### FDA PUBLIC MEETING

CLINICAL ACCURACY REQUIREMENTS FOR

POINT OF CARE BLOOD GLUCOSE METERS

March 16, 2010

1	DR. HARPER: Good morning everyone. My
2	name is Courtney Harper and I'm the director of the
3	Division of Chemistry and Toxicology Devices at the
4	Food and Drug Administration, and I'd like to welcome
5	you all to our public meeting on blood glucose meters.
6	We're very excited to have you all here, and we really
7	think that this is a great opportunity for us at FDA
8	to hear from stakeholders about this important topic,
9	blood glucose meters and their use in the lay-user
10	population, and also in health care facilities and
11	settings.
12	So I hope you all are looking forward to the
13	next two days as much as I am. I'm going to give a
14	few logistics, and then I'm going to introduce Dr.
15	Jeff Shuren, our Center Director, who is going to
16	officially open this meeting.
17	So a couple of housekeeping items. For
18	lunches on today and tomorrow, lunch is on your own.
19	The hotel actually offers a buffet and other menu
20	items, but we've also provided in your packet some
21	information about some of the local lunch areas that
22	

1 driving distance.

2	We will be strictly adhering to the start
3	times of the sessions, so please be prompt in
4	returning to your seats. I believe there's a bell
5	that may significant the start of each session. And
6	we ask that you turn off all cell phones to be
7	courteous to those around you.
8	So before I review the format for today, I
9	am going to remind you that transcripts of this
10	meeting can actually be obtained approximately ten
11	days after the meeting, and the instructions for
12	obtaining those transcripts are actually located in
13	the FR notice, which can be linked through this public
14	meetings website. So you can go on line and find out
15	how to get transcripts of the meeting if you're
16	interested. We ask that you actually contact speakers
17	individually if you would like copies of their
18	presentations, to ask them if they're willing to share
19	them.
20	So the format of this meeting, we actually
21	have three sessions; two sessions are today. The
22	first session is on the clinical accuracy requirements

1	for blood glucose meters, and the second session is on
2	glucose meter interferences and limitations. And
3	tomorrow we will be talking about tight glycemic
4	control in health care facilities, and also a couple
5	of topics on user error and liability.
6	For each of these sessions the moderators
7	will be introducing the topic. If there is time at
8	the end of each presentation, we'll take a few
9	questions. Then there will be presentations from the
10	speakers in that area, and following that there will
11	be a panel discussion by panelists. The panels will
12	consist of the speakers from that session, and in some
13	cases a few other selected experts.
14	Our moderators will lead the panel
15	discussions. The moderators may have some questions
16	for the panel that they want the panel to address, but
17	we would also really encourage audience participation
18	in that portion of the program. We would really like
19	people to come up to the microphones that are set up
20	in the aisles, and address some questions to the panel
21	that you would like discussed. Also, if you have any
22	comments or points of view, we would be very happy to

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010 1 hear from you on those.

2	The microphones are set up in the aisles, as
3	I said. We ask a couple of things, though; first,
4	that you identify yourself prior to asking a question
5	or giving a brief comment, and second, that you limit
6	your comments to a minute or less so that they can be
7	brief. So questions to the panel or brief comments or
8	a point of view are quite welcome.
9	So now it's my great pleasure to introduce
10	Dr. Shuren. Dr. Shuren became the Director of The
11	Center for Devices and Radiological Health in January
12	of 2010. Before that he was our acting Center Director
13	since September. Our Center is responsible for
14	assuring the safety, effectiveness and quality of
15	medical devices, assuring the safety and quality of
16	radiation-emitting products, such as cell phones and
17	microwaves, and for fostering device innovation, which
18	is why we're here today.
19	Dr. Shuren received his Bachelor of Science
20	and Medical Doctorate Degrees from Northwestern
21	University under its Honors Program in Medical
22	Education. He completed his Medical Internship at

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	Beth Israel Hospital in Boston, his Neurology
2	Residency at Tufts New England Medical Center, and a
3	Fellowship in Behavioral Neurology and Neuropsychology
4	at the University of Florida. He received his J. D.
5	from the University of Michigan. He has
6	held various policy positions and planning positions
7	within the FDA from 1998 to 2009, including Acting
8	Deputy Commissioner for Policy, Planning and Budget,
9	Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning,
10	Special Counselor to the Principal Deputy
11	Commissioner, Assistant Commissioner for Policy and
12	Medical Officer in the Office of Policy.
13	Dr. Shuren has served in the leadership role
14	at FDA, or on behalf of the Agency, on numerous
15	initiatives, just to name a few, including the
16	reauthorization of The Medical Device User Fee Act,
17	the creation of the Sentinel Initiative and the
18	development of FDA's Pandemic Influenza Preparedness
19	Strategic Plan. So we're in good hands, and I would
20	really like you to join me in welcoming Dr. Shuren.
21	DR. SHUREN: Thank you, Courtney. Good
22	morning. Can everyone hear me in the back? Good. I

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	ask because I'm known to mumble, and this actually got
2	me in trouble the other week. So I don't know if
3	you've ever been out to our White Oak facilities, but
4	if you go, particularly the conference rooms on the
5	ground floor, they have glass windows. And just about
6	ten days ago I had this professor come in, an elderly
7	gentleman, very nice, and he started talking and I
8	started to answer his questions. He goes, well, I
9	can't hear you, I'm a little hard of hearing. So I
10	speak up. I really can't hear you. So the next thing
11	I know, I'm talking very loudly. After the meeting
12	some people came up to me and said, why were you
13	yelling at that old man? So I want to make sure I get
14	it right.
15	Well, thank you for joining us, either in
16	person or on webcast, for today's meeting on the
17	clinical accuracy of blood glucose meters. If you're
18	viewing via the web and would like to comment on
19	anything that you see or hear today, I encourage you
20	to submit written comments to the docket, which will
21	remain open until April 20.
22	Diabetes affects individuals of all ages,

1	from infants to the elderly. There are currently at
2	least 24 million Americans with either Type I or Type
3	II diabetes, and likely many more cases that have yet
4	to be diagnosed. Over the past 20 years, the number of
5	people diagnosed with diabetes has increased from 30
6	million to 250 million worldwide. And the prevalence
7	of the disease, if it continues to increase, is
8	estimated to be, in 2025, as many as 350 million
9	diabetics worldwide. The numbers are staggering.
10	Without proper management, diabetes can have
11	devastating consequences. Let me quickly run through
12	some statistics. Diabetes increases the risk of
13	cardiovascular disease by up to a factor of four. It
14	accounts for thousands of emergency room visits each
15	year, and is the leading cause of kidney failure and
16	adult onset blindness. Additionally, complications
17	for diabetes can lead to more than 80,000 amputations
18	each year.
19	The importance of blood glucose meetings in
20	the management of control of diabetes is
21	unquestionable. Thirty percent of those diagnosed with
22	diabetes require insulin, and are likely to use blood

1	glucose meters. These devices are used by patients
2	themselves for self- monitoring, and also by health
3	care providers in a variety of clinical settings such
4	as hospitals, emergency response units, nursing homes
5	and physicians' offices.
6	We're here today to discuss issues related
7	to point- of-care use of blood glucose meters. FDA
8	receives approximately 12,000 adverse event reports
9	associated with blood glucose meters each year. Many
10	reports highlight issues related to the analytical and
11	physiological limitations of these devices to the lay
12	users, whether at home or in the clinical setting,
13	influence the performance of these devices, and to the
14	way performance may vary under different conditions of
15	use. This workshop will focus on three important
16	topics related to blood glucose meters performance.
17	Session 1 will focus on the clinical need
18	for accuracy in blood glucose meters, and the reality
19	of what point-of-care meters are capable of achieving.
20	To evaluate pre-market submissions of blood glucose
21	meters, FDA currently applies the principles outlined
22	in our own guidance on glucose meters, and ISO 15197

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	Standard. Some in the clinical and patient
2	communities have questioned whether the current FDA
3	recognized accuracy standards for blood glucose meters
4	are acceptable, and have challenged FDA to require
5	tighter performance requirements. Others believe the
6	current analytical performance of glucose meters is
7	adequate, and that there is no evidence to support the
8	need for higher standards.
9	We are interested in hearing about what the
10	appropriate analytical and clinical accuracy
11	requirements for blood glucose meters should be. This
12	discussion is very timely, since we are currently
13	updating our guidance and the ISO Standard is going
14	through revision.
15	Session 2 will focus on medications and
16	other substances that interfere with the technologies
17	blood glucose meters employ. Performance of blood
18	glucose meters may be affected by administered drugs,
19	common physiological conditions such as diabetic
20	ketoacidosis and user interface issues. For example,
21	administration of therapies containing maltose, which
22	are commonly prescribed to patients in the hospital,

have resulted in falsely elevated glucose readings. We are interested in hearing about analytical interferences and physiological limitations, an issue that is not unique to blood glucose meters, but rather one that the majority of point-of-care technologies face.

7 The third and final session, to take place tomorrow, will focus on the use of blood glucose 8 meters for tight glycemic control in clinical 9 Despite the fact that these devices have 10 settings. not been approved for this use, glucose meters are 11 increasingly being used to achieve tight glycemic 12 13 control. Over the past three decades, blood glucose meters have become smaller, faster and more accurate, 14 15 and they now allow for better glycemic control than in 16 the past. However, there is no consensus that blood 17 glucose meters currently on the market are accurate 18 enough to be used in this way. We're interested in hearing about the benefits and risks of using glucose 19 20 meters to achieve and maintain tight glycemic control. 21 We've assembled an impressive and 22 distinguished list of speakers for this meeting. They

1	will provide a basic framework from which to begin our
2	discussions. The roughly 400 participants and
3	attendants at this workshop, you, form an equally
4	impressive group. You represent health care
5	providers, diabetic educators, professional
6	organizations, and perhaps most importantly, the
7	people who use these meters every day, either for
8	self- monitoring or for clinical care. I encourage
9	you to engage in the discussions today and tomorrow,
10	share your questions, as they might shed further light
11	at the issues at hand, and please also share your
12	ideas for solving the problems we will be discussing
13	today and tomorrow.
14	I'll conclude by leaving you with two
15	critical questions that we want you to keep in mind
16	and address during this workshop. First, how should
17	the FDA address and balance the clinical needs of
18	diabetics and the technological limitations that are
19	inherent to fast and relatively simple blood glucose
20	meters. Second, what steps should the FDA take to
21	improve the quality of point-of-care blood glucose
22	meters, and what are the responsibilities of industry,

1	the health care professional community and consumers,
2	to assure that point-of-care blood glucose meters are
3	safe and used safely.
4	Thank you very much for joining us today and
5	tomorrow, and I look forward to a very lively dialog.
6	DR. HARPER: Thank you, Jeff. I'd like to
7	now introduce Dr. Bill Clarke. Dr. Clarke is the
8	Robert Blizzard Professor of Pediatrics and Chief of
9	Pediatric Endocrine Division at the University of
10	Virginia School of Medicine, in Charlottesville,
11	Virginia. He is the author of over 130 Journal
12	articles, has served on several editorial boards, and
13	has been associate editor of Growth, Genetics and
14	Hormones for the past 15 years.
15	Dr. Clarke is a graduate of Duke University
16	and Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, and did
17	his pediatric and endocrine training at Washington
18	University in St. Louis, Missouri. He is board
19	certified in Pediatrics and Pediatric Oncology.
20	You all are familiar with Dr. Clarke's error
21	grid, which has been useful in the evaluation of the
22	performance of glucose meters. His research

1	interests involve understanding glucose counter-
2	regulation and devising methods for improving glucose
3	control in children with Type I diabetes, including
4	recent contributions regarding the accuracy of
5	continuous glucose sensors and the artificial
6	pancreas. Dr. Clarke has been honored by the American
7	Diabetes Association for his work and outstanding
8	contributions to diabetes in youth, and has been
9	listed in Best Doctors in America. Welcome, Dr.
10	Clarke.
11	DR. CLARKE: Thank you. I'm always a little
12	bit technologically impaired. Well, I was given ten
13	minutes to be the moderator, so I am going to take my
14	ten minutes but no longer.
15	I do have some questions and some comments
16	that I think are important for us to think about this
17	morning as we talk about clinical accuracy
18	requirements for blood glucose meters, the first of
19	which is what we mean by accuracy standards for
20	glucose monitors. This is the current FDA
21	requirements for blood glucose monitors, for self-
22	blood glucose monitor accuracy, and I think that we're

1	going to be spending a lot of time talking about ISO
2	criteria, and maybe even some time talking about the
3	error grid analysis and strictly clinical accuracy of
4	the systems a little bit later.
5	Now, from my standpoint, clinical accuracy
6	means that the information that is presented to one
7	can result in a clinically accurate treatment
8	decision. And those decisions may be different in
9	different situations, and I think we're going to talk
10	about that over the course of the next couple of days.
11	Specifically, self-blood glucose monitors were
12	developed for patients and for health care
13	professionals to guide clinical decisions. And there
14	are a lot of us who were around at the time when they
15	were developed, so that people didn't have to collect
16	urine samples to make clinical decisions. With these
17	systems, I think it's important to point out that we
18	conducted a 10-year diabetes control and complications
19	trial, which is the largest clinical trial ever, and
20	we got very, very significant results. So they can
21	really, really help us, even in their current form.
22	The other important factor is, I am unaware

1	of any superiority studies with one meter versus
2	another. Do people have less hypoglycemia on one
3	system than another, more DKA, do they have better
4	hemoglobin A1Cs?
5	Fourth, here, it's very important that the
6	ADA has said that they are not acceptable for
7	diagnosing diabetes, and the FDA will tell you that
8	their use is really not approved in intensive care
9	units.
10	So, where are the problems and what are the
11	problems that we're kind of looking for? I think it's
12	going to be a little bit of a challenge for us to look
13	at this, but here are some reasons I think of for
14	concerns regarding accuracy: Hypoglycemia, it's still
15	the barrier to normal blood sugar levels. Glycemic
16	variability causes oxidative stress. Failure to
17	achieve hemoglobin A1C targets. Cognitive dysfunction,
18	which is now reported in people with frequent low
19	blood glucose and frequent high blood glucose.
20	Depression, which is rampant in the diabetic
21	population. And new uses, such as in the intensive
22	care unit. Krouwer and Cembrowski, and I saw Dr.

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	Cembrowski here just a few minutes ago. I didn't
2	speak to him, but they talk about total error, and
3	this is part of the presentation you're going to hear
4	later. But if you look at total error, or total
5	accuracy, which is the way I changed it, notice that
6	analytical, clinical and statistical really only form
7	a small portion of the accuracy, and I think that's
8	because there are limitations. And those limitations
9	may be particularly in the area of interpretation and
10	response.
11	A paper in diabetes care last month, with an
12	internet survey of people with Type I diabetes,
13	demonstrated that over 50 percent of people omitted
14	insulin, and over 30 percent intentionally omitted
15	insulin. Peter Chase at the Barbara Davis Center has
16	shown that if you omit one injection a week, it's
17	approximately a .5 increase in the hemoglobin A1C
18	level.
19	So what are we trying to really achieve
20	here? Dr. Breton's going to tell us about some
21	simulation studies later, and insulin delivery. If
22	you're talking about giving a dose of five units or

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	less, well, we know that the accuracy of that is at
2	least plus or minus one unit, that's 20 percent. For
3	children that's a big deal, because that may be what
4	their insulin dose is prior to a meal. And then there
5	are all kinds of health care professional factors that
6	I'm not going even begin to talk about.
7	I like to always show the error grid. I
8	think most of you are familiar with it, but I want to
9	also show you how it can be modified when one changes
10	the target range. So here you see the target range is
11	70 to 180. Here is the target range of 80 to 110,
12	which is what's commonly being talked about for
13	intensive care unit purposes. And notice that what
14	happens is, that when you scrunch that target range,
15	you increase the errors by a significant amount.
16	Pardon my drawings, but the computer program
17	for doing error grid was down, so I can guarantee you
18	that this is accurate. I'm not a good colorer and
19	actually, my junior faculty associate pleaded with me
20	to be allowed to make these on his computer, and I
21	told him, no, he needed to go do his research.
22	Anyway, the original error grid is on the

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	left. Here on the right is what happens to the error
2	grid when you say, well, we're only going to have plus
3	or minus 5 percent be considered accurate. So you
4	really, really squeeze down that accurate range and
5	increase again your other errors, and perhaps your
6	benign errors as well. If you do both, squeeze down
7	the zone A or the accuracy to plus or minus 5 percent,
8	and move the target to 80 to 120, what you see is that
9	there's a very narrow window in which you can be
10	clinically accurate, and lots of overtreatment. Either
11	too much insulin or not, decisions that could be made,
12	at least based on what we have right now.
12 13	at least based on what we have right now. Finally, I think we need to talk about how
13	Finally, I think we need to talk about how
13 14	Finally, I think we need to talk about how we will evaluate a change in meter accuracy. Will
13 14 15	Finally, I think we need to talk about how we will evaluate a change in meter accuracy. Will superiority be our goal, or will equivalency I
13 14 15 16	Finally, I think we need to talk about how we will evaluate a change in meter accuracy. Will superiority be our goal, or will equivalency I apologize for the spelling be tolerated, and poor
13 14 15 16 17	Finally, I think we need to talk about how we will evaluate a change in meter accuracy. Will superiority be our goal, or will equivalency I apologize for the spelling be tolerated, and poor spelling can be certainly tolerated. At the current
13 14 15 16 17 18	Finally, I think we need to talk about how we will evaluate a change in meter accuracy. Will superiority be our goal, or will equivalency I apologize for the spelling be tolerated, and poor spelling can be certainly tolerated. At the current moment, I think there's only one decision that can be
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Finally, I think we need to talk about how we will evaluate a change in meter accuracy. Will superiority be our goal, or will equivalency I apologize for the spelling be tolerated, and poor spelling can be certainly tolerated. At the current moment, I think there's only one decision that can be made using a blood glucose monitor, and that is, my

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	to be talking about continuous systems and trends and
2	rates of fall and direction of change, in order to
3	make an intelligent clinical decision.
4	Well that's my last slide. I hope that I've
5	given you some things to think about over the next day
6	or so, and we will move on to our first speaker, who
7	is Patricia Bernhardt. Ms. Bernhardt is a scientific
8	reviewer here at FDA, and she is involved in pre-
9	market clearance and approval, and has been since
10	1997. And so she is going to present for us the FDA
11	perspective on evaluation of point-of-care blood
12	glucose meters. And would somebody like to clear
13	that, and we'll escape this, maybe, and go to your
14	talk.
15	MS. BERNHARDT: Thank you, Dr. Clarke, and
16	good morning, everyone. Blood glucose monitoring
17	systems are used by diabetics in the United States
18	every day. They have been around for more than three
19	decades, and during that time they have become
20	smaller, faster, easier to use and more accurate. They
21	are used not only by diabetic patients, but also by
22	health care providers in a variety of settings such as

1 hospitals, nursing homes, emergency response units and in physicians' offices. 2 3 Before I talk about FDAs evaluation of blood glucose monitoring systems, I'm going to provide a 4 brief overview of the medical device regulations. 5 Congress gave FDA the authority to regulate medical 6 devices under the 1976 Medical Device Amendments to 7 the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. So, how are 8 medical devices regulated? 9 10 They're regulated by intended use, they're risk-based by intended use in to three 11 classifications: Class 1, which is low risk; Class 2, 12 which are moderate risk; and Class 3, which are high 13 14 risk. 15 Now, how do blood glucose monitoring systems 16 fit into this picture? Blood glucose monitoring 17 systems are in a category of medical devices called in 18 vitro diagnostic devices, or IVDs. By definition, an 19 IVD is a reagent instrument or system intended for use 20 in the diagnosis of a disease or other conditions, 21 including a determination of the state of health, in 22 order to cure, mitigate, treat or prevent disease, or

its sequellae in man. They are for use in the
collection, preparation and examination of specimens
from the human body. IVDs are used in clinical
laboratories, point-of-care sites such as operating
rooms, emergency room, nursing units, nursing homes,
and by patients at home.
FDA regulates IVDs by their intended use and
the risk of an incorrect result. For example, a high-
risk IVD could be an HIV test, where the risk of a
false negative result could expose others to the
disease. All IVDs must establish adequate analytical
and clinical performance, and IVDs have their own
unique labeling regulations, which require that
certain information such as intended use, limitations
and performance are in the product labeling.
So blood glucose monitoring systems as IVDs
are Class 2 devices that have a moderate risk. They
require FDA clearance. They must be substantially
equivalent to a predicate device, which means that
they must be at least as good as, but do not have to
be better than, a device that is already on the market
with a similar intended use. FDA evaluates the

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	intended use performance and labeling of glucose
2	meters. So a typical intended use for glucose meter
3	is that they are for the quantitative measurement of
4	glucose and whole blood by lay users at home, or by
5	health care professionals in clinical settings, to
6	assist in the ongoing evaluation and management of
7	individuals with diabetes. They are for monitoring,
8	not for diagnosing or screening. And currently there
9	is no distinction between the performance requirements
10	for over-the-counter and professional use glucose
11	meters. So when a glucose meter is cleared for over-
12	the-counter use, it can also be used in professional
13	settings.
14	The components of a blood glucose monitoring
15	system typically include a meter, test strips, quality
16	control solutions and sometimes lancing devices,
17	lancets and alcohol wipes. Although sometimes more
18	than one meter from a single manufacturer can use the
19	same test strip, FDA considers each meter and test
20	strip, when used together, to be a separate system,
21	and each system requires its own performance and is
22	evaluated separately.

1	There are different samples types that can
2	be used with glucose meters, and each sample type
3	requires FDA review and clearance. All meters
4	typically use capillary whole blood from finger
5	sticks, but in addition, some use arterial, venous or
6	neonatal blood. Also capillary blood from sites other
7	than the finger, such as the forearm, upper arm, palm,
8	thigh or calf, is sometimes used. This is known as
9	alternative site testing, or AST.
10	Glucose measurements from alternative sites
11	can differ significantly from measurements from the
12	finger at certain times, and require specific
13	instructions for use that define the appropriate times
14	when alternative site testing can and cannot be used.
15	There are a variety of guidances, guidelines and
16	standards that FDA currently uses in the evaluation of
17	blood glucose monitoring systems. This list shows
18	some of these documents. The documents provide
19	recommendations for the types of information and data
20	to be evaluated for glucose monitors, and are used by
21	industry to prepare FDA submissions, and by FDA when
22	reviewing the submissions.

1	To evaluate the performance of glucose
2	meters, FDA looks at factors. To evaluate the
3	precision of a blood glucose monitor, we look at
4	repeatability and intermediate precision. We evaluate
5	glucose concentration spread across the measuring
6	range, and determine the variation and repeated
7	results over time. One way to evaluate accuracy is
8	with method comparison. Method comparison studies are
9	conducted to demonstrate how well results compare to a
10	reference method. A reverence method, such as the
11	YSI, is defined as one that is well validated for
12	precision and trueness, and is traceable to a
13	recognized glucose standard, such as the National
14	Institute of Standards and Technology standard
15	reference material.
16	Method comparison studies are conducted on a
17	minimum of 100 capillary samples that span the
18	measuring range of the device. Because it's hard to
19	find samples with glucose concentrations at the
20	extreme low and high ends of the measuring range, a
21	small number can be spiked or altered to achieve those
22	levels.

1	The results of the method comparison study
2	are evaluated with a variety of statistical
3	presentations to determine system accuracy. The term,
4	system accuracy, means how well the results agree with
5	truth. And total system accuracy includes elements of
6	imprecision and interferences as well. The current
7	FDA minimal acceptable system accuracy, and accuracy
8	in the hands of lay users, is that 95 percent of
9	individual glucose results shall fall within plus or
10	minus 15 milligrams of the results of the reference
11	measurement at glucose concentrations less than 75,
12	and 95 percent of individual results shall fall within
13	plus or minus 20 percent at glucose concentrations of
14	greater than or equal to 75. This criteria is the
15	current recommended ISO 15197, standard criteria for
16	system accuracy.
17	Now to see how well the device performance
18	meets the minimum acceptable criteria, the data from
19	the meter is presented in two tables that show the
20	number and percent of results that are within 15, 10
21	and 5 milligrams per deciliter of the reference
22	results for samples with concentrations less than 75,

1	and within plus or minus 20, 15, 10 and 5 percent of
2	reference results for samples with concentrations
3	greater than or equal to 75. This format is
4	recommended by ISO 15197. A minimum of 95 percent of
5	the results must meet the minimum acceptable criteria
6	for both less than 75, and greater than or equal to
7	75.
8	It's interesting to note that in a recent
9	internal evaluation of glucose meters cleared in the
10	last two years, we saw that approximately 72 percent
11	of them would meet a plus or minus 10 milligrams per
12	deciliter for concentrations less than 75, and
13	approximately 50 percent would meet plus or minus 15
14	percent at concentration greater than or equal to 75.
15	In addition to method comparison, we
16	evaluate performance in the hands of lay users. We
17	look at studies conducted with a minimum of 100
18	participants. The participants collect and measure
19	their own finger stick samples, using only the
20	instructions for use that will be provided with the
21	marketed device. A health care professional also
22	obtains samples from the participants at the same time

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	to run on the reference device. A statistical
2	comparison is made between the lay user results and
3	the reference, and the results are presented in the
4	ISO recommended tabular format that I just showed you.
5	In addition, FDA evaluates the results from
6	questionnaires given to the study participants to
7	assess the readability of the labeling, and the ease
8	of use of the device.
9	When a claim is made for alternative site
10	testing, FDA also evaluates data from studies where
11	lay users obtain and run their own samples from each
12	alternative site being claimed. The subject should be
13	in a steady state condition, which means times when
14	their blood glucose is stable, and results from each
15	site are compared to a sample obtained by a health
16	care professional at the same time, and tested on a
17	reference method. This data from each site must meet
18	the minimum acceptable accuracy criteria, and is also
19	presented in the ISO recommended tabular format.
20	Other sample types that we evaluate are
21	venous and arterial when claims are made for those
22	matrices. Data from study comparing the results from

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	each matrix to a reference are evaluated. The samples
2	are collected in the appropriate anticoagulant, and
3	they span the measuring range. For neonatal claims,
4	as mentioned on the slide that showed the guidance
5	documents that we use, there is an FDA guidance that
6	provides recommendations on the study, design and data
7	collection for neonatal studies. The critical glucose
8	range for these samples is 10 to 15 milligrams per
9	deciliter, which hematocrits between 45 to 65 percent,
10	so extra attention is paid to samples with those
11	values.
12	FDA also evaluates linearity which refers to
12 13	FDA also evaluates linearity which refers to the ability of the device to provide results directly
13	the ability of the device to provide results directly
13 14	the ability of the device to provide results directly proportional to the true concentration across the
13 14 15	the ability of the device to provide results directly proportional to the true concentration across the measuring range. In other words, how well the device
13 14 15 16	the ability of the device to provide results directly proportional to the true concentration across the measuring range. In other words, how well the device results compared to true results conformed to a
13 14 15 16 17	the ability of the device to provide results directly proportional to the true concentration across the measuring range. In other words, how well the device results compared to true results conformed to a straight line. We evaluate multiple replicates of
13 14 15 16 17 18	the ability of the device to provide results directly proportional to the true concentration across the measuring range. In other words, how well the device results compared to true results conformed to a straight line. We evaluate multiple replicates of multiple points across the entire claimed reportable
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	the ability of the device to provide results directly proportional to the true concentration across the measuring range. In other words, how well the device results compared to true results conformed to a straight line. We evaluate multiple replicates of multiple points across the entire claimed reportable range. We look at the line of regression and the

1	Now all IVDs have some interference from
2	certain compounds, and blood glucose monitors are no
3	exception. When we evaluate interference with glucose
4	meters, we identify the substances that interfere and
5	define the extent of the interference. There are
6	common endogenous and exogenous substances that can
7	interfere with glucose meters. Endogenous refers to
8	substances naturally found in the patient's blood,
9	such as cholesterol or bilirubin, and exogenous refers
10	to substances such as drugs.
11	We evaluate endogenous and exogenous
12	substances that have been known to interfere with
13	glucose methodology. The endogenous substances, such
14	as cholesterol, are evaluated at the highest levels at
14 15	as cholesterol, are evaluated at the highest levels at which they are known to occur in patients' blood. The
15	which they are known to occur in patients' blood. The
15 16	which they are known to occur in patients' blood. The exogenous substances, such as acetaminophen, are
15 16 17	which they are known to occur in patients' blood. The exogenous substances, such as acetaminophen, are evaluated at therapeutic levels and at the highest
15 16 17 18	which they are known to occur in patients' blood. The exogenous substances, such as acetaminophen, are evaluated at therapeutic levels and at the highest levels at which toxic doses may occur. Samples are
15 16 17 18 19	which they are known to occur in patients' blood. The exogenous substances, such as acetaminophen, are evaluated at therapeutic levels and at the highest levels at which toxic doses may occur. Samples are evaluated at clinically relative decision points, and

31

1	For hematocrit, we evaluate samples with
2	glucose concentrations that span the measuring range
3	at hematocrit levels that span the claimed range. We
4	compare individual results of each hematocrit and
5	glucose combination to results of a sample at the same
6	glucose concentration with a normal hematocrit, and
7	also to a reference value. The calculated bias should
8	not be greater than plus or minus 15 percent for
9	hematocrit interference.
10	Other factors that we evaluate are
11	environmental effects such as temperature, humidity
12	and altitude, and we also look at conformance to the
13	International Electrical Commission Standards for
14	medical electrical equipment. We also look at
15	electromagnetic compatibility, and we look at
16	software.
17	And lastly, FDA evaluates the labeling of
18	blood glucose meters. The term labeling refers to all
19	printed material that will be provided with the
20	marketed device. This includes user manuals, test
21	strip inserts, quality control solutions inserts,
22	quick reference guides, if applicable, and also box

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

	C. C.
1	and container labels. As mentioned earlier, IVDs have
2	their own labeling regulation, so when we evaluate
3	glucose meter labeling, we make sure it contain the
4	required elements, such as intended use, instruction
5	for use and performance, as mentioned earlier. And
6	since most glucose meters are for over-the-counter
7	use, we evaluate the readability assessments of the
8	labeling to ensure that it is written at no higher
9	than eighth grade level.
10	So in summary, I have talked about many
11	individual factors that can affect blood glucose
12	meters. However, another factor that I haven't
13	touched upon is user error. User error, intentionally
14	or unintentionally, is misuse of the device, or when a
15	user does not follow the instructions for use, or
16	disregards the limitations and warnings in the
17	labeling. This will be discussed in a separate
18	session tomorrow. But the factors that I have
19	discussed, and their effects on blood glucose
20	monitoring systems, are those that can occur when the
21	device is being used as intended, with the limitations
22	heeded and the instructions appropriately followed.

1	And while we evaluate each of these factors
2	individually, and determine the individual acceptable
3	limits where appropriate, it is important to realized
4	that the user experiences the cumulative effect of
5	these factors. Thank you for your attention, and I
6	think we have time for any questions.
7	DR. CLARKE: If you have any questions for
8	Ms. Bernhardt, she is the FDA person who is speaking
9	this morning, so please come forward and state your
10	name and ask your question. (Pause) You had your
11	chance. Okay.
12	The next speaker for this morning is Dr.
13	Mitchell Scott, who is Professor of Pathology and
14	Immunology at Washington University School of
15	Medicine, and he is going to talk to us about
16	analytical performance of blood glucose meters, and
17	give us a state-of-the-art presentation. Dr. Scott.
18	DR. SCOTT: Well, first, I'd like to thank
19	Courtney and Arlene for inviting me, and what I would
20	like to do today is, first, figure out the computer.
21	I'll try to sort of give us a historical
22	perspective on glucose meter evaluations. Now there's

1	no shortage of glucose meter evaluations in the
2	literature, and if I stood here for 20 minutes, and
3	went through 20 different glucose meter evaluation
4	studies, I'm pretty sure everyone out here would be
5	asleep by the end of it. So I'm just going to give a
6	few representative examples, and then present some
7	suggestions about, or actually go through the
8	allowable error criteria that are there now. I'll talk
9	about some data from my own institution, which is a
10	1,200 bed academic center, and then make some
11	suggestions about maybe where we should start the
12	discussion in terms of allowable error criteria.
13	So I think some of these things have already
14	been stated this morning, the meters are getting
15	smaller, there's over 30 of them listed on the ADA
16	Website for home use, there's five manufacturers for
17	hospital use. It's a growing market, and it actually
18	accounts for, according to a Frost and Sullivan
19	report, 30 percent of all laboratory revenue, in vitro
20	diagnostics laboratory revenue. So it's significant.
21	Recent improvement in meters, no wipe

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	from a hospital perspective is data storage and
2	capture. It's only been five or six years that we've
3	actually been able to capture the data from our
4	glucose meters at our institution. Prior to that they
5	were performed, they sometimes got written in the
6	nursing notes, but we had no other way of capturing
7	the data until five or six years ago. Alternate site
8	testing was mentioned. There's a time lag issue in
9	terms of alternate sites, and I'm not really going to
10	discus that because we aren't using this in the
11	hospital at this point in time.
12	Interferences, more this afternoon: the
12 13	Interferences, more this afternoon: the hematocrit effect, anemia, higher glucose. Keep that
13	hematocrit effect, anemia, higher glucose. Keep that
13 14	hematocrit effect, anemia, higher glucose. Keep that in mind when you think of these meters being used in a
13 14 15	hematocrit effect, anemia, higher glucose. Keep that in mind when you think of these meters being used in a critical care setting. Anemia is very common in
13 14 15 16	hematocrit effect, anemia, higher glucose. Keep that in mind when you think of these meters being used in a critical care setting. Anemia is very common in intensive care units. Reducing agents, the effects
13 14 15 16 17	hematocrit effect, anemia, higher glucose. Keep that in mind when you think of these meters being used in a critical care setting. Anemia is very common in intensive care units. Reducing agents, the effects vary by method; I'll show you just a few figures. But
13 14 15 16 17 18	hematocrit effect, anemia, higher glucose. Keep that in mind when you think of these meters being used in a critical care setting. Anemia is very common in intensive care units. Reducing agents, the effects vary by method; I'll show you just a few figures. But some newer meters correct for hematocrit and reducing
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	hematocrit effect, anemia, higher glucose. Keep that in mind when you think of these meters being used in a critical care setting. Anemia is very common in intensive care units. Reducing agents, the effects vary by method; I'll show you just a few figures. But some newer meters correct for hematocrit and reducing agents. And I think the theme that I'm going to try

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	So here's an example of the hematocrit
2	effect, significant differences, particularly in
3	hematocrits that you'll actually see in an intensive
4	care setting, and if it's falsely elevated, is that
5	going to cause overdosing of insulin? PO2 effect.
6	Glucose-oxidase methods are affected, glucose
7	dehydrogenase methods are not. Here's a glucose-
8	oxidase method that takes it into account, and is not
9	affected by PO2. So they're out there.
10	The maltose for the GDH methods has already
11	been mentioned, as has user-induced errors. Now in
12	this study, this was users actually performing self-
13	monitoring following the package insert. And what
14	they did in this study, it's somewhat contrived, I
15	agree, but they had a mechanical flicker, that after
16	the sample was applied to the strip, this little
17	spring would hit the strip, and this is what happened
18	to the results. So this was a sort of a reproducible
19	way to induce user error. So you can see that just
20	flicking the strip a little bit can greatly alter the
21	values.
22	Okay. My main interest is the use of meters

1	in hospital setting, so I have to mention tight
2	glycemic control. Today, most critical areas have
3	protocols to keep glucose below now 130 until NICE
4	sugar was generally below 110. This requires frequent
5	and rapid glucose values, resulting in IV insulin
6	adjustment.
7	Now what kind of an impact has TGC had on
8	the use of glucose meters in hospitals? In 2000,
9	before TGC became standard care, we used about 250,000
10	strips a year. Last year we used 550,000 strips at
11	our institution, and almost half of those are in
12	critical care settings. These meters are being used in
13	intensive care units to the tune of 250,000 times a
14	year at our institution alone.
15	So the original Van den Berghe study is
16	blood gas instruments in arterial blood, the second
17	use, the Hemo- Q, but very few of the TGC studies out
18	there even tell you what method was used to measure
19	glucose. The meta- analysis that was published in
20	JAMA, in August of 2008, looked at 27 studies. Only
21	ten of those studies, when I actually looked at the
22	original papers, tell you how the glucose was

1	measured. Two of those were the Van den Berghe
2	studies, that didn't use glucose meters, eight used
3	meters, and seventeen, you have no clue, it does not
4	say how glucose was measured. In the NICE-SUGAR paper
5	you can't tell; it says, glucose was obtained by
6	meters or blood gas analyzers, that's it. Again, I
7	just want to point this again as the interference.
8	Here's some meters are greatly affected with low
9	hematocrits, and anemia is common in intensive care
10	settings.
11	What about sample type? This is a study
12	from Mayo, with 20 patients in the CCU, and they
12 13	from Mayo, with 20 patients in the CCU, and they looked at the first five hourly samples after they
13	looked at the first five hourly samples after they
13 14	looked at the first five hourly samples after they began IV insulin. They looked at arterial, venous and
13 14 15	looked at the first five hourly samples after they began IV insulin. They looked at arterial, venous and capillary samples compared to the main lab. Now I'm
13 14 15 16	looked at the first five hourly samples after they began IV insulin. They looked at arterial, venous and capillary samples compared to the main lab. Now I'm not going to show the capillary data; it actually
13 14 15 16 17	looked at the first five hourly samples after they began IV insulin. They looked at arterial, venous and capillary samples compared to the main lab. Now I'm not going to show the capillary data; it actually matched very well to the main laboratory. But
13 14 15 16 17 18	looked at the first five hourly samples after they began IV insulin. They looked at arterial, venous and capillary samples compared to the main lab. Now I'm not going to show the capillary data; it actually matched very well to the main laboratory. But arterial samples, the difference between the main lab
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	looked at the first five hourly samples after they began IV insulin. They looked at arterial, venous and capillary samples compared to the main lab. Now I'm not going to show the capillary data; it actually matched very well to the main laboratory. But arterial samples, the difference between the main lab and arterial blood gas values ranged from a positive

1	How about venous samples? The same mean
2	bias, but tremendously more scattered, using a venous
3	sample. And again, the TGC studies that are out there
4	do not usually say what type of sample was used. And
5	I know in our critical care settings, it's all three,
6	it's finger stick, its arterial and its venous.
7	So, after the JAMA meta-analysis we started
8	thinking about this and wrote an editorial in Clin
9	Chem, asking the question of whether or not these
10	things are up to the task of use in critical care
11	settings. Pointing out the fact that they are not to
12	be used for diagnosis, so should they be used to make
13	dosing decisions with what is a very dangerous drug?
14	Okay, accuracy and reproducibility. Where
15	have we been, where are we now? We've seen these
16	already, so I'm not going to spend a whole lot of time
17	here. Main laboratory is 10 percent or 6, and these
18	are the other criteria with the ADA, of course, being
19	less than 5 percent, which all know really no meter
20	can achieve. What I really want to point out here is
21	the requirements of all of these criteria, that 95
22	percent of the values fulfill these criteria.

		40
1	What about the other 5 percent? Okay, we do	
2	600,000 a year at our institution, and let's just do a	
3	comparison study using one dear of data from my	
4	institution, okay. 600,000, that means 570,000 glucose	
5	values have to be within 20 percent. 30,000 can be	
6	anywhere. So I think we really need to think about	
7	this 5 percent of the values just sort of being	
8	unclassified.	
9	Okay, let's just review a few representative	
10	studies, saying we'll start with some older ones. This	
11	was 2,000 values performed by nurses, published in	
12	2001 but it was really data from the 90s. And if you	
13	look here, you'll see that 25, 15 percent of the	
14	values are not within 15 percent. So pretty poor	
15	performance in the 90s.	
16	This is a more recent CDC study performed by	
17	Mary Kimberly and Gary Myers here in the front row, at	
18	CDC. A single medical technologist operator looked at	
19	five meters to see ranged from 6 to 11 percent, even	
20	more important, up to 32 percent bias between meters.	
21	And their conclusion was that standardization was	
22	necessary for meters and they needed to match the main	

1	laboratory much better than they currently did.
2	This study came from the NIH, was
3	commissioned by the FDA of four common meters, and the
4	data was a little bit better, CVs in the one to nine
5	percent range; again, health care operators, not self-
6	users. The worse CVs, as expected, were at lower
7	glucose values, but still, eight or nine percent,
8	that's not too bad below 60. But again, there were
9	significant biases to the laboratory reference method,
10	so between negative 12 and positive 12 per cent bias,
11	so up to 24 percent.
12	Now let's take that study and look at the
13	various criteria. Okay. All four of these meters
14	would not have done very well with the ADA criteria,
15	92 percent of the values would have failed with meter
16	A, 42 percent with meter C. Meter B, C and D all
17	would have done quite well with the current FDA and
18	
	ISO criteria, and very well with the Clarke error
19	ISO criteria, and very well with the Clarke error grid, including meter A, which was miserable by any of
19 20	_
	grid, including meter A, which was miserable by any of

1	suggestion. Let's look at CAP data. There is where
2	we are today. See these between methods, and this is
3	all hospital meters with five manufacturers
4	represented here. With exception of a few, where the
5	end is very small, the CVs with very large ends is not
6	that bad any more. I mean, it's not main laboratory
7	CV. If you look at this same report from the main
8	laboratory it's between 1 and 2 percent, but a lot
9	of 3 percent CVs between all laboratories using the
10	same method.
11	Now for CAP data it's a little unfair, I
12	think, to compare mean values per system, because of
13	matrix effects. So I think the 78 to 124 difference
14	between meters is probably partially due to matrix
15	effects. But let's look at the low and high value
16	within a system. Here's a meter used at 4,000
17	institutions, and the lowest value was 83, the highest
18	was 116. That's within a system, so there is still
19	spread within a system. But overall, I think the CVs
20	are reasonable.
21	Okay, what about Barnes Jewish Hospital at
22	Washington University Medical Center? We've got about

1	200 meters out on the floors, over 2,000 certified
2	operators. We do 1,400 of these strips a day, and
3	this is our QC data, very similar to the CAP. I
4	think, you know, 200 meters, 4,000 QC points a month,
5	CVs in the 9 to 6 percent range. That's how we do in
6	our institution. I actually distributed a sample to 40
7	different sites, same patient sample, and the range of
8	values was 153 to 210 in a 95 percent confidence
9	interval of 139 to 195. So there is still some, with
10	the system that we're current using at Barnes,
11	considerable spread.
12	Now this data from our institution I think
12 13	Now this data from our institution I think is particularly telling. I get a report on a monthly
13	is particularly telling. I get a report on a monthly
13 14	is particularly telling. I get a report on a monthly basis of all meter values that are repeated within 15
13 14 15	is particularly telling. I get a report on a monthly basis of all meter values that are repeated within 15 minutes. The reason for this report is actually a
13 14 15 16	is particularly telling. I get a report on a monthly basis of all meter values that are repeated within 15 minutes. The reason for this report is actually a billing compliance issue. We can't bill for duplicate
13 14 15 16 17	is particularly telling. I get a report on a monthly basis of all meter values that are repeated within 15 minutes. The reason for this report is actually a billing compliance issue. We can't bill for duplicate testing. So I saw it, not from a compliance billing
13 14 15 16 17 18	is particularly telling. I get a report on a monthly basis of all meter values that are repeated within 15 minutes. The reason for this report is actually a billing compliance issue. We can't bill for duplicate testing. So I saw it, not from a compliance billing opportunity, but let's see what kind of repeat values
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	is particularly telling. I get a report on a monthly basis of all meter values that are repeated within 15 minutes. The reason for this report is actually a billing compliance issue. We can't bill for duplicate testing. So I saw it, not from a compliance billing opportunity, but let's see what kind of repeat values we're actually seeing. And this number is between .8

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1 within 15 minutes. The median repeat time is 3.5 2 minutes. 3 So these are not values being repeated because they just gave insulin or they just gave 4 5 orange juice and they want to see what happens. These are values being repeated because the operator didn't 6 believe the number. The mean absolute difference 7 between repeat values is 84, in November. That number 8 9 I've seen as high as 125. These are clearly being repeated because they didn't believe the first value. 10 What about values that are performed and never 11 repeated, because they're close enough. I have no 12 idea of that number, but I think there's a hint in 13 14 these repeat values here. 15 Okay, let's go back to some comparison 16 studies and look at some more recent ones, published 17 last year. This is a newer meter. All the CVs in 18 this evaluation using venous arterial whole blood and aqueous Qz material were less than 5 percent. 19 No 20 effects from hematocrits or reducing substances, this 21 is one of the newer meters that corrects for that.

22 Very good bias values.

1	If you put it on an error grid, that is what
2	that particular study looked like, fairly impressive.
3	This tells me that probably some of the newer meters
4	are able to pull off tighter performance criteria than
5	what's currently out there.
6	Here's another study of a new meter. Again,
7	very good precision and very small bias, you see, plus
8	or minus 10 or so versus the laboratory method.
9	Okay, so what criteria should we use? I
10	think the outcome studies to determine that are
11	probably not going to happen. It's going to involve
12	randomizing patients to a meter versus a main
13	laboratory or a blood gas analyzer, and the end's
14	going to have to be tremendously large to detect a
15	difference, I believe.
16	But, how about biologic variability? Callum
17	Fraser is a very strong proponent of using biologic
18	variability. And for glucose, total allowable error
19	should be less than 8 percent. Well, now, what's the
20	biologic variability in a critical care setting? I
21	have no idea, I don't think anybody does. But, is
22	this a place to start?

1	So, what I'd like to end with is this is a
2	discussion point and a place to start. 10 percent, or
3	10 milligrams, I think the newer meters can probably
4	do that. And then let's develop a new error grid for
5	critical care settings, and George Cembrowski and Jon
6	Krouwer are big proponents of doing this, and I think
7	you can. I don't have the crayon skills of Dr.
8	Clarke, so I didn't actually draw a new error grid. So
9	95 percent within 10 percent, or 10, would be like
10	zone A, 99 percent of the values within 15 percent, or
11	12, zone B, and then nothing exceeding 20 or 15, or
12	very few. But I think what this does it accounts for
13	all the values, and you don't have this 5 percent sort
14	of random numbers out there that can be anywhere,
15	according to the current criteria.
16	So, what about can new meters do this?
17	Well, I don't know. Here's another study in 2009.
18	This is the current ISO criteria, and I just drew in
19	here the 10 percent, maybe not. But I think it's a
20	point to start discussions and see where we end up.
21	So with that, I believe the newer meters
22	appear to be getting better, the comparison studies

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	seem to suggest better in precision, less bias, less
2	effects from interferences. I think they can clearly
3	do better than the current ISO/CLSI criteria.
4	Can they meet a 10 to 15 percent allowable
5	error? I think time will tell, and the FDA
6	presentation before me showed that half of them, at
7	least, probably can. But, in the overall analytical
8	performance criteria, you've got to always consider
9	more than just precision and bias. You've got think
10	about interferences, particularly in critical care
11	settings, sample types, user errors. These all go
12	into the evaluation of a meter and have to be
13	considered.
14	I believe the patients receiving a dangerous
15	drug should have the best analytic method available,
16	and, quite frankly, there are alternatives to meters
17	in critical care settings, blood gas analyzers, a few
18	meters that are approved for diagnosis. They probably
19	cost more, but they're out there. So with that I'll
20	be glad to take questions.
21	DR. CLARKE: Questions?
22	DR. GINSBERG: Dr. Barry Ginsberg, Wyckoff,

48

1	N.J. You sought to raise an interesting question,
2	which I'm going to raise in my talk as well, which is
3	that of outliers. And it's interesting, because when
4	you look at the clinical data from virtually every
5	meter out there, which is done on 100 or 200 or 500
6	patients, you don't see outliers. When they give
7	their ranges on Clarke or the Consensus error grid,
8	its 97, 98, 99 percent A, and 2, 3 or 4 percent B, no
9	Cs, no Ds, no Es.
10	When you look at data from the manufacturers
11	when they're not doing 100, 200 or 300, but in the
12	laboratory they're doing 5,000, 10,000, 15,000, 50,000
13	numbers, you start to see that outliers are real. I'll
14	show you some data on that. That depends upon the
15	company, but somewhere between .03 and .1 percent of
16	data is out in that range, is which is more than 100
17	or 200 milligrams away. And it's real, and it's
18	something that I think we need to start thinking
19	about.
20	DR. SCOTT: Yes, I mean that's exactly why I
21	presented the duplicate data from our own institution,
22	where almost 1 percent are being repeated, and of

49

1 those, probably right, .2, .3 percent show greater than 150, 200, I mean, they go as high as a 450 2 difference between values. 3 4 DR. ELAHI: Dariush Elahi, Baltimore. Could 5 you make a comment? When you spoke about repeatability, you were speaking of a second sample 6 7 within 15 minutes, I assume. 8 DR. SCOTT: Correct. DR. ELAHI: Could make a comment about the 9 repeatability of this exact same sample within a 10 minute of duplicate reading or triplicate reading. 11 12 What are your thoughts about that? How close should that be? 13 I took a blood sample, I don't believe it. 14 15 Maybe I made a mistake, I'm going to do it again. Now 16 I have a 40 milligrams difference. Should I take a 17 new sample? Should I run the third time? 18 DR. SCOTT: The problem is these decisions are being made by the patient caregivers. 19 20 DR. ELAHI: I'm asking your opinion. 21 DR. SCOTT: Oh, my opinion? I think if it 22 was carefully performed, they're probably going to

1	come within 5 or 6 percent of each other, which is
2	what our quality control, what the studies show as
3	current imprecision of glucose meters. What we're
4	seeing with our values that are repeated, in my
5	opinion are user errors, not an error by the device
6	itself. But something was done incorrectly by the
7	user.
8	DR. GINSBERG: I disagree with that. Again,
9	using some data, in 1993 we tested about 1,000 strips,
10	having the patients test their own meter against a
11	reference. And we found that the average error was
12	about 13 percent. And it turned out that at that time,
13	if a health care professional did it, they had an
14	average error of about 7 percent. So in the early
15	90s, strips, required a lot of attention to how the
16	user did it, and professionals were much better than
17	patients.
18	We repeated that study in 1996, and what we
19	found was that the professionals were still about 7
20	percent, a little bit better, meters and strips had
21	gotten a little bit better but not a lot, in the hands
22	of people who were very careful about how they did it.

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	The difference was at that point, that patients were
2	substantially more accurate than professionals, that
3	patient's were about a half percent better than the
4	professionals were at that, because they actually do
5	it more often. And I think, the outliers I talked
6	about were done in the laboratory by highly
7	experienced professionals. I think there are some,
8	whenever you produce large numbers of anything you're
9	going to have some outliers.
10	DR. SOLDO: Monnett Soldo. I'm from
11	California. My question is, it seems that there are
12	two issues here, one is whether or not meters can meet
13	the accuracy of the ISO or any other standard in any
14	environment, and the other is in an ICU environment.
15	And for one, with all the data that is being
16	presented, I personally am having trouble
17	distinguishing between these two. I can't tell when
18	you present data, and when any of the panelists
19	present data, whether it's for an ICU setting with
20	significant interferences, or whether it's just what
21	the manufacturer did. So, to the extent possible, if
22	we can distinguish between what data is being

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1 presented that's relevant to an ICU setting, or point-2 of-care setting, I think that would be helpful. DR. SCOTT: The only two studies, one I said 3 the Mayo study was clearly from a CCU, the evaluation 4 of the newer meter strip in 2009, that was also from a 5 critical care setting and I failed to say that. 6 The others were performed in the laboratory or by users. 7 8 MS. MANN: Hi, Elizabeth Mann. I'm from the 9 Army Burn Center. We tested five different meters, four of the currently available meters, and then the 10 11 new 4- channel meter. I personally did all the 12 glucose measurements myself. I'm a nurse, throughout 13 our ICUs within our hospital, Burn, Trauma, Surgical and Medical ICUs. 14 15 The error in normal patients who have hematocrits between 18 and 25 percent, generally, 16 17 after the ABARE study, where we definitely titrate to 18 a very low level, I think this point about was it done 19 in the ICU versus non- ICU is extremely relevant, 20 especially with the data that you presented here. 21 I would just like to say that we did develop 22 a correction factor for that hematocrit. It's a

1	
1	simple math formula and we applied it to each of those
2	meters, and we were able to achieve less than 5
3	percent error in real patients. And then we did the
4	4-channel glucometer and it was no different in our
5	labs. So I would agree with you that, yes, the
6	technology is there with the new meter, but even more
7	so, the technology is actually available in the
8	current meters if they're corrected. And when you
9	correct, you actually capture occult hypoglycemia, and
10	we found that we reduced our hypoglycemia rate within
11	our unit by just treating the proper number with
12	insulin.
13	DR. SCOTT: I believe there to be some
14	practical issues, unless you could actually get the
15	meter to do it.
16	MS. MANN: Well, that's the best thing.
17	Right now we use the computer and the nurses enter the
18	glucometer value into a computer, so it is an extra
19	step, but we felt like, for safety's sake, when these
20	glucometers all had errors more than 15 percent, some
21	over 20 percent, it was simply not safe to do tight
22	glycemic control without some sort of correction until

1	we got the 4-channel glucometer.
2	DR. SCOTT: We've got over 2,000 operators,
3	and trying to get sort of a manual step conversion
4	like that, I think it would be very difficult, really.
5	MS. MANN: As a nurse, just to follow along
6	with the user error, I do agree. When we're busy, and
7	we're doing tight glycemic control in this day and
8	age, and we're doing a measurement every hour, the
9	strips sit for a long time, there's not appropriate
10	draw out of the A-line or the central line. So I
11	agree, it really is user error rather than
12	repeatability on a device.
13	DR. CLARKE: Thank you, and we will proceed.
14	Our next speaker this morning also comes to us by way
15	of Washington University. Dr. David Sacks is
16	Associate Professor of Pathology at Harvard, and
17	Direction of the Clinical Chemistry Division at
18	Brigham and Women's Hospital. He did his medical
19	training in Cape Town, South Africa, and Residency in
20	internal medicine at Georgetown, and Clinical
20 21	internal medicine at Georgetown, and Clinical Pathology at Washington University School of Medicine.

2 Standardization Program Steering Committee. And he is 3 going to talk to us this morning about the clinical 4 perspective, and the clinical need for tighter 5 performance requirements. Dr. Sacks. 6 DR. SACKS: Thank you for the introduction, 7 and I'd also like to thank Courtney and Arlene for	
<ul> <li>4 perspective, and the clinical need for tighter</li> <li>5 performance requirements. Dr. Sacks.</li> <li>6 DR. SACKS: Thank you for the introduction,</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>5 performance requirements. Dr. Sacks.</li> <li>6 DR. SACKS: Thank you for the introduction,</li> </ul>	
6 DR. SACKS: Thank you for the introduction,	
7 and I'd also like to thank Courtney and Arlene for	
, and I d dibo tike to chank courchey and mitche for	
8 inviting me to speak here today. So if I can get this	
9 thing to work. So just an overview of my talk. I'm	
10 going to talk about, since I'm doing the clinical	
11 perspective, I'm going to give a little background on	
12 the clinical aspects, the need for near normal	
13 glycemia, then I'm going to divide the clinical use of	
14 meters into two groups, self- monitoring of blood	
15 glucose and tight glycemic control in ICUs.	
16 And so I thought, being the first clinical	
17 speaker, I should give a little bit of context. Now	
18 this has been touched on before but this is a map of	
19 the world, showing the prevalence of diabetes in the	
20 year 2000, which are the red bars, and the blue bars	
21 are the predicted prevalence in 2030. And you can	
22 see, in the United States there's a predicted increase	

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	of 70 percent. But the most dramatic increases are in
2	Asia, India and South America, where the increases are
3	up to 150 percent or more.
4	And, of course, the major complications of
5	diabetes, which is the reason why people with diabetes
6	are treated, are microvascular complications,
7	retinopathy, neuropathy, nephropathy, and then, of
8	course, the macrovascular complications. So I'd just
9	like to emphasize the Diabetes Control and
10	Complications Trial, because that was the major study
11	that looked at the role of self- monitoring in
12	diabetes, and they had 1,441 patients, all with Type I
13	diabetes. And they were randomized to either
14	intensive or conventional insulin therapy. And the
15	goals of the intensive therapy were evaluated by the
16	patients performing self-monitoring four times a day,
17	and also monthly hemoglobin A1Cs. And the patients
18	were followed for a mean of 6.5 years.
19	And the outcomes of the study were very
20	dramatic. The patients on conventional control, this
21	is the glucose, capillary glucose, during a single day
22	at different times of the day. The conventional

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	control is the top line, the intensive control is the
2	lower line, and you can see there was a marked
3	reduction in glucose values at all times of the day in
4	the intensively controlled patients.
5	And if one looks at the development of
6	complications, the conventionally controlled group are
7	the blue bars, the intensive control the red bars, all
8	the microvascular complications, retinopathy,
9	nephropathy and neuropathy, were significantly lower
10	in patients on the intensive control. Macrovascular
11	complications were not decreased at the time the study
12	ended in 1993, but subsequent follow-up has shown a 50
13	percent reduction in myocardial infarction in the
14	intensively treated group.
15	So what are the recommendations for portable
16	meter use? Well, they're used by patients at home,
17	work and school, and also in acute and chronic care
18	facilities, including ICUs and in physician offices.
19	So I am going to talk first about self-
20	monitoring of blood glucose. And like Dr. Scott, I'm
21	going to pick a few representative studies again, just
22	to illustrate points. So self-monitoring is

1 recommended for the following reasons: To determine the insulin doses at meals, and 2 the recommendation by the ADA is this should be 3 performed at least three times daily if people are on 4 multiple insulin injections. And there is evidence in 5 the literature that glycemic control is worse if this 6 is done less than three times a day. 7 8 To determine the insulin dose in pregnant women with diabetes. 9 To determine whether patients are achieving 10 11 glycemic controls. And the last one, which is really important, 12 13 is detection and avoidance of hypoglycemia, and actually there is a very large body of literature on 14 15 the fear of hypoglycemia. This is the factor that's most limiting for tight glycemic control. 16 17 So that raises the question of does meter 18 performance meet clinical needs? So let's have a look So hypoglycemia, the risk increases 19 at this. dramatically with therapy directed at near 20 21 normoglycemia. Patients in the intensively treated 22 group in the DCCT had three times the rate of severe

hypoglycemia. As I mentioned, near normoglycemia
 reduces the risk of chronic complications, so this is
 the goal.

4 Another important factor to consider is that many patients with Type I, and even with longstanding 5 Type II diabetes, have hypoglycemia unawareness, so 6 they lose the symptoms of hypoglycemia. And self-7 monitoring is the only defense when the symptoms are 8 9 lost, because the patients don't know they're hypoglycemic. And severe hypoglycemia is associated 10 with mortality, dementia and harm to self, or others, 11 12 for example, if the subject has an episode while 13 driving.

14 So there are a lot of books about 15 hypoglycemia. If one looks at the internet you can 16 find the recipe to conquering hypoglycemia. You can 17 even find hypoglycemia for dummies. But the important 18 question is, can meters reliably detect hypoglycemia, since this is one of the major uses for people with 19 20 diabetes. Say, if one uses the current ISO/CLSI 21 criteria, and you imagine that an individual has a 22 true glucose of 50, if one does the calculation the

60

1 acceptable limits, the results, are 35 to 65 2 milligrams per deciliter. So 35 would be severe 3 hypoglycemia, 65 would be, you don't have to do 4 anything. 5 And of courses, as was emphasized in the previous talk, 5 percent of values may be outside of 6 these ranges. The problem is, the patient may not know 7 which values are wrong. So if the patient ends up 8 9 with a value that's outside the limits, they may not know, particularly if there is hypoglycemia 10 unawareness. So I would argue that these results 11 12 cannot reliably detect hypoglycemia. And you may end 13 up with severe hypoglycemia, requiring help from another individual, and again, somebody may actually 14 15 have to call 911. 16 Let's look at meter use in practice. 17 Accuracy criteria are exclusively for analytical 18 performance, as has been mentioned before. I think one of the advantages of being the 19 20 third or fourth speaker is that there is limited 21 overlap with what's gone before. The last speaker, I 22 don't know if they're going to be able to say

1	anything, because probably everything they need to say
2	will have been said before. So I apologize for some
3	repetition. But it helps, you know. People doze off,
4	you know, you wake up. For those of you who stay awake
5	all the time, I'm sorry.
6	But in practice, the accuracy criteria did
7	not consider pre- or post-analytical error, and very
8	importantly, the evaluation is usually performed by
9	highly trained medical technologists under optimal
10	conditions. And the ISO specifications, I would
11	argue, do not inform the condition of how the meters
12	actually perform in the patients' hands.
13	So as it's been mentioned, current meters
14	have performance superior to prior generations, you
15	know, the technological advances by the manufacturers
16	have been remarkable, they decrease operator error.
17	But the evidence in the literature shows that
18	performance by patients is inferior to medical
19	technologists.
20	I'm just going to give one representative
21	example of this study from Norway, by Sandberg. And
22	they looked at five different meter types, and the CVs

1	for patients among these five meters ranged from 7 to
2	as high as 20 percent, and the medical technologists
3	had CVs of 2.5 to 5.9 percent. So there's a huge
4	difference in the hands of patients who were
5	performing self-monitoring anyway. These were people
6	who were doing self-monitoring.
7	And this is an example of one of those
8	meters, this is from the same study, what's shown in
9	the vertical axis is the percent deviation from the
10	laboratory method, the horizontal axis is the
11	concentration of glucose in the lab method. The left
12	panel is patients, the right is technologists, and you
13	can see a huge difference. This meter seems to have a
14	positive bias, even in the hands of the medical
15	technologists, but there's a very tight precision when
16	it's done by technologist.
17	And one of the interesting findings in the
18	study, which was published in 2002, is that patients
19	failed to meet ISO criteria. None of the five meters
20	in the patients hands met ISO criteria in this study.
21	Two of them met ISO criteria in the technologists'
22	hands, but none in the patients' hands.

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

		63
1	How accurate does a glucose measurement need	
2	to be? Well, this has been addressed a little bit	
3	before. Several criteria have been proposed for	
4	analytical goals. There is expert opinion, there's	
5	opinion of clinicians I don't know what the	
6	difference is between 1 and 2 it implies that	
7	clinicians are not experts, state-of-the- art,	
8	regulation, biological variation. But there is no	
9	consensus regarding this.	
10	But what's missing from this is what do	
11	patients think? So for most, analytes were measured	
12	in the lab, it's done in the clinical lab. But self-	
13	monitoring of glucose is different because this is	
14	actually done by patients themselves. So what do	
15	patients think? How accurate do patients think that	
16	the meters need to be?	
17	So there was a very nice study which looked	
18	at 201 patients with Type I diabetes. And these	
19	people, on average, had been doing self-monitoring for	
20	ten years, and there was a means of 11 measurements a	
21	week, which is less than the recommendation, but	
22	still, people who had been doing this for a long time.	

And each individual completed a questionnaire, there were nine questions. And the patients said that they reacted to critical differences, which is the difference between two consecutive results, of 22 to 30 percent. So that's quite a big difference with four patients reacted.

7 And this shows you, from that study, the vertical axis is the imprecision, the horizontal axis 8 is the bias, and the critical difference of 22 percent 9 is plotted here, and 30 percent is plotted there. 10 So based on the results of the study, the calculations, 11 12 the analytical CV of 6.4 to 9.7 percent is needed for 13 patient-derived criteria. However, this excludes hypoglycemia. And the patients were very afraid of 14 15 hypoglycemia. And for hypoglycemia, they wanted a CV 16 of 3.1 percent, which is incredibly low, but this is 17 what patients say they need. And based on the study, a 18 CV of less than 5 percent and a bias of less than 5 19 percent are required to meet the expectations of 75 20 percent of these patients. Again, this excludes 21 hypoglycemia. So patients expect their meters to 22 perform very well.

1	Now in 1987, the ADA recommended a total
2	error of less than 10 percent for 100 percent of
3	results, and in 1996, in response to the DCCT, the ADA
4	modified this to total analytical error of less than 5
5	percent. And as has been mentioned, the other
6	recommendations, CLSI or ISO, 95 percent of results,
7	and this has been discussed in some detail, but I'm
8	going to discuss it again. So, as was suggested by
9	Dr. Scott, I think we need an addendum to meet a
10	performance criteria, because 5 percent are excluded
11	from accuracy criteria. And these values can be
12	essentially anything. So, if you do the calculation,
13	if a patient does self-monitoring of blood glucose
14	four times a day, you'd expect one result to be
15	outside the analytical limit every five days. The
16	problem is the patient won't know which this one
17	result is, which is outside. So that's very, very
18	frequent. So I think we need to define criteria that
19	include these 5 percent of values.
20	Okay, so now I'm going to talk about tight
21	glycemic control. I like this picture, which was put
22	in a News and Views article I wrote by the editors of

1 Nature.

So does meter performance meet the clinical 2 needs in tight glycemic control? Nobody can see this 3 of course, you're not supposed to. This is from that 4 JAMA meta- analysis. So there're lots and lots and 5 lots of studies, so how does one pick a study to 6 evaluate this? And I thought I would pick the NICE-7 SUGAR because that's the study that seems to have 8 9 influenced practice the most since the original paper by Greet Van den Berghe. 10 See, if you're from South Africa you can 11 pronounce the name properly. I think it's close; 12 13 there's somebody here from Belgium that could correct 14 me. 15 But it was also the biggest study. And for those of you who don't know, it's a multinational 16 17 study designed to test the hypothesis that intensive 18 glucose control reduces mortality in 90 days, a very large study, 6,104 adults, who were admitted either to 19 20 the medical or the surgical ICU at one of 42 hospitals 21 in Australia, New Zealand or Canada. And within 24 22 hours of admission, the patients who were expected to

> (866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	require more than three days, at least three days of
2	critical care, were randomized either to intensive or
3	conventional glucose control. And they had quite
4	tight criteria. They target glucose ranges where
5	intensive control was 81 to 108, and the conventional
6	control was less than 180 milligrams per deciliter.
7	So what were the results of the study? Well,
8	if you compare the intensive and the conventional
9	treatments, there was a significantly lower mean
10	glucose in the intensively treated group, 115, versus
11	144 in the conventional group. There was a
12	statistically significant increase in mortality in the
13	intensively treated patients, 27.5 percent, versus
14	24.9 in the conventional group. And a remarkable
15	increase in severe hypoglycemia, which is defined as
16	less than or equal to 40 milligrams per deciliter, 6.8
17	percent in intensive, and 0.5 percent in the
18	conventional group.
19	Now this is hypoglycemia that was detected.
20	So as Mitch mentioned earlier, it's impossible to
21	obtain details concerning how glucose was analyzed in
22	this NICE- SUGAR study. So this has changed clinical

1 practice, but we don't even know how they measured 2 glucose. 3 What did they say? They said glucose measurements were performed on arterial blood whenever 4 possible -- I don't know what that means -- using 5 point-of-care or arterial blood gas analyzers, or 6 laboratory analyzers in routine use at each center. 7 Ι mean, this is just absolutely useless information. 8 9 There's just no way to know how glucose was measured. And this has changed clinical practice. 10 So let's look at the study in a little more 11 detail. So, one of the potential problems is that the 12 13 different glucose values produced by diverse methods and samples will lead to different insulin doses, and 14 15 potentially wide variations in true glucose 16 concentrations, right, because the results they're 17 getting may not be the true glucose concentration, 18 which is what we really need to know. So I did some analysis of this study. 19 Now 20 if you look at CAP proficiency testing dotted for 17 21 meters, the bias is up to 41 percent. So let's think 22 about that for a little bit. So if the true glucose

69

1	is 144, which is the mean of the conventionally
2	treated patients in the NICE-SUGAR study, a bias of 41
3	percent is 59 milligrams per deciliter. So if you
4	take that value, the difference in the mean glucose
5	between intensive and conventional groups in NICE-
6	SUGAR was 29 milligrams per deciliter, so the bias can
7	be twice the difference in the mean glucose between
8	these two groups. That's just bias.
9	So if you think about this, if a meter is
10	high bias, what does it mean? The results will be
11	higher than the patient's actual glucose, and the
12	patient will receive too much insulin and will develop
13	hypoglycemia, which may not be detected in these
14	patients because many of them are unconscious. And we
15	have no way of knowing whether these people are
16	hypoglycemic if you use a meter that has high bias.
17	Let's do a little more analysis of the
18	study. So let's say the patient has a true glucose of
19	95, that's right in the middle of the target goal for
20	the intensively treated patients. So the acceptable
21	range for the meter, based on current ISO/CLSI
22	criteria, is 76 to 114 milligrams per deciliter. So

1	the meter will give you this result. Anywhere is
2	acceptable between 76 and 114. This is excluding any
3	of the conditions that occur in patients in ICUs.
4	Remember, 5 percent of values could be outside this
5	range, and when you're doing hundreds of thousands of
6	these, a lot are going to be outside the range. Now
7	these values, 76 to 114, exceed the range for the
8	intensive control target of 81 to 108 milligrams per
9	deciliter. So I'm not sure that anybody in this study
10	knew what the actual glucose was.
11	So, I'm going to summarize now. Measurement
12	of blood glucose concentrations has a very important
13	role in patient management, obviously. Accurate
14	identification of hyperglycemia is absolutely
15	essentially for people with diabetes who are doing
16	self-monitoring, and certainly patients in intensive
17	care units on tight glycemic control protocols do.
18	Current performance criteria for glucose meters, I
19	would argue, are inadequate for clinical needs. And
20	based on biological variability, the recommended
21	accuracy criteria for meters would be a minimum of
22	plus or minus 15 percent, desirable would be plus or

1	minus 10 percent, and optimum would be plus or minus 5
2	percent, clearly not achievable with the current
3	generation of meters.
4	And I'd just like to end with a potential
5	new problems with meters that has come up recently,
6	that people would not have thought of before, and this
7	is somebody on an airplane that goes beep-beep-beep
8	and he says, sorry, it's just my glucose monitor.
9	Thank you very much.
10	DR. CLARKE: Go ahead, please.
11	MR. ERVIN: Ken Ervin from California. Dr.
12	Sacks, given the known differences in the way CAP
13	proficiency samples behave with respect to glucose
14	meters, do you think that's an appropriate way to
15	evaluate bias of glucose meters with old whole
16	samples?
17	DR. SACKS: Look, clearly, I mean one of the
18	problems with a CAP proficiency testing for glucose
19	meters is that it's not whole blood. I'm actually on
20	the CAP Committee, Chemistry Committee, and every few
21	years I raise the point of can we do whole blood, and
22	we have not been able to do that. So clearly, some of

1	the bias is exaggerated in that study, as you point
2	out, because of matrix effects among the different
3	meters, which was mentioned earlier by Dr. Scott.
4	DR. CLARKE: Other questions? Well, I have
5	a question. Would you suggest that our criteria for
6	testing meters and looking at their accuracy should
7	include a specific percentage of numbers in the
8	hypoglycemic range? In other words, we see lots of
9	data presented on new meters, but very few of the data
10	points are less than 70 milligrams per deciliter,
11	whereas when we're out in the real world, what we see
12	is 8, 9, 10 percent of our patients' glucose numbers
13	are actually in that range.
14	DR. SACKS: Right. Now I think that's a
15	very good point that you make, and I think that since
16	the hypoglycemic range is so critical to patient
17	decision making, I think it's very important that the
18	meters perform as accurately as possible in that
19	range, and they should be evaluated for that.
20	DR. CLARKE: Go ahead, please.
21	DR. SIMMONS: Dr. David Simmons, Tarrytown,
22	NY. Professor Sacks, we had this conversation at the

1	ISO meeting in February, and I'm still struggling a
2	little bit with how we can take a study where you led,
3	NICE-SUGAR, led by telling us we have no idea what
4	samples were used or what analytic method was used,
5	take the results of that study and then very elegant
6	analysis of what the potential modeling may have been,
7	but use that as a strong argument to say that hand-
8	held meters, which might be used for home care, or
9	might be used in the study, but we don't know whether
10	they were used in this study, use that as a compelling
11	story for why hand- held meters might not have the
12	analytic strength to be used in intensive care units.
13	So my concerns are, one, we haven't
14	separated out home use from intensive care unit use;
15	and two, we have no idea whether the study cited, with
16	the problematic outcome, had any use of the meters
17	where you used the modeling from a 41 percent bias,
18	which I don't think that the current standards would
19	accept, would provide inadequate results. So I think
20	that I'm seeing a lot of mixing of different results
21	to come to the conclusions.
22	DR. SACKS: I'm sorry you were confused. I

1 thought I made it very clear with the difference between -- the first half of my talk was on self-2 monitoring, and the second half was on tight glycemic 3 4 control. 5 And what I was trying to point out in the analysis of the NICE-SUGAR study is, as you indicated, 6 clearly not only glucose meters that were used in the 7 study. But I'm just pointing out the limitations of 8 9 the glucose meters as currently accepted for ISO criteria could not be used properly in a study of that 10 nature because of the large variation in acceptable 11 12 criteria for meter accuracy. 13 DR. SIMMONS: But I just think, to be completely transparent, we should de-link the results 14 15 of NICE-SUGAR from those criteria, because we don't 16 know what analytic methods were used. And then the 17 other is there are other issues with NICE-SUGAR, 18 including attribution of morbidity and mortality in the time windows applied. So although the analysis 19 20 may be very interesting, I think we need to de-link 21 that from the outcome in NICE-SUGAR, to be completely transparent. 22

		75
1	DR. SACKS: I'm not sure that some of the,	
2	that you can actually do that, because it's quite	
3	possible that some of the patients in NICE-SUGAR, some	
4	of the worst outcomes, may be due to undetected	
5	hypoglycemia. And there's no way to know whether	
6	that's true or not.	
7	MR. COMBS: Art Combs, St. Louis. I'm	
8	actually an ICU director. ICU patients have nothing	
9	to do with ambulatory patients. I was interested in	
10	this a number of years ago and I just looked at the	
11	laboratory printout and found that more than 50	
12	percent of all of my admissions had at least one	
13	abnormal ionized calcium. More than 80 percent had at	
14	least one abnormality serum phosphorous. These are	
15	things you never see in an ambulatory person. So	
16	that's one point I wanted to make.	
17	The second I wanted to make is that we heard	
18	at the beginning, from the regulatory perspective,	
19	that this is all about intended use. I would ask the	
20	panel what in home care is intended for the intensive	
21	care unit, and the answer is nothing. And the	
22	standards for the way we measure blood pressure in	

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	home care, or the way we measure temperature in home
2	care, or the way we measure anything in home care, has
3	nothing to do with the intensive care unit.
4	I would submit to you that in the intensive
5	care unit, there currently are no adequate
6	technologies to test the hypothesis of the benefits of
7	tight glycemic control. With that conclusion, I agree
8	100 percent. But to suggest that every ambulatory
9	diabetic should be walking around with an instrument
10	qualified for the care of the critically ill is
11	preposterous. I don't think we need standards for
12	home care that were established in the intensive care
13	unit. We need to divide these, we need to talk about
14	them completely separately, and we need to understand,
15	in my opinion, ironically, the FDA's point of view,
16	which is what is the intended us. Thank you.
17	DR. SACKS: Those are clearly very valid
18	points, and I'm not for a femtosecond suggesting that
19	everybody who dies in these ICU and tight glycemic
20	control protocols is due to hypoglycemia. These
21	people are really, really sick, as was made evident.
22	So one of the suggestions that comes up from and

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

77

1	the other point, of course, is that everybody in this
2	room knows is that glucose meters are not FDA approved
3	for use in tight glycemic control protocols in ICUs.
4	But having said that, people are using them, and they
5	are used very, very, very widely, and not just in this
6	country.
7	I mean, so one of the possibilities from
8	your argument is that there can be two different
9	criteria, one for meters in ICUs, and one for meters
10	in home use. And that's something that is a topic for
11	extensive discussion, and could certainly be addressed
12	by the FDA and other people.
13	DR. CLARKE: Final question.
14	MR. COMBS: May I just offer a minor
15	rebuttal now?
16	DR. CLARKE: What's a I'm not sure what a
17	minor rebuttal is. The term, minor
18	MR. COMBS: Let me call it a clarification.
19	It's my opinion, and this is an opinion, that the
20	migration of hand-held glucose meters into the
21	intensive care unit was, as many things in medicine,
22	the result of a lot of perverse incentives. Some of

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	them actually, however, are legitimate. The
2	turnaround time of laboratories may not be enough to
3	meet the needs of the care of critically ill patients.
4	In some cases there is point-of-care meters testing,
5	in some cases there are satellite laboratories, in
6	other places there really is only a central
7	laboratory, and the turnaround time is simply
8	unacceptable. And so the nurses wanted to have
9	something at the bedside.
10	Secondly, there was the convenience and the
11	cost factor. It is easier to put a meter at each
12	bedside than it is to install, qualify, staff, et
13	cetera, a satellite laboratory, and so that is another
14	reason.
15	And the third is a very important thing, and
16	I want to echo the comments of the nurse who spoke
17	earlier. No one has any idea what a burden this is.
18	Let's say, soup to nuts, from obtaining a blood
19	sample, purging the arterial line, getting the strip,
20	measuring the number, writing it down, re-purging the
21	lines, establishing everything, takes five minutes. My
22	nurses work 12 hours. Twelve times five is 60. That is

1 one hour out of an entire nursing shift, one hour, devoted to a single task. 2 I would submit that intensive care patients 3 are a good deal more complex than that. So I believe 4 that cost, convenience, turnaround time and immediacy 5 or immediate availability of results are the things 6 that drove hand-held meters to the bedside. But they 7 don't belong there. They belong in the hands of 8 ambulatory diabetics who are not on a continuous 9 insulin drip, and who are not a priori critically ill. 10 DR. SACKS: So I have no rebuttal to your 11 12 rebuttal because I agree with you. 13 DR. CLARKE: We are going to take a break until eleven o'clock, and you can enjoy your coffee 14 15 and whatever in the foyer. Please take your seats so that we can keep on time. (Meeting recessed.) 16 17 SECOND SESSION 18 DR. CLARKE: The first speaker for the second session here is here -- ah, yes, oh, you were 19 20 hiding behind there, Marc -- Dr. Marc Breton, who is 21 in -- at the University of Virginia, has a PhD in 22 Systems Engineering, and has specialized in the

> (866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	application of engineering to medicine and has done
2	human testing of autonomic or automatic, excuse me,
3	insulin control systems and simulation of glucose
4	insulin dynamics in man. And he's going to talk to us
5	about clinical perspectives, self-monitoring of blood
6	glucose inaccuracy, and clinical consequences in Type
7	I using an in silico model. Dr. Breton?
8	DR. BRETON: Good morning. So I'm put in
9	the slightly odd position of being an engineer
10	addressing a mainly clinical panel and talking about
11	clinical consequences, but I'm going to try to make as
12	much sense as I can.
13	So, the quick background, which has been
14	talked about at length by now, is most all Type I
15	diabetics, and consequent number of Type II diabetics,
16	who use insulin, face a challenge of trying to attain
17	tight glucose control and avoid hypoglycemia at the
18	same time. And they are trying to attain that tight
19	glucose control for the reasons that were discussed
20	previously and the consequences of not having a tight
21	glucose control.
22	And the issue with working towards that

tight glucose control, that target, as low as possible is that you need a very good information, a very accurate information, about the status of the system to control it. And in that particular case, you need very good information about the glucose level of a particular patient.

