance for the overall
		variance for the overall process.	process.
1063	22	I believe that reads like a	I believe that reads like a
1005	22	geometric medium	
		geometric medium	geometric median

1066	10	For example, this would be incorrect if the population had a	For example, this would be incorrect if the population had a
		certain distribution,	Cauchy distribution,
1068	4	The sample limit theorem that I	The specific central limit theorem
		referred to deals with the	that I referred to deals with the
		composition of multiple	composition of multiple
		multiplicative steps.	multiplicative steps.
1069	3	It's only partially derived but	It's only partially derived. But
	1	there's a much simpler argument to	there's a much simpler argument
ŧ		getting there that's much more data	for getting there that's much more
		driven.	data driven.
1070	21	No, I didn't rely on it because you	No, I didn't rely on it, because you
		might be able to remove one or	might be able to remove one or
		two points and change the answer	two points and change the answer,
		in something that only has 7 data	in something that only has 7 data
		points. What I relied on was the	points. What I relied on was the
		underlying data, which is a lot	underlying data, which is a lot
		richer but this is the simplest way	richer. But this is the simplest
		of showing the results.	way of showing the results.
1071	5	You picked the regression	Who picked the regression
	<u> </u>	equation for this?	equation for this?
1071	6	The statistics package that I was	The statistics package that I was
		using in the upper not clearly	using (in the upper, not clearly
		legible margin of the picture.	legible, margin of the picture.)
1072	7	What I'm saying is if you take the	What I'm saying is: If you take the
		simplest possible look at the data,	simplest possible look at the data,
		you'll see it doesn't look anything	you'll see it doesn't look anything
		like straight line sloping upward to	like a straight line sloping upward
1000	10	the right	to the right.
1073	10	I don't think I used the jargon	I don't think I used the jargon
		exploratory data analysis. I think I	"exploratory data analysis". I
		have indicated in multiple places	think I have indicated in multiple
		that the simplest way of looking at	places that with the simplest way
		the data that the hypothesis, that	of looking at the data, that the
		it's a cluster around a straight line	hypothesis (that it's a cluster
		leaning from the lower left corner	around a straight line leaning
		upwards has no relation to the real	from the lower left corner
		data even when you look at it in	upwards) has no relation to the
		the simplest possible way.	real data, even when you look at it
1074	11	Wall this testiment wasitte	in the simplest possible way.
10/4	11	Well, this testimony was written	Well, this testimony was written
		with hyperlink in it and they were	with hyperlinks in it, and they
		very close based on hyperlink but	were very close based on
		I'm not sure how close they are in	hyperlinks. But I'm not sure how
1076	11	terms of pages.	close they are in terms of pages.
10/0	111	aggression	regression

1079	6	little slow to go along with either.	little loathe to go along with "either".
1079	14	one forces use	one forces it use
	6	 	
1080	 	is you should	is, you should
1082	14-	mark for exhibit	mark for an exhibit
1085	11	FDA.	USDA.
1089	3	the human health risk, is	that human health risk is
1090	10	it in a	it as a
1092	15	predictable	predicting
1093	11	totally private?	totally in private?
1093	13	about we should	about how we should
1095	12	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
1095	15	raw data and	raw data, and
1095	16	that data as	that data, as
1098	2	being not clear.	not being clear.
1098	14	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
1103	10	controlled	control
1105	12	Erisycolitis	air sacculitis
1105	12	Erisycolitis	air sacculitis
1106	4	Erisycolitis	air sacculitis
1108	3, 21	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
1108	5	are saying it doesn't	are saying: "it doesn't
1108	6	it be, why didn't things	it be? Why didn't things
1108	7	drug.	drug?"
1113	2	your	you're
1114	20	called eight chick.	called "ate" chick.
1114	21	Eight chick,	"Ate chick",
1116	17	classification, vis farm, you got	classification "vis farm", you got

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

In the Matter of:

Enrofloxacin for Poultry: Withdrawal of Approval of New Animal Drug Application NADA 140-828 FDA DOCKET: 00N-1571

Date: June 6, 2003

ORDER

On June 6, 2003, Respondent Bayer Corporation submitted proposed corrections in the transcript of oral testimony in this matter. The proposed corrections were limited to correcting transcription errors. It appearing that each of the proposed corrections is justified, it is <u>ORDERED</u> that corrections be made to the official transcript of oral testimony as follows:

WITNESS: <u>Linda Tollefson</u> DATE TAKEN: <u>April 28, 2003</u>

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To 🙀
27	19	Cerofloxacin	Sarafloxacin
28	15	fluoroquinolones;	fluoroquinolones";
36	7	Greg,	Gregg,
52	10	TOPES	Tauxe's
55	4	of ruse	for use
55	6	Freedman	Friedman
56	19	CVM BOSE	CVM/Vose
57	1	CVM BOSE	CVM/Vose
61	2	Dr. Freedman	Dr. Friedman
61	22	this come	this comes
62	5	"8 Chicken	. Ate chicken
63	6	Freedman	Friedman
64	14	Freedman	Friedman
66	22	Freedman	Friedman