7 Now, the only means for diabetic patients to have regular, frequent information about their glucose 8 levels is the glucose meters. Now, Dr. Clark, on my 9 right, in the review article stated the following 10 sentence, which basically say that accuracy should 11 only be seen in terms of clinical consequences, and 12 13 that pure engineering study of the devices, though interesting, were mostly irrelevant to the patients 14 15 themselves, and I tend to agree with that particular 16 statement.

There were several studies along the last ten years, we'll say, that looked at particular errors of glucose meters and their clinical consequences. The first one that I wanted to cite was by Raine, et al. in 2008, and they studied the effect of miscoding meters. And they had a series of automatically coding

1	meters and non- automatically that were either coded
2	or miscoded. And he looked at the consequences in
3	terms of glucose excursions and insulin dosing and
4	detected that the risk for hypoglycemia in miscoding
5	meters, so creating a bias, was about ten percent
6	higher.
7	There were very few clinical studies of the
8	effect of accuracy, mainly because to design such a
9	study is extremely intricate, and in some cases
10	unethical. It's difficult to send a patient out in
11	the field and then intentionally miscode or bias his
12	or her meter by a hundred points.
13	So to circumvent that particular hurdle,
14	what Burnt, Burns and Boyd did a few years ago, and
15	what in a landmark article for us was that they
16	used simulation, or a mathematical model of a human
17	of the glucose response of a human being to study more
18	thoroughly the effect of inaccuracies in meters. And
19	the work that I'm going to present here is really in
20	line with Dr. Bruns' work.
21	Now, the first thing I need to talk to you
22	about, and I will try to be as short as I can, is

83

1	simulation, and the tool that I basically use in the
2	study of this image inaccuracy. So what you're seeing
3	here has absolutely nothing to do with diabetes,
4	obviously. And the one thing that is interesting
5	about these three pictures it was more interesting
6	than last year until last year, the plane that
7	you're seeing on the screen had never flew. And the
8	Boeing 787 was entirely designed based on simulations,
9	mathematical modeling, and such engineering tools.
10	So I present that slide to basically show
11	you that simulation is not, by any stretch of the
12	imagination, a new idea. It's a tool that has been
13	used over the last decades by engineers to design and
14	to test the validity of different systems.
15	Now, why do you need to create such a
16	simulation in man and to apply it to diabetes? Well,
17	first you need mathematical models that are based on
18	clinical knowledge. And so some understanding of the
19	physiology that will allow you to create mathematical
20	models. You need to accumulate data targeting a
21	specific subsystem of that physiology to understand
22	how the different fluxes interact. You need to

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010 identify the physiological processes and the fluxes that I just talked about. Finally, you create in silico subjects, and based on these in silico subjects, in silico standing in for a computer, you assess the intra-subject variability and create in silico populations.

7 Finally, you implement it in a software, and you absolutely need to validate it against in vivo 8 data, and in vivo data that you did not use to create 9 the simulation environment in the first place. 10 And that, basically, allows you to have a software that 11 12 will give you the opportunity to run what we call in 13 silico experiments. The advantage of in silico experiments versus in vivo experiments is not only do 14 15 you go incredibly faster, a fraction of a second to 16 simulate several days of diabetes treatment, but you 17 can test situations that would put the human at risk, 18 knowing that in a computer, the risk is also 19 mitigated. 20 Now, what you start with is that 21 mathematical models based on understanding of the 22 physiology. That work was started probably 30 years

1	ago, if not 40 years ago, by Dr. Cobelli in Padova in
2	Italy, and his assistant, Kadava(ph) Amann. They had
3	two publications in 2006 and 2007 presenting the
4	mathematical models that we worked on. And then Dr.
5	Kovatchev(ph) and myself took these models one extra
6	step, and developed them to specifically address Type
7	I diabetes. And you can see that you basically had
8	mathematical models of the liver, the glucose system,
9	muscle adipose tissues, insulin delivery. In Type II
10	or normal subjects, you would have insulin secretion
11	also. And, of course, the gastrointestinal tract to
12	simulate meals.
13	You attach simulate measurements to these
14	mathematical models. These allow you to measure the
15	glucose of these patients. You can, of course,
16	simulate the YSR(ph) of Beckman, or you can simulate
17	an SMBG, which is exactly what we're going to do
18	today.
19	We can also simulate a continuous monitor,
20	which has allowed up to do alcosed loop twicks in

20 which has allowed us to do closed-loop trials in 21 simulation environments. You devise a treatment, 22 obviously, and then you administer the treatment

> (866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	through a simulated pump or a simulated multiple daily
2	injection or even IV injection in the types of in
3	the case of simulating ICU studies.
4	You need to accumulate data, and we
5	accumulate well, we got access to 350 healthy Type
6	I, Type II, and pre-diabetic patients across
7	numerous universities and studies. For all these
8	patients, they had one characteristic in common: all
9	these experiments were done with triple tracers, and
10	this gave us access to the fluxes of glucose and not
11	only its concentration, so we actually know what's
12	coming out of the liver, what's coming from the meal,
13	which is used in the tissues, what's excreted. And
14	using all these fluxes, we can actually identify a
15	patient, and it corresponds to our good-old
16	mathematical problem of the holes in the bathtub.
17	Now, the bathtub in this case is that
18	particularly ugly depiction of you can, for
19	example, recognize here the concentration of glucose
20	in plasma. These are the insulin states. Insulin is
21	administered subcutaneously in that case, makes its
22	way to the plasma. Plasma and insulin influence the

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1 different musage (ph) of glucose.

And what's even more ugly is the 2 mathematical equations that correspond to that 3 figures. I'm showing that first to justify my PhD, 4 and second to show you that a patient is --5 corresponds to 26 independent barometers. And I'm not 6 trying to throw 26 to impress you. What I'm trying to 7 convey is that it's absolutely impossible, even 8 9 knowing perfectly the patient, to guess in advance how a patient is going to react to a meal or to a bolus of 10 So we do not have any foreknowledge when we 11 insulin. 12 simulate of what's going to happen. We set the 13 scenario. The patient is going to eat 60 grams of 14 carbohydrates at one hour and take a bolus of three 15 units at the same time. But we really don't know what 16 the -- how glucose is going to evolve in the next six 17 We have to actually run the software to figure hours. 18 it out. Once you've created an insilico subject, you 19 20 get to create an in silico population, and that's

22 case, that span all the variability that is observed

basically to have as -- about 100 subjects, in our

21

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	in vivo. And that basically allows us to have very
2	different subjects, the same way you observe them in
3	your clinics.
4	We finally validated with external datasets
5	both from hyperinsulemic clamp and from the direct net
6	study. We also did some validation using basal rates
7	and carbohydrate ratios and different measures of
8	insulin sensitivity. And I have to thank Dr.
9	Buckingham and Dr. Clarke for sharing their the
10	data of their patient in these particular case that
11	allow us to verify that the patients that were present
12	in that simulator had characteristics that
13	corresponded to what's observed in vivo.
14	Finally, that simulator was accepted in
15	January 2008 by the FDA to replace pre-clinical
16	studies in closed loop trials. And so it means that
17	it was at least good enough to replace animal trials,
18	and it has been at the foundation of all of our
19	investigational device exemption for such studies
20	since.
21	The current in silico population is made of
22	300 patients 100 children, 100 teenagers, and 100

1	adults, all Type I. They can be admitted to the CRC.
2	They can be tested in different ways to extract
3	information about them, and of course you can submit
4	any scenarios composed of any combination of meals,
5	carbohydrate intake of any form, and insulin injection
6	of any form. And that's the demographic
7	characteristic of the population. All right.
8	Now, enough about the tool. Let's talk a
9	little bit about the study that we did. So we used
10	this simulator to study the effect of how tight that
11	ISO standard that we've been hearing about, what's the
12	effect of its amplitude on glucose control. And so
13	the only thing that I've done here is reproduced that
14	ISO standard, you can see that, of 275 milligram per
15	deciliter. You have a fixed error, and after 75
16	milligram per deciliter, you have a relative error. In
17	this case, it was 20 percent plus/minus 15. I wanted
18	to emphasize with another figure that what we're
19	talking about is the famous 95 percent, and not all
20	the points have to be in there. And so the color-
21	coded graph that is on the right here, the more red
22	you are, the more data points you're going to see. The

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	more blue you are, the less data points you're going
2	to see, but you're still going to see data points in
3	the blue area.
4	The first study we did was to look at the
5	detection of hypoglycemia based on different levels of
6	sensor accuracy. And so that's been shown to be a
7	very important feature to Type I diabetic patients, is
8	that fear of hypoglycemia is what generally limits
9	their capability of controlling their (inaudible)
10	their glucose.
11	Now, if you take the actual sensor well,
12	the actual ISO standards of 20 percent, you can see
13	that first, if your true sugar is 70, there is a 50
14	percent chance of detecting or not. So that basically
15	means that what we're studying are unbiased sensors.
16	We're only looking at the spread as defined by the ISO
17	standard.
18	Now, when you go down in true plasma
19	glucose, of course, your probability of missing the
20	hypoglycemic event diminishes, and you can see that
21	about if the true glucose is about 60, you have
22	about a 10 percent chance of missing it. When it's

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

about 50, you barely have a one percent chance of
 missing the event, and that was demonstrated in a talk
 earlier.

4 Now, if your accuracy becomes better, so if you move from 20 to 15 to 10 and to 5, you can see 5 that your probability of missing a hypoglycemic event 6 is reduced dramatically. And I'm going to be 7 particularly interested in the .60, and you can see 8 9 that if your true plasma glucose is 60 milligrams per deciliter, with a five percent errors -- of course, if 10 you have a perfect sensor, you're not going to miss 11 12 the hypoglycemic event. At a five percent accuracy 13 level, there is almost no chance of missing that It's .001 or something like that. 14 event, either. 15 At ten percent, you have about one percent chance of missing a hypoglycemic event, which is 16

17 reasonable. And you can see that between ten and 15, 18 something happened that actually makes that risk of 19 missing an event increase quite dramatically. And the 20 difference between 10 percent accuracy and 20 percent 21 accuracy is actually a factor 10.

22

Now, we also looked, in a second study, at

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	what the effect of accuracy is on one very simple
2	treatment, treatment of hyperglycemia. So we used the
3	previously described simulator and the previously
4	described model of SMBG noise, or SMBG error. Each in
5	silico patient starts the experiments stable at 200
6	milligrams per deciliter, and for each of these
7	patients we designed a perfect bolus that would bring
8	the patient down to 100 within four hours. And so
9	basically you measure glucose at times zero, that
10	measure is perfect, and you have the perfect bolus
11	that will bring the patient down to 100.
12	And then we repeated that experiment with
13	actual measure designed with the SMBG error model and
14	looked at what was happening. Now, of course if you
15	measure lower, you're going to treat a little lower
16	and you're not going to achieve your target. If you
17	measure higher, you're going to actually see that you
18	go lower than your target, and you might actually get
19	
19	into hypoglycemia.
20	into hypoglycemia. Now, this presented the result that we have

1	about 90. The maximum that we saw at about 110. So
2	by all practical measures, they achieved perfect
3	treatment of hyperglycemia. And you can see how the
4	capacity of treating hyperglycemia deteriorates with
5	increased errors, SMBG errors. At 15 percent, you
6	actually start seeing occurrence of hypoglycemia. At
7	20 percent, you see both hypoglycemia and for some
8	subjects, they did not even reach the 140 milligram
9	per deciliter limit. So they probably have to treat
10	further down the line.
11	And these results are presented in bar
12	graph. You can see that the risk of hypoglycemia is
13	zero percent up to 10 percent of error, and then rises
14	to 3.5, and then 5.5 percent.
15	We also looked at glucose variability, and
16	this time we actually simulated a meal. So we measure
17	at the beginning of a meal for the meal bolus, and we
18	also have a measure two hours later. The meal bolus
19	was intentionally underestimated so that we would be
20	high two hours later. And then the patient treats
21	from the point there are two hours later.
22	If you under-measure at times zero right

1	before the meal, you're probably going to under-bolus.
2	You're going to get a little higher. Let's say you
3	over-measure at two hours later, you're going to over-
4	treat, and then this time probably end up lower than
5	you initially intended. The results that are
6	presented here are it's called the control
7	variability grid. On the X axis is the lower points
8	that you attained. On the Y axis is the highest
9	points that you attained. So basically, if I was an
10	absolutely perfect control, I would be somewhere
11	around this in the A zone. You will note the
12	similarity with the Clare Error Grid. Anywhere around
13	that arc is proper treatment in the D zone, and then
14	these are the error zones of danger. For example, if
15	you're in the E zone, not only do you go over 300
16	milligram per deciliter after your meal, but you went
17	hypoglycemic afterwards.
18	So you take, basically your glucose curves.

19 You obtain the maximum to minimum. Take these two
20 numbers, and that gives you a point on the grid. And
21 you can see the difference between white and black.
22 White is almost no noise; black is a lot of noise. You

1	can see that when you had an inaccurate sensor, you
2	start dealing with dangerous situations.
3	Finally, we studied the long-term effect of
4	SMBG accuracy, and so it's it was a similar
5	simulation, but with three meals a day for ten days
6	for each patient. And what we observed first in a
7	nominal we fixed the risk of hyperglycemia for each
8	patient at 15 percent, which is basically one day out
9	of one day every week where they would experience a
10	hypoglycemic event.
11	And when we augmented the sensor errors, we
12	actually observed that these hypoglycemic events
13	became more frequent. And so we estimated that each
14	patient had their own their own aversion for
15	hypoglycemia, and so we dialed back in all the traces
16	for each patient to their original nominal aversion of
17	hypoglycemia, which is the 50 percent I just talked
18	about, and that dial back in, we transform into HbA1c
19	using the ADA formula. And that basically shows that
20	at nominal level, it's exactly at 15 percent. Five
21	percent error, you had no more hypoglycemia. And then
22	10 percent, 15 percent, 20 percent, you can see a

1	linear increase. In transforming into HbAlc, you can
2	see a moderate increase from nominal to 20 percent, of
3	about .4 percent of HbAlc.
4	So in conclusion, in silico experiments
5	allow for fast and inexpensive study of clinical
6	consequences. We've shown that SMBG accuracy has
7	dramatic consequences in terms of hypoglycemia
8	detection. We've shown that it has also very
9	important consequences in terms of treatment of
10	hypoglycemia. It also augments glucose variability,
11	due to the treatment of the meal. And it had a
12	moderate effect in HbAlc over a long term period.
13	I would like to end up with very wise words,
14	which is that all models are wrong, but some of them
15	are useful.
16	(Applause) I would like
17	DR. GINSBERG: Ginsberg, New Jersey. Marc,
18	very nice study.
19	When you do a model of merits, it's
20	important that you consider all the system merits.
21	When you modeled it, what did you use as the error for
22	carb counting, for error in the constants, and error

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1 for the absorption of insulin? DR. BRETON: So what I really -- so there's 2 different answers for the different parts of your 3 4 question. So first, the error in carb counting, I was 5 What I wanted to not necessarily interested in that. 6 see was the sole effect of an error of glucose 7 measurement. So of course I can induce some error of 8 9 carb counting, but that would have induced errors in my -- in my results that would not have been caused by 10 the SMBG. So there was no errors in carb counting. 11 Now, for the difference in insulin 12 13 absorption, as you very well know, each of our subjects has a specific insulin absorption, and it's 14 15 not going to change during the course of the day. What we are simulating, the observed variability, is not 16 17 within one subject, but by having different subjects 18 with very different characteristics. And so even though our subjects keep the same insulin absorption 19 throughout the day, Subject Number 2 is going to have 20 21 a very different insulin absorption than Subject 22 Number 1, and that's how we account for that

> (866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1 variability.

2	DR. GINSBERG: Okay. I'll present some of
3	that in my talk. But when you put in all the errors,
4	would you find, for a patient with Type I, based upon
5	a meal dosing, that the error in glucose is about four
6	to six percent of the total error in the system?
7	Doubling the error in glucose goes to almost nothing.
8	DR. BRETON: It's not surprising. As Dr.
9	Clarke was telling me earlier before this talk, if a
10	patient forgets correct me if I'm wrong if the
11	patient forgets one insulin shot in one week, their
12	HbAlc is probably going to rise by the equivalent
13	amount of what I showed today.
14	DR. CLARKE: One final quick question.
15	DR. BRETON: Okay.
16	DR. HARPER: I'd like to remind people with
17	questions to please state your affiliation, as well.
18	MR. HUANG: Okay.
19	DR. CLARKE: Even if you've asked before.
20	MR. HUANG: Dijia Huang with Bayer Diabetes
21	Care from Indiana. It's just a quick comment.
22	And I feel generally people use simulations

1	for two purposes. One is to identify the trend, such
2	as the percentage that we miss the hypo event versus
3	the accuracy of the meter. The second application is
4	to read exact number, such as, under what accuracy of
5	the meter meter accuracy and what's the exact
6	percentage of a missed hypoglycemic event?
7	And personally, I feel for the first
8	application, for the trend, simulation is an excellent
9	tool. But then when we go to when we go beyond
10	this trend, go to the to read an exact number, to
11	reach the conclusion, use the exact number, then I
12	think it becomes weak. My concern is, such as the
13	differential equation you showed, and in it, minor
14	adjustment on those constants could shift the curve
15	left and right and make the make us get different
16	readings.
17	Just my short comments.
18	MARC BRETON: I'm going to have to both
19	which is interesting both agree absolutely with you
20	and disagree. First, let's go on with the perfectly
21	agree. Simulations is a limited tool, and it had it
22	is designed for specific goals, and generally it

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	shouldn't be used outside of these goals. You will
2	note also that I only claim to replace pre-clinical
3	data. At no point in this talk will I ever claim to
4	replace clinical studies.
5	The place where I disagree with you is
6	you're saying any shift of these constants in the
7	equations would shift the curve left or right. Well,
8	you're right if I was using only one set of such
9	parameters. Now, this particular simulator has the
10	advantage of having a 300 subject population, in which
11	we claim we actually represent the variability.
12	Actually, we represent more than the variability that
13	is observed in vivo. So that particular shift that
14	you're talking about, we actually see it here, and we
15	account for it. And the result that I present to you,
16	of course, averages over all these subjects.
17	MR. HUANG: Thank you.
18	DR. CLARKE: Thank you, Marc.
19	(Applause) Our next speaker this morning is
20	Dr. Stephen Brotman, who is vice-president of payment
21	and Healthcare Delivery Policy at AdvaMed. Dr.
22	Brotman, like Dr. Shuren, has both an M.D. and a J.D.,

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1 and he's Board- certified in pathology and has worked 2 as a senior regulatory and research attorney at Wyeth, which is now Pfizer this week, and who knows what next 3 4 week. 5 And Dr. Brotman's going to talk about tighter performance criteria for blood glucose meters 6 and whether or not they're needed. 7 8 DR. BROTMAN: Thank you. Good morning, good 9 afternoon maybe. My name is Steve Brotman, and I'm currently a senior vice president at AdvaMed, which is 10 the Advance Medical Technology Association. I'll be 11 discussing this morning the industry perspective on 12 13 tighter accuracy requirements for blood glucose 14 meters. This is an incredibly important issue for 15 16 which industry has been engaged for years in 17 development of the standard and ongoing advances in 18 technology to bring the latest innovations in blood 19 glucose meters to patients. We thank FDA for the 20 opportunity to speak today at this meeting. 21 Just a little bit of background about our 22 organization. AdvaMed is the world's largest

		ΤC
1	association representing manufacturers of medical	
2	devices, diagnostic products, and medical information	
3	systems. Our member companies produce the medical	
4	devices, diagnostic products, and health information	
5	systems that transform they're transforming	
6	healthcare through early disease detection, less	
7	invasive procedures, and more effective treatments.	
8	The medical technology industry is strongly	
9	committed to designing and manufacturing blood glucose	
10	meters that meet the needs of individuals with	
11	diabetes. We share the goal of improving meter	
12	accuracy.	
13	Meter accuracy includes not only analytical	
14	performance, but the key areas impacting blood glucose	
15	meter accuracy include use error and interferences.	
16	The industry has made tremendous strides in	
17	improvements in both reducing use error and reducing	
18	the impact of interferents. Both are incredibly	
19	important aspects of use of blood glucose meters by	
20	self-testers.	
21	The standard currently governing blood	
22	glucose meters for self-testing, ISO 15197, itself	

1	recognizes the importance of usability improvement.
2	Specifically, it notes that the goals for performance
3	criteria should be weighed against the capabilities of
4	current self- monitoring devices. Furthermore, the
5	standard notes that care should be taken implementing
6	performance requirements that cause manufacturers to
7	focus design improvements on analytical performance at
8	the expense of other important attributes, such as
9	greater convenience and greater compliance. Thus, the
10	standard acknowledges the careful balance of these
11	factors and the minimum acceptable device performance
12	for glucose meters for self-testing. The standard
13	supports performance improvements beyond analytical
14	performance, such as advances that reduce dependence
15	on user technology, otherwise referred to as patient
16	usability.
17	Industry has made major advances through
18	usability improvements since the approval of ISO
19	15197. These address ergonomic and human factors that
20	are incredibly important to patients who are self-
21	testing. Manufacturers also integrate overall

22 usability engineering in device design. There has

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

	T
1	never been an array of usability there have been an
2	array of usability improvements. Such features will,
3	of course, vary per meter. No single blood glucose
4	meter will meet the needs of all patients.
5	While I'm not going to go into detail on
6	each and all the various usability improvements, it
7	should be noted that there are numerous improvements
8	for which we have outlined. This gives a sense of the
9	types of advances made by industry which contribute to
10	the overall improved device performance. Among
11	others, they include faster test times; smaller blood
12	samples for decreased comfort (sic), and I just want
13	to mention under that, patient discomfort was, in
14	fact, a focus of the discussion in October 2001 FDA
15	panel, where the panel encouraged FDA to approve blood
16	glucose monitors with alternate site testing labeling
17	instructions. Although alternative site testing may
18	introduce more inaccuracy in precision, the panel
19	cited that reducing pain would improve overall patient
20	compliance with their testing program.
21	If we look at additional usability
22	improvements, they also include overall increased

		105
1	robustness, such as cleaning solutions and hardware	
2	testing, enhanced meter displays, such as larger	
3	readouts, back lighting, and universal symbols. They	
4	include ergonomic design, such as buttons and meter	
5	size, including smaller meters for more discreet	
6	testing.	
7	Another usability improvement would be non-	
8	changeable unit of measure by the user. And in some	
9	cases, no coding or calibration or timing is needed.	
10	Other usability improvements include wider	
11	temperature range; improved range and stability for	
12	longer use life and decrease susceptibility to	
13	exposure; biosensor in addition to photometric	
14	technology; plasma- referenced results; integrated	
15	meter and lancing devices; improved voice simulators	
16	for the visually impaired; flagging test results, for	
17	example, meal markers; innovative software to organize	
18	meter data; and in some cases, no individual test	
19	strip for lancet handling, to reduce use error and to	
20	increase the ease of use.	
21	And the list goes on. I will not go through	
22	all the improvements, but they are quite significant	

1 and certainly have impacted increased compliance and 2 frequency of patient testing.

Just a word about additional usability improvements which are listed here. I'm not going to go into these, but it's evident there are clearly many options available, reflecting significant technology advances over the years.

8 Most of these usability improvements are 9 actually beyond the current standard. They are not required under ISO 15197. They are the result of 10 manufacturers' commitment to constant innovation to 11 meet the needs of the self-tester. It should be noted 12 13 that beyond the usability improvements, there are other significant improvements, including advances 14 that have reduced susceptibility to interference, such 15 16 as hematocrit. All of the advances are part of 17 industry's efforts to support technology innovations 18 that improve health care and lead to better outcomes. 19 So the question comes, where are we today? Well, multiple clinical studies have shown that home 20 21 blood glucose meters meeting the current standard for 22 accuracy, which is ISO 15197, are associated with

		1(
1	improved glycemic control and produce positive	
2	clinical outcomes in such large randomized clinical	
3	trials, such as DCCT, the Diabetes Control and	
4	Complications Trial, which looked at the effect on	
5	insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus.	
6	Furthermore, the current standard has been	
7	shown to produce clinically acceptable results. This	
8	was illustrated in consensus error grid analysis which	
9	has been constructed as an unbiased tool to analyze	
10	the clinical significance of blood glucose self-test	
11	measurement errors.	
12	According to the consensus error grid	
13	analysis, 96 percent of the results fall within the	
14	range indicating no effect on clinical action, and the	
15	remainder fall in a range indicating altered clinical	
16	action with little or no effect on clinical outcome.	
17	Error consensus grid is a tool, we think, that is	
18	strongly considered an important tool for objective	
19	outcome assessment for blood glucose devices for self-	
20	testing.	
21	We also believe that the impact of criteria	
22	changes on current meters should be considered in any	

	L
1	change to accuracy. This is important, because some
2	improvements will be difficult to sustain. Potential
3	negative impact may be increased test time, increased
4	sample size; narrow operational conditions, such as
5	temperature or relative humidity; potential bulkier
6	meter; and impact on usability and how overall user-
7	friendly a meter may be. Cost is also a factor for
8	patients in terms of affordable meters that meet the
9	needs for self-testing.
10	It is important to recognize that the
11	current accuracy criteria in the ISO standard is
12	specific to self-monitoring use, not professional use.
13	Industry fully supports efforts to develop increased
14	accuracy requirements for blood glucose meters used in
15	hospitals and long-term facilities. A standard is
16	being completed to address this issue as we speak
17	through the Clinical Laboratories Standards
18	Institutes, CLSI, through updating of POCT(12),
19	otherwise referred to as point of care blood glucose
20	testing in acute and chronic care facilities. FDA,
21	industry, and key representatives of the clinician
22	community are all engaged in this effort. The

1 political consequence of an inaccurate glucose result in these particular settings, which include immediate 2 treatment decisions and generally increase 3 susceptibility of the hospitalized patient merit 4 specific guideline development for meters used in 5 those settings. 6 7 We fully support those efforts. We also acknowledge that tight glycemic control is an 8 important issue for hospitalized patients and the 9 clinicians who are treating them. Importantly, we 10 note that the current standard, which is for home use, 11 was never intended for patients on tight glycemic 12 13 control in the hospital setting. It will be addressed in POCT(12) and we fully support these efforts to 14 15 address this in POCT(12). 16 As previously discussed, there has been a 17 number of recent advances and evolution in blood 18 glucose meter innovation by industry, contributing to an enhanced overall device performance. As part of 19 that commitment to blood glucose meter innovation, 20 21 industry is actively participating to update ISO 15197. In addition to other revisions to further 22

1	improve the standard, industry strong supports
2	revising the accuracy standard in section 7 of ISO
3	15197 for system accuracy of more than or equal to 95
4	percent of the individual glucose results to be within
5	plus or minus 15 milligrams per deciliter from the
6	reference glucose values, and within plus or minus 15
7	percent. At present, the current standard is plus or
8	minus 20 percent.
9	There is also recognition by the standard
10	review working group that the standards for hospital
11	is CLSI POCT(12), and not ISO 15197. In addition,
12	industry is actively engaged in discussing how to best
13	deal with interfering factors in the standard.
14	Industry is strong supportive of all these efforts,
15	which we expect to culminate in a newly updated
16	standard of great importance to the blood glucose
17	meter industry and the patients using these innovative
18	technologies.
19	Industry has also been proactively engaged,
20	as mentioned, in an update of POCT(12). It should be
21	noted that the document that the document is near
22	completion and will set out the latest guidelines for

1	blood glucose monitors in the hospital setting,
2	including considerations of overall accuracy and tight
3	glycemic control in that setting.
4	We also believe there are other mechanisms
5	to support appropriate use of standards. FDA could
6	formally adopt the ISO standard into FDA guidance to
7	support enforcements for use of standards for self-
8	testing only. But we continue to encourage that
9	usability and analytical performance should be
10	carefully weighed to assure meters that meet patients'
11	needs.
12	Thank you for the opportunity to present
13	today. Industry looks forward to ongoing work with FDA
14	and the global standards community in systemic review
15	of ISO 15197, as well as the completion of POCT(12) to
16	support blood glucose meter innovation and the needs
17	of users. I'll take any questions.
18	(Applause)
19	DR. CLARKE: I have one question. I guess
20	maybe I'm I'm inferring, from what you've said,
21	that industry is trying to separate or would like to
22	perhaps separate out home use by patients from

		$\perp \perp$
1	intensive care use. And if that is so and they would	
2	like to have an ISO standard to improve the home use,	
3	but not necessarily the ICU use, I'm sure that	
4	industry wouldn't want to forego those 250,000 blood	
5	tests that are done in the ICU at Barnes Hospital	
6	every year, or I mean, I'm I don't get that	
7	seems like that's a disconnect.	
8	DR. BROTMAN: Well, I I see your concern,	
9	and I think the best way to address it is that there	
10	are members in Panel 2 from the blood glucose working	
11	group that have been talking about this for quite some	
12	time in quite some detail. And I think it's probably	
13	better addressed during that panel, if you wouldn't	
14	mind.	
15	Yes, ma'am?	
16	MS. RUTHERFORD: My name is Diane	
17	Rutherford, with Kenbuck(ph) Consulting in Dallas,	
18	Texas. And as a representative of industry, I thought	
19	this might be better suited for you.	
20	We're talking about increasing the	
21	capabilities, the accuracy of the monitoring devices.	
22	How does that affect the accuracy of the dosing	

1	instruments? Your syringe dose tolerances are pretty
2	wide, from my experience in industry. And is it fair
3	to make the monitors more accurate and not make the
4	dosing requirements more accurate, as well?
5	DR. BROTMAN: Well, I I think that that's
6	a valid point for discussion. I think that's a
7	discussion that's probably an ongoing discussion, and
8	it's probably something that is continuing at this
9	time. Again, I think that's something that could be
10	addressed, and probably has been addressed, by the
11	blood glucose working group, and you may want to pose
12	that question.
13	DR. CLARKE: One further question? It's a
14	long way down front.
15	MS. SOLDO: Sorry.
16	DR. CLARKE: It's okay.
17	MS. SOLDO: Monnett Soldo from OptiScan in
18	California. We are not participants in the industry
19	group that you mentioned, as a small startup. I was
20	wondering if you could share with everybody, since you
21	said the new proposed CLSI standard is near
22	completion, what exactly that standard would be?

		114
1	DR. BROTMAN: Again, I think in terms of all	
2	the details that have been worked through and	
3	considered, the members of the working group would be	
4	the best members to be able to address something like	
5	that.	
6	MS. SOLDO: Okay. I was thinking at the	
7	level of, you know, we're talking plus or minus 15	
8	plus or minus 15 percent. Can you summarize at that	
9	level?	
10	DR. BROTMAN: Again, ask me specifically	
11	your question? The POCT(12)?	
12	MS. SOLDO: Yeah.	
13	DR. BROTMAN: I think that's a question	
14	that's probably best aimed at the working group, if	
15	you wouldn't mind.	
16	DR. CLARKE: Other questions? Thank you	
17	very much.	
18	DR. BROTMAN: Thank you.	
19	DR. CLARKE: I'm going to just wing it,	
20	Barry.	
21	Our next speaker is Dr. Barry Ginsberg, who	
22	is the CEO of Diabetes Technology Consultants. Dr.	

		115
1	Ginsberg is former vice president of WorldWide Medical	
2	Affairs for the Diabetes Division of Becht &	
3	Dickinson, where he led the diabetes program there for	
4	about 17 years. He is a former professor of internal	
5	medicine at the University of Iowa. He has done his	
6	training at Beth Israel Hospital, as well as at the	
7	diabetes branch at the NIH.	
8	He has been a consultant to the	
9	technological aspects of diabetes for a number of	
10	years, and he's going to talk to us today on Industry	
11	Perspective: Tighter Performance Criteria	
12	are Achievable and Appropriate.	
13	DR. GINSBERG: Thank you, Bill.	
14	I actually had tried to make it easier for	
15	Bill by actually putting a small CV up in here, but	
16		
17	Let me talk a little about my conflict,	
18	first. I'm a consulting medical director for	
19	Agamatrix, which is a blood glucose monitoring	
20	company, as well as a speaker for Bayer and a	
21	consultant to the Juvenile Diabetes Research	
22	Foundation on the Artificial Pancreas Project.	
1		

1 Indirectly, I work for companies who've worked for Roche and for LifeScan. 2 Let me talk a little about the industry 3 perspective, tighter performance control -- criteria 4 are achievable and appropriate. 5 I think I'm the first speaker up here today who has an academic, a clinical, 6 and an industry background. And all three of those go 7 8 into my opinions today, which are solely my own. 9 As an overview, we'll produce some background. We'll talk about measurements of 10 11 inaccuracy, necessary accuracy, and a little bit of 12 outliers, and something about the sources of error. 13 I'll talk a little about the current technology, where the accuracy is, and methods to improve it. 14 I'll talk 15 about testing and reporting, whether the testing ought 16 to be done by the companies themselves internally or 17 externally by a notified body like company, and 18 whether testing should be done initially or 19 periodically. And then finally, since this is a 20 consumer product, what we ought to do about consumer 21 labeling. And I think I can do that all in 20 22 minutes.

1	All right. When we talk about accuracy,
2	we're really talking about accuracy and precision, and
3	you really need both. A device which looks like this
4	in terms of its accuracy, when you average out that
5	accuracy, it's actually perfectly accurate, even
6	though none of the individual values are even close to
7	being accurate. So average accuracy by itself doesn't
8	necessarily help us.
9	Similarly, average precision, by itself,
10	doesn't help, because that's pretty tight and precise
11	but nowhere near the value that we're interested in.
12	And it's only when you consider both accuracy and
13	precision that you get values which are right at your
14	target. We'd like that with one number. And the
15	number that comes closest to that is the number that's
16	been given a couple of different names today, or mean,
17	absolute, relative error, mean average deviation,
18	relative average deviation, and so on.
19	And what it really does is, you just look at
20	accuracy. What you're looking at here, if this is
21	plus ten, this is minus ten, that's plus ten, that's
22	minus ten. When you average those all out, that comes

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	out to zero error. When you do this, you take the
2	absolute value. So a plus ten becomes a plus ten, a
3	minus ten becomes a plus ten, plus ten and minus ten
4	again the average error here is ten percent. And
5	so that single value, you're taking the absolute
6	value, gives you an error which is useful in this. We
7	also need to consider bias.
8	Now, we've talked a lot about ISO 15197.
9	It's an international standard. It contains both
10	clinical and laboratory standards, as well as other
11	parts. Most importantly, it contains the study design
12	of how this study should be done. We've talked about
13	values, that 95 percent of the values should be within
14	20 percent of the reference value for values greater
15	than 75, and 15 milligrams per deciliter for values
16	less than 75. And shown on a graph, that's sort of
17	what this looks like.
18	Within the ISO, there's also an extended ISO

18 Within the ISO, there's also an extended ISO 19 standard, which is not required for approval, but is 20 suggested it be done as well. And the extent that ISO 21 looks at accuracy of not only 95 percent -- 20 22 percent, but at 15 percent, 10 percent, and 5 percent,

2 yellow, light green, and dark green. 3 More importantly, when you ask the question 4 of, what do these do in terms of hypoglycemia? Because 5 I believe that glucose monitoring is most useful at a 6 patient level. Let me point out here, I am only 7 talking about self-glucose monitoring here. I am not 8 talking about hospital use of meters in any part of 9 this talk. It's really useful in two respects for the 10 patient. One is it's useful in helping them select 11 the dose of insulin appropriate at a meal, and 12 secondly, it's helpful in letting them know when 13 they're becoming hyperglycemic. And we'll talk about 14 those two separately. 15 But when you look at the ISO standard and 16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent 18 confidence limits on what I'm going to see? And so at
4 of, what do these do in terms of hypoglycemia? Because 5 I believe that glucose monitoring is most useful at a 6 patient level. Let me point out here, I am only 7 talking about self-glucose monitoring here. I am not 8 talking about hospital use of meters in any part of 9 this talk. It's really useful in two respects for the 10 patient. One is it's useful in helping them select 11 the dose of insulin appropriate at a meal, and 12 secondly, it's helpful in letting them know when 13 they're becoming hyperglycemic. And we'll talk about 14 those two separately. 15 But when you look at the ISO standard and 16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent
5 I believe that glucose monitoring is most useful at a 6 patient level. Let me point out here, I am only 7 talking about self-glucose monitoring here. I am not 8 talking about hospital use of meters in any part of 9 this talk. It's really useful in two respects for the 10 patient. One is it's useful in helping them select 11 the dose of insulin appropriate at a meal, and 12 secondly, it's helpful in letting them know when 13 they're becoming hyperglycemic. And we'll talk about 14 those two separately. 15 But when you look at the ISO standard and 16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent
6 patient level. Let me point out here, I am only 7 talking about self-glucose monitoring here. I am not 8 talking about hospital use of meters in any part of 9 this talk. It's really useful in two respects for the 10 patient. One is it's useful in helping them select 11 the dose of insulin appropriate at a meal, and 12 secondly, it's helpful in letting them know when 13 they're becoming hyperglycemic. And we'll talk about 14 those two separately. 15 But when you look at the ISO standard and 16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent
7 talking about self-glucose monitoring here. I am not 8 talking about hospital use of meters in any part of 9 this talk. It's really useful in two respects for the 10 patient. One is it's useful in helping them select 11 the dose of insulin appropriate at a meal, and 12 secondly, it's helpful in letting them know when 13 they're becoming hyperglycemic. And we'll talk about 14 those two separately. 15 But when you look at the ISO standard and 16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent
8 talking about hospital use of meters in any part of 9 this talk. It's really useful in two respects for the 10 patient. One is it's useful in helping them select 11 the dose of insulin appropriate at a meal, and 12 secondly, it's helpful in letting them know when 13 they're becoming hyperglycemic. And we'll talk about 14 those two separately. 15 But when you look at the ISO standard and 16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent
9 this talk. It's really useful in two respects for the 10 patient. One is it's useful in helping them select 11 the dose of insulin appropriate at a meal, and 12 secondly, it's helpful in letting them know when 13 they're becoming hyperglycemic. And we'll talk about 14 those two separately. 15 But when you look at the ISO standard and 16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent
<pre>10 patient. One is it's useful in helping them select 11 the dose of insulin appropriate at a meal, and 12 secondly, it's helpful in letting them know when 13 they're becoming hyperglycemic. And we'll talk about 14 those two separately. 15 But when you look at the ISO standard and 16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent</pre>
11 the dose of insulin appropriate at a meal, and 12 secondly, it's helpful in letting them know when 13 they're becoming hyperglycemic. And we'll talk about 14 those two separately. 15 But when you look at the ISO standard and 16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent
<pre>12 secondly, it's helpful in letting them know when 13 they're becoming hyperglycemic. And we'll talk about 14 those two separately. 15 But when you look at the ISO standard and 16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent</pre>
13 they're becoming hyperglycemic. And we'll talk about 14 those two separately. 15 But when you look at the ISO standard and 16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent
14 those two separately. 15 But when you look at the ISO standard and 16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent
But when you look at the ISO standard and ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent
16 ask, So if the actual blood glucose is 70, at the 17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent
17 various ISO standards, what is my 95 percent
10 confidence limits on what I'm going to good And so at
18 confidence limits on what I'm going to see? And so at
19 the ISO standard of 20 percent, that 70 is somewhere
20 between 55 and 85. Well, if I'm 70 and the meter's
21 telling me 85, I'm not sure I'm getting the
22 appropriate information.

1	At 15 percent, it goes up to 81; at 10
2	percent, 78; and at 5 percent, it's down to 74. So
3	the more accuracy here is actually probably pretty
4	important.
5	ON the other hand, when you consider the
6	effect of blood glucose in terms of selecting an
7	insulin dose, I think it becomes pretty unimportant.
8	Let's consider all the errors that go into selecting
9	an insulin dose. So I'm sitting down to a meal, and
10	the first thing I'm going to do is count my
11	carbohydrates. Well, how much of an error is there
12	when I figure out how much food is in that meal? Well,
13	it turns out the likely number is 15 to 20 percent.
14	Some people are significantly less accurate than that
15	and may have numbers up to 25, even 35 percent.
16	So I now have a number, I'm going to eat 60
17	grams of carbohydrate. Well, I'm going to take that
18	and divide that by my carbs to insulin ratio, which is
19	ten, saying I need six units of insulin. How much
20	error is that constant? Because it turns out that
21	most patients are given a number when they develop
22	diabetes, and no one ever changes that number again.

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	They have that number for the rest of their life. The
2	likely error there is at least ten percent, and maybe
3	as high as 25 percent.
4	And then finally, I actually get my
5	calculation, I need six units of insulin, and I inject
6	it. How much error is there in that six units of
7	insulin being absorbed? And again, it depends on the
8	kind of insulin. For a rapid-acting insulin like
9	lispro, it turns out that's about 20 percent. For a
10	less-rapid acting insulin, like regular insulin, it
11	turns out that's about 35 percent.
12	Now, when you have a series of errors
13	engineers like to stack them but it turns out the
14	correct thing to do is to take the square root of the
15	sum of the squares. And when you do that, you find
16	out that the total error here is about 27 percent,
17	which gives you a 95 percent confidence in the error
18	of plus or minus almost 70 percent. And likely error
19	here is 46 percent, with a 95 percent confidence limit
20	on that of plus or minus 115 percent.
21	Now, it turns out I didn't put blood
22	glucose monitoring in here, because it turns out that

1	if you take blood glucose monitoring and change the
2	error, the average error, from five percent to ten
3	percent, you barely change that number. You increase
4	it by one to three percent. Well, at three percent at
5	27 percent, I increase my error by only ten percent.
6	And here, even less.
7	So it turns out that blood glucose
8	monitoring error, in terms of selecting a meal, is
9	actually probably relatively unimportant. ON the
10	other hand, as you look at Number 4, blood glucose
11	monitoring error when I select when I want to know
12	if I'm hypoglycemic, is actually pretty important.
13	Now, based upon that, and this is only
14	personal opinion, what I would suggest is how much
15	accuracy you need depends upon who you are. If I'm a
16	patient with Type II Diabetes on diet or non-
17	hypoglycemic oral agents, I don't need to know about
18	hypoglycemia. I'm never going to become hypoglycemic.
19	There's nothing there to make me hypoglycemic. And so
20	the current standard of 20 percent is actually fine.
21	If I'm a patient with Type II Diabetes on
22	insulin or an oral agent that does cause hypoglycemia,

1	which is becoming rarer and rarer, then I probably
2	need a little more accuracy, and 15 percent is
3	probably appropriate for me.
4	If I am a patient with Type I Diabetes who
5	is now running my blood glucose an average of 80 or 90
6	or maybe 100, now accuracy in terms of hypoglycemia
7	becomes very important for me, and an average accuracy
8	of ten percent would actually be very helpful to me. I
9	might comment here that laboratory accuracy at two
10	percent would put me up here.
11	Just an interesting point as an aside here.
12	When you start to consider the accuracy of these
13	meters, you start to consider how you're going to test
13	meters, you start to consider how you're going to test
13 14	meters, you start to consider how you're going to test them. If I have an average meter with ten percent
13 14 15	<pre>meters, you start to consider how you're going to test them. If I have an average meter with ten percent 95 percent confidence limits or a four percent average</pre>
13 14 15 16	<pre>meters, you start to consider how you're going to test them. If I have an average meter with ten percent 95 percent confidence limits or a four percent average in accuracy, I can't test that with a laboratory</pre>
13 14 15 16 17	<pre>meters, you start to consider how you're going to test them. If I have an average meter with ten percent 95 percent confidence limits or a four percent average in accuracy, I can't test that with a laboratory instrument. Because laboratory instruments have two</pre>
13 14 15 16 17 18	<pre>meters, you start to consider how you're going to test them. If I have an average meter with ten percent 95 percent confidence limits or a four percent average in accuracy, I can't test that with a laboratory instrument. Because laboratory instruments have two and a half to three percent inaccuracy. That means</pre>
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	meters, you start to consider how you're going to test them. If I have an average meter with ten percent 95 percent confidence limits or a four percent average in accuracy, I can't test that with a laboratory instrument. Because laboratory instruments have two and a half to three percent inaccuracy. That means the error in my testing instrument is going to be 30

1 going to be very hard to do.

2	Now, we talked a little about error grids.
3	And what I've shown here is something I consider very
4	important in terms of outliers. This is not real
5	data, because the real data it's based upon is owned
6	by a company that I couldn't I actually didn't have
7	a chance to ask them to use the data. So this is data
8	that I've made up, but it does reflect real data. So
9	it's for illustrative purpose only.
10	And here you have 5,000 samples on a
11	consensus error grid. It looks pretty good, except
12	there are five values there, or about .1 percent,
13	which are not so good. It's a value of 290, which is
14	showing up as 525; a value of 230, showing as 475; a
15	value of 205, showing up as 350. At .1 percent, the
16	average patient with Type I Diabetes will get at least
17	one of these a year, and probably more. And if they
18	don't if they believe this, that's going to lead to
19	serious hypoglycemia when they take that insulin for
20	that.
21	So I think outliers are important. I don't
22	know what to do about them, but right now we're doing

1 nothing about them. We're not even talking about 2 them. I think it's important that we start talking about them. 3 Now, where are the sources of error that's 4 5 we're going to deal with? Well, the first is intrinsic sources. Manufacturing variation -- there 6 are small variations in the size of the well or the 7 size of the silkscreen-printed electrodes. There are 8 differences in how well the enzyme is laid down in 9 that well or print screen. There is the age of the 10 strip, and mediator oxidation, all of which add to 11 12 intrinsic error of the strip. 13 This physical location -- temperature can affect this, and altitude can affect this. There are 14 15 interfering substances, and I won't go into these in detail, because they have been before -- intrinsic 16 17 urate triglycerides for some oxygen, for glucose 18 oxidase, ascorbate, acetaminophen, L-Dopa, Enflazamide, and for glucose, the hydrogenous PQQ 19 20 maltose, icodextrin, and xylose. 21 And then finally, there are patient factors. 22 From a medical point of view, there's hematocrit. From

1	an educational point of view, there's technique,
2	coding, and hand-washing, all of which add to the
3	errors that we're dealing with.
4	Now, this is a paper by Freckmann from
5	Diabetes Therapeutics and Technology in December. And
6	God bless him, he actually took a whole bunch of
7	meters and tested them all in the lab, and actually
8	found that for the most part, they were pretty
9	accurate. That you can see all of them met the 20
10	percent standard, many of them met the 15 percent
11	standard. As you go down to the ten and five, fewer
12	and fewer of them did.
13	If you look at data from FDA submissions or
14	in package inserts, you find data here, and this is
15	from nine companies which we could get this from, and
16	you can see that for the most part, they all met the
17	20 percent. A number of them met the 15 percent; some
18	ten, and some five. Some of these are clinical and
19	some of these are laboratory, but Company E, actually,
20	I know is clinical. And they did pretty well. They
21	can meet a 15 percent standard. They can almost meet
22	a ten percent standard. The question you could ask is,

		127
1	do you need that? We'll get back to that in a second.	
2	Now, there are methods to improve this.	
3	Hematocrit can be measured by AC impedance or by	
4	dynamic electrochemistry. Temperature and altitude	
5	can be met by thermistors, and again, dynamic	
6	electrochemistry. Manufacturing variation, QC,	
7	interference by multiple electrodes or dynamic	
8	electrochemistry. Coding, by no coding meters, either	
9	by code selection or coding on the strip. And	
10	finally, aging some of the meters actually, they	
11	use cartridges, print the age on the cartridge, and	
12	the meter won't work if the strip is too old. So	
13	there are approaches which will get us more accurate	
14	as we go further along.	
15	Now, a number of years ago, I made a	
16	statement you can trust device manufacturers in	
17	clinical trials. If it's EU certified, you can ask	
18	the notified body testing, and you can pass it. I've	
19	seen some data recently which makes me a little less	
20	confident about manufacturing testing, particularly	
21	from some of the smaller manufacturers, and I sort of	
22	wonder about that. So I'm going to ask the question,	

		128
1	Is it appropriate now to go beyond internal testing by	
2	the manufacturers and go to a system closer to Europe,	
3	where you have notified bodies or other groups that	
4	actually do the testing for you, so you can be sure	
5	that when you publish the results of your accuracy,	
6	it's the same for everybody?	
7	Blood glucose meters have become consumer	
8	products. When companies advertise on blood glucose	
9	monitors, they talk about size. They talk about	
10	shape, they talk about color. They talk about	
11	convenience. Those are consumer features. Some of	
12	them are talking about accuracy, but for the most	
13	part, we're talking about consumer products, in which	
14	consumers are making decisions about the device they	
15	choose. And for a consumer product, information is	
16	king. You need to create informed consumers, and the	
17	consumer needs to have standardized, accurate	
18	information.	
19	Because of that, I think we ought to go to	
20	external testing. It's a standard protocol with	
21	clinical testing of random lots, not specific lots. A	
22	standardized analysis of the data in order to produce	

		129
1	standardized labeling. And put the label right on the	
2	strip container, saying exactly how accurate how you	
3	are in a method that anyone can understand. As a	
4	matter of fact, at a fifth grade reading level as a	
5	matter of fact, if we come up with a better number,	
6	something akin to a batting average, I think that will	
7	be even better.	
8	I put this in gold because I don't know	
9	whether we ought to have we ought to develop a	
10	standard protocol for outlier analysis, but I don't	
11	know what to do with it after you get that.	
12	Clinical testing ought to be periodic. It	
13	ought to be every six to 12 months so we know that the	
14	accuracy of the initial test is continuing. It ought	
15	to be done on random lots. I think reasonable	
16	failures don't require a corrected they require	
17	correction, they don't require recall. And outlier	
18	testing ought to be continuous, but outlier testing	
19	requires so many strips. You need 10, 20, 30, 50,000	
20	strips to test for outliers. I think that has to be	
21	done by the manufacturer.	
22	So my recommendation is, then, our accuracy,	

	1
1	the substantial majority of users, which is those
2	patients with Type II Diabetes on diet or non-
3	hypoglycemic oral agents, don't require more accuracy
4	than we have today. And if we get if we demand more
5	accurate devices, we're going to lose other consumer
6	features and/or make them more expensive. So I think
7	we ought to keep the current ISO standard as the
8	minimal acceptable clinical accuracy, although it
9	ought to be done with random lots.
10	I think we ought to be labeling devices with
11	what the true accuracy is. The strip container should
12	be labeled with the mean average rule of error, and
13	the ISO errors, and maybe, although I'm not sure,
14	labeled as group-appropriate. This is appropriate for
15	Type II's on oral agents; this is appropriate for Type
16	I's on insulin, et cetera.
17	Testing ought to be done initially with
18	random lots, external control at a notified body-like
19	device, and periodic testing of random lots and better
20	testing of outliers.
21	Labeling I just put a hypothetical label
22	here should show, develop a standard label, sort of

	13.
1	like nutrition labeling, or Energy Star labeling. I
2	mean, all other consumer products have this. Why
3	shouldn't this consumer product have it? So develop a
4	standard label so you can look at it and know exactly
5	where the average error is going to be, where the
6	extended ISO error is going to be. Put in MARE, or
7	even better, a batting average. Put in extended ISO
8	data, and question about intended consumers.
9	So in summary, then, I think blood glucose
10	monitoring is currently accurate enough for a
11	substantial majority of patients. Now let me say,
12	this is not strips. Those patients do not use the
13	majority of the strips, but it is the majority of
14	patients.
15	Better accuracy is achievable, but not
16	necessary for everybody. Since it's a consumer
17	product, better labeling is essential. We ought to do
18	that with external testing with a standard protocol
19	and periodic testing. And a standard label, like a
20	nutrition label.
21	With that, I'll stop, and ask if there are
22	any questions.

#### (866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1 (Applause) 2 DR. CLARKE: Are there questions for Dr. 3 Ginsberg? I have a question. 4 DR. GINSBERG: Okay. 5 DR. CLARKE: You talked about labeling, and you talked about pitching it at a fifth grade level, 6 which I think is really a good idea. But it seemed to 7 me like the labeling that you were talking putting on 8 9 the strip bottle could not be interpreted by somebody with a fifth grade or an eighth grade education. 10 I'm not sure that -- I'm not 11 DR. GINSBERG: 12 sure that's true. If you present a booklet to go 13 along with this -- when you go to Consumer Reports and look at their red circles, black circles, and half 14 15 circles, they don't explain to you what it means. And it's not that hard to say a MARE, the lower the number 16 17 it is, the more accurate it is; that for the ISO 18 standards, the higher the number it is the better it 19 is. And that for different groups, you may require 20 different amounts. And we have to agree on what that is, but I think that could be done. 21 22 DR. CLARKE: Go ahead, please.

		133
1	MR. BASHAN: Eran Bashan from Michigan. I	
2	actually think that your data suggests that we're much	
3	better positioned than we think, because you know,	
4	even if you look among insulin testers, 60 percent of	
5	the folks on insulin use either long-acting insulin or	
6	premixed biphasic insulin. And their dose doesn't	
7	actually depend on the glucose level. And if you look	
8	at, you know, your major concern, the outliers, there	
9	are roughly ten billion tests done in the U.S. every	
10	year. If you think that one percent of them are	
11	extremely inaccurate, that's 100 million tests per	
12	year.	
13	DR. GINSBERG: Point one percent.	
14	MR. BASHAN: If you look1 percent, ten	
15	million. If you look at, you know, mortality from	
16	diabetes, that's two orders of magnitude less than	
17	that. So you can actually claim that 99.95 percent of	
18	the tests done today are extremely safe.	
19	DR. GINSBERG: But there are 50,000 serious	
20	hypoglycemic events per year.	
21	MR. BASHAN: I know. But that suggests,	
22	given the amount of measurements, that the real	

1 accuracy that you have today is much better than the 2 ones actually reported. 3 DR. GINSBERG: Thank you. DR. WHITE: I'm Neil White. I'm a pediatric 4 endocrinologist from Washington University in St. 5 Louis. I think that education of the consumer is 6 really important, and you've made -- you've made that 7 point. And we talk about error in here, I think some 8 9 of us in the audience are learning a lot about error in the measurements. But I don't think our patients, 10 11 especially the mothers of our children with diabetes, 12 understand error at all. They expect the number to be 13 a number; okay? They don't see -- they call us when they do two measurements in rapid succession and one 14 is 120 and one is 135, okay, which we all know is 15 within the error of a test. But they don't understand 16 17 that. There's a huge opportunity for education for 18 the consumers understanding what these strips are 19 capable of doing and what the results mean. 20 DR. GINSBERG: I agree. As long as Neil is up and reminding me, actually, let me actually point 21 22 out in terms of accuracy that a number of people have

135

1	talked about the DCCT. The average error of the
2	meters in DCCT was between 13 and 15 percent in the
3	hands of patients, significantly higher than we're
4	talking about today, by a factor of three.
5	DR. CLARKE: Other questions? Thank you.
6	(Applause) We are going to break now for
7	lunch until 1:30. At that time, we will reassemble
8	here, and a larger, expanded panel will be present for
9	you to question. So while you're having lunch, ask
10	your friends, or you're not-friends, what they thought
11	of this morning's presentations and what questions
12	they had, and let's make sure our questions are
13	answered at 1:30. Thank you.
14	SESSION 1 PANEL DISCUSSION
15	DR. CLARKE: Please take your seats. We are
16	ready to begin this afternoon's session. We are about
17	to have a panel discussion, and the panel includes all
18	of the speakers from this morning, plus some
19	additional distinguished individuals, including Ellen
20	Ullman, who is a diabetes advocate and Vice President
21	of Children with Diabetes, and works closely with
22	Kelly Close and Closer Concerns and is a parent. And

1	so she is really the Type I Diabetes advocate here,
2	and we're going to all want to hear from her.
3	Dr. David Klonoff, who is sitting to her
4	left, but to my right, who is Clinical Professor of
5	Medicine at UC San Francisco, the founder of the
6	Diabetes Technology Center, the Editor-in-Chief of the
7	Journal of Diabetes Science & Technology, and the
8	Medical Director of the Mills-Peninsula Diabetes
9	Research Institute, in his spare time.
10	And next to him is Dr. Alberto Gutierrez,
11	who is the Office director or Director of the Office
12	of In Vitro Diagnostics at the FDA.
13	And this is going to be an exciting time. I
14	would stress to the people here, when a question is
15	asked to you, make sure you push your microphone until
16	the red light comes on, and when you're finished
17	talking, make sure you turn it off, because otherwise
17	talking, make sure you turn it off, because otherwise people will hear what you say.
18	people will hear what you say.
18 19	people will hear what you say. (Laughter) And it could be embarrassing.

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1 someone who stood in line a long time and didn't get
2 to ask a question.

3 I'm going to start out with a Okay. question for Ms. Ullman. Because you've been through 4 this business of testing blood glucose a lot in a 5 child, and because I'm a pediatrician I can empathize 6 with that. And I guess I'm wondering, do you feel 7 that you needed a blood glucose monitor for your son 8 9 which was significantly more accurate than you had? And -- here's the second part of the question -- would 10 you be willing to give up something in order to have 11 12 more accuracy? And that giving up might mean taking 13 longer to get a test result, giving a -- maybe having a larger drop of blood, or something else? 14

15 MS. ULLMAN: Oh, absolutely. We needed --16 my son was one when he was diagnosed. He's now 22, so 17 we've done 21 years of blood glucose testing. And 18 when you have a little child, you know, one year old, 19 and you see a 360 on a meter because -- for whatever 20 reason, you're going to dose. And if that 360 was really a 240, your child's going to be hypo, we're 21 22 going to be getting out the gluca gun, and yeah, we

> (866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	would sacrifice several of the convenience factors.
2	Not that I want to bring back the hanging drop of
3	blood, but yeah, I mean, what's another 20 seconds
4	versus five seconds? Absolutely, accuracy is the most
5	important.
6	And that's really what I heard across the
7	board. I'll talk about the survey tomorrow, but across
8	the board, parents want accuracy, first and foremost.
9	DR. HARPER: Ellen, do you believe that
10	parents of Type I diabetic children, or some Type I
11	diabetics that you've talked to, do you believe they
12	realize that the blood glucose meters have some
13	inherent inaccuracy? Or do you do you think
14	they're aware of that or not?
15	MS. ULLMAN: Well, in the survey, and I
16	don't remember the statistics exactly, but it was
17	approximately at least 40 percent thought it was 15
18	percent or less, within 15 percent. And this was a
19	fairly sophisticated group, because they all took it
20	online, so they were all Googling, and they could
21	certainly look up to see that it was 20 percent. So,
22	yeah, I don't think I think there are a lot of

1 people that have no idea, and I do think we need labeling. 2 3 DR. CLARKE: Questions? MS. BOWMAN: My name is Cynthia Bowman. I'm 4 from Long Island Jewish Medical Center. And I was 5 just wondering how you would tie in -- I mean, I 6 realize the total testing process is pre-analytic and 7 analytic and post-analytic. And you know, you have to 8 9 equate glucose monitoring with wave testing. And the definition is -- you know, the fundamental definition 10 is it's so simple that you won't make a mistake. 11 And 12 if you do make a mistake, it doesn't matter. It was 13 part of the, you know, fundamental definition of wave 14 testing. 15 But how much do you think that actually contributes? I mean, do you think that still 16 17 contributes to some sort of devaluing of it? As many 18 fail-safes as you put in, et cetera, do you think that, especially in the hospital setting, that people 19 20 take it as seriously as they should? Do you think that 21 that actually gets in the way of taking it seriously? 22 For anybody.

1	DR. HARPER: You know, I'll leave the
2	clinical comments to the clinicians, but I would like
3	to comment that Carol Benson tomorrow will be giving a
4	talk on sort of the difference between CLIA
5	requirements she's not going to go into it a lot,
6	but I'll mention that anything that's cleared over the
7	counter is actually automatically waived. So the
8	evaluation that goes into a device that actually gets
9	evaluated for being simple and having those fail-safe
10	processes isn't actually implemented for all over-the-
11	counter reviews. So that is something that perhaps is
12	not in place necessarily for all over-the- counter
13	product reviews, including including this.
14	Now, that doesn't mean we don't assess any
15	user factors or the ability of users to use these
16	devices. But it definitely is a place where if people
17	are assuming that these devices have gone through that
18	type of evaluation, that actually isn't true.
19	MS. BOWMAN: I mean, in that grueling
20	hospital environment, one of the things we find is a
21	resistance to proper technique. I mean, these are
22	supposed to be easy. Plus, you know, in their defense,

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

		14
1	they're very busy. They're doing many other things, et	
2	cetera, et cetera. But you know, doing the QC, paying	
3	attention time after time to the technique, et cetera,	
4	et cetera, is sometimes devalued. And, you know, I	
5	realize it's not just the meter that you're looking at	
6	here when you're looking at accuracy. You're looking	
7	at the whole process.	
8	DR. SCOTT: I'll take a shot at that, and	
9	also maybe try to get a discussion amongst the panel	
10	members here, because I don't think there's a single	
11	shy person up here, so	
12	The total testing process is really more	
13	than just the meter. I was talking with Gary Tobin,	
14	who heads our diabetes clinics in St. Louis, just last	
15	week. And he believes that errors in the meters are	
16	just a small component of the total number of errors	
17	that are made in the intensive care units. There's	
18	errors in dosing; there's errors in timing. But	
19	and I think Dr. Ginsberg made this point the errors	
20	of the meters are a small part. But it's sort of like	
21	Toyota, you know. They've got a brake problem and	
22	they've got an acceleration problem. And to say,	

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

142

1	well, we're going to ignore the brake problem, because
2	the acceleration problem is bigger. Fix what we can,
3	I mean one step at a time. And meters are certainly
4	one of those steps that I think we can fix.
5	I'm tossing that out to Barry.
6	DR. GINSBERG: Actually, probably the
7	biggest error in glucose monitoring is one that I
8	don't think I had on my slides, although I may have,
9	in the home setting. And probably the biggest single
10	error is hand-washing. That, you know, all the meters
11	say wash your hands before you do a test. Well, it
12	turns out nobody does. We actually studied that, and
13	at least four out of five patients did not wash their
14	hands, including our director of blood glucose
15	monitoring marketing, who had diabetes, and didn't
16	wash his hands before he did it. I came in one day,
17	and our head of a lab was bashing me as I walked in
18	the door, that "your meter is so inaccurate." You
19	know, "I don't have diabetes, and I'm getting a
20	reading of 300." Well, it turns out she had just
21	eaten a banana, and the banana was on her hands. We
22	had to wash her hands, the blood glucose was back down

1 to 80.

Then if you have Chips A'hoy on your hands, 2 that will raise your blood glucose by 200 to 300 3 points. That's as bad as talking about with the 4 icodextrins(ph), that hand-washing is a critical 5 factor in these things. There's probably nothing you 6 can do -- nothing you can do in the meter to protect 7 against that. And part of it is that the drop of 8 9 blood that you take now is so small. For those of you who don't -- I assume you all know this, but if you 10 11 don't, the average meter is now running .3 to .5 12 microliters. If you were to look at that on a piece 13 of paper, that's a decimal point. That's the dot at the end of the period is how much blood you need to 14 15 run one of those things. 16 Well, it doesn't take very much glucose to 17 raise that drop of blood by a lot, and that's a big 18 error. And I'm not suggesting in the least that we don't need better accuracy of meters. 19 What I'm 20 suggesting is that not everybody needs better accuracy 21 of meters. And a better accuracy of meters means that 22 you have to give up something, that you have to go

		Τ4
1	back to a hanging drop, or you have to go to a bigger	
2	meter, or you have to go to longer times. That's a	
3	consumer products issue.	
4	And some people, you'll need to go to	
5	hanging drops. And some people who don't like to go to	
6	bigger meters, and some people don't care. What's	
7	appropriate is to make people understand help	
8	people to understand what they need and how they get	
9	it, and then give them the information they need to	
10	make that decision properly.	
11	DR. HARPER: So I have maybe something to	
12	add to that, because I agree that certainly user	
13	errors and perhaps of unawareness of the things that	
14	might impact a glucose result definitely do contribute	
15	to error. But what I'd like to point out is that that	
16	error is actually not captured in the numbers that we	
17	were talking about earlier today in terms of the	
18	requirements. So that error is above and beyond the	
19	data that FDA, for example, sees when they're clearing	
20	or approving a glucose device.	
21	So the studies that we see are performed in	
22	the laboratory, or they're performed in cases where	

1 maybe a layuser comes in. And they probably make sure 2 they wash their hands. 3 DR. GINSBERG: Absolutely. DR. HARPER: So -- so although we may not be 4 able to address every single source of error, we can 5 certainly try to increase education and awareness. 6 Like Mitch said, we actually -- I'd like to see if we 7 could focus on the types of error that perhaps we can 8 9 address, because the error that you're referring to is on top of the 20 percent. So what you're seeing is 10 11 that, you know, you have the 20 percent error inherent 12 in the system, in an ideal situation, plus any added 13 error based on use. 14 MR. TORJMAN: Marc Torjman, Cooper 15 University Hospital. I think you've probably answered my question. But what I was wondering is whether there 16 17 are requirements for the manufacturers to actually 18 alert the patient when a glucose value is -- is out of range, and how you define this out of range is an open 19 20 question, I guess. But does the agency require that, 21 so that a patient who is at home at least has some 22 idea that they need to repeat the measurement, as

146 1 opposed to the -- in the hospital setting, where the clinicians tend to make those decisions and send a 2 blood sample to the laboratory to make sure that they 3 have an accurate value? That's not the case with the 4 5 home use. DR. HARPER: Yes, that's definitely a 6 So the home user does not have another 7 challenge. method to rely on to check a value, and I think in 8 9 most cases, a false result may be unidentifiable to the patient. 10 Probably the only way a patient might be 11 12 able to determine when a meter is not working, and 13 this is if it's a systemic problem, is if they do the recommended control material testing. 14 We've heard, 15 though, that a lot of patients may not do that as often as perhaps is recommended. So if, you know, a 16 17 reduced amount of control material testing is done, 18 then they may not catch any inherent problems with 19 their meter. And also if it's a sporadic issue. If 20 it's not hand washing, if it's a sample application 21 issue, if it's something like that that's specific to 22 that one test strip, then I think that there is a

1 problem that the patients at home wouldn't be able to identify. 2 3 DR. GINSBERG: Let me raise a question. We're dealing with two separate items, and we're 4 dealing with them together, which is probably 5 inappropriate. 6 7 When we talk about a blood glucose which is really 240 but measures out 360, there we're talking 8 9 about an outlier. And outliers occur at .1 percent or less, so one in a thousand strips will be there. 10 Ι mean, they happen, and I think we ought to be paying 11 more attention to them, but they're not that common. 12 13 When we talk about a 20 percent error, which we're saying 95 percent of the values would be that, 14 15 and we do the ISO testing, the other five percent are 16 not out at 400. They're at 21 percent, 22 percent --17 they're not way out there. They're pretty close. 18 On 240, a 20 percent error is 48. So you're looking at 200 to 280. That's a big difference, but 19 in terms of insulin dose, that's only one unit for 20 21 most people. And that the absorption change in insulin, if you give somebody six units, the 22

		148
1	variability of giving to the same patient in the same	
2	place with the same syringe or same pen or same pump	
3	at exactly the same time of day is 20 to 35 percent.	
4	So they're going to be one and a half to two units off	
5	just because the insulin's so variable.	
6	MR. TORJMAN: Thank you.	
7	MS. ULLMAN: And I would add that one unit	
8	in a two- year-old is huge.	
9	DR. GINSBERG: I'm sorry, I agree with that,	
10	because a unit she was only taking two units. But	
11	in a two- year-old, 40 wouldn't be a unit. Forty	
12	would be a quarter of a unit.	
13	MS. ALLBRIGHT: Hi, I'm Ann Allbright. I'm	
14	the Director of the Division of Diabetes at the CDC.	
15	I'm going to ask the panel a question that I hope will	
16	spark some discussion. From the public health	
17	perspective, meter accuracy is absolutely critical for	
18	patients who are testing for their management, and	
19	certainly for hospital use. But there is another end	
20	of the spectrum, and that is really the screening	
21	arena. And it's very controversial, and those of us	
22	in public health deal with this every day.	
1		

149

1	So comments from the panel about not
2	diagnosis of diabetes, but screening, and where it's
3	used. And there's actually a reasonable amount of
4	evidence that suggests that people are much more
5	responsive for follow- up if their screening
6	conversation involves a blood measure of some sort, as
7	opposed to paper and pencil risk test.
8	So I'd be interested in the panel's comments
9	on that, particularly as we're now moving into the
10	arena of needing to identify people with pre-diabetes,
11	get them into having conversations, and now developing
12	a national prevention program.
13	So, eager to hear the panel's comments on
14	screening using monitoring.
15	MS. BERNHARDT: Well, currently, the FDA
16	does not clear meters for screening or diagnosis.
17	We're well aware that they're used in that manner,
18	especially like at health fairs and stuff, but just
19	informationally, they are not cleared for that use.
20	DR. CLARKE: If I may say something as a
21	pediatrician who whose parents and grandparents
22	who has parents and grandparents who are forever

1	screening their children and their grandchildren, and
2	calling at all hours of the night with blood sugars
3	that are 150 and 160 or 40, and these are in children
4	who don't have diabetes. And this necessitates quite
5	a large workup, because they are either their local
6	physician will not see those children. They are sent
7	immediately to the medical center with the diagnosis
8	of diabetes, which they most of the time do not have.
9	So that I think that if we had something
10	that was more accurate in terms of screening, I think
11	that would be a tremendous asset, but it would need to
12	be in every system, it wouldn't need to you know,
13	because it's grandmother's meter that is usually the
14	impetus for the patient to come to the hospital the
15	next day.
16	DR. GINSBERG: I'm going to disagree again.
17	If you had a more accurate meter and you took it from
18	20 percent down to 10 percent, what that would mean is
19	for an average value of 120, instead of being 120 plus
20	or minus 24, it would be 120 minus 12. So you'd go
21	from 144 to 132. That's not going to make a big
22	difference in your phone calls.