67	17	Freedman's	Friedman's
70	13	Homberg	Holmberg
70	14	Taket	Tacket
70	14	Conan Talkes	Cohen and Tauxe
70	14	Bivey	Bibi
71	1	Homberg	Holmberg
71	10	Taket	Tacket
71	20	Conan Talkes	Cohen and Tauxe
72	2	Bivey	Bibi
75	11	bed	be
82	4	lori	lari
94	13	Minnick's	Minnich's
97	3	D-	B-
100	1	understanding	understand
107	9	from2000	from 2000
108	8	laundry	monitoring
120	5	non-typoid	non-typhoid
120	8	typing	typhi
120	9	non-typing	non-typhi
120	13	non-typing	non-typhi
121	8	One week	One per week
134	12	Which	Would
137	9	thank	to
137	22	the	that
140	18	founded	rounded
153	13	no	not
154	8	Glysson	Glisson
154	19	Glysson's	Glisson's
154	21	Glysson's	Glisson's
155	8	Glysson's	Glisson's
155	12	Glysson's	Glisson's
157	4	Glysson	Glisson
157	12	ADUCA	AMDUCA
159	9	ADUCA	AMDUCA
162	21	ops	authors
165	15	Dr. Freedman	Dr. Friedman
166	14	Dr. Freedman	Dr. Friedman
168	1	Freedman	Friedman
170	22	Guilliam-Barre	Guillain-Barre
171	2	lead	Mead
171	11	lead	Mead
182	1	Guilliam-Barre	Guillain-Barre
182	4	Guilliam-Barre	Guillain-Barre

WITNESS: Robert Walker DATE TAKEN: April 29, 2003

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
188	12	CVC	CDC
188	14	turnover	Tenover
189	4	proto-formula,	protocol
189	11	CVC	CDC
203	1	free agents	reagents
204	1	micro-organisms	microorganisms
204	12	micro-organisms	microorganisms
205	14	micro-organism	microorganism
207	15	Amacrolyte	macrolide
210	19	gastral enteritis	gastroenteritis
210	19	and	an
210	22	And is what's	And it is what's
217	9	am I offered it?	am I off of it?
217	12	Am I offered it?	Am I off of it?
222	9	CVC	CDC
222	10	CVC	CDC
236	5	enterobacteriosis,	Enterobacteriaceae
238	13	gastro-enteritis	gastroenteritis
238	18	pharmaco-kinetic	pharmaco-kinetics
243	20	whether that antimicrobial is	whether that an antimicrobial is

WITNESS: Frederick Angulo DATE TAKEN: April 30, 2003

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
267	10	attachment.	attachments.
268	16	jejune	jejuni
269	22	offer	author
271	22	till	until
272	2	till	until
279	11	date versus	data versus
279	11	date which	data which
285	1	apriority	a priori
289	15	fluoroquinolone Campylobacter	fluoroquinolone resistant
			Campylobacter
293	16	grahms	gram
294	2	Chicatoxin	shiga toxin
294	5	Chagilla	Shigella
294	17	Chagilla	Shigella
296	16	Campyl	Campylobacter
306	4	Hard Net	Hardnett
306	16	site	cite

309	1	HardNet	Hardnett
310	3	Hard Net	Hardnett
322	7	call	all
322	8	venting	vetting
338	1	or E. coli	or coli
344	19	grahms	grams
345	12	juni	jejuni
345	17	to juni	jejuni
345	18	coli so we	coli we
346	4	isolate	isolates
348	16	milligrams	micrograms
349	1	resistant	resistance
351	21	or	for
353	11	had an effective	had ineffective
360	3	aggression	regression
362	12	is approximation	is an approximation
374	22	juni	jejuni
395	13	1, 028	1,028
395	15	was89	was 89
399	9	as	is
404	10	controlled	control
414	20	Alteri	poultry
431	20	MR. NICHOLAS	MR. SPILLER
433	1	899	A-99
448	17	medium	median
449	22	resistance	resistant
450	15	whether you know whether	Smith controlled
		you controlled	
461	2	apriority	a priori
462	10	apriority	a priori
462	12	apriority	a priori
463	5	apriority	a priori

WITNESS: Kirk Smith DATE TAKEN: May 1, 2003

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
483	7	of the corporation.	of the Bayer Corporation.
484	3	norms	NARMS
484	7	scan.	scheme.
488	19	conducting cross examination.	conducting the cross-examination.
491	21	jurist?	reviewer?
492	12	review	reviewer
494	6	former	formal
494	18	methods analytical	methods and analytical

494	20	that was you	that you
494	21	all of those defined	all of those been defined
497	4	Embry,	Emery,
498	5-6	what information he got	what information the witness got
498	6	he	they
503	2	Pyddic, Gunn,	Piddock, Gaunt,
503	3	Thruolphal,	Threlfall,
503	4	Thruolphal	Threlfall
504	5	Pro crit	purpose
505	11	there prospective as	this prospective, as
505	12	got control	got a control
505	16	there	it
507	11	using nalidixic	using a nalidixic
508	1	genes.	genus.
508	2	genes?	genus?
513	8	with	were
516	19	TCR	PCR
521	5	flore-typing	fla typing
521	14	great.	correct.
523	11	to	as
524	14-15	sources in poultry	sources in particular poultry
530	19	forms	subtypes
536	2	flaw	fla
536	5	flaw-typing	fla typing
536	8	Nachompkin	Nachamkin
536	10	following in the	following the
536	11	Nachompkin	Nachamkin
536	15	flaw	fla
536	20	Flaw	Fla
536	20	F-L-A-W.	F-L-A.
536	21	Flaw	Fla
538	7	But wouldn't you consider	But you wouldn't consider
538	20	detection	detected
547	7	we can die of variables	we can divide variables
547	9	flawed	fla
556	6	FLAG	FLA

WITNESS: Heidi Kassenborg DATE TAKEN: May 2, 2003

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
567	17	packaging	pathogens
572	2	CBM's	CVM's
573	5	draft	direct
578	13	infectious diseases	Infectious Diseases

WITNESS: Mary Bartholomew DATE TAKEN: May 6, 2003

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
730	7	firm in Washington address	firm's Washington address
730	13-14	courts, Registry of	courts in the District of Columbia.
		Commonwealth.	
738	19	stateholders	stakeholders
739	12	KPK	CVM
740	3	fluoroquinolone	fluoroquinolone-resistant
740	9	campylobacterial	campylobacter
740	10	eating chickens that were	eating chickens, that were
740	11	fluoroquinolone	fluoroquinolones, campylobacter
		campylobacterial infection that	infections that
740	13	people who	people, who
740	14	provider and	provider, and
741	21	chicken that	chicken, that
742	17	discussed, were	discussed, would
742	18	in m questions	in my questions
746	3	attachment	catchment
746	9	when one wants to	then one wants a
747	1	welcomed	welcome
747	6	the ideal	the "ideal
747	7	incident	incidence
747	8	knowledge and	knowledge of the
747	10	diseases.	disease."
747	15	representatives	representativeness
748	5	detachment	the catchment
751	15	determinate	determinant
753	7	"multi - varied	"multivariate
753	8-9	population, attributable	population attributable fractions,
		fractions, Campylobacteriosis	Campylobacter case control study,
		case control study, 1998, 1999."	1998-1999."
753	10	population, attributable	population attributable
754	6	population, attributable	population attributable
754	9	There's "A," undercooked or	There's "Ate undercooked or pink
		pink chicken.	chicken."
754	10	"A" chicken prepared at home	"Ate chicken prepared at home"
754	14	"A," undercooked or pink	"Ate undercooked or pink
		chicken,	chicken",
754	22	do with this	do this
755	21	FoodNet in	FoodNet population in
756	12	question	questions
757	15	rate	rates
763	11-12	on the evidence cause.	in evidence law.
763	18	Registrar	Register

763	21	important considering	important, considering
763	22	outside home	outside the home
764	2-3	their dollars	their food dollars
764	11		
768		rely.	rely on.
	16		limitation of
768	17	risks	risk
768	18-19	fraction."	fraction is that those cases that
7.00	20	Is it those cases that were	were
768	20	interest even	interest, even
768	21	been a cause of the disease,	been the cause of the disease,
7.0		could	would
768	22	risk thereby	risk, thereby
769	1	risk?	risk".
769	22	fraction but	fraction, but
770	3	ACRIORI	a priori
772	16	reduction	fraction
774	4	the "A" chicken prepared in	the "Ate chicken prepared at a
774	5	the restaurant has	restaurant" has
774	6	44	24
774	9	says, " 'A' chicken	says, "Ate chicken
775	5	respond, yes	respond, "yes
775	6	home would	home "would
775	8	said yes	said "yes
775	9	home than	home" than
775	13	cases for disease more	cases get disease more frequently
		frequently from exposure to	from exposure than do
776	7	awfully	awful
779	4	attachment 29	attachment 1
782	22	Schmidt	Schmid
783	3	Schmidt, et al in	Schmid, et al Study in
787	1	ill less	ill persons were less
787	7	set of controls."	set of controls"
787	10	I said, more	I said, " more
787	11	undercooked.	undercooked."
788	18	Schmitz study in Debuque	Schmid study in Dubuque
789	4	Debuque	Dubuque
790	10	here. You're	here. You
790	16	as the question.	ask the question.
790	19	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
791	5	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
791	17	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
791	20	chicken," other than nor	chicken other than in restaurants
		,	nor
791	21	kitchen practices. We	kitchen hygiene practices." We
792	18	Schmitz	Schmid

792	20	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
794	3	epidemial	endemic
794	22	contamination	contaminated
797	4	CVC	CDC
799	20	separating out. This is	separating out this is
800	8	At if	And if
802	8	slip of	flip of
802	18	indication	etiologic
803	9	CVC	CDC
803	21	CVC	CDC
804	13	Floraquinolone	fluoroquinolone
805	18	Predence	Friedman
805	19	Predence	Friedman
805	20	CVC	CDC
806	8-9	Drank untreated water from a	"Drank untreated water from a
		lake, river, or stream.	lake, river, or stream."
806	19	Floraquinolone	fluoroquinolone
808	4	solution	sewage
809	11	Norm's	NARM's
810	14	proposition trivial	population attributable
812	2	know	known
812	6	resistant	resistance
812	18	talked maybe	talked about how maybe
817	7	come of	come out of
819	19	resistant of chicken	resistant from chicken
821	13	Ciprofloxacin	ciprofloxacin
822	2	it says number of	
822	3	that indicated of	it says "number of
822	4		with indicated pathogen" of
822	9	Ciprofloxacin 27; and it says	ciprofloxacin 37"; and it says
822	21	had one of the patients	had among patients
		"Of the	"Among
822	22	patients affected with	patients who had only
823	1	campylobacter	campylobacter
823	4	isolate"	isolated"
824	7	Ciprofloxacin	ciprofloxacin
824	8	see. One of these patients, the	see. "One of these patients"the
824	9	for 7 days, having on	"for 7 days", having "on
824	10	resistant. The same isolate	resistant" The "same isolate
824	10	2 days after Ciprofloxacin	10 days after ciprofloxacin therapy
824	11	therapy was initiated. And	was initiated. A
024	11	Ciprofloxacin-susceptible	ciprofloxacin-susceptiblespecies
824	12	species was isolated	was isolated
824	13	at admission. That	at admission; that
		four days.	four days"
825	10	Aithromycin	azithromycin

825	11	Ciprofloxacin	ciprofloxacin	
825	20	"Recovery	"Recovered	
826	1	Azithromycin	azithromycin	
826	2	Azithromycin	azithromycin	
826	3	Ciprofloxacin	ciprofloxacin	
830	18	Exhibit 9433.	Exhibit G-953.	
830	21	Table 1.2?	Table I.2?	
831	4	I think it's 1.2,	I think it's I.2,	
832	20	MR. SPILLER:	MR. NICHOLAS:	