	1
1	And as to Ann's question, I think that's
2	it's a very interesting question, that when you look
3	at impairing glucose tolerance, which I think is one
4	of the major risk factors that you're looking for, an
5	hour after a meal, you're looking for a blood glucose
6	value of 200 or more. And so if you take the 20
7	percent accuracy where we are now, that would say that
8	if you're looking for 200, your 95 percent confidence
9	limit is 160 to 240. The upper side is no problem, you
10	still have over 200, you still have impaired glucose
11	tolerance.
12	The problem is, what happens if you're low?
13	Well, I would actually say, you know, if somebody two
14	having offer a meal has a glusses welve of 100 they we
	hours after a meal has a glucose value of 160, they're
15	still somebody you want to look at. So I think while
15 16	
	still somebody you want to look at. So I think while
16	still somebody you want to look at. So I think while they're not as accurate as you'd like for this, I
16 17	still somebody you want to look at. So I think while they're not as accurate as you'd like for this, I think they still meet the needs.
16 17 18	still somebody you want to look at. So I think while they're not as accurate as you'd like for this, I think they still meet the needs. DR. KLONOFF: I'd like to comment on this
16 17 18 19	still somebody you want to look at. So I think while they're not as accurate as you'd like for this, I think they still meet the needs. DR. KLONOFF: I'd like to comment on this discussion and where I see this is going. I feel that
16 17 18 19 20	<pre>still somebody you want to look at. So I think while they're not as accurate as you'd like for this, I think they still meet the needs.         DR. KLONOFF: I'd like to comment on this discussion and where I see this is going. I feel that the group has already accomplished a lot. When this</pre>

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	this meeting could be very confrontational and that
2	perhaps the FDA would be making demands of industry
3	that it would be very difficult to achieve. Perhaps
4	industry would be refusing to budge on the products
5	that they're producing.
6	In fact, I'm seeing this as very collegial,
7	and for the most part, it seems as if the two groups
8	are coming together very well. Plus the medical and
9	academic communities, everybody seems to agree that we
10	need in general lower standards for accuracy, go down
11	from 20 to around 15. That's the number that keeps
	-
12	coming up.
	coming up. And what I think is happening is that when
12	
12 13	And what I think is happening is that when
12 13 14	And what I think is happening is that when the FDA is setting standards, these are regulatory
12 13 14 15	And what I think is happening is that when the FDA is setting standards, these are regulatory standards. A regulatory standard means this is
12 13 14 15 16	And what I think is happening is that when the FDA is setting standards, these are regulatory standards. A regulatory standard means this is something that's achievable. When doctors make
12 13 14 15 16 17	And what I think is happening is that when the FDA is setting standards, these are regulatory standards. A regulatory standard means this is something that's achievable. When doctors make requests or standards, we tend to talk about what's
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	And what I think is happening is that when the FDA is setting standards, these are regulatory standards. A regulatory standard means this is something that's achievable. When doctors make requests or standards, we tend to talk about what's needed. Those are clinical standards. We can say
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	And what I think is happening is that when the FDA is setting standards, these are regulatory standards. A regulatory standard means this is something that's achievable. When doctors make requests or standards, we tend to talk about what's needed. Those are clinical standards. We can say we're like the ADA, we want five percent accuracy or

1	achievable, either in terms of the technology or in
2	terms of making it economically viable. I mean, for
3	enough money, you probably could get a device that's
4	extremely accurate, but the cost would be impossible.
5	So what I think we're seeing here is a very
6	healthy process. I see that industry is responding to
7	the the sense that they're hearing from FDA, from
8	what they're hearing from the clinical and the medical
9	community, that something has to be done. The
10	standards have to become at a lower number. And there
11	are some issues that still have to be resolved, such
12	as do hospital use meters need the same standards as
13	outpatient use meters? That's probably going to be
14	discussed some here.
15	The kind of process that we're seeing
16	reminds me of how standards are set in other
17	industries. I'll give you an example. I'm from
18	California, and almost every hospital in California
19	now is being replaced because of the seismic act of
20	earthquakes. And we realized in California in the
21	'70s after the San Fernando earthquake that we needed
22	some hospital seismic security activities, and the

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	Hospital Seismic Security Act was passed right around
2	the time that blood glucose monitoring came to the
3	forefront. And as blood glucose monitor standards
4	have been getting tighter over the years, so has
5	hospital seismic security.
6	And what happens is that about every ten to
7	20 years, it's announced that every hospital is going
8	to have to withstand an even greater earthquake, or
9	they have to shut down. So essentially, all the
10	hospitals get rebuilt. We've just seen the most
11	expensive hospital in the history of California built,
12	which is the Ronald Reagan UCLA Medical Center. That
13	cost over a billion dollars. What'll happen in
14	another 20 years is the earthquake requirements are
15	going to get even stiffer, and even modern hospitals
16	like Ronald Reagan, my own hospital, Mills-Peninsula,
17	and many others are going to be deemed behind the
18	times.
19	This is just a natural evolution as the
20	technology improves, and it's going to happen with
21	blood glucose monitoring. But what I really have
22	enjoyed about the meeting so far is seeing that people

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

	1
1	really are getting together. We see the need. We're
2	not going to get to zero percent today, just like
3	we're not going to get to a medical center in
4	California that will withstand every possible
5	earthquake. But it's a gradual process, and every
6	once in a while things get tighter and tighter. That's
7	what's happening with blood glucose monitoring.
8	So I wanted to really commend what I think
9	must e a lot of really good behind-the-scenes work by
10	FDA people and by industry people and AdvaMed to get
11	to this collegial point. Because it didn't
12	automatically seem like it was going to happen, but it
13	is happening. So, thanks to everybody.
14	MS. RUTHERFORD: Diane Rutherford again with
15	Ken Block Consulting in Dallas.
16	What I brought up earlier was the dose
17	accuracy issue with syringes. What you had said the
18	difference between one unit and two on a child, is
19	very significant. But if I recall correctly, the
20	tolerance on one unit could you could be giving two
21	and still meet the syringe requirements. So I would
22	think that would still be a concern on some level.

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

		156
1	Also, you guys are talking about re-testing	
2	high values, it seems to be. And basically, it sounds	
3	like if you get a value you like, you accept it. If	
4	you get a value you don't like, you're going to re-	
5	test and see if it's really the right number. So how	
6	many of the numbers that we like are actually	
7	accurate?	
8	DR. CLARKE: That's an exceedingly important	
9	question, and who would like to answer that?	
10	MR. CEMBROWSKI: Hi. George Cembrowski,	
11	University of Alberta. The test is as good as the	
12	drop of blood that is derived from the patient. I'm	
13	wondering if someone has done any theoretic	
14	calculations as to how well we can measure this drop	
15	of blood as the volumes get smaller and smaller and	
16	the analytic time decreases, as well. I think we're	
17	hitting a wall, and I'm thinking that there are all	
18	kinds of reasons for bad results. A hypertensive	
19	patient in Alberta winters, the drop of blood is	
20	mercilessly evaporating once it comes out of the	
21	patient; the nurse might not be all that good at	
22	moving that drop of blood to the instrument. I'm	

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	wondering if, especially in the ICU, whether we can
2	even achieve 100 percent of the time, a CV of five
3	percent measuring a drop of blood. And I'm wondering
4	Dr. Ginsberg is probably the numbers guy. Could
5	you throw some numbers around?
6	DR. GINSBERG: I actually think that a drop
7	of blood is probably a bad way to measure blood in an
8	ICU. That you have patients who may be hypotensive;
9	they may be over-hydrated, they may be under-hydrated,
10	and all of those add a lot to the inaccuracy of a drop
11	of blood in ICU. I think a venous and arterial is
12	probably a much better way to do it in ICU.
13	Unfortunately, not all meters are calibrated
14	appropriately for venous/arterial blood. As we've
15	talked about today, a number of the meters are very
16	oxygen- sensitive. All the glucose oxidase meters,
17	all the oxidase biocenters are, or should be, oxygen-
18	sensitive. If the oxygen is high, the reading is going
19	to be low. If the oxygen is low, the reading is high.
20	They are calibrated to capillary blood, but capillary
21	blood is a bad way I think a bad way to go in the
22	ICU.

1 That said, I'm not a hospital expert. Ι 2 haven't done anything in the hospital for over 20 3 years. MS. HARPER: So, if there -- if there were a 4 need for, and it sounds like there is, obviously, 5 because these products have migrated into the ICU and 6 other hospital settings even though they're not --7 they're tested or intended for those facilities. Since 8 9 there is a need there, what type of -- you know, we're talking a lot about requirements. We've heard a lot 10 about, you know, that maybe ten percent accuracy might 11 be a minimum needed for that type of environment. 12 But 13 how do you design a study -- I'd like to hear from some of the -- the clinical people - - how do you 14 15 design a study to demonstrate that in that population 16 in the ICU, that you have a device that performs 17 adequately? 18 DR. SCOTT: They are difficult studies to 19 do. I mean, your outcomes are going to be fairly rare 20 events. I mean, look at NICE-SUGER. They had a three 21 percent difference in mortality, and it took 6,000 22 patients to determine that. But, I mean, ideally what

1 you would do is randomize patients in units to current 2 meters versus something that is far more accurate, and track outcomes. 3 But I think the end required for that study 4 5 is going to be quite large. DR. HARPER: So that's definitely true for 6 clinical determinations of benefit or perhaps 7 accuracy. But I'm also interested in hearing how you 8 9 believe that, you know, because I agree that perhaps capillary blood might not be appropriate in some very 10 sick patients, or things like that. Analytically, how 11 12 would you determine for the range of types of patients 13 that might be seen in hospitals just what type of analytical study? Because right now we do, as Pat 14 15 pointed out, you know, we have 100 patients, and they do 100 capillary samples, and that's the performance. 16 17 Is that enough for something in the ICU, or not? 18 That's .... DR. SCOTT: I think the closest that 19 20 addressed that was a study that Brad Carrone (ph) did 21 at Mayo, where they simultaneously drew all three 22 types of samples and then sent a venous sample to the

<ul> <li>main laboratory. And I presented those findings, or</li> <li>actually the capillary, which surprised me, because I</li> <li>tend to agree with what who was it, was it George</li> <li>that said that finger-sticks may not be the ideal</li> <li>sample in intensive care units. But that was a</li> <li>reasonably well designed study, in my opinion. And I</li> <li>think it's going to be very meter-dependent. That was</li> <li>done with one of the newer meters.</li> <li>DR. KLONOFF: One feature of a study that</li> <li>was suggested earlier is that you make sure that there</li> <li>are enough data points in the hypoglycemic range.</li> <li>That's what we did when we had our continuous glucose</li> <li>monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We</li> <li>ended up stipulating that there has to be some</li> <li>hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you</li> <li>know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look</li> <li>just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look</li> <li>to bad on the analytic. But you have to have some</li> <li>hypoglycemic points.</li> <li>DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of</li> <li>ICU patients is, the hundred patients that you do for</li> </ul>			10
<ul> <li>tend to agree with what who was it, was it George</li> <li>that said that finger-sticks may not be the ideal</li> <li>sample in intensive care units. But that was a</li> <li>reasonably well designed study, in my opinion. And I</li> <li>think it's going to be very meter-dependent. That was</li> <li>done with one of the newer meters.</li> <li>DR. KLONOFF: One feature of a study that</li> <li>was suggested earlier is that you make sure that there</li> <li>are enough data points in the hypoglycemic range.</li> <li>That's what we did when we had our continuous glucose</li> <li>monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We</li> <li>ended up stipulating that there has to be some</li> <li>hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you</li> <li>know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look</li> <li>too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some</li> <li>hypoglycemic points.</li> <li>DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of</li> </ul>	1	main laboratory. And I presented those findings, or	
<ul> <li>4 that said that finger-sticks may not be the ideal</li> <li>5 sample in intensive care units. But that was a</li> <li>6 reasonably well designed study, in my opinion. And I</li> <li>7 think it's going to be very meter-dependent. That was</li> <li>8 done with one of the newer meters.</li> <li>9 DR. KLONOFF: One feature of a study that</li> <li>10 was suggested earlier is that you make sure that there</li> <li>11 are enough data points in the hypoglycemic range.</li> <li>12 That's what we did when we had our continuous glucose</li> <li>13 monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We</li> <li>14 ended up stipulating that there has to be some</li> <li>15 hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you</li> <li>16 know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look</li> <li>17 just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look</li> <li>18 too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some</li> <li>19 hypoglycemic points.</li> </ul>	2	actually the capillary, which surprised me, because I	
<ul> <li>sample in intensive care units. But that was a</li> <li>reasonably well designed study, in my opinion. And I</li> <li>think it's going to be very meter-dependent. That was</li> <li>done with one of the newer meters.</li> <li>DR. KLONOFF: One feature of a study that</li> <li>was suggested earlier is that you make sure that there</li> <li>are enough data points in the hypoglycemic range.</li> <li>That's what we did when we had our continuous glucose</li> <li>monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We</li> <li>ended up stipulating that there has to be some</li> <li>hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you</li> <li>know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look</li> <li>just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look</li> <li>too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some</li> <li>hypoglycemic points.</li> <li>DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of</li> </ul>	3	tend to agree with what who was it, was it George	
<ul> <li>reasonably well designed study, in my opinion. And I</li> <li>think it's going to be very meter-dependent. That was</li> <li>done with one of the newer meters.</li> <li>DR. KLONOFF: One feature of a study that</li> <li>was suggested earlier is that you make sure that there</li> <li>are enough data points in the hypoglycemic range.</li> <li>That's what we did when we had our continuous glucose</li> <li>monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We</li> <li>ended up stipulating that there has to be some</li> <li>hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you</li> <li>know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look</li> <li>just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look</li> <li>too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some</li> <li>hypoglycemic points.</li> <li>DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of</li> </ul>	4	that said that finger-sticks may not be the ideal	
<ul> <li>7 think it's going to be very meter-dependent. That was</li> <li>8 done with one of the newer meters.</li> <li>9 DR. KLONOFF: One feature of a study that</li> <li>10 was suggested earlier is that you make sure that there</li> <li>11 are enough data points in the hypoglycemic range.</li> <li>12 That's what we did when we had our continuous glucose</li> <li>13 monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We</li> <li>14 ended up stipulating that there has to be some</li> <li>15 hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you</li> <li>16 know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look</li> <li>17 just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look</li> <li>18 too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some</li> <li>19 hypoglycemic points.</li> <li>20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of</li> </ul>	5	sample in intensive care units. But that was a	
<ul> <li>8 done with one of the newer meters.</li> <li>9 DR. KLONOFF: One feature of a study that</li> <li>10 was suggested earlier is that you make sure that there</li> <li>11 are enough data points in the hypoglycemic range.</li> <li>12 That's what we did when we had our continuous glucose</li> <li>13 monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We</li> <li>14 ended up stipulating that there has to be some</li> <li>15 hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you</li> <li>16 know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look</li> <li>17 just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look</li> <li>18 too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some</li> <li>19 hypoglycemic points.</li> <li>20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of</li> </ul>	6	reasonably well designed study, in my opinion. And I	
9 DR. KLONOFF: One feature of a study that 10 was suggested earlier is that you make sure that there 11 are enough data points in the hypoglycemic range. 12 That's what we did when we had our continuous glucose 13 monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We 14 ended up stipulating that there has to be some 15 hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you 16 know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look 17 just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look 18 too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some 19 hypoglycemic points. 20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of	7	think it's going to be very meter-dependent. That was	
<ul> <li>10 was suggested earlier is that you make sure that there</li> <li>11 are enough data points in the hypoglycemic range.</li> <li>12 That's what we did when we had our continuous glucose</li> <li>13 monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We</li> <li>14 ended up stipulating that there has to be some</li> <li>15 hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you</li> <li>16 know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look</li> <li>17 just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look</li> <li>18 too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some</li> <li>19 hypoglycemic points.</li> <li>20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of</li> </ul>	8	done with one of the newer meters.	
11 are enough data points in the hypoglycemic range. 12 That's what we did when we had our continuous glucose 13 monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We 14 ended up stipulating that there has to be some 15 hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you 16 know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look 17 just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look 18 too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some 19 hypoglycemic points. 20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of	9	DR. KLONOFF: One feature of a study that	
12 That's what we did when we had our continuous glucose 13 monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We 14 ended up stipulating that there has to be some 15 hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you 16 know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look 17 just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look 18 too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some 19 hypoglycemic points. 20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of	10	was suggested earlier is that you make sure that there	
13 monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We 14 ended up stipulating that there has to be some 15 hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you 16 know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look 17 just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look 18 too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some 19 hypoglycemic points. 20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of	11	are enough data points in the hypoglycemic range.	
<ul> <li>ended up stipulating that there has to be some</li> <li>hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you</li> <li>know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look</li> <li>just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look</li> <li>too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some</li> <li>hypoglycemic points.</li> <li>DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of</li> </ul>	12	That's what we did when we had our continuous glucose	
15 hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you 16 know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look 17 just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look 18 too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some 19 hypoglycemic points. 20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of	13	monitoring performance guidelines through CLSI. We	
16 know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look 17 just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look 18 too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some 19 hypoglycemic points. 20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of	14	ended up stipulating that there has to be some	
17 just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look 18 too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some 19 hypoglycemic points. 20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of	15	hypoglycemic points. Otherwise, you get this, you	
18 too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some 19 hypoglycemic points. 20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of	16	know, 180 to 240 syndrome, and you can certainly look	
19 hypoglycemic points. 20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of	17	just fine on the error grid, and you don't even look	
20 DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of	18	too bad on the analytic. But you have to have some	
-	19	hypoglycemic points.	
21 ICU patients is, the hundred patients that you do for	20	DR. GINSBERG: The other point in terms of	
	21	ICU patients is, the hundred patients that you do for	
22 a supplementary blood glucose study is because the	22	a supplementary blood glucose study is because the	

1	assumption, with some reason behind it, is that out in
2	at home, that most patients are fairly healthy and
3	are similar, although you do ask that you have a wide
4	variety of races involved.
5	When you go to the ICU, I think a hundred
6	patients in insufficient. I think you need to start
7	categorizing by kind of patient, and look at the
8	various kinds of patients you're going to have in
9	terms of hypotensive, under-hydrated, over-hydrated,
10	and so on, as well as a wide variety of blood glucose
11	So I'd be surprised if a hundred was enough.
12	MR. MELKER: Richard Melker, University of
12 13	MR. MELKER: Richard Melker, University of Florida College of Medicine. I could change the tone
13	Florida College of Medicine. I could change the tone
13 14	Florida College of Medicine. I could change the tone of the meeting, but (laughter from audience)
13 14 15	Florida College of Medicine. I could change the tone of the meeting, but (laughter from audience) I've elected not to. But number one, the first thing
13 14 15 16	Florida College of Medicine. I could change the tone of the meeting, but (laughter from audience) I've elected not to. But number one, the first thing I'd like to say is that everybody talks about meter
13 14 15 16 17	Florida College of Medicine. I could change the tone of the meeting, but (laughter from audience) I've elected not to. But number one, the first thing I'd like to say is that everybody talks about meter accuracy. It's really the test strips that are the
13 14 15 16 17 18	Florida College of Medicine. I could change the tone of the meeting, but (laughter from audience) I've elected not to. But number one, the first thing I'd like to say is that everybody talks about meter accuracy. It's really the test strips that are the issue. It's not the meters. The meters are very
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Florida College of Medicine. I could change the tone of the meeting, but (laughter from audience) I've elected not to. But number one, the first thing I'd like to say is that everybody talks about meter accuracy. It's really the test strips that are the issue. It's not the meters. The meters are very accurate. It's the test strips that deteriorate over

1	the manufacturers use when a patient gets an
2	inaccurate reading and gives themselves an
3	inappropriate dose of insulin. I I've done a lot
4	of studies on myself, since I'm a Type I diabetic, and
5	so I have to consent myself for studies, which is fun.
6	But I'll actually run my glucose up and down on
7	purpose in order to test glucose meters. And so I'd
8	like to ask Dr. Ginsberg, if I open a vial of test
9	strips and I test the first time and the number is
10	175, and I immediately take another drop of blood and
11	put another strip in the same meter and it's 200, and
12	then I immediately take out another strip and I put in
13	the meter, it's 225 if I had taken any one of those
14	individually and tried to calculate that it was plus
15	or minus 20 percent, you realize how confusing it
16	becomes to the patient when they only did one of those
17	three. I'd like to say that the middle one was the
18	average of the three, but you don't know that if you
19	only take one, and one of them is 175 and one is 225.
20	The last thing I want to say is what you
21	said about hand washing, which I think is really
22	interesting. Because if you wash your hands and you

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	don't dry them really well, you get low glucose
2	readings, because you have water on your hands. So
3	not washing your hands is a problem, and washing your
4	hands and not drying which takes a fair amount of
5	time to do properly is a problem.
6	The other problem with not drying your hands
7	completely is if you open the vial and you take a
8	glucose test strip out while your hands are wet, you
9	can ruin all the other test strips in that vial.
10	Nobody teaches patients about any of these issues, so
11	have at any of them.
12	MS. HARPER: Well, I personally really
12 13	MS. HARPER: Well, I personally really appreciate those comments, because these are things
13	appreciate those comments, because these are things
13 14	appreciate those comments, because these are things that, you know we always struggle with labeling.
13 14 15	appreciate those comments, because these are things that, you know we always struggle with labeling. We heard some really good comments today that may help
13 14 15 16	appreciate those comments, because these are things that, you know we always struggle with labeling. We heard some really good comments today that may help us with that, including this one. Labeling isn't,
13 14 15 16 17	appreciate those comments, because these are things that, you know we always struggle with labeling. We heard some really good comments today that may help us with that, including this one. Labeling isn't, obviously, the the be-all, end-all, and it
13 14 15 16 17 18	appreciate those comments, because these are things that, you know we always struggle with labeling. We heard some really good comments today that may help us with that, including this one. Labeling isn't, obviously, the the be-all, end-all, and it certainly isn't the answer to all. But the more input
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	appreciate those comments, because these are things that, you know we always struggle with labeling. We heard some really good comments today that may help us with that, including this one. Labeling isn't, obviously, the the be-all, end-all, and it certainly isn't the answer to all. But the more input we can get on how we can help to develop clearer

		164
1	DR. CLARKE: And take it from someone who	
2	one night was testing a continuous glucose sensor, and	
3	it was the alarm went off to put in the glucose	
4	reading, and we were just finishing up dessert. And	
5	it was this wonderful English, what is it, you know,	
6	trifle, that's right. And I licked my finger, and got	
7	a glucose of 222 and nearly passed out, and wondered	
8	what in the world I was going to do next. Yeah,	
9	washing your hands is really an important thing to do.	
10	DR. CARISKI: Alan Cariski, LifeScan OPS	
11	California. I think this is an issue that's been	
12	addressed tangentially, but I just wanted to make it a	
13	little clearer and get some comment from the panel.	
14	It's true that the accuracy standards are plus/minus	
15	20 percent, plus/minus 15, but that's for populations,	
16	whereas the precision is closer to five or six	
17	percent, so that the variability that any individual	
18	patient will see is generally going to be a lot less	
19	than plus/minus 20 percent, because the things that	
20	affect the accuracy of the strip are going to be	
21	pretty constant to that patient the hematocrit, the	
22	uric acid, et cetera, et cetera. I was wondering if	

1 the panel agrees or disagrees. Thank you. Well, for some of that, it 2 DR. HARPER: 3 depends on if you're comparing two results or not. Ι mean, if the patient has a hematocrit, it may actually 4 affect the true value. I mean, it may actually affect 5 the reading. 6 7 MR. MELKER: (Inaudible, off-mike) the next glucose is going to be off by the same amount? 8 9 DR. HARPER: Right. But your comment that -- you're commenting that this may not be a problem 10 with 20 percent total error in an individual patient, 11 12 and I'm saying it's possible it could be that or more 13 if they have a high or low hematocrit. So it could actually -- or an interfering substance, or something 14 15 like that. So, it's -- imprecision is certainly part 16 of it, and certainly where there are not other issues, 17 it is part of the total error. But it isn't 18 necessarily the only part of the total error that might lead somebody to treat on a number that isn't 19 20 really the true number. 21 DR. CLARKE: Next? 22 MAJOR MANN: Major Mann again from the Army

		166
1	Burn Center. One thing that really concerned us when	
2	we discovered the hematocrit effect on our point of	
3	care glucometer was when we approached the lab, and we	
4	use CLIA or we use CLIP, rather than CLIA,	
5	actually, in the military they said, well, the	
6	meters meet all of our standards. And we looked at	
7	the fine print, and they were supposed to test the	
8	meters on normal subjects. And our subjects, our burn	
9	patients, actually have a hematocrit of 24 percent.	
10	And so that is below the meter accuracy that's on the	
11	label of our glucometer. So there's a big disconnect	
12	in the providers understanding the variability within	
13	these meters, as well as the meters that we tested	
14	that said that they have an accuracy to 20 percent	
15	hematocrit. Frankly, that wasn't true, either, in our	
16	data that we collected.	
17	So I guess one of my concerns would be that	
18	there would be a requirement within the hospital,	
19	within an ICU, to test the device that you're going to	
20	use on the patients you intend to use it, not on	
21	normal controls.	
22	And furthermore, as I had mentioned before,	

1	I think a study that you can do an outcome study
2	clearly is not feasible to do any kind of morbidity or
3	mortality. But it's very simple to do an outcome study
4	on rates of hypoglycemia using different meters. And
5	that's exactly what we did, and we found that once we
6	changed to the corrected value, we stopped having
7	occult hypoglycemia, and this means the matched blood
8	that we sent to the lab was hypoglycemic, but the
9	point of care device was clearly in a normal range.
10	So I think that's a very easy study to do to
11	test meter performance in a variety of subjects.
12	Thank you.
13	DR. GINSBERG: Let me actually comment on
14	that.
15	Hematocrit is actually much more complicated
16	than that. Part of it is that no meter is a pure
17	whole blood glucose meter, and no meter is a pure
18	plasma meter. They are all somewhere in between. And
19	so based upon an average hematocrit, they then put in
20	a correction factor to bring you to a plasma value.
21	And if the hematocrit's not correct, then that
22	correction factor needs to be corrected. Many meters

have a correction factor within that, if they can
 measure the hematocrit.

But it also turns out that hematocrit --3 that the change in the volume of red blood cells can 4 5 also affect the reading in other ways. For example, the surface area of the electrode is a critical factor 6 in terms of current flow, which is the determinant of 7 -- of the blood glucose. The higher number of red 8 9 cells you have, the more red cells clog up, because the red cells don't pass that current -- clog up that 10 electrode, and you have to correct for that as well. 11

12 And for at least some companies I've seen, 13 the error in hematocrit can be huge. Not four or -14 when you correct plasma to glucose, that's a 12 15 percent correction at a hematocrit of 40. The 16 correction can be up to 50 percent, depending on the 17 particular meter, that meter/strip combination that 18 you're using.

19 So I applaud that you're correcting for the 20 correction from whole blood to plasma and changing the 21 hematocrit in that, but the correction is actually 22 more - - and you're doing something, but the

169 1 correction is actually more complicated than that. MAJOR MANN: If you're looking at a similar 2 patient population that all tend to be anemic, 3 wouldn't the normal correction sort of be consistent 4 5 across that population? DR. GINSBERG: Yes. 6 7 MAJOR MANN: You wouldn't use the same correction factor for a neonatal population as you 8 would for an anemic adult population --9 10 DR. GINSBERG: Right. MAJOR MANN: -- for example, so that you are 11 precise and maybe not accurate, but --12 13 DR. GINSBERG: Yeah. I -- I'm sorry. Ιf you were correcting using empirical data, I agree. 14 That's even better. 15 16 MAJOR MANN: Right. 17 DR. GINSBERG: I assumed you were correcting 18 just based upon taking the 12 percent for hematocrits. MAJOR MANN: We -- we actually take the 19 daily hematocrit. It is automatically extracted from 20 21 our patient care record in the electronic medical database, and the formula is embedded in our 22

		170
1	electronic medical record. So when the nurse enters	
2	the glucometer value, it automatically retrieves the	
3	most recent hematocrit value and matches to that most	
4	updated value. And we feel like a 24-hour or 12-hour	
5	hematocrit is pretty fine in a non-bleeding patient.	
6	And we again have had a decrease in the rate of	
7	hypoglycemia that's measurable compared to a unit that	
8	didn't correct, and their rate of hypoglycemia	
9	actually went up.	
10	So that's just a different type of study to	
11	think about.	
12	DR. KLONOFF: I'd like to comment.	
13	First, I think what you're doing does make	
14	sense in a specific group of patients. Second is we	
15	need to see more modeling data like what Marc did with	
16	Boris Kobichev. If we're going to find out what are	
17	the what are the clinical consequences of error,	
18	then either we do a study which basically, as Dr.	
19	Scott said, is impossible it's unethical, we're	
20	never going to do that or we get some modeling	
21	data.	
22	Modeling data is so useful. You can find	

1	out what's the frequency of hypoglycemia, what's the
2	frequency of different combinations, complications.
3	The modeling studies do require assumptions. Even
4	with all the equations, they're assumptions. And I
5	think that it would be very nice if others in this
6	room were to try to do a study similar to what Marc
7	and Boris did. Their study is the first of its kind
8	that's gone beyond looking at what happens to the
9	insulin dose with inaccuracy, but actually what then
10	goes on to happen to the blood glucose level. So it's
11	a pioneering, very important study.
12	But the basic idea of modeling what happens,
13	others could do it, too. And I think that if we see
14	more of this type of information brought forward,
15	we'll all have a better idea. Because we're saying,
16	well, we'd like more accuracy, but I think it's still
17	very difficult for all of us to get a handle on how
18	much accuracy do we really need, let alone what's it
19	going to cost. So let's see some more modeling
20	studies.
21	MR. SOUTHERLAND: Phil Southerland, Team
22	Type I. I've got a few comments which I hope will

1 maybe spark also some discussion.

2	I've had Type I since I was seven months
3	old, so almost 28 years now. So Ellen, I can relate
4	to what your son's going through. But in the first 25
5	years, I checked my blood sugar about 118,000 times,
6	which means at .01 percent of outliers, I've had 118
7	outliers, and then guess what? I've lived through
8	them.
9	But, you know, we've come a long way in that
10	time. My mom used to squeeze the urine out of my
11	diaper to get it onto a test strip to find out where
12	my blood sugar was four hours before, you know, where
13	I actually was. So here we are talking about a small
14	differential of percentages, but I do agree, David, to
15	what you said. We can keep moving the needle forward,
16	which is going to make the control better.
17	Also in the last three years, and using
18	continuous glucose modeling technology, I've checked
19	my blood sugar 109,000 times. Averaging the fact that
20	I pressed the button about a hundred times a day to
21	figure out not only where I am, but the trend in where
22	it's going. And if you look at the average person who

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

		17
1	checks two times a day, going on the basic math,	
2	that's .04 percent of the day that they know where the	
3	blood sugar is. You know, they have no idea what the	
4	trend's going, what direction it's going, and that	
5	creates a huge margin for user error and the effect	
6	that it might have.	
7	So can we, you know, start pushing for the	
8	Type I community who's on insulin using CGM, because	
9	that takes so much of the user out of it the majority	
10	of the time? And I do agree, there is still user	
11	error. Last Friday in advance of coming to this	
12	meeting, I checked with three different meters. One	
13	of them said 69; one of them said 150; another said	
14	213, all at the same time. So I checked again. Then	
15	another one said 78; one said 108; one said 113. And	
16	the third time, they were all around 102. You know,	
17	it's	
18	UNIDENTIFIED: Wash your hands?	
19	MR. SOUTHERLAND: I did wash my hands before	
20	that third test.	
21	(Laughter) But, you know, that user error,	
22	if I went on that first 213 and gave three units of	

1	insulin like I normally would, I'd have been in for
2	big trouble if I wouldn't have checked my blood sugar
3	45 minutes later like I always do after I give
4	insulin. So, I mean, where is where's the curve,
5	where do we need to go? Can we make this, you know,
6	five percent a little bit better?
7	The ICU, I've been in the hospital, and they
8	said, we're going to check your blood sugar every six
9	hours, and we're going to give you a shot of regular
10	insulin every six hours. You know, we're talking
11	about five percent in the meters, when I'm going to
12	use regular insulin, which I haven't used in ten
13	years? Where's the margin of error in that one?
14	DR. HARPER: Yes.
15	MR. SOUTHERLAND: Where do we draw the
16	lines?
17	DR. HARPER: Those are all good comments,
18	and I'd like to say, we are talking to not only do
19	we work with the glucose meter manufacturers, but we
20	also work with the CGM manufacturer community to try
21	and get them accurate enough so that people could
22	possibly in the future use them.

1	But I think you raise a good point about
2	standardization, and that came up earlier in one of
3	the talks. So I would like to hear perhaps from some
4	of the other panel members on whether there's a need
5	for increased standardization or not, given that at
6	least at home, single meters are used, and generally
7	multiple different types of meters are not used. Or
8	are they?
9	DR. KLONOFF: Phil, the problem that I think
10	happened to you that day was your 213 was one of these
11	five percent outliers that was really bad. And this
12	seems to be an area that people are now starting to
13	discuss. It's only in the last year or so that I'm
14	hearing much talk about it. And if I think
15	something should be done to address that five percent
16	group. And it has to either be at the most extreme
17	would be to eliminate it completely and say 100
18	percent have to be within range, or something that may
19	be more achievable is to just analyze that five
20	percent and say how it has to be distributed.
21	Currently, the worst of that five percent can be as
22	bad as you can imagine. But if something was done to

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1 tighten those up, those you would just never see a number like that again. 2 3 MR. SOUTHERLAND: And thank you, everyone in the room, for all the work you're doing. You're 4 5 making all of our lives better. Appreciate it. DR. BRETON: There was one -- one more thing 6 that I wanted to add, in that Phil is pointing at an 7 application of SMBG that we've barely discussed. 8 And 9 they're used to calibrate the continuous meters. And all right, you know, an error of ten or 15 percent 10 might not make a huge difference in your insulin dose, 11 12 especially if you have error in what's absorbed or 13 what's actually injected. But an error of ten percent will have a 14 15 dramatic effect on the calibration algorithm of a continuous meter. And that effect won't be apparent 16 17 when you calibrate; it will be apparent at your next 18 meal excursion. And now you're not talking about ten 19 percent error any more. You're probably talking about 20 50 to 100 percent error. And if you ever were to, by 21 all means use a CGM to treat or even take another SMBG 22 at that time and that happened to be erroneous, too,

1 you can be in actually serious trouble. So there is also clinical consequences of 2 SMBGs that are not directly linked to your insulin 3 4 dosing at the time of SMBG. 5 DR. GINSBERG: I'm going to take that, 6 actually, as another chance to suggest what I'm 7 suggesting, and that is, there are different segments. 8 9 For that segment that is looking to calibrate their glucose meter, to calibrate their continuous monitor, 10 they may want five percent inaccuracy, or five 11 percent/95 percent confidence limits on inaccuracy. 12 13 That's not the suggest that everybody has to have And a suggestion that there are different needs 14 that. 15 for the device, and that we ought to publish what the 16 accuracy is people can select the meter appropriate 17 for -- system appropriate for their needs. 18 DR. HARPER: But part of the -- part of the thing we struggle with there is how do we get data 19 20 good enough to actually demonstrate the accuracy? 21 Because I think what we struggle with not only in 22 blood glucose meters, but in any of the devices we

		178
1	regulate, is that we get the data we get. That's what	
2	goes in the label. And in the field, we may or may	
3	not see that same performance. So what what we	
4	would like to hear from people, either today or, you	
5	know, you can send in comments or give us a call or	
6	whatever, what we actually want to know is if you have	
7	ideas on how we can actually tell people how they	
8	work, for real, in the real use environments.	
9	MR. BALTUR(ph): I'd like to make a comment	
10	about ICUs and the intensive insulin therapy. The	
11	nurse who runs this usually makes the decision based	
12	on the current evaluation and the one that would	
13	probably make six hours or two hours or whatever the	
14	interval was. Some of us think that a continuous	
15	glucose monitor will be ideal for intensive IV insulin	
16	therapy in a ICU, provided you had a reliable machine.	
17	And we tested the continuous glucose monitor which is	
18	interstitial, and that's not good enough, because the	
19	delay is so bad. And I know there are some companies,	
20	and I tried to get a hold of them, that have a meter	
21	that you can place in the vein, and then you really	
22	have there is no nursing, there is a continuous	

1 monitor; you can look at its trend, and you can make 2 very nice decision. 3 Can you tell us what the status of those kind of instruments are today? 4 5 DR. HARPER: There are some blood gas analyzers there are indwelling currently, and I 6 believe there is one system that was, I believe, 7 cleared in the '90s that is capable of making frequent 8 measurements of blood glucose meters. But in terms of 9 continuous monitoring, I think, you know, we have also 10 heard about some companies that have some products in 11 12 development, but none of those have been recently 13 cleared. MS. PINKOS: Arleen Pinkos from Baltimore. 14 15 We have heard 15 percent over and over again, and there does seem to be some kind of agreement or 16 17 comfort level with that. So my question is a couple. 18 Is 15 percent good enough for -- I would like to hear from all of -- at least the clinicians on whether 15 19 20 percent is good enough. And also not just the 15 21 percent, but how many milligrams per deciliter should it be below 75 milligrams per deciliter? 22

		180
1	And after you've answered that, I'd just be	
2	curious to know how you would apply those to home	
3	settings versus clinical settings. Are they the same?	
4	Should they be different? But is 15 percent good	
5	enough? What about the low range, too?	
6	DR. GINSBERG: I think it depends upon who	
7	you are. I think if you're calibrating a continuous	
8	glucose monitor, 15 percent is not good enough. I	
9	think if you're an intensive insulin therapy patient,	
10	keeping your blood glucose in the 80, 85 range most of	
11	the time, I think 15 percent is not good enough. I	
12	think if you're a Type II on insulin, sure, 15	
13	percent's plenty good. If you're a Type II not on	
14	insulin, I think you don't even need 15 percent, so	
15	it's certainly good enough for them.	
16	I think a reasonable number below 75 is to	
17	use the same standard that you use for 20 percent	
18	that basically you take the value at 75 and just bring	
19	it down. And at 15 percent, the value at 75 is 12.25	
20	or 12, and you just bring that down from there.	
21	DR. CLARKE: Let me say that I have a little	
22	problem with that 15 under 75, and I think that if	

1	I think that 10 under 75 would be much more
2	acceptable, especially in children. And yeah, and
3	I also think that, now, I agree with your other
4	comments. I think that if you're going to put
5	labeling on glucose strips, that it really needs to
6	say specifically, under 75 this product will read
7	this. Above 75, it will read that. Because those are
8	the standards those are the ISO standards that
9	you're using, and to just tell somebody that it's
10	accurate within this many times within this percent
11	of accuracy really doesn't tell them anything that
12	they can use.
12 13	they can use. MR. BRETON: I would like to add one more
13	MR. BRETON: I would like to add one more
13 14	MR. BRETON: I would like to add one more thing towards that Bill was saying, which is that for
13 14 15	MR. BRETON: I would like to add one more thing towards that Bill was saying, which is that for hypoglycemia detection, so for values in the low
13 14 15 16	MR. BRETON: I would like to add one more thing towards that Bill was saying, which is that for hypoglycemia detection, so for values in the low range, 15 percent still gives you the opportunity to
13 14 15 16 17	MR. BRETON: I would like to add one more thing towards that Bill was saying, which is that for hypoglycemia detection, so for values in the low range, 15 percent still gives you the opportunity to miss hypoglycemic events in quite large numbers. Ten
13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. BRETON: I would like to add one more thing towards that Bill was saying, which is that for hypoglycemia detection, so for values in the low range, 15 percent still gives you the opportunity to miss hypoglycemic events in quite large numbers. Ten percent seemed that you were actually starting to
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. BRETON: I would like to add one more thing towards that Bill was saying, which is that for hypoglycemia detection, so for values in the low range, 15 percent still gives you the opportunity to miss hypoglycemic events in quite large numbers. Ten percent seemed that you were actually starting to reduce the number of mis-events, and in quite a
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. BRETON: I would like to add one more thing towards that Bill was saying, which is that for hypoglycemia detection, so for values in the low range, 15 percent still gives you the opportunity to miss hypoglycemic events in quite large numbers. Ten percent seemed that you were actually starting to reduce the number of mis-events, and in quite a dramatic way.

1 is probably not that great.

2	Another comment that I wanted to make is
3	that I'm wondering where that fixed rate of error
4	below 75 milligrams per deciliter came from. Because
5	it seems to me that even though it's technically
6	challenging, I understand that, I want to be much more
7	precise. At 50, even, I want to be at 75. And the
8	relative nature of the error that we have higher than
9	75 seems to still have some relevance below. And so
10	I'm pretty sure that people might have comments about
11	that.
12	DR. CLARKE: Anybody else on the panel want
13	to take that?
14	MS. PINKOS: Can I just have one follow-up
15	for Barry? You said 15 percent is probably not good
16	enough for those patient populations. What is?
17	DR. GINSBERG: Oh, for that patient
18	population, Marc and I are actually talking about the
19	same problem. And that is the problem of knowing when
20	you're hypoglycemic. If you remember his graph of how
21	often you would miss hypoglycemia at various error
22	levels, what he said is at five percent you won't miss

1 it at all. At ten percent, you'd miss it at one percent. At 15 percent, you'd miss it at five 2 3 percent, and at 20 percent, I think you'd miss it at 4 ten percent. And so the big cutoff there, it'd be nice to 5 get down to five percent. That's really quite 6 challenging. I think ten percent would be acceptable. 7 8 DR. CLARKE: Neil? 9 MR. WHITE: Neil White, St. Louis. And I --I'll say in many ways, I agree with Barry. 10 That's probably pretty unusual. But -- (laughter) -- we need 11 12 -- we probably need different standards for different 13 things. But I just want to point out -- maybe this is repetitious of what others have alluded to -- if we're 14 15 ever going to move in the direction of a closed loop, 16 and if we're going to count on blood glucose meters as 17 the standard by which we calibrate the sensor, we 18 can't tolerate large levels of error on both devices in a device that's going to be making decisions 19 20 independent of our own human input. 21 DR. BRETON: To further that comment, so we 22 -- at UVa, we have a few trials going on about

1	artificial pancreas and closed loop. And what we've
2	noticed is that a CGM calibrated with a YSI, for
3	example, is tremendously more accurate than a CGM
4	that's calibrated even with a good meter value. And
5	by I mean, you're always have the problem of the
6	delay, of course, and it's still slightly different in
7	plasma or glucose, what you're measuring. But a
8	perfect calibration makes all the difference with the
9	use of a CGM in a closed loop system. And so I really
10	want to emphasize the need for accuracy when we talk
11	about calibration, and not necessarily insulin dosing.
12	DR. HARPER: So I have a question, actually,
13	for Steve and Barry, so our industry panel.
14	DR. GINSBERG: May I?
15	DR. HARPER: Sure.
16	DR. GINSBERG: It's critical to realize that
17	the YSI is not a perfect instrument. The YSI actually
18	has about a two and a half percent error, meaning the
19	95 percent confidence limit on that is plus or minus
20	eight percent. So that when we talk about a
21	calibration device, what we're saying is we need
22	something between five and ten percent, which I think

		185
1	everyone would agree with. And we're not that far. If	
2	you look at the very best meters out there, they're	
3	now getting 75 percent of their values within five	
4	percent.	
5	DR. BRETON: All right. I might want to	
6	just qualify a little bit what I said. When I said we	
7	calibrated with YSI, what we do is we have duplicates,	
8	and actually four total membranes. So that eight	
9	percent is dramatically reduced with that type of	
10	setting.	
11	DR. HARPER: So, I have a question for our	
12	industry panel members, so Steve and Barry. We talk a	
13	lot about sort of, oh, what would the ideal, you know,	
14	level be. We hear a lot about 15; now we're starting	
15	to hear about in the hypoglycemic ranges, getting down	
16	to ten or even ten percent, I heard.	
17	From an industry point of view, we'd like to	
18	hear some discussion about the barriers to achieving	
19	better accuracy. So what would need to happen, from a	
20	manufacturing point of view, or a development point of	
21	view, to enable meters to become more reliably	
22	accurate to the point where we're discussing?	

		1
1	DR. BROTMAN: That's obviously a very	
2	important question. And, you know, it's	
3	manufacturers really look at designing these things	
4	and trying to meet the users' needs all the time. And,	
5	you know, you reach a certain level sometimes where	
6	you have tradeoffs between accuracy. Accuracy is made	
7	up of accurate results sometimes, and you're also	
8	looking at user end user errors and interferences,	
9	and so forth.	
10	So it's a delicate balance between that	
11	situation. And if you're looking for consistency	
12	across the board, as you, you know, as you get closer	
13	and closer to ten percent, there may be devices now	
14	that are measuring ten percent. There may be as	
15	you get closer and closer to that non-tolerant level	
16	of having any errors, you're looking at, you know, how	
17	much these improvements can be sustained across the	
18	board. And I think that's a hard thing to do at a	
19	certain point. So you get down and you get down, and	
20		
21	DR. HARPER: Yeah. So what's hard about it?	
22	I think we're trying to understand what actually needs	

187

1 to happen. Are there -- are there any ways that scientists can help --2 3 DR. BROTMAN: Well, I --DR. HARPER: -- or any ways that we can 4 5 actually help? 6 DR. BROTMAN: Right. I mean, I think you're also looking at all the other things that have been 7 brought up today. You have a lot of interferences, 8 9 and you have a lot of use type of situations. So your, you know, your hematocrit, your humidity, 10 11 everything else that -- that's in there contributes to 12 this process also. 13 DR. KLONOFF: Courtney, one thing, it strikes me that we've been hearing about the 14 15 tradeoffs, that there are many nice features of 16 monitors, so it's not -- even if the accuracy hasn't 17 improved that much, there's a lot of nice features. 18 And some of them, I think, could be sacrificed if it would lead to more accurate blood glucose readings. 19 For example, in the hospital, you're not 20 worried about, does the consumer like the product? 21 22 Does he find it easy to use? Because it's not even

		ТО
1	the consumer, it's the nurse, and the consumer doesn't	
2	really notice what's going on. Or the same thing with	
3	a long-term facility.	
4	So if a company is going to have a second	
5	line of meters, let's say the standard accuracy and	
6	the greater accuracy, to me the first thing they would	
7	do is get rid of some of the features that are nice	
8	for being less accurate, but aren't necessary. For	
9	example, in some cases, have a longer measuring time;	
10	in some cases, have a larger drop of blood; in some	
11	cases, require a type of coding system require it,	
12	which is very clunky and difficult to do, but the	
13	patient doesn't have to worry about it, the nurse is	
14	going to do it.	
15	So I think that some of the ability to	
16	create a more accurate monitor has to already be there	
17	if certain populations are willing to forego those	
18	nice features. And I think those populations will.	
19	I'll be even the CGM user, knowing how important it is	
20	to have an accurate calibrating device, would be	
21	willing to give up some of those features, too. And	
22	the majority of patients would never have to face	

		189
1	that. They could get by with the standard accuracy.	
2	DR. GINSBERG: Let me talk about the company	
3	I know best, which uses something called dynamic	
4	electrochemistry. And what that means is the	
5	following. What they do first is they bring what a	
6	normal meter does, is it brings the voltage up to,	
7	let's say, .3 volts, and then measures the current	
8	over time as a way of measuring blood glucose.	
9	What this system does is it brings the	
10	voltage up to .01 volts, or some number like that. And	
11	from that, you measure nothing except the well size.	
12	So if there are any changes in the manufacturing of	
13	the well, you immediately pick that up.	
14	Then it goes up a little higher and does	
15	some tricks to pick up the hematocrit. Then it	
16	notices the slope of the current as it's changing its	
17	voltage, from which it can pick up the oxygen	
18	concentration and the altitude.	
19	Then it goes up to a voltage just a little	
20	bit below, where it'll pick up glucose, and picks up	
21	all the interference. Then it goes up and picks up	
22	the glucose and uses software to get rid of all the	

		1
1	others. And by doing this, they took an original	±.
2	strip, a Korean strip, which had by itself an	
3	inaccuracy of 11 percent, and brought that down to a	
4	little over five. And they believe, at least, when	
5	they designed their strip themselves, that they can	
6	get their inaccuracy down to about two.	
7	DR. CLARKE: We have time for one comment.	
8	Go ahead.	
9	MR. COMBS: Art Combs from St. Louis. A few	
10	years ago, they closed the major east-west road in St.	
11	Louis, and so that road right next to the university	
12	got a lot of extra traffic. And it always had a 30	
13	mile an hour speed limit, and nobody ever paid	
14	attention to it. But now with the extra volume, they	
15	put up a new sign, and the new sign said, "30 miles an	
16	hour no tolerance." And they started giving out	
17	tickets for people driving 34 in a 30. Now people	
18	drive 30 miles an hour on the street. I think if you	
19	walk into a classroom and say, Passing is 65, but	
20	starting next week, passing's going to be 75, all the	
21	same people are going to fail, and now more people are	
22	going to fail.	

		191
1	My suggestion would not be to lower the	
2	standard. My suggestion would be to enforce the	
3	standard you have, and enforce it in the user	
4	environment. I know that any of the large strips	
5	companies can perform a clinical trial, and under the	
6	right conditions hit that Clarke A space 95 percent of	
7	the time. But that's not what's going on in people's	
8	kitchens.	
9	So why don't we enforce the standard, rather	
10	than change it? I think that speaks to the outlier	
11	question, particularly.	
12	The second thing I wanted to say is, no	
13	monitor, in my view, is worth anything unless it's a	
14	safety monitor. If your blood sugar is dangerously	
15	low, that's an emergency, and everybody needs to be	
16	able to detect that with a certain accuracy. If your	
17	blood sugar is 300 or 360, it's not an issue from a	
18	treatment point of view, and no one's life is in	
19	danger. The 20 percent standard is adequate.	
20	So we seem to be in this meeting looking for	
21	a one size fits all. We need a standard across the	
22	entire dynamic range of glucose, and we need a	

1	standard that's from the entire dynamic range of
2	patient experience from their own kitchen to being
3	profoundly ill in an intensive care unit, and I don't
4	think that's the case.
5	The last point I wanted to make: I think
6	that from an FDA point of view, and I certainly can't
7	speak for them, but two things have been lost. One
8	is, what is the intended use? And the second is, what
9	is the indication for use? There are many diabetics,
10	and I suspect the young man who was up here earlier
11	wears an insulin pump. This is a \$5,000 device. It's
12	very precise. It's programmable, it's complex. Not
13	every diabetic gets it. Some people get a \$5,000
14	device, some people get a bag of 100 syringes for
15	\$9.99 and a multi-use vial of insulin. The same thing
16	should be true of meters. That's why I don't believe
17	you can use the same thing in the intensive care unit
18	as you can in your kitchen.
19	But why don't we view standards, instead of
20	saying, Gee, it's 20, should we lower it to 15? Let's
21	start with, Why don't we enforce the one we have now
22	so we don't have outlier problems? Why don't we make

		193
1	sure it's always a safety monitor, at the very least,	
2	in the hypoglycemic range? And why don't we start	
3	thinking about indications for use? If I'm an	
4	ambulatory or otherwise well Type II diabetic in my	
5	kitchen, do I need an ICU monitor? And should I have	
6	the same standard?	
7	Thank you.	
8	DR. CLARKE: Thank you for your comment.	
9	We're going to have to stop now. I want to	
10	thank all of the panel members for your participation,	
11	and the audience for your participation, as well.	
12	(Applause)	
13	DR. HARPER: So first, I'd like to extend	
14	warm thanks to Dr. Clarke, who did a wonderful job	
15	moderating Session Number 1. I think we had a lot of	
16	good discussion, and I know I can certainly speak for	
17	myself that I heard a lot of interesting insights that	
18	I think will be very helpful to us.	
19	So while the Session 1 panelists are coming	
20	to their seats, I'd like to introduce the moderator	
21	for Session 2. Dr. Gary Myers is the Chief of the	
22	Clinical Chemistry Branch in the Division of	

		194
1	Laboratory Sciences at the Center for Disease Control	
2	and Prevention. In his more than 30-year career at	
3	CDC, he has focused on improving lab measurements of	
4	biochemical markers used to assess chronic disease	
5	risk, with particular emphasis on cardiovascular	
6	disease and diabetes.	
7	Dr. Myers is a member of the American	
8	Diabetes Association's Insulin Standardization Working	
9	Group, and in 2007, Dr. Myers served as president of	
10	the American Association for Clinical Chemistry. He	
11	has authored or co-authored more than 80 peer reviewed	
12	publications and chapters.	
13	Please join me in welcoming Dr. Myers.	
14	(Applause)	
15	DR. MYERS: Thank you, Courtney.	
16	Okay. It was a pleasure to be here, and I	
17	want to thank Courtney and the FDA for asking me to	
18	moderate this session.	
19	Our session today is, the second session is	
20	Blood Glucose Meter Performance, Interferences, and	
21	Limitations. And you've heard from Dr. Scott and Dr.	
22	Ginsberg when they were talking about total error, the	

1	idea that total error is not just bias and
2	imprecision, but there are other things as far as the
3	pre-analytical and post-analytical that goes into
4	considerations of performance for blood glucose
5	meters.
6	So meter performance is limited by a variety
7	of environmental, physiologic, and operator factors.
8	And in my brief introduction, I'm going to list a few
9	of these things. You've heard some of them already
10	described. We're going to refocus on these in this
11	session, so our speakers will have an opportunity to
12	go in a little bit more detail.
13	What I've listed here, and I'm not going to
14	go into any kind of detail, but just list these
15	there are possible factors, interferences, that have
16	been investigated and reported in the published
17	literature. And there are environmental factors. We've
18	heard about exposure of test strips exposure to
19	air, exposure to light. The use of generic strips
20	that may not have been evaluated on different meters,
21	but are also available. Age of strips we did an
22	evaluation of meter performance at the CDC some years

	1
1	ago, and we found that on getting strips from the
2	pharmacy, if you had strips that were early in their
3	shelf life versus those that are towards of their
4	shelf life, we found a significant difference in the
5	performance of those strips. Reuse of strips
6	altitude has an effect on the performance; humidity
7	and temperature, again, having the strips exposed to
8	various humidity and temperatures. Specimen
9	preservatives volume of the sample, are you under-
10	dosed or over-dosing the sample? And animal blood
11	not in the measurement of animal blood, but in the use
12	of animal blood in the preparation of control and
13	survey materials. Maybe not as prevalent now as it
14	used to be, but there was a time that animal blood was
15	used to prepare control materials and survey
16	materials. That may still be going on. And we know,
17	we've heard from Dr. Scott, the problem of matrix
18	effects when survey materials do not simulate patient
19	samples, so that's a big concern when evaluating the
20	performance of meters.
21	Patient-specific variables: extremes in
22	hydration. Is the person hydrated or over-hydrated?

		197
1	Hypotension, prandial state. We've heard a lot about	
2	hematocrit, and we're going to hear some more from one	
3	of our speakers. Hemodialysis, hemolosis, extremes in	
4	pH. Cases of severe acidosis, like diabetic	
5	ketoacidosis, as an example. Hypoglycemia you've	
6	heard a lot about hypoglycemia from Dr. Sacks. Blood	
7	sources differences in arterial versus capillary,	
8	versus venous blood. The specimen matrix	
9	differences between whether you're measuring it as	
10	plasma or whole blood.	
11	And then the issue of substances and	
12	conditions.	
13	Acetaminophen, which at therapeutic drug	
14	levels certainly causes interferences. Ascorbic acid,	
15	dopamine, fluorescein IV's, mannitol, salicylate. We	
16	all know about the therapeutic products with non-	
17	glucose sugars:	
18	maltase, galactase, and xylose with GDH and	
19	PTQ test strips. And we're going to hear a little bit	
20	more about that in some detail in just a minute from	
21	Dr. Harper.	
22	So as we go forward in this session, just	

		198
1	some issues and questions to consider. And some of	
2	these we've already heard discussed and brought up in	
3	the previous session. But again, focusing on	
4	inferences and limitations, some things to consider.	
5	First of all, the investigation of	
6	interference effects is the responsibility of	
7	instrument manufacturers. This really has to be done	
8	by the manufacturers before it's put on the market.	
9	The information provided is often too vague	
10	and to be of little value, and some manufacturers may	
11	take exception with this, but this is some of the	
12	general feelings that have been published in the	
13	literature by people that have done studies: There is	
14	no specific single criterion that exists for	
15	delineating the presence of significant interference.	
16	What do we mean in the product insert, what is a	
17	significant interference? There's no consistent	
18	definition of that.	
19	Guidelines have been established for	
20	evaluating of interference effects, and we've heard	
21	some of those. There is the CLSI EP7. IFCC has a	
22	guideline. Several individual groups, individuals	

1	have published in the literature different processes
2	for approaching how we evaluate interferences and
3	limitations for glucose monitors.
4	There is no current consensus exists among
5	manufacturers about the most appropriate way to
6	publish guidelines on how a interfering substance is
7	affecting a particular method. We've heard from Dr.
8	Ginsberg the idea of standardizing. And I'm all for
9	standardization, and so we do need to look at how we
10	can standardize the information that's provided to the
11	end user.
12	And some other issues and questions: Should
12 13	And some other issues and questions: Should there be a standardized procedure for evaluating
	-
13	there be a standardized procedure for evaluating
13 14	there be a standardized procedure for evaluating interferences? Yes, I think there should be. How
13 14 15	there be a standardized procedure for evaluating interferences? Yes, I think there should be. How aware of these factors and interferences are the end
13 14 15 16	there be a standardized procedure for evaluating interferences? Yes, I think there should be. How aware of these factors and interferences are the end users, and has such an awareness survey been done? Do
13 14 15 16 17	there be a standardized procedure for evaluating interferences? Yes, I think there should be. How aware of these factors and interferences are the end users, and has such an awareness survey been done? Do we really know how aware the end users are, whether
13 14 15 16 17 18	there be a standardized procedure for evaluating interferences? Yes, I think there should be. How aware of these factors and interferences are the end users, and has such an awareness survey been done? Do we really know how aware the end users are, whether they be in the ICU or whether they be the home users?
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	there be a standardized procedure for evaluating interferences? Yes, I think there should be. How aware of these factors and interferences are the end users, and has such an awareness survey been done? Do we really know how aware the end users are, whether they be in the ICU or whether they be the home users? Are package inserts enough? Are they adequate in the

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1 needed.

Sources of information for the end user: 2 3 again, package inserts and instructions, are they adequate? Probably not. Where can the public get 4 information about their blood glucose meter? 5 Well, some of them go to the pharmacist to ask the 6 pharmacist at their local pharmacy. These individuals 7 are not trained necessarily, and aren't staying on top 8 9 of the information, but this may be a source where many of the end users go to ask for information. 10 Ιf it's a hospital staff, obviously, they have their 11 clinical chemist in their central laboratory that they 12 13 can get information. And the place where most people nowadays go 14 15 get information, the Internet. And what websites are available? One website, and example, is the ACC's Lab 16 17 Tests On Line, which provides end users with 18 information about the glucose test and what the test means and what the limitations of those tests are. 19 So 20 there are websites that are available, but we need to 21 look and see if these websites can be improved. 22 So this gives you a little bit of a

1	background, what I'd like for you to consider as we
2	hear and talk more now in this session about
3	interferences and limitations for blood glucose
4	determinations.
5	So with that introduction, I'll introduce
6	our first speaker in this session, and that's Dr.
7	Courtney Harper. And as you know, she is the current
8	Chief of the Division of Chemistry and Toxicology and
9	Devices. And Courtney's going to talk about the FDA
10	perspective, public health notification, potentially
11	fatal errors with the GDH PQQ glucose monitoring
12	technology.
13	DR. HARPER: Thank you, Gary.
14	So, today I'm going to talk to you a little
15	bit about interfering substances. And I'm also going
16	to talk to you about how FDA sort of tries to detect
17	problems with devices. So this morning we heard about
18	some inherent problems with devices. I'm going to
19	talk a little bit from a different perspective about
20	those problems, first of all how FDA collects that
21	type of information, and second of all how FDA and
22	others react to it. And what I hope to gain out of

	20
1	this is by using one particular example, later on this
2	afternoon I'd really like to hear input from the panel
3	and also any of you in the audience about how can FDA
4	and others better send messages and collect
5	information about the problems with products.
6	So first, I'd just like to reemphasize.
7	We've been talking today about a lot of issues with
8	glucose meters. We keep talking about how they need to
9	be more accurate, they don't do well enough in the
10	ICU, or they do do well enough at home, or whatever
11	we're talking about. But these particular devices,
12	these types of devices, have been very beneficial. And
13	we've heard a little bit about this, too. So let's
14	keep in mind the context here, which is that without
15	self-monitoring of blood glucose, diabetic patients
16	would be worse off than they are today. So even
17	without our current performance, I think we need to
18	recognize that these are good products to have out
19	there, and they have revolutionized the treatment and
20	monitoring of patients with diabetes.
21	Most of you probably know the majority of
22	glucose meters that are used at home use two different

1	types of methodologies. One methodology is the
2	glucose oxidase method. You've heard some about that
3	today. This is the one that's more oxygen sensitive.
4	The other type of methodology is a glucose
5	dehydrogenase enzyme, and this particular enzyme can
6	use three different types of mediators: PQQ, FAD, and
7	NAD. And those actually have some separate types of
8	interferences.
9	These types of technologies are used, as you
10	all know and we've discussed, at different places.
11	They're used at home by lay users. They're used in
12	healthcare settings, and those settings vary quite a
13	bit, from hospitals and ICU units all the way to
14	emergency response units and also long-term care
15	facilities and nursing homes. And perhaps each of
16	these facilities and each of these use settings has a
17	lot of different issues, as we also discussed today.
18	So hopefully the majority of the time,
19	things go well, and these devices are used well and
20	the majority of the time people get accurate results,
21	or accurate enough results to use for dosing insulin
22	or any other treatment choices they may make. But

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	sometimes things go wrong, and sometimes we have
2	adverse events as a result of incorrect test results
3	or the use of medical products. And FDA actually
4	collects adverse event data from our medical device
5	reporting system.
6	The medical device reporting system has a
7	method for users, laboratories, and clinicians to
8	actually report to FDA any problems they may have been
9	with any medical devices. So if you take glucose as
10	an example, if a lay user realizes somehow that they
11	have an inaccurate measurement on their glucose meter,
12	they can actually report that to the manufacturer, who
13	then can report it to FDA. Or you can actually report
14	to FDA directly. At the end of the talk, I'll
15	actually have a link so anybody who wants to can
16	actually report adverse events to FDA, and we
17	encourage that they do so.
18	And when we get that data, FDA tries analyze
19	it for trends. We look to see whether or not there's
20	a trend of a problem, or we look to see whether or not
21	there's a problem that's sticking out as something
22	that needs to be addressed, or perhaps something

1	that's showing that things are going well or things
2	like that. We can do that with greater or lesser
3	success depending somewhat on product type and also
4	the type of reports that we get.
5	So the medical device reporting is actually
6	sometimes difficult to analyze, and difficult to find
7	those trends. And this is particularly true for over-
8	the-counter devices. So you have to keep in mind that
9	blood glucose meters are used there are billions of
10	test strips sold per year. So the denominator is
11	huge, and the number of tests that are performed is
12	huge. And we know that events are underreported, but
13	they're also underreported in specific populations.
14	They're underreported by lay users. They're probably
15	more likely to be reported when there's a problem
16	noticed at the hospital. And we know that overall
17	they're underreported, and that even when there is a
18	device result, either it's unrecognized that the
19	incorrect result happened, or it's not reported to
20	FDA. So the actual reporting of blood glucose meter
21	adverse event data is actually a little bit misleading
22	for us.

		20
1	Another issue is that the data fields that	
2	we receive is often descriptive. So what happens is,	
3	depending on the reporter, sometimes there's more or	
4	less information about the event that's included. And	
5	this actually really limits the ability for us to do	
6	electronic analysis of large datasets. So we know	
7	there are some cases where you can search for a	
8	particular word, but if it was entered with an	
9	incorrect spelling or if it was entered with a	
10	different word or a synonym for something that's not	
11	often used, sometimes it's very difficult to group	
12	similar or like issues together.	
13	So these are some limitations of the	
14	database. Now, it stands out for glucose meters,	
15	because if you have a product where perhaps there's	
16	only three or four of these devices implanted into	
17	patients in the U.S., you're going to be able to look	
18	at very closely every single adverse event report that	
19	comes to you, so you'll be able to read them	
20	individually. You can do a very good analysis. We	
21	get more than 12,000 reports on glucose meters per	
22	year, and so it's actually not feasible for FDA	

1	analysts to read every single report and somehow group
2	them or analyze them and call and contact every single
3	reporter. So that's where some of the limitations of
4	the database come through.
5	Now, the fact is we get these 12,000 reports
6	a year, but also keep in mind that that's almost a
7	little bit good, because we do have billions of tests
8	performed per year.
9	Now, here's an idea of what I mean by how
10	it's difficult sometimes to group some of the device
11	reports. So we did a little bit of an analysis of the
12	database, where we actually pulled out all of the
13	glucose serious injury reports from 2004 to 2008. And
14	I will point out that probably we would get different
15	numbers if we used different search terms, so this is
16	another limitation of our database. So for this
17	particular search, we pulled out 12,672 serious
18	injuries.
19	Now, each of these injuries is described in
20	different ways. So here I've shown you the top 11
21	injury codes that came out of this search, and you can
22	tell that the numbers don't add up to 100 percent,

		208
1	because sometimes these things are overlapping. Also,	
2	the terminology that's inherent in the FDA database is	
3	confusing, because they have blood glucose low and	
4	hypoglycemia as separate events, and sometimes things	
5	are reported in both, and sometimes things are	
6	reported in one. So it very much makes the job of FDA	
7	in terms of looking for these trends difficult. So	
8	we're actually actively working on trying to improve	
9	some of the data analysis and reporting techniques for	
10	glucose meters over time to see if we can get some	
11	better data to try and make sure that if there are	
12	trends or events, that we can pick up on them.	
13	What's a little easier to look at is the	
14	death data, because fortunately, there is a manageable	
15	number of deaths reported to FDA. These are also	
16	underreported, but like I said, given the volume of	
17	testing, 100 deaths since 1992 is actually not good in	
18	that you don't want any deaths, but it's better than	
19	having 12,000. So we actually did look at all 100	
20	deaths between 1992 and 2009 in a single analysis, and	
21	we tried to classify them. And as you can see,	
22	because of the database, the majority or not the	

		209
1	majority, but the largest category that we had to put	
2	things in was "unknown cause." And that is actually a	
3	feature of our reporting database, where you might	
4	read the description of the event and you can actually	
5	not attribute any cause to the death that occurred. So	
6	you don't know whether it was associated with the	
7	meter or not, or you don't know what happened with the	
8	meter to make that happen.	
9	Meter malfunctions would be 11. An example	
10	of this would be meters that inadvertently switched	
11	from milligrams per deciliter to millimoles per liter.	
12	If somebody might take an action on a number for	
13	millimoles per liter, thinking it's milligrams per	
14	deciliter, they may actually make an incorrect	
15	treatment choice.	
16	False high results and diabetic ketoacidosis	
17	were also high numbers. And there were 13 deaths from	
18	the issue of maltose interference for glucose	
19	dehydrogenase PQQ meters.	
20	And so I'm going to take this example to	
21	walk you through a case where we have identified an	
22	issue over time and the way FDA has gone about trying	

1	to address this issue, because later on, if you have
2	an input on how FDA can better do this to actually
3	help put out the message, we'd really like to hear it.
4	So I'd like to use this as an example.
5	So the particular issue with glucose
6	dehydrogenase PQQ is the following. So glucose PQQ
7	in the interests of time, I'm not going to try and
8	pronounce PQQ for you, but there it is on the screen.
9	This is a type of technology that's been around for a
10	very long time. It's been marketed for over 20 years.
11	This technology is non- selective for glucose, and
12	that means that it also detects other sugars, such as
13	maltose, xylose, or galactose. And these meters were
14	actually already around when certain drug products
15	were approved by FDA that contain these sugars as
16	components. And when that happened, sometimes when
17	patients were treated with these drugs, the meters
18	actually detected those sugars as glucose, to some
19	extent, and so although the meter is actually giving a
20	correct reading of the sugar that it's seeing in the
21	blood, all of it isn't glucose. So taking an action
22	on that number can be inappropriate clinically. And

		211
1	there have been deaths and serious injuries associated	
2	with this, and also severe hypoglycemic events.	
3	Now, both the devices and the drug are	
4	labeled against this use, so there's clear labeling on	
5	the devices and clear labeling on these drugs, as	
6	well, to say that these two products shouldn't be used	
7	together because of this interaction. But as I'll	
8	show you in a minute, some of that hasn't been	
9	effective.	
10	So the types of drugs I'll list them more	
11	completely later. But a lot of them are IB drugs,	
12	because that's where you get enough exposure to these	
13	sugars to actually cause the issue with the reading.	
14	So Extraneal would be a peritoneal dialysis solution	
15	that's been involved in some of these issues, and also	
16	some IB immunoglobulin solutions that use maltose as a	
17	stabilizer.	
18	So FDA actually recognized this problem	
19	several years ago and has taken several actions over	
20	the last several years. So in 2005, we released a	
21	MedWatch Safety Alert on this issue. In 2006 we did	
22	another Patient Safety News to try and reach out to	

1	healthcare providers to describe this problem. In
2	2008 we published two articles, one out of the Center
3	for Drugs and another out of the Center of Biologics
4	on this particular issue, describing deaths that may
5	occur, and also another Patient Safety News on the
6	topic. And last spring, in 2009, the Center for Drugs
7	actually updated the package insert for the Extraneal
8	drug product to include a back- box warning against
9	using GDH-PQQ test strips on these patients.
10	Regardless, from 1997 to 2009, FDA has
11	received 13 total deaths reported to FDA associated
12	with this glucose test strip. We've actually seen a
13	few other cases in the literature that weren't
14	reported to FDA, as well. These deaths all occurred
15	in healthcare facilities, and six of the 13 deaths
16	have occurred since 2008. So this told us that even
17	though we've been doing sort of outreach efforts for
18	the last several years, these deaths continue to
19	happen at some rate, so it really gives us a signal
20	that some of our outreach efforts are not being
21	effective enough.
22	Ten of these 13 patients reported were on

1	Extraneal, the drug that received the black box
2	warning, and three of the 13 patients were receiving
3	other maltose- containing substances, like these IV
4	immunoglobulins.
5	So as you can see, we have a problem. These
6	previous actions that we've taken are not having an
7	effect on deaths, and we are actually continuing to
8	see deaths. It's almost as if when an alert goes out,
9	there's some period of awareness and then there's a
10	little bit of a decline in awareness, perhaps because
11	of turnover of workers in healthcare facilities.
12	And the other part of this problem is that
12 13	And the other part of this problem is that this is an issue that doesn't actually affect the
13	this is an issue that doesn't actually affect the
13 14	this is an issue that doesn't actually affect the majority of patients using these devices. So this is
13 14 15	this is an issue that doesn't actually affect the majority of patients using these devices. So this is a very this is a pretty small minority of patients
13 14 15 16	this is an issue that doesn't actually affect the majority of patients using these devices. So this is a very this is a pretty small minority of patients that are on these devices. But when this happens,
13 14 15 16 17	this is an issue that doesn't actually affect the majority of patients using these devices. So this is a very this is a pretty small minority of patients that are on these devices. But when this happens, it's devastating for that patient, so it is a very
13 14 15 16 17 18	this is an issue that doesn't actually affect the majority of patients using these devices. So this is a very this is a pretty small minority of patients that are on these devices. But when this happens, it's devastating for that patient, so it is a very serious problem when it happens.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	this is an issue that doesn't actually affect the majority of patients using these devices. So this is a very this is a pretty small minority of patients that are on these devices. But when this happens, it's devastating for that patient, so it is a very serious problem when it happens. So FDA, we thought that additional action
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	this is an issue that doesn't actually affect the majority of patients using these devices. So this is a very this is a pretty small minority of patients that are on these devices. But when this happens, it's devastating for that patient, so it is a very serious problem when it happens. So FDA, we thought that additional action was warranted, but what we were worried about, because

	214
1	important, we really struggled with how to balance the
2	message, to make sure that people continued to test
3	and did not misunderstand the message and believed
4	that there was a problem that applied to them, when
5	really we wanted to reach a very small population of
6	patients and the healthcare providers who treated
7	them.
8	So how do we balance a safety warning and,
9	you know, getting the message out that patients, you
10	know, really need to keep testing? So the
11	communication of complex issues is definitely
12	something that we really work on and try to do well,
13	and I think sometimes we succeed and sometimes we
14	don't.
15	So this time we actually decided on a
16	stronger message, hoping that it would get a little
17	bit more attention in the healthcare facilities, and
18	also some ongoing other actions. So FDA published in
19	August of 2009 a public health notification on this
20	issue. And the point was to try and raise the level
21	of the recommendation to attempt to increase awareness
22	about the problem. And this public health

1	notification was aimed at healthcare providers and
2	healthcare facilities. And it described the nature of
3	the problem in detail in the public health
4	notification, and the link was on the previous slide.
5	And it described that this issue, when it's
6	unrecognized and when these test strips are used on
7	patients that have these drugs in their system, may
8	lead to inappropriate insulin dosing that could lead
9	to serious injuries, such as severe hypoglycemia or
10	perhaps leading to coma and also death. And also, it
11	can lead to unrecognized hypoglycemia. And it can
12	occur anywhere, so although these all the deaths
13	have occurred in healthcare facilities, it is possible
14	for some of these drugs, which are outpatient drugs,
15	that it could happen at home.
16	We also tried to describe that this is not a
17	problem with other types of technologies. It does not
18	affect glucose oxidase test strips. It doesn't affect
19	the other two glucose dehydrogenase test strips, which
20	aren't maltose-sensitive. So the GDH-NAD and GDH-FAD
21	have a much lower sensitivity to maltose, galactose,

22 and xylose. And it also doesn't affect laboratory-

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	based methods, so usually those methods use
2	hexokinase, which is a little bit more sensitive.
3	So the recommendations that we gave to
4	healthcare facilities were these. We actually
5	recommended that healthcare facilities avoid, in
6	general, the use of glucose dehydrogenase PQQ test
7	strips in their facilities. For those facilities who
8	continue to use, or in the meantime before they
9	switched over, GDH-PQQ test strips, we recommended
10	that they never use them on patients receiving these
11	particular drugs or products and/or on patients from
12	whom they couldn't get that information, so patients
13	who were perhaps unresponsive when they entered the
14	hospital. And we recommended that only laboratory-
15	based assays be used on these patients.
16	We also recommended that not only hospitals
17	determine whether patients are receiving these upon
18	admission, but also periodically through their stay;
19	that hospitals increase efforts to educate staff about
20	this issue; that they consider using drug action
21	alerts in their hospital information systems, and that
22	they periodically verify glucose meter results on any

1 meter with laboratory-based methods. And the public health notification also lists the particular drugs. 2 3 As I mentioned already, Extraneal and some IV immunoglobulins -- Orencia, Adept adhesion 4 reduction solution, Bexxar(ph). And also we included 5 a bullet saying any product containing or metabolizing 6 7 into maltose, galactose or xylose. We have had some questions on this, because 8 9 it is a little bit vague. And the reason it's vague is that there are some products out there where the 10 content of maltose or these sugars isn't known, or 11 12 there could be compounding within hospitals using some 13 of these products. 14 So what happened in some of these cases is 15 that you have an issue where a test or result on one of these strips and the patient who receives some of 16 17 these drugs might be three to 15 times higher than the 18 lab result. For example, one patient where the blood 19 glucose result on the meter was 200, the lab result at 20 the same time was 19. And when those patients are 21 treated with insulin, it drives them even lower, and that's where the deaths have occurred. 22

		21
1	So at the same time we released the public	
2	health notification, we also released an advice for	
3	patients. This is a publication that accompanies the	
4	public health notification and is intended for lay	
5	users. And it held similar, but separate	
6	recommendations for these lay users, because we were	
7	trying to balance the message to make sure that people	
8	could find out whether they were affected or not and	
9	what they should do in the meantime.	
10	So we recommended that diabetic patients who	
11	any of those blood products should never use test	
12	systems that use GDH-PQQ test strips, and that they	
13	contact their healthcare provider if they aren't sure	
14	if they have those particular types of technologies or	
15	are on those drugs, or if their results don't reflect	
16	the way they feel.	
17	We went on to make general recommendations	
18	for all diabetic patients that they continue testing;	
19	that they not change test strips that were intended to	
20	use for their meter; that they try and find out or	
21	understand the type of technology they're using, the	
22	drugs they're on; and to make sure that they know that	

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

any meters and strips that don't use this technology
 are okay for them.

And in the meantime, we're still working with manufacturers to address some of these issues. And we're also monitoring the adverse event reports to see if this problem keeps occurring. In the meantime, like I said, we encourage all facilities and users to report problems of this type or any type to us so that we can continue to do this type of trend analysis.

Because here's an example that I've given, 10 where you have an interference that's known. 11 So this 12 is something that a lot of people in this room 13 probably already know about. This interference is If you're on one of these drugs, you 14 predictable. 15 know that this is going to happen. And it's preventable, because if you know it's going to happen, 16 17 then you can certainly avoid it.

But the problem is that the awareness has been too low, and it continues to be too low. So we're trying to figure out what is the right balance of how much is enough to do in this case. So our challenges that I'll leave you with

		220
1	are that past communications have not had a lasting	
2	effect, so we would like to hear from you all about	
3	potential other ways that we can do outreach and	
4	education on issues like this or whether other actions	
5	are necessary to mitigate the risk of this type of	
6	problem. And what more can we, the healthcare	
7	industry, and the medical device industry do to	
8	prevent some unnecessary deaths due to known	
9	interferences like this and like other interferences?	
10	So I thank you for your attention, and I	
11	look forward to the discussion. Thanks.	
12	(Applause)	
13	DR. CLARKE: We have time for one question.	
14	MR. KIECHLE: I'll be quick. It's Fritz	
15	Kiechle, clinical pathologist from Memorial Healthcare	
16	System in Hollywood, Florida. Excellent presentation.	
17	This sort of represents a never event, and it's	
18	clearly a patient's safety issue. But it's one that a	
19	hospital is perfectly capable of tackling if done	
20	carefully and with diligence and surveillance.	
21	And the way we've handled it, and I've dealt	
22	with this problem in two different hospitals we	
1		

1	handled it the same way both places. Those items that
2	contain maltose, for the most part, the interfering
3	substance, are in the pharmacy. The pharmacy has a
4	committee, has a formulary, which controls the
5	substances they carry in the pharmacy. And they have
6	a Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee that makes those
7	decisions. The first thing we did was go to the P&T
8	Committee, as it's known, and asked them to remove
9	these maltose-containing substances from their
10	formulary and find substitutes. If that couldn't be
11	done or there was an exception where there might be a
12	physician who insists on using one of these compounds,
13	we would then send the compound with a note from the
14	pharmacy reiterating that we will not use this
15	particular glucose meter for these patients while
16	they're taking this substance. And we also get a
17	phone call to the point of care coordinator the minute
18	the drug is shipped to the floor. That person goes up
19	and re-instills with the actual nursing staff that are
20	taking care of the patient that they should not be
21	using the glucose meter.
22	And that really has worked quite well, and

222

1	as far as I know, we've had absolutely no problems.
2	DR. HARPER: I'm really glad to hear that. I
3	mean, that sounds like your hospital has taken this
4	problem seriously and tried to address it. And that
5	sounds like it will be effective when you are actually
6	the ones administering the drug. Some of the reports
7	have actually been cases where a patient had had the
8	drug outside of the healthcare facility in which they
9	are being treated, and they actually then arrived at
10	the healthcare facility and in some cases told the
11	nurse or nurse practitioner that they shouldn't use
12	that meter. And unfortunately, there wasn't enough
13	education of the person running the test to know that
14	maybe they should believe the patient. So it actually
15	can be quite tragic.
16	But I'm glad to hear that there's a lot of
17	risk mitigation procedures being put in place.
18	MS. SKEENS: Can I just clarify? This is
19	Lisa Skeens from Baxter Healthcare. And I just want
20	to point out that for Extraneal, where this a very
21	serious issue, as you've pointed out, that maltose
22	actually stays in your body for two weeks after a

		223
1	patient is administered. It's not prescribed by the	
2	pharmacy, so that actually would not mitigate this	
3	risk for Extraneal patients. So it's, as you	
4	mentioned, very important to have other types of	
5	education involved, because it's not your typical	
6	situation, and Extraneal is a chronic use product. So	
7	again, a patient may be administered not receiving the	
8	product in the hospital, but have this serious issue.	
9	DR. HARPER: Right. Thank you.	
10	DR. CLARKE: Okay. Thank you again.	
11	It's time for our break. We'll take a 15-	
12	minute break. We'll reconvene at 3:20 or when you	
13	hear the bell ringers in the crowd.	
14	(BREAK)	
15	DR. MYERS: If I could ask everyone to take	
16	your seats, we'll continue with our second session.	
17	Okay. I want to welcome you back to the	
18	continuation of our second session, Blood Glucose	
19	Meter Performance, Interferences and Limitations. Our	
20	second speaker today is Ken Ervin. And Ken obtained	
21	his bachelor's and master's degree with a focus on	
22	analytical chemistry from the University of California	

		22
1	at Riverside. He's held positions with R&D with Syva	
2	Corporation, Abbott Diagnostics, and SmithKline	
3	Instruments. In 1983 he joined the startup company of	
4	LifeScan as an R&D director, and there he participated	
5	in the development of Glucoscan, One Touch, and	
6	SureStep blood glucose monitor systems. And he took	
7	early retirement in 2004 and has been consulting	
8	primarily with startup companies in the blood glucose	
9	field.	
10	His talk today is going to be Analytical	
11	Interferences and Physiological Limitations of Blood	
12	Glucose Meters. Ken?	
13	MR. ERVIN: Thank you, Dr. Myers. As you	
14	may have gathered from that introduction, I've spent a	
15	good part of my career within the glucose monitoring	
16	area, and as such, I have observed evolution of the	
17	product over this time frame.	
18	Initially, the biggest place to hit accuracy	
19	was with user error. And a lot of the early products	
20	attempted to do that. We ended up with what were	
21	called second generation products, where we did away	
22	with that wiping and blotting business, and that was	

1 the major source of user error. But we've also seen evolution in the 2 technology itself to provide a more convenient, 3 4 faster, and cheaper product. And we are also seeing evolution of the technology to produce more accurate 5 results and to deal with some of the lingering 6 problems. One of these is the area of analytical 7 8 interferences and physiologic limitations. There's a plethora of information out there 9 on this topic. And if you're really interested in it, 10 I think two reviews in particular by Wahl and Duncan 11 are particularly useful, in that they're pretty 12 13 comprehensive and pretty informative. There's also a number of original articles. I've just got partial 14 lists here in both categories. There's no shortage of 15 16 information. 17 We've already heard about package inserts 18 several times today. And generally, these things are captured in the section that's typically called 19 20 procedural limitations. And they're bucketed into 21 several different categories: things that are 22 considered to be sample- related, that is, the sample

1	hematocrit; po2; whether or not the patient's in DKA
2	or HHNK. There's a category for endogenous compounds,
3	sort of naturally occurring substances which, should
4	they become elevated, could possibly create a problem;
5	exogenous compounds we just heard a bit about
6	maltose, but there are others; and of course the
7	environmental considerations.
8	Now, one of the things we were talking about
9	a little while ago was accuracy. One of the main
10	differences between blood glucose monitors and
11	laboratory instruments is I know this coming from a
12	laboratory instrument background they do everything
13	they can to control things like temperature and the
14	environment that the test is being done in. Blood
15	glucose monitors probably could do that, but as we've
16	heard earlier, the cost of the devices would probably
17	go up exponentially. It takes a lot of power and a lot
18	of work to do that.
19	So what they've done is to sort of confine
20	the use range in terms of temperature or in terms of
21	humidity. Altitude is essentially a po2 problem.
22	One theme that I'd like to carry through

1	today is that each manufacturer, in producing their
2	product, has some design goals that they're going to
3	go after, and that those design goals to some extent,
4	and also the effort to achieve a proprietary position,
5	they're going to pick some set of technologies to put
6	into their system and give them a competitive device.
7	The choices of those technologies in essence leads to
8	some of these interferences and these limitations.
9	However I'll go back to the point I
10	wanted to make earlier technology is evolving, and
11	you are seeing products in the marketplace now that
12	are dealing with some of these, and dealing with them
13	quite effectively.
14	This is just a partial list of some design
15	goals that a blood glucose manufacturer might
16	consider. The obvious ones, accuracy and precision,
17	specificity, et cetera. I've asterisked some very
18	important ones from their perspective, though. The
19	product has to be stable. That is, the test strips
20	have to be stable at room temperature. We've already
21	heard some discussion this afternoon about the impact
22	of using fresh and late-dated strips.

1	The test has to be rapid. Now, we're
2	talking in the order of five seconds now for many
3	products that are available to the consumer. That
4	basically and the environment where we're dealing
5	with it in the home, in particular, means that you're
6	going to use whole blood. You don't have time to deal
7	with plasma or serum. So the use of a whole blood
8	sample is a key piece of the design goal.
9	And then the second or the third item
10	here I've asterisked is, it has to be very easy to
11	use. If these products are going to be used even by
12	nurses in the hospital, they've got to be easy,
13	because they don't have time to pay attention to a lot
14	of technical detail.
15	Another item I'm going to mention here,
16	because it relates to accuracy, is you've got to
17	develop some sort of calibration strategy. And
18	historically, the calibration codes have actually been
19	windows. It could be two, three, four percent that a
20	particular cal code would represent. And so one of
21	the areas that manufacturers obviously are trying to
22	work is how they can actually pull these calibration

1 codes into tighter and tighter ranges. So in order to meet these design goals and 2 specifications, they choose particular technologies, 3 both for the device and for its method of production. 4 5 The other thing that's worth remembering is that blood glucose measurement is based on combining 6 technologies. For example, you have to have a method 7 of getting your sample into the device. 8 And 9 currently, most methods are using some sort of capillary action. There are some that are using, for 10 example, blood drops on a membrane, but for the most 11 12 part, everybody's headed toward some sort of capillary 13 approach. 14 You have to have a method to identify 15 glucose, and you want to do this without question. 16 This is the reason for the GDH-PQQ problem in the 17 maltose. It's referred to as specificity, and in 18 fact, there are three enzymes that have been used in blood glucose monitoring devices. All of them are 19 20 fairly common in the laboratory, and they've all been 21 used in blood glucose monitoring devices, as well. 22 And finally, you need to have a method to

230

1	quantify the glucose. Essentially right not, it's
2	either a photometric, colorimetric assay or an
3	electrochemical assay. You also have a method of
4	calibration, which I mentioned a moment ago, and this
5	not only relates to sort of the samples that you have
6	to use, the reference system that you're going to use,
7	the width of your cal code space a number of
8	important variables. And in recent years you've seen
9	more effort in the area of assessing whether or not a
10	test was done correctly. Is there something that
11	could have gone wrong? Was the temperature incorrect?
12	Instrument manufacturers have been trying to evolve
13	their technology to identify these conditions, and
14	even more recently now, if they've identified a
15	significant contributor, can they correct the results
16	for that?
17	So interferences result in two areas. One,
18	from the analyte specificity or some effect on the
19	reaction that follows, either a sample influence or an
20	environmental influence on the measurement reaction.
21	I've said the enzymes that are being used are glucose

22 oxidase, glucose dehydrogenase, and hexokinase.

1	Glucose oxidase in the original products was
2	exclusively used. All of the original blood glucose
3	monitoring products used that, for two reasons. One,
4	it's very stable at room temperature, and secondly, it
5	was very specific. It could easily be formulated into
6	a test strip. And then thirdly, it was easily coupled
7	to a colorimetric indicator system, of which there
8	were many, and you had your blood glucose monitoring
9	device.
10	GDH has historically been most used with the
11	HemoCue system I mean, that's the one that's been
12	out there the longest using GDH. That enzyme is
13	particularly insensitive to interferences. However,
14	it does have a tradeoff, in that it's not particularly
15	stable, and therefore their cuvettes have to be
16	refrigerated.
17	There was one product from Bayer, called the
18	Encore, that actually used a hexokinase G6 PDH system,
19	affording it great specificity. And I'll talk a
20	little bit more about it later on when we're talking
21	about po2.
22	We've heard a lot already about endogenous

		232
1	substances and exogenous substances, but what I really	
2	wanted to talk a little bit about today is not what	
3	they were and how much effect they have, but rather,	
4	how does that happen? Let me take ascorbate as an	
5	example.	
6	In a colorimetric system using glucose	
7	oxidase, where we produce hydrogen peroxide as an	
8	intermediate product, and then a final colored	
9	product, ascorbate has the property that it can either	
10	reduce the peroxide or the colored product and	
11	actually produce a low result. In some electrochemical	
12	systems, it can be read independently of the glucose	
13	reaction and produce a positive bias to the result.	
14	Fortunately, the electrochemical systems are now	
15	beginning to incorporate, as Dr. Ginsberg has	
16	mentioned, schemes to identify the occurrence of this	
17	background current and to eliminate it from the	
18	glucose calculation.	
19	When we talk about patients with DKA or	
20	HHNK, I don't think I've seen very much about a pH	
21	problem with glucose test strips. That's not to say I	
22	don't think they've happened, but generally the test	

1	strips are highly buffered so that pH shifts in DKA
2	are not going to be much of an issue. On the other
3	hand, viscosity of the sample remembering that
4	these samples tend to be dehydrated, and as such,
5	there's very little water left in them they tend to
6	be hyperosmolar. And these can have flow effects in a
7	system, particularly in capillary systems.
8	Back in my days at LifeScan, we had an HHFK
9	sample that I put on top of a test strip. It took
10	over 30 seconds to penetrate into that test strip when
11	a really high hematocrit sample might take only three
12	to four seconds. There was so little water in that
13	sample that it wouldn't penetrate the strip. When it
14	did, it produced a very low result. So these kinds of
15	samples can have what I call flow effects on your
16	glucose monitor. They don't happen very often, but
17	that's why they're in the labeling.
18	Environmental influences I mentioned
19	earlier that laboratory instruments are trying to
20	control everything. Glucose monitors just try to
21	control by defining a range in which they work. The
22	altitude thing is basically a po2 problem.

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	When we go to looking at physiological
2	limitations, we basically have three choices of
3	samples, or after talking with Jeff DuBois earlier, I
4	probably should have said "specimen" here
5	capillary, venous, or arterial. This presents us with
6	three or four different difficulties. One is that the
7	actual concentrations of glucose can be different in
8	the three, and that's well understood. We've also
9	heard today reiterated several times that hypotensive
10	patients, other conditions creating profusion
11	problems, and I ran across a patient once where
12	Reynaud's Syndrome actually created a big difference
13	between the vein of puncture and the capillary result.
14	We've heard already today about the alternate site
15	time lag and the po2 differences.
16	Okay. What I wanted to do today, and since
17	I'm beginning to run out of time I'm going to have to
18	hustle along here, I was going to cover two examples,
19	hematocrit and the po2 problem. These reactions on
20	the screen, the upper one is that typical glucose
21	oxidase reaction where oxygen is used. And this is
22	where the po2 effect comes from. In systems where

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	oxygen cannot get to the sample, or where the sample
2	itself varies a great deal in its concentration, you
3	can create an effect that is the result of
4	competition. So for example, in an electrochemical
5	system, where they use mediators, because they're more
6	efficient in turning over the current, the this
7	reaction will be in competition with the glucose plus
8	oxygen reaction. And we get a competition now such
9	that in the case of venous blood, you're going to get
10	higher results, because there's less oxygen present in
11	the sample. More of the glucose can go the mediator
12	pathway, and so you tend to get higher results.
13	Arterial tends to read lower, because you have a lot
14	more oxygen present. By the way, this is all relative
15	to being calibrated with capillary blood, so you have
16	more oxygen, or in the case of highly oxygenated
17	venous samples. You can take a venous sample and mix
18	it with air for a while, you'll get the same effect.
19	So we have a competition going on there that drives
20	this po2 effect.
21	The second-generation products had a similar
22	difficulty if their reaction site was somehow occluded

1	from exposure to the atmosphere. Products like One
2	Touch and SureStep, where the membrane surface is open
3	to the atmosphere, they didn't have much of an issue.
4	But other products, where they use a window, you no
5	longer could get oxygen in there, and so you ended up
6	with this po2 competition problem.
7	I mentioned the Bayer product earlier,
8	hexaconagesic (ph) PDH. They went with this system
9	ostensibly to get away from the po2 effect, but they
10	also had some stability issues, as well.
11	The GDH PQQ system was introduced to
12	alleviate this po2 effect. Doesn't involve oxygen, so
13	there's no competition. And this particular enzyme
14	happened to be relatively stable at room temperature,
15	so it had that attribute. However, that particular
16	enzyme has demonstrated less specificity for glucose,
17	as we've heard, and recognizing other glucose-
18	containing sugars. And hence the problem.
19	In terms of the evolution, people have been
20	working on trying to develop GDH enzymes that, again,
21	use the NAD or FAD co-factor. And these are, through
22	their genetic engineering, becoming more specific and

1 more stable, and you're seeing some of these in 2 products now. The other condition I wanted to talk about 3 was -- that we've heard a lot about today is 4 hematocrit. One of the problems here is that because 5 we were dealing with so much confusion between 6 understanding the difference between whole blood and a 7 plasma result, a lot of the manufacturers moved over 8 9 to reporting plasma-equivalent results. These systems have to be calibrated at normal hematocrit, but we 10 know that the hematocrit ranges can vary 11 substantially, five-fold, or nearly five-fold. So 12 13 applying that calibration to samples that are significantly different than normal is a source of 14 15 error. 16 In this illustration, what I'd like to show, 17 the blue line is what you would expect just on the 18 basis of physiology. In other words, if you take a whole blood sample and plasma from that same sample 19 and look at the glucose content, as you go down 20 21 towards a sample with a hematocrit of 20, you're going 22 to have basically about a six percent bias. If you go

1 to higher hematocrits, you've going to have a six percent negative bias. That's just the physiology of 2 3 that sample. And as Dr. Ginsberg mentioned earlier, 4 hematocrit is a more complex issue, and he already 5 alluded to the business of red blood cells and how 6 they may impact the measurement itself. 7 8 The yellow line illustrates a product which has minimal what I'd call method effect related to the 9 technology, the green line representing a product 10 which has increased or greater effect as a result of 11 its technology. And some products are really 12 13 sensitive, to the extent that as you approach higher hematocrits, they just nosedive, and that's 14 15 illustrated here by the red line. 16 And as he was suggesting, hematocrit does 17 influence the access of plasma or the diffusion of 18 glucose through that sample in the test device, 19 suppressing results. So you would expect, then, that 20 when you're really trying to turn over reactions 21 quickly, like at higher glucose, the effect is going 22 to be greater. And in fact, that's observed. If you

239

1 look at some of the labeling and products a while ago, the -- they actually had two different hematocrit 2 ranges, one for lower glucoses and one for higher 3 glucoses, the higher glucoses being somewhat 4 compressed. 5 The good news is, and several companies are 6 doing this now, it can be measured, and it can be 7 corrected. One question I have there is, is there a 8 9 price? Now that you're making two measurements, is there a price you pay in terms of imprecision? 10 So in conclusion, limitations and 11 interferences are related to the particular 12 13 technologies. The goals of a BGM system to me make it unlikely they'll ever completely match a lab-based 14 15 system, but they'll get close. They can get close. 16 And the evolution of these devices is a demonstration 17 of trying to achieve this balance between a high 18 degree of performance with a rapid, versatile, easy-19 to-use system. 20 And of course, the last conclusion is when we're talking about hematocrit, we've got an automatic 21 22 plus or minus six percent.

		240
1	Thank you.	
2	(Applause)	
3	DR. MYERS: We have time for some questions.	
4	Ken, I have a question for you. How many	
5	different bases of calibration for the instruments are	
6	you aware of, as far as methodology calibration?	
7	MR. ERVIN: Oh, one of the reference bases	
8	early on was YSI, because it dealt very easily with	
9	whole blood samples. So a lot of the instrument	
10	manufacturers used YSI initially.	
11	Also initially, all of the testing was	
12	intended to be done on capillary blood, because these	
13	were intended for users at home. As we moved to	
14	trying to improve accuracy and the versatility of the	
15	product, you started seeing other reference systems	
16	utilized. For example, one company I know used a	
17	deproteinized hexokinase as their reference system.	
18	If you're asking the question about the	
19	calibration codes themselves, I don't have	
20	information. A lot of it's proprietary. But there	
21	are very different schemes in the way people approach	
22	calibration of their devices. Some will use equations	

1	built into the system to actually describe the
2	behavior versus whether it's a current or a
3	photometric measurement. Others will make sure that
4	their product behaves in a linear fashion, and then
5	they just assign a cal code that normalizes their
6	result to their reference value.
7	I'm not sure if that completely answers your
8	question, but
9	DR. MYERS: Well, I guess the question is,
10	some are, as you say, calibrated to the YSI, and some
11	are actually calibrated directly to mass spec. So is
12	there an issue among meter variability because of how
13	the variation in what the calibration point is?
14	MR. ERVIN: I hope I didn't say GC mass
15	spec. I don't believe any of the manufacturers are
16	using that as their routine method for calibration.
17	When you're in a manufacturing situation, and I'm sure
18	they're going to address this themselves, but when
19	you're in a manufacturing situation, you've got to
20	have something that is feasible for routine day-in and
21	day-out operation. And I'm not privy to what all of
22	the different manufacturers are using as their

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1 reference systems. For example, Nova probably is using something very different. 2 3 But initially, and it's evolved from that, but initially everybody pretty much was using YSI, 4 because of its convenience in dealing with whole blood 5 6 samples. 7 DR. MYERS: Thank you. 8 Okay. Our next speakers will be two 9 individuals representing the industry's perspective. And I'll go ahead and introduce them both at the same 10 11 time. First of all is Dr. Alan Cariski. And Dr. 12 13 Cariski received his bachelor's degree from John Hopkins University, his medical degree from the 14 15 University of Rochester School of Medicine and 16 Dentistry, and his law degree from the University of 17 Maryland School of Law. Dr. Cariski has over 30 years 18 of experience in the healthcare industry, having practiced medicine as a board-certified internist and 19 20 endocrinologist before transitioning to industry in 21 1991. Since 2001, he has been Vice President of Worldwide Medical Affairs and Medical Safety Officer 22

1 at LifeScan.

2	And our other individual is Mike Fliss, and
3	he has a BS degree in mechanical engineering from
4	Marquette University. His industry leadership
5	experience includes serving as Co-chair of AdvaMed's
6	Blood Glucose Working Group since 2007, and he has
7	held a variety of key regulatory roles during his 23
8	years at Roche Diagnostics working with product
9	developers to optimize product design characteristics,
10	product risk assessments, clinical trial designs, and
11	instructions for use in promotional materials to
12	facilitate prompt registration processes.
13	Gentlemen?
14	DR. CARISKI: Thank you very much, Dr.
15	Myers.
16	Why don't you manufacturers make glucose
17	meters more accurate? That's a question a well-known
18	endocrinologist asked me at the Diabetes Post-Graduate
19	course in San Francisco that was held recently. And
20	as luck would have it, I didn't have this slide set
21	with me. But I have it today, and I'd like to spend
22	the next few minutes answering that question for you

1 as best I can.

2	So the glucose manufacturers as a whole are
3	committed to designing and manufacturing glucose
4	meters to meet the needs of individuals with diabetes.
5	And industry shares a goal of advancing
6	meter technologies and improving accuracy through
7	innovations in meter systems that accomplish these
8	three things:
9	Reduce use error. And I think it's
10	important that most people today have used the term
11	"use error" rather than "user error," because the term
12	"use error" recognizes that it's not only the user,
13	per se, but it may be the way in which the product was
14	designed, so that any user might encounter problems.
15	So I think use error is an important term.
16	Also, the manufacturers try to reduce the
17	impact of interference and improve the overall quality
18	of testing for patients.
19	And finally, both the glucose standard for
20	consumer meters, that 15197, and industry recognize
21	the role of design to improve not only analytical
22	performance, but also the usability of the instruments

1 to increase patient compliance with glucose monitoring 2 regimens.

3 It's instructive to compare the meter to the other technologies that are available, and to some 4 extent, Ken and some of the other speakers have done 5 that. The so- called definitive method uses isotape-6 labeled glucose dilution mass spectrometry with gas 7 tromatography. And while this is something you might 8 9 think that no home should do without, I think you have to concede that it's not something you're going to 10 take on the road with you. The method requires 11 12 meticulous and time-consuming serum sample 13 preparation.

The same thing is true for the reference 14 15 method. It's time-consuming, requires serum or plasma. 16 And finally, the typical diagnostic laboratory method 17 also uses prepared serum or plasma, and the 18 environment is very precisely controlled, both the environment in which the device sits and also the 19 environment within the device itself in terms of pH 20 reaction initiation, et cetera. 21 22 The meter, on the other hand, uses capillary

		246
1	whole blood, a point that Ken just emphasized. And it	
2	emphasizes ease of use. It has to be portable; it	
3	uses small volumes, people want fast testing. And it	
4	has to be used in a variety of environments. The lab,	
5	it has, of course, a controlled environment. There	
6	are restrictions on where meters can be used, but	
7	they're fairly broad in terms of temperature, altitude	
8	most will work up to 10,000 feet and most have a	
9	fairly broad range of relative humidity.	
10	And of course, these tests are performed by	
11	lay users, not by trained laboratory technicians. And	
12	when you think about it, we're really asking lay	
13	people to perform a laboratory test; okay? And we're	
14	trying to make it as simple as possible and still be	
15	accurate.	
16	So the next few slides will compare and	
17	contrast the lab instrument to the glucose meter. So,	
18	as I mentioned, the lab has definitive reference	
19	methods. The glucose meter can at best say that it's	
20	ultimately traceable to the definitive or reference	
21	method.	
22	There are standard reference materials to	

1 test the lab instrument. These don't exist for 2 glucose meters. The hematocrit effect we discussed. 3 In glucose meters, the hematocrit effect is mitigated by 4 measurement, but not necessarily entirely, and also by 5 the use of algorithms. 6 7 Finally, there are some fairly accurate devices that use whole blood, but they eliminate the 8 hematocrit effect through membranes, and the membranes 9 also protect the enzymes and sensor from interfering 10 compounds. SMBG technology, at least what's available 11 today, doesn't have these advantages. And the 12 13 presence of multiple interference provide a considerable technical challenge. 14 15 Again, laboratory instruments tend to cost more than \$10,000. A typical glucose meter is less 16 17 than \$100. Lab instruments require maintenance; 18 glucose meters don't. Plasma versus blood -- giving of 19 plasma equivalent. Trained technician versus a lay 20 person -- the lab instruments are typically calibrated 21 many times daily. Glucose meters cannot be calibrated 22 by the user. The controlled versus the uncontrolled

1	environment I've alluded to. And in the lab, controls
2	are run frequently. Control solution is available for
3	users to test the integrity of their system. Many
4	people don't use it, or use it sparingly. And if they
5	detect a problem, unlike the lab, there's nothing they
6	can do, at least with the product they have.
7	A laboratory instrument is large and
8	stationary, susceptible to shock. The meters, you
9	know, are brought everywhere. They have shock
10	testing. They're very tolerant to shock. Most lab
11	equipment requires at least five milliliters of blood.
12	I expressed it as microliters just to contrast with
13	the glucose meter, which requires less than a
14	microliter. And the meters requiring the smallest
15	samples today require just .3 microliters.
16	A typical lab instrument takes at least 60
17	seconds to give a result. The glucose meter, less
18	than 10 seconds, and the majority of meters today take
19	less than five seconds, or no more than five seconds
20	to give a result.
21	The inaccuracy of a lab is generally in the
22	range of plus or minus four percent. Studies have

		249
1	shown some are as high as plus or minus ten percent,	-
2	but I think in general it's closer to the lower level.	
3	As Dr. Ginsberg mentioned, in general the meter can be	
4	much more than two times as accurate as the laboratory	
5	instrument on which its accuracy as being based.	
6	So this is a slide which, by the way, took	
7	me hours to produce.	
8	(Laughter) But it shows the the basic	
9	reaction, and I'll just go over it briefly, as Ken has	
10	spoken about it a little bit. So glucose is converted	
11	by an enzyme with more or less specificity. There's	
12	sometimes co- factors. And that enzyme is an oxidizer.	
13	It produces electrons. The electrons often are passed	
14	on to a mediator, and the mediator captures and	
15	transports the electrons to a test strip electrode or	
16	a test strip indicator. The meter reads a current,	
17	which is proportional to the glucose, or a colorless	
18	dye precursor is converted to a dye, which is read	
19	photometrically, and the changing color is	
20	proportional, again, to the glucose concentration.	
21	So that's the basic principle. Of course,	
22	there are various things that can interfere. We've	

		250
1	already mentioned things like inadequate washing, that	
2	milking the site can dilute the glucose. Various	
3	enzymes have interference. Courtney spoke at some	
4	length about GDH PQQ. The mediators are sensitive to	
5	substances such ascorbic acid, or Vitamin C. The	
6	electrodes are sensitive to a variety of endogenous	
7	compounds, such as uric acid. And despite all this,	
8	the enzyme mediator actions have to be fast to yield a	
9	fast test time.	
10	So there are a number of sources of	
11	inaccuracy. Some are analytical and some non-	
12	analytical. So interference, we've talked about	
13	endogenous interference. The one that presents the	
14	greatest issue is hematocrit. And then there are	
15	exogenous compounds, such as acetaminophen, the	
16	environment, temperature, relative humidity, altitude.	
17	Misuse can be exposing test strips to high	
18	temperature and relative humidity. It's very hard for	
19	manufacturers to prevent a test strip that's been	
20	misused to be for a patient to use that test strip.	
21	All you can do is label.	
22	And industry carefully considers all these	

1	factors and the customer requirements, for example,
2	hospital versus consumer, in providing devices that
3	deliver maximum medical benefit.
4	Another important thing to remember is that
5	the accuracy and precision testing of individual test
6	strips is destructive. So any individual test strip
7	has not been tested; okay? The lot has been tested.
8	And the release criteria rest on sampling and
9	statistical modeling. But to my knowledge, no
10	manufacturer has a technique today that allows him or
11	her or it to say that any given test strip meets
12	specifications. It's a statistical statement.
13	Patents one of the reasons for the
14	existence of patents is to provide blocking of other
15	manufacturers from using your technologies. There are
16	variabilities in raw materials that are not always
17	understood, and small variations may have a
18	substantial impact. It's incredibly difficult to
19	tease out which ones to address to try to make the
20	test strips work uniform and to extract whatever
21	remaining variability in an individual test strip that
22	is that remains.

		25
1	And manufacturers are committed to meeting	
2	these challenges in ways that address patient needs as	
3	to cost, convenience, accuracy and precision, and data	
4	analysis.	
5	So the challenge to industry is to	
6	manufacture high volumes of glucose meters and test	
7	strips. And in 2009 on a worldwide basis, individuals	
8	tested 17 to 18 billion times annually, which works	
9	out to 47 to 49 million tests a day. And the	
10	corresponding figures in the U.S. were 6.2 billion	
11	tests annually and 17 million tests daily. So that's	
12	a lot of product with which to maintain quality	
13	control. And any given manufacturer may make several	
14	billion test strips a year.	
15	And I'll give the floor to Mike.	
16	DR. MYERS: Thank you, Alan.	
17	MR. FLISS: Whereas Alan is a medical	
18	doctor, I'm a little bit of a process geek, and it's	
19	my role to help my company register products. And I'm	
20	a big fan of national and international standards,	
21	because they create a roadmap. They're built upon	
22	consensus of industry, health authorities, and the	

1	diabetes community. So they lay out if a
2	manufacturer follows these requirements or the roadmap
3	for developing a product, manufacturing a product,
4	evaluating a product, and then presenting that data to
5	the health authorities, they're like to receive a
6	quick and favorable outcome to their registration, and
7	that's helpful to the public that is served by the
8	products.
9	Let me push through a few of these.
10	We've already heard today that there's an
11	interest in addressing the performance characteristics
12	of hospital systems differently than self-testing
13	products. And industry supports that view, that not
14	only from the perspective of accuracy, but also in the
15	identification of potential interferences and
16	limitations of procedure. We're working in conjunction
17	with the ISO standard group, as well as the CLSI
18	working group. And I wanted to clarify something that
19	may have been said this morning. Neither one of these
20	activities is close to bearing fruit at this point.
21	The working groups are still gathering ideas and
22	putting together their first drafts of the documents.

1	The CLSI committee, I believe, has two documents that
2	they're working on. The ISO group is trying to revise
3	the self-test blood glucose document that was created
4	in 2003. So there is still quite a bit of an
5	opportunity to have your voices heard. And the people
6	who are involved in these groups, several of them are
7	here with us today. In fact, Dr. David Sacks, who
8	spoke this morning, is the chair of the CLSI committee
9	that is examining what to put in this point of care
10	document for glucose testing.
11	At a recent ISO meeting held in Washington,
12	D.C., in January, we considered interferences and
13	thought it might be best if we could create a master
14	list of all the compounds that manufacturers should
15	consider for self- testing and what concentrations
16	those compounds should be evaluated at. And now the
17	work it's a homework assignment a couple of the
18	individuals accepted to put together a straw man
19	proposal that could be shared with the other members
20	of the ISO team. And that first document is going to
21	be addressing self-testing.
22	From what we heard this morning, that

		255
1	hospitals would have different requirements than self-	
2	testing, we'd like to see that perhaps the CLSI group,	
3	when they see what the ISO group creates for self-	
4	testing, can look at that and see, could a similar	
5	document be created for glucose tests that are	
6	performed in a hospital setting? And that document	
7	would, it would seem need to have a mechanism to be	
8	periodically updated. If we find that it's difficult	
9	to do that within standards, we might defer to a local	
10	health authority who has the ability to occasionally	
11	issue guidance documents, and in that guidance	
12	document perhaps as attachment, we could have this	
13	list of potential interfering compounds and the	
14	concentrations at which they should be tested.	
15	What ideally if you can imagine, if there	
16	are over 20 companies that are competing to offer	
17	blood glucose monitoring devices, and as Dr. Cariski	
18	mentioned, there are almost 18 billion strips that are	
19	used over the world in a year. But only about a third	
20	of those are used in the United States. The other two	
21	are used globally. If 20 companies come up with 20	
22	different ways of evaluating hematocrit, and all of	

1	the interested health authorities around the world
2	have a different way of looking for data from
3	hematocrit, that is chaos. So if possible, within the
4	next version of the international standard, we would
5	like to see if we could address similar, as you see
6	today, that there's a section that refers to accuracy
7	studies; another section about user performance
8	evaluation let's introduce another section that
9	refers to how to evaluate potential interferences and
10	how to present them to the health authorities so that
11	they can make quick and informed decisions.
12	There was some mention by Dr. Ginsberg of
12 13	There was some mention by Dr. Ginsberg of reexamining how labeling should be laid out so that
13	reexamining how labeling should be laid out so that
13 14	reexamining how labeling should be laid out so that it's more helpful to our users, and I think that's an
13 14 15	reexamining how labeling should be laid out so that it's more helpful to our users, and I think that's an initiative that we all support. And I was reminded
13 14 15 16	reexamining how labeling should be laid out so that it's more helpful to our users, and I think that's an initiative that we all support. And I was reminded that back in 2001, FDA published a really nice
13 14 15 16 17	reexamining how labeling should be laid out so that it's more helpful to our users, and I think that's an initiative that we all support. And I was reminded that back in 2001, FDA published a really nice guidance document for patient labeling. Now, it
13 14 15 16 17 18	reexamining how labeling should be laid out so that it's more helpful to our users, and I think that's an initiative that we all support. And I was reminded that back in 2001, FDA published a really nice guidance document for patient labeling. Now, it really goes into what you could say in a package
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	reexamining how labeling should be laid out so that it's more helpful to our users, and I think that's an initiative that we all support. And I was reminded that back in 2001, FDA published a really nice guidance document for patient labeling. Now, it really goes into what you could say in a package insert. And what it if you're familiar with the

1	you're given some amount of latitude to try to take
2	your content, your text, and write it in such a way
3	that the self-tester would understand. So we're
4	allowed to deviate from the the format of the
5	centralized lab, and the companies are actually
6	deviating from each other, as well.
7	So if you wanted to compare two products
8	side by side by pulling out the package inserts from
9	two different manufacturers, you might have a little
10	bit of difficulty finding the similar claims. And
11	this is something that perhaps we could work together
12	through consensus as to the best way to lay out the
13	package inserts so that people can get the information
14	they need. And then Dr. Ginsberg's idea from this
15	morning of let's perhaps get more information out at
16	the point of purchase, perhaps on the carton label or
17	on the vial label. Just as an idea, we know on the
18	back of the carton label today, we have the range and
19	composition table, which isn't very helpful to our lay
20	public. So that's space that could be available to
21	convey to the user what are some of the key
22	limitations and procedure of that particular product,

258

1 and if there's a way to characterize accuracy with a 2 number or small display. So what we would like to conclude is that it 3 is somewhat challenging to create many millions of 4 these devices when we have to perform the tests with 5 whole blood samples. We're aware that there's a need 6 to evaluate several potential interferences, and we 7 wish to work with the consensus developing 8 9 organizations, both domestically and internationally, to create lists of potential interferences that should 10 be examined and how they should be examined so that 11 whether -- whatever product you're buying from 12 13 whatever company, you can be confident that they all evaluated their product in a consistent manner. 14 15 As was mentioned earlier, it is challenging 16 for these products, because they're used in a wide 17 variety of settings. There's a potential the user 18 might misuse the product beyond the manufacturer's instructions. And we have constraints for size, the 19 20 meter sample, and the test time in order to make the 21 product appealing so that people will reliably perform 22 their tests and comply with their monitoring program.

> (866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

		259
1	So one of the key pieces we've been asked,	
2	how do we make our decisions as to the final design of	
3	our product? And we really try to take into	
4	consideration the requirements that have been	
5	expressed by our customers. And then we co-optimize	
6	across all these potential decisions we can make to	
7	design the product which is best-suited for that	
8	particular part of the marketplace.	
9	Perhaps for the consumer channel, we might	
10	want to emphasize having a broad operating temperature	
11	claim so that we're confident that if there is a	
12	parent who wants to run a glucose test on a soccer	
13	field in Georgia in August, they're going to get a	
14	quantified test result, rather than an error message.	
15	But we might take that same product and look	
16	at it a little differently in design technology, just	
17	a little different so that when it's being used in the	
18	healthcare facility, where we could perhaps narrow the	
19	operating temperature, and we could optimize one of	
20	the other characteristics of the product.	
21	I hope you've found these remarks helpful.	
22	Thank you.	

		2
1	(Applause)	
2	DR. MYERS: Thank you. Do we have any	
3	questions for either Dr. Cariski or Mr. Fliss? Yes?	
4	MS. ULLMAN: Ellen Ullman, patient advocate.	
5	I wanted to know with respect to the	
6	temperature of the strips, because now a lot of people	
7	through managed care are getting their strips	
8	delivered through mail order pharmacy, spending at	
9	least a week in transportation in dark brown UPS	
10	trucks in south Florida, so it's been now exposed to,	
11	I don't know, 140 degrees, who knows. Are they still	
12	accurate, those strips?	
13	DR. CARISKI: You know, the supply chain and	
14	the way strips are transported is taken into account	
15	in the way the strips are made and the expiration	
16	dates. But what isn't taken into account is the	
17	notion that somebody can leave the vial in the baking	
18	sun for weeks on end, okay. But those elements of the	
19	supply chain are taken into account.	
20	MS. ULLMAN: So up to how many days is that	
21		
22	DR. CARISKI: I couldn't tell you, because	
1		

		261
1	it's going to vary on temperature and humidity and the	
2	product, and there are all kinds of variables. I will	
3	say this: in case there's ever any doubt, the best	
4	thing to do would be to run a control solution test,	
5	and that'll tell you the system's working or not.	
6	MS. ULLMAN: Okay. Thank you.	
7	DR. CARISKI: Sure.	
8	MR. SCHLEIS: Tom Schleis with Octapharma.	
9	We're one of the manufacturers of immune globulin that	
10	has maltose in it, and we've worked with the FDA very	
11	closely to make our customers and our patients aware	
12	of this interference. And I published a peer-reviewed	
13	article regarding the interference of maltose,	
14	icodextrin, galactose, and xylose with blood glucose	
15	monitoring systems. And we've hard about maltose and	
16	icodextrin. But the other thing I learned when I was	
17	doing the research for this article is about galactose	
18	and xylose. And galactose and xylose are naturally	
19	occurring. You can find them in fruits, vegetables,	
20	herbs, and dairy products. Whether or not ingestion	
21	of these foods can result in a high enough level to	
22	cause the interference, we really don't know. It's	

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

		262
1	not been studied. But what's more worrisome is that	
2	they are heavily marketed in health food stores for a	
3	whole wide range of unsubstantiated claims. They're	
4	purported to prevent and cure cancer, cure multiple	
5	sclerosis, cure bacterial and viral infections, boost	
6	the immune system, improve the functioning of the	
7	liver and intestinal tract and that's the short	
8	list.	
9	And they are promoted in very high doses,	
10	doses high enough to cause this interference. And	
11	they're also specifically noted to be safe for use in	
12	diabetic patients, because they don't increase glucose	
13	levels serum glucose levels. So this is another	
14	area where we really don't know if patients are	
15	experiencing hypoglycemia and potentially deaths as a	
16	result of these two sugars.	
17	And when I saw the number of 13 deaths with	
18	maltose and icodextrin-containing solutions, that's 13	
19	deaths that we know of. And as was mentioned, many of	
20	these more of these cases of adverse incidents are	
21	unreported, so that number is, I think we can safely	
22	say, is quite a bit higher.	

		26
1	And I have a problem just looking at this as	
2	a statistic. To me, this is 13 deaths. This is 13	
3	families that lost a loved one because of an	
4	interference that was completely avoidable. And I	
5	really have to ask the question, why do we allow these	
6	glucometers to still remain on the market? These	
7	patients did not die from maltose. They did not die	
8	from icodextrin. They died because the glucometer	
9	gave a false reading. And we have safe alternatives.	
10	We continue to do as much education as possible, but I	
11	guarantee there will be more deaths, and I have a real	
12	problem with that.	
13	DR. HARPER: Well, we definitely appreciate	
14	your comments. And I agree that we may not know the	
15	extent of the problem, so any information that you may	
16	have discovered about some other potential issues, we	
17	would be happy to hear.	
18	We are talking to manufacturers and others	
19	to try and figure out what is the best way to move	
20	forward to be sure that products are available for	
21	people who are safe. And so any input we get on that	
22	is actually very much appreciated.	

		28
1	MR. SCHLEIS: Thank you.	
2	DR. MYERS: Before we take the next	
3	question, we're scheduled now for our open panel	
4	discussion. So I just want to indicate that we're	
5	open for any questions to any of the panel members at	
6	this time.	
7	MS. SKEENS: Hi. Lisa Skeens, Baxter	
8	Healthcare, and I appreciate the comments from the	
9	person before me and agree with that.	
10	I want to now move on to what can we to	
11	further mitigate the interference issue, whether it's	
12	icodextrin or other drug products that are now. For	
13	Extraneal or icodextrin, we have a global risk	
14	management program that is in place to ensure that we	
15	are educating clinicians and our patients about this	
16	risk. And we've done verification of that training.	
17	We also provide patient med guides; we provide	
18	hospital admission kits to educate them about how to	
19	advocate for themselves when they are going into a	
20	hospital; and this will shortly be approved as a	
21	REMS(ph) through Cedar.	
22	And so part of the question is, if you are a	

1	manufacturer who has an interfering enzyme and
2	provides falsely elevated readings when used with
3	something like icodextrin, you know, what are the
4	device companies to mitigate the risk, to educate
5	their end users, such as hospitals, where we're seeing
6	the biggest issue? It's actually trained healthcare
7	professionals where we're seeing the significant
8	issues around the world.
9	So what can device manufacturers do, or what
10	can FDA do to require risk management programs of
11	device manufacturers to further reduce the risk, to
12	educate clinicians about the risk? And it seems like
13	there should be parity between what we're doing on the
14	drug side and what we're doing on the device side.
15	Other things I know, other ministries of health, have
16	done are required stickers in the hospital. So
17	actually a sticker on the point of care monitors that
18	reminds the nurse that if this person is on peritoneal
19	dialysis, that they should not be using the point or
20	care monitors, that they should be using the
21	analytical hospital labs.
22	So are there other I want to throw out

266

1 those ideas and really ask both industry and FDA to 2 comment on that. Thank you. 3 DR. MYERS: Thank you. DR. HARPER: I'll just go briefly, Mike, 4 first, because our recommendations are in the public 5 health notification. And just to reiterate, our first 6 recommendation is that health care facilities avoid 7 using these particular test strips in their facility 8 9 at all, and if they do use them, we did recommend a series of steps that we believe would be risk 10 11 mitigation steps to help increase awareness of this. 12 So we have attempted to do that. The 13 question does remain open on how effective has that I don't think we have enough time yet to 14 been. understand how effective that communication has been 15 yet, but we are following it. 16 17 MR. FLISS: On behalf of industry, it is our 18 goal to provide safe, reliable, and accurate product, and we think that we're doing so. When we become 19 20 aware of an issue, we have -- the best solution is to 21 do something through design. But you also, if you're unable to do that for a period of time, you try to 22

> (866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

address it through labeling, through an education
 campaign.

3 In the case of maltose, you're seeing the companies get the message out over the course of 4 several years, and keep having the message out. 5 And then through design, in addition to having the 6 stickers on the device, some of the meters now have 7 been changed so that there is a software prompt that 8 9 comes up for the operator to make sure to ask themselves, "Is this a patient who might be on therapy 10 that would raise their maltose level?" So that's a 11 12 design solution for the short term.

13 MR. CEMBROWSKI: Cembrowski, University of Alberta. A point for Dr. Cariski. You could get out 14 15 of your box a little bit. There are different boxes 16 for measuring blood glucose. Probably the best one to 17 compare to any point of care method is the blood gas 18 glucose. It gives you whole blood. It's as good as -- as good as or better than a laboratory method, and 19 20 you can use it in your evaluations or even sort of 21 post-marketing, and this would be a good idea for FDA. 22 There are a lot of patients in ICUs who have their

> (866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	bloods drawn both with capillary specimens that are
2	run on point of care instruments and then they also
3	have their arterial bloods run on blood gas glucoses.
4	And it's amazing what you can find. And I think you
5	could be able to discover many, many interesting
6	outliers that you could use to develop better systems.
7	DR. CARISKI: Well, thank you for your
8	suggestion. I know that people from $R\&D$ are here
9	listening to the meeting. I know that we use as our
10	reference the YSI, which is supposed to be a, you
11	know, reasonably accurate instrument and measures
12	capillary samples so that we're comparing, you know,
13	apples to apples rather than, you know, a capillary to
14	arterial. But thank you for your point.
15	MS. SOLDO: Hi. Monnett Soldo again from
16	OptiScan.
17	You know, we in our company, use a different
18	technology, so perhaps it's not a fair question, but
19	I'm going to ask anyway. Where we put the bar for our
20	own performance is that we meet the ISO standard even
21	in the presence of all the interference that one
22	would find in the ICU. And so I'm a little bit

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1	confused in this discussion how we're distinguishing
2	between, there's the ISO standard and then there's
3	interferences, and we're going to just basically try
4	to label against them, which obviously has
5	effectiveness problems; right?
6	So I would challenge the other industry
7	representatives on two counts. Number one, can we
8	meet the ISO standard as currently stated in an ICU
9	setting, including all the interferences that are
10	currently present in that environment, number one? And
11	number two, is it possible to introduce, using maybe
12	this dynamic electrochemistry or whatever was
13	mentioned before, some sort of a no-read criteria to
14	detect outliers and report them as outliers, and give
15	no reading whatsoever rather than a fundamentally
16	wrong reading?
17	It would seem to me that the technology
18	possible today ought to support both of those, so I'd
19	like to hear your thoughts.
20	DR. CARISKI: Well, I've looked around and
21	nobody else looks like they're prepared to answer, so
22	I'll do the best that I can.

1	First of all, I think this meeting has
2	one thing it's done has clearly distinguished between
3	meters for consumers and meters for hospitals. And
4	the ISO standard, by its very statement, addresses
5	consumer meters. It has nothing to do with hospital
6	meters, and by default, it came to be used for meters
7	that are used in hospitals. And as has been noted,
8	CLSI is working on POCT(12) to address standards for
9	hospital meters, and that's a separate issue.
10	For consumer meters, I tried to point out
11	how difficult it is for manufacturers with current
12	technologies to eliminate all interferences. And when
13	you start stacking interferences, it becomes a real
14	problem. So a meter might do okay with the crit, and
15	then you add some uric acid, and it's okay. But then
16	when you start adding, you know, acetaminophen and the
17	patient has high lipids and a high bilirubin, and
18	which, you know, some people do when they're
19	outpatients it becomes really problematic.
20	I don't know enough about the technology
21	that Dr. Ginsberg mentioned to say to what extent it
22	can successfully address these things, but also there

		27
1	may be patents involved that prevent other	
2	manufacturers from using it. All I can say is that	
3	every manufacturer, I think it's fair to say, wants to	
4	make the best, most accurate product that they can	
5	that the patient can use, and we're all working	
6	towards that end.	
7	DR. HARPER: I would actually like to press	
8	on this issue a little bit more, because I think this	
9	is something we're interested in. Not not simply	
10	for the current ISO standard or some other standard,	
11	but if there were to be standards developed, no matter	
12	whether it's a standard for lay use or a standard for	
13	hospital use, do you believe anyone on the panel	
14	do you believe that interference should be a part of	
15	this concept of total system accuracy, or a total	
16	allowable error concept? Because, you know, what is	
17	encompassed in that total allowable error in terms of	
18	the intended use of the device?	
19	So I'd like to hear from you all about your	
20	opinions on the inclusion of interference in that.	
21	MR. FLISS: Well, the challenge is when	
22	you're trying to stack potential errors to evaluate	

	۷
1	what their total might be. What we do is, before we
2	market any new product, we bring our product out to
3	the marketplace, to hospitals, physician offices, and
4	we conduct method comparison studies where we gather
5	samples from patients, measure them on the
6	investigative device as well as on our reference
7	method, and we're also recording what concentrations
8	of potential interferences are in that sample to see,
9	if we do find that there's a flyer, was it caused by
10	the presence of one of the compounds that we suspect
11	is an interferent for that particular assay?
12	DR. HARPER: So do you think interference
13	should be included in the total allowable error? Is
14	that what you're saying?
15	MR. FLISS: Well, actually I think you find
16	that by looking at the regression equation that comes
17	out of the method comparison study. Because the
18	sample isn't contrived or controlled. It in theory
19	has whatever interfering compounds the patient is
20	carrying with them or her at that given time.
21	DR. HARPER: Yeah. I mean, I think we're
22	not aware, and perhaps you have this data and we

		273
1	haven't seen it or aren't aware I don't think we're	
2	aware at FDA when the data we get, that it actually	
3	would, you know, be a broad enough selection of	
4	patients to actually get an idea of the range of	
5	interferences that are possible. And that's	
6	especially true for, I'd say, hospital use and the	
7	types of sick patients. We already talked about that	
8	this morning. But even in the lay environment, the	
9	sort of ranges of interferences you'd see. So we are	
10	interested in feedback from people, you know, to the	
11	docket or any other way on how interferences can be	
12	assessed, and also which products and we're working	
13	on this as well with some other groups which	
14	products are actually most important to look at where	
15	you might be more likely to see it more often than	
16	sporadically. Because if you have a sporadic	
17	interference that's significant, you might want to	
18	look at that. If you have a constant sort of	
19	interference that's likely, you also want to make sure	
20	you look at that. And I don't know how much current	
21	study designs actually evaluate that.	
22	MR. ERVIN: I would like to suggest that	

1	interferences usually aren't sporadic; that an
2	interference is going to be a relatively systemic
3	effect. Witness ascorbate as an example.
4	And another thing I would like to suggest is
5	that rather than including it, necessarily, in total
6	error, eliminate them. I think we should be trying to
7	develop technologies and there are pieces of them
8	out there that manufacturers can use to ultimately
9	eliminate the effect of interferences. Maltose is a
10	good example. There are other enzymes available. You
11	can get away from it, but from a manufacturer's
12	perspective, that's not an easy thing to do, but it's
13	really where we should be headed.
14	DR. HARPER: Yeah, I mean by sporadic, I had
15	meant, you know, people some people are on a drug
16	and some people aren't. Some people may be on
17	acetaminophen, some people may not.
18	But that's an interesting point of view, I
19	think, is to eliminate it. And I think we would all
20	like to see that happen.
21	But another question I had relative to this
22	question of interferences is how best to communicate

1	this information to lay users? I tell you one thing
2	we struggle with sometimes is if there is a certain
3	level of interference in a laboratory or a hospital
4	environment, we may be able to label against it.
5	Sometimes more effectively than others, obviously,
6	with the PQQ issue shows that sometimes not not
7	terribly effective. But in the lay population, you
8	may have interferences that are not identifiable by
9	the patient. So they may not know that they have a
10	high level of triglycerides; they may not know that
11	they have some sort of high level of an endogenous
12	compound. They may be able to avoid acetaminophen if
13	they read it. But so any suggestions, as well, on how
14	best to communicate information about interferences to
15	the lay public would also be helpful.
16	MR. FLISS: We're also interested in
17	pursuing that line of thought. We were recently
18	considering ascorbic acid as being something of
19	interest that shows up in some of the tests for
20	package inserts. But how would someone from the lay
21	public figure out what that means to them? Do they
22	realize that we're talking about Vitamin C, and how

		276
1	many glasses of orange juice or how many vitamins they	
2	can take before they reach a point that they should be	
3	concerned? So making a limitation statement that's	
4	very scientific in nature isn't easily used by the lay	
5	public. So I was hoping that this would be the type	
6	of subject that we could address perhaps within this	
7	consensus organization, whether it be CLSI, or if it's	
8	a lay product, it'd be the ISO organization.	
9	DR. CARISKI: I want to make one comment,	
10	and that is that there has to be some limit to the	
11	consideration of interferences in terms of total	
12	error, because by definition, they're interfering	
13	substances. We don't test every substance known to	
14	man. We test only certain substances, because we know	
15	they have a propensity to interfere with the	
16	technology. And sure, ultimately we would like to	
17	have a technology that eliminates any interference	
18	whatsoever, but right now, to my knowledge, for the	
19	test strips that isn't the case.	
20	One thing that patients can do is they can	
21	check their blood sugar against the lab. And there	
22	are instructions in all the inserts telling them how	

1	to do that, and it will give them some idea as to how
2	accurate it is for them. So whereas they may not know
3	their lipid level or their how much acetaminophen
4	or ascorbic acid they have, they can see whether
5	they're close to the lab or not.
6	DR. HARPER: I will comment that at FDA, we
7	tend to believe that all sources of error should be
8	included in an allowable error measurement. So we
9	would be interested in actually identifying the
10	interferences and being sure that a particular patient
11	is likely to be within that error range, even with the
12	presence of interferences.
1 0	
13	MS. PINKOS: Arleen Pinkos, FDA. My
13	MS. PINKOS: Arleen Pinkos, FDA. My expectations for this session were to hear the
14	expectations for this session were to hear the
14 15	expectations for this session were to hear the barriers, and for the barriers to be described
14 15 16	expectations for this session were to hear the barriers, and for the barriers to be described specifically enough that we could start working on the
14 15 16 17	expectations for this session were to hear the barriers, and for the barriers to be described specifically enough that we could start working on the solutions towards them. We've already heard that
14 15 16 17 18	expectations for this session were to hear the barriers, and for the barriers to be described specifically enough that we could start working on the solutions towards them. We've already heard that there are some other technologies that can eliminate a
14 15 16 17 18 19	expectations for this session were to hear the barriers, and for the barriers to be described specifically enough that we could start working on the solutions towards them. We've already heard that there are some other technologies that can eliminate a lot of the interferences and can get more accurate

1	technology, or do we really need to be looking at a
2	different technology? Is it achievable or not, and if
3	it really is, I've heard cost is a factor. But I
4	mean, is there anything that's specific that anybody
5	can do to help remove those limitations?
6	MR. ERVIN: Well, I think that there are at
7	least two companies out there that are demonstrating
8	that you can do this, and publishing a lot on the
9	topic. So like with all things, sometimes it takes
10	considerable energy to move a huge, massive business.
11	I mean you're talking here multiple billions of tests
12	and lots of different products. The companies that
13	can come up with a innovative technology that has a
14	proprietary position and can go and develop tools to
15	do this, they're working on it. They're doing it.
16	Other companies have a lot invested in where they're
17	at at the moment, and they have to move forward, too.
18	But it's a little bit more difficult for them.
19	MS. PINKOS: Just a follow-up. Are the
20	companies that you're referring to things like HemoCue
21	and i-STAT, or are there a simple, inexpensive device
22	that people could use at home that are starting to

overcome the physiological limitations and
interferences? I guess my question is, is it possible
for these home use types of meters the pure, simple
point of care analyzers that we're used to thinking of
at the home use are we ever going to, with that
technology, be able to overcome the limitations, or do
we really do we need a new technology like some of
these other devices and the blood gas analyzer?
MR. ERVIN: I don't know if we can get this
technology into the home use situation. Sitting
behind you is Jeff Dubois, who probably could address
that more easily. But I don't see any long-term
barrier to it. As with most things, you once you
scale up things and you get your technology made rock-
solid and less costly to manufacture, yeah, you can
spread it out into other environments. And I think
that's possible with some of these products. In fact,
I know some of them are actually targeting the home
use market now. So it's possible.
DR. KLONOFF: David Klonoff, Mills-Peninsula
Health Services. One suggestion was made that if
there's interference, that the meter should provide no

1	information, should just be blocked. That ties in
2	with one of the accuracy topics, that we were trying
3	to figure out how to deal with outliers. But I didn't
4	hear anybody this morning talk about how to deal with
5	non-readings, what happens if there's no reading at
6	all? That should be a form of an outlier. I think
7	that should be taken into account.
8	MS. BOWMAN: Cynthia Bowman, Long Island
9	Jewish Medical Center. I know this is a conference
10	concerning glucometers, but I'm just going to say as
11	far as interference goes, it's not so easy in the
12	central lab on the main analyzers, too. And if any of
13	you have ever tried to confirm your interferences
14	you know, confirm the manufacturer's claims? Sometimes
15	you wish you hadn't tried, because it is really
16	confusing. And for somebody who's been on a three-
17	year odyssey right now to try to figure out what's
18	going on because you have you put rules in and, you
19	know, middle ware and auto verification and all that
20	sort of stuff. And I'm aware of peers who've gone the
21	same road that I have, that it varies over time. You
22	try to set very conservative limits.

1	But the other thing, too, and there's
2	literature about one person's lipemia is not the same
3	as another person's lipemia, different particle size -
4	- I suspect the same thing is true for hemolysis and
5	icterus also. And so I can tell you that, you know, I
6	give the device manufacturers their due it's not
7	easy. And I think it probably cuts across all sorts
8	of instruments, and the interferent we fear is the one
9	we're not aware of.
10	DR. SACKS: Sacks from Boston. One of the
11	points that came up in several slides in this last
12	session as one of the limitations of the technology
13	was the time. It's not clear to me why this is
14	necessary. I can understand why patients would want
15	small meters that they can put in their purse or
16	pocket, why they'd want small volume of blood. But
17	why a test needs to be done in ten seconds or five
18	seconds versus 45 seconds is not clear to me if people
19	are only doing it four times a day. Would
20	manufacturers care to respond to that?
21	DR. CARISKI: I know that I don't have
22	the specific data. I know it's been looked at in

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

		282
1	terms of patient preferences. And clearly the	
2	preference is for shorter, because, you know, it's	
3	like anything else. We used to have, you know, a	
4	modem that worked at 400 or 1600 or whatever, and now	
5	it's and you wonder how we ever lived with it	
6	before.	
7	And as meters became faster and faster, that	
8	was what people expected. I think if a manufacturer	
9	were to come out with a meter now that took a minute,	
10	let's say, but was more accurate, I'm not sure how	
11	many people would would embrace it. All I know is	
12	the marketing says that most people want faster and,	
13	you know, smaller.	
14	MR. FLISS: As people are living more active	
15	lives, they desire to be able to discreetly perform	
16	their tests. And being able to get a result quickly is	
17	attractive to many people.	
18	DR. SACKS: I understand those points, but I	
19	remain unconvinced that a 30-second difference in the	
20	timing that could significantly improve the accuracy	
21	of a meter and avoid hypoglycemia is beneficial to	
22	patient care.	

		28
1	DR. CARISKI: The other thank you.	_
2	DR. WHITE: Neil White, pediatric	
3	endocrinologist from St. Louis. I think if the	
4	patients don't understand the importance or the lack	
5	of accuracy that we're talking about here, and if you	
6	tried to market a meter now that took a minute next to	
7	a meter that took five seconds, they're not going to	
8	go for the minute. I can tell you that. They	
9	every time the meter gets shorter, they say, Oh, I'm	
10	going to get this one, because it only takes three	
11	seconds or whatever.	
12	Now, if we can really demonstrate an	
13	importance in certain patient populations where the	
14	accuracy is a key component that they will understand	
15	that accuracy as important, then they might be willing	
16	to sacrifice the speed for the accuracy if there was a	
17	reason that they needed that we can convince them	
18	that they needed that accuracy. But at this point in	
19	time, they don't know they're not convinced of	
20	that. They're not even convinced that there's an	
21	error at all.	
22	MS. KOLLER: Beth Koller from	

		284
1	DR. CARISKI: I'd like to add one thing, if	-
2	I may. I know that for some technologies, more time	
3	doesn't make a difference. So it may be a matter of	
4	going to a whole new technology. It's not like if you	
5	have a strip today and you said, Okay, instead of	
6	running the test five seconds, we'll run it 30	
7	seconds. It'll be more accurate. It won't	
8	necessarily be true, because the strip may have been	
9	optimized for the five-second result, okay. So it's a	
10	little complicated, is what I'm trying to say.	
11	MS. KOLLER: Beth Koller from CMS.	
12	I'd like to make an inquiry about what is	
13	and is not in the label, and how the label changes.	
14	And if you would comment on how this relates to drugs,	
15	where I think people have a better understanding of	
16	what a label means.	
17	It's my understanding that a label can be	
18	can be more transient for devices than it is for	
19	for drugs, that there can be that manufacturers can	
20	insert the label can change the labels without	
21	agreement with the FDA. And it's also been our	
22	experience that it's difficult to actually find the	

(866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

1 most current label for a device, and this has some 2 implications for us at our agency. And in addition, because many devices are 3 approved - - not approved, they're cleared through the 4 510(k) process, if you could comment on that. 5 And what kinds of drift in the data might occur when 6 you're using not a single predicate, where there can 7 8 be multiple predicates. 9 Thank you. DR. HARPER: Sure. So Beth has pointed out 10 some -- definitely some differences between drug 11 labels and device labels. So for those of you who 12 13 aren't aware, when a drug is approved, the labeling is available on line, and it actually cannot be modified 14 without interaction with FDA and FDA approval of that 15 16 modified labeling. 17 For Class 2 devices like glucose meters, that isn't true. FDA looks at what we would consider 18 draft labeling. And so some of the information on the 19 20 labeling, or the way that's stated, could possibly be 21 modified by the manufacturer without a submission to FDA or FDA review. 22

1	Now, there are some limitations on that.
2	They cannot change claims or add additional claims to
3	the labeling that would be outside of the clearance
4	they received. But they can certainly modify the
5	labeling sufficiently.
6	And also you're right that there is right
7	now, because of this a little bit, there isn't
8	consistently any sort of resource to obtain device
9	labeling. There's definitely discussions, especially
10	for over-the-counter products, of trying to get that
11	to happen, but those discussions are in the early
12	stages. And it's difficult where there is a draft
13	labeling involved, in terms of figuring out how to
14	keep that current. So that is definitely one of the
15	challenges there.
16	In terms of the potential problem with
17	performance drift because of the nature of the 510(k)
18	program, it certainly is possible. For those of you
19	who are less familiar, FDA has and for Class 2
20	devices, it's actually a performance between devices.
21	So if one device compares to another device, and that
22	device compares to another device, and that compares

		2
1	to another device, there is a possibility sometimes	
2	for performance drift from the original device. And	
3	this sometimes creates a situation where devices	
4	aren't comparable.	
5	We try to minimize that as much as we can. I	
6	think it's very clear that these devices aren't always	
7	completely comparable to each other. But at least for	
8	blood glucose meters, we do look at them in	
9	relationship to a reference method that's we try	
10	to keep a little bit more traceable. So we try to	
11	minimize that a little bit by comparing the	
12	performance to the reference, rather than to another	
13	blood glucose meter. It may not be ideal, but it	
14	certainly is something to keep in mind.	
15	MR. FLISS: If I may add a remark? There is	
16	a certain limitation to that freedom to change	
17	labeling, like Dr. Harper mentioned. We're not	
18	allowed to expand the intended use or indication for	
19	use of the product, and we're not allowed to remove a	
20	warning, precaution, or limitation without seeking	
21	concurrence from the FDA before that labeling is	
22	changed.	

1	DR. MYERS: Yeah, and I have one other
2	comment.
3	With the 510(k), using the predicate device
4	comparison, what would it take to change that to do it
5	make it a standards-based comparison, rather than a
6	predicate comparison?
7	DR. HARPER: We do have, or have exercised,
8	some leeway there, in that in 2003, FDA actually did
9	recognize the ISO standard. And that standard was
10	actually better than what we had been using before.
11	And so there are devices that are not cleared because
12	they don't meet that standard.
13	So there is some way for us to do that, and
14	certainly right now many of you may be aware that the
15	Center for Devices is actually looking into the 510(k)
16	program in general. And part of that evaluation is
17	looking at the scientific standards and where they
18	should be looked at or evaluated. So I think if we
19	have, especially clinical and scientific reasons
20	behind meeting certain types of data, I think that
21	where we have justification, we could do it for
22	patient safety.