WITNESS: Louis Cox, Jr. DATE TAKEN: May 6, 2003

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
726	4	Louie Cox, Jr.	Louis Cox, Jr.
834	22	Louie Anthony Cox, Jr.	Louis Anthony Cox, Jr.
841	10	her	him
849	22	checking consumption	chicken consumption
850	14-15	what are the causes of the associations.	what are the causes of the associations?
853	10	core six.	course six.
854	9	none exist.	none exists.
856	18	I rush to say	I blush to say
866	3	might tackle the approach	might tackle the problem
867	9	thought keys	thought piece
869	3-5	yet the probability that exactly one person will become ill may be less than the probably that two or more will become ill, right?	"yet the probability that exactly one person will become ill may be less than the probably that two or more will become ill, right?"
869	14-15	I did say this seems to me to be a very practical, sound approach. I have no remaining concern.	I did say, "This seems to me to be a very practical, sound approach. I have no remaining concerns."
870	3-4	They can be spacial clusters.	There can be spacial clusters.
870	5	Let me just say, not necessarily.	Let me just say: not necessarily.
870 -	22 -	if several people in the same	if several people in the same
871	1	family get sick, it's an outbreak.	family get sick, is it an outbreak?
875 -	20 -	It's the page on which the first	It's the page on which the first
876	5	complete sentence is, I mean like 10, it the study, the model it has to make a few baroque assumptions, K being	complete sentence is, I mean like 10, "It the study, the model it has to make a few baroque assumptions, K being

		the big one, to get across big data gaps, but it is very explicit about that. So all in all, I think that is a job well done. I want to	the big one, to get across big data gaps, but it is very explicit about that. So all in all, I think that is a job well done. I want
		invite you to critically examine a few assumptions if you share	to invite you to critically examine a few assumptions to
		that conclusion.	see if you share that conclusion."
877	20-21	the model says risk is equal to big K exposure	the model says risk is equal to big K times exposure
878	18-19	where you try to say is this model correct and useful.	where you try to say, "Is this model correct and useful?"
878	20-21	saying do its consequences follow from its premises,	Saying, "Do its consequences follow from its premises?",
878	22	empirically valid.	empirically valid?
878 -	22-	So these comments are directed	So these comments are directed
879	3	at a logical matter, if you would	at a logical matter. If you
		make the big K model work, a	could make the big K model
		lot of little factors, that would be	work, a lot of little factors, that
		a terrific thing to do.	would be a terrific thing to do.
879	7	On that, a somewhat	Oh, that's a somewhat
	·	imponderable question.	imponderable question.
880	19	Virginia Misen	Virginiamycin
883	20-21	And that refers to the number of	And that refers to a number of
		contracts.	contracts.
888	9-12	I've I don't know. It's not in	I've I don't know. It's not, in
		deadline, I can tell you that. I	my mind, I can tell you that. I
		don't think it was. And again, I	don't think it was. And again,
	:	tend to have some area of	it's outside my area of
		expertise. I think Bayer helped	expertise. I think Bayer helped
		to Bayer, with some of the	out Bayer, with some of the
		production costs.	production costs.
890	14	progression models	regression models
892	1-3	This is a reference for the	This is a reference for the
		rather-than-chicken assumption,	"rather-than-chicken
		per se, portion, not for the	consumption, per se" portion,
		restaurant dining portion.	not for the "restaurant dining"
			portion.
893	17	And thirdly, the relation that	And thirdly, if the relation that
		you're referring to is	you're referring to is
894	10-12	showing up as being	showing up as being
		significant don't be impressed	significant. Don't be impressed
		by big odds ratio because of the	by big odds ratio because of the
		logarithm scale that goes as low	logarithmic scale that goes as
		as zero but as high as 70.	low as zero but as high as 70.
895	1	I love that data step.	I love that data set.

895	9	Dr. Angelo's	Dr. Angulo's
895	11	Dr. Angelo's	Dr. Angulo's
898	14-15	This finding supports not the	This finding supports not the
		restaurant dining, but the not	"restaurant dining", but the
		chicken per se point.	"not chicken per se" point.
898	17-18	My point is, why.	My point is, Why?
899	13-14	indicates that chicken at home	indicates that chicken at
		I admit we haven't gotten	home I admit, we haven't
		down to business yet,	gotten down to business yet
903	14-19	The Eberhart-Phillips	The Eberhart-Phillips
<i>,</i> 00		conclusion that you just	conclusion that you just
		mentioned uses common causes.	mentioned uses "common
		Campylobacteriosis is a	causes". "Campylobacteriosis
		common disease with a number	is a common disease with a
		of common causes, the most	number of common causes, the
		important being, at least for	most important being, [at least
		campylobacteriosis in New	for campylobacteriosis in New
		Zealand, the most important	Zealand], the most important
		being the consumption of	being the consumption of
		undercooked chicken.	undercooked chicken."
903 -	22 -	She is drawing a conclusion	She is not drawing a conclusion
904	1	about causes.	about causes.
904	15-16	I think there is probably a host	I think there is probably a host-
		of these interactions.	disease interaction.
905	7-10	Let's see. There was no	Let's see. "There was no
		statistically significant risk	statistically significant risk
		associated with consumption of	associated with consumption of
		chicken other than in	chicken other than in
		restaurants, nor with reported	restaurants, nor with reported
		domestic kitchen hygiene factor.	domestic kitchen hygiene
			factor."
906	13	logistic progression	logistic regression
907	14-17	Absolutely not. If you'll look at	Absolutely not. If you'll look
		table 1 of Effler, you'll see on	at table 1 of Effler you'll see
		that on that page 3 of this	that on page 3 of this exhibit
		exhibit you just handed me,	you just handed me from a
		from a restaurant there's an	restaurant there's an association
		association in this model.	in this model.
908	15	math odds ratio	matched odds ratio
910	11-14	I state that he used a particular	I state that he used a particular
		model conditional logistic	modelconditional logistic
		progression without reporting	regression without reporting
		the standard model diagnostics	the standard model diagnostics
		and tests that would roughly	and tests that would roughly
010	1.6	correspond to what I just said.	correspond to what I just said.
910	16	how variable testing was done.	how variable selection was

			done.
912	19	No, it's seem to support.	No, it's "seem to support".