1 MR. NEUMANN: Glenn Neumann, New World 2 Regulatory Solutions. 3 Something that struck me early on today was how much the user can impact the accuracy of the test. 4 And it seems to me we have -- we know about human 5 I don't think we know enough. We have flex 6 factors. study menu; I don't think it's big enough. 7 So perhaps if we could put more effort into preventing user error 8 9 through flex studies and better technology, even -- if we could take or eliminate or reduce, seriously 10 11 reduce, the user error, we could take a big bite out 12 of this total error, it would seem to me. 13 So for example, I've typed how many millions of words into my computer in my lifetime. 14 I still 15 make typos. I still make the same typos over and over. Microsoft Word is smart enough to correct some 16 17 of them for me. But if we could do something with 18 these meters that would see and detect user error, and if we do more flex studies to really know what goes 19 20 on, you now, maybe what Courtney needs is a million 21 data points, a thousand users doing a thousand 22 repetitions. The young man who was here did over

> (866) 448-DEPO www.CaptialReportingCompany.com ©2010

		29
1	100,000. He got a 76 and a 210 on the same day.	
2	There's got to be something going on there. So I think	
3	if we focus on that, that's something we can do right	
4	now. It could help out.	
5	MR. FLISS: Thank you. I know you're	
6	hearing a lot about standards today, but I've got a	
7	couple more to share with you.	
8	IEC has published a document that has the	
9	number 62366, and it describes a usability engineering	
10	program that a company might consider while designing	
11	a product. Another standard is ISO 14971, which is	
12	risk management for medical devices. And there was an	
13	annex added to that a couple years ago to address in	
14	vitro diagnostic products.	
15	So the designers of blood glucose meters are	
16	aware of these standards and have adapted our	
17	development, manufacturing, verification and	
18	validation activities to comply with those standards.	
19	So an example of how a system might be changed because	
20	of usability engineering many devices now have come	
21	out with under-dose detection. So although the size	
22	of the sample is much smaller than it used to be, but	

		291
1	still if the user places a sample on the strip that is	
2	too small to conduct the test, the meter now is smart	
3	enough to notice that and default to an error message	
4	rather than giving a biased test result.	
5	DR. SCOTT: Mitch Scott from St. Louis.	
6	One thing I'm hearing now that I think	
7	everyone is buying into is that we need to have	
8	different performance criteria in different settings.	
9	The three of you from industry just said you support	
10	that.	
11	The issue today, though, is that it doesn't	
12	exist. The technology, the interferences, is pretty	
13	much spread across home use and hospital use meters;	
14	correct? Okay? That leaves you to a hypothetical	
15	question that I think gets to the crux of the matter,	
16	and I'd like to hear your opinions on the answer. You	
17	have two choices. You tell those of us in a hospital,	
18	"Keep using what you're using. We'll get you a better	
19	meter in three or five years." The other alternative	
20	is stop using what you're using, and go use a blood	
21	gas analyzer or an i-STAT.	
22	That's the two answers you've got, if	

292 1 everyone's in agreement with this, and I --MR. ERVIN: In the hospital. 2 DR. SCOTT: -- in the hospital. In the 3 4 hospital. DR. CARISKI: Isn't that a question the 5 hospital can answer -- isn't that a question the 6 hospital can answer for itself? 7 8 DR. SCOTT: You're absolutely correct. But 9 we're going to have a lot of pressure on cost. 10 UNIDENTIFIED: He would answer in a different way than his hospital. 11 12 (Laughter) 13 DR. SCOTT: Yes. If I had my 'druthers, we would switch to a more accurate method, but I think 14 we'll run into issues with cost. 15 16 MR. FLISS: I think your question is 17 complicated for us to answer, because we haven't 18 really yet considered how accurate, precise a device needs to be in order to address your need to implement 19 a tight glycemic control, so -- and our devices aren't 20 21 on label indicated for tight glycemic control programs. They're monitoring devices. They were 22

		293
1	created when we thought that our self-testers were	
2	interested in being between 80 and 180, and I believe	
3	it was mentioned earlier today that the hospital	
4	protocol has historically been to try to keep the	
5	patient below 180 milligrams per deciliter. So that's	
6	what we're providing today.	
7	DR. SCOTT: Okay. So, does anybody want to	
8	tell me what to do?	
9	(Laughter)	
10	MR. WHITE: I have a question which is a	
11	little bit off the subject, and I'm sorry. I wanted	
12	to ask somebody in response to something that Mr.	
13	Ervin said, and I don't know if you'll be able to	
14	answer this or not, but maybe somebody here in the	
15	front row can help me answer this. You talked about	
16	the po2 and the difference between arterial and venous	
17	blood. When we are doing physiologic studies in a	
18	clinical research center environment, we are often	
19	trying to keep blood glucoses at a steady level, such	
20	as by a clamp. We often arterialize the blood because	
21	we think that the venous blood is different than the	
22	arterial blood. Is that an analytic difference, or is	

1 that a physiologic difference of actual blood sugar? 2 MR. ERVIN: And the process for 3 arterializing involves? 4 MR. WHITE: Warming -- warming the hand. 5 MR. ERVIN: Okay. You're going to have the temperature effect on the equilibrium. I'm going to 6 say that that's probably an analytical effect. 7 8 UNIDENTIFIED: Think so? (Inaudible, off 9 mike) It's different than what I've always been taught, yeah. 10 11 DR. GINSBERG: When you arterialize the blood, what you basically do is you create AV shots, 12 13 so that you basically bypass the capillaries, and the arterial blood is now picked up in the veins. 14 And 15 when you do that, you do two things. One, you do increase the oxygen. Well, they don't think you 16 17 increase the oxygen in the arterialized blood much 18 above 80 or 85 milligrams -- milliliters of mercury. 19 So you're not going to create a major oxygen problem, 20 I don't think. I've never checked it, but I don't 21 think you're going to create that. 22 What you are going to do, though, is there's

		295
1	another factor. And that is, the blood glucose is not	
2	the same in the arteries, the capillaries, and the	
3	veins. And part of that is because there's some	
4	glucose extracted by the muscles and other things as	
5	you go along there. And when you arterialize it	
6	and for that reason, arterial and capillary blood are	
7	actually pretty close. Venous blood is lower,	
8	particularly in a time around a meal. So that if you	
9	measure glucose in the veins about within an hour	
10	to two hours after a meal, it will be one to two	
11	millimolar. So 18 to 36 milligrams per deciliter	
12	lower than capillary blood, which is very similar to	
13	arterializing. But because arterializing capillary is	
14	similar, and I don't think there's an oxygen problem	
15	on arterialized blood, although I don't know that,	
16	it'd be worth checking I think that arterialized	
17	blood would be very similar to capillary blood in	
18	terms of the number you get.	
19	MR. WHITE: (Off mike) What you're saying is	
20	what I've always been taught, but you (inaudible).	
21	MR. ERVIN: I probably misunderstood the	
22	point you were trying to make. If in fact the oxygen	

		296
1	levels in that arterialized venous blood is in the	
2	order of 80 to 90 milligrams I'm sorry, millimeters	
3	pressure, then that's very very, very close to	
4	capillary level. So you're not going to see a po2	
5	effect with these po2 sensitive methods in that	
6	application.	
7	MR. STR Hi. Anders Strfrom HemoCue Sweden.	
8	A question for FDA. Considering the two	
9	sessions today talking about accuracy and precision,	
10	combined with this interference discussion we're	
11	having, is the result of this that we need to have	
12	different requirements for different type of patient	
13	settings and so on? So it's not only about home use	
14	and hospital use, but it's about neonatals, about	
15	different type of ICU settings, about different type	
16	of home patients, being that using a lot of I	
17	don't know the English word, but substances you buy in	
18	the drugstore and so on?	
19	DR. HARPER: So I think that part of part	
20	of the reason that we hosted this meeting is actually	
21	to hear from this community of people about maybe what	
22	steps we might need to take. Because, you know, we	

1	definitely heard the point of view that perhaps there
2	needs to be some enforcement of FDA's point of view
3	about intended use population. So, you know, right
4	now these meters are being used off-label as part of
5	the practice of medicine in hospitals, and we're
6	hearing some people have feedback that perhaps they're
7	not safe.
8	We've also heard today, though, that some
9	people are using them in their hospitals and need
10	them. So we'll have to create the right balance, and
11	we're interested from hearing all stakeholders on
12	that. But that is exactly the question that we're
13	trying to address, is how do we make these safe for
14	all patients on which they're used?
15	DR. BRETON: It just tends to be just home
16	use versus hospital use, and that means maybe not the
17	only two options.
18	DR. HARPER: Yeah, I mean, quite frankly,
19	even though these meters come in for over-the-counter
20	clearance right now, when they are claiming healthcare
21	provider use in populations such as neonates, we
22	already actually ask special questions for those. So

		298
1	I think it wouldn't be outside of our realm of comfort	
2	to be sure that if there are populations that need to	
3	be addressed, we would want to address them.	
4	MR. DUBOIS: Jeff DuBois. I'm with Nova	
5	Biomedical, Waltham, Massachusetts. And Ken used my	
6	name, and indicated that there may be some technology.	
7	So in answer to Arleen's question, there is some	
8	technology that does address the issue of accuracy and	
9	precision. Barry referred to it this morning.	
10	But that's not why I'm up here. Gary has	
11	been involved with a program through NKDEP where we	
12	looked at an analyte that's problematic in the	
13	laboratory. That's creatinine. And there's an	
14	initiative that's global to standardize creatinine	
15	measurements so that we can report an EGFR and	
16	properly assess the patient's glamerial filtration	
17	rates and assess their stage in chronic kidney	
18	disease.	
19	What we haven't done with glucose, and what	
20	we need to do, and having been responsible for the	
21	Area Committee for Point of Care Testing of CLSI, is	
22	to have an initiative where we standardize glucose	

		29
1	testing. There was some reference to IDMS	
2	traceability. And there are informed or notarized	
3	bodies in Europe that take some different methods than	
4	we do here in the United States, and there's	
5	traceability.	
6	So what we need to move toward in the United	
7	States and overseas is harmonization of this approach	
8	with glucose. And once we begin to do that	
9	industry, practitioners, and the regulatory bodies	
10	then we will improve the accuracy and precision of	
11	devices.	
12	DR. MYERS: Yeah. A comment on that. One	
13	of the things that we've looked at at CDC in the past	
14	is looking at that very issue of having a	
15	standardization program for blood glucose meters. And	
16	the issue is one of the challenges that we have is	
17	that unlike for creatinine, we don't have good	
18	reference materials that really simulate what the	
19	blood glucose meters are actually measuring.	
20	And that's part of the challenge that we're	
21	facing: how do you come up with a whole blood glucose	
22	reference material that's easily stable, that can be	

1	used to establish traceability? So there are
2	challenges involved in coming up with a program that
3	standardizes blood glucose meters. Not laboratory
4	instruments, but blood glucose meters.
5	MR. DUBOIS: But Gary, there are issues with
6	the central lab method. I attended a chronic disease
7	conference, and David was the speaker there, along
8	with a fellow from UCLA, Davidson. And their
9	justification for using hemoglobin A1C for diagnosis
10	of diabetes is there's too much variability in plasma
11	glucose from central lab analyzers. So we've got a
12	problem, and we need to begin to work at it as a
13	community. So I don't see glucose apart from central
14	lab or apart from self-monitoring, or at the bedside.
15	Glucose is glucose, and we really need to give
16	accurate and precise glucose measurements to our
17	clinicians so they can make appropriate decisions
18	about the use of a lethal drug, insulin.
19	MS. PINKOS: Hi. Arleen Pinkos, FDA. I
20	have two questions, and I'd really appreciate hearing
21	an answer to both of them.
22	The first is, we've already heard this

1	morning that there are some technologies in point of
2	care meters that are meeting a much stricter
3	performance criteria, or performance cutoff, closer to
4	ten percent. What can be done to get some of the
5	other manufacturers to pull their quality up? Is that
6	something that can be done when incentives might be
7	provided?
8	And secondly, the way FDA operates, once a
9	product is on the market, and maybe in five years or
10	seven years, it still doesn't meet the current
11	requirement, should there be something in place, like
12	a sunset law, that says, you know, here's the new
13	performance criteria. If you still haven't met it in
14	five years or whatever that time might be is that a
15	reasonable approach? Or should they all be left on
16	the market indefinitely?
17	MR. ERVIN: I'll try and answer the first
18	question. The second one, I'm probably going to leave
19	to either industry or to Dr. Harper here.
20	I would be surprised if every manufacturer
21	is not already trying to get to that plus or minus ten
22	percent. I know that there are programs in development

		302
1	that have that as their target, and so I think it's on	
2	the near horizon. And that's about all I could say on	
3	that is that there are it is an important goal of	
4	all of these companies, to get there.	
5	DR. HARPER: I don't know if I can address	
6	your second question or not, Arleen.	
7	MS. PINKOS: No, I really wanted to hear	
8	from	
9	DR. HARPER: Right.	
10	MS. PINKOS: from Mike and Alan, from	
11	industry, like do you think that's a reasonable	
12	approach to have some type of sunset law on one	
13	people. When the performance requirements go up	
14	let's say it's raised to 15 or 10 percent now, then in	
15	another five years or whatever, it's raised again	
16	what, if any, action do you think should be taken on	
17	all those products that were cleared a while ago and	
18	they're not anywhere near that that criteria?	
19	What's what's your opinion on that?	
20	MR. FLISS: My sense is that individuals,	
21	when they grow accustomed to using a particular test	
22	system, it becomes part of their daily live, and they	

	3
1	would like to continue to use that system if they have
2	found that it's safe and effective for managing their
3	particular health. And although the 510(k) may have
4	cleared three years ago, if it's a reliable product
5	for that individual, I think industry would like to
6	continue to provide test strips and controls so that
7	they can continue to operate that meter.
8	DR. CARISKI: I think also it should be
9	based on risk, as best one can assess it. And for
10	example, you know, it may be that one wants to look at
11	different risk categories. So for example, as Dr.
12	Ginsberg suggested, the standard for someone who's a
13	Type II on orals or diet, and the oral isn't anything
14	that will produce hypoglycemia, the current standard
15	may be okay. And if it turns out that the meters
16	meeting the tighter standard are a lot more expensive
17	in terms of the meter itself and/or the test strips,
18	it may not be appropriate to require people who don't
19	need that kind of accuracy to get a more accurate
20	meter. But it may be appropriate to label the but
21	to, you know, make that distinction in the labeling as
22	to who the intended user is.

		304
1	Again, it's a question of health risk. I	
2	mean, I don't think anybody today would remove all the	
3	meters from the market on the grounds that they're not	
4	as accurate as we would like. They're certainly doing	
5	an adequate job. You know, it could be better, but	
6	they're certainly better than nothing. So to just	
7	like say, you know, in X number of years if the	
8	standard is stricter, we should remove all the old	
9	meters, I'm not so sure I would agree with that.	
10	Partly for the economic reasons and, as Mike said,	
11	when people get accustomed to	
12	MS. PINKOS: That is what they do in Europe,	
13	though, right? With the IVD directive you have a	
14	certain grace period and then if you don't need it any	
15	more, you're you have to come off the market?	
16	DR. CARISKI: That's true.	
17	MS. PINKOS: Do I understand?	
18	DR. CARISKI: It's not like it's not been	
19	tried. You're just asking our opinion. I'm giving you	
20	our opinion. You didn't ask what's done worldwide.	
21	Thank you.	
22	DR. MYERS: This will have to be our last	

1 question.

2	MR. WHITE: Yeah. I'm sorry to be up here
3	again. I guess I just like to hear myself speak. But
4	I just wanted to make a comment that I don't think had
5	been made earlier until just a minute ago, when Dr.
6	Harper made another setting in which we really have to
7	be very careful is our very vulnerable population of
8	the neonatal intensive care unit, where sugars tend to
9	run on the low side anyway, so the accuracy is poor.
10	And they have all many of the different
11	interference factors, such as different hemoglobins
12	and many medications and low oxygens and high PC02's.
13	And I think we have to really think of that as a
14	population which we don't know if we're getting any
15	good numbers or not.
16	DR. MYERS: Well, that concludes our
17	afternoon session. I'm going to turn the microphone
18	over to Dr. Harper for closing remarks. Before I do,
19	I want to thank all of our afternoon speakers.
20	(Applause)
21	DR. HARPER: So I really want to thank
22	everyone for a wonderful day. As I said in the

		30
1	opening of this particular session, I'm really happy	00
2	with the the information that I've heard with the	
3	discussions that we've had so far, and I'm really	
4	looking forward to tomorrow.	
5	So as a reminder, we start again tomorrow at	
6	9:00 a.m. And everyone who's here today, you still	
7	will need to sign in again tomorrow, as you did this	
8	morning.	
9	We have a really exciting day tomorrow.	
10	While today we talked about accuracy standards in	
11	general and some of the issues with meter performances	
12	and interferences, tomorrow morning we're going to	
13	focus on the issue of tight glycemic control in	
14	hospitals and the advantages and disadvantages of	
15	that, and have probably a little bit more discussion	
16	on some of the requirements that might be required for	
17	that, or the advantages and disadvantages, and	
18	hopefully with an emphasis on patient safety.	
19	And then also we are going to hear from a	
20	patient representative on the issues that are	
21	important to patients when they choose and use blood	
22	glucose meters, and also from a point of care risk	

		307
1	manager about the issues that are that are	
2	important to them.	
3	Opening the day, we'll actually hear about	
4	liability issues, potential liability issues on the	
5	use of blood glucose meters.	
6	So I hope that you're as excited about	
7	tomorrow as I am, and I will adjourn the meeting for	
8	the day, and see you tomorrow.	
9	Thank you.	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		

		3
1	CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER	0
2		
3		
4	I, NATASHA KORNILOVA, the officer before whom the	
5	foregoing meeting was taken, do hereby certify that the	
6	statements was taken by me in audio recording and	
7	thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction;	
8	that said transcript is a true record of the recording	
9	taken by me; that I am neither counsel for, related to,	
10	nor employed by any of the parties to the action in	
11	which this transcript was taken; and, further, that I	
12	am not a relative or employee of any counsel or	
13	attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor	
14	financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of	
15	this action.	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	NATASHA KORNILOVA	
22	NOTARY/COURT REPORTER	

\$ \$10,000 247:16 \$100 247:17 \$5,000 192:11,13	48:5,11,16 65:2 76:8 87:21 88:22 92:8,11 123:6 133:11 157:2 159:15,16 175:17	<pre>13 50:12 135:2 209:17 212:11,15,22 213:2 262:17,18 263:2 130 13:11 37:3</pre>
<b>\$9.99</b> 192:15	176:20 192:14 207:22 208:17,19	<b>130</b> 13.11 37.3
	<b>100,000</b> 290:1	<b>135</b> 134:15
0 <b>0.5</b> 67:17	<b>102</b> 173:16	<b>139</b> 43:9
<b>001</b> 91:14	<b>108</b> 67:5 70:8	<b>140</b> 93:8 260:11
<b>01</b> 172:6 189:10	173:15	<b>144</b> 67:11 69:1
<b>03</b> 48:15	<b>109,000</b> 172:19	150:21
<b>04</b> 173:2	<b>10-year</b> 15 <b>:</b> 18	<b>14971</b> 290:11
1	<b>11</b> 40:19 63:20 190:3 207:20 209:9	<b>15</b> 13:14 26:10,20 27:1,13 29:8 31:8
<b>1</b> 9:17 21:12 42:8	<b>110</b> 18:11 37:4 93:1	38:21 40:13,14 43:14 44:1
48:15,22 63:6 97:22 124:12,15	<b>113</b> 173:15	46:10,11 47:4 49:7
133:14 135:14	<b>114</b> 69:22 70:2,7	53:20 70:22 89:17
147:9 193:15,19	<b>115</b> 67:10 121:20	91:5,17 93:5 95:8,20,22 110:5,6
<b>1,000</b> 50:9	<b>116</b> 42:18	114:7,8 118:15,22
<b>1,200</b> 34:10	<b>118</b> 172:6	120:1,13 123:2
<b>1,400</b> 43:2	<b>118,000</b> 172:5	126:10,17,21 135:2 138:17,18 152:11
<b>1,441</b> 56:12	<b>12</b> 41:10 46:11	164:15 176:10
<b>1.2</b> 43:20	78:22 129:13	179:15,18,19,20 180:4,8,11,12,14,1
<b>1:30</b> 135:7,13	150:20 168:14 169:18 180:20	9,22 181:16,22
<b>10</b> 26:20 27:1,11 29:8 30:22 39:17 45:8 46:2,3,9,19	<b>12,000</b> 9:8 206:21 207:5 208:19	182:15 183:2 185:14 192:20 217:17 223:11
47:4 65:2 71:1	<b>12,672</b> 207:17	302:14
72:12 90:22 91:5,20,21 93:13	<b>12.25</b> 180:19	<b>15,000</b> 48:12
95:22 118:22 120:1 129:19 150:18	<b>120</b> 19:8 134:15 150:19,20	<b>150</b> 49:2 56:3 150:3 173:13 181:21
181:1 248:18	<b>124</b> 42:13	15197 9:22 26:15
302:14	<b>125</b> 44:9	27:4 102:22 103:19 106:10,22 109:22
10,000 48:12 246:8	<b>12-hour</b> 170:4	110:3,11 111:15
<b>100</b> 25:17 27:17		

118:8 244:20	38:12 40:5 46:11	252:7
<b>153</b> 43:8	53:21 62:2 89:17	<b>201</b> 63:18
<b>16</b> 1:9	90:12 91:5,20 93:7 95:22 96:2 110:8	<b>2010</b> 1:9 5:12
<b>160</b> 150:3 151:9,14	116:21 118:14,21	2025 8:8
<b>1600</b> 282:4	119:19 120:13 121:9 122:20	<b>2030</b> 55:21
<b>17</b> 68:20 115:4	126:9,17 129:19	<b>205</b> 124:15
252:8,11	138:3,21 145:10,11	<b>21</b> 137:17 147:16
<b>175</b> 162:10,19	147:13,18 148:3 150:18 151:6	<b>210</b> 43:8 290:1
<b>18</b> 52:16 252:8	152:11 154:7,14	<b>213</b> 173:14,22
255:18 295:11	158:2 162:15	175:10
<b>180</b> 18:11 67:6 160:16 293:2,5	164:15,19 165:11 166:14 180:17	<b>22</b> 64:4,9 137:16
<b>19</b> 217:20	183:3 191:19	147:16
<b>195</b> 43:9	192:20 210:10	<b>222</b> 164:7
<b>1976</b> 21:7	237:21 255:16,21	<b>225</b> 162:13,19
<b>1983</b> 224:3	<b>200</b> 43:1,4 48:5,11,17 49:2	<b>23</b> 243:7
<b>1987</b> 65:1	92:5 143:3 147:19	<b>230</b> 124:14
<b>1987</b> 85:1 <b>1991</b> 242:21	151:6,8,10 162:11 217:19	<b>24</b> 8:2 41:11 66:21
	<b>2000</b> 37:8 55:20	150:20 166:9
<b>1992</b> 208:17,20		<b>24.9</b> 67:14
<b>1993</b> 50:9 57:12	<b>2001</b> 40:12 104:14 242:21 256:16	<b>240</b> 137:21 147:8,18 151:9 160:16
<b>1996</b> 50:18 65:3	<b>2002</b> 62:18	<b>24-hour</b> 170:4
<b>1997</b> 20:10 212:10	<b>2003</b> 254:4 288:8	<b>25</b> 40:13 52:16
<b>1998</b> 6:7	<b>2004</b> 207:13 224:7	120:15 121:3 172:4
2	<b>2005</b> 211:20	<b>250</b> 8:6
<b>2</b> 10:15 21:12 22:17	<b>2006</b> 85:3 211:21	<b>250,000</b> 37:9,13
42:8 48:8 49:1 63:6 97:20 112:10	<b>2007</b> 85:3 194:9	112:4
193:21 285:17	243:6	<b>26</b> 87:6,7
286:19	2008 37:20 81:21	<b>27</b> 37:20 121:16
<b>2,000</b> 40:11 43:1	88:15 207:13	122:5
54:2	212:2,16	<b>27.5</b> 67:13
<b>2.5</b> 62:3	<b>2009</b> 6:7 43:21 46:17 52:5 208:20	<b>275</b> 89:14
<b>20</b> 7:21 8:4 18:2 26:13 27:1 34:2,3	212:6,10 214:19	<b>28</b> 172:3

<b>280</b> 147:19		<b>50</b> 17:13 27:13
<b>29</b> 69:6	4	57:12 59:22 75:11
<b>290</b> 124:13	<b>4</b> 48:8 52:11 96:3 122:10	90:13 91:1 95:17 168:16 176:20
	<b>4,000</b> 42:16 43:4	182:7
3 3 21:13 42:9 48:8 49:1 143:11 189:7	<b>40</b> 43:6 49:16 67:16 85:1 123:20 138:17	<b>50,000</b> 48:12 129:19 133:19
248:15	148:11 150:3 168:15	<b>500</b> 48:5
<b>3.1</b> 64:16	<b>40,000</b> 43:22	<b>510 (k</b> 285:5 286:17
<b>3.5</b> 44:1 93:14		288:3,15 303:3
<b>3:20</b> 223:12	<b>400</b> 12:2 147:16 282:4	<b>525</b> 124:14
<b>30</b> 8:5 17:14	<b>41</b> 68:21 69:2 73:17	<b>55</b> 119:20
34:15,19 64:5,10	<b>42</b> 41:16 66:20	<b>550,000</b> 37:10
84:22 123:19	<b>45</b> 29:9 174:3	<b>570,000</b> 40:4
129:19 190:12,15,17,18	<b>45</b> 29:9 174:3 281:18	<b>59</b> 69:3
233:10 242:17	<b>450</b> 49:2	
284:6	<b>46</b> 121:19	6 6 39:17 40:19 43:5
<b>30,000</b> 40:5	<b>47</b> 252:9	50:1
<b>300</b> 48:11 88:22		<b>6,000</b> 158:21
94:15 100:10	<b>475</b> 124:14	<b>6,104</b> 66:19
142:20 143:3 191:17	<b>48</b> 147:18	<b>6.2</b> 252:10
<b>30-second</b> 282:19	<b>49</b> 252:9	<b>6.4</b> 64:12
<b>30-year</b> 194:2	<b>4-channel</b> 53:4 54:1	
-		<b>6.5</b> 56:18
<b>32</b> 40:20	<u>5</u> 5 17:17 19:3,7	<b>6.8</b> 67:16
<pre>34 190:17 35 38:20 60:1,2 120:15 121:11 148:3</pre>	26:21 27:1 38:20 39:19 40:1,7 44:19 46:13 50:1 53:2	<b>60</b> 41:8 78:22 87:13 90:21 91:8,9 120:16 133:4 248:16
<b>350</b> 8:8 86:5 124:15	60:6 64:18 65:4,10,19 70:4	<b>600,000</b> 40:2,4
<b>357</b> 43:22	71:1 91:5 118:22	<b>62366</b> 290:9
<b>36</b> 295:11	120:2 143:11	<b>65</b> 29:9 60:1,3
	5,000 48:12 124:10	190:19
<b>360</b> 137:19,20 147:8 191:17	<b>5.5</b> 93:14	<b>69</b> 173:13
	<b>5.9</b> 62:3	
		7

<b>7</b> 50:14,19 62:1	<b>9.7</b> 64:12	293:13
110:2	<b>9:00</b> 306:6	abnormal 75:13
<b>70</b> 18:11 56:1 72:10 90:13 119:16,19,20	<b>90</b> 66:18 93:1 123:5 296:2	<pre>abnormality 75:14 absolute 44:7</pre>
121:18 70s 153:21	<b>90s</b> 40:12,15 50:15 179:8	117:17 118:2,5 absolutely 68:8
<b>72</b> 27:10	<b>911</b> 60:15	70:14 83:3 84:8
<b>74</b> 120:2	<b>92</b> 41:15	87:8 94:10 99:19
<b>75</b> 26:11,14,22 27:3,6,7,12,14 64:19 89:15 118:15,16 179:22 180:16,18,19,22	<b>95</b> 26:8,12 27:4 39:21 43:8 46:9 65:6 69:19 89:19 110:3 118:13,21 119:17 121:17,19	137:15 138:4 145:3 148:17 152:20 222:1 292:8 <b>absorbed</b> 121:7 176:12
181:1,6,7 182:4,7,9 185:3 190:20	123:15 147:14 151:8 184:19 191:6	<b>absorption</b> 97:1,13,14,19,21 147:21
<b>76</b> 69:22 70:2,7	<b>96</b> 107:13	<b>AC</b> 127:3
290:1	<b>97</b> 48:8	academic 34:10
78 42:13 120:2	<b>98</b> 48:8	116:6 152:9
173:15	<b>99</b> 46:10 48:8	acceleration 141:22
<b>787</b> 83:8	<b>99.95</b> 133:17	142:2
8		<b>accept</b> 73:19 156:3
<b>8</b> 43:19 45:19 72:12	A a.m 306:6	acceptable 10:4
<b>80</b> 18:11 19:8 75:13	A1C 16:17 17:17	16:6 26:7,18 27:5 28:18 33:2 60:1
123:5 143:1 180:10 194:11 293:2	300:9	69:20 70:2 74:11
294:18 296:2	A1Cs 16:4 56:17	103:11 107:7 130:8
<b>80,000</b> 8:17	<b>ABARE</b> 52:17	181:2 183:7
<b>81</b> 67:5 70:8 120:1	<b>Abbott</b> 224:2	<b>accepted</b> 74:9 88:14 254:18
<b>83</b> 42:17	<b>ability</b> 29:13 140:15 188:15	<b>access</b> 86:5,10
<b>84</b> 44:8	206:5 255:10	238:17
<b>85</b> 119:20,21 180:10	<b>able</b> 35:3 45:4 53:2	accompanies 218:3
294:18	60:22 71:22 114:4	accomplish 244:7
	145:5 146:12 147:1	accomplished 151:20
9 9 43:5 72:12	191:16 206:17,19 268:5 275:4,12 279:6 282:15,16	<b>according</b> 34:18 46:15 107:12

	177.16 00 101.11	204.11
<b>account</b> 36:8 97:22	177:16,20 181:11	304:11
100:15	184:10 185:19	acetaminophen 30:16
260:14,16,19 280:7	186:6 187:16	125:18 197:13
<b>accounts</b> 8:14 34:18	188:5,6 189:1	250:15 270:16
	191:16 224:18	274:17 275:12
46:12	226:9 227:16	
ACC's 200:16	228:16 240:14	277:3
accumulate 83:20	244:6 249:5 251:5	achievable 71:2
	252:3 253:14 256:6	115:12 116:5
86:4,5	258:1 271:15 280:2	131:15 152:16
<b>accuracy</b> 1:7 3:22	282:20	153:1 175:19 278:2
7:17 9:18 10:3,10		
14:4,17,19,22	283:5,14,15,16,18	<b>achieve</b> 11:12,20
15:3,5 16:14	289:4 296:9 298:8	16:17 17:19 25:21
17:5,7 18:1	299:10 303:19	39:20 53:2 92:16
	305:9 306:10	152:3 157:2 227:4
19:7,14 25:7	<b>accurate</b> 11:14,17	239:17
26:3,4,5,7,16	15:7 18:18	
28:18 39:14 51:13		achieved 93:2
60:17 61:6 65:11	19:3,4,10 20:20	achieving 9:19
70:21 72:6 74:12	51:2 63:1,15 70:13	58:10 185:18
81:11 82:8 90:6	81:3 113:3,4	
91:4,12,20,21 92:1	117:5,7 120:14	<b>acid</b> 164:22 197:14
95:4 96:6 99:3,4,5	126:9 127:13	250:5,7 270:15
101:13	128:17 129:2 130:5	275:18 277:4
102:12,13,15	131:10 132:17	acidosis 197:4
106:22 108:1,11,14	137:9 146:4	
110:2,3 111:2	150:10,17 151:16	acknowledge 109:8
112:21,22	153:4 156:7 159:2	acknowledges 103:10
-	161:19 169:12	-
116:11,14	174:21 181:10	<b>across</b> 25:5
117:1,2,4,5,7,12,2	184:3 185:22 186:7	29:14,18 86:6
0 118:21 120:3		138:6,7 169:5
122:15	187:19 188:8,16,20	186:12,17 191:21
123:2,6,7,9,12,16	202:9 203:20,21	234:11 259:6 281:7
128:5,12 129:14,22	225:5 243:17	291:13
130:3,8,11 131:15	246:15 247:7 249:4	
134:1,22 137:12	260:12 266:18	<b>act</b> 6:16 21:8
138:4,8 141:6	268:11 271:4	153:19 154:1
143:19,20,21	277:2,19 282:10	<b>acting</b> 5:12 6:7
148:17 151:7	284:7 292:14,18	121:10
152:10,19 155:17	300:16 303:19	
158:11 159:8	304:4	<b>action</b> 107:14,16
		209:12 210:21
161:17 164:14,20	accurately 72:18	213:19 216:20
166:10,14	accustomed 302:21	229:10 302:16
171:16,18		

308:10,15	171:9 172:13	<b>added</b> 145:12 290:13
<b>actions</b> 211:19	176:13 177:1,7,20 178:6,7 181:18	addendum 65:9
213:6 214:18 220:4	182:18 184:12,17	<b>adding</b> 270:16
250:8	185:8 186:22 187:5	addition 24:5 27:15
<b>active</b> 282:14	203:7	28:5 105:13 109:22
<b>actively</b> 109:21	204:3,8,12,13,15,1	110:11 267:6 285:3
110:12 208:8	6 205:5,21 206:5,22 207:12	additional 104:21
activities 153:22	208:8,17,19	106:3 135:19
253:20 290:18	209:2,4,14	213:19 286:2
<b>actual</b> 69:11 70:10	210:2,14,18,19	Additionally 8:16
90:11,12 92:13	211:13,18 212:7,12	<b>address</b> 4:16,20
119:16 205:20	213:7,13 214:15	12:16,17 85:6
221:19 234:7 294:1	216:4	103:19 108:16
actually 2:19	222:5,7,9,14,22	109:15 112:9 114:4
3:10,12,16,20 7:1	223:2 228:18,22 231:18 232:11	145:5,9 175:15
18:19 34:7,17 35:3	231:18 232:11 234:12 239:2	210:1 219:4 222:4
36:3,12 37:21	241:1,11 256:21	241:18 251:19
38:16 43:6,15,19 46:8 51:4	257:5 263:22	252:2 256:5 267:1
46:8 51:4 53:7,9,14 58:14	265:6,17 271:7	270:8,22 276:6 279:11 290:13
60:14 61:12 63:14	272:15	292:19 297:13
71:19 72:13 75:2,8	273:2,4,14,21	298:3,8 302:5
78:1 86:11,14	277:9 279:18	addressed 63:2
87:17 91:18,21	284:22 285:14	77:11 109:13
92:17,18 93:6,16	286:20 288:8,10,15 295:7 296:20	112:13 113:10
95:12 100:11,12,14	295:7 296:20	159:20 164:12
106:9 115:14,15	307:3	204:22 298:3
117:5 120:3 121:4 122:9,12,20 123:8	<b>acute</b> 57:17 108:20	addresses 270:4
124:6 126:6,7,19		addressing 80:10
127:10 128:4	ADA 16:6 34:15 39:18 41:14 58:3	253:11 254:21
133:2,7,17	65:1,3 95:19	adds 163:21
134:2,21 139:15,21	152:19	
140:7,8,10,18	<b>adapted</b> 290:16	<b>Adept</b> 217:4
142:6,12 144:16	-	<b>adequate</b> 10:7 22:11
145:7,17 149:3 151:13 156:6 157:6	add 125:11 126:2	76:5 191:19 199:19
160:2 162:6	144:12 148:7	200:4 304:5
165:4,5,14 166:5,9	157:10 176:7 181:13 207:22	adequately 158:17
167:13,15 168:21	270:15 284:1 286:2	adhering 3:2
169:1,19 170:9	287:15	2

adhesion 217:4 adipose 85:9 **adjourn** 307:7 adjustment 37:6 99:14 administer 85:22 administered 10:18 86:21 223:1,7 administering 222:6 administration 2:4 10:21 admission 66:22 216:18 264:18 admissions 75:12 admitted 66:19 89:1 adopt 111:6 adult 8:16 169:9 adults 66:19 89:1 **AdvaMed** 100:21 101:10,22 155:10 **AdvaMed's** 243:5 advance 87:9 101:11 173:11 advances 61:15 101:17 103:14,17 104:9 106:7,14,16 109:17 advancing 244:5 advantage 84:13 100:10 advantages 60:19 247:12 306:14,17 adverse 9:8 204:2,4,16 205:21 206:18 219:5

262:20 advertise 128:8 **advice** 218:2 **advocate** 135:20 136:1 260:4 264:19 **Affairs** 115:2 242:22 **affect** 32:11 112:22 125:14 164:20 165:5 168:5 213:13 215:18,22 affected 10:18 36:6,9 38:8 218:8 affecting 199:7 **affects** 7:22 213:21 affiliation 98:17 affordable 108:8 affording 231:19 **afraid** 64:14 **Africa** 54:19 66:11 afternoon 35:12 101:9 202:2 227:21 305:17,19 afternoon's 135:16 afterwards 94:17 against 50:10 84:8 103:3 143:8 211:4 212:8 269:4 275:4 276:21 **Agamatrix** 115:19 age 54:8 125:10 127:11 195:21 **agency** 6:14 145:20 285:2 **agent** 122:22

agents 35:16,19 122:17 130:3,15 **ages** 7:22 aging 127:10 **ago** 7:6 17:1 35:7 75:10 82:14 85:1 127:15 151:21 190:10 196:1 211:19 226:9 230:4 239:1 290:13 302:17 303:4 305:5 **agreement** 179:16 284:21 292:1 **ah** 79:19 **ahead** 71:10 72:20 132:22 190:8 242:10 **A'hoy** 143:2 **aimed** 114:14 215:1 **air** 195:19 235:18 airplane 71:7 **aisles** 4:20 5:2 **akin** 129:6 **al** 81:20 **Alan** 164:10 242:12 252:16,17 302:10 **alarm** 164:3 **Alberta** 156:11,19 267:14 **Alberto** 136:10 **alcohol** 23:17 **alert** 145:18 211:21 213:8 **alerts** 216:21 algorithm 176:15

algorithms 247:6	263:9
<b>A-line</b> 54:10	altitude 31:12
Allbright 148:13	125:14 127:4
alleviate 236:12	189:18 196:6 226:21 233:22
<b>allow</b> 11:15 83:19	246:7 250:16
85:14 88:11 96:5 263:5	<b>am</b> 2:13 3:9 14:13 15:22 51:16 57:19
<b>allowable</b> 34:8,12 45:18 47:4 271:16,17 272:13	119:6,7 123:4 172:21 307:7 308:9,12
277:8	Amann 85:2
<b>allowed</b> 18:20 85:20	amazing 268:4
257:4 287:18,19 allows 84:11 88:1	<b>ambulatory</b> 75:9,15 76:8 79:9 193:4
251:10	Amendments 21:7
<b>alluded</b> 183:14 238:6 248:1	<b>America</b> 14:9 56:2
alone 37:14 171:18	American 14:6 194:7,10
<b>already</b> 22:21 34:13 36:10 39:16 151:20	Americans 8:2
188:16 195:9 198:2 210:14 217:3 219:13 225:17	<b>among</b> 62:1 72:2 104:10 133:4 199:4 241:12
227:20 231:22 234:14 238:5 250:1	amongst 141:9
253:10 273:7 277:17 297:22 300:22 301:21	<pre>amount 18:15 98:13 133:22 146:17 149:3 163:4 165:8 257:1</pre>
<b>alter</b> 36:20	amounts 132:20
<b>altered</b> 25:21 107:15	amplitude 89:12
alternate 35:7,9	amputations 8:17
<pre>104:16 234:14 alternative 24:9,10,14 28:9,12 104:17 291:19 alternatives 47:16</pre>	analysis 15:3 37:19 66:5 68:19 69:17 73:6 74:6,19 107:8,13 128:22 129:10 206:6,20 207:11 208:9,20

219:9 252:4 analysts 207:1 **analyte** 230:18 298:12 analytes 63:11 **analytic** 47:15 73:4,12 74:16 139:8 156:16 160:18 293:22 analytical 9:10 10:6,10 11:2 17:6 22:11 33:16 47:7 60:17 63:4 64:12 65:4,15 102:13 103:7,13 111:9 159:14 223:22 224:10 225:7 244:21 250:11,12 265:21 294:7 Analytically 159:11 **analyze** 107:9 175:19 204:18 205:6 207:2 analyzed 67:21 **analyzer** 45:13 279:8 291:21 analyzers 38:6 47:17 68:6,7 179:6 279:4 280:12 300:11 and/or 130:6 216:11 303:17 Anders 296:7 **anemia** 35:13,15 38:9 **anemic** 169:3,9 **animal** 88:17 196:10,11,12,14

**Ann** 148:13 **annex** 290:13 announced 151:21 154:7 Ann's 151:1 **annually** 252:8,11 **answer** 7:8 41:22 75:21 156:9 163:18 269:21 291:16 292:6,7,10,17 293:14,15 298:7 300:21 301:17 **answered** 135:13 145:15 180:1 answering 243:22 **answers** 97:3 241:7 291:22 anticoagulant 29:2 **anybody** 45:21 70:9 139:22 182:12 204:15 278:4 280:4 293:7 304:2 **anyone** 129:3 271:13 **anything** 7:19 51:8 60:4 61:1 65:12 76:2 140:6 158:2 181:11 191:13 278:4 282:3 303:13 anyway 18:22 62:5 268:19 305:9 **anywhere** 40:6 46:14 70:1 94:12 215:12 302:18 **apart** 300:13,14 apologize 19:16 61:2 **apparent** 176:16,17 177:16,17 199:5

appealing 258:21 **appear** 46:22 **applaud** 168:19 **Applause** 96:16 100:19 111:18 132:1 135:6 193:12 194:14 220:12 240:2 260:1 305:20 **apples** 268:13 applicable 31:22 application 80:1 99:3,8 146:20 176:8 296:6 **applied** 36:16 53:1 74:19 214:4 applies 9:21 **apply** 83:16 180:2 applying 237:13 appreciate 163:13 176:5 263:13 264:8 300:20 appreciated 263:22 **approach** 229:13 238:13 240:21 299:7 301:15 302:12 approached 166:3 approaches 127:13 approaching 199:2 appropriate 10:10 24:13 29:2 33:3 54:9 71:14 111:5 115:12 116:5 119:11,22 123:3 128:1 130:14,15 144:7 159:10

300:17 303:18,20 appropriately 32:22 157:14 approval 20:9 103:18 118:19 285:15 **approve** 104:15 **approved** 11:11 16:8 47:18 77:2 210:15 264:20 285:4,13 approving 144:20 approximately 3:10 9:8 17:17 27:10,13 138:17 **April** 7:21 **aqueous** 44:19 **arc** 94:13 **area** 4:10 17:9 90:3 168:6 175:12 224:16 225:7 230:9 262:14 298:21 **areas** 2:21 37:2 102:14 228:21 230:17 **arena** 148:21 149:10 aren't 35:10 188:8 200:8 215:20 218:13 273:1 274:1,16 285:13 287:4,6 292:20 **argue** 60:11 61:11 70:19 argument 73:7 77:8 **Arleen** 179:14 277:13 300:19 302:6

**Arleen's** 298:7

Arlene 33:19 55:7	<b>assay</b> 230:2,3	asterisked 227:17
<b>arm</b> 24:7	272:11	228:10
Army 52:9 165:22	<b>assays</b> 216:15	<pre>atmosphere 236:1,3</pre>
<b>array</b> 104:1,2	assembled 11:21	<b>attach</b> 85:13
arrived 222:9	<b>assess</b> 28:7 84:5	attachment 255:12
<b>art</b> 63:7 75:7 190:9	140:14 194:4 298:16,17 303:9	<b>attain</b> 80:16,18
<b>arterial</b> 24:5 28:21	assessed 273:12	attained 94:8,9
37:16	assessing 230:9	<b>attempt</b> 214:21
38:14,18,19,22 39:6 44:18 68:4,6	assessment 107:19	attempted 224:20 266:12
78:19 157:11 197:7 234:5 235:13	<b>assessments</b> 32:7 243:10	attendants 12:3
268:3,14 293:16,22	<b>asset</b> 150:11	attended 300:6
294:14 295:6 arterialize 293:20	assign 241:5	<b>attention</b> 29:10
294:11 295:5	assignment 254:17	33:5 50:15 141:3 147:12 190:14
arterialized 294:17	assist 23:6	214:17 220:10
295:15,16 296:1	assistant 6:11 85:2	228:13
<b>arterializing</b> 294:3 295:13	<b>associate</b> 6:9 13:13 18:19 54:16	attorney 101:2 308:13
arteries 295:2		attractive 282:17
<b>article</b> 65:22 81:10 82:15 261:13,17	<b>associated</b> 9:9 59:10 106:22 209:6 211:1 212:11	<b>attribute</b> 209:5 236:15
articles 13:12	association 14:7	attributes 103:8
212:2 225:14	101:11 102:1	attribution 74:18
artificial 14:5	194:10	<b>audience</b> 4:17 134:9
115:22 184:1	Association's 194:8	161:14 193:11
<b>ascorbate</b> 125:18 232:4,9 274:3	<b>assume</b> 49:7 143:10	202:3 <b>audio</b> 308:6
<b>ascorbic</b> 197:14	<b>assumed</b> 169:17	
250:5 275:18 277:4	assuming 140:17	augmented 95:11
<b>Asia</b> 56:2	assumption 161:1	augments 96:10
<b>aside</b> 123:11	assumptions 171:3,4	August 37:20 214:19 259:13
<b>asleep</b> 34:5	<b>assure</b> 13:2 111:10	Australia 66:21
aspects 55:12	assuring 5:14,15	<b>author</b> 13:11
102:19 115:9	<b>AST</b> 24:9	

authored 194:11	avoidable 263:4	297:10
authorities 252:22	avoidance 58:13	Baltimore 49:4
253:5 256:1,10	awake 61:4	179:14
authority 21:6	aware 138:14 149:17	<b>BALTUR (ph</b> 178:9
255:10	199:15,17 240:6	<b>banana</b> 142:21
<b>auto</b> 280:19	258:6 261:11	<b>bar</b> 93:11 268:19
automatic 80:2	266:20 272:22	
239:21	273:1,2 280:20	<b>Barbara</b> 17:15
automatically 81:22	281:9 285:13	<b>barely</b> 91:1 122:3
82:1 140:7 155:12	288:14 290:16	176:8
169:20 170:2	awareness 145:6	Barnes 42:21 43:10
autonomic 80:2	199:16 213:9,10	112:5
	214:21 219:18 266:11	barometers 87:6
<b>AV</b> 294:12		barrier 16:15
availability 79:6	away 48:17 224:21 236:9 274:11	279:13
available 47:15		barriers 185:18
52:10 53:7 106:6	<b>axis</b> 62:9,10 64:8 94:7,8	277:15
195:21 200:16,20 228:3 245:4 247:11	94:/,0	<b>Barry</b> 47:22
248:2 257:20	В	114:20,21 142:5
263:20 274:10	Bachelor 5:19	182:15 183:10
285:14		184:13 185:12
average 38:20	<b>bachelor's</b> 223:21 242:13	298:9
50:11,14 63:19		<b>bars</b> 55:20 57:7
117:4,7,9,17,18,22	<b>background</b> 55:11 80:13 101:21	<b>basal</b> 88:6
118:4 122:2	116:7,10 201:1	<b>based</b> 19:12,21
123:5,7,14,15 124:16 129:6	226:12 232:17	64:11,17 69:21
130:12 131:5,7	bacterial 262:5	70:20 83:8,17
135:1 143:11	<b>bad</b> 41:8 42:6 143:4	84:3,21 90:5 98:4
150:19 162:18	156:18 157:7,21	122:13 124:5 145:13 167:19
167:19 172:22	160:18 175:11,22	145:13 167:19 169:18 178:11
averages 100:16	178:19	216:1,15 229:6
Averaging 172:19	<b>bag</b> 192:14	249:5 303:9
aversion 95:14,16	<b>baking</b> 260:17	<b>bases</b> 240:5,7
avoid 80:17 216:5	balance 12:17	<b>Bashan</b> 133:1,14,21
219:17 266:7	103:10 186:10	bashing 142:17
275:12 282:21	214:1,8 218:7	-
	219:20 239:17	<b>basic</b> 12:1 171:12

173:1 249:8,21	beep-beep-beep 71:7
<pre>basically 81:11 83:1,10 84:11 85:7 87:21 88:1 90:14 92:9 94:9,18</pre>	<b>begin</b> 12:1 18:6 135:16 299:8 300:12
95:8,19 156:2 170:18 180:18 228:4 233:22 234:2	beginning 75:18 93:17 232:15 234:17
237:22 269:3 294:12,13	<pre>behalf 6:14 266:17 behave 71:13</pre>
<b>basis</b> 43:14 237:18 252:7	behaves 241:4
<b>bathtub</b> 86:16,17	behavior 241:2
batting 129:6 131:7	Behavioral 6:3
Baxter 222:19 264:7	<b>behind</b> 79:20 154:17 161:1 279:11
Bayer 98:20 115:20 231:17 236:7	288:20 behind-the-scenes
<b>be-all</b> 163:17	155:9
bearing 253:20	Belgium 66:13
<pre>beat 35:21 became 5:10 37:9 95:13 282:7 Becht 115:2 Beckman 85:16 become 11:14 20:19 122:18 128:7 153:10 185:21 226:4 266:19</pre>	<pre>believe 3:4 10:5    44:7,10 45:15    46:21 47:14 49:14    53:13 79:4 107:21    111:4 119:5 124:18    138:9,11 159:9    179:7 190:4 192:16    222:14 241:15    254:1 266:10    271:13,14 277:7    293:2</pre>
<b>becomes</b> 91:4 99:12	<b>believed</b> 214:3
118:2,3 120:7 123:7 162:16 270:13,19 302:22	believed 214.3 believes 141:15 bell 3:4 223:13
becoming 119:13	belong 79:8
123:1 236:22	beneficial 202:12
<b>bed</b> 34:10	282:21
<b>bedside</b> 78:9,12 79:7 300:14	<b>benefit</b> 159:7 251:3

**benefits** 11:19 76:6 benign 19:6 Benson 140:3 Berghe 37:15 38:1 66:10 Bernhardt 20:7,15 33:8 149:15 **best** 14:9 47:15 53:16 110:12 112:9 114:4,14 185:2 189:3 244:1 246:19 254:13 257:12 261:3 263:19 266:20 267:16 269:22 271:4 274:22 275:14 303:9 best-suited 259:7 Beth 6:1 115:6 283:22 284:11 285:10 **better** 11:15 16:3 22:21 35:21 41:1,4 46:22 47:1,3 50:16,20,21 51:3 91:4 106:18 112:13,19 129:5,7 130:19 131:7,15,17 132:18 133:3 134:1 143:19,20,21 157:12 163:21 169:15 171:15 172:16 174:6 176:5 185:19 202:4 208:11,18 210:2 267:19 268:6 284:15 288:10 289:9 291:18 304:5,6

Bexxar (ph 217:5

		5 00 10 2010
<b>beyond</b> 99:9 103:13	70:20	11:4,8,13,16
106:9,13 128:1	Biologics 212:3	12:19,21 13:2
144:18 171:8	Biomedical 298:5	14:18,21,22
258:18		16:15,19 19:19,20
<b>BGM</b> 239:13	biosensor 105:13	20:11,16
<b>bias</b> 30:20 31:7	biphasic 133:6	21:3,15,16 22:16 23:4,14 24:4,6,17
39:2 40:20 41:10	<b>bit</b> 14:12 15:4	25:3 28:14
44:22 45:7 47:1,9	16:12 36:20 41:4	30:2,8,15 31:18
62:14 64:9,18	50:20,21 55:17	32:11,19 33:16
68:21	63:2 68:22 73:2	37:16 38:6,19
69:2,6,8,10,16	89:9 101:21 116:11	44:18 45:13 47:17
71:15 72:1 73:17	174:6 185:6 189:20	49:14 55:14 57:20
82:5,11 118:7 195:1 232:13	195:12 197:19	65:13 68:4,6 70:12
237:22 238:2	200:22 201:15,19 202:13 203:13	71:19,21 75:22 78:18 80:5
	205:21 207:7,11	101:6,13,18
<b>biased</b> 291:4	213:10 214:17	102:9,14,19,21
biases 41:9	216:2 217:9 226:5	104:3,11,15 106:21
<b>bigger</b> 142:2	231:20 232:2	107:10,19
144:1,6	249:10 252:18	108:14,19
biggest 66:15	254:4 257:10	109:17,20 110:16
142:7,9 224:18	262:22 267:15	111:1,16 112:4,10
265:6	268:22 271:8	113:11 115:19
bilirubin 30:9	278:18 286:7 287:10,11 293:11	119:16 120:6
270:17	306:15	121:21 122:1,7,10 123:5 128:7,8
<b>bill</b> 13:7 43:16		131:9
115:13,15 181:14	<b>bite</b> 289:11	137:5,8,14,17
	<b>black</b> 94:21,22	138:3,12 142:14,22
<b>billing</b> 43:16,17	132:14 213:1	143:3,9,14,17
<b>billion</b> 133:9	<b>bless</b> 126:6	146:3 147:7 149:6
154:13 252:8,10,14 255:18	blindness 8:16	150:2 151:5 154:2,3,21 155:7
billions 205:9	Blizzard 13:8	156:12,15,19,22
207:7 278:11	<b>Block</b> 155:15	157:3,7,11,14,20,2 1 159:10 160:22
biocenters 157:17	<b>blocked</b> 280:1	161:10 162:10
biochemical 194:4	<b>blocking</b> 251:14	167:7,17
biologic	<b>blood</b> 1:8 2:5,9 4:1	168:4,8,20 171:10
45:16,17,20	7:17 8:19,22	172:5,12,19 173:3
biological 63:8	9:7,9,16,18,20	174:2,8 177:22 179:5,9 180:10
	10:3,11,17	183:16 187:19

188:10 189:8 191:14,17 194:20 195:4 196:10,11,12,14 197:6,8,10 200:5 201:3 202:15 205:9,20 208:3 210:21 213:22 217:18 218:11 223:18 224:6,8,11 226:10,14 227:15 228:6,7 229:5,11,19,21 231:2,8 235:9,15 237:7,19 238:6 240:9,12 242:5 243:6 246:1 247:8,18 248:11 254:3 255:17 258:6 261:14 267:16,17,18 268:3 276:21 279:8 281:16 287:8,13 290:15 291:20 293:17,19,20,21,22 294:1,12,14,17 295:1,6,7,12,15,17 296:1 299:15,19,21 300:3,4 306:21 307:5 **bloods** 268:1,3 **blotting** 224:22 **blue** 55:20 57:7 90:1,3 237:17 board 13:18 101:1 138:7,8 186:12,18 board-certified 242:19 **boards** 13:12 **bodies** 128:3 299:3,9

**body** 22:3 58:14 116:17 127:18 222:22 **body-like** 130:18 Boeing 83:8 **bolus** 87:10,14 92:7,10 93:17,18 **booklet** 132:12 **books** 59:14 **boost** 262:5 Boris 170:16 171:7 Boston 6:1 281:10 **bottle** 132:9 Bowman 139:4 140:19 280:8 **box** 31:22 212:8 213:1 267:15 **boxes** 267:15 **Boyd** 82:14 **Brad** 159:20 brake 141:21 142:1 branch 115:7 193:22 **break** 79:13 135:6 223:11,12,14 Breton 79:20 80:7,8 97:2 98:8,15 99:18 176:6 181:13 183:21 185:5 297:15 Breton's 17:20 **brief** 5:5,7 21:5 195:8 briefly 249:9 266:4 Brigham 54:18 bring 92:7,11

101:18 138:2 167:20 180:18,20 189:5 272:2 brings 189:6,9 **broad** 246:7,9 259:10 273:3 Brotman 100:20,22 101:8,9 112:8 113:5 114:1,10,13,18 186:1 187:3,6 Brotman's 101:5 **brought** 155:16 171:14 187:8 190:3 198:2 248:9 brown 260:9 Bruns 82:20 **BS** 243:3 **bucketed** 225:20 Buckingham 88:9 **budge** 152:4 Budget 6:8 buffered 233:1 **buffet** 2:19 **built** 154:11 241:1 252:21 **bulkier** 108:5 **bullet** 217:6 **bunch** 126:6 **burden** 78:17 **burn** 52:9,13 166:1,8 Burns 82:14 Burnt 82:14 **business** 137:5

224:22 238:6 278:10 **busy** 54:6 141:1 **button** 172:20 **buttons** 105:4 **buy** 296:17 buying 258:12 291:7 **bypass** 294:13 С **cal** 228:20 230:7 241:5 **calcium** 75:13 **calculate** 162:14 calculated 30:20 31:7 calculation 59:22 65:12 121:5 232:18 calculations 64:11 156:14 **calf** 24:8 **calibrate** 176:9,17 177:9,10 183:17 calibrated 157:13,20 184:2,4 185:7 235:15 237:10 241:10,11 247:20,21 calibrating 180:7 188:20 calibration 105:9 176:15 184:8,11,21 228:17,18,22 230:4 237:13 240:5,6,19,22 241:13,16 California 51:11

71:11 113:18 153:18,20 154:11 155:4 164:11 223:22 **Callum** 45:16 campaign 267:2 **Canada** 66:21 **cancer** 262:4 **CAP** 42:1,11 43:3 68:20 71:12,18,20 capabilities 103:3 112:21 capability 90:9 capable 9:19 134:19 179:8 220:19 capacity 93:4 **Cape** 54:19 capillaries 294:13 295:2 **capillary** 24:4,6 25:17 38:15,16 56:21 157:20 159:10,16 160:2 197:7 229:10,12 233:7 234:5,13 235:15 240:12 245:22 268:1,12,13 295:6,12,13,17 296:4 **capture** 35:2,3 53:9 **captured** 144:16 225:19 **captures** 249:14 capturing 35:6 **carb** 96:22 97:5,9,11 carbohydrate 88:7

89:5 120:17 carbohydrates 87:14 120:11 **carbs** 120:18 cardiovascular 8:13 194:5 **care** 1:8 2:10 4:4 9:3 12:4,8 13:1 15:12 16:8,22 17:11 18:5,13 20:22 23:5 27:21 28:16 35:15,16 36:4 37:9,12,13 38:9 39:5,10 41:5 45:20 46:5 47:10,17 50:13 52:6 57:17 67:2 70:17 73:8,12,14 75:20,21 76:1,2,3,5,10,12 77:21 78:3 79:3 98:21 103:5 106:18 108:19,20 112:1 141:17 144:6 160:5 166:3 167:9 169:21 192:3,17 203:14 221:17,20 254:9 260:7 265:17,20 266:7 267:17 268:2 279:4 281:20 282:22 298:21 301:2 305:8 306:22 **career** 194:2 224:15 **careful** 50:22 103:10 305:7 carefully 49:22 111:10 220:20 250:22 caregivers 49:19 Cariski 164:10

242:12,13,17 243:14 255:17 260:3,13,22 261:7 267:14 268:7 269:20 276:9 281:21 283:1 284:1 292:5 303:8 304:16,18 Carol 140:3	<pre>caused 97:10 272:9 causes 16:16 197:14 CCU 38:12 52:4 CDC 40:16,18 148:14 194:3 195:22 299:13 Cedar 264:21</pre>	148:19 160:16 163:18,21 165:15,16 180:15 192:6 193:16 197:14 199:21 219:17 286:4,18 287:14 288:14 304:4,6 <b>CERTIFICATE</b> 308:1
<b>Carrone</b> 159:20	<b>cell</b> 3:6 5:16	certified 13:19
carry 221:5 226:22	<b>cells</b> 168:4,9,10 238:6	43:1 101:1 127:17
carrying 272:20	Cembrowski 16:22	<b>certify</b> 308:5
<b>carton</b> 257:16,18 <b>cartridge</b> 127:11	17:1 46:5 156:10 267:13 cent 41:10	<b>cetera</b> 78:13 130:16 139:18 141:2,3,4 164:22 227:17
cartridges 127:11	center 2:15	245:21
<pre>case 81:4   86:3,17,21 87:22   88:10 89:17 146:4   192:4 209:21   219:21 235:9,16   261:3 267:3 276:19</pre>	5:11,12,13 6:2 17:15 34:10 42:22 52:9 68:7 136:6 139:5 150:7 154:12 155:3 166:1 194:1	CGM 173:8 174:20 176:21 184:2,3,9 188:19 chain 260:13,19 chair 55:1 254:8
<pre>cases 4:13 8:3 78:4,5 82:9 105:9,18 144:22 146:9 188:9,10,11 197:4 206:7 212:13 217:14 222:7,10</pre>	212:2,3,6 280:9 288:15 293:18 central 54:10 78:6 200:12 280:12 300:6,11,13 centralized 257:5	<pre>challenge 16:12     80:16 146:7 247:14     252:5 269:6 271:21     299:20 challenged 10:4 challenges 219:22</pre>
262:20	<b>CEO</b> 114:22	252:2 286:15
<b>catch</b> 146:18	<b>certain</b> 22:14 24:12	299:16 300:2
<pre>categories    225:15,21 303:11 categorizing 161:7 category 21:17    209:1 226:2</pre>	30:2 186:5,19 188:17 191:16 210:14 275:2 276:14 283:13 287:16 288:20 304:14	<pre>challenging 182:6    183:7 258:4,15 chance 33:11    90:14,22    91:1,13,16 124:7    177:7</pre>
<pre>cause 8:15 36:5 103:6 122:22 209:2,5 211:13 261:22 262:10</pre>	<b>certainly</b> 19:17 70:16 77:11 106:1 138:21 142:3 144:12 145:6	change 19:14 20:2 97:15 108:1 122:1,3 147:21 161:13 168:4

191:10 218:19 284:20 286:2 287:16 288:4
changeable 105:8
<b>changed</b> 17:5 67:22 68:10 167:6 267:8 287:22 290:19
<b>changes</b> 18:9 107:22 120:22 189:12 284:13
<b>changing</b> 168:20 189:16 249:19
<b>channel</b> 52:11 259:9
<b>chaos</b> 256:3
<b>chapters</b> 194:12
<pre>characteristic 86:8 89:7</pre>
<pre>characteristics     88:12 97:18 243:9     253:11 259:20</pre>
characterize 258:1
Charlottesville 13:10
<b>Chase</b> 17:15
<b>cheaper</b> 225:4
<b>check</b> 146:8 174:8 276:21
<b>checked</b> 172:5,18 173:12,14 174:2 294:20
checking 295:16
<b>checks</b> 173:1
<b>Chem</b> 39:9
<b>chemist</b> 200:12
<b>chemistry</b> 2:3 54:17 71:20 193:22

194:10 201:8 223:22 **Chief** 13:8 193:21 201:8 **child** 137:6,18 155:18 **children** 14:3 18:3 88:22 134:11 135:21 138:10 150:1,3,6 181:2 child's 137:21 **Chips** 143:2 **choice** 209:15 **choices** 203:22 227:7 234:2 291:17 cholesterol 30:9,14 **choose** 128:15 229:3 306:21 **chronic** 57:17 59:2 108:20 194:4 223:6 298:17 300:6 circles 132:14,15 circumvent 82:13 **cite** 81:20 **cited** 73:15 104:19 **claim** 28:9 100:2,3,11 133:17 259:11 **claimed** 28:12 29:18 31:3 **claiming** 297:20 **claims** 28:21 29:3 257:10 262:3 280:14 286:2 **clamp** 88:5 293:20 **Clare** 94:12

clarification 77:18 **clarify** 222:18 253:18 **Clark** 81:9 **Clarke** 13:7,15 14:6,10,11 20:15 33:7 41:18 46:8 47:21 48:7 54:13 71:10 72:4,20 77:13,16 79:13,18 88:9 98:9,14,19 100:18 111:19 113:13,16 114:16,19 132:2,5,22 135:5,15 139:3 149:20 156:8 164:1 165:21 180:21 182:12 183:8 190:7 191:6 193:8,14 220:13 223:10 **Clarke's** 13:20 **Class** 21:12,13 22:17 285:17 286:19 classifications 21:12 **classify** 208:21 classroom 190:19 cleaning 105:1 **clear** 20:12 74:1 149:16 211:4,5 281:13,18 287:6 clearance 20:9 22:18 24:3 286:3 297:20 **cleared** 23:11 27:9 140:6 149:19 179:8,13 285:4

288:11 302:17	210:22	co-authored 194:11
303:4	clinician 108:21	<b>Cobelli</b> 85:1
<b>clearer</b> 163:19 164:13	<b>clinicians</b> 63:5,7 109:10 140:2 146:2	<b>Co-chair</b> 243:5
clearing 144:19	179:19 204:7	code 127:9 228:20 230:7 241:5
<b>clearly</b> 44:9 47:2 52:4 71:2,17,22	264:15 265:12 300:17	coded 82:1 89:21
74:7 76:17 106:5 167:2,9 220:18	<pre>clinics 88:3 141:14 CLIP 166:4</pre>	<pre>codes 207:21 228:18     229:1 240:19</pre>
270:2 282:1 CLIA 140:4 166:4	<b>clog</b> 168:9,10	coding 81:22 105:9 126:2 127:8,9
<b>Clin</b> 39:8	<b>close</b> 44:12 49:12 66:12 117:6 135:22	188:11
clinical 1:7 3:22	147:17 239:15	<b>co-factor</b> 236:21
7:17 9:3,12,17	253:20 277:5 295:7	<b>coffee</b> 79:14
10:1,10 11:9	296:3	Cognitive 16:17
12:8,17 14:17 15:3,5,13,16,19 17:6 20:3 22:3,12	<b>closed</b> 88:16 183:15 184:1,9 190:10	<b>collect</b> 15:15 27:18 202:4
23:5 29:20 48:4	closed-loop 85:20	collected 29:2
54:17,20	<b>closely</b> 135:21	166:16
55:3,4,10,12,13,16 58:18 63:12 66:2	206:18 261:11	collection 22:2
67:22 68:10 70:19	<b>closer</b> 128:2 135:22	29:7
80:5,6,10,11 81:12,19 82:7	164:16 186:12,13,15 249:2 277:20 301:3	<b>collects</b> 201:20 204:4
83:18 96:5 100:4		<b>College</b> 54:22
106:20 107:2,10,14,15,16	<b>closest</b> 117:15 159:19	161:13
108:17 116:6 118:10 126:18,20	<b>closing</b> 305:18	<b>collegial</b> 152:6 155:11
127:17 128:21 129:12 130:8 136:4	CLSI 65:6 108:18 110:11 113:21	<b>color</b> 89:20 128:10 249:19
140:2 152:18 153:8	160:13 198:21 253:17 254:1,8	colored 232:8,10
158:14 159:7 170:17 177:2 180:3	255:2 270:8 276:7	<b>colorer</b> 18:18
191:5 193:22	298:21	colorimetric 230:2
194:10 200:12	<b>clue</b> 38:3	231:7 232:6
220:15 243:10 288:19 293:18	<b>clunky</b> 188:12	<b>colorless</b> 249:17
clinically 15:7	CMS 284:11	coma 215:10
19:10 30:19 107:7	<b>co</b> 249:12	combination 31:5

89:4 168:17 combinations 171:2 **combined** 296:10 combining 229:6 **Combs** 75:7 77:14,18 190:9 **comes** 54:14 76:22 106:19 117:15,22 136:16 145:1 156:20 206:19 234:22 267:9 272:16 **comfort** 104:12 179:17 298:1 **coming** 86:12 152:8,12 173:11 193:19 226:11 300:2 **commend** 155:8 **comment** 5:5 7:18 49:5,9 98:21 123:9 140:3 151:18 161:20 164:13 165:9 167:13 170:12 178:9 182:2 183:21 190:7 193:8 266:2 276:9 277:6 284:14 285:5 288:2 299:12 305:4 commenting 165:10 comments 4:22 5:6,7 7:20 14:15 78:16 99:17 140:2 149:1,8,13 163:13,15 171:22 174:17 178:5 181:4 182:10 263:14 264:8 Commission 31:13

#### commissioned 41:3 Commissioner 6:8,9,11 commitment 106:11 109:20 committed 102:9 244:3 252:1 committee 55:2 71:20 221:4,6,8 254:1,8 298:21 **common** 10:19 30:6 35:15 38:9 41:3 86:8 147:12 229:20 commonly 10:22 18:12 communicate 274:22 275:14 communication 214:11 266:15 communications 220:1 communities 10:2 152:9 community 13:1 108:22 111:14 153:9 173:8 174:20 253:1 296:21 300:13 companies 102:3 116:1,16 126:15 128:8 168:12 178:19 179:11 191:5 224:8 239:6 255:16,21 257:5 265:4 267:4 278:7,12,16,20 302:4 **company** 48:15 115:20 116:17

124:6 126:19 188:4 189:2 224:3 240:16 252:19 258:13 268:17 290:10 **comparable** 287:4,7 **compare** 25:9 31:4 42:12 67:8 245:3 246:16 257:7 267:17 **compared** 28:15 29:16 38:15 170:7 **compares** 286:21,22 comparing 28:22 165:3 268:12 287:11 comparison 25:8,16 26:1 27:15 28:2 40:3 44:15 46:22 272:4,17 288:4,5,6 compatibility 31:15 compelling 73:10 competing 255:16 competition 235:4,7,8,19 236:6,13 competitive 227:6 **completed** 5:22 64:1 108:16 **completely** 74:14,21 76:14 163:7 175:17 211:11 239:14 241:7 263:4 287:7 completion 110:22 111:15 113:22 **complex** 79:4 192:12 214:11 238:5 **compliance** 43:16,17

103:9 104:20 106:1 245:1 complicated 167:15 169:1 284:10 292:17 complications 8:16 15:18 56:4,6,8,10 57:6,8,11 59:2 107:4 171:2 **comply** 258:22 290:18 component 141:16 283:14 components 23:14 210:16 composed 89:4 composition 257:19 **compound** 221:13 275:12 compounding 217:12 compounds 30:2 221:12 226:2,5 247:11 250:7,15 254:14,16 255:13 272:10,19 comprehensive 225:13 compressed 239:5 **computer** 18:16,20 33:20 53:17,18 84:4,18 289:14 **concede** 245:10 concentration 25:5 27:14 29:14 31:6 62:11 68:17 86:11,19 189:18 235:2 249:20

concentrations 25:19 26:11,13,22 27:2,12 31:2 68:16 70:12 234:7 254:15 255:14 272:7 **concept** 271:15,16 concern 99:12 112:8 133:8 155:22 196:19 concerned 166:1 276:3 concerning 67:21 280:10 concerns 16:14 73:13 135:22 166:17 conclude 12:14 258:3 **concludes** 305:16 conclusion 40:21 76:7 96:4 99:11 239:11,20 conclusions 73:21 concurrence 287:21 condition 28:13 61:11 237:3 conditions 9:14 10:19 21:20 61:10 70:3 108:4 191:6 197:12 230:13 234:10 **conduct** 272:4 291:2 conducted 15:18 25:9,16 27:17 conference 7:4 280:9 300:7 confidence 43:8

119:18 121:17,19 123:15 151:8 177:12 184:19 confident 127:20 258:13 259:11 **confine** 226:19 **confirm** 280:13,14 **conflict** 115:17 conformance 31:12 conformed 29:16 confrontational 152:1 confused 73:22 269:1 confusing 162:15 208:3 280:16 confusion 237:6 Congress 21:6 conjunction 253:16 conquering 59:16 consecutive 64:4 consensus 11:16 48:7 63:9 107:8,12,17 124:11 199:4 252:22 257:12 258:8 276:7 **consent** 162:5 consequence 109:1 consequences 8:11 80:6,11,20 81:12,19 82:2 96:6,7,9 170:17 177:2 consequent 80:15 conservative 280:22 **consider** 47:8 59:4

		<u> </u>
61:7 96:20 117:12 118:7 120:5,8 123:12,13 124:3 198:1,4 201:1 216:20 227:16 254:15 285:18 290:10 considerable 43:11 247:14 278:10 consideration 259:4 276:11	224:7 <b>consumer</b> 116:20 128:7,11,13,15,17 130:5 131:2,3,16 132:13 134:6 144:3 187:21 188:1 228:3 244:20 251:2 259:9 270:5,10 <b>consumers</b> 13:1 128:14,16 131:8 134:18 270:3	129:18 160:12 164:2 172:18 176:9,16 177:10 178:14,17,22 179:10 180:7 contrast 246:17 248:12 contribute 104:9 144:14 contributes 139:16,17 187:11
considerations 111:2 195:4 226:7	contact 3:16 207:2 218:13	contributing 109:18 contributions
<pre>considered 19:3 47:13 107:18,22 114:3 225:22 254:12 292:18 </pre>	<pre>contain 32:3 210:15     221:2 container 32:1     129:2 130:11</pre>	14:4,8 contributor 230:15 contrived 36:14 272:18
<pre>considering 275:18 296:8 considers 23:19</pre>	<pre>containing 10:21     30:21 213:3 217:6     236:18</pre>	<b>control</b> 4:4 8:20 11:9,13,15,20 14:3
250:22 consist 4:12	contains 118:9,11 content 217:11	15:18 23:16 31:21 37:2 50:2 53:22 54:7 55:15 56:9,20
<pre>consistency 186:11 consistent 169:4 198:17 258:14</pre>	237:20 257:2 <b>context</b> 55:17 202:14	57:1,7,10 58:6,16 65:21 66:3,18 67:3,5,6 70:8,17 74:4 76:7,20 77:3
consistently 286:8	continuation 223:18	80:3,17,19,21
constant 106:11 120:20 164:21 273:18	<pre>continue 111:8    212:18 216:8    218:18 219:9    223:16 263:10</pre>	81:1,4 89:12 94:6,10 107:1,3 109:8,13 111:3 116:4 130:18
constants 96:22 99:14 100:6	303:1,6,7 continued 214:2	146:14,17 161:21 172:16 194:1
constraints 258:19 constructed 107:9	<b>continues</b> 8:7 219:19	196:12,15 226:13 233:20,21 248:2 252:13 261:4
<pre>consultant 115:8,21 Consultants 114:22</pre>	<b>continuing</b> 113:8 129:14 213:7	292:20,21 306:13 controlled 57:4,6
<b>consulting</b> 112:17 115:18 155:15	<b>continuous</b> 14:5 20:1 79:9 85:19	245:18 246:5 247:22 272:18

292:8

controlling 90:9 controls 58:11 166:21 221:4 248:1 303:6 controversial 148:21 convenience 78:10 79:5 103:9 128:11 138:1 242:5 252:3 convenient 225:3 conventional 56:14,20,22 67:3,5,8,11,14,18 69:5 conventionally 57:6 69:1 conversation 72:22 149:6 conversations 149:11 conversion 54:3 **converted** 249:10,18 convey 87:8 257:21 **convince** 283:17 **convinced** 283:19,20 **Cooper** 145:14 co-optimize 259:5 coordinator 221:17 **copies** 3:17 Corporation 224:2 **correct** 35:18 49:8 53:9 66:13 98:10 121:14 167:21 168:11,14 170:8 210:20 230:15 289:16 291:14

corrected 53:8 129:16 167:6,22 239:8 correcting 168:19 169:14,17 correction 52:22 53:22 129:17 167:20,22 168:1,15,16,20,21 169:1,4,8 **correctly** 155:19 230:10 corrects 44:21 correspond 87:3 corresponded 88:13 corresponding 252:10 corresponds 86:15 87:6 Cosmetic 21:8 **cost** 47:19 78:11 79:5 108:7 153:4 154:13 171:19 226:16 247:15 252:3 278:3 292:9,15 costly 279:15 **counsel** 308:9,12 Counselor 6:10 **count** 120:10 183:16 counter 14:1 140:7,11,12 counting 96:22 97:5,9,11 country 77:6

**counts** 269:7 couple 2:17 4:4 5:3 15:10 117:16 179:17 254:17 290:7,13 coupled 231:6 course 15:10 39:18 56:4,8 66:4 77:1 85:11,15 89:3 90:19 91:10 92:14 97:8,15 100:16 104:3 184:6 226:6 239:20 243:19 246:5,10 249:21 267:4 courses 60:5 **COURT** 308:1 courteous 3:7 Courtney 2:2 6:21 33:19 55:7 187:13 194:15,17 201:7 250:3 289:20 Courtney's 201:9 cover 234:18 **crayon** 46:7 **CRC** 89:1 create 83:15,19 84:2,5,9 87:20 128:16 188:16 226:4 235:3 252:21 254:13 258:4,10 294:12,19,21 297:10 **created** 87:19 234:12 254:3 255:5 293:1 creates 173:5 255:3 287:3

creating 82:5	cure 21:22 262:4,5	<b>CV</b> 42:7 64:12,15,18
234:10	curious 180:2	115:15 157:2
<pre>creatinine    298:13,14 299:17 creation 6:17</pre>	current 10:2,6 14:20 15:21 19:17 26:6,15 35:22	<b>CVs</b> 41:4,6 42:5,9,19 43:5 44:17 61:22 62:3
crit 270:14	41:17 43:10	<b>Cynthia</b> 139:4 280:8
<pre>crit 270:14 criteria 15:2 26:14,15,18 27:5 28:18 34:8,12 35:22 39:18,21,22 41:13,14,18,20,21 45:4,9 46:15,18 47:3,8 59:21 60:17 61:6 62:19,20,21 63:3 64:13 65:10,11,18 67:4 69:22 70:18,21 72:5 74:10,12,15 77:9 101:6 103:3 107:21 108:11</pre>	46:15,18 47:3 50:3 53:8 59:20 61:13 69:21 70:18 71:2 73:18 88:21 103:4 106:9,21 107:6,22 108:11 109:11 110:7 116:13 122:20 130:7 159:1 168:7,10 178:12 189:7,16 199:4 201:7 202:17 232:17 235:6 241:2 249:16 270:11 271:10 273:20 285:1 286:14	D D.C 254:12 daily 58:4 86:1 169:20 247:21 252:11 302:22 dairy 261:20 Dallas 112:17 155:15 danger 94:14 191:19 dangerous 39:13 47:14 95:2
115:11 116:4 251:8	301:10 303:14	dangerously 191:14
269:13 291:8 301:3,13 302:18	currently 8:1 9:21	<b>Dariush</b> 49:4
criterion 198:14	10:12 11:17 23:8 24:16 41:1 45:5	<b>dark</b> 119:2 260:9
<pre>critical 12:15 29:7     35:15 37:2,12     39:5,10 45:20 46:5     47:10,17 52:6     64:3,9 67:2 72:16     143:5 148:17 168:6     184:16</pre>	52:10 55:1 74:9 76:5 101:10 102:21 131:10 149:15 175:21 179:6 229:9 269:8,10 curve 99:14 100:7 174:4	<pre>data 24:19 26:18     28:10,17,22 29:6     34:9 35:1,3,7     38:16 40:3,12 41:4     42:1,11 43:3,12     48:4,10,14,16,21     50:9     51:15,18,19,22</pre>
critically 76:10	<b>curves</b> 94:18	52:20 72:9 83:20
78:3 79:10	<b>customer</b> 251:1	84:9 86:4 88:10
<b>crowd</b> 223:13 <b>crux</b> 291:15	customers 259:5 261:11	89:22 90:1,2 100:3 105:18 124:5,7,8 126:13,14 127:19
<b>Cs</b> 48:9	<b>cutoff</b> 183:5 301:3	128:22 131:8 133:2
culminate 110:15	cuts 281:7	144:19 160:11 166:16 169:14
cumulative 33:4	cuvettes 231:15	170:15,21,22 177:19 178:1

204:4,18 205:21 206:1 208:9,11,14 252:3 253:4 256:2 272:22 273:2 281:22 285:6 288:20 289:21	235:2 280:3,4 dealing 95:2 126:3 147:4,5 227:12 228:4 237:6 242:5 dealt 220:21 240:8 dear 40:3	183:19 221:7 256:11 259:2,6 300:17 decline 213:10 decrease 61:16 105:12 170:6
<pre>database 169:22   206:14 207:4,12,16   208:2,22 209:3</pre>	death 208:14 209:5 215:10	<b>decreased</b> 57:11 104:12
<pre>databases 161:22 datasets 88:4 206:6 dates 260:16</pre>	<pre>deaths     208:15,17,18,20     209:17 211:1     212:4,11,14,15,18</pre>	decreases 156:16 deemed 154:17 default 270:6 291:3
David 54:15 72:21 136:3 172:14 254:7 279:20 300:7 Davidson 300:8	213:7,8 215:12 217:22 220:8 262:15,17,19 263:2,11	<pre>defense 59:8 140:22 defer 255:9 define 24:13 30:5 65:18 145:19</pre>
<b>Davis</b> 17:15	<b>decades</b> 11:13 20:19 83:13	<b>defined</b> 25:11 67:15 90:16
day 12:7 20:5,18 43:2 54:7 56:16,21,22 57:3	<b>December</b> 126:5 <b>decided</b> 214:15	defining 233:21 definitely 52:17
58:7 65:14 95:5,8,9 97:15,20 142:16 148:3,22 150:15 172:20 173:1,2 175:10 252:9 281:19 290:1 305:22 306:9	<pre>deciliter 26:21     27:12 29:9 60:2     67:6,16 69:3,6,22     70:9 72:10     89:15,16 91:10     92:6 93:9 94:16</pre>	140:16 144:14 146:6 159:6 214:11 263:13 285:11 286:9,14 297:1 <b>definition</b> 21:18 139:10,13 198:18
307:3,8 <b>day-in</b> 241:20	110:5 118:15 179:21,22 181:22 182:4 209:11,14 293:5 295:11	276:12 definitive 245:6 246:18,20
day-out 241:21	decimal 143:13	degree 223:21
days 2:13 3:11 7:6 15:10 65:15 66:18 67:1 84:16 95:5 233:8 260:20	<b>decision</b> 15:8 19:18,21 20:3 30:19 72:17 144:10	239:18 242:13,14,16 243:3 degrees 5:20 260:11
<pre>DCCT 58:22 65:3 107:3 135:1,2 deal 18:3 79:4 110:13 125:5 148:22 225:6 228:6</pre>	178:11 179:2 decisions 15:8,13,16 19:11 39:13 49:18 109:3 128:14 146:2	<pre>dehydrated 233:4 dehydrogenase 36:7 203:5 209:19 210:6 215:19 216:6</pre>

230:22	240:17	197:20 215:3
<b>delay</b> 178:19 184:6	<b>Deputy</b> 6:8,10	228:14
delicate 186:10	<b>derived</b> 156:12	details 67:21 114:2
delineating 198:15	describe 212:1	<b>detect</b> 45:14 59:18
<b>de-link</b> 74:14,20	215:16 241:1	60:12 191:16 201:16 248:5
<b>deliver</b> 251:3	described 92:3,4	269:14 289:18
delivered 260:8	195:10 207:19 215:2,5 277:15	detected 67:19
<b>delivery</b> 17:21 85:9	describes 290:9	69:13 82:4 210:18
100:21		detecting 90:14
<b>demand</b> 130:4	describing 212:4	detection 34:22
demands 152:2	description 209:4	58:13 90:5 96:8
dementia 59:11	descriptive 206:2	102:6 181:15 290:21
<b>demographic</b> 89:6	design 29:6 82:8 83:13 103:7,22	<b>detects</b> 210:12
demonstrate 25:9	105:4 118:11	<b>deteriorate</b> 161:19
158:15 177:20	158:13,15	deteriorates 93:4
283:12	227:2,3,14 228:8 229:2 243:9 244:21	determinant 168:7
demonstrated 17:13	259:2,7,16 266:21	
91:2 236:16	267:6,12	determination 21:21
demonstrating 278:7	designed 66:17 83:8	determinations 159:7 201:4
demonstration	92:7,13 99:22	determine 25:6 26:3
239:16	160:6 190:5 244:14	33:2 45:10
<b>den</b> 37:15 38:1 66:10	designers 290:15	58:2,8,10 146:12
denominator 205:10	<b>designing</b> 102:9 186:3 244:3 290:10	158:22 159:12 216:17
Dentistry 242:16		<b>devalued</b> 141:4
-	<b>designs</b> 243:10 273:21	
depend 133:7	desirable 70:22	devaluing 139:17
dependence 103:14	desire 282:15	<b>devastating</b> 8:11 213:17
<b>depending</b> 168:16 205:3 206:3	despite 11:10 250:7	develop 46:4 52:21
depends 48:14 121:7	dessert 164:4	69:12 108:13
122:15 165:3 180:6		120:21 129:9
depiction 86:18	destructive 251:6	130:22 131:3 163:19 228:17
Depression 16:20	<b>detail</b> 65:7 68:12 104:5 112:12	236:20 268:6 274:7
deproteinized	125:16 195:12,14	278:14

<b>developed</b> 15:12,15 85:6 271:11	9:1,11,13 11:10 21:7,9,17,18 22:17	243:18 244:4 253:1 300:10
developers 243:9	23:16 81:13	diabetic 10:19 12:5
developing 149:11 253:3 258:8	102:2,4 103:4 105:15 107:19 112:21 130:5,10	16:20 20:21 76:9 81:7 90:7 138:10 162:4 192:13 193:4
<b>development</b> 6:18 57:5 101:17 109:5 179:12 185:20 224:5 290:17	140:16,17 177:22 183:18 186:13 201:9,17,18 202:11,12 203:19	197:4 202:15 209:16 213:22 218:10,18 262:12 diabetics 8:9 12:18
301:22	204:9 205:8 206:16 211:3,5 213:14,16	20:17 79:9 80:15
<b>deviate</b> 257:4	226:16 229:19,21	138:11 192:9
deviating 257:6	239:16 240:22	diagnosed 8:4,5,21
deviation 62:9	247:8 251:2 255:17	137:16
117:17,18 <b>device</b> 5:17 6:16	258:5 279:8 284:18 285:3,17 286:20	<b>diagnosing</b> 16:7 23:8
21:5,7 22:19,21 25:18 26:17 27:21 28:1,8 29:13,15	287:3,6 288:11,15 290:12,20 292:20,22 299:11	diagnosis 21:20 39:12 47:18 149:2,16 150:7
31:20 32:14,21	<b>devise</b> 85:21	300:9
50:5 54:12 88:19	devising 14:2	diagnostic 21:18
103:11,22 104:10	devising 14:2 devoted 79:2	102:2,4 245:16
	-	-
103:11,22 104:10 109:19 117:3 127:16 128:14 130:19 140:8 144:20 153:3	<pre>devoted 79:2 diabetes 7:22 8:3,5,10,12,17,20, 22 14:3,7,8 15:18</pre>	102:2,4 245:16
103:11,22 104:10 109:19 117:3 127:16 128:14 130:19 140:8 144:20 153:3 158:16 166:19	<pre>devoted 79:2 diabetes 7:22 8:3,5,10,12,17,20, 22 14:3,7,8 15:18 16:7 17:11,12 23:7</pre>	102:2,4 245:16 290:14 diagnostics 34:20
103:11,22 104:10 109:19 117:3 127:16 128:14 130:19 140:8 144:20 153:3 158:16 166:19 167:9 177:15	<pre>devoted 79:2 diabetes 7:22 8:3,5,10,12,17,20, 22 14:3,7,8 15:18</pre>	102:2,4 245:16 290:14 diagnostics 34:20 136:12 224:2 243:8
103:11,22 104:10 109:19 117:3 127:16 128:14 130:19 140:8 144:20 153:3 158:16 166:19	<pre>devoted 79:2 diabetes 7:22 8:3,5,10,12,17,20, 22 14:3,7,8 15:18 16:7 17:11,12 23:7 55:19 56:5,9,12,13 58:9 59:6,20 63:18 70:15 83:3,16</pre>	102:2,4 245:16 290:14 diagnostics 34:20 136:12 224:2 243:8 dial 95:18 dialed 95:15
103:11,22 104:10 109:19 117:3 127:16 128:14 130:19 140:8 144:20 153:3 158:16 166:19 167:9 177:15 183:19 184:21 188:20 192:11,14 204:4,6 205:5,18 207:10 220:7 227:6	<pre>devoted 79:2 diabetes 7:22 8:3,5,10,12,17,20, 22 14:3,7,8 15:18 16:7 17:11,12 23:7 55:19 56:5,9,12,13 58:9 59:6,20 63:18</pre>	102:2,4 245:16 290:14 diagnostics 34:20 136:12 224:2 243:8 dial 95:18
103:11,22 104:10 109:19 117:3 127:16 128:14 130:19 140:8 144:20 153:3 158:16 166:19 167:9 177:15 183:19 184:21 188:20 192:11,14 204:4,6 205:5,18	<pre>devoted 79:2 diabetes 7:22 8:3,5,10,12,17,20, 22 14:3,7,8 15:18 16:7 17:11,12 23:7 55:19 56:5,9,12,13 58:9 59:6,20 63:18 70:15 83:3,16 84:16 85:7 98:20 102:11 107:3,5</pre>	102:2,4 245:16 290:14 diagnostics 34:20 136:12 224:2 243:8 dial 95:18 dialed 95:15 dialog 13:5 dialysis 211:14
103:11,22 104:10 109:19 117:3 127:16 128:14 130:19 140:8 144:20 153:3 158:16 166:19 167:9 177:15 183:19 184:21 188:20 192:11,14 204:4,6 205:5,18 207:10 220:7 227:6 229:4,8 231:9	<pre>devoted 79:2 diabetes 7:22 8:3,5,10,12,17,20, 22 14:3,7,8 15:18 16:7 17:11,12 23:7 55:19 56:5,9,12,13 58:9 59:6,20 63:18 70:15 83:3,16 84:16 85:7 98:20 102:11 107:3,5 114:22 115:2,3,7,9,21 120:22 122:16,21</pre>	102:2,4 245:16 290:14 diagnostics 34:20 136:12 224:2 243:8 dial 95:18 dialed 95:15 dialog 13:5 dialysis 211:14 265:19
103:11,22 104:10 109:19 117:3 127:16 128:14 130:19 140:8 144:20 153:3 158:16 166:19 167:9 177:15 183:19 184:21 188:20 192:11,14 204:4,6 205:5,18 207:10 220:7 227:6 229:4,8 231:9 238:18 245:19,20 265:4,9,11,14 267:7 271:18 272:6	<pre>devoted 79:2 diabetes 7:22 8:3,5,10,12,17,20, 22 14:3,7,8 15:18 16:7 17:11,12 23:7 55:19 56:5,9,12,13 58:9 59:6,20 63:18 70:15 83:3,16 84:16 85:7 98:20 102:11 107:3,5 114:22 115:2,3,7,9,21 120:22 122:16,21 123:4 124:16 126:5</pre>	102:2,4 245:16 290:14 diagnostics 34:20 136:12 224:2 243:8 dial 95:18 dialed 95:15 dialog 13:5 dialysis 211:14 265:19 Diane 112:16 155:14
103:11,22 104:10 109:19 117:3 127:16 128:14 130:19 140:8 144:20 153:3 158:16 166:19 167:9 177:15 183:19 184:21 188:20 192:11,14 204:4,6 205:5,18 207:10 220:7 227:6 229:4,8 231:9 238:18 245:19,20 265:4,9,11,14 267:7 271:18 272:6 278:21 281:6	<pre>devoted 79:2 diabetes 7:22 8:3,5,10,12,17,20, 22 14:3,7,8 15:18 16:7 17:11,12 23:7 55:19 56:5,9,12,13 58:9 59:6,20 63:18 70:15 83:3,16 84:16 85:7 98:20 102:11 107:3,5 114:22 115:2,3,7,9,21 120:22 122:16,21 123:4 124:16 126:5 130:2 133:16</pre>	102:2,4 245:16 290:14 diagnostics 34:20 136:12 224:2 243:8 dial 95:18 dialed 95:15 dialog 13:5 dialysis 211:14 265:19 Diane 112:16 155:14 diaper 172:11 Dickinson 115:3
103:11,22 104:10 109:19 117:3 127:16 128:14 130:19 140:8 144:20 153:3 158:16 166:19 167:9 177:15 183:19 184:21 188:20 192:11,14 204:4,6 205:5,18 207:10 220:7 227:6 229:4,8 231:9 238:18 245:19,20 265:4,9,11,14 267:7 271:18 272:6 278:21 281:6 285:1,12	<pre>devoted 79:2 diabetes 7:22 8:3,5,10,12,17,20, 22 14:3,7,8 15:18 16:7 17:11,12 23:7 55:19 56:5,9,12,13 58:9 59:6,20 63:18 70:15 83:3,16 84:16 85:7 98:20 102:11 107:3,5 114:22 115:2,3,7,9,21 120:22 122:16,21 123:4 124:16 126:5</pre>	102:2,4 245:16 290:14 diagnostics 34:20 136:12 224:2 243:8 dial 95:18 dialed 95:15 dialog 13:5 dialysis 211:14 265:19 Diane 112:16 155:14 diaper 172:11 Dickinson 115:3 die 263:7
103:11,22 104:10 109:19 117:3 127:16 128:14 130:19 140:8 144:20 153:3 158:16 166:19 167:9 177:15 183:19 184:21 188:20 192:11,14 204:4,6 205:5,18 207:10 220:7 227:6 229:4,8 231:9 238:18 245:19,20 265:4,9,11,14 267:7 271:18 272:6 278:21 281:6	<pre>devoted 79:2 diabetes 7:22 8:3,5,10,12,17,20, 22 14:3,7,8 15:18 16:7 17:11,12 23:7 55:19 56:5,9,12,13 58:9 59:6,20 63:18 70:15 83:3,16 84:16 85:7 98:20 102:11 107:3,5 114:22 115:2,3,7,9,21 120:22 122:16,21 123:4 124:16 126:5 130:2 133:16 134:11 135:20,21 136:1,6,7,8 141:14 142:15,19 148:14</pre>	102:2,4 245:16 290:14 diagnostics 34:20 136:12 224:2 243:8 dial 95:18 dialed 95:15 dialog 13:5 dialysis 211:14 265:19 Diane 112:16 155:14 diaper 172:11 Dickinson 115:3 die 263:7 died 263:8
103:11,22 104:10 109:19 117:3 127:16 128:14 130:19 140:8 144:20 153:3 158:16 166:19 167:9 177:15 183:19 184:21 188:20 192:11,14 204:4,6 205:5,18 207:10 220:7 227:6 229:4,8 231:9 238:18 245:19,20 265:4,9,11,14 267:7 271:18 272:6 278:21 281:6 285:1,12 286:8,21,22	<pre>devoted 79:2 diabetes 7:22 8:3,5,10,12,17,20, 22 14:3,7,8 15:18 16:7 17:11,12 23:7 55:19 56:5,9,12,13 58:9 59:6,20 63:18 70:15 83:3,16 84:16 85:7 98:20 102:11 107:3,5 114:22 115:2,3,7,9,21 120:22 122:16,21 123:4 124:16 126:5 130:2 133:16 134:11 135:20,21 136:1,6,7,8 141:14</pre>	102:2,4 245:16 290:14 diagnostics 34:20 136:12 224:2 243:8 dial 95:18 dialed 95:15 dialog 13:5 dialysis 211:14 265:19 Diane 112:16 155:14 diaper 172:11 Dickinson 115:3 die 263:7

303:13	255:1,22 256:2	241:11
<b>differ</b> 24:11	257:9 259:17	director 2:2,15
<pre>difference 30:20     38:18,20 42:13     44:7 45:15 49:3,16     51:1 62:4,13 63:6</pre>	267:15 268:17 278:2,12 281:3 291:8 292:11 293:21 294:9 296:12,15 299:3	5:10,12 75:8 115:18 136:8,11 142:14 148:14 224:4
64:4,5,9 69:4,7 74:1 91:20 94:21	303:11 305:10,11	disadvantages 306:14,17
97:12 140:4 147:19 150:22 155:18	differential 99:13 172:14	<b>disagree</b> 50:8 99:20
158:21 176:11 181:22 184:8 196:4	<pre>differently 253:12     259:16</pre>	100:5 150:16 disagrees 165:1
234:12 237:7 282:19 284:3	difficult 54:4	discomfort 104:13
293:16,22 294:1	82:10 108:2 152:3 158:18 171:17	disconnect 112:7 166:11
differences 36:2 64:3 71:12 125:9	188:12 205:6 206:11 207:10	discover 268:5
197:7,9 226:10 234:15 285:11	208:7 251:18 255:8 270:11 278:18	<b>discovered</b> 166:2 263:16
different 9:14	284:22 286:12	discreet 105:5
15:8,9 24:1 29:20	difficulties 234:6	discreetly 282:15
34:3 43:7 52:9 53:4 56:22 61:22	<b>difficulty</b> 235:22 257:10	<b>discus</b> 35:10
63:13 68:13,14 72:2 73:20 77:8	diffusion 238:17	<b>discuss</b> 9:6 65:8 175:13
83:14,22 87:1 88:2,7 89:2 90:5	<b>Dijia</b> 98:20 <b>diligence</b> 220:20	<b>discussed</b> 4:21 32:17,19 65:7
97:3,17,18,21 99:15 117:16	dilute 250:2	80:19 109:16 153:14 176:8 198:2
132:19,20 167:4 170:10 171:2	dilution 245:7	203:10,17 247:3
173:12 175:7	diminishes 90:20	discussing 12:12
177:8,14 180:4 183:12 184:6	direct 88:5 directed 58:20	101:12 110:12 185:22
195:20 199:1 201:19 202:22 203:6,10,17 206:10 207:14,15,20 220:22 225:21 234:6,7 237:14 239:2 240:5,21 241:22 242:2	direction 20:2 54:17 173:4 183:15 308:7 directive 304:13 directly 29:13 177:3 204:14	discussion 4:11 10:12 34:12 46:2 77:11 104:14 113:6,7 135:14,17 141:9 148:16 151:19 172:1 185:18 193:16 220:11 227:21

264:4 269:1 296:10 306:15	255:5,6,12 256:17 290:8	141:18 177:4 184:11 203:21
discussions 4:15 12:2,9 46:20	<b>documents</b> 24:18 29:5 253:22 254:1	215:8 <b>dot</b> 143:13
286:9,11 306:3	255:11	<b>dotted</b> 68:20
disease 8:7,13 21:20,22 22:11	dollars 154:13	Doubling 98:7
102:6 194:1,4,6	domestically 258:9	<b>doubt</b> 261:3
298:18 300:6	<pre>done 41:14,17 48:5 50:6 51:6 52:18</pre>	<b>doze</b> 61:3
display 258:2	58:7 62:16	Dr 2:1,14 5:10,19
displays 105:2	63:12,14 80:1 86:9	6:13,20,21
disregards 32:16	89:13 112:5 115:5 116:16,18	13:6,7,15,20 14:6,9,11 16:22
distance 2:22 3:1	118:12,20	17:20 20:15
<b>distinction</b> 23:9 303:21	129:15,21 130:9,17 132:21 133:9,18	33:7,12,17,18 46:7 47:21,22 48:20
distinguish 51:22	137:17 146:17 153:9 156:13 158:2	49:4,8,9,18,20,21 50:8 51:10 52:3
<b>distinguished</b> 11:22 135:19 270:2	160:8 162:3 175:15,22 198:7,13	53:13 54:2,13,15 55:5,6 57:20 65:9
distinguishing	199:16 220:19 221:11 226:14,19	71:10,11,17 72:3,4,14,20,21
51:17 269:1	230:10 240:12	73:22 74:13 75:1
<b>distributed</b> 43:6 175:20	245:5 264:16	76:17 77:13,16 79:11,13,18,20
diverse 68:13	265:16 270:2 281:17 298:19	80:7,8 81:9 82:20
divide 55:13 76:13	301:4,6 304:20	85:1,4 88:8,9
120:18	<b>door</b> 142:18	96:17 97:2 98:2,8,14,15,16,19
Division 2:3 13:9	dopamine 197:15	100:18,20,21,22
54:17 115:2 148:14	<b>dose</b> 17:22 18:4	101:5,8 111:19
193:22 201:8	58:8 113:1 119:11	112:8 113:5,13,16 114:1,10,13,16,18,
<b>DKA</b> 16:3 226:1 232:19 233:1	120:7,9 133:6 137:20 147:20	19,21,22 115:13
docket 7:20 273:11	155:16 162:3 171:9	132:2,4,5,11,22
doctor 252:18	176:11	133:13,19 134:3,4,20
Doctorate 5:20	<b>dosed</b> 196:10	135:5,15 136:3,10
doctors 14:9 152:16	doses 30:18 58:2	138:9 139:3 140:1
	68:14 262:9,10	141:8,19 142:6 144:11 145:3,4
document 110:21 254:3,10,20	dosing 39:13 82:3 98:5 112:22 113:4	146:6 147:3 148:9

		)
149:20 150:16	304:16,18,22	210:17 211:5,10,11
151:18 156:8	305:5,16,18,21	212:3,6 215:7,14
157:4,6 158:18	<b>draft</b> 285:19 286:12	216:11 217:2,17
159:6,19 160:9,20		218:15,22 219:14
162:8 164:1,10	<b>drafts</b> 253:22	284:14,19
165:2,9,21 167:13	dramatic 56:1,20	drugstore 296:18
169:6,10,13,17	96:7 176:15 181:20	<b>druthers</b> 292:13
170:12,18 174:14,17 175:9	dramatically 58:20	
176:6 177:6,18	91:7,19 185:9	<b>dry</b> 163:1
179:5 180:6,21	<b>draw</b> 46:8 54:10	<b>drying</b> 163:4,6
182:12,17 183:8,21	174:15	<b>Ds</b> 48:9
184:12,14,15,16	drawings 18:16	dubois 234:3 298:4
185:5,11 186:1,21	_	300:5
187:3,4,6,13 189:2	<b>drawn</b> 268:1	
190:7	drew 46:18 159:21	<b>Dubois</b> 279:11
193:8,13,14,21	drift 285:6 286:17	<b>due</b> 42:14 75:4
194:7,9,13,15,21	287:2	76:20 96:11 220:8
196:17 197:6,21 199:7 201:6,13	<b>drip</b> 79:10	281:6
220:13 222:2	_	<b>Duke</b> 13:15
223:9,10,15 224:13	<b>drive</b> 190:18	<b>dummies</b> 59:17
232:15 238:4 240:3	<b>drives</b> 217:21	<b>Duncan</b> 225:11
241:9 242:7,12,17	235:19	
243:14 249:3	driving 3:1 59:13	duplicate 43:16
252:16 254:7	190:17	48:21 49:11
255:17 256:12	drop 137:14 138:2	duplicates 185:7
257:14	143:8,17 144:1	during 12:16 20:19
260:2,3,13,22	156:12,14,19,22	56:21 97:15 112:13
261:7 263:13 264:2 266:3,4 267:14	157:3,6,10 162:10	243:7
268:7 269:20	188:10	<b>dye</b> 249:18
270:21 271:7	drops 144:5 229:11	dynamic 127:4,5,7
272:12,21 274:14	<b>drove</b> 79:7	189:3 191:22 192:1
276:9 277:6 279:20		269:12
281:10,21 282:18	<b>drug</b> 2:4 21:8 39:13 47:15 197:13	dynamics 80:4
283:1,2 284:1	210:14 211:3 212:8	-
285:10 287:17	213:1 216:20	dysfunction 16:17
288:1,7 291:5	221:18 222:6,8	
292:3,5,8,13 293:7 294:11 296:19	264:12 265:14	E
294:11 296:19 297:15,18 299:12	274:15 285:11,13	<b>eager</b> 149:13
301:19 302:5,9	300:18	<b>earlier</b> 32:1,5
303:8,11	drugs 10:18 30:10	67:20 72:3 78:17
-	-	

91:3 98:9 144:17 155:16 160:10 175:2 192:10 226:16 227:10 233:19 234:3 236:7 238:4 258:15 293:3 305:5 early 50:14 102:6 196:2 224:7,19 240:8 286:11 289:3 earthquake 153:21 154:8,14 155:5 earthquakes 153:20 **ease** 28:7 105:20 246:2 **easier** 20:20 78:11 115:14 208:13 **easily** 231:5,6 240:8 276:4 279:12 299:22 east-west 190:10 **easy** 140:22 167:10 187:22 228:10,12 239:18 274:12 280:11 281:7 **eat** 19:20 87:13 120:16 **eaten** 142:21 **echo** 78:16 economic 304:10 economically 153:2 **editor** 13:13 editorial 13:12 39:8 Editor-in-Chief 136:6 **editors** 65:22

educate 216:19 264:18 265:4,12 educating 264:15 education 5:22 132:10 134:6,17 145:6 199:21,22 220:4 222:13 223:5 263:10 267:1 educational 126:1 163:20 educators 12:5 **effect** 33:4 35:13 36:2,5 81:21 82:8,18 89:10,12 92:1 95:3 96:12 97:7 107:4,14,16 120:6 166:2 173:5 176:15,16 196:6 213:7 220:2 230:18 232:3 234:22 235:3,18,20 236:9,12 238:9,11,21 247:3,4,9 274:3,9 294:6,7 296:5 effective 102:7 211:9 212:21 222:5 266:13,15 275:7 303:2 effectively 227:13 275:5 effectiveness 5:14 269:5 effects 31:11 32:19 35:16 42:13,15 44:20 47:2 72:2 196:18 198:6,20 233:6,15

efficient 235:6

effort 108:22 227:4 230:9 289:8 **efforts** 106:17 108:13 109:7,14 110:14 212:17,20 216:19 **EGFR** 298:15 **eight** 38:2 41:7 184:20 185:8 **eighth** 32:9 132:10 either 7:15 8:2 12:7 19:10 56:13 66:19 67:2 82:1 91:14 127:8 133:5 150:5 153:1 166:15 170:18 175:16 178:4 205:18 230:2,19 232:9 260:3 301:19 Elahi 49:4,9,20 **elderly** 7:6 8:1 **elected** 161:15 **electrical** 31:13,14 electrochemical 230:3 232:11,14 235:4 electrochemistry 127:4,6,8 189:4 269:12 **electrode** 168:6,11 249:15 electrodes 125:8 127:7 250:6 electromagnetic 31:15 electronic 169:21 170:1 206:6

**electrons** 249:13,15 elegant 73:5 **elements** 26:5 32:4 260:18 **elevated** 11:1 36:4 226:4 265:2 **eleven** 79:14 eliminate 175:17 232:17 247:8 270:12 274:6,9,19 277:18 289:10 eliminates 276:17 eliminating 277:21 Elizabeth 52:8 Ellen 135:19 138:9 172:3 260:4 **else** 137:14 182:12 187:11 269:21 282:3 embarrassing 136:19 **embedded** 169:22 **embrace** 282:11 **emergency** 8:14 9:4 21:1 22:5 191:15 203:14 empathize 137:6 emphasis 194:5 306:18 emphasize 56:9 89:18 184:10 259:10 emphasized 60:5 246:1 emphasizes 246:2 empirical 169:14

**employ** 10:17 **employed** 308:10,13 **employee** 308:12 **enable** 185:21 encompassed 271:17 Encore 231:18 **encounter** 244:14 **encourage** 4:17 7:19 12:8 111:8 204:17 219:7 encouraged 104:15 **end-all** 163:17 **endocrine** 13:9,17 endocrinologist 134:5 242:20 243:18 283:3 endogenous 30:6,7,11,13 226:2 231:22 250:6,13 275:11 end's 45:13 **energy** 131:1 278:10 Enflazamide 125:19 enforce 191:2,3,9 192:21 enforcement 297:2 enforcements 111:7 engage 12:9 **engaged** 101:16 108:22 110:12,19 engineer 80:9 engineering 79:22 80:1 81:13 83:9 103:22 236:22 243:3 290:9,20

engineers 83:13 121:13 England 6:2 **English** 164:5 296:17 enhanced 105:2 109:19 **enjoy** 79:14 **enjoyed** 154:22 **ensure** 32:8 264:14 **enter** 53:17 entered 206:8,9 216:13 **enters** 170:1 entire 29:18 79:1 191:22 192:1 entirely 83:8 247:5 environment 51:14 84:10 140:20 158:12 191:4 226:14 228:4 245:18,19,20 246:5 248:1 250:16 269:10 273:8 275:4 293:18 environmental 31:11 195:7,17 226:7 230:20 233:18 environments 85:21 178:8 246:4 279:16 enzyme 125:9 203:5 231:12 236:13,16 249:11,12 250:8 265:1 **enzymes** 229:18 230:21 236:20 247:10 250:3

274:10	116:12 117:17	278:6 279:9 292:2
<b>EP7</b> 198:21	118:1,4,6	293:13 294:2,5
<b>episode</b> 59:12	120:11,20 121:2,6,16,17,18	295:21 301:17 <b>Es</b> 48:9
<b>equal</b> 26:14	122:2,5,8,11	
27:3,6,14 67:16	123:19,20 124:2,11	<b>escape</b> 20:13
110:3	125:4,12 130:12	especially 52:20
equally 12:3	131:5,6 134:8,9,12,16	134:11 139:19
<b>equate</b> 139:9	135:1 142:7,10	149:18 157:1 176:12 181:2 273:6
equation 99:13	143:18	286:9 288:19
272:16	144:15,16,18	
	145:5,8,9,11,13	essence 227:7
equations 87:3	147:13,18 160:17	essential 131:17
100:7 171:4 240:22	165:11,17,18	essentially 65:12
equilibrium 294:6	168:13 170:17	70:15 154:9 226:21
equipment 31:14	173:5,11,21 174:13	230:1
248:11	176:10,12,14,19,20 182:3,8,21 183:18	establish 22:11
equivalency 19:15	184:18 194:22	300:1
equivalent 22:19	195:1 224:19 225:1	established 76:12
98:12 247:19	237:15	198:19
	244:9,11,12,15	establishing 78:21
<b>Eran</b> 133:1	259:14 271:16,17	-
ergonomic 103:19	272:13 274:6	<b>estimated</b> 8:8 95:13
105:4	276:12 277:7,8,11	<b>et</b> 78:12 81:20
erroneous 176:22	283:21	130:16 139:18
<b>error</b> 4:5 13:20	289:8,11,12,18 291:3	141:1,2,3,4 164:22
15:3 17:2,4		227:17 245:21
18:7,17,22 19:1	errors 18:15 19:5,6	<b>EU</b> 127:17
32:13 34:8,12	36:11 47:11 50:5 53:20 81:18 91:10	Europe 128:2 299:3
36:19 41:18	93:5 95:11 97:9,11	304:12
45:1,18 46:4,8	98:3 107:11 120:8	<b>evaluate</b> 9:20 19:14
47:5 48:7	121:12 126:3	25:1,2,4,7 27:16
50:5,11,14 52:15 53:3 54:6,11	130:13	28:20 29:17
61:7,16 65:2,4	141:15,16,18,19	30:3,11 31:1,10
89:15,16	144:13 152:20	32:2,7 33:1 66:7
92:4,13,22 93:13	186:8,16 201:11	71:15 199:2 256:9
94:12,14 95:21	271:22	258:7 271:22
96:21,22 97:5,7,8	Ervin 71:11 223:20	273:21
98:5,6,7 102:15,17	224:13 240:7	evaluated 23:22
105:19 107:8,12,17	241:14 273:22	24:20 26:2 29:1

30:14,17,19 56:15	305:22 306:6	232:5 235:4 240:16
72:19 140:9 195:20 254:16 258:14	everyone's 292:1	242:1 251:1 274:3,10 289:13
288:18	everything 61:1	290:19 303:10,11
evaluates 22:22 28:5,10 29:12	78:21 187:11 226:12 233:20	<b>examples</b> 34:6 234:18
31:17	everywhere 248:9	<b>exceed</b> 70:7
evaluating 196:19	<b>evidence</b> 10:7 58:5	
198:20 199:13	61:17 149:4	exceeding 46:11
253:4 255:22	evident 76:21 106:5	exceedingly 156:8
evaluation 13:21 20:11 21:3 23:6	evolution 109:17 154:19 224:16	<b>excellent</b> 99:8 220:16
24:16 27:9 29:21 34:3 44:18 47:12	225:2,5 236:19 239:16	<b>except</b> 124:11 189:11
52:4 61:8 140:8,18 178:12 195:22	evolve 87:16 230:12	<b>exception</b> 30:3 42:4
256:8 288:16	evolved 242:3	198:11 221:11
evaluations 33:22	evolving 227:10	<b>excited</b> 2:6 307:6
34:1 267:20 evaporating 156:20	<b>exact</b> 49:10 99:4,5,10,11	<b>exciting</b> 136:13 306:9
event 9:8 90:20	<b>exactly</b> 48:20 85:17	<b>excluded</b> 65:10
91:2,6,12,14,16,19	95:20 113:22 129:2	<b>excludes</b> 64:13,20
95:10 99:2,6 204:4 205:21 206:4,18	131:4 138:16 148:3 167:5 297:12	excluding 70:2
209:4 219:5 220:17	exaggerated 72:1	<b>exclusively</b> 60:17 231:2
events 95:12 133:20 158:20 181:17	examination 22:2	excreted 86:13
204:2,16 205:12	<b>examined</b> 258:11	excursion 176:18
208:4,12 211:2	examining 254:9	excursions 82:3
<b>everybody</b> 76:19 77:1 113:20 128:6	<b>example</b> 10:20 22:8	excuse 80:2
131:16 143:20	36:1 59:12 61:21 62:7 86:19 94:14	exemption 88:19
152:9 155:13	105:17 144:19	exercised 288:7
161:16 177:13	153:17 168:5	<b>exist</b> 247:1 291:12
191:15 242:4	169:11 184:3 187:20 188:9 197:5	existence 251:14
everybody's 229:12	200:16 202:1	exists 198:14 199:4
everyone 2:1 6:22 20:16 34:4 176:3 185:1 223:15 291:7	204:10 209:9,20 210:4 217:18 219:10 229:7,11	exogenous 30:6,9,11,16 226:5

232:1 250:15 expand 287:18 **expanded** 135:8 **expect** 64:21 65:14 110:15 134:12 237:17 238:19 **expectations** 64:19 277:14 **expected** 41:6 66:22 282:8 **expense** 103:8 expensive 130:6 154:11 303:16 experience 95:9 113:2 192:2 242:18 243:5 284:22 experienced 51:7 experiences 33:4 experiencing 262:15 **experiment** 92:12,21 experiments 84:13,14 86:9 92:5 96:4 **expert** 63:4 158:1 **experts** 4:13 63:7 expiration 260:15 **explain** 132:15 exponentially 226:17 **expose** 22:10 **exposed** 196:7 260:10 **exposing** 250:17 **exposure** 105:13 195:18,19 211:12

236:1 **expressed** 248:12 259:5 **extend** 193:13 **extended** 118:18 131:6,7 extensive 77:11 **extent** 30:5 51:21 118:20 210:19 227:3 238:13 245:5 263:15 270:21 external 88:4 128:20 130:18 131:18 externally 116:17 **extra** 29:10 53:18 85:5 190:12,14 **extract** 89:2 251:20 extracted 169:20 295:4 Extraneal 211:14 212:7 213:1 217:3 222:20 223:3,6 264:13 **extreme** 25:20 175:16 extremely 52:19 82:9 133:11,18 153:4 extremes 196:21 197:3 F **face** 11:6 80:16 188:22 facilitate 243:12 **facilities** 2:10 4:4

7:3 57:18 108:15,20 158:8 203:15,16 212:15 213:11 214:17 215:2,13 216:4,5,7 219:7 266:7

facility 188:3
 222:8,10 259:18
 266:8

**facing** 299:21

fact 11:10 39:11
 104:14 129:4,5
 152:6 172:19 207:5
 229:18 238:22
 254:7 279:17
 295:22

factor 8:13 15:22
32:12 52:22 58:15
59:4 78:11 91:21
108:7 135:4 143:6
167:20,22 168:1,6
169:8 278:3 295:1

factors 18:5 25:2
31:10 32:11,18
33:1,5 103:11,19
110:13 125:21
138:1 140:15 151:4
195:7,15,17 199:15
249:12 251:1 289:6
305:11

faculty 18:19
faculty 18:19
FAD 203:6 236:21
fail 190:21,22
failed 41:15 52:6
 62:19
fail-safe 140:9
fail-safes 139:18
failure 8:15 16:16

<b>failures</b> 129:16	101:19 104:14,15	297:6
<b>fair</b> 113:2 163:4 268:18 271:3	108:20 111:5,6,13 126:13 136:12 144:19 149:15	<b>feel</b> 98:22 99:7 137:7 151:19 170:4
<pre>fairly 45:2 138:19 158:19 161:2 229:20 246:7,9 247:7</pre>	152:2,14 153:7 155:10 192:6 194:17 201:9,16,20,21	218:16 feelings 198:12 feet 246:8
<b>fairs</b> 149:18	202:3	fellow 54:22 300:8
<pre>fall 20:2 26:9,12 107:13,15</pre>	204:3,8,13,14,16,1 8 205:20 206:22 208:2,6,15 209:22	<pre>Fellowship 6:3 felt 53:19</pre>
<b>false</b> 22:10 146:9 209:16 263:9	210:2,15 211:18 212:10,11,14	<pre>femtosecond 76:18 Fernando 153:21</pre>
<b>falsely</b> 11:1 36:4 265:2	213:19 214:18 256:16 261:10 265:10 266:1	<pre>fewer 126:11,12 field 82:11 178:2</pre>
<b>familiar</b> 13:20 18:8 256:19 286:19	267:21 273:2 277:6,13 284:21	224:9 259:13 fields 206:1
<pre>families 263:3 famous 89:19</pre>	285:15,18,22 286:19 287:21 288:8 296:8 300:19	<b>fifth</b> 129:4 132:6,10
<b>fan</b> 252:20	301:8	<b>figure</b> 33:20 87:17
<pre>fashion 241:4 fast 12:19 96:5 246:3 250:8,9</pre>	FDAs 21:3 FDA's 6:18 76:15 297:2	89:18 120:12 172:21 219:20 263:19 275:21 280:3,17
<pre>faster 11:14 20:20     84:15 104:11 225:4     282:7,12</pre>	<b>fear</b> 58:15 90:8 281:8	<b>figures</b> 35:17 87:4 252:10
fatal 201:11	feasible 167:2 206:22 241:20	figuring 286:13
favorable 253:6	<b>feature</b> 90:7 160:9	filtration 298:16
<pre>FDA 1:6 2:7 6:7,14 9:7,21 10:2,4 12:17,20 14:20 16:7 20:8,10 21:6 22:7,18,22 23:19 24:3,16,21 25:2 26:7 28:5,10 29:5,12 31:17 33:8 41:3,17 47:5</pre>	209:3 features 104:2 128:11 130:6 187:15,17 188:7,18,21 February 73:1 Federal 21:8 Fee 6:16	<pre>final 11:7 77:13    98:14 232:8 259:2 finally 19:13    84:2,7 88:4,14    95:3 116:19 121:4    125:21 127:10    229:22 244:19    245:16 247:7 financially 308:14</pre>
77:2,12 88:15	feedback 273:10	finding 257:10
	_ · • • • • •	-

findings 62:17	174:6,11	306:13
160:1	175:11,15,19,21 177:11 182:22	focused 194:3
<b>fine</b> 122:20 160:17 166:7 170:5	183:2,6 184:22	focusing 198:3
finger 24:4,7,12	185:3 190:4 228:2	folks 133:5
27:19 39:6 164:6	248:11,19 281:17 283:7 284:6 291:19	<b>follow-up</b> 57:12
finger-sticks 160:4	301:9,14 302:15	182:14 278:19
finished 136:16	five-fold 237:12	food 2:4 21:8 120:12 262:2
finishing 164:4	<pre>five-second 284:9</pre>	foods 261:21
first 3:22 5:3	<b>fix</b> 142:2,4	forearm 24:7
12:16 14:18 20:6	<b>fixed</b> 89:15 95:7	forefront 154:3
33:18,20 38:13 44:10 55:16 57:19	182:3	forego 112:4 188:17
74:2 79:18 81:20	flagging 105:16	foregoing 308:5
82:21 83:17 84:10	<b>flew</b> 83:7	
87:4 90:4,13 95:6 97:5 99:7,20	<b>flex</b> 289:6,9,19	<pre>foreknowledge 87:11</pre>
115:18 116:5	<b>flicker</b> 36:15	foremost 138:8
120:10 125:5 138:8	flicking 36:20	forever 149:22
161:15,20 162:9	Fliss 243:2 252:17	forgets 98:10,11
170:13 171:7 172:4 173:22 188:6 189:5	260:3 266:17	form 12:3 15:21
193:13 198:5	271:21 272:15	17:6 89:5,6 280:6
201:6,20 202:6	275:16 282:14 287:15 290:5	formally 111:6
221:7 242:12	292:16 302:20	format 3:8,20 27:3
253:22 254:20 266:5,6 270:1	<b>floor</b> 7:5 221:18	28:4,19 256:21 257:4
300:22 301:17	252 <b>:</b> 15	
<b>fit</b> 21:16	floors 43:1	former 115:1,4
<b>fits</b> 191:21	<b>Florida</b> 6:4 161:13	<b>formula</b> 53:1 95:19 169:22
five 17:22 34:16	220:16 260:10	
35:2,7 38:13 40:19	<b>flow</b> 168:7 233:6,15	formulary 221:4,10
42:3 52:9 61:22	fluorescein 197:15	formulated 231:5
62:1,19 65:15	<b>fluxes</b> 83:22 84:1	forth 186:9
78:21,22 91:10,12 92:21 95:20 122:2	86:10,14	fortunately 208:14
124:12 126:11,18	<b>flyer</b> 272:9	232:14
138:4 142:13	<b>focus</b> 9:15,17 10:15	Forty 148:11
147:15 152:19 157:2 164:16	11:8 103:7 104:14	forward 2:12 13:5
IJ/.Z IUI.IU	145:8 223:21 290:3	33:9 111:13 171:14

	(	)
172:15 197:22	<b>fruit</b> 253:20	GCMS 123:21
220:11 263:20	<b>fruits</b> 261:19	GDH 36:10 197:18
278:17 306:4	fulfill 39:22	201:11 231:10,12
<pre>fostering 5:17</pre>	<b>fully</b> 108:13	236:11,20 250:4
foundation 88:18	109:7,14	<b>GDH-FAD</b> 215:20
115:22	<b>fun</b> 162:5	<b>GDH-NAD</b> 215:20
<b>founder</b> 136:5	<pre>functioning 262:6</pre>	GDH-PQQ 212:9 216:9
fourth 16:5 60:20	fundamental	218:12 229:16
<b>foyer</b> 79:15	139:10,13	Gee 192:20
<b>FR</b> 3:13	fundamentally	geek 252:18
fraction 84:15	269:15	general 152:10
<b>frame</b> 224:17	furthermore 103:4	198:12 216:6
<pre>framework 12:1</pre>	107:6 166:22	218:17 249:2,3 288:16 306:11
Francisco 136:5	<b>future</b> 174:22	generally 37:4
243:19		52:16 90:8 98:22
<pre>frankly 47:16</pre>	G	99:22 109:3 164:18
166:15 297:18	<b>G6</b> 231:18	175:6 225:18
<b>Fraser</b> 45:17	<b>gain</b> 201:22	232:22 248:21
Freckmann 126:4	galactase 197:18	generation 71:3
<b>freedom</b> 287:16	galactose 210:13	224:21
<pre>frequency 106:2</pre>	215:21 217:7	generations 61:14
171:1,2	261:14,17,18	<b>generic</b> 195:19
<b>frequent</b> 16:18,19	Gary 40:17 141:13 193:21 201:13	genetic 236:22
37:4 65:18 81:8	298:10 300:5	Genetics 13:13
95:13 179:8	<b>gas</b> 37:16 38:6,19	gentleman 7:7
<pre>frequently 248:2</pre>	45:13 47:17 68:6	Gentlemen 243:13
<b>fresh</b> 227:22	179:5 245:7 267:17	George 46:5 156:10
<b>Friday</b> 173:11	268:3 279:8 291:21	160:3
<pre>friendly 108:7</pre>	<pre>gastrointestinal     85:11</pre>	Georgetown 54:20
<b>friends</b> 135:10	gather 272:4	<b>Georgia</b> 259:13
Fritz 220:14	gathered 224:14	gets 139:21 140:8
front 40:17 113:14	gathering 253:21	162:1 192:13 283:9 291:15
293:15		
<b>Frost</b> 34:18	<b>GC</b> 241:14	<b>getting</b> 34:14 35:21 46:22 68:17 78:19

119:21 137:22	glass 7:5	62:11 63:1,13
142:19 154:4 155:1	glasses 276:1	65:13 66:18
185:3,15 196:1	<b>Glenn</b> 289:1	67:3,4,10,21
214:9 229:8 260:7		68:2,3,9,13,15,17,
305:14	<b>global</b> 111:14	22 69:4,7,11,18 70:10,12,18
Ginsberg 47:22 50:8	264:13 298:14	71:8,13,15,18
96:17 98:2 114:21	globally 255:21	72:12 74:7,9
115:1,13	globulin 261:9	77:2,20
132:3,4,11 133:13,19 134:3,20	<b>gluca</b> 137:22	80:3,6,17,19,21
141:19 142:6 145:3	-	81:1,5,8,9,19
147:3 148:9 150:16	glucometer 53:4,18	82:3,17 85:8,15
157:4,6 160:20	54:1 166:3,11	86:10,19 87:1,16
162:8 167:13	170:2 263:8	89:12 90:10,19,21
169:6,10,13,17	glucometers 53:20	91:9 92:9 93:15
177:6 180:6 182:17	263:6 280:10	94:18 96:10 97:7
184:14,16 189:2	Glucoscan 224:5	98:5,7 101:6,13,19
194:22 199:8	<b>glucose</b> 1:8 2:5,9	102:9,14,19,22 103:12 104:3,16
232:15 238:4 249:3	4:1,2 7:17 8:19	106:21 107:10,19
256:12 270:21	9:1,7,9,16,18,20,2	108:14,19
294:11 303:12	2 10:3,6,11,17,18	109:1,18,20
Ginsberg's 257:14	11:1,4,8,11,13,17,	110:4,6,16
given 14:12 20:5	19 12:19,21	111:1,16 112:10
28:6 71:12 117:16	13:2,22	113:11 115:19
120:21 133:22	14:1,2,5,18,20,21,	119:5,16 120:6
175:5 208:16	22 15:11 16:19	121:22 122:1,7,10
219:10 251:11	19:19,22 20:12,16	123:5 125:17,19
252:13 257:1	21:4,15,16 22:16	128:7,8 131:9
272:20	23:1,2,4,10,11,14	133:7 137:5,8,17
gives 94:20 104:8	24:2,10,17,20	138:12 139:9
118:6 121:17 162:2	25:1,3,5,13,19	142:7,14,22
181:16 200:22	26:9,11,13 27:9 28:14 29:7	143:3,16 144:14,20
212:19 267:18	30:2,3,7,13	145:18 147:7
giving 5:5 17:22	31:2,5,6,18	151:3,5,10,14 154:2,3,21 155:7
137:12,13 140:3	32:3,6,11,19	157:16 160:12,22
148:1 155:20	33:16,22 34:1,3	161:10,21 162:6,7
190:16 210:19	35:4,13 36:6,7	163:1,8 164:2,3,7
247:18 291:4	37:3,5,8,19,22	165:8 167:17
304:19	38:2,4,5 40:4 41:7	168:8,14 171:10
<b>glad</b> 47:20 222:2,16	43:20 45:18 50:3	172:18 174:19
$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}$ $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{z} \mathbf{v}$ $\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{z} \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{z} \mathbf{z} \mathbf{z}$	10.20 10.10 00.0	±, ±, ±, ±, ±, ±, ±,
glamerial 298:16	52:12 55:15 56:21	177:10,22

		,
180:8,10 181:5 183:16 184:7	<b>glucoses</b> 239:3,4 268:3 293:19	grandchildren 150:1 grandmother's
187:19 189:8,20,22	glycemia 55:13	150:13
191:22 194:20 195:4 197:17 199:3 200:5,18 201:3,11	<b>glycemic</b> 4:3 11:9,12,15,20	<pre>grandparents 149:21,22</pre>
202:8,15,22 203:2,4 204:9,11 205:9,20 206:14,21 207:13 208:3,10	16:15 37:2 53:22 54:7 55:15 58:6,11,16 65:21 66:3 70:17 74:3	<b>graph</b> 89:21 93:12 118:16 119:1 182:20
209:18 210:5,6,11,18,21 212:12 213:22	76:7,19 77:3 107:1 109:8,12 111:3 292:20,21 306:13	<pre>great 2:7 5:9    110:16 182:1    231:19 235:2</pre>
215:18,19 216:6,22 217:19 221:15,21 223:18	<b>Glycohemoglobin</b> 55:1	<pre>greater 26:14    27:3,6,14 30:22    31:8 49:1 103:9</pre>
224:6,8,12,15 226:10,15 227:15	<pre>goal 19:15 59:3   69:19 102:11 228:8   244:5 266:18 302:3</pre>	118:14 154:8 188:6 205:2 238:11,22
229:6,15,19,21 230:1,21,22	<b>goals</b> 56:15 63:4	<b>greatest</b> 250:14
231:1,2,8	99:22 100:1 103:2	greatly 36:20 38:8
232:6,12,18,21	227:2,3,15 229:2	green 119:2 238:10
233:16,20 234:7,20 235:7,11 236:16,17	239:13	<b>Greet</b> 66:10
237:20 238:18,21	<b>God</b> 126:6	grid 13:21 15:3
243:6,16	<b>gold</b> 129:8	18:7,17,22 19:2
244:2,3,19 245:1,7 246:17,19 247:2,4,16,18,21 248:13,17	<pre>gone 60:21 140:17     171:8 209:22     230:11 280:20 good-old 86:15</pre>	41:19 45:1 46:4,8 48:7 94:7,12,20 107:8,12,17 124:11 160:17
249:10,17,20 250:2	-	grids 124:2
252:6 254:3,10 255:5,17 259:12	Googling 138:20	ground 7:5
261:14 262:12,13	gotten 50:21	grounds 304:3
267:16,18 285:17	governing 102:21	group 12:4 57:6,14
287:8,13 290:15 295:1,4,9	grace 304:14	58:22
298:19,22	<b>grade</b> 32:9 129:4	67:10,11,14,18 110:10 112:11
299:8,15,19,21	132:6,10	110:10 112:11 113:11,19 114:3,14
300:3,4,11,13,15,1 6 306:22 307:5	gradual 155:5	138:19 151:20
Glucose-oxidase	graduate 13:15	170:14 175:16
36:6	grams 87:13 120:17	194:9 206:11 207:1,10 243:6
		201.1110 210.0

253:17,18 254:2 half 37:11 47:6 236:14 255:2,3 51:3 74:2,3 123:18 happens 18:14 19:1 132:14 148:4 group-appropriate 43:21 44:5 151:12 184:18 130:14 154:6 171:8,12 206:2 213:16,18 hand 12:11 73:7,11 groups 55:14 69:5,8 280:5 120:5 122:10 128:3 132:19 152:7 146:20 162:21 198:22 253:21 **happy** 4:22 263:17 233:3 245:22 294:4 254:6 273:13 306:1 hand-held 77:20 **hard** 7:9 25:18 grow 302:21 79:7 124:1 132:16 growing 34:17 186:18,21 250:18 handle 171:17 **Growth** 13:13 261:15 handled 220:21 grueling 140:19 hardware 105:1 221:1 guarantee 18:17 harm 59:11 handling 105:19 263:11 harmonization 299:7 hands 6:19 26:8 guess 87:9 111:19 27:16 50:21 61:12 Harper 2:1,2 13:6 137:7 145:20 62:4,14,20,22 79:8 98:16 138:9 140:1 166:17 172:7 241:9 135:3 144:11 145:4 146:6 279:2 305:3 142:11,14,16,21,22 158:4 159:6 163:12 143:2 145:2 162:22 **guidance** 9:22 10:13 165:2,9 174:14,17 163:2,3,4,6,8 29:4,5 111:6 177:18 179:5 164:9 173:18,19 255:11 256:17 184:12,15 185:11 186:21 187:4 hand-washing 126:2 guidances 24:15 193:13 197:21 142:10 143:5 guide 15:13 201:7,13 222:2 hanging 138:2 guideline 109:5 223:9 263:13 266:4 144:1,5 198:22 271:7 272:12,21 happen 45:11 87:12 274:14 277:6 guidelines 24:15 147:11 154:13,20 285:10 287:17 29:21 110:22 155:12 171:10 288:7 296:19 160:13 198:19 185:19 187:1 209:8 297:18 301:19 199:6 212:19 215:15 302:5,9 guides 31:22 264:17 219:15,16 232:4 305:6,18,21 233:16 274:20 **gun** 137:22 **Harvard** 54:16 286:11 **Gutierrez** 136:10 haven't 32:12 73:13 happened 36:17 158:2 174:12 273:1 guy 157:4 91:18 175:10 292:17 298:19 176:22 205:19 guys 156:1 301:13 209:7 210:16 217:14 232:22 having 50:10 51:16 Η 77:4 80:20 97:17

100:10 135:9 137:13 140:9 149:11 167:6 186:16 196:7 208:19 213:6 242:18 259:10 267:5,6 296:11 298:20 299:14 HbA1c 95:18 96:1,3,12 98:12 head 142:17	136:2,18 149:13 158:13 175:3 178:4 179:18 185:14,15,18 197:2,19 201:2 202:2 210:3 220:2 222:2,16 223:13 263:17 269:19 271:19 277:14 280:4 291:16 296:21 302:7 305:3 306:19 307:3	117:8,10 144:7 163:15,19 187:2,5 210:3 252:19 266:11 278:5 290:4 293:15 helpful 52:2 119:12 123:8 193:18 253:7 256:14 257:19 259:21 275:15 helping 119:10 helps 61:3
headed 229:12	<b>heard</b> 75:17 138:6	hematocrit
274:13	146:14 158:10	31:1,3,4,6,9
<b>heads</b> 141:14	163:15 179:11,15 185:16 193:17	35:13,18 36:1
<pre>health 2:10 4:4 5:11 9:2 12:4 13:1 15:12 18:5 20:22 21:21 23:5 27:21 28:15 41:5 50:13 102:4 106:18 148:16,22 149:18 201:10 214:19,22 215:3 217:2 218:2,4 252:22 253:5 255:10 256:1,10 262:2 265:15 266:6,7 279:21 303:3 304:1</pre>	185:16 193:17 194:21 195:9,18 196:17 197:1,6 198:2,20 199:7 201:17 202:13 203:2 225:17 226:5,16 227:21 231:22 234:9,14 236:17 237:4 253:10 254:5,22 277:17 278:3 297:1,8 300:22 306:2 hearing 7:9 10:9 11:2,19 89:11	52:22 106:16 125:22 127:3 164:21 165:4,13 166:2,9,15 167:15,19 168:2,3,13,15,21 169:20 170:3,5 187:10 189:15 197:2 226:1 233:11 234:19 237:5,10,11,21 238:5,16 239:2,21 247:3,4,9 250:14 255:22 256:3 hematocrits 29:9
healthcare 100:21 102:6 203:12	153:7,8 159:8	36:3 38:9 44:20
212:1,15 213:11	175:14 187:14 290:6 291:6	52:16 169:18
214:6,17	290:6 291:6 297:6,11 300:20	238:1,14
215:1,2,13 216:4,5 218:13 220:6,15	hearts 152:22	hematocrit's 167:21
222:8,10,19 242:18	<pre>heavily 262:2</pre>	Hemo 37:17
259:18 264:8 265:6 297:20	heeded 32:22	HemoCue 231:11 278:20 296:7
healthy 86:5 153:6	held 6:6 73:8,11	Hemodialysis 197:3
161:2	218:5 224:1	hemoglobin 16:4,17
<b>hear</b> 2:8 5:1 6:22 7:9,10,19 17:3	243:7,19 254:11 help 15:21 60:13	17:17 56:17 300:9

hemoglobins 305:11	higher 10:8 32:8	279:3,5,10,18
hemolosis 197:3	35:13 69:11 82:6 92:17 94:2 132:18	291:13 296:13,16 297:15
hemolysis 281:4	135:3 168:8 182:8	homes 9:4 21:1 22:5
hence 236:18	189:14 217:17	203:15
herbs 261:20	235:10,12 238:1,13,21	<b>homework</b> 254:17
hereby 308:5	239:3,4 262:22	honored 14:6
<pre>here's 36:1,7 38:8 42:16 45:6 46:17</pre>	highest 30:14,17 42:17 94:8	Honors 5:21
137:10 207:9	highlight 9:10	hope 2:12 20:4 148:15 171:22
219:10 301:12 hereto 308:13	highly 51:6 61:9 233:1 235:16	201:22 241:14 259:21 307:6
he's 80:4 101:1 115:10 137:16	hint 44:13	hopefully 203:18 306:18
224:1	historical 33:21	hoping 214:16 276:5
hexaconagesic 236:8	historically 228:18 231:10 293:4	Hopkins 242:14
hexokinase 216:2 230:22 231:18	<b>history</b> 154:11	horizon 302:2
240:17	hit 36:17 191:6	<b>horizontal</b> 62:10 64:8
<b>HHFK</b> 233:8	224:18	
HHNK 226:2 232:20	<b>hitting</b> 156:17	Hormones 13:14
Hi 52:8 148:13 156:10 264:7 268:15 296:7 300:19	HIV 22:9 hold 178:20 holes 86:16	<pre>hospital 6:1 10:22 34:17 35:1,11 37:1 42:3,21 52:13 54:18 109:13 110 10 111 1 110 5</pre>
<b>hiding</b> 79:20	Hollywood 220:16	110:10 111:1 112:5 115:6 119:8 139:19
<pre>high 16:19 21:13 22:8 25:20 42:15 44:9 49:2 62:2 69:10,16 93:20 121:3 156:2 157:18,19 165:13 209:16,17 233:11 239:17 249:1 250:17 252:6 261:21 262:9,10 270:17 275:10,11 305:12</pre>	<pre>home 9:12 22:6 23:4     34:16 57:16     73:8,14 75:20     76:1,2,12 77:10     106:20 109:11     111:22 112:2 142:9     145:21 146:5,7     147:1 161:2 175:6     180:2 199:18     202:10,22 203:11     215:15 228:5     240:13 245:9     278:22</pre>	140:20 145:15 146:1 148:19 150:14 153:12,18,22 154:1,5,7,11,16 158:1,2,7 166:18 174:7 187:20 200:11 205:16 216:14,21 220:19 222:3 223:8 228:12 251:2 253:12 255:6 264:18,20 265:16,21 270:5,9

```
271:13 273:6 275:3
                         humidity 31:11
                                                   170:7,8 171:1
 291:13,17
                                                   181:15 182:21
                           108:5 187:10
 292:2,3,4,6,7,11
                                                   197:5,6 208:4
                           196:6,8 226:21
 293:3 296:14
                                                   215:9,11 262:15
                           246:9 250:16,18
 297:16
                                                   282:21 303:14
                           261:1
hospitalized
                                                 hypoglycemic 59:10
                         hundred 82:12
 109:4,9
                           160:21 161:5,11
                                                   69:16 72:8,16
                                                   90:20 91:6,12,16
                           172:20
hospitals 9:4 21:1
                                                   94:17 95:10,12
 37:8 66:20 108:15
                         hundreds 70:5
                                                   99:6
 154:10,15 159:13
                         hurdle 82:13
                                                   122:12,17,18,19
 203:13 216:16,19
                                                   130:3 133:20
                         hustle 234:18
 217:12 220:22
                                                   160:11,15,19 167:8
 255:1 265:5
                         hydrated 196:22
                                                   181:17 182:20
 270:3,7 272:3
                         hydration 196:22
                                                   185:15 193:2 211:2
 297:5,9 306:14
                         hydrogen 232:7
                                                  Hypotension 197:1
hosted 296:20
                         hydrogenous 125:19
                                                 hypotensive 157:8
hotel 2:19
                                                   161:9 234:9
                         hyperglycemia 70:14
hour 54:8 79:1
                                                 hypothesis 66:17
                           92:2 93:3,4 95:7
 87:14 151:5
                                                   76:6
                         hyperglycemic
 190:13,16,18 295:9
                           119:13
                                                 hypothetical 130:21
hourly 38:13
                                                   291:14
                         hyperinsulemic 88:5
hours 66:22 78:22
 87:17 92:8
                         hyperosmolar 233:6
                                                          Ι
 93:18,20,21 94:3
                         hypertensive 156:18
                                                  IB 211:11,16
 150:2 151:14
                         hypo 99:2 137:21
 172:12 174:9,10
                                                  icodextrin 125:20
                                                   261:14,16 263:8
 178:13 249:7
                         hypoglycemia
                                                   264:12,13 265:3
 295:10
                           16:2,14 53:9,10
                           58:13,15,19
                                                  icodextrin-
housekeeping 2:17
                           59:1,6,7,10,15,16,
                                                   containing 262:18
Huang 98:18,20
                           17,18
                                                  icodextrins (ph
 100:17
                           60:3,10,12,13
                                                   143:5
huge 62:3,13 134:17
                           64:14,15,21
 148:8 168:13 173:5
                                                  icterus 281:5
                           67:15,19 69:13
 176:11 205:11,12
                           75:5 76:20 80:17
                                                  ICU 51:14,19
 278:10
                           82:4 90:5,8 92:19
                                                   52:1,19 66:20 75:8
                           93:6,7,12
human 22:3 80:2
                                                   76:19 86:3 112:3,5
                           95:15,17,21
 82:16,17 84:17
                                                   157:1,8,11,12,22
                           96:7,10 119:4
 103:19 183:20
                                                   158:6,16 159:17
                           122:18,22 123:6
 289:5
                                                   160:21 161:5
                           124:19 167:4,7
```

166:19 174:7 178:16 193:5	70:14 253:15 identified 209:21	<pre>illustrates 238:8 illustration 237:16</pre>
199:18 202:10 203:13 268:22 269:8 296:15	230:14 identify 5:4 30:4	<b>illustrative</b> 124:9 <b>I'm</b> 2:2,13,14
<b>ICUs</b> 52:13,14 55:15 57:18 70:3 77:3,9 178:10 267:22	84:1 86:14 99:1 147:2 149:10 229:14 230:13 232:16	7:1,9,11 14:11 18:6,18 21:4 34:4,5 35:9,19 38:15 39:16 41:22
<b>I'd</b> 2:4 13:6 33:18	<pre>identifying 277:9</pre>	48:2 49:15,20
46:1 55:7 56:8 71:4 98:16 136:20	<b>IDMS</b> 299:1	51:10 52:8,12
144:15 145:7 149:8	<b>IEC</b> 290:8	55:9,10,11,13 57:20 61:5,20
151:18 158:13 161:11,16,20	<b>IFCC</b> 198:21	65:7,20 70:9,11
162:7,17 170:12	<b>ignore</b> 142:1	71:19 73:1,20,22 74:8 75:1,7 76:18
174:1,18 178:9 180:1 193:13,20 201:1 202:2,6 210:4 226:22 237:16 238:9 243:21 269:18	<pre>II 8:3 59:6 80:15     85:9 86:6     122:16,21 130:2     180:12,13 193:4     303:13 II's 130:15</pre>	77:16 80:8,11 82:19 87:4,6,7 91:7 98:10 99:18 101:9 104:5 106:4 111:20 112:3,6 114:19 115:18
271:19 273:6 284:1,12 291:16 300:20	<b>ill</b> 76:10 78:3 79:10 192:3	116:5 119:18,20,21 120:9,10,16,17 122:12,15,18,21
<pre>idea 44:13 45:21 73:3,15 78:17 83:12 132:7 139:1 145:22 171:12,15 173:3 195:1 199:8 207:9 257:14,17 267:21 273:4 277:1</pre>	<pre>I'll 12:14 33:21     34:8 35:17 47:19     48:13 98:2 101:11     111:17 116:13,14     131:21 138:7     140:1,6 141:8     153:17 162:6</pre>	123:21 127:22 130:13 132:11 134:4 137:3,6,7 139:4 142:5,19 143:18,19 148:9,13,15 150:16 152:6 153:17
<pre>ideal 145:12 160:4 178:15 185:13 287:13</pre>	183:10 188:19 201:5 204:14 211:7,10 219:22	156:12,17,22 157:3 158:1 159:8 162:4 165:12 169:13
<pre>ideally 158:22 255:15</pre>	220:14 227:9 231:19 242:10 249:9 252:15 266:4	174:11 175:13 177:6,7 182:3,10 193:3 195:8,13
ideas 12:12 178:7	269:22 301:17	199:8 201:14,15,18
253:21 266:1	<pre>illustrate 57:22</pre>	209:20 210:7 222:2,16 228:15
<pre>identifiable 275:8 identification</pre>	<b>illustrated</b> 107:8 238:15	234:17 241:7,17,21 252:18,19

268:19,22	292:19	110:1 112:2 116:14
280:10,20 282:10	implemented 140:10	127:2 208:8 240:14
283:9 284:10 291:6 293:11 294:6 296:2	<pre>implementing 103:5</pre>	244:17,21 262:6 282:20 299:10
298:4,10 301:18	<pre>implications 285:2</pre>	<b>improved</b> 104:10
304:9,19 305:2,17 306:1,3	<pre>implies 63:6</pre>	105:11,15 107:1
<pre>image 83:2</pre>	<pre>importance 8:19</pre>	187:17 200:21
-	103:1 110:16	improvement 34:21
<pre>imagination 83:12</pre>	283:4,13	103:1 105:7
<pre>imagine 59:21    175:22 255:15</pre>	<pre>important 2:8 9:15    14:16 15:17,22</pre>	<pre>improvements 102:17 103:7,13,18</pre>
immediacy 79:5	16:5 33:3 40:20	104:2,6,7,22
immediate 79:6 109:2	58:12 59:4,17 70:12 72:17 78:15 90:7 96:9,20	105:10,22 106:4,8,13,14 108:2 186:17
<pre>immediately 150:7 162:10,12 189:13</pre>	101:15 102:19 103:8,20 107:18	<b>improves</b> 154:20
immune 261:9 262:6	108:1,10 109:9 120:4 122:12 123:7	<pre>improving 14:2 102:11 194:3 244:6</pre>
immunoglobulin	124:4,21 125:2	inaccuracies 82:18
211:16 immunoglobulins 213:4 217:4	134:7 138:5 156:8 164:9 171:11 186:2 188:19 214:1 223:4	<pre>inaccuracy 80:6     83:2 104:18 116:11     123:18 138:13</pre>
Immunology 33:14	227:18 230:8 244:10,15 251:4	157:10 171:9 177:11,12 190:3,6
<pre>impact 37:7 102:18 107:21 108:3,6</pre>	273:14 283:15 302:3 306:21 307:2	248:21 250:11
144:14 227:21 238:7 244:17 251:18 289:4	<pre>importantly 12:6     34:22 61:8 109:10     118:11 119:3</pre>	<pre>inaccurate 95:1    109:1 133:11    142:18 162:2    004 11</pre>
<pre>impacted 106:1</pre>	<pre>impossible 67:20</pre>	204:11
impacting 102:14	87:8 153:4 170:19	<pre>inadequate 70:19 73:19 250:1</pre>
<pre>impaired 14:12    105:16 151:10 </pre>	<pre>imprecision 26:6     50:3 64:8 165:15     195:2 239:10</pre>	<pre>inadvertently 209:10</pre>
<pre>impairing 151:3</pre>	impress 87:7	<pre>inappropriate 147:6</pre>
<pre>impedance 127:3</pre>	-	162:3 210:22 215:8
<pre>impetus 150:14 implanted 206:16</pre>	<pre>impressive 11:21 12:4 45:2</pre>	<pre>inaudible 90:9    165:7 294:8 295:20</pre>
implement 84:7	<pre>improve 12:21 104:19 106:18</pre>	incentives 77:22

```
301:6
                         increasing 112:20
incidents 262:20
                         increasingly 11:12
include 23:15 65:19
                         incredibly 64:16
 72:7 102:15
                           84:15 101:15
 104:11,22 105:4,10
                          102:18 103:20
 109:2 212:8
                          251:18
included 206:4
                         indefinitely 301:16
 217:5 272:13 277:8
                         independent 87:6
includes 26:5 31:20
                           183:20
 102:13 135:17
                         independently
 243:5
                           232:12
including 6:7,15
                         India 56:2
 14:3 21:21 41:19
                         Indiana 98:21
 57:18 74:18 105:5
 106:14 111:2
                         indicate 264:4
 135:19 140:13
                         indicated 74:6
 142:14 163:16
                           292:21 298:6
 269:9 274:5
                         indicating
inclusion 271:20
                           107:14,15
incorporate 232:15
                         indication 192:9
incorrect 22:8
                           287:18
 204:2 205:19 206:9
                         indications 193:3
 209:14 230:11
                         indicator 231:7
incorrectly 50:6
                           249:16
increase 8:7 17:17
                         Indirectly 116:1
 18:15 19:5 55:22
 67:12,15 91:19
                         individual 26:9,12
                          31:4 32:11 33:2
 96:1,2 105:20
 109:3 122:3,5
                          59:21 60:14 64:1
                          105:18 110:4 117:6
 145:6 214:21
 216:19 245:1
                          164:17 165:11
                          198:22 243:2
 262:12 266:11
                          251:5,6,21 303:5
 294:16,17
                         individually 3:17
increased 8:5 93:5
                           33:2 162:14 206:20
 104:22 106:1
 108:3,13 175:5
                         individuals 7:22
 238:11
                           23:7 102:10 135:19
increases 8:12
                           198:22 200:7 242:9
 56:1,2 58:19
                           244:4 252:7 254:18
```