WITNESS: Louis Cox, Jr. DATE TAKEN: May 7, 2003

Page	Line	As Transcribed	Change To
925	3	Louie Cox, Jr.	Louis Cox, Jr.
925	6	LOUIE COX, JR.	LOUIS COX, JR.
930	9	Michael Bond	Michael Vaughn
931	1	Dr. DeGrouth.	Dr. DeGroot.
931	19	Dr. DeGrouth	Dr. DeGroot
932	14	Dr. DeGrouth	Dr. DeGroot
937	5, 10	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
941	20	Louie Cox, Jr.	Louis Cox, Jr.
946	1	reduction stage.	production stage.
951	16	Of course, minor effect	Of course: "minor effect
		demonstrates.	demonstrate(s)".
955	4	I continued through, for example	I continued through, "For
		oh, here's where the log 10 comes	example". Oh, here's where the
		in. For example, a reduction of	log 10 comes in: "For example, a
		three log 10 colony forming units	reduction of three log 10 colony
		per chicken.	forming units per chicken"
956	11	What I show is not a quote but	What I show is not a quote, but
		which is pertinent and reflects the	which is pertinent and reflects the
		point there is that the effect of such	point there is that the effect of
		a decrease in the number it's a	such a decrease in the number (it's
		pretty large decrease in the number	a pretty large decrease in the
		of campylobacter would not have	number of campylobacters) would
		been detected by the what he	not have been detected by the
		refers to as "qualitative methods,"	what he refers to as "qualitative
		meaning the prevalence metric.	methods," meaning the prevalence
	- 		metric.
962	4	represents using	represents, using
966	11	several things on here	several things going on here
967	6	In all of the cases, if I'm not	In all of the cases, if I'm not
		referring to figures, specialized to	referring to figures (specialized to
		the context such as 7(a) and 7(b)	the context, such as 7(a) and 7(b),
		and something that I pull out, or if	and something that I pull out); or
		a reference, for example, a number	if a reference for example, a
		is given, reference 17, that's not	number is given, reference 17,
		pertinent to the content, I would	that's not pertinent to the content -
		not feel obliged to repeat those	- I would not feel obliged to
		typographical marks in the quoted	repeat those typographical marks
		section for example, in a journal	in the quoted section, for
		article.	example, in a journal article.

968	8	I think that correcting the punctuation and putting in the S I think that's fair. The how to deal with the sentence break around the deleted figure reference, in light of our long discussion, I question in my own mind whether it would have been useful to have quoted the entire thing either though that would be duplicating material already in there.	I think that correcting the punctuation and putting in the S, I think that's fair. The how to deal with the sentence break around the deleted figure reference In light of our long discussion, I question in my own mind whether it would have been useful to have quoted the entire thing, either, though that would be duplicating material already in there.
969	11	looks to me that this	looks to me like this
970	11	as a form for	as a farm-to-fork
971	1	and that Rosenquist demonstrates is not linear is	and that Rosenquist demonstrates is not linear is
971	4	microbial lode	microbial load
971	10	Prevalence says not how many microbes is this chicken carrying; prevalence says what fraction of flocks in this case have at least some campylobacter present.	Prevalence says not, "How many microbes is this chicken carrying?" Prevalence says, "What fraction of flocks in this case have at least some campylobacter present?"
972	16	microbial load has held constant	microbial load is held constant
972	18	microbial load, such as all the situations I'm looking at where Enrofloxacin use is contemplated.	microbial load such as all the situations I'm looking at, where Enrofloxacin use is contemplated.
973	21	So for you to say that CVM incorporates an important component is to leave out everything important which is in simulation runs where microbial load doesn't change, for example, because there's no manipulation of Enrofloxacin use.	So for you to say that "CVM incorporates an important component" is to leave out everything important which is in simulation runs where microbial load doesn't change for example, because there's no manipulation of Enrofloxacin use.
975	21	A An approximately linear relationship for these simulations. The reason I'm saying that is it's not a general relationship. It's a relationship conditioned on what we just talked about, which is holding microbial load constant.	A An approximately linear relationship for <i>these</i> simulations. The reason I'm saying that is, it's not a <i>general</i> relationship. It's a relationship conditioned on what we just talked about which is holding microbial load constant.
976	8	Actually, not necessarily, but you're falling into I think just the perhaps confusion that I was trying to clarify which is these are not	Actually, not necessarily. But you're falling into I think just the, perhaps, confusion that I was trying to clarify, which is: these

		general relationships. These are plots of perhaps 8 different simulation run outputs.	are <i>not</i> general relationships. These are plots of perhaps 8 different simulation run outputs.
		To that, you're trying to attach a general rule which is that human illness is proportional to flock prevalence. I'm telling you that general rule is an incorrect generalization because in general, microbial loads are not held constant as they are in these simulations.	To that, you're trying to attach a general rule, which is that human illness is proportional to flock prevalence. I'm telling you: that general rule is an incorrect generalization because, in general, microbial loads are <i>not</i> held constant as they are in these simulations.
980	1	I was hung up on which of the many assumptions, some explicit, some subsequently described, by CVM as being implicit but not explicitly stated you were thinking of.	I was hung up on which of the many assumptions some explicit, some subsequently described, by CVM, as being implicit but not explicitly stated you were thinking of.
981	2	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
982	16,	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
762	16, 16, 21	Rounguez	Rourigues
982	20	Almost. The demonstrably is only partially covered. I'd say for Rodriguez it's suggested.	Almost. The "demonstrably" is only partly covered. I'd say for Rodrigues, it's suggested.
983	3, 4,	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
984	13, 14, 20	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
984	14	I cite Rodriguez to support the idea travel abroad and consumption of chicken in a restaurant are associated with being a cause,	I cite Rodriguesz to support the idea that travel abroad and consumption of chicken in a restaurant are associated with being a case,
985	1	Well, again, what Rodriguez says, being careful to exactly quote his words, in the abstract on page 1, fourth line, sentence starting at the end of that line, where travel, he says two things two main things. Travel abroad and consumption of chicken in a restaurant were statistically associated with being a cause so yes, he talks about	Well, again, what Rodriguez says (being careful to exactly quote his words), in the abstract on page 1, fourth line, sentence starting at the end of that line, where travel - he says two things two main things: Travel abroad, and consumption of chicken in a restaurant, were statistically associated with being a cause. So