302:20 induce 36:19 97:8 induced 97:9 industries 153:17 industry 12:22 24:21 101:12,16 102:8,16 103:17 104:9 108:13,21 109:18,21 110:1,12,14,17,19 111:13,21 112:4,18 113:2,18 115:10 116:3,7 152:2,4 153:6 155:10 184:13 185:12,17 220:7 242:18,20 243:4 244:5,20 250:22 252:5,22 253:13 266:1,17 269:6 291:9 299:9 301:19 302:11 303:5 **industry's** 106:17 242:9 indwelling 179:6 inexpensive 96:5 278:21 infants 8:1 infarction 57:13 infections 262:5 inferences 198:4 inferior 61:18 inferring 111:20 influence 9:13 86:22 230:19,20 238:17 influenced 66:9

influences 233:18 **injected** 176:13 institution 34:9 35:4 37:11,14 Influenza 6:18 injection 17:16 40:2,4 43:6,12 86:2 89:5 **inform** 61:11 48:21 injections 58:5 information 2:21 institutions 42:17 15:6 22:14 24:19 injuries 207:18,19 instruction 32:4 68:8 81:2,3,5,8 211:1 215:9 instructions 3:11 89:3 102:2,4 **injury** 207:13,21 24:13 27:20 119:22 128:15,18 innovation 5:17 144:9 171:14 198:9 32:15,22 104:17 106:11 109:18,20 200:3 243:11 199:10,20 111:16 200:2,5,9,10,13,15 258:19 276:22 ,18 201:21 202:5 innovations 101:18 instructive 245:3 206:4 216:12,21 106:17 244:7 instrument 21:19 225:9,16 240:20 innovative 105:17 76:9 123:17,19 257:13,15 263:15 110:17 278:13 156:22 184:17 275:1,14 280:1 198:7 226:12 **input** 163:18 183:20 285:19 306:2 230:12 240:9 202:2 210:2 263:21 informationally 246:17 247:1 **inquiry** 284:12 149:19 248:7,16 249:5 informative 225:13 insensitive 231:13 268:11 **insert** 36:13 198:16 **informed** 128:16 instruments 37:16 212:7 256:19 256:11 299:2 113:1 123:17 179:4 284:20 224:3 226:11 ingestion 261:20 233:19 240:5 inserts 31:21 **inherent** 12:19 244:22 126:14 199:19 138:13 145:11 247:15,17,20 268:2 200:3 225:17 146:18 201:18 281:8 300:4 257:8,13 275:20 208:2 276:22 insufficient 161:6 **initial** 129:14 **insights** 193:17 insulin 8:22 initially 94:5 17:14,15,21 18:4 insilico 87:19 116:18 130:17 19:11 36:5 37:5 224:18 240:10,11 **insists** 221:12 38:14,22 44:4 242:3,4 53:12 56:14 **install** 78:12 58:2,5,8 68:14 initiation 245:21 **instead** 150:19 69:12 79:10 initiative 6:17 192:19 284:5 80:3,4,16 82:3 256:15 298:14,22 Institute 25:14 85:9,10 86:20,22 initiatives 6:15 136:9 87:11 88:8 89:5 97:1,12,14,19,21 Institutes 108:18 **inject** 121:5 98:11 119:11 Institute's 29:21 120:7,9,18,19

121:5,7,8,10 180:9 192:3,17 261:12,13,22 122:22 124:19 262:10 263:4 305:8 130:16 133:4,5,6 264:11 268:21 intensively 57:4,14 147:20,22 162:3 271:14,20 272:12 58:21 67:10,13 171:9 173:8 273:17,19 274:2 69:20 275:3 276:17 174:1,4,10,12 intentionally 17:14 176:11 177:3 279:22 280:11 32:13 82:11 93:19 178:10,15 296:10 305:11 180:9,12,14 184:11 interact 83:22 interferences 4:2 192:11,15 194:8 11:3 26:6 35:12 interaction 211:7 203:21 215:8 47:2,10 51:20 285:15 217:21 300:18 102:15 186:8 187:8 interest 36:22 insulin-dependent 194:20 195:15 253:11 275:19 107:5 197:14 199:2,14,15 interested 3:16 201:3 203:8 220:9 **insulin's** 148:5 10:9 11:2,18 75:9 223:19 224:11 **intake** 89:5 91:8 97:6 117:11 225:8 227:8 230:17 149:8 159:8 225:10 231:13 239:12 integrate 103:21 256:1 271:9 273:10 253:15 254:12 integrated 105:14 275:16 277:9 293:2 256:9 258:7,10 integrity 248:3 297:11 308:14 269:3,9 270:12,13 272:8 273:5,9,11 intelligent 20:3 interesting 27:8 274:1,9,22 48:1,3 62:17 74:20 **intend** 166:20 275:8,14 276:11 81:14 83:4,5 99:19 277:10,12,19,22 intended 123:11 151:2 279:2 280:13 21:10,11,19 162:22 193:17 291:12 306:12 22:7,14,22 23:1,2 268:5 274:18 32:4,21 75:19,20 interferent 30:21 interests 14:1 76:16 94:5 109:12 272:11 281:8 210:7 131:8 158:8 192:8 interferents 102:18 interface 10:20 218:4,19 240:12,13 271:18 287:18 interfering 110:13 interfere 10:16 297:3 303:22 125:15 165:14 30:4,7,12 249:22 199:6 201:15 221:2 intensive 16:8,21 276:15 247:10 255:13 18:13 35:16 36:3 interference 265:1 272:19 37:13 38:9 30:1,3,5 31:9 38:7 276:12 56:14,15 57:1,7,10 106:15 127:7 66:17 67:2,5,8,17 intermediate 25:4 189:21 69:5 70:8,16 232:8 198:6,15,17,20 73:12,14 75:20 internal 27:9 54:20 209:18 219:11,13 76:3,4,12 77:21 244:17 247:13 115:4 128:1 79:3 112:1 141:17 250:3,12,13 internally 116:16 160:5 178:10,15

<pre>international 31:13 118:9 252:20 256:4</pre>	<pre>inviting 33:19 55:8 involve 14:1 45:11</pre>	268:20 269:2,8 270:4 271:10 276:8
internationally	236:12	288:9 290:11
258:9	involved 20:8 161:4	<b>ISO/CLSI</b> 47:3 59:20
internet 17:12	211:15 223:5 254:6	69:21
59:15 200:15	271:1 286:13	isotape 245:6
internist 242:19	298:11 300:2	Israel 6:1 115:6
Internship 5:22	<b>involves</b> 149:6 294:3	<b>issue</b> 11:3 35:8
interpretation 17:9		43:16 80:22 101:15
interpreted 132:9	ionized 75:13	108:16 109:9 144:3 146:19,21 155:17
interstitial 178:18	<b>Iowa</b> 115:5	161:18 164:11
interval 43:9	<pre>ironically 76:15</pre>	191:17 197:11
178:14	<pre>irrelevant 81:14</pre>	206:1 209:18,22 210:1,5 211:13,21
intestinal 262:7	<b>I's</b> 130:16	212:4 213:13
<pre>intra-subject 84:5</pre>	Island 139:5 280:8	214:20 215:5
intricate 82:9	<b>isn't</b> 140:10,18	216:20 217:15 220:18 222:21
intrinsic	163:16,18	223:8 233:2 236:3
125:6,12,16	165:17,19 210:21 217:11 257:19	238:5 241:12
<b>introduce</b> 2:14 5:9	260:16 272:18	250:14 255:11
13:7 104:18 193:20	276:4,19 285:18	264:11 265:6
201:5 242:10 256:8	286:7 292:5,6	266:20 270:9 271:8
269:11	303:13	275:6 291:11 298:8 299:14,16 306:13
<pre>introduced 236:11</pre>	<b>ISO</b> 9:22 10:13 15:1	issues 9:6,10 10:20
<pre>introducing 4:7</pre>	26:15 27:4 28:4,19 41:18 46:18 51:13	12:11 51:12 53:14
introduction 55:6	61:10 62:19,20,21	74:17 153:11
195:8 201:5 224:14	65:6 73:1 74:9	163:10 165:16 198:1 199:12 202:7
<pre>invasive 102:7</pre>	89:11,14 90:12,16 102:22 103:18	203:17 206:12
invested 278:16	106:10,22 108:11	211:15 214:11
<pre>investigated 195:16</pre>	109:21 110:2,11	219:4 220:4 236:10 263:16 265:8
<pre>investigation 198:5</pre>	111:6,15 112:2 118:8,18,20	292:15 300:5
investigational	119:15,17,19	306:11,20 307:1,4
88:19	130:7,13 131:6,7	<b>i-STAT</b> 278:21
<pre>investigative 272:6</pre>	132:17 147:15	291:21
<b>invite</b> 136:20	181:8 253:17 254:2,11,20 255:3	Italy 85:2
	201.2711720 200.0	it'd 183:5 276:8

295:16	189:16 191:13,17	89:13 124:3,8
<b>item</b> 228:9,15	192:11,12,20 193:1 198:8 200:11	127:18 161:15 162:3 168:12
items 2:17,20 147:4	205:18,19	171:22
221:1	206:11,22 207:10	172:2,6,7,18 174:7
it'll 189:20 284:7	208:18 209:13	195:13 207:20
it's 5:9 15:17	210:10,20 213:8,17 215:5 217:9	219:10 220:21 224:14 225:14
16:5,11,14 17:16	219:15,16	227:17 228:10
25:18 27:8	220:14,17,18 221:8	230:21 232:20
34:17,20 35:2 36:4,14 39:5,6	223:1,3,5,11	248:1 269:20 278:3
42:6,8,11 45:11	229:17 230:1	289:13 290:6
46:19 48:3,17	231:4,14 240:20	294:9,20 295:20
51:19,20 52:22	241:2 242:3	306:2
61:13 62:16 63:12	244:9,12	<b>IV's</b> 197:15
66:12,16 67:20	245:3,10,15 246:19 249:2 250:18	
71:8,19 72:17 75:2	251:12,18 252:18	J
77:19 82:10 83:12	254:17 255:8	<b>J.D</b> 100:22
87:8 90:22 91:14	256:14 259:17	<b>JAMA</b> 37:20 39:7
94:6 95:4,20 96:19 97:14 98:8,21	260:10 261:1,22	66 <b>:</b> 5
106:5 112:12	264:11 265:6	<b>January</b> 5:11 88:15
113:8,13,16	267:18 268:4,18	254:12
117:5,12 118:9	270:2,15 271:3,12 274:12 276:7	<b>Jeff</b> 2:15 13:6
119:9,10,12 120:2	278:18 279:19	234:3 279:11 298:4
124:5,9,13 125:2	280:11 281:6,13,22	<b>Jersey</b> 96:17
127:17 128:6,20	282:2,5	_
131:16 132:16 139:11 141:5,20	284:4,9,17,21,22	Jewish 42:21 139:5
146:13,19,20,21	286:12,20 287:6	280:9
148:21 149:2	289:7 294:9	<b>job</b> 193:14 208:6
150:13 151:2	296:13,14 302:1,14,15	304:5
154:7,20 155:5	303:2,4 304:1,18	<b>John</b> 242:13
156:5 160:7 161:17,18,19	<b>IV</b> 37:5 38:14 86:2	<b>join</b> 6:20 194:13
162:11,13 164:14	178:15 213:3 217:4	joined 224:3
165:12,15 167:3	<b>IVD</b> 21:19 22:9	joining 7:15 13:4
170:19 171:10,16 172:22 173:4,17	304:13	<b>Jon</b> 46:5
172:22 173:4,17 175:13 180:15	<b>IVDs</b> 21:18	Journal 13:11 136:7
181:9 182:5	22:3,7,11,12,16	juice 44:5 276:1
184:6,16 186:2,10	30:1 32:1	<b>junior</b> 18:19
187:16,22 188:1	<b>I've</b> 20:4 44:9	J 10,10

justification 288:21 300:9 justify 87:4 Juvenile 115:21 <u>K</u> Kadava (ph 85:2 Kelly 135:22	<pre>known 7:1 24:8     30:12,15 71:12     217:11 219:11     220:8 221:8 276:13 Kobichev 170:16 Koller 283:22     284:11 Korean 190:2 KOPNILOVA 308:4 21</pre>	132:5,8 139:2 163:14,16,20 181:5 211:4,5 233:17 239:1 256:13,17 267:1 285:13,16,19,20 286:3,5,9,13 287:17,21 303:21 labels 32:1 284:20 285:12
<b>Ken</b> 71:11 155:15 223:20 224:12	<b>KORNILOVA</b> 308:4,21 <b>Kovatchev(ph</b> 85:5	laboratories 22:4
240:4 245:5 246:1 249:9 298:5	Krouwer 16:22 46:6	42:9 78:2,5 108:17 204:7
<b>Kenbuck (ph</b> 112:17	L	<b>laboratory</b> 29:20
<b>ketoacidosis</b> 10:20 197:5 209:16	<b>lab</b> 38:15,18 62:11 63:12 126:7 142:17	34:19,20 38:17 39:17 41:1,9 42:6,8 45:8,13
<b>key</b> 102:14 108:21 228:8 243:7 257:21 259:1 283:14	166:3 167:8 194:3 200:16 217:18,19 246:4,17,18 247:1,17,20	48:12 51:6 52:7 62:10 68:7 75:11 78:7,13 118:10
kidney 8:15 298:17	248:1,5,10,16,21	123:9,16,17 126:19 144:22 146:3 160:1
Kiechle 220:14,15	257:5 276:21 277:5 280:12 300:6,11,14	194:1 200:12
Kimberly 40:17	<b>lab-based</b> 239:14	215:22 216:14 226:11,12 229:20
kinds 18:5 156:18 161:8 233:14 261:2 285:6	<b>label</b> 129:1 130:21,22	233:19 245:16 246:11,13 247:15 248:7 249:4 256:20
king 128:16	131:4,19,20 166:11 178:2 250:21	267:19 275:3
kitchen 192:2,18 193:5	257:16,17,18 269:4 275:4	298:13 300:3 laboratory-based
kitchens 191:8	284:13,16,17,20	217:1
<b>kits</b> 264:18	285:1 292:21 303:20	<b>labs</b> 53:5 265:21
Klonoff 136:3 151:18 160:9 170:12 175:9 187:13 279:20	<pre>labeled 130:12,14   211:4 245:7 labeling 22:13,15</pre>	<pre>lack 283:4 lag 35:8 234:15 laid 125:9 256:13</pre>
<b>knew</b> 70:10	23:1 28:7 31:17,18 32:2,3,8,17 104:16	lancet 105:19
<pre>knowledge 83:18 251:9 276:18</pre>	116:21 129:1 130:10,21 131:1,17	<pre>lancets 23:17 lancing 23:16</pre>

105:15	27:16 28:2,11	legitimate 78:1
landmark 82:15	203:11 204:10 205:14 218:4,6	length 80:14 250:4
<pre>large 42:5 45:14 51:8 58:14 66:19 74:11 107:2 150:5 159:5 181:17 183:18 191:4 206:6 248:7</pre>	203.14 218.4,6 246:11,12 247:19 253:1 257:12,19 271:12 273:8 275:1,7,15,20 276:4,8 layuser 145:1	<pre>less 5:6 16:2 18:1     26:11,22 27:6,12     39:19 44:19 45:19     47:1 53:2 58:7     63:21 64:18 65:2,4     67:6,16 72:10 90:1</pre>
larger 105:2 135:8	lay-user 2:9	102:6 118:16 120:14 122:6
137:14 188:10	<b>L-Dopa</b> 125:18	120:14 122:6 127:19 133:16
<pre>largest 15:19   101:22 209:1 last 17:11 20:4</pre>	<b>lead</b> 4:14 8:17 38:21 68:14 106:18	138:18 147:10 164:18 188:8 206:4 235:10 236:16
27:10 37:10 44:17 58:12 60:21 81:17 83:6,13 141:14	124:18 165:19 187:19 215:8,11 <b>leadership</b> 6:13	247:16 248:13,17,19 249:11 279:15
162:20 172:17	243:4	286:19
173:11 175:13 192:5 211:20	leading 8:15 215:10	<b>lesser</b> 205:2
212:6,18 239:20	<b>leads</b> 227:7	less-rapid 121:10
212.0,10 233.20		-
281:11 304:22	<b>learned</b> 261:16	lethal 300:18
-	<pre>learned 261:16 learning 134:9</pre>	<pre>lethal 300:18 let's 40:2,9 41:12</pre>
281:11 304:22 lasting 220:1 lastly 31:17 late-dated 227:22 later 15:4 17:4,21 93:18,20,21 94:3		<pre>lethal 300:18 let's 40:2,9 41:12    42:1,15 43:18    44:15 46:4 58:18    60:16 68:11,21    69:17,18 78:18    89:8 94:2 99:20</pre>
281:11 304:22 lasting 220:1 lastly 31:17 late-dated 227:22 later 15:4 17:4,21 93:18,20,21 94:3 174:3 202:1 210:1 211:11 231:20 latest 101:18	<pre>learning 134:9 least 8:2 18:2 19:12 22:20 47:7 58:4 67:1 75:12,14 88:17 121:2 124:16 138:17 142:13 143:18 145:21 168:12 175:6 179:19 190:4 193:1</pre>	<pre>lethal 300:18 let's 40:2,9 41:12    42:1,15 43:18    44:15 46:4 58:18    60:16 68:11,21    69:17,18 78:18    89:8 94:2 99:20    120:8 135:12    171:19 188:5 189:7    192:20 202:13</pre>
281:11 304:22 lasting 220:1 lastly 31:17 late-dated 227:22 later 15:4 17:4,21 93:18,20,21 94:3 174:3 202:1 210:1 211:11 231:20 latest 101:18 110:22	<pre>learning 134:9 least 8:2 18:2 19:12 22:20 47:7 58:4 67:1 75:12,14 88:17 121:2 124:16 138:17 142:13 143:18 145:21 168:12 175:6 179:19 190:4 193:1 247:11 248:6,11,16</pre>	<pre>lethal 300:18 let's 40:2,9 41:12    42:1,15 43:18    44:15 46:4 58:18    60:16 68:11,21    69:17,18 78:18    89:8 94:2 99:20    120:8 135:12    171:19 188:5 189:7</pre>
281:11 304:22 lasting 220:1 lastly 31:17 late-dated 227:22 later 15:4 17:4,21 93:18,20,21 94:3 174:3 202:1 210:1 211:11 231:20 latest 101:18	<pre>learning 134:9 least 8:2 18:2 19:12 22:20 47:7 58:4 67:1 75:12,14 88:17 121:2 124:16 138:17 142:13 143:18 145:21 168:12 175:6 179:19 190:4 193:1 247:11 248:6,11,16 260:9 278:7 287:7</pre>	<pre>lethal 300:18 let's 40:2,9 41:12     42:1,15 43:18     44:15 46:4 58:18     60:16 68:11,21     69:17,18 78:18     89:8 94:2 99:20     120:8 135:12     171:19 188:5 189:7     192:20 202:13     256:8 257:15</pre>
281:11 304:22 lasting 220:1 lastly 31:17 late-dated 227:22 later 15:4 17:4,21 93:18,20,21 94:3 174:3 202:1 210:1 211:11 231:20 latest 101:18 110:22	<pre>learning 134:9 least 8:2 18:2 19:12 22:20 47:7 58:4 67:1 75:12,14 88:17 121:2 124:16 138:17 142:13 143:18 145:21 168:12 175:6 179:19 190:4 193:1 247:11 248:6,11,16 260:9 278:7 287:7 leave 140:1 219:22 260:17 301:18 leaves 291:14</pre>	<pre>lethal 300:18 let's 40:2,9 41:12     42:1,15 43:18     44:15 46:4 58:18     60:16 68:11,21     69:17,18 78:18     89:8 94:2 99:20     120:8 135:12     171:19 188:5 189:7     192:20 202:13     256:8 257:15     282:10 302:14 letting 119:12 level 17:18 32:9     52:18 81:5 91:13     95:20 114:7,9</pre>
281:11 304:22 lasting 220:1 lastly 31:17 late-dated 227:22 later 15:4 17:4,21 93:18,20,21 94:3 174:3 202:1 210:1 211:11 231:20 latest 101:18 110:22 latitude 257:1 laughter 136:19 161:14 173:21 183:11 249:8	<pre>learning 134:9 least 8:2 18:2 19:12 22:20 47:7 58:4 67:1 75:12,14 88:17 121:2 124:16 138:17 142:13 143:18 145:21 168:12 175:6 179:19 190:4 193:1 247:11 248:6,11,16 260:9 278:7 287:7 leave 140:1 219:22 260:17 301:18</pre>	<pre>lethal 300:18 let's 40:2,9 41:12     42:1,15 43:18     44:15 46:4 58:18     60:16 68:11,21     69:17,18 78:18     89:8 94:2 99:20     120:8 135:12     171:19 188:5 189:7     192:20 202:13     256:8 257:15     282:10 302:14 letting 119:12 level 17:18 32:9     52:18 81:5 91:13</pre>

261:21 267:11 275:3,10,11 277:3 293:19 296:4	253:16 257:22 277:22 278:5 279:1,6 281:12	<pre>lists 217:2 225:15     258:10 liter 209:11,13</pre>
<pre>levels 16:15 25:22 30:14,17,18 31:3 81:9 90:5 182:22 183:18 197:14 262:13 296:1</pre>	286:1 limited 60:20 99:21 195:6 limiting 58:16	<pre>literature 34:2     58:6,14 61:17     195:17 198:13     199:1 212:13 281:</pre>
liability 4:5 307:4	<b>limits</b> 33:3 60:1,9 90:8 119:18 123:15	<pre>little 7:9 14:11 15:4 16:12</pre>
<b>licked</b> 164:6	177:12 206:5	36:16,20 41:4
<pre>life 105:12 121:1 191:18 196:3,4</pre>	280:22 line 3:14 29:17,19	42:11 50:20,21 55:11,17 63:2
LifeScan 116:2 164:10 224:4 233:8 243:1	54:10 57:1,2 78:19 82:20 93:10 137:1 188:5 200:17 237:17 238:8,10,15	68:11,22 69:17 73:2 89:9 92:15 94:2 101:21 107:1 115:17 116:3,11,1
<b>lifetime</b> 289:14	275:17 285:14	123:2 124:2 127:1 137:18 164:13
light 12:10 119:2 136:16 195:19	<pre>linear 96:1 241:4 linearity 29:12,22</pre>	174:6 180:21 185: 189:14,19 190:4
lighting 105:3	lines 78:21 174:16	195:12 197:19
likely 8:3,22		198:10 200:22
120:13 121:2,18 205:15 273:15,19 277:11	<pre>lingering 225:6 link 204:15 215:4 linked 3:13 177:3</pre>	201:14,19 202:13 205:21 207:7,11 208:13 213:10
<b>limit</b> 5:5 65:15		214:16 216:2 217:
93:9 121:19 151:9 184:19 190:13 276:10	lipemia 281:2,3 lipid 277:3	226:9 231:20 232: 233:5,12 249:10 252:18 257:9
	<b>lipids</b> 270:17	259:16,17 267:15
limitation 207:16 276:3 287:16,20	Lisa 222:19 264:7 lispro 121:9	268:22 271:8 278:18 284:10 286:7 287:10,11
<pre>limitations 4:2 9:11 11:3 12:18 17:8 22:14 32:16,21 74:8 194:21 198:4 199:3 200:19 201:3</pre>	<pre>list 11:22 24:17   105:21 195:8,14   211:10 227:14   254:14 255:13   262:8</pre>	293:11 306:15 live 302:22 lived 172:7 282:5 lively 13:5
200:19 201:3 206:13 207:3 223:19 224:11	<pre>listed 14:9 34:15     106:4 195:13</pre>	<b>liver</b> 85:8 86:12 262:7
225:8,20 227:8 234:2 239:11	listening 268:9	lives 176:5 282:15

258:10 iter 209:11,13 iterature 34:2 58:6,14 61:17 195:17 198:13 199:1 212:13 281:2 ittle 7:9 14:11 15:4 16:12 36:16,20 41:4 42:11 50:20,21 55:11,17 63:2 68:11,22 69:17 73:2 89:9 92:15 94:2 101:21 107:16 115:17 116:3,11,13 123:2 124:2 127:19 137:18 164:13 174:6 180:21 185:6 189:14,19 190:4 195:12 197:19 198:10 200:22 201:14,19 202:13 205:21 207:7,11 208:13 213:10 214:16 216:2 217:9 226:9 231:20 232:2 233:5,12 249:10 252:18 257:9 259:16,17 267:15 268:22 271:8 278:18 284:10 286:7 287:10,11 293:11 306:15 ive 302:22 ived 172:7 282:5 ively 13:5 iver 85:8 86:12

<b>living</b> 282:14	222:16 224:19	lunches 2:18
<b>local</b> 2:21 150:5 200:7 255:9	226:17 228:13 231:22 235:13	 M
located 3:12	237:4,8 240:9,20 251:7 252:12 260:6	<b>M.D</b> 100:22
location 125:13	267:22 277:19	<b>ma'am</b> 112:15
logistics 2:14	278:8,16 290:6	<b>machine</b> 178:16
long 54:9 63:22	292:9 296:16 303:16	macrovascular 56:8
96:12 113:14	<b>lots</b> 19:10 66:5,6	57:10
134:20 137:1 139:5 172:9 210:10 280:8	72:8 128:21 129:15	magnitude 133:16
long-acting 133:5	130:9,18,19 278:12	<b>mail</b> 260:8
longer 14:14 105:12	loudly 7:11	<pre>main 36:22     38:15,17,18 39:17</pre>
137:13 144:2 188:9	Louis 13:18 75:7	40:22 42:6,7 45:12
236:5	134:6 141:14 183:9 190:9,11 283:3	160:1 226:9 280:12
longest 231:12	291:5	mainly 80:10 82:8
<pre>longstanding 59:5</pre>	loved 263:3	maintain 11:20
<pre>long-term 95:3</pre>	low 16:18 19:20	252:12
108:15 188:3	21:12 25:20 38:8	<pre>maintenance 247:17</pre>
203:14 279:12	42:15 52:18 64:16 81:1 151:12 157:19	<b>major</b> 56:4,10 59:19
<b>loop</b> 88:16 183:15 184:1,9	163:1 165:13 180:5	103:17 133:8 151:4 165:22
·	181:15 191:15	169:2,7,11,16,19
<b>lose</b> 59:7 130:5	208:3 219:19	190:10 225:1
<b>lost</b> 59:9 192:7	232:11 233:14 305:9,12	294:19
263:3	lower 41:6 57:2,9	<b>majority</b> 11:5 130:1
<b>lot</b> 15:1,14 39:16	67:9 92:15,18	131:11,13 173:9
42:8 50:15,21 59:14 70:6 73:20	94:4,7 132:16	188:22 202:21
77:22 94:22 118:8	152:10 153:10	203:18,20 208:22 209:1 213:14
134:9 137:5 138:22	191:1 192:20	248:18
140:5 143:17	215:21 217:21	malfunctions 209:9
146:15 151:20	235:13 239:3 249:2	
155:9 157:10 158:10 162:3	295:7,12	<b>maltase</b> 197:18
164:18 185:13,14	<b>lowest</b> 42:17	maltose 10:21 36:10
187:8,9,17 190:12	<b>luck</b> 243:20	125:20 209:18
	<b>IUCK</b> 243.20	210.13 211.16
193:15,17 197:1,6	lunch 2:18,21	210:13 211:16 213:3 215:21
		210:13 211:16 213:3 215:21 217:7,11 221:2

261:10,13,15       42:3 48:10 61:15         262:18 263:7       102:1 103:6 106:11         267:3,11 274:9       127:16,21 128:2         maltose-containing       145:17 162:1         221:9       145:17 162:1         215:20       20:12 237:8         maltose-sensitive       219:4 228:21         215:20       20:12 237:8         market 11:17 20:9         221:9       145:17 162:1         31:16 192:10       23:16 244:2,16         254:18 276:14       250:19 251:15         289:22       261:9 263:18         manageable 208:14       265:9,11 270:11         23:6 70:13 148:18       265:9,11 270:11         23:6 70:13 148:18       265:9,11 270:11         23:6 70:13 148:18       201:5         264:14 265:10       manufacturer's         290:12       258:18 274:11         manageing 303:2       Manufacturer's         103:21       massive 278:10         mantef 19:17       25:6 1277:6,20         manufacture 25:2       103:21         manufacture 25:2       125:6 127:6,20         manufacture 25:2       125:6 127:6,20         manufacture 25:18       marc 79:20 96:17         manufature 25:18       match 38:17 167:7<	229:17	manufacturers 34:16	194:4
262:18 263:7       102:1 103:6 106:11       22:21 34:17 198:8         267:3,11 274:9       127:16,21 128:2       23:6 6 272:2 279:19         maltose-containing       174:19 186:3       283:6 301:9,16         221:9       174:19 186:3       304:3,15         maltose-sensitive       23:12 237:8       marketed 27:21         215:20       230:12 237:8       marketing 142:15         283:16 192:10       243:16 244:2,16       262:12         254:18 276:14       250:19 251:15       marketing 142:15         289:22       252:1 254:14 257:9       259:8 272:3         manageable 208:14       265:9,11 270:11       259:8 272:3         manageable 208:14       265:9,11 270:11       Mary 40:17         manageable 208:14       261:9 263:18       Mary 40:17         manageable 208:14       265:9,11 270:11       Mary 40:17         manageag 307:1       280:14       Mary 40:17         managing 303:2       manufacturer's       massive 278:10         manter 149:17       241:17, 19 244:3       master's 223:21         169:2,7,11,16,19       155:12       match 40:22 239:14         manufacture 252:6       171:6 182:18       match 40:22 239:14         manufacture 252:6       171:6 182:18       1119 44:19		42:3 48:10 61:15	<b>market</b> 11:17 20:9
maltose-containing 221:9         145:17 162:1 174:19 186:3 198:7,8,10 199:5 230:12 237:8         283:6 301:9,16 304:3,15           maltose-sensitive 215:20         198:7,8,10 199:5 230:12 237:8         marketed 27:21 31:20 210:10 262:2           mantfacture         200:19 251:15 289:22         marketed 27:21 200:10 261:16         marketed 27:21 220:12 24:14 257:9           manageable 208:14         265:9,11 270:11 265:9,227:3         marketplace 227:11 259:8 272:3           manageable 208:14         265:9,11 270:11 265:9,237:1         Marguette 243:4           manage 260:7         271:2 274:8 281:6,20 284:19 301:5         Marguette 243:4           manage 307:1         280:14         Marguette 242:17 mass 241:11,14 245:7           manufacturer's 290:12         280:14         massive 278:10 massive 278:10           manufacturer's 290:12         103:21         master's 223:21           manufacture 25:8 53:16         manufacturer's 253:3 290:17         matched 38:17 167:7           manufacture 252:6         171:6 182:18         marerial 25:15 31:19 44:19           manufacture 252:6         171:6 182:18         marerial 163:20           174:20 204:12         161:22         251:16 299:18           manufacture 252:6         March 1:9         243:11 246:22           174:20 204:12         161:22         251:16 299:18           marig 173:5 17			22:21 34:17 198:8
174:19 186:3 198:7,8,10 199:5 219:4 228:21 215:20       174:19 186:3 198:7,8,10 199:5 219:4 228:21 230:12 237:8       301:3,16 304:3,15         maltose-sensitive 215:20       230:12 237:8 230:12 237:8       marketd 27:21 31:20 210:10 262:2         man 7:13 22:1 80:4       240:10 241:15,22 230:12 237:8       marketing 142:15 282:12         manageable 208:14       250:19 251:15 201:9 263:18       marketplace 227:11 259:8 272:3         manageable 208:14       265:9,11 270:11 201:2       marketplace 227:11 259:8 272:3         manageament 8:10,20 23:6 70:13 148:18 264:14 265:10       288:16 274:11 280:14       Mary 40:17         manager 307:1       281:6, 20 284:19 301:5       Mary 40:17         manager 307:1       280:14       Masschusetts 298:5         managing 303:2       manufacturers 103:21       master 254:13         manneger 307:1       285:16 127:6,20 185:20 189:12       master 254:13         manufacturers 109:2,7,11,16,19       103:21       master 254:13         manufacture 252:6 279:15       marc 79:20 96:17 171:6 182:18       matched 38:17 167:7         manufacture 252:6 279:15       171:6 182:18       materials 163:20 196:13,15,16,18         manufacture 252:6 279:15       171:6 182:16       124:12         manufacture 252:6 279:15       161:22       251:16 299:18         martofacture 252:6       171:6 182:16	267:3,11 274:9		263:6 272:2 279:19
221:3       198:7,8,10 199:5       30413,13         maltose-sensitive       219:4 228:21       31:20 210:10 262:2         man 7:13 22:1 80:4       240:10 241:15,22       marketd 27:21         235:12 237:8       243:16 244:2,16       282:12         254:18 276:14       250:19 251:15       282:12         manageable 208:14       265:9,11 270:11       marketplace 227:11         236:70:13 148:18       265:9,11 270:11       Maryland 242:17         236:70:13 148:18       265:9,11 270:11       Maryland 242:17         management 8:10,20       281:6,20 284:19       301:5         236:70:13 148:18       265:9,11 270:11       Maryland 242:17         management 8:10,20       258:18 274:11       245:7         manager 307:1       280:14       Massachusetts 298:5         managing 303:2       Manufacturers       massive 278:10         manter 149:17       256:16 272:6,20       mathetol 197:15         manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15       matched 38:17 167:7         manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15       1:19 44:19         146:14,17 299:22       146:14,17 299:22       matched 129:15         manufacture 23:18       Marc 79:20 96:17       9:16:13,15,16,18         279:15       March 1:9       243:11	maltose-containing		283:6 301:9,16
maltose-sensitive       219:4 228:21       marketed 27:21         215:20       230:12 237:8       31:20 210:10 262:2         230:12 237:8       240:10 241:15,22       31:20 210:10 262:2         83:16 192:10       243:16 244:2,16       282:12         254:18 276:14       250:19 251:15       282:12         289:22       252:1 254:14 257:9       282:12         manageable 208:14       265:9,11 270:11       Marketplace 227:11         23:6 70:13 148:18       301:5       Maryland 242:17         290:12       258:18 274:11       245:7         manager 307:1       280:14       Massachusetts 298:5         manner 149:17       256:10 276:6,20       master's 223:21         169:2,7,11,16,19       125:6 127:6,20       match 40:22 239:14         manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15       matched 38:17 167:7         manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15       matched 38:17 167:7         manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15       11:19 44:19         196:13,15,16,18       243:11 246:22       251:16 299:22         manufacture 23:18       March 1:9       146:14,17 299:22         manufacture 23:18       March 1:9       146:122         manufacture 23:12       161:22       251:16 299:18	221:9		304:3,15
215:20       230:12 237:8       31:20 210:10 262:2         man 7:13 22:1 80:4       240:10 241:15,22       marketing 142:15         83:16 192:10       243:16 244:2,16       282:12         245:21 254:14 257:9       252:1 254:14 257:9       282:12         manageable 208:14       265:9,11 270:11       259:8 272:3         manageable 208:14       265:9,11 270:11       259:8 272:3         management 8:10,20       231:6,20 284:19       301:5         264:14 265:10       manufacturer's       280:14         290:12       258:18 274:11       245:7         manager 307:1       280:14       Maryland 242:17         manager 307:1       280:14       Massachusetts 298:5         manaing 303:2       Manufacturers       massive 278:10         169:2,7,711,16,19       125:6 127:6,20       match 40:22 239:14         manuer 149:17       256:18 201:12       matched 38:17 167:7         258:14       253:3 290:17       matched 38:17 167:7         manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15       31:19 44:19         manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15       31:19 44:19         251:21 129:21       MARE 131:6 132:16       196:13,15,16,18         manufacture 23:18       March 1:9       251:16 299:18	maltose-sensitive		marketed 27:21
man 7:13 22:1 80:4240:10 241:15,22marketing 142:1583:16 192:10243:16 244:2,16282:12254:18 276:14250:19 251:15282:12289:22251:2 524:14 257:9259:8 272:3manageable 208:14265:9,11 270:11Marquette 243:4management 8:10,20281:6,20 284:19301:523:6 70:13 148:18301:5Mary 40:1723:6 70:13 148:18265:9,11 270:11Mary 40:1723:6 70:13 148:18301:5mass 241:11,14290:12258:18 274:11245:720:12258:18 274:11245:7manager 307:1280:14Massachusetts 298:5managing 303:2Manufacturersmaster 254:1354:5 165:22103:21master 254:13169:2,7,11,16,19125:6 127:6,20master 254:13manual 54:3Marc 79:20 96:17match 40:22 239:14manufacture 252:6145:14 170:1531:19 44:19146:14,17 299:22145:14 170:1531:19 44:19146:14,17 299:22145:14 170:1531:19 44:19146:14,17 299:22145:14 170:1531:19 44:19146:14,17 299:22145:14 170:1531:19 44:19146:14,17 299:22145:14 126:2225:16 229:18174:20 204:12161:22161:22161:22277:1,15 251:10252:13 253:2 265:1161:2225:16 239:18174:20 204:12161:22161:2225:16 23:16174:20 204:12161:2233:9,17,19 84:21252:13 253:2 265:1174:13163:9,17,19 84:21252:13	215:20		31:20 210:10 262:2
83:16 192:10243:16 244:2,16282:12254:18 276:14250:19 251:15marketplace 227:11289:22261:9 263:18259:8 272:3manageable 208:14261:9 263:18259:8 272:3managed 260:7271:2 274:8Marquette 243:4management 8:10,20281:6,20 284:19301:523:6 70:13 148:18301:5Maryland 242:1723:6 70:13 148:18301:5mass 241:11,14290:12258:18 274:11245:7manager 307:1280:14Massachusetts 298:5managing 303:2Manufacturersmaster 254:13169:2,7,11,16,19125:6 127:6,20master's 223:21manufacturing 102:9125:6 127:6,20master's 223:21169:2,7,11,16,19125:6 127:6,20match 40:22 239:14manufacture 25:8 53:16marufacturing 102:9match 40:22 239:14manufacture 25:15map 55:18match 40:22 239:14manufacture 252:6145:14 170:1531:19 44:19146:14,17 299:22145:14 170:15manufacture 252:6171:6 182:18279:15March 1:9243:11 246:22145:21 129:21161:22math 53:1 173:1margin 173:5 174:13mathematical 82:16252:13 253:2 265:1margin 173:5 174:13251:20 20:12251:16 299:18	man 7:13 22:1 80:4		marketing 142:15
289:22       252:1 254:14 257:9       marketplace 227:11         manageable 208:14       261:9 263:18       259:8 272:3         managed 260:7       271:2 274:8       Marquette 243:4         management 8:10,20       281:6,20 284:19       Mary 40:17         23:6 70:13 148:18       265:9,11 270:11       Mary 40:17         23:6 70:13 148:18       258:18 274:11       mass 241:11,14         290:12       258:18 274:11       245:7         manager 307:1       280:14       Massachusetts 298:5         managing 303:2       Manufacturers       massive 278:10         Mann 52:8 53:16       103:21       master 's 223:21         169:2,7,11,16,19       125:6 127:6,20       match 40:22 239:14         manuare 149:17       241:17,19 244:3       matched 38:17 167:7         258:14       253:3 290:17       matched 38:17 167:7         manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15       31:19 44:19         146:14,17 299:22       145:14 170:15       31:19 44:19         146:14,17 299:22       146:14,17 299:22       146:14,17 299:22         manufacture 252:6       171:6 182:18       196:13,15,16,18         174:20 204:12       161:22       251:16 299:18       146:122         math 53:1 173:1       mathematical 82:16	83:16 192:10	243:16 244:2,16	-
289:22       252:1 254:14 257:9 261:9 263:18 261:9 263:18 265:9,11 270:11 271:2 274:8 281:6,20 284:19 301:5       Marquette 243:4 Marquette 243:4         management 8:10,20 23:6 70:13 148:18 264:14 265:10 290:12       281:6,20 284:19 301:5       Mary 40:17         manager 307:1       280:14       Mary 40:17         manager 307:1       280:14       Mars 241:11,14 245:7         managing 303:2       Manufacturer's 103:21       258:18 274:11         Mann 52:8 53:16       manufactures 103:21       master 254:13         manner 149:17 258:14       125:6 127:6,20 185:20 189:12       match 40:22 239:14         manual 54:3       marc 79:20 96:17       matched 38:17 167:7         manufacture 252:6 279:15       99:18 100:18       146:14,17 299:22         manufacture 252:6 279:15       171:6 182:18       material 25:15         manufacture 252:6 279:15       March 1:9       146:122         manufacture 23:18       March 1:9       243:11 246:22         51:21 129:21       MARE 131:6 132:16       251:16 299:18         174:20 204:12       161:22       251:16 299:18         271:3 282:8 285:21       marked 57:2       83:9,17,19 84:21         301:20       markers 105:17       85:4,8,14 86:16	254:18 276:14		marketplace 227.11
manageable 208:14       261:9 263:18       Marquette 243:4         managed 260:7       271:2 274:8       Mary 40:17         management 8:10,20       281:6,20 284:19       Maryland 242:17         23:6 70:13 148:18       265:9,11 270:11       Maryland 242:17         23:6 70:13 148:18       265:9,21 20 284:19       Maryland 242:17         23:6 70:13 148:18       manufacturer's       281:6,20 284:19         264:14 265:10       manufacturer's       281:6,20 284:19         290:12       258:18 274:11       245:7         manager 307:1       280:14       Massachusetts 298:5         managing 303:2       Manufacturers       massive 278:10         Manner 149:17       215:6 127:6,20       match 40:22 239:14         manner 149:17       241:17,19 244:3       match 40:22 239:14         manul 54:3       Marc 79:20 96:17       matched 38:17 167:7         manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15       31:19 44:19         146:14,17 299:22       146:14,17 299:22       material 25:15         manufacture 23:18       March 1:9       146:14,17 299:22         manufacture 23:18       March 1:9       146:14,17 299:22         51:21 129:21       MARE 131:6 132:16       13:19 44:19         174:20 204:12       161:22       <	289:22		-
managed 260:7       271:2 274:8         management 8:10,20       281:6,20 284:19         23:6 70:13 148:18       301:5         264:14 265:10       manufacturer's         290:12       258:18 274:11         manager 307:1       280:14         Mann 52:8 53:16       103:21         54:5 165:22       103:21         169:2,7,11,16,19       125:6 127:6,20         manner 149:17       258:12 20:12         258:14       253:3 290:17         manula 54:3       Marc 79:20 96:17         manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15         171:6 182:18       131:6 132:16         174:20 204:12       161:22         277:15       margin 173:5 174:13         mathematical 82:16       83:9,17,19 84:21         271:2       marked 57:2         301:20       markers 105:17	manageable 208:14		
management8:10,20281:6,20 284:19 301:5Mary 40:1723:6 70:13 148:18 264:14 265:10 290:12301:5Maryland 242:17 mass 241:11,14 245:7manager 307:1280:14Massachusetts 298:5managing 303:2Manufacturers 103:21massive 278:10 master 254:13Mann 52:8 53:16 54:5 165:22 169:2,7,11,16,19103:21master 254:13 master 254:13manner 149:17 258:14125:6 127:6,20 185:20 189:12master's 223:21 match 40:22 239:14manual 54:3 manual 54:3map 55:18 Marc 79:20 96:17 99:18 100:18 145:14 170:15 171:6 182:18material 25:15 31:19 44:19 146:14,17 299:22manufacture 252:6 279:15171:6 182:18 March 1:9materials 163:20 196:13,15,16,18 243:11 246:2251:21 129:21 174:20 204:12 227:1,15 251:10 252:13 253:2 265:1 271:3 282:8 285:21 301:20Mare 57:2 marked 57:2mathematical 82:16 83:9,17,19 84:21 85:4,8,14 86:16	managed 260.7		-
Maryland 242:1723:6 70:13 148:18301:5Maryland 242:17264:14 265:10258:18 274:11245:7290:12258:18 274:11245:7manager 307:1280:14Massachusetts 298:5managing 303:2Manufacturers103:21Mann 52:8 53:16103:21master 254:1354:5 165:22103:21master 254:13169:2,7,11,16,19125:6 127:6,20master's 223:21manner 149:17241:17,19 244:3match 40:22 239:14258:14253:3 290:17match 40:22 239:14manul 54:3Marc 79:20 96:17matched 38:17 167:7manufacture 252:6145:14 170:1531:19 44:19279:15171:6 182:18146:14,17 299:22manufacturer 23:18March 1:9243:11 246:2251:21 129:21MARE 131:6 132:16131:10 44:22174:20 204:12161:22251:16 299:18277:1,15 251:10252:13 253:2 265:1margin 173:5 174:13251:13 282:8 285:21marked 57:283:9,17,19 84:21301:20markers 105:1785:4,8,14 86:16	-		<b>Mary</b> 40:17
264:14 265:10 290:12manufacturer's 258:18 274:11 280:14mass 241:11,14 245:7managing 303:2Manufacturers 103:21massive 278:10 master 254:13Mann 52:8 53:16 54:5 165:22 169:2,7,11,16,19Manufacturing 102:9 125:6 127:6,20 185:20 189:12 241:17,19 244:3 258:14master's 223:21 match 40:22 239:14 match 40:22 239:14manner 149:17 258:14Marc 79:20 96:17 99:18 100:18 145:14 170:15 171:6 182:18matched 38:17 167:7 matches 170:3manufacture 252:6 279:15Marc 79:20 96:17 99:18 100:18 146:14,17 299:22material 25:15 31:19 44:19 146:14,17 299:22manufacture 252:6 279:15March 1:9 161:22Mare 131:6 132:16 161:22matherial 26:20 251:16 299:18 math 53:1 173:1manufacture 23:18 51:21 129:21 227:1,15 251:10 252:13 253:2 265:1 201:20Mare 131:6 132:16 161:22mathematical 82:16 83:9,17,19 84:21 85:4,8,14 86:16	•		Maryland 242:17
290:12       258:18 274:11       245:7         manager 307:1       280:14       Massachusetts 298:5         managing 303:2       Manufacturers       massive 278:10         Mann 52:8 53:16       103:21       master 254:13         54:5 165:22       103:21       master 254:13         169:2,7,11,16,19       125:6 127:6,20       match 40:22 239:14         manner 149:17       245:7       match 40:22 239:14         258:14       245:7       match 40:22 239:14         manual 54:3       marc 79:20 96:17       matched 38:17 167:7         manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15       31:19 44:19         146:14,17 299:22       145:14 170:15       31:19 44:19         manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15       31:19 44:19         279:15       March 1:9       245:11 246:22         manufacture 23:18       March 1:9       245:11 246:22         51:21 129:21       MARE 131:6 132:16       196:13,15,16,18         174:20 204:12       161:22       math 53:1 173:1         252:13 253:2 265:1       marked 57:2       83:9,17,19 84:21         251:20       marked 57:2       83:9,17,19 84:21         301:20       markers 105:17       85:4,8,14 86:16		manufacturer's	mass 241:11,14
manager 307:1280:10Massachusetts 298:5managing 303:2Manufacturersmassive 278:10Mann 52:8 53:16103:21master 254:1354:5 165:22manufacturing 102:9master's 223:21169:2,7,11,16,19125:6 127:6,20master's 223:21manner 149:17258:14253:3 290:17258:14map 55:18matched 38:17 167:7manual 54:3Marc 79:20 96:1731:19 44:19manufacture 252:6145:14 170:1531:19 44:19279:15March 1:9243:11 246:22manufacture 23:18March 1:9243:11 246:2251:21 129:21MARE 131:6 132:16251:16 299:18174:20 204:12161:22math 53:1 173:1252:13 253:2 265:1marked 57:283:9,17,19 84:21301:20markers 105:1785:4,8,14 86:16			245:7
managing 303:2Manufacturers 103:21massive 278:10Mann 52:8 53:16103:21master 254:1354:5 165:22125:6 127:6,20master's 223:21169:2,7,11,16,19125:6 127:6,20master's 223:21manner 149:17241:17,19 244:3match 40:22 239:14258:14253:3 290:17matched 38:17 167:7mannitol 197:15map 55:18material 25:15manual 54:3Marc 79:20 96:1731:19 44:19manufacture 252:6145:14 170:1531:19 44:19279:15145:14 170:15171:6 182:18196:13,15,16,18manufacturer 23:18March 1:9243:11 246:2251:21 129:21161:22math 53:1 173:1174:20 204:12161:22math 53:1 173:1252:13 253:2 265:1margin 173:5 174:13mathematical 82:16301:20markers 105:1785:4,8,14 86:16			Massachusetts 298:5
Mann 52:8 53:16manufacturing 102:9master 254:1354:5 165:22125:6 127:6,20185:20 189:12169:2,7,11,16,19125:6 127:6,20185:20 189:12manner 149:17241:17,19 244:3253:3 290:17258:14241:17,19 244:3253:3 290:17mannitol 197:15map 55:18matched 38:17 167:7manual 54:3Marc 79:20 96:1731:19 44:19manufacture 252:6145:14 170:1531:19 44:19279:1599:18 100:18146:14,17 299:22manufacture 252:6145:14 170:1531:19 44:1951:21 129:21March 1:9146:13,15,16,1851:21 129:21MARE 131:6 132:16196:13,15,16,18174:20 204:12161:22math 53:1 173:1252:13 253:2 265:1margin 173:5 174:13mathematical 82:16271:3 282:8 285:21301:20markers 105:17	managing 303:2		<b>massive</b> 278:10
54:5 165:22 169:2,7,11,16,19manufacturing 102:9 125:6 127:6,20 185:20 189:12 241:17,19 244:3 253:3 290:17master's 223:21 match 40:22 239:14manner 149:17 	Mann 52:8 53:16	103:21	<b>master</b> 254:13
169:2,7,11,16,19125:6 127:6,20 185:20 189:12 241:17,19 244:3 258:14match 40:22 239:14manner 149:17 258:14241:17,19 244:3 253:3 290:17matched 38:17 167:7 matched 38:17 167:7mannitol 197:15map 55:18matched 38:17 167:7 matched 38:17 167:7manual 54:3Marc 79:20 96:17 99:18 100:18matched 125:15 31:19 44:19 146:14,17 299:22manufacture 252:6 279:15145:14 170:15 171:6 182:18material 25:15 31:19 44:19 146:14,17 299:22manufacturer 23:18 51:21 129:21 174:20 204:12 252:13 253:2 265:1 271:3 282:8 285:21March 1:9 MARE 131:6 132:16 161:22math 53:1 173:1 mathematical 82:16 83:9,17,19 84:21 85:4,8,14 86:16		_	master's 223:21
manner 149:17241:17,19 244:3matched 38:17 167:7258:14241:17,19 244:3253:3 290:17mannitol 197:15map 55:18matches 170:3manual 54:3Marc 79:20 96:1731:19 44:19manuals 31:2099:18 100:18146:14,17 299:22manufacture 252:6145:14 170:15146:14,17 299:22279:15March 1:9243:11 246:22manufacturer 23:18March 1:9243:11 246:2251:21 129:21MARE 131:6 132:16196:13,15,16,18174:20 204:12161:22math 53:1 173:1277:1,15 251:10margin 173:5 174:13mathematical 82:16252:13 253:2 265:1marked 57:283:9,17,19 84:21301:20markers 105:1785:4,8,14 86:16	169:2,7,11,16,19		
258:14241:17,19 244:3 253:3 290:17matched 38:17 167:7 matched 38:17 167:7manuitol 197:15map 55:18matches 170:3manual 54:3Marc 79:20 96:17 99:18 100:18matches 170:3manufacture 252:6 279:15145:14 170:15 171:6 182:1831:19 44:19 146:14,17 299:22manufacturer 23:18 51:21 129:21March 1:9146:13,15,16,18 243:11 246:22 251:16 299:1851:21 129:21 174:20 204:12 252:13 253:2 265:1 271:3 282:8 285:21March 1:9146:14,22 251:16 132:16margin 173:5 174:13 marked 57:2matches 182:16 83:9,17,19 84:21 85:4,8,14 86:16	<b>manner</b> 149:17		
mannitol 197:15map 55:18matches 170:3manual 54:3Marc 79:20 96:1731:19 44:19manuals 31:2099:18 100:18146:14,17 299:22manufacture 252:6145:14 170:15146:14,17 299:22279:15March 1:9146:13,15,16,18manufacturer 23:18March 1:9243:11 246:2251:21 129:21MARE 131:6 132:16196:13,15,16,18174:20 204:12161:22math 53:1 173:1227:1,15 251:10margin 173:5 174:13mathematical 82:16252:13 253:2 265:1marked 57:283:9,17,19 84:21301:20markers 105:1785:4,8,14 86:16			<b>matched</b> 38:17 167:7
manual 54:3Marc 79:20 96:17material 25:15manuals 31:2099:18 100:18146:14,17 299:22manufacture 252:6145:14 170:15146:14,17 299:22279:15145:14 170:15171:6 182:18manufacturer 23:18March 1:9243:11 246:2251:21 129:21MARE 131:6 132:16161:22174:20 204:12161:22math 53:1 173:1227:1,15 251:10margin 173:5 174:13mathematical 82:16252:13 253:2 265:1marked 57:283:9,17,19 84:21301:20markers 105:1785:4,8,14 86:16	<b>mannitol</b> 197:15		matches 170:3
manuals 31:20marc 79:20 96:1731:19 44:19manufacture 252:699:18 100:18146:14,17 299:22279:15145:14 170:15171:6 182:18manufacturer 23:18171:6 182:18196:13,15,16,1851:21 129:21March 1:9243:11 246:22174:20 204:12161:22251:16 299:18227:1,15 251:10margin 173:5 174:13mathematical 82:16252:13 253:2 265:1marked 57:283:9,17,19 84:21301:20markers 105:1785:4,8,14 86:16		_	material 25:15
manufacture 252:6       145:14 170:15         279:15       145:14 170:15         manufacturer 23:18       171:6 182:18         51:21 129:21       March 1:9         174:20 204:12       161:22         227:1,15 251:10       margin 173:5 174:13         252:13 253:2 265:1       marked 57:2         301:20       markers 105:17			
manufacture       252:6       171:6       182:18       materials       163:20         279:15       171:6       182:18       196:13,15,16,18       243:11       246:22         51:21       129:21       MARE       131:6       132:16       251:16       299:18         174:20       204:12       161:22       math       53:1       173:1         227:1,15       251:10       margin       173:5       174:13       mathematical       82:16         252:13       253:2       265:1       marked       57:2       83:9,17,19       84:21         301:20       markers       105:17       85:4,8,14       86:16	manuals 31:20		146:14,17 299:22
279:15       196:13,15,16,18         manufacturer 23:18       March 1:9       243:11 246:22         51:21 129:21       MARE 131:6 132:16       251:16 299:18         174:20 204:12       161:22       math 53:1 173:1         227:1,15 251:10       margin 173:5 174:13       mathematical 82:16         252:13 253:2 265:1       marked 57:2       83:9,17,19 84:21         301:20       markers 105:17       85:4,8,14 86:16			materials 163:20
manufacturer 23:18       243:11 246:22         51:21 129:21       MARE 131:6 132:16         174:20 204:12       161:22         227:1,15 251:10       margin 173:5 174:13         252:13 253:2 265:1       marked 57:2         301:20       markers 105:17	279:15		196:13,15,16,18
174:20       204:12       161:22       margin       173:5       174:13         227:1,15       251:10       margin       173:5       174:13       math 53:1       173:1         252:13       253:2       265:1       marked       57:2       83:9,17,19       84:21         301:20       markers       105:17       85:4,8,14       86:16	manufacturer 23:18	March 1:9	
227:1,15 251:10       margin 173:5 174:13       mathematical 82:16         252:13 253:2 265:1       marked 57:2       83:9,17,19 84:21         301:20       markers 105:17			251:16 299:18
252:13       253:2       265:1         271:3       282:8       285:21         301:20       markers       105:17    markers 105:17          markers       105:17		161:22	<b>math</b> 53:1 173:1
271:3       282:8       285:21       marked       57:2       83:9,17,19       84:21         301:20       markers       105:17       85:4,8,14       86:16	•	<b>margin</b> 173:5 174:13	mathematical 82:16
301:20 markers 105:17 85:4,8,14 86:16			
	271:3 282:8 285:21	marked 57:2	

matrices 28:22	137:13 141:9	88:16 90:15 123:18
<b>matrix</b> 29:1	144:11 145:1	132:15 143:21
42:13,14 72:2	158:11 169:12	152:15 167:7 172:6
196:17 197:8	172:1 183:13 196:13 222:14	176:21 189:4 200:19 210:12
<b>matter</b> 129:4,5	269:11 289:20	228:5 275:21
139:12 271:11	293:14 296:21	284:16 297:16
284:3 291:15	297:16 301:9	
<b>maximum</b> 93:1 94:19	<b>Mayo</b> 38:12 52:4	<b>meant</b> 274:15
251:3	159:21	meantime 216:8
		218:9 219:3,6
<b>may</b> 3:5 4:15 9:14 10:18 15:8 17:9	<b>meal</b> 18:4 86:12	measurable 170:7
10:18 15:8 17:9 18:3 30:18	87:10 93:16,17,18	<b>measure</b> 27:18 37:18
60:6,7,9,12,14	94:1,16 96:11 98:5	75:22 76:1,2 85:14
68:17 69:13 73:6	105:17 119:11	92:9,10,13,15,17
74:20 75:4 77:14	120:9,12 122:8	93:16,18 105:8
78:2 104:17	151:5,14 176:18 295:8,10	149:6 156:14 157:7
108:3,7 113:11		168:2 189:11 272:5
120:15 132:19	<b>meals</b> 58:2 85:12	295:9
136:21 142:8 145:4	89:4 95:5	measured 38:1,4
146:9,15,18 149:20	<b>mean</b> 14:19 39:1	63:11 68:1,9 127:3
157:8,9 160:4	42:6,12 44:7 48:20	239:7
163:15 165:4,5,10	49:2 56:18 67:9	
175:18 177:11	68:8 69:1,4,7,10	measurement 23:3
178:2 184:14	71:17 77:7 92:22	26:11 29:22 54:8
186:13,14 195:20	112:6 117:16,17	63:1 70:11 97:8 107:11 145:22
196:16 198:10	130:12 131:2	196:11 204:11
200:9 203:22 204:8	134:19 137:12	229:6 230:20 238:7
209:14 212:4 215:7	138:3 139:6,16 140:14,19,21 142:3	241:3 247:5 277:8
223:7 224:14 238:7 244:13 251:17	140:14,19,21 142:3	
252:13 253:19	153:2 158:19,20,22	measurements
263:14,15 271:1	165:4,5 174:4	24:10,11 52:12 63:20 68:4 85:13
274:16,17	184:5 187:6 198:16	116:10 133:22
275:4,8,9,10,12	207:9 222:3 231:11	134:10,14 179:9
277:2 284:2,3,8	272:21 274:14	194:3 239:9 298:15
287:13,15 288:14	278:4,11 297:18	300:16
298:6	304:2	
303:3,10,15,18,20	<b>meaning</b> 184:18	<b>measures</b> 88:7 93:2 147:8 189:7 268:11
<b>maybe</b> 15:2 19:22	-	
20:13 34:11 46:19	<b>means</b> 15:6 22:19 26:4 28:13 40:4	measuring
49:15 101:9 111:20	28:4 28:13 40:4 63:20 68:5 81:7	25:5,18,20 29:3,15
121:2 123:6 130:13	03.20 00.3 01.7	31:2 78:20 157:3

mechanical 36:15 243:365:9 102:1066:2 104:432:1,5 35:8 36:11243:3102:10104:459:1 106:1259:1 106:1259:1 106:12106:20mechanism111:4151:17155:21106:62106:22117:3223:420:4median44:1268:12301:10236:7238:4246:18236:7238:4246:18mediator125:11meeting1:6255:16249:3250:1255:18236:7238:4246:18235:11249:143:10,11,15,20258:15262:19250:12255:18249:3250:12255:18235:5250:4106:21151:21269:13270:21289:71289:71289:71289:71298:71medical106:12106:12101:20287:17293:3merit 109:431:4214:2,3,9,16218:751:5,20,21,22191:20252:1251:13214:2,3,9,16218:7291:3merit 29:19,2031:1440:1842:22301:2301:2301:2301:2291:3merit 109:431:1440:1842:22301:2301:2301:2301:2291:3merit 96:19,2031:1440:1842:22301:2301:2301:2291:3214:2,3,9,16218:720:12,2,3,8meetings3:148:19214:2,3,9,16218:7291:3214:2,3,9,16218:7102:1,2,3,8154:22114:3,4141:101	184:7 186:14 188:9 189:8 197:9 267:16 299:19	<pre>meet 27:5,11,13     28:17 47:4 51:12     58:18 62:19 64:19</pre>	140:6 228:15 256:12 <b>mentioned</b> 29:4
243:3106:12 108:859:1 00:18 01:13mechanism 255:7111:10 126:2155:5 67:20 72:3mediam 44:1151:17 155:21106:12 106:2median 44:128:12 301:1023:12 43:14mediator 125:11meeting 1:6 2:5,1623:11 249:14250:87:11,16 11:22 73:1269:13 270:21mediators 203:67:11,16 11:22 73:1269:13 270:21250:87:11,16 11:22 73:1269:13 270:21mediators 203:679:16 101:20287:17 293:3235:5 250:4106:11 154:22menu 2:19 289:7medical152:1 154:22mercury 294:186::20,21,22161:14 173:12mercury 294:1810:21,2,38150:7188:20 296:2031:14 40:18 42:2230:12 303:16 307:731:14 40:18 42:2230:12 303:16 307:731:14 40:18 42:2230:12 303:16 307:731:14 40:18 42:2230:12 303:16 307:731:14 40:18 42:2230:12 303:16 307:731:14 40:18 42:2230:12 303:16 307:731:14 40:18 42:2230:12 303:16 307:7308:5mests 26:18 251:1110:21,2,3,8mest 26:18 251:1111:51:1,18 125:22members 112:1012:32:13 252:17 280:9114:34 141:1013:10,16264:530:12membrane 229:1113:10,1626:233:15 54:20,21membrane 229:1113:11,15:5membrane 229:1113:12,19 24:1324:13 39:1924:13,19 22:1541:15,16,19 42:1614:14 41:1026:19 32:3 33:2234:14 44:17 <th></th> <th></th> <th>·</th>			·
mechanism       111:10       126:21       110:20       113:19         median       111:10       126:21       166:61       229:2       217:3       223:42       230:4         mediator       125:11       meeting       1:62:5,16       232:16       233:18       232:16       233:18         235:11       249:14       23:10,11,15,20       256:15       269:13       270:21       269:13       270:21         mediator       203:6       79:16       101:20       287:17       293:3       289:7         medical       152:1       154:22       161:24       173:12       mercilessly       156:20         sists, 20, 21, 22       191:20       252:1       mercilessly       156:20       mercilessly       156:20         5:15, 20, 21, 22       191:20       252:1       mercilessly       156:20       mercilessly       156:20         5:15, 20, 21, 22       191:20       252:1       mertil       109:4       mertil       109:4         31:14       40:18       42:22       308:5       mertil       29:13       124:2,3,9,16       218:7         125:13       139:1       102:1,2,3,8       meeting       31:14       81:12       161:12       165:7			
med 264:17166:6 186:4 229:2 244:4 268:20 269:8 288:12 301:101101:121 160:22 217:3 223:4 230:4 230:4 230:4 230:4mediator 125:11meeting 1:6 2:5,16 235:11 249:14 250:8288:12 301:10236:7 238:4 246:18 249:3 250:1 255:18 269:13 270:21 287:17 293:3mediators 203:6 235:5 250:4meeting 1:6 2:5,16 35:15,20,21,22 			
med 264:17244:4 268:20 269:8232:16 233:18mediator 44:1248:12 301:10232:16 233:18mediator 125:11meeting 1:6 2:5,16249:3 250:1 255:18235:12 249:143:10,11,15,20269:13 270:21250:87:11,16 101:20269:13 270:21medical106:21 151:21menu 2:19 289:7medical106:21 151:21mercury 294:18medical106:21 202:11269:13 270:215:15,20,21,22106:21 151:21mercury 294:186:2,12,16254:11 268:9 270:1mercury 294:18254:11 268:9 270:1288:20 296:20merit 109:431:14 40:18 42:22301:2 303:16 307:7merits 96:19,2052:14 54:18308:5merits 96:19,20102:1,2,3,8meetings 3:14 8:19meriss 96:19,20102:1,2,3,8meetings 3:14 8:19message 210:3115:1,18 125:22mellitus 107:5message 202:4155:3 169:21 170:1member 102:3 194:7met 62:20,21155:3 169:21 170:1114:3,4 141:10met 37:19 66:5200:12114:3,4 141:10meta 37:19 66:5103:12members 112:10meta 37:19 66:5200:12membrane 229:11meta 37:19 66:5133:15 54:20,21membrane 229:1119:14233:15 54:20,21membrane 185:8247:9136:5 161:13247:941:15,16,19 42:16136:5 161:13membrane 120:1539:19142:15,16,19 297:5memtin 37:1 104:1343:14 44:17			
median44:1288:12 301:10236:7 238:4 246:18mediator125:11meeting1:6 2:5,16236:7 238:4 246:18235:11 249:143:10,11,15,20258:15 262:19258:15 262:19250:87:11,16 11:22 73:1269:13 270:21287:17 293:3mediators203:6106:21 151:21287:17 293:3medical105:21 154:22106:21 151:21merculessly 156:205:15,20,21,22161:14 173:12merculessly 156:206:2,12,16254:11 268:9 270:1merculessly 156:2021:5,6,7,9,17268:20 296:20merit 109:431:14 40:18 42:22301:2 303:16 307:7mests 96:19,2052:14 54:18meetings 3:14 8:19merit 267:4,5102:1,2,3,8meets 26:18 251:11message 210:3115:1,18 125:22members 112:10meter 102:3 194:7136:8 139:5 150:7members 112:10155:3 169:21 170:1members 112:10155:3 20:7 242:14,22114:3,4 141:1020:12175:4 185:12193:10 254:19264:520:12membrane 229:11136:5 161:13247:924:15,19 297:5Memorial 220:15Medwatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:13	<b>med</b> 264:17		
235:11 249:14       3:10,11,15,20       258:15 262:19         250:8       7:11,16 11:22 73:1       269:13 270:21         mediators 203:6       106:21 151:21       287:17 293:3         235:5 250:4       106:21 151:21       287:17 293:3         medical       152:1 154:22       161:14 173:12       mercury 294:18         5:15,20,21,22       191:20 252:1       mercury 294:18       merit 109:4         31:14 40:18 42:22       301:2 303:16 307:7       308:5       merits 96:19,20         52:14 54:18       308:5       301:2 303:16 307:7       308:5       214:2,3,9,16 218:7         102:1,2,3,8       meetings 3:14 8:19       214:2,3,9,16 218:7       259:14 267:4,5         102:1,2,3,8       meets 26:18 251:11       message 210:3       214:2,3,9,16 218:7         155:3 169:21 170:1       member 102:3 194:7       269:1,0,16,17       27:5 301:13         126:9,10,16,17       127:5 301:13       meta 37:19 66:5       meta 37:19 66:5         305:12       membrane 229:11       19:14       23:2,11,15,18,19         medicine 13:10,16       26:2       32:1,3 33:22       33:15 54:20,21         77:21 80:11 115:5       membranes 185:8       247:9       34:1,3 39:19         242:15,19 297:5       Memorial 220:15       41:15,16,19 42:16	median 44:1	288:12 301:10	
250:87:11,16 11:22 73:1269:13 270:21mediators 203:67:11,16 11:22 73:1289:13 270:21235:5 250:479:16 101:20287:17 293:3medical106:21 151:21menu 2:19 289:7medical152:1 154:22menu 2:19 289:76:2,12,16191:20 252:1mercury 294:1821:5,6,7,9,17288:20 296:20merit 109:431:14 40:18 42:22301:2 303:16 307:7merits 96:19,2052:14 54:18209:20merit 26:19,2052:14 54:19meetings 3:14 8:19merits 96:19,20102:1,2,3,8meets 26:18 251:11meets 26:18 251:11102:1,2,3,8meets 26:18 251:11message 210:3102:1,2,3,8meets 161:12 165:7messages 202:4102:1,2,3,8meets 112:10met 62:20,21102:1,2,3,8members 112:10met 37:19 66:5200:7 242:14,22114:3,4 141:10met 37:19 66:5200:12membrane 229:11meta 37:19 66:5200:12membrane 229:11metabolizing 217:6medicine 13:10,16247:9Memorial 220:1531:15 54:20,21membranes 185:824:15,19 297:5Memorial 220:15MedWatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:1341:14 44:17	mediator 125:11	meeting 1:6 2:5,16	
mediators 203:6 235:5 250:4287:17 293:3 287:17 293:3medical 5:15,20,21,22 6:2,12,16 21:5,6,7,9,17 31:14 40:18 42:22 52:14 54:18 61:9,18 62:2,14 66:20 101:11 102:1,2,3,8 115:1,18 125:22 136:8 139:5 150:7 155:3 169:21 170:1 204:3,4,6,9 205:5 220:7 242:14,22 251:3 252:17 280:9 290:1279:16 101:20 102:1,23,38 meets 26:18 251:11 Melker 161:12 165:7 member 102:3 194:7 115:1,18 125:22 155:3 169:21 170:1 204:3,4,6,9 205:5 220:7 242:14,22 251:3 252:17 280:9 290:12287:17 293:3 menu 2:19 289:7 mercury 294:18 mert 109:4medicine 13:10,16 33:15 54:20,21 77:21 80:1 115:5 136:5 161:13 242:15,19 297:5member 101:20 102:15 membranes 185:8 247:9membrane 229:11 236:2 metaolizing 217:6medicine 13:10,16 33:15 54:20,21 77:21 80:1 115:5 136:5 161:13 242:15,19 297:5membrane 229:11 236:12meter 4:2 16:1 19:14 236:2 metaolizing 217:6medwatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:13metion 37:1 104:13			
Instructors203.0235:5 250:4106:21 151:21medical152:1 154:22fill152:1 154:22fill152:1 154:22fill16:2,12,162:15,6,7,9,17254:11 268:9 270:131:14 40:18 42:22301:2 303:16 307:752:14 54:18308:561:9,18 62:2,14meetings 3:14 8:1966:20 101:11meetings 3:14 8:19102:1,2,3,8meets 26:18 251:11115:1,18 125:22mellitus 107:5136:8 139:5 150:7mellitus 107:5155:3 169:21 170:1member 102:3 194:7204:3,4,6,9 205:5114:3,4 141:10209:12114:3,4 141:10medicine 13:10,1633:15 54:20,21305:12membrane 229:11medicine 13:10,16264:533:15 54:20,21membranes 185:8242:15,19 297:5Memorial 220:15Medwatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:13	250:8		
233.3 230.4152:1 154:22Immedicalmedical152:1 154:22mercilessly 156:205:15,20,21,22191:20 252:1mercilessly 156:206:2,12,16254:11 268:9 270:1mercilessly 156:2021:5,6,7,9,17288:20 296:20301:2 303:16 307:731:14 40:18 42:22301:2 303:16 307:7merits 96:19,2052:14 54:18308:5merits 96:19,2066:20 101:11meetings 3:14 8:19merits 96:19,20102:1,2,3,8meetings 3:14 8:19214:2,3,9,16 218:7102:1,2,3,8meets 26:18 251:11259:14 267:4,5115:1,18 125:22mellitus 107:5messages 202:4136:8 139:5 150:7mellitus 107:5met 62:20,21155:3 169:21 170:1member 102:3 194:7126:9,10,16,17204:3,4,6,9 205:5114:3,4 141:10meta 37:19 66:5200:12175:4 185:12meta 437:19 66:5medications 10:15264:5meta-analysis 39:7305:12membrane 229:1123:2,11,15,18,19264:523:2,11,15,18,1926:19 32:3 33:2233:15 54:20,21membranes 185:8247:977:21 80:1 115:5247:941:15,16,19 42:1634:1,3 39:1941:15,16,19 42:1643:14 44:17			
medical161:14 173:12mercilessly 156:205:15,20,21,22191:20 252:191:20 252:16:2,12,16254:11 268:9 270:1mercury 294:1821:5,6,7,9,17288:20 296:20301:2 303:16 307:731:14 40:18 42:22301:2 303:16 307:7merits 96:19,2052:14 54:18308:5merits 96:19,2066:20 101:11meetings 3:14 8:19214:2,3,9,16 218:7102:1,2,3,8meets 26:18 251:11259:14 267:4,5102:1,2,3,8meets 26:18 251:11259:14 267:4,5115:1,18 125:22Melker 161:12 165:7messages 202:4136:8 139:5 150:7member 102:3 194:7met 62:20,21126:9,10,16,17126:9,10,16,17126:9,10,16,17204:3,4,6,9 205:5114:3,4 141:10127:5 301:13205:12114:3,4 141:10175:4 185:121305:12membrane 229:11264:5medications 10:15266:2meter 4:2 16:133:15 54:20,21membranes 185:8247:9242:15,19 297:5Memorial 220:1541:15,16,19 42:16MedWatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:1343:14 44:17	235:5 250:4		<b>menu</b> 2:19 289:7
6:2,12,16191.20 232.1mericury 294:1821:5,6,7,9,17254:11 268:9 270:1merit 109:431:14 40:18 42:22301:2 303:16 307:7merits 96:19,2052:14 54:18308:5merits 96:19,2066:20 101:11meetings 3:14 8:19259:14 267:4,5102:1,2,3,8meets 26:18 251:11259:14 267:4,5115:1,18 125:22melicury 294:18254:11 268:9 270:1136:8 139:5 150:7meetings 3:14 8:19214:2,3,9,16 218:7136:8 139:5 150:7meets 26:18 251:11259:14 267:4,5155:3 169:21 170:1melicur 107:5met 62:20,21155:3 169:21 170:1member 102:3 194:7126:9,10,16,17204:3,4,6,9 205:5members 112:10127:5 301:13201:214:3,4 141:10127:5 301:13209:12175:4 185:12meta 37:19 66:5209:12175:4 185:12meta-analysis 39:7medicine 13:10,16246:5meta-analysis 39:733:15 54:20,21membrane 229:11236:277:21 80:1 115:5247:941:15,16,19 42:1634:1,3 39:19242:15,19 297:5Memorial 220:1541:15,16,19 42:1642:16:143:14 44:17			mercilessly 156:20
21:5,6,7,9,17233.11 208.9 270.11 288:20 296:20merit 109:431:14 40:18 42:22301:2 303:16 307:7 308:5merits 96:19,2052:14 54:18308:5merits 96:19,2066:20 101:11meetings 3:14 8:19214:2,3,9,16 218:7 259:14 267:4,5102:1,2,3,8meets 26:18 251:11259:14 267:4,5 291:3115:1,18 125:22mellitus 107:5message 202:4136:8 139:5 150:7mellitus 107:5messages 202:4155:3 169:21 170:1member 102:3 194:7met 62:20,21204:3,4,6,9 205:5member 102:3 194:7met 62:20,21205:12114:3,4 141:10127:5 301:13medications 10:1514:3,4 141:10meta 37:19 66:5305:12membrane 229:11264:5medicine 13:10,16236:2meter 4:2 16:133:15 54:20,21membranes 185:8247:977:21 80:1 115:5247:941:15,16,19 42:1634:1,3 39:1941:15,16,19 42:1643:14 44:17		191:20 252:1	<b>mercury</b> 294:18
21:13,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0			<b>merit</b> 109:4
52:14 54:18301:2 303:16 307:7mathefield 90:19,2061:9,18 62:2,14308:5message 210:366:20 101:11meetings 3:14 8:19214:2,3,9,16 218:7102:1,2,3,8meets 26:18 251:11259:14 267:4,5115:1,18 125:22Melker 161:12 165:7messages 202:4136:8 139:5 150:7mellitus 107:5messages 202:4155:3 169:21 170:1member 102:3 194:7met 62:20,21204:3,4,6,9 205:5member 102:3 194:7126:9,10,16,17204:3,4,6,9 205:5114:3,4 141:10127:5 301:13205:12114:3,4 141:10127:5 301:13251:3 252:17 280:9114:3,4 141:10205:12193:10 254:19medications 10:15264:5305:12membrane 229:1123:15 54:20,21membranes 185:877:21 80:1 115:5247:9242:15,19 297:5Memorial 220:15MedWatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:13			
61:9,1862:2,1466:20101:11102:1,2,3,8115:1,18125:22136:8139:5155:3169:21155:3169:21170:1member204:3,4,6,9205:520:7242:14,22213:2member102:1,2,3,8meets155:3169:21155:3169:21175:412:10114:3,4141:10204:3,4,6,9114:3,4205:12114:3,4205:12114:3,4105:12114:3,4105:12114:3,4114:3,4141:10127:5301:13127:5301:13127:5301:13127:5305:12128:12membrane129:1423:2,11,15,18,19264:5meter129:1423:2,11,15,18,1926:219:1423:1554:20,2177:2180:1115:5247:9242:15,19297:5MedWatch211:21metWatch211:21			,
66:20 101:11meets 26:18 251:11259:14 267:4,5102:1,2,3,8meets 26:18 251:11291:3115:1,18 125:22Melker 161:12 165:7messages 202:4136:8 139:5 150:7mellitus 107:5met 62:20,21155:3 169:21 170:1member 102:3 194:7126:9,10,16,17204:3,4,6,9 205:5members 112:10127:5 301:13205:12114:3,4 141:10127:5 301:13205:12114:3,4 141:10meta 37:19 66:5200:12175:4 185:12meta 37:19 66:5305:12membrane 229:11264:5medicine 13:10,16236:2meter 4:2 16:133:15 54:20,21membranes 185:8247:977:21 80:1 115:5247:941:15,16,19 42:16136:5 161:13247:941:15,16,19 42:1643:14 44:1743:14 44:17	61:9,18 62:2,14		-
102:1,2,3,8meets 26:18 251:11291:3115:1,18 125:22Melker 161:12 165:7messages 202:4136:8 139:5 150:7mellitus 107:5met 62:20,21152:8 153:8 154:12member 102:3 194:7126:9,10,16,17155:3 169:21 170:1members 112:10127:5 301:13204:3,4,6,9 205:5114:3,4 141:10127:5 301:13205:12114:3,4 141:10meta 37:19 66:5200:12175:4 185:12meta 37:19 66:5305:12membrane 229:11264:5medicine 13:10,16264:5metabolizing 217:633:15 54:20,21membranes 185:8247:977:21 80:1 115:5247:941:15,16,19 42:16422:15,19 297:5mention 37:1 104:1343:14 44:17		<b>meetings</b> 3:14 8:19	
115:1,18125:22136:8139:5150:7152:8153:8154:12155:3169:21170:1204:3,4,6,9205:5220:7242:14,22251:3252:17280:9114:3,4141:3,4141:10175:4185:12193:10254:19264:519:1433:1554:20,2177:2180:1115:5242:15,19297:5Memorial220:721:21		meets 26:18 251:11	
152:8153:8154:12mellitus107:5155:3169:21170:1member102:3194:7204:3,4,6,9205:5member102:3194:7126:9,10,16,172017242:14,22114:3,4141:10127:5301:13251:3252:17280:9114:3,4141:10127:5301:13290:12114:3,4141:10175:4185:12meta37:1966:5305:12193:10254:19264:5meta-analysis39:7medicine13:10,16236:2metar 4:216:133:1554:20,21membrane229:1123:2,11,15,18,1977:2180:1115:5247:934:1,339:19242:15,19297:5Memorial220:1541:15,16,1942:16MedWatch211:21mention37:1104:1343:1444:17	-	Melker 161:12 165:7	
155:3 169:21 170:1 204:3,4,6,9 205:5 220:7 242:14,22 251:3 252:17 280:9 290:12member 102:3 194:7 126:9,10,16,17 127:5 301:13medications 10:15 305:12114:3,4 141:10 175:4 185:12 193:10 254:19 264:5meta 37:19 66:5 meta-analysis 39:7medicine 13:10,16 33:15 54:20,21 77:21 80:1 115:5 136:5 161:13 242:15,19 297:5membrane 229:11 264:5meter 4:2 16:1 19:14 236:2medications 10:15 305:12membrane 229:11 264:5meter 4:2 16:1 19:14 236:2medicine 13:10,16 32:15 54:20,21 77:21 80:1 115:5 136:5 161:13 242:15,19 297:5membranes 185:8 247:9MedWatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:1343:14 44:17		mellitus 107:5	_
204:3,4,6,9 205:5members 112:10127:5 301:1320:7 242:14,22114:3,4 141:10meta 37:19 66:5251:3 252:17 280:9175:4 185:12meta 37:19 66:5290:12193:10 254:19264:5metabolizing 217:6medications 10:15264:5metbrane 229:1119:14305:12264:5metbrane 229:1119:1433:15 54:20,2126:219:1423:2,11,15,18,1977:21 80:1 115:5247:926:19 32:3 33:22136:5 161:13247:941:15,16,19 42:16MedWatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:1343:14 44:17	155:3 169:21 170:1	<b>member</b> 102:3 194:7	
220:7242:14,22251:3252:17290:12114:3,4114:3,4141:10175:4185:12193:10254:19264:5264:5305:12membranemedicine13:10,1633:1554:20,2177:2180:1115:5247:9242:15,19297:5MedWatch211:21		<b>members</b> 112:10	
290:12175:4 185:12medications 10:15193:10 254:19305:12264:5medicine 13:10,16236:233:15 54:20,21membranes 185:877:21 80:1 115:5247:9136:5 161:13242:15,19 297:5MedWatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:13			<b>meta</b> 37:19 66:5
medications 10:15 305:12193:10 254:19 264:5metabolizing 217:6medicine 13:10,16 33:15 54:20,21 77:21 80:1 115:5 136:5 161:13 242:15,19 297:5membrane 229:11 236:2metabolizing 217:6MedWatch 211:21membrane 229:11 242:15,19 297:5membranes 185:8 247:926:19 32:3 33:22 34:1,3 39:19MedWatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:1343:14 44:17		175:4 185:12	
305:12membrane 229:11meter 4:2 16:1medicine 13:10,16236:219:1433:15 54:20,21membranes 185:823:2,11,15,18,1977:21 80:1 115:5247:926:19 32:3 33:22136:5 161:13247:941:15,16,19 42:16MedWatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:1343:14 44:17			-
medicine13:10,16membrane229:11meter4:216:133:1554:20,21236:219:1423:2,11,15,18,1977:2180:1115:5247:926:1932:333:22136:5161:13247:934:1,339:1941:15,16,1942:16MedWatch211:21mention37:1104:1343:1444:17		264:5	metabolizing 217:6
33:15       54:20,21         77:21       80:1       115:5         136:5       161:13         242:15,19       297:5         MedWatch       211:21		membrane 229:11	
77:21 80:1 115:5 136:5 161:13 242:15,19 297:5membranes 185:8 247:9185:8 26:19 32:3 33:22 34:1,3 39:19 41:15,16,19 42:16 43:14 44:17MedWatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:1343:14 44:17		236:2	
136:5 161:13       247:9       34:1,3 39:19         242:15,19 297:5       Memorial 220:15       41:15,16,19 42:16         MedWatch 211:21       mention 37:1 104:13       43:14 44:17	·	membranes 185:8	
242:15,19 297:5Memorial 220:1541:15,16,19 42:16MedWatch 211:21mention 37:1 104:1343:14 44:17		247:9	
MedWatch 211:21 mention 37:1 104:13 43:14 44:17	242:15,19 297:5	<b>Memorial</b> 220:15	·
	MedWatch 211:21	mention 37:1 104:13	