1 5

7-11		chicken in a restaurant.	yes, he talks about chicken in a restaurant.
985	1	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
986	1	And as I said, I cited myself and my own causal analysis for the demonstrably part	And as I said, I cited myself and my own causal analysis for the "demonstrably" part
986	6, 7, 8, 17	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
987	18	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
992	6	This article doesn't discuss or this abstract doesn't discuss whether the design is prospective, saying if you have poor kitchen hygiene are you more likely to get campylobacteriosis or whether it's retrospective, meaning if you got campylobacteriosis, it's more likely that you had poor kitchen hygiene.	This article doesn't discuss (or this abstract doesn't discuss) whether the design is <i>prospective</i> saying if you have poor kitchen hygiene, are you more likely to get campylobacteriosis? or whether it's <i>retrospective</i> , meaning: if you got campylobacteriosis, it's more likely that you had poor kitchen hygiene.
992	15	This may be showing if you ask people who are sick, hey, did you wash your hands, more of them will say no, which is the point the distinction I was aiming at before.	This may be showing, if you ask people who are sick, "Hey, did you wash your hands?", more of them will say no which is the point, the distinction, I was aiming at before.
993	10	What it could be showing is that people who are asked, after they become cases, did you wash your cutting board, are more likely to respond no.	What it could be showing is that people who are asked, after they become cases, "Did you wash your cutting board?" are more likely to respond "No".
994	15	I don't think that's correct, but and the reason is what exactly does "unattributed" mean here. you know, is it unattributed because there was no evidence that this was the source?	I don't think that's correct. But and the reason is, what exactly does "unattributed" mean here? You know, is it "unattributed" because there was no evidence that this was the source?
999	4	I didn't say which I interpreted. Which I know, as I sit here, interpret as an average, yes, per capita.	I didn't say "which I interpreted". Which I now, as I sit here, interpret as an average yes, per capita.
999	17	NOO page.	NOOH.
1000	1	You mean the risk assessment itself or the CVM assessment?	You mean the risk assessment itself or what CVM said about its risk assessment?
1000	6	represents their use of what they	represents their use, i.e., what

		meant about it.	they meant about it.
1001	13	No. I'm not looking for those	No. I'm not looking for those
		words. I am looking for these	words. I am looking for these
		words: human health impact,	words: human health impact,
		lamda, is equal to some constant,	lambda, is equal to some constant,
		k-res, times the pounds of chicken	k-res, times the pounds of chicken
		consumed with Fluoroquinolone-	consumed with Fluoroquinolone-
		resistant campylobacter. And my	resistant campylobacter. And my
		point is that this is describing risks	point is that this is describing
		to a typical on average a	risks to a typical or average or
		representative consumer.	representative consumer.
1001	20	I know that's been stated and, you	I know that's been stated. And,
		know, what's not here is what is	you know, what's <i>not</i> here is:
		the distribution of exposures for	What is the distribution of
		different people.	exposures for different people?
1003	13	Yes. For example, you could say	Yes. For example, you could say
		this is a, quote, hypothetical. It	this is a, quote, "hypothetical". It
		wouldn't have to be that somebody	wouldn't have to be that
		actually said that	somebody actually said that
1006	11	And that does not establish a	And that does not "establish" a
		relation between them, again,	"relation" between them, again
		quoting from all the written	quoting from all the written
		discussion on this, in any	discussion on this, in any
		meaningful or useful sense.	meaningful or useful sense.
1006	21	I believe that the examples are I	I believe that the examples are. I
		attempt to suggest that the	attempt to suggest that the
		aggregate I'm sorry the ratio	aggregateI'm sorry. The ratio of
		of aggregate level of	aggregate level of
		campylobacteriosis cases to the	campylobacteriosis cases to the
		aggregate level of chicken	aggregate level of chicken
		consumption has not been shown	consumption has not been shown
		to have any stronger causal	to have any stronger causal
		connection than other ratios,	connection than other ratios,
		including manifestly ridiculous	including manifestly ridiculous
		ones.	ones.
1008	4	A When I reviewed this model	A When I reviewed this
		in 1999, was I not when I	model in 1999, was I not? When
		reviewed the risk assessment I	I reviewed the risk assessment I
		certainly read what was written	certainly read what was written
		about the design.	about the design.
1010	10	As you will I'm sorry and you	"As you will" I'm sorry. "And
		will notice that the big assumption	you will notice that the big
		is that the incidence of bad	assumption is that the incidence
		outcomes more formally in	of bad outcomes [more formally,
		response that we don't want is	of response] that we don't want is
	Т	proportional to the volume of	proportional to the volume of

		outgoing chicken informally the	outgoing chicken [informally the
		exposure, or something	exposure, or something
	ļ	proportional to exposure.	proportional to exposure]. Right. It's "exposure" and
	ĺ	Right. It's exposure and	
		undesirable or bad effect, not dose response.	"undesirable (or bad) effect", not "dose" and "response".
1014	14	I spoke informally of munging together different parameters, said this was something that needed to be checked out.	I spoke informally of "munging together different parameters" and said this was something that needed to be checked out.
1015	3	First thing is to be correct.	The first thing is to be correct.
1015	10	making it open and inspectable and documenting the assumptions is all good things.	making it open and inspectable and documenting the assumptions are all good things.
1024	3	When you say your model, this is an early version.	When you say "your model", this is an early version.
1024	13	It depends if you're referring to Cox 2002, then it was the 2002 model.	It depends. If you're referring to Cox 2002, then it was the 2002 model.
1028	11	my statement that sensitivity	my statement that "Sensitivity
		analysis provides partial solution	analysis provides a partial
		to the problem of unknown	solution to the problem of unknown and variable dose
		variable dose response relations.	
1031	1	What I was not relying on as I	response relations." What I was <i>not</i> relying on, as I
1031	*	have clearly written is any	have clearly written, is any
		assumption that there can't be any	assumption that there can't be any
		risk below 500 CFUs. And as I've	risk below 500 CFUs. And, as
]	written in Exhibit B-1629 on page	I've written in Exhibit B-1629 on
		36, any dose response relation with	page 36, any dose response
]	these qualitative features that are	relation with these qualitative
		discussed tends to produce similar	features (that are discussed) tends
		expected number of CB cases from	to produce similar expected
		given population frequency	number of CP cases from a given
		distribution microbial loads.	population frequency distribution
		distribution interest for the second	of microbial loads.
1034	3,	Tunis	Teunis
	15,	_	
	22		
1035	14,	Tunis	Teunis
	22		
1037	1	Tunis	Teunis
1039	11,	Tunis	Teunis
	14		
1040	17	Tunis	Teunis
1042	13,	Tunis	Teunis

	16		
1042	18	You know, I could find myself	You know, I confined myself to
		with a range of data.	the range of the data.
1043	14,	Tunis	Teunis
	18		
1044	7	Tunis	Teunis
1044	12	My model states or my	Well, no. My model states (or my
		description and discussion of	description and discussion of
		exactly this issue in my model	exactly this issue in my model
		states that risks are low or zero.	states) that risks are low or zero.
		They don't have to be zero, they	They don't have to be zero. They
		can be low for sufficiently small	can be low for sufficiently small
		doses, e.g., less than 500 CFUs,	doses, e.g., less than 500 CFUs
		doesn't have to be 500 CFUs, and	it doesn't have to be 500 CFUs.
		illness probability increases	And illness probability increases
		rapidly as a function of dose	rapidly as a function of dose,
		reaching an approximate plateau	reaching an approximate plateau.
		this is now describing why I deal	This is now describing how I deal
		with this model in my model it	with this model in my model it
		reaches an approximate plateau of	reaches an approximate plateau of
		about .2 for CFU levels of about a	about .2 for CFU levels of about a
		thousand to 10,000 CFUs.	thousand to 10,000 CFUs.
		What I've said is by	What I've said is: by
		doing sensitivity analyses, I've	doing sensitivity analyses, I've
		found that any dose response	found that <i>any</i> dose response
		model that captures the rough	model that captures the rough
		qualitative features of the data will	qualitative features of the data
	<u> </u>	suffice.	will suffice.
1045	13	Popkin	Popken
1046	1	Tunis	Teunis
1047	11	If you look at those data, you'll see	If you look at those data, you'll
	ļ	that assuming that there's zero	see that, assuming that there's
		response to zero dose, the pattern	zero response to zero dose, the
		as far as we know is that not much	pattern as far as we know is that
		happens and I don't believe that	not much happens (and I don't
ļ		there are data for humans below	believe that there are data for
		about 500 CFUs. Well, not in this	humans below about 500 CFUs
		experiment.	well, not in this experiment)
		Basically, not much	basically, not much happens until
		happens until you get up to a few	you get up to a few hundred
		hundred CFUs, then about 20	CFUs. Then about 20 percent of
		percent of people get sick. So I	people get sick. So, I think that
		think that these data from one	these data from one feeding study
		feeding study it's hard to know	it's hard to know what to make
		what to make of them but they're consistent with the idea that there's	of them, but they're consistent
	<u> </u>	consistent with the idea that there's	with the idea that there's a higher

	<u> </u>	a higher response probability when	response probability when you
		you have several hundred, several	have several hundred, several
		thousand CFUs. And we don't	thousand CFUs. And we don't
		really know what happens in the	i
		low dose range.	really know what happens in the low-dose range.
1048	12	Tunis	Teunis
	4	- 	
1051	4	and there has subsequently been	and that has subsequently been
1050	 	peer review to published.	peer reviewed and published.
1052	5	are extremely robust, the	are extremely robust to the
1052	101	assumptions.	assumptions.
1053	21	a bilinear probability	a binomial probability
1054	2	For the next one down, another	For the next one down, another
		bilinear distribution,	binomial distribution,
1054	4	For the surface microbial load	For the surface microbial load
		which starts to get exciting from a	(which starts to get exciting from
		cause and effect point of view, as	a cause-and-effect point of view),
		specified, a triangular distribution	as specified, a triangular
	1	for the lot of 10 of the values.	distribution for the log of 10 of
1055			the values.
1055	11	And there's a substantial	And there's a substantial
		framework that these piece by	framework that these piece-by-
		piece steps get into to justify that	piece steps fit into to justify that
	1	dual role and that is the framework	dual role. And that is the
		outlined in the exhibit that I just	framework outlined in the exhibit
	1	referred to, the B-1020 in my	that I just referred to, the B-1020 -
		book.	- in my book.
1056	22	In this role of the table, yes.	In this row of the table, yes.
1060	4	This is a matter of what the	This is a matter of the <i>operational</i>
	1	operational definition of the	definition of what the numbers
		numbers mean. My operational, I	mean. By "operational" I mean,
	1	mean what measurement	what measurement procedures are
		procedures are we using.	we using?
1063	10	The point there is that mean	The point there is that the mean
		variance for each step in a process	and variance for each step in a
		where a number of factors are	process where a number of factors
		being multiplied is sufficient when	are being multiplied is sufficient
		there are a large number of steps,	(when there are a large number of
		as there are here, fully characterize	steps, as there are here) to fully
		the distribution, the meaning of the	characterize the distribution, the
		variance for the overall process.	mean and variance for the overall
			process.
1063	22	I believe that reads like a	I believe that reads like a
		geometric medium	geometric median
1066	10	For example, this would be	For example, this would be
		incorrect if the population had a	incorrect if the population had a