		5
50:10 52:5,11	9:1,7,9,16,18,19,2	166:6,8,13
53:6,15 57:16	1,22	167:4,22 173:12
58:17 60:16 61:22	10:3,6,11,17,18	174:11 175:6,7
62:13 66:2	11:4,9,11,14,17,20	176:9 177:22 179:9
69:9,16,21 70:1	12:7,20,22 13:2,22	183:16 185:2,21
74:12 78:11 82:12	14:18 20:12	188:5 192:16
99:3,5	23:2,11 24:2,3	195:5,20 196:20
102:11,13,15	25:2 27:9 30:4,7	202:8,22 205:9
104:3,4	31:18 32:6,12	206:14,21 208:10
105:2,4,15,18	33:16 34:14,21	209:10,19
108:6,7 109:18,20	35:4,14,18,21	210:13,17 219:1
110:17 111:16	36:22 37:8,12	243:17 244:4,20
123:14 127:12	38:2,3,6,8	246:6
137:19 141:5,13	40:19,20,22	247:2,4,18,21
142:18 143:7,11	41:3,13 42:3,14	248:8,14,18 252:6
144:2 146:12,19	43:1,4 44:21 45:3	267:7
148:17 150:13,17	46:3,16,21	270:3,5,6,9,10
161:16 162:11,13	47:16,18 50:3,20	279:3 281:15 282:7
166:10	51:12 52:9 <b>,</b> 10	285:17 287:8
167:11,16,17,18	53:2,8 55:14 59:18	289:18 290:15
168:17 174:19	61:11,13 62:1,8,19	291:13 297:4,19
176:16 177:10,16	63:16 64:21 68:21	299:15,19 300:3,4
178:20 184:4 189:6	70:18,21	301:2 303:15
194:20 195:6,22	71:3,5,14,15,19	304:3,9 306:22
200:5 204:11	72:3,6,9,18	307:5
205:20 209:7,8,9	73:8,11,16 74:7,9	<b>meter's</b> 119:20
210:19 216:22	77:2,9,20 78:4	
217:1,19 218:20	79:7 81:9,19,22	Meters 1:8 224:12
221:15,21 222:12	82:1,5,18	<b>method</b> 25:8,10,16
223:19 241:12	101:6,14,19	26:1 27:15 28:17
244:6,7 245:3,22	102:10,19,22	35:17 36:8 37:18
246:17,19 247:16	103:12 105:5	41:9 42:10 45:8
248:13,17 249:3,16	106:21 107:22	47:15 62:10,11
258:20 270:14	108:8,14 109:5	73:4 129:3 146:8
279:22 282:9,21	111:10 119:8	199:7 203:2 204:7
283:6,7,9 287:13	123:13 126:7	229:4,7,14,22
291:2,19	127:8,10 128:7	230:3 238:9 241:16
303:7,17,20 306:11	135:2 138:12	245:6,11,15,16
meter/strip 168:17	141:15,20 142:3,10	246:21 267:17,19
meter-dependent	143:19,21 144:6	272:4,7,17 287:9
160:7	149:16 152:21	292:14 300:6
	153:12,13	methodologies 203:1
meters 2:5,9 4:1	157:13,15,16 159:2	-
7:17	160:8 161:18 162:7	methodology 30:13

203:1,4 240:6 methods 14:2 36:6,7,10 42:2 68:13 74:16 116:14 127:2 216:1 217:1 229:9 246:19 296:5 299:3	67:6,16 69:3,6,22 70:8 72:10 91:9 92:6 110:5 118:15 179:21,22 181:21 182:4 209:11,13 293:5 294:18 295:11 296:2	27:1,11,13 30:22 31:8 45:8 70:22 71:1 110:5,6,8 114:7,8 117:21,22 118:3 121:18,20 150:20 162:15 184:19 239:22 248:22 249:1
meticulous 245:12	milliliters 248:11 294:18	301:21
Michigan 6:5 133:1	millimeters 296:2	<pre>minute 5:6 49:11 197:20 211:8</pre>
microliter 248:14	millimolar 295:11	221:17 223:12
microliters 143:12 248:12,15	<pre>millimoles 209:11,13</pre>	282:9 283:6,8 305:5
microphone 136:15,21 305:17	million 8:2,6,8	minutes 14:13,14
microphones 4:19 5:2	133:11,15 252:9,11 289:20	17:1 34:2 43:15 44:1,2 49:7 78:21 116:22 174:3
Microsoft 289:16	millions 258:4	243:22
microvascular 56:6	289:13 <b>Mills-Peninsula</b>	miscode 82:11
57:8	136:8 154:16	miscoded 82:2
microwaves 5:17	279:20	miscoding 81:21
middle 69:19 162:17	mind 12:15 35:14	82:4
280:19	112:14 114:15 202:14 205:8 207:6	miserable 41:19
migrated 158:6	287:14	<b>mis-events</b> 181:19
migration 77:20	minimal 26:7 130:8	misleading 205:21
<pre>mike 243:2 252:15   266:4 294:9 295:19   302:10 304:10</pre>	238:9 minimize 287:5,11	<pre>miss 91:11 99:2     181:17 182:21,22     183:1,2,3</pre>
mile 190:13	<pre>minimum 25:17 26:18 27:4,5,17 28:18</pre>	<b>missed</b> 99:6
miles 190:15,18	70:21 92:22 94:19	missing 63:10
military 166:5	103:11 158:12	90:19,22 91:2,6,13,16,19
<pre>milking 250:2</pre>	ministries 265:15	Missouri 13:18
<pre>milligram 89:14,16 93:8 94:16</pre>	<b>minor</b> 77:14,17 99:13	<b>mistake</b> 49:15
<pre>milligrams 26:10,21</pre>	minority 213:15,21	139:11,12 misunderstand 214:3
27:11 29:8 46:3	minus 18:2 19:3,7	
48:17 49:16 60:2	26:10,13	misunderstood

295:21	modified 18:9 65:4	113:17 268:15
misuse 32:14 250:17	285:14,16,21	<b>month</b> 17:11
258:18	<b>modify</b> 286:4	43:4,21,22
misused 250:20	<b>mom</b> 172:10	monthly 43:13 56:17
Mitch 67:20 145:7 291:5	<pre>moment 19:18 230:4 278:17</pre>	months 129:13 151:21 172:2
Mitchell 33:13	<b>money</b> 153:3	morbidity 74:18
<pre>mitigate 21:22    220:5 223:2 264:11    265:4</pre>	<pre>monitor 14:22 19:19 25:3 71:8 85:19 137:8 154:3 177:10 178:15,17 179:1</pre>	167:2 morning 2:1 6:22 14:17 20:16 33:9,12 34:14
<b>mitigated</b> 84:19 247:4	180:8 188:16 191:13,14 193:1,5	35:20 54:14 55:3 80:8 100:19
<b>mitigation</b> 222:17 266:11	224:6 233:16	101:8,12 135:18 201:17 253:19
<b>mix</b> 235:17	<pre>monitoring 9:2 12:8 20:16 21:4,15,16</pre>	254:8,22 257:15
<b>mixing</b> 73:20	22:16 23:7,14 24:17 32:20 36:13	273:8 280:4 298:9 301:1 306:8,12
<pre>model 80:7 82:16 92:4,13 96:19</pre>	55:14 56:11 57:20	morning's 135:11
modeled 96:21	59:8 63:13 74:3 103:4 112:21	mortality 59:11
<pre>modeling 73:6,17 83:9 170:15,20,22 171:3,12,19 172:18 251:9</pre>	115:19 119:5,7 121:22 122:1,8,11 131:10 139:9 142:7,15 149:14	66:18 67:12 74:18 133:15 158:21 167:3 mostly 81:14
<pre>models 83:17,20 84:21 85:4,5,8,14 96:14</pre>	154:2,21 155:7 160:13 179:10 201:11 202:20 219:5 224:15	<pre>mothers 134:11 move 19:8 20:6 91:5 183:15 263:19 264:10 278:10,17</pre>
<b>modem</b> 282:4	229:19,21 231:3,8	299:6
<pre>moderate 21:13    22:17 96:2,12    194:18</pre>	245:1 255:17 258:22 261:15 292:22	<pre>moved 237:8 240:13 moving 149:9 156:22</pre>
moderating 193:15	monitors 14:20,21	172:15
<b>moderator</b> 14:13 193:20	15:11 24:20 30:2 104:16 111:1 113:3 128:9 187:16 199:3	<pre>multinational 66:16 multiple 29:17,18 </pre>
moderators	226:10,15 233:20	58:5 86:1 106:20 127:7 175:7 247:13
4:6,14,15 modern 154:15	265:17,20 Monnett 51:10	262:4 278:11 285:8 multi-use 192:15

mumble 7:1 musage(ph 87:1 **muscle** 85:9 **muscles** 295:4 Myers 40:17 193:21 194:7,9,13,15 223:15 224:13 240:3 241:9 242:7 243:15 252:16 260:2 264:2 266:3 288:1 299:12 304:22 305:16 myocardial 57:13 myself 52:12 85:5 162:4,5 193:17 305:3 Ν **N.J** 48:1 **NAD** 203:7 236:21 **narrow** 19:9 108:4 259:18 **NATASHA** 308:4,21 **national** 25:13 55:1 149:12 252:20 **natural** 154:19 naturally 30:8 226:3 261:18 **nature** 66:1 74:11 182:8 215:2 276:4 286:17 nearby 2:22 **nearly** 164:7 237:12 necessarily 97:6 112:3 117:8 140:12 152:22 165:18 184:11 200:8 247:5

274:5 284:8 necessary 40:22 116:11 131:16 188:8 220:5 281:14 necessitates 150:4 **needle** 172:15 negative 22:10 38:20 41:10 108:3 238:2 Neil 134:4,20 183:8,9 283:2 **neither** 253:19 308:9 neonatal 24:6 29:3,7 169:8 305:8 neonatals 296:14 neonates 297:21 **nephropathy** 56:7 57:9 **net** 88:5 **Neumann** 289:1 Neurology 6:1,3 **neuropathy** 56:7 57:9 Neuropsychology 6:3 **newer** 35:18 44:17,21 45:3 46:3,21 52:5 160:8 **newly** 110:15 **news** 65:22 211:22 212:5 239:6 **nice** 7:7 37:3 63:17 66:7 67:22 69:5 96:18 171:5 179:2 183:5 187:15,17

NICE-SUGAR 38:4 69:2 73:3 74:6,15,17,21 75:3 **NICE-SUGER** 158:20 **night** 150:2 164:2 **NIH** 41:2 115:7 **nine** 41:4,7 64:2 126:15 **NKDEP** 298:11 **nobody** 66:3 142:12 163:10 190:13 269:21 **nobody's** 161:21 **noise** 92:4 94:22 **nominal** 95:7,16,20 96:2 **non** 52:19 82:1 105:7 122:16 130:2 197:16 210:11 250:11 non-bleeding 170:5 **none** 62:19,22 117:6 179:12 non-readings 280:5 non-tolerant 186:15 **nor** 308:10,13 **no-read** 269:13 normal 16:15 31:6 52:15 55:12 85:10 166:8,21 167:9 169:4 189:6 237:10,14 normalizes 241:5 normally 174:1 normoglycemia 58:21 59:1

(866)448-DEPO www.CapitalReportingCompany.com ©2010

188:7,18 256:16

Northwestern 5:20 **Norway** 61:21 **nosedive** 238:14 notarized 299:2 NOTARY/COURT 308:22 **note** 27:8 94:11 100:2 109:11 221:13 **noted** 104:7 106:12 110:21 262:11 270:7 **notes** 35:6 103:2,5 not-friends 135:10 **nothing** 46:11 75:8,21 76:3 83:3 98:7 122:19 125:1 143:6,7 189:11 248:5 270:5 304:6 **notice** 3:13 17:5 18:13 188:2 291:3 **noticed** 184:2 205:16 **notices** 189:16 notification 201:10 214:19 215:1,4 217:2 218:2,4 266:6 notified 116:17 127:18 128:3 130:18 **notion** 260:17 Nova 242:1 298:4 November 43:21 44:8 **nowadays** 200:14 **nowhere** 117:11 numerous 6:14 86:7

104:7 **nurse** 52:12 54:5 78:16 156:21 170:1 178:11 188:1,13 222:11 265:18 **nurses** 40:11 53:17 78:8,22 228:12 **nursing** 9:4 21:1 22:5 35:6 79:1 178:22 203:15 221:19 **nutrition** 131:1,20 **nuts** 78:18 **NY** 72:22 0 **Oak** 7:3 objective 107:18 obtain 28:11 67:21 94:19 286:8 **obtained** 3:10 28:15 38:5 223:20 obtaining 3:12 78:18 obtains 27:22 **obvious** 227:16 obviously 70:13 83:4 85:22 158:5 163:17 186:1 200:11 228:21 269:4 275:5 occasionally 255:10 **occluded** 235:22 occult 53:9 167:7 occur 30:15,18 32:20 70:3 147:9

212:5 215:12 285:6 occurred 209:5 212:14,16 215:13 217:22 occurrence 93:6 232:16 occurring 219:6 226:3 261:19 o'clock 79:14 Octapharma 261:8 **October** 104:14 odd 80:9 **odyssey** 280:17 of-care 9:7 52:2 offer 77:14 255:16 offers 2:19 **Office** 6:12 136:11 officer 6:12 242:22 308:4 offices 9:5 21:2 57:18 272:3 officially 2:16 **off-label** 297:4 **off-mike** 165:7 **oh** 49:21 79:19 137:15 182:17 185:13 240:7 283:9 okay 33:11 36:22 39:14 40:1,4,9 41:13 42:21 44:15 45:9 65:20 98:2,15,18 113:16 114:6 132:4 134:13,15 137:3 194:16 219:2 223:10,17 234:16

242:8 246:13 251:7	54:2	276:7,8
260:18 261:6 270:14,15 284:5,9 291:14 293:7 294:5 303:15	<pre>opinion 49:20,21 50:5 63:4,5 76:15 77:19 122:14 160:6 302:19 304:19,20</pre>	organizations 12:6 258:9 organize 105:17
old 7:13 71:15 127:12 137:18 172:3 304:8	<b>opinions</b> 116:8 271:20 291:16	original 18:22 37:15,22 66:9 95:16 190:1 225:14
<b>older</b> 40:10	<pre>opportunity 2:7    43:18 84:12 101:20</pre>	231:1,2 287:2
omit 17:16	111:12 134:17 181:16 195:11	ostensibly 236:9 others 10:5 22:10
omitted 17:13,14	254:5	52:7 59:11 104:11
Oncology 13:19 ones 40:10 44:16 134:2 222:6 227:16,18 251:19	<pre>opposed 146:1 149:7 OPS 164:10 optimal 61:9</pre>	154:17 171:5,13 183:14 190:1 201:22 202:4 226:6 241:3 263:18 275:5
one's 191:18	optimize 243:9	<b>otherwise</b> 103:15
ongoing 23:6 101:17 111:13 113:7	259:19 optimized 284:9	108:19 136:17 160:15 193:4 308:14
214:18	optimum 71:1	<b>ought</b> 116:15,20
online 138:20 onset 8:16 onto 172:11	<b>options</b> 106:6 297:17 <b>OptiScan</b> 113:17	128:19 129:9,12,13,14,18 130:7,9,10,17
open 2:16 7:21	268:16	131:17 147:11 177:15 269:18
145:19 162:8 163:7 236:2 264:3,5 266:13	<pre>oral 122:17,22     130:3,15 303:13 orals 303:13</pre>	<pre>outcome 45:10 73:16 74:21 107:16,19 167:1,3 253:6</pre>
opening 306:1 307:3	<b>orange</b> 44:5 119:1	308:14
operate 303:7	276:1	outcomes 56:19 75:4
<pre>operates 301:8 operating 22:4     259:10,19</pre>	order 20:2 21:22 128:22 137:11 162:7 228:2 229:2	106:18 107:2 158:19 159:3 outlier
operation 241:21	258:20 260:8 292:19 296:2	129:10,17,18 147:9 191:10 192:22
operational 108:4	orders 133:16	280:6
operator 40:18 44:6 61:16 195:7 267:9	Orencia 217:4 organization 101:22	<b>outliers</b> 48:3,6,13 51:5,9 116:12 124:4,21 129:20
<b>operators</b> 41:5 43:2		. ,

6 5

9

130:20 133:8 147:9 172:6,7 175:11 268:6 269:14 280:3 outlined 9:21 104:8 outpatient 153:13 215:14 outpatients 270:19 outreach 212:17,20 220:3 **outside** 60:6,9 65:15,17 70:4,6 100:1 222:8 286:3 298:1 outstanding 14:7 overall 42:19 47:7 103:21 104:10,19,22 108:6 109:19 111:2 205:16 244:17 overcome 279:1,6 overdosing 36:5 over-dosing 196:10 over-hydrated 157:9 161:9 196:22 **overlap** 60:21 overlapping 208:1 over-measure 94:3 overseas 299:7 over-the 140:10,12 over-the-counter 23:10 32:6 286:10 297:19 overtreatment 19:10 overview 21:5 55:9 116:9 owned 124:5

**oxidase** 36:8 125:18 157:16,17 203:2 215:18 230:22 231:1 232:7 234:21 oxidation 125:11 oxidative 16:16 **oxidizer** 249:12 **oxygen** 125:17 157:16,17,18,19 189:17 203:3 234:21 235:1,8,10,14,16 236:5,12 294:16,17,19 295:14,22 oxygenated 235:16 oxygens 305:12 Ρ **P&T** 221:7 package 36:13 126:14 199:19 200:3 212:7 225:17 256:18 257:8,13 275:20 **packet** 2:20 **Padova** 85:1 paid 29:10 190:13 **pain** 104:19 **palm** 24:7 pancreas 14:6 115:22 184:1 Pandemic 6:18 **panel** 4:11,14,16,20 5:7 62:12 75:20 80:10 104:15,18 112:10,13

148:15 149:1 164:13 165:1 175:4 182:12 184:13 185:12 193:10 202:2 264:3,5 271:13 panelists 4:11 51:18 193:19 **panels** 4:11 panel's 149:8,13 **paper** 17:11 38:4 66:9 126:4 143:13 149:7 **papers** 37:22 parameters 100:9 **Pardon** 18:16 **parent** 135:22 259:12 parents 138:8,10 149:21,22 **parity** 265:13 **partial** 225:14 227:14 partially 42:14 participants 12:2 27:18,22 28:6 113:18 participated 224:4 participating 109:21 participation 4:17 193:10,11 particle 281:3 particular 45:2 81:4,6,15,18 82:13 88:10 100:9,13

135:8,14,17 141:9

109:2 168:17 194:5 199:7 202:1,11	70:13 72:16 81:6 82:10 86:15	62:1,4,12,18,20,22 63:11,14,15,18
203:5 206:8 207:17 210:5 212:4 216:11	87:5,9,10,13 88:10 92:5,8,11 93:20	64:2,6,14,17,20,21 66:22 67:13
217:2 218:14	95:6,8,14,16	69:2,14,20 70:3,16
221:15 225:11	98:4,10,11 103:15	72:12 75:3,8,9
228:5,20 229:3	104:13,19 106:2	78:3 79:3 81:7,14
236:13,15 239:12	109:4 119:6,10	85:15 86:6,8
257:22 259:8 266:8	122:16,21 123:4	88:11,22 90:7 92:7
272:11 277:10 302:21 303:3 306:1	124:16 125:21 145:18,21	101:19 103:20 104:4 108:8
	146:10,11 148:1	109:9,12 110:17
particularly 7:4	150:14	111:10,22 120:21
17:9 36:2 43:13	156:12,19,21 161:7	130:2 131:11,12,14
47:10 60:10 86:18 91:8 127:20 149:9	162:1,16 164:18,21	134:10 135:3
191:11 205:7	165:4,11 169:3,21	142:13 146:15
225:12 231:13,14	170:5 180:9	147:1 148:18 157:8
233:7 295:8	182:16,17 188:13	158:22
<b>parties</b> 308:10,13	192:2 196:18	159:1,11,12,15
-	211:22 212:5	160:21 161:2,6,8
<b>Partly</b> 304:10	213:17 217:16,18 221:20 222:7,14	163:10,20 166:9,20 170:14 188:22
<b>pass</b> 127:18 168:10	223:1,7 234:11	202:15,20 206:17
<b>passed</b> 154:1 164:7	245:1 250:20 252:2	210:17 212:9,22
249:13	256:17 260:4	213:2,14,15,21,22
Passing 190:19	264:17 267:10	214:6,9 215:7
_	270:17 271:5	216:10,11,12,15,17
<pre>passing's 190:20</pre>	272:19 275:9	217:20 218:3,10,18
<b>past</b> 8:4 11:13,16	277:10 282:1,22	221:15 223:3
13:14 220:1 299:13	283:13 288:22	232:19 234:10
<b>Pat</b> 159:14	293:5 296:12	244:18 261:11
<b>patents</b> 251:13,14	306:18,20	262:12,14 263:7 264:15 267:22
271:1	patient-derived	272:5 273:4,7
	64:13	276:20 281:14
<pre>pathologist 220:15</pre>	<b>patients</b> 9:1 10:22	283:4 296:16
Pathologists 54:22	15:12 20:21 22:6	297:14 306:21
pathology 33:13	30:15 38:12 45:12	<pre>patient's 30:8 51:3</pre>
54:16,21 101:1	47:14 48:6	69:11 220:18 226:1
<b>pathway</b> 235:12	50:10,17 51:1 52:15 53:3	298:16
<b>patient</b> 10:1 43:7	56:12,16,17,20	Patients 58:21
49:19 60:7,8	57:4,10,16 58:10	
65:13,16 69:12,18	59:5,9 61:12,18	Patient-specific

196:21	177:16 178:4,7	47:4 48:8,15,22
Patricia 20:7	182:10 190:17,21 192:13,14 198:13	49:1 50:1,12,14,20 51:3 52:16
<b>Pause</b> 33:10	200:14 203:20	53:3,20,21 56:1,3
<b>pay</b> 228:13 239:10	214:2 218:7 219:12	57:13 60:6
<b>paying</b> 141:2 147:11	236:19 240:21 244:10 246:3,13	62:2,3,9 64:5,9,10,12,16,18
<b>payment</b> 100:20	248:4 254:5 257:13	,19,20
PC02's 305:12	258:21 260:6	65:2,5,6,10,19
PDH 231:18 236:8	263:21 268:8 270:18 273:10	67:13,17 68:21 69:3 70:4,22
pediatric	274:15,16,17	71:1,2 72:12 73:17
13:9,17,19 134:4	278:22 281:18	75:12,13 76:8 82:5
283:2	282:8,11,12,14,17	89:17,19
pediatrician 137:6	284:15 296:21	90:12,14,22
149:21	297:6,9 302:13	91:1,10,12,15,20
	303:18 304:11	92:22 93:5,7,13,14
Pediatrics 13:8,19	<b>people's</b> 191:7	95:8,17,20,21,22
<b>peer</b> 194:11	per 26:21 27:11	96:2,3 98:6 107:13
peer-reviewed	29:8 41:10 42:12	110:4,7,8 114:8
261:12	60:2 67:6,16	118:4,13,14,21,22 119:17,19
<b>peers</b> 280:20	69:3,6,22 70:8	120:1,2,13,15
-	72:10 89:14,16	121:2,3,9,11,16,17
<b>pen</b> 148:2	91:9 92:6 93:9	,18,19,20
<b>pencil</b> 149:7	94:16 104:3 110:5	122:2,3,4,5,20
<b>penetrate</b> 233:10,13	118:15 133:11,20	123:2,8,10,14,15,1
<b>people</b> 4:19 7:12	179:21,22 181:21	8,20 124:12,15
8:5 12:7 15:15	182:4 205:10	126:10,17,21,22
16:2,18 17:12,13	206:21 207:8	133:4,10,13,14,17
50:22 56:5 58:4	209:11,13 244:13	135:2 138:17,18,21
59:19 61:3 62:5	293:5 295:11	145:10,11
63:19,22 69:15	percent 8:21	147:9,13,14,15,16,
70:15 71:6 76:21	17:13,14 18:2	18 148:3 150:18
77:4,12 98:16,22	19:3,7	151:7,8 152:19,20
120:14 134:22	26:8,12,13,20	155:2 157:2,3
136:14,18,21	27:1,4,10,13,14	158:11,21 162:15
139:1,19 140:16	29:9 30:22 31:8	164:15,17,19
144:4,5,6,7,8	34:19 39:17,19,22	165:11 166:9,14
147:21 149:4,10	40:1,5,7,13,14,19,	168:15,16 169:18
151:22 154:22	20 41:5,7,11,15,16	172:6 173:2
155:10 158:14	42:8,9 43:5,8,20	174:6,11
	44:19 45:19	175:11,15,18,20,21
174:21 175:12	46.2 9 10 13 19	176:10,14,19,20

177:11,12 179:15,18,20,21 180:4,8,11,14,17,1 9 181:10,16,18,22 182:15,22 183:1,2,3,4,6,7 184:18,19,20,22 185:3,4,9,16	159:16 160:13 167:11 178:3 194:20 195:4,6,22 196:5,6,20 202:17 223:19 239:18 244:22 253:11 256:7 268:20 277:20 286:17,20	<pre>peritoneal 211:14    265:18 peroxide 232:7,10 person 7:16 33:8    75:15 141:11    172:22 196:22    221:18 222:13    247:20 264:9</pre>
186:13,14 190:3 191:6,19 207:22	287:2,12 291:8 301:3,13 302:13	265:18
228:19 237:22 238:2 239:22	<pre>performances 306:11</pre>	<b>personal</b> 122:14
238:2 239:22 248:22 249:1 301:4,22 302:14	<pre>performed 35:5    40:11,16 44:11    49:22 52:7 58:4</pre>	<pre>personally 51:16     52:11 99:7 163:12</pre>
percent/95 177:12	61:8 68:4	<b>person's</b> 281:2,3
<pre>percentage 72:7 99:2,6</pre>	144:21,22 205:11 207:8 246:10 255:6	<pre>perspective 20:11     33:22 35:1 55:4,11     75:18 101:12</pre>
percentages 172:14	performing 36:12	115:11 116:4
<b>percent's</b> 180:13	56:16 62:5	148:17 201:10,19
<b>perfect</b> 91:11 92:7,10 93:2 94:10	performs 158:16 perhaps 12:6 19:5	227:18 242:9 253:14 274:12 <b>perspectives</b> 80:5
152:21 184:8,17	111:22 140:11 144:13 145:8	
<pre>perfectly 87:9 99:20 117:5 220:19</pre>	146:16 152:2,3 159:7,9 175:3	<b>perverse</b> 77:22 <b>Peter</b> 17:15
<b>perform</b> 61:12 64:22	203:15 204:22	<b>Pfizer</b> 101:3
72:18 191:5 246:13 258:5,21 282:15 performance	206:15 213:10 215:10 216:13 255:2,12	<pre>ph 159:20 197:4     232:20 233:1 236:8     245:20</pre>
9:13,14,16	257:11,15,16	
10:5,6,17 13:22 22:12,15 23:1,9,21 25:1 26:17 27:16	259:9,18 268:18 272:22 276:6 289:7 297:1,6	<pre>pharmacist 200:6,7 pharmacy 196:2 200:7 221:3,5,6,14</pre>
32:5 33:16 40:15	<b>period</b> 96:12 143:14	223:2 260:8
45:4 47:8 55:5 58:18 60:18	213:9 266:22	<b>PhD</b> 79:21 87:4
61:14,18 65:10 66:2 70:18 101:6	304:14 <b>periodic</b> 129:12 130:19 131:19	<b>Phil</b> 171:21 175:9 176:7
102:14		phone 150:22 221:17
103:2,6,7,11,13,14 104:10 109:19 111:9 115:11 116:4	<pre>periodically 116:19     216:18,22 255:8</pre>	<b>phones</b> 3:6 5:16

(866)448-DEPO www.CapitalReportingCompany.com ©2010

phosphorous 75:14	<b>plane</b> 83:6	234:15,19,22
photometric 105:13	<b>planning</b> 6:6,8,9	235:20 236:6,9,12 293:16 296:4,5
230:2 241:3	<b>plasma</b> 86:20,22	
photometrically 249:19	90:18 91:9 105:14 167:18,20	<pre>pocket 281:16 POCT(12 108:18</pre>
<b>physical</b> 125:13	168:14,20 184:7 197:10 228:7	109:14,15 110:11,20 111:15
<b>physician</b> 57:18 150:6 221:12 272:3	237:8,19 238:17 245:15,17	114:11 270:8
physicians 9:5 21:2	247:18,19 300:10	<pre>point 1:8 5:8 9:7     15:17 35:11 38:7</pre>
<pre>physiologic 195:7 225:8 293:17 294:1</pre>	<pre>plasma-equivalent 237:9</pre>	39:20 46:2,20 51:1 52:1,18 71:21
	<b>pleaded</b> 18:19	72:1,15 74:5 75:16
<pre>physiological 9:11 10:19 11:3 84:1 224:11 234:1 277:22 279:1</pre>	please 3:3 12:11 33:9 71:10 72:20 79:15 98:17 132:22	76:15 77:1 93:21 94:20 100:3 108:19 113:6 119:6 123:11 125:22 126:1
<pre>physiology 83:19,21 84:22 237:18 238:2</pre>	135:15 194:13 <b>pleasure</b> 5:9 194:16	133:13 134:8,21 141:19 143:13
pick 57:21 66:6,7	_	144:15 155:11
189:13,15,17,20	<b>plenty</b> 180:13	160:20 166:2 167:9
208:12 227:5	plethora 225:9	175:1 183:13
<b>picked</b> 294:14	<b>plots</b> 29:20	185:17,20,22 186:19 191:18
<b>picks</b> 189:20,21	plotted 64:10	192:5,6 207:14
picture 21:16 65:21	<b>plus</b> 18:2 19:2,7 26:9,13 27:1,11,13	214:20 221:17 222:20 227:9
pictures 83:5	30:22 31:8 45:7	241:13 246:1
piece 143:12 228:8	70:22 71:1	253:20 254:9
<b>pieces</b> 259:1 274:7	110:5,6,7 114:7,8 117:21 118:2,3	257:16 265:17,19 267:14,17 268:2,14
<b>Pinkos</b> 179:14 182:14 277:13 278:19 300:19 302:7,10 304:12,17	121:18,20 135:18 140:22 145:12 150:19 152:8 162:14 184:19 235:7 239:22	270:10 274:18 276:2 279:4 283:18 295:22 297:1,2 298:21 301:1 306:22
<pre>pioneering 171:11</pre>	248:22 249:1	<b>pointed</b> 159:15
pitching 132:6	301:21	222:21 285:10
<b>places</b> 78:6 203:10 221:1 291:1	<b>plus/minus</b> 89:17 164:14,15,19	<b>pointing</b> 39:11 74:8 176:7
<b>Plan</b> 6:19	<b>po2</b> 36:5,9 226:1,21 231:21 233:22	point-of-care 9:19

11:5 12:21 13:2 232:13 20:11 22:4 68:6 possibilities 77:7 78:4 possibility 287:1 points 4:22 29:18 possible 51:21 68:5 30:19 43:4 57:22 72:18 75:3 81:1 72:10 76:18 82:12 155:4 165:12 89:20,22 90:1,2 195:15 215:13 94:7,9 143:4 246:14 256:3 160:11,15,19 263:10 269:11,18 281:11 282:18 195:3 273:5 279:2,17,19 289:21 286:18 policy **possibly** 174:22 6:6,8,9,11,12 226:4 285:20 100:21 post-analytic 139:8 political 109:1 post-analytical **poor** 19:16 40:14 61:7 195:3 305:9 Post-Graduate population 2:10 243:18 16:21 87:20 88:21 89:7 100:10 158:15 post-marketing 169:3,5,8,9 182:18 267:21 214:5 275:7 297:3 potential 68:12 305:7,14 71:4 73:6 108:2,5 populations 84:6 100:2 220:3 253:15 164:15 182:16 255:13 256:9 188:17,18 205:13 258:7,10,17 259:6 283:13 297:21 263:16 271:22 298:2 272:8 286:16 307:4 portable 57:15 potentially 68:15 246:2 201:10 262:15 portion 4:18 17:7 **power** 226:17 pose 113:11 **PQQ** 125:19 201:11 203:6 209:19 position 80:9 227:4 210:6,8 216:6 278:14 236:11 250:4 275:6 positioned 133:3 practical 53:14 **positions** 6:6 224:1 93:2 **positive** 38:19,21 **practice** 60:16 61:6 41:10 62:14 107:1 66:9 68:1,10 297:5

practiced 242:19 practitioner 222:11 practitioners 299:9 **prandial** 197:1 pre 20:8 61:7 pre-analytic 139:7 pre-analytical precaution 287:20 **precise** 117:10 169:12 182:7 192:12 292:18 300:16 precisely 245:18 **precision** 25:3,4,12 45:7 47:1,9 62:15 104:18 117:2,9,13 164:16 227:16 251:5 252:3 296:9 298:9 299:10 pre-clinical 88:15 **precursor** 249:18 pre-diabetes 149:10 pre-diabetic 86:6 predicate 22:19 285:7 288:3,6 predicates 285:8 predictable 219:14 **predicted** 55:21,22 preference 282:2 preferences 282:1 pregnant 58:8 pre-market 9:20

premixed 133:6	242:21	<b>prior</b> 5:4 18:4 35:4
preparation 22:2	<b>press</b> 271:7	61:14
196:12 245:13	<b>pressed</b> 172:20	<b>priori</b> 79:10
prepare 24:21	pressure 75:22	<b>privy</b> 241:21
196:15	292:9 296:3	<pre>proactively 110:19</pre>
<b>prepared</b> 245:17 269:21	<b>pretty</b> 34:4 40:14	<pre>probability 90:19</pre>
	113:1 117:10	91:6
Preparedness 6:18	120:3,7 122:12	probably 42:14
preposterous 76:11	124:11 126:8,20 147:17 164:21	45:3,11 46:3
prescribed 10:22	170:5 182:10	47:7,18 49:1,22
223:1	183:11 213:15	61:1 84:22 93:9 94:1,4 98:12
<b>presence</b> 198:15	225:12,13 242:4	112:12 113:7,8,10
247:13 268:21	291:12 295:7	114:14 120:3 122:9
272:10 277:12	prevalence 8:6	123:1,3 124:17
present 20:10 34:6	55:19,21	142:6,9 143:6
35:20 51:18,19	prevalent 196:13	145:1,15 146:11
82:19 83:10 88:11	prevent 21:22 220:8	147:5 153:3,13
98:2 100:15 110:7	250:19 262:4 271:1	157:4,7,12 176:19 178:13 182:1,15
111:12 132:12 135:8 235:10,14	preventable 219:16	183:11,12 200:4
256:10 269:10	preventing 289:8	202:21 205:14
presentation 4:8	prevention 149:12	207:14 219:13
17:3 33:17 47:6	194:2	226:15,16 234:4
220:16		242:1 267:16 279:11 281:7 294:7
presentations 3:18	<b>previous</b> 19:22 60:6	295:21 301:18
4:9 26:3 135:11	198:3 213:6 215:4	306:15
presented 15:6	previously 80:20	
26:19 28:3,19	92:3 109:16	<pre>problem 49:18 60:7 65:16 86:16</pre>
48:21 51:16	<b>price</b> 239:9,10	141:21,22 142:1,2
52:1,20 72:9 92:20	<pre>primarily 224:8</pre>	146:13 147:1
93:11 94:6 160:1	Principal 6:10	151:9,12 163:3,5,6,22
<pre>presenting 85:3     253:4</pre>	principle 249:21	165:10 175:9
presents 234:5	principles 9:21	180:22 182:19
250:13	print 125:10 127:11	184:5 196:17 204:20,21 205:15
preservatives 196:9	166 <b>:</b> 7	211:18 212:1
president 101:10	printed 31:19	213:5,12,18
115:1 135:20 194:9	printout 75:11	214:4,22 215:3,17

219:6,18 220:6,22 222:4 226:4,21 229:16 232:21 233:22 234:19 236:6,18 248:5 263:1,12,15 270:14 286:16 294:19 295:14 300:12	<pre>producing 152:5     227:1 product 22:15     116:20 128:15     131:3,17 140:13     181:6 187:21     198:16 205:3     206:15 212:8 217:6</pre>	<pre>professional 12:5 13:1 18:5 23:10,12 27:21 28:16 50:13 108:12 professionals 15:13 23:5 50:16,19 51:2,4,7 265:7</pre>
<pre>problematic 73:16 270:19 298:12 problems 12:12 16:10,11 68:12 71:5,18 146:18</pre>	223:6,8 224:17 225:4 227:2,19 231:17 232:8,9,10 236:7 238:8,10 240:15 241:4	<pre>professor 7:6 13:8     33:13 54:16 72:22     115:4 136:4 proficiency 68:20     71:13,18</pre>
192:22 201:17,18,20 202:5 204:8 219:8 222:1 225:7 234:11 237:5 244:14 269:5	243:8,9,10 244:13 248:6 252:12 253:3,4 256:22 257:22 258:12,14,18,21 259:3,7,15,20	<pre>profoundly 192:3 profusion 234:10 program 4:18 5:21 18:16 55:2 104:20 115:3 149:12</pre>
<pre>procedural 225:20 procedure 199:13 253:16 257:22</pre>	259:3,7,15,20 261:2 266:18 271:4 272:2 276:8 287:19 290:11 301:9 303:4	258:22 264:14 286:18 288:16 290:10 298:11 299:15 300:2
<pre>procedures 29:22 102:7 222:17 proceed 54:13</pre>	<pre>production 229:4 products 5:16 102:2,4 128:8,13</pre>	programmable 192:12 programs 265:10
<pre>process 139:7 141:7,12 153:6,15 155:5 187:12 252:18 285:5 294:2</pre>	131:2 144:3 152:4 158:6 179:11 197:16 202:5,18 204:3 210:14 211:6 216:11 217:10,13	292:22 301:22 Project 115:22 promoted 262:9 promotional 243:11
processes 84:1 140:10 199:1 243:12	218:11 224:19,21 227:11 228:3,11 231:1,3 235:21 236:1,4 237:2	prompt 3:3 243:11 267:8 pronounce 66:12
<pre>produce 51:8 102:3 107:1,7 116:9 128:22 225:5 232:7,11,13 249:7 303:14 produced 68:13</pre>	238:12 239:1 252:19 253:8,13 257:7 258:16 261:20 263:20 264:12 273:12,14	210:8 propensity 276:15 proper 8:10 53:11 94:13 140:21
<pre>produced 68:13   233:14 produces 249:13</pre>	278:12 279:17 286:10 290:14 302:17	<pre>properly 66:12 74:10 144:10 163:5 298:16</pre>

property 232:9 148:16,22 199:21 **putting** 115:15 200:4 201:10 132:8 253:22 proponent 45:17 214:19,22 215:3 proponents 46:6 217:1 218:1,4 Q 253:7 257:20 266:5 proportional 29:14 **QC** 43:3,4 127:6 275:15,21 276:5 249:17,20 141:2 publication 218:3 proposal 254:19 qualified 76:10 publications 85:3 proposed 63:3 qualify 78:12 185:6 194:12 113:21 quality 5:14,15 **publish** 128:5 proprietary 227:4 12:21 23:15 31:21 177:15 199:6 240:20 278:14 50:2 244:17 252:12 published 37:19 301:5 **protect** 143:7 40:11 44:16 62:18 247:10 quantified 259:14 195:16 198:12 protocol 128:20 quantify 230:1 199:1 212:2 214:18 129:10 131:18 256:16 261:12 quantitative 23:3 293:4 290:8 29:22 protocols 37:3 publishing 278:8 **quarter** 148:12 70:17 76:20 77:3 **pull** 45:4 228:22 question 5:4 33:10 provide 12:1 21:4 301:5 39:9 48:1 51:11 24:18 29:13 73:19 58:17 59:18 72:5 **pulled** 207:12,17 225:3 247:13 77:13 97:4 98:14 251:14 264:17 pulling 257:8 106:19 111:19 266:18 279:22 pump 86:1 148:2 113:12,13 303:6 192:11 114:11,13 119:3 provided 2:20 27:20 126:22 127:22 **puncture** 234:13 31:19 178:16 198:9 131:8 132:3 135:9 purchase 257:16 199:10,20 301:7 136:14,22 137:2,4,10 provider 218:13 **pure** 81:13 145:16,20 147:3 167:16,17 279:3 297:21 148:15 151:1,2 providers 9:3 12:5 **purging** 78:19 156:9 179:17 20:22 166:12 212:1 purported 262:4 184:12 185:11 214:6 215:1 186:2 191:11 purpose 124:9 162:7 provides 29:6 220:13 229:15 purposes 18:13 99:1 200:17 265:2 239:8 240:4,18 purse 281:15 241:8,9 243:17,22 providing 251:2 263:5 264:3,22 293:6 **pursuing** 275:17 266:13 268:18 **PTQ** 197:19 push 136:15 253:9 274:21,22 279:2 291:15 292:5,6,16 **public** 1:6 2:5 3:13 pushing 173:7

293:10 296:8 Radiological 5:11 228:1 239:18 297:12 298:7 rapid-acting 121:8 Raine 81:20 301:18 302:6 304:1 **rare** 158:19 **raise** 48:1,2 71:21 305:1 143:3,17 147:3 **rarer** 123:1 questioned 10:2 175:1 214:20 **rate** 53:10 58:22 questionnaire 64:1 267:11 170:6,8 182:3 questionnaires 28:6 **raised** 302:14,15 212:19 questions 4:9,15,20 **raises** 58:17 **rates** 20:2 88:6 5:7 7:8 12:10,15 rampant 16:20 167:4 298:17 14:15 33:6,7 **rather** 11:4 54:11 **ran** 234:11 47:20,21 64:2 72:4 166:4 191:9 232:3 98:17 111:17 **random** 46:14 128:21 244:11 259:14 114:16 131:22 129:15 130:9,18,19 268:13 269:15 132:2 135:5,11,12 randomize 159:1 274:5 287:12 288:5 139:3 198:1 199:12 291:4 217:8 240:3 260:3 randomized 56:13 264:5 297:22 67:2 107:2 **ratio** 120:18 300:20 randomizing 45:12 ratios 88:7 quick 31:22 80:13 **range** 18:10,11,14 **raw** 251:16 98:14,21 220:14 19:4 25:6,18,20 **re** 156:4 253:6 256:11 29:3,8,15,19 quickly 8:11 238:21 31:2,3 41:5 43:5,7 **reach** 93:8 99:11 48:16 69:21 186:5 211:22 214:5 282:16 276:2 70:5,6,7 quite 5:8 41:17 72:8,13,16,19 **react** 87:10 201:22 47:16 64:5 67:3 105:11 107:14,15 75:2 91:19 105:22 **reacted** 64:3,6 145:19 159:12 112:11,12 150:4 160:11 167:9 **reaction** 230:19,20 159:5 181:17,19 175:18 180:5,10 232:13 234:21 183:6 203:12 181:16 191:22 235:7,8,22 245:21 221:22 222:15 192:1 193:2 226:20 249:9 227:13 254:4 233:21 246:9 262:22 297:18 reactions 234:19 248:22 257:18 238:20 Qz 44:19 262:3 273:4 277:11 readability 28:7 ranged 38:19 40:19 32:7 R 62:1 **R&D** 224:1,4 268:8 **reading** 49:11 129:4 **ranges** 48:7 60:7 142:20 157:18,19 **races** 161:4 67:4 185:15 229:1 162:2 164:4 165:6 237:11 239:3 273:9 radiation-emitting 168:5 210:20 5:16 rapid 37:5 134:14 211:13 263:9

269:15,16 280:5	183:6 184:9 186:3	<b>recall</b> 129:17
<b>readings</b> 11:1 99:16	188:2 198:7 199:17 202:2 206:5 210:3	155:19
163:2 187:19 265:2	202:2 206:5 210:3 212:19	<b>receive</b> 69:12 206:2
readouts 105:3	214:1,5,10,12	253:5
<b>reads</b> 249:16	221:22 222:2	<b>received</b> 5:19 6:4
<b>ready</b> 135:16	225:10 232:1	212:11 213:1 242:13 286:4
- Reagan 154:12,16	233:11 238:12,20 246:12 256:16,18	
	259:3 261:22	receives 9:8 217:16
reagent 21:19	262:14 263:5 266:1	receiving 47:14
reagents 256:20	270:19 274:13	213:2 216:10,17 223:7
real 48:13,17 53:3	278:1,3 279:7	
72:11 124:4,5,8	280:15 283:12 289:19 292:18	recent 14:4 27:8 34:21 40:16 44:16
133:22 178:8 263:11 270:13	289:19 292:18 299:18 300:15,20	109:17 170:3 230:8
	302:7 305:6,13,21	254:11
reality 9:18	306:1,3,9	recently 71:5
realize 138:12	<b>realm</b> 298:1	127:19 179:12
139:7 141:5 162:15	<b>reason</b> 43:15 56:5	230:14 243:19
184:16 275:22	78:14 137:20	275:17
realized 33:3	161:1,22 217:9	recessed 79:16
153:20	229:16 283:17	
153:20 realizes 204:10	-	<b>recipe</b> 59:16
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18</pre>	229:16 283:17	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18 6:20 7:10 15:21</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18 6:20 7:10 15:21 16:8 17:6,19</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19 108:10 202:18</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18 6:20 7:10 15:21 16:8 17:6,19 19:4,22 35:9</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19 108:10 202:18 244:20 288:9</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18   6:20 7:10 15:21   16:8 17:6,19   19:4,22 35:9   39:19,20 40:6,12</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15 302:11 reasonably 160:6	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19    108:10 202:18    244:20 288:9 recognized 10:3</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18 6:20 7:10 15:21 16:8 17:6,19 19:4,22 35:9</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15 302:11	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19    108:10 202:18    244:20 288:9 recognized 10:3    25:13 211:18</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18   6:20 7:10 15:21   16:8 17:6,19   19:4,22 35:9   39:19,20 40:6,12   54:4,11 58:12</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15 302:11 reasonably 160:6 268:11 reasons 16:13 58:1	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19 108:10 202:18 244:20 288:9 recognized 10:3 25:13 211:18 recognizes 103:1</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18   6:20 7:10 15:21   16:8 17:6,19   19:4,22 35:9   39:19,20 40:6,12   54:4,11 58:12   68:18 76:21 78:6   82:19 87:15 97:2   117:2,3,19 119:9</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15 302:11 reasonably 160:6 268:11 reasons 16:13 58:1 80:19 156:18 231:3	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19    108:10 202:18    244:20 288:9 recognized 10:3    25:13 211:18 recognizes 103:1    244:12</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18   6:20 7:10 15:21   16:8 17:6,19   19:4,22 35:9   39:19,20 40:6,12   54:4,11 58:12   68:18 76:21 78:6   82:19 87:15 97:2   117:2,3,19 119:9   123:22 132:7 134:7</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15 302:11 reasonably 160:6 268:11 reasons 16:13 58:1 80:19 156:18 231:3 251:13 288:19	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19 108:10 202:18 244:20 288:9 recognized 10:3 25:13 211:18 recognizes 103:1</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18   6:20 7:10 15:21   16:8 17:6,19   19:4,22 35:9   39:19,20 40:6,12   54:4,11 58:12   68:18 76:21 78:6   82:19 87:15 97:2   117:2,3,19 119:9   123:22 132:7 134:7   136:1 137:21 138:6</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15 302:11 reasonably 160:6 268:11 reasons 16:13 58:1 80:19 156:18 231:3 251:13 288:19 304:10	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19    108:10 202:18    244:20 288:9 recognized 10:3    25:13 211:18 recognizes 103:1    244:12</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18   6:20 7:10 15:21   16:8 17:6,19   19:4,22 35:9   39:19,20 40:6,12   54:4,11 58:12   68:18 76:21 78:6   82:19 87:15 97:2   117:2,3,19 119:9   123:22 132:7 134:7   136:1 137:21 138:6   141:12 147:8</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15 302:11 reasonably 160:6 268:11 reasons 16:13 58:1 80:19 156:18 231:3 251:13 288:19	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19    108:10 202:18    244:20 288:9 recognized 10:3    25:13 211:18 recognizes 103:1    244:12 recognizing 236:17</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18   6:20 7:10 15:21   16:8 17:6,19   19:4,22 35:9   39:19,20 40:6,12   54:4,11 58:12   68:18 76:21 78:6   82:19 87:15 97:2   117:2,3,19 119:9   123:22 132:7 134:7   136:1 137:21 138:6</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15 302:11 reasonably 160:6 268:11 reasons 16:13 58:1 80:19 156:18 231:3 251:13 288:19 304:10 reassemble 135:7 reauthorization	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19 108:10 202:18 244:20 288:9 recognized 10:3 25:13 211:18 recognizes 103:1 244:12 recognizing 236:17 recommend 266:9 recommendation 58:3 63:21 129:22</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18   6:20 7:10 15:21   16:8 17:6,19   19:4,22 35:9   39:19,20 40:6,12   54:4,11 58:12   68:18 76:21 78:6   82:19 87:15 97:2   117:2,3,19 119:9   123:22 132:7 134:7   136:1 137:21 138:6   141:12 147:8   148:20 154:21   155:1,8,9 156:5   161:17 162:21</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15 302:11 reasonably 160:6 268:11 reasons 16:13 58:1 80:19 156:18 231:3 251:13 288:19 304:10 reassemble 135:7	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19 108:10 202:18 244:20 288:9 recognized 10:3 25:13 211:18 recognizes 103:1 244:12 recognizing 236:17 recommend 266:9 recommendation 58:3</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18   6:20 7:10 15:21   16:8 17:6,19   19:4,22 35:9   39:19,20 40:6,12   54:4,11 58:12   68:18 76:21 78:6   82:19 87:15 97:2   117:2,3,19 119:9   123:22 132:7 134:7   136:1 137:21 138:6   141:12 147:8   148:20 154:21   155:1,8,9 156:5   161:17 162:21   163:1,12,15 164:9</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15 302:11 reasonably 160:6 268:11 reasons 16:13 58:1 80:19 156:18 231:3 251:13 288:19 304:10 reassemble 135:7 reauthorization	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19    108:10 202:18    244:20 288:9 recognized 10:3    25:13 211:18 recognizes 103:1    244:12 recognizing 236:17 recommend 266:9 recommendation 58:3    63:21 129:22    214:21 266:7 recommendations</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18   6:20 7:10 15:21   16:8 17:6,19   19:4,22 35:9   39:19,20 40:6,12   54:4,11 58:12   68:18 76:21 78:6   82:19 87:15 97:2   117:2,3,19 119:9   123:22 132:7 134:7   136:1 137:21 138:6   141:12 147:8   148:20 154:21   155:1,8,9 156:5   161:17 162:21   163:1,12,15 164:9   165:20 166:1</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15 302:11 reasonably 160:6 268:11 reasons 16:13 58:1 80:19 156:18 231:3 251:13 288:19 304:10 reassemble 135:7 reauthorization 6:16	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19 108:10 202:18 244:20 288:9 recognized 10:3 25:13 211:18 recognizes 103:1 244:12 recognizing 236:17 recommend 266:9 recommendation 58:3 63:21 129:22 214:21 266:7 recommendations 24:19 29:6 57:15</pre>
<pre>realizes 204:10 really 2:6 4:17,18   6:20 7:10 15:21   16:8 17:6,19   19:4,22 35:9   39:19,20 40:6,12   54:4,11 58:12   68:18 76:21 78:6   82:19 87:15 97:2   117:2,3,19 119:9   123:22 132:7 134:7   136:1 137:21 138:6   141:12 147:8   148:20 154:21   155:1,8,9 156:5   161:17 162:21   163:1,12,15 164:9</pre>	229:16 283:17 295:6 296:20 reasonable 42:20 91:17 129:15 149:3 180:16 301:15 302:11 reasonably 160:6 268:11 reasons 16:13 58:1 80:19 156:18 231:3 251:13 288:19 304:10 reassemble 135:7 reauthorization 6:16 rebuilt 154:10	<pre>recipe 59:16 recognition 110:9 recognize 86:19    108:10 202:18    244:20 288:9 recognized 10:3    25:13 211:18 recognizes 103:1    244:12 recognizing 236:17 recommend 266:9 recommendation 58:3    63:21 129:22    214:21 266:7 recommendations</pre>

218:6,17 266:5 recommended 26:15 27:4 28:4,19 29:20 58:1 65:1 70:20 146:14,16 216:5,9,14,16 218:10 **reconvene** 223:12 **record** 169:21 170:1 308:8 recording 272:7 308:6,8 **red** 55:20 57:7 89:21 132:14 136:16 168:4,8,9,10 238:6,15 **reduce** 103:14 105:19 181:19 232:10 244:9,16 265:11 289:10,11 **reduced** 53:10 91:7 106:15 146:17 185:9 308:7 **reduces** 59:2 66:18 **reducing** 35:16,18 44:20 102:17 104:19 reduction 57:3,13 217:5 reemphasize 202:6 reexamining 256:13 **reference** 25:10,15 26:10,21 27:2 28:1,3,17 29:1 30:21 31:7,22 41:9 50:11 110:6 118:14 123:22 230:6 240:7,15,17 241:6

242:1 245:14 246:18,20,22 268:10 272:6 287:9,12 299:1,18,22 referenced 105:14 **referred** 103:15 108:19 229:17 298:9 referring 145:9 278:20 **refers** 29:12 30:7,9 31:18 256:6,9 reflect 124:8 218:15 reflecting 106:6 **refocus** 195:10 refrigerated 231:16 refusing 152:4 regarding 14:4 16:14 63:9 261:13 Regardless 212:10 regimens 245:2 **register** 252:19 registration 243:12 253:6 regression 29:19 272:16 **regular** 81:8 121:10 174:9,12 **regulate** 21:6 178:1 **regulated** 21:9,10 regulates 22:7 regulation 14:2 32:2 63:8 regulations 21:5

22:13 256:22 regulatory 75:18 101:2 152:14,15 243:7 289:2 299:9 re-instills 221:19 reiterate 266:6 reiterated 234:9 reiterating 221:14 **relate** 172:3 **related** 9:6,10,16 225:22 238:9 239:12 308:9 **relates** 228:16 230:5 284:14 relationship 287:9 **relative** 30:19 89:16 108:5 117:17,18 182:8 235:14 246:9 250:16,18 274:21 308:12 relatively 12:19 122:9 236:14 274:2 **release** 251:8 **released** 211:20 218:1,2 relevance 182:9 **relevant** 52:1,19 **reliable** 178:16 266:18 303:4 reliably 59:18 60:12 185:21 258:21 **rely** 146:8 **remain** 7:21 263:6 266:13 282:19

remainder 107:15 **replaced** 153:19 re-purging 78:20 remaining 251:21 replicates 29:17 **requests** 152:17 **remains** 251:22 **report** 34:19 42:7 **require** 8:22 10:4 43:13,15 22:13,18 24:12 **remark** 287:15 204:8,12,13,16 67:1 129:16,17 remarkable 61:16 206:18 207:1 219:8 130:3 132:19 67:14 269:14 298:15 145:20 171:3 188:11 247:17 **remarks** 259:21 reportable 29:18 248:15 265:10 305:18 **reported** 16:18 303:18 remember 70:4 134:2 195:16 **required** 32:4 50:15 138:16 182:20 205:15,19 64:19 106:10 251:4 208:5,6,15 118:19 159:4 212:11,14,22 remembering 229:5 265:16 306:16 233:3 reporter 206:3 requirement 166:18 207:3 308:1,22 **remind** 3:9 98:16 301:11 reporting 116:15 **reminded** 256:15 requirements 1:7 204:5,6 205:5,20 **reminder** 306:5 3:22 10:5,11 208:9 209:3 237:9 14:18,21 23:9 reminding 134:21 **reports** 9:8,10 39:21 55:5 101:13 **reminds** 153:16 132:13 205:4 103:6 108:14 113:4 265:18 206:21 207:5,11,13 140:5 144:18 219:5 222:6 **remove** 221:8 278:5 145:17 154:14 155:21 158:10 287:19 304:2,8 represent 12:4 251:1 253:2 255:1 100:11,12 228:20 **REMS (ph** 264:21 259:4 296:12 representative 34:6 **repeat** 43:18 302:13 306:16 40:9 57:21 61:20 44:1,8,14 145:22 requires 23:21 24:3 112:18 306:20 repeatability 25:4 37:4 129:19 representatives 49:6,10 54:12 245:11,15 108:21 269:7 248:11,13 repeated 25:6 represented 42:4 43:14,22 requiring 60:13 44:3,6,10,12 48:22 representing 102:1 248:14 50:4,18 92:12 238:10 242:9 research 13:22 repetition 61:3 represents 220:17 18:21 101:2 115:21 136:9 261:17 repetitions 289:22 reproduced 89:13 293:18 repetitious 183:14 reproducibility **Residency** 6:2 54:19 39:14 **replace** 88:15,17 resistance 140:21 100:2,4 reproducible 36:18

<b>resolved</b> 153:11	26:1,4,9,10,12,20,	revision 10:14
resource 286:8	22 27:2,5 28:2,3,5,14,22	revisions 109:22
respect 71:13 260:5	29:13,16 31:4,5	revolutionized
respects 119:9	36:18 60:1,11	202:19
respond 281:20	64:4,11 65:3,6 67:7 68:16 69:10	<b>Reynaud's</b> 234:12
responding 153:6	73:5,19,20 74:14	Richard 161:12
response 9:4 17:10	79:6 93:11 94:5	<b>rid</b> 188:7 189:22
21:1 65:3 82:17	97:10 105:14,16	<b>ringers</b> 223:13
203:14 293:12	107:7,13 110:4 128:5 134:19	<b>rise</b> 98:12
responsibilities	156:18 165:3 186:7	<b>rises</b> 93:13
12:22	203:20,21 204:2	<b>risk</b> 8:12
responsibility	209:16 216:22 218:15 225:6	21:12,13,14
198:6	230:15 235:10,12	22:8,9,17 58:19
<b>responsible</b> 5:13 298:20	237:9 238:19	59:2 82:4 84:17,18 91:18 93:12 95:7
	277:20	149:7 151:4 194:5
responsive 149:5	<pre>re-testing 156:1</pre>	220:5 222:17 223:3
rest 121:1 251:8	<pre>retinopathy 56:7</pre>	243:10 264:13,16
restrictions 246:6	57:8	265:4,10,11,12 266:10 290:12
result 15:7 22:8,10	retirement 224:7	303:9,11 304:1
65:14,17 70:1 77:22 92:20 100:15	retrieves 170:2	306:22
106:10 109:1	returning 3:4	risk-based 21:11
137:13 144:14	<b>Reuse</b> 196:5	<b>risks</b> 11:19
146:9 204:2 205:18,19	<b>revenue</b> 34:19,20	Riverside 224:1
217:15,18,19	reverence 25:10	<b>road</b> 190:10,11
230:17 232:11,13	review 3:8 24:3	245:11 280:21
233:14 234:13 235:3 237:8 238:11	40:9 81:10 110:10	roadmap 252:21
241:6 248:17,20	111:14 285:22	253:2
259:14 261:21	<b>reviewed</b> 194:11	Robert 13:8
262:16 282:16	reviewer 20:8	robustness 105:1
284:9 291:4 296:11	<pre>reviewing 24:22</pre>	Roche 116:2 243:8
resulted 11:1	<b>reviews</b> 140:11,13	Rochester 242:15
resulting 37:5	225 <b>:</b> 11	<b>rock</b> 279:14
results 15:20	<b>revise</b> 254:2	role 6:13 56:11
25:7,9	revising 110:2	70:13 244:21

252:19	sacrifice 138:1	39:1 68:14
<b>roles</b> 243:7	283:16	71:13,16 73:4
Ronald 154:12,16	<pre>sacrificed 187:18</pre>	104:12 124:10 159:16,22 196:19
<pre>room 8:14 22:5 77:2 171:6 176:4 219:12 227:20 231:4 236:14</pre>	<pre>safe 13:3 53:21   133:18 262:11   263:9,21 266:18   297:7,13 303:2 safely 13:3 262:21</pre>	230:5 233:4,15 234:3 235:17 237:13 240:9 242:6 248:15 258:6 268:12 272:5
rooms 7:4 22:5	<b>safety</b> 5:14,15	<pre>sampling 251:8</pre>
<pre>root 121:14 roughly 12:2 133:9 routine 68:7</pre>	191:14 193:1 211:21,22 212:5 214:8 220:18	San 136:5 153:21 243:19 Sandberg 61:21
241:16,20	242:22 288:22	_
row 40:17 293:15	306:18	<b>satellite</b> 78:5,13
Royal 54:22 ruin 163:9	<b>safety's</b> 53:19 <b>sake</b> 53:19	saw 16:22 27:10 43:17 92:22 93:1
	salicylate 197:15	262:17
<b>rule</b> 130:12	sample 24:2	<b>scale</b> 279:14
<b>rules</b> 280:18	28:15,20 30:20	scattered 39:2
run 8:11 28:1,11	31:5 34:22 36:16	scenario 87:13
49:17 84:12 87:17	38:11 39:3,4	scenarios 89:4
143:15 162:6 234:17 248:2	43:6,7 47:11	scheduled 264:3
259:12 261:4	49:6,10,14,17 78:19 108:4	schemes 232:16
268:2,3 284:6	146:3,20 159:22	240:21
292:15 305:9	160:5 196:9,10	Schleis 261:8 264:1
<pre>running 123:5 143:11 222:13 284:6</pre>	225:22 228:8 229:8 230:19 233:3,9,11,13 235:1,11,17	school 13:10,16 33:14 54:21 57:17 242:15,17
runs 178:11	237:19,21 238:3,18	Science 5:19 136:7
Rutherford	245:12 258:20	
112:16,17 155:14	272:8,18 290:22	Sciences 194:1
S	291:1 samples 15:16 24:1	scientific 20:7 276:4 288:17,19
Sacks 54:15 55:5,6	25:17,19 26:22	scientists 187:2
71:12,17 72:14,22 73:22 75:1 76:17	27:2,19,22 28:11 29:1,8,10 30:18	sclerosis 262:5
79:11 197:6 254:7 281:10 282:18	31:1 38:13,15,18,22	Scott 33:13,17,18 48:20 49:8,18,21

(866)448-DEPO www.CapitalReportingCompany.com ©2010

52:3 53:13 54:2	284:6,7	selected 4:13
57:20 65:9 72:3 141:8 158:18 159:19 170:19	<pre>secretion 85:10 section 110:2</pre>	<b>selecting</b> 120:6,8 122:8
194:21 196:17 291:5 292:3,8,13 293:7	225:19 256:6,7,8 security 153:22 154:1,5	<pre>selection 127:9     273:3 selective 210:11</pre>
<pre>screen 83:7 125:10 210:8 234:20 screening 23:8 148:20 149:2,5,14,16 150:1,10 scrunch 18:14</pre>	seeing 43:19 50:4 73:20 83:2,7 93:6 145:10 152:6 153:5,15 154:22 210:20 225:4 227:11 237:1 240:15 265:5,7 267:3	<pre>selective 210:11 self 9:2 12:8 14:21     36:12 41:5 55:14     56:11 57:19     59:7,11 63:12 74:2     103:4,20 107:19     111:7 254:15     255:1,3 256:22 self-blood 15:11</pre>
<pre>se 244:13 search 206:7 207:15,17,21</pre>	<pre>seeking 287:20 seem 47:1 155:12 </pre>	<pre>self-glucose 119:7 self-monitoring</pre>
<b>seats</b> 3:4 79:15 135:15 193:20 223:16	179:16 191:20 255:7 269:17 289:12 seemed 132:7 181:18	56:16 57:22 62:5,6 63:19 65:13 70:16 80:5 108:12 202:15 300:14
<pre>second 4:1 5:5 12:20 37:16 49:6 74:3 75:17 79:17,19 84:15 87:5 91:22 99:3</pre>	<pre>seems 51:11 62:13   66:8 112:7 152:7,9   156:2 175:12   182:5,9 265:12