1068	4	The sample limit theorem that I	The specific central limit theorem
1000	i '	referred to deals with the	that I referred to deals with the
		composition of multiple	composition of multiple
		multiplicative steps.	multiplicative steps.
1069	3	It's only partially derived but	It's only partially derived. But
1007		there's a much simpler argument to	there's a much simpler argument
		getting there that's much more data	for getting there that's much more
		driven.	
1070	21		data driven.
1070	21	No, I didn't rely on it because you	No, I didn't rely on it, because you
		might be able to remove one or	might be able to remove one or
		two points and change the answer	two points and change the answer,
		in something that only has 7 data	in something that only has 7 data
		points. What I relied on was the	points. What I relied on was the
		underlying data, which is a lot	underlying data, which is a lot
		richer but this is the simplest way	richer. But this is the simplest
		of showing the results.	way of showing the results.
1071	5	You picked the regression	Who picked the regression
	_	equation for this?	equation for this?
1071	6	The statistics package that I was	The statistics package that I was
		using in the upper not clearly	using (in the upper, not clearly
		legible margin of the picture.	legible, margin of the picture.)
1072	7	What I'm saying is if you take the	What I'm saying is: If you take the
		simplest possible look at the data,	simplest possible look at the data,
		you'll see it doesn't look anything	you'll see it doesn't look anything
		like straight line sloping upward to	like a straight line sloping upward
		the right	to the right.
1073	10	I don't think I used the jargon	I don't think I used the jargon
		exploratory data analysis. I think I	"exploratory data analysis". I
		have indicated in multiple places	think I have indicated in multiple
	1	that the simplest way of looking at	places that with the simplest way
		the data that the hypothesis, that	of looking at the data, that the
		it's a cluster around a straight line	hypothesis (that it's a cluster
		leaning from the lower left corner	around a straight line leaning
		upwards has no relation to the real	from the lower left corner
		data even when you look at it in	upwards) has no relation to the
		the simplest possible way.	real data, even when you look at it
		The samples position way.	in the simplest possible way.
1074	11	Well, this testimony was written	Well, this testimony was written
		with hyperlink in it and they were	with hyperlinks in it, and they
		very close based on hyperlink but	were very close based on
		I'm not sure how close they are in	hyperlinks. But I'm not sure how
		terms of pages.	close they are in terms of pages.
1076	11	aggression	regression
1079	6	little slow to go along with either.	little loathe to go along with
		ment stow to go along with cities.	"either".
1079	14	one forces use	one forces it use
1017		one forces use	one forces it use

1080	6	is you should	is, you should
1082	14-	mark for exhibit	mark for an exhibit
	15		
1085	11	FDA.	USDA.
1089	3	the human health risk, is	that human health risk is
1090	10	it in a	it as a
1092	15	predictable	predicting
1093	11	totally private?	totally in private?
1093	13	about we should	about how we should
1095	12	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
1095	15	raw data and	raw data, and
1095	16	that data as	that data, as
1098	2	being not clear.	not being clear.
1098	14	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
1103	10	controlled	control
1105	12	Erisycolitis	air sacculitis
1105	12	Erisycolitis	air sacculitis
1106	4	Erisycolitis	air sacculitis
1108	3, 21	Rodriguez	Rodrigues
1108	5	are saying it doesn't	are saying: "it doesn't
1108	6	it be, why didn't things	it be? Why didn't things
1108	7	drug.	drug?"
1113	2	your	you're
1114	20	called eight chick.	called "ate" chick.
1114	21	Eight chick,	"Ate chick",
1116	17	classification, vis farm, you got	classification "vis farm", you got

DATED this the day of _	, 2003.
	Daniel J. Davidson Administrative Law Judge

A Partnership Including Professional Corporations 600 Thirteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005-3096 202-756-8000 Facsimile 202-756-8087 www.mwe.com

Chicago
London
Los Angeles
Miami
Moscow
New York
Orange County
Silicon Valley
Vilnius
Washington, D.C.

Boston

McDermott, Will & Emery

Gregory A. Krauss Attorney at Law gkrauss@mwe.com 202-756-8263

June 6, 2003	0 6 .	
<u>VIA HAND DELIVERY</u>	7 5	
Dockets Management Branch (HFA-305)	3	
Food and Drug Administration 5630 Fishers Lane (Room 1061)		
Re: Enrofloxacin for Poultry: Withdrawal of Approval of	f P	
New Animal Drug Application	:3 2	
NADA 140-828; FDA Docket: 00N-1571	2	

Dear Sir/Madam:

Enclosed for filing please find an original and two copies of Respondent Bayer Corporation's Proposed Corrections in the Transcript of Oral Testimony.

Please call with any questions.

Sincerely,

Gregory A. Krauss

Cregory A. Krauss

GAK:jeh Enclosures

ce: Nadine Steinberg, Esquire (w/enclosure)

Kent McClure, Esquire (w/enclosure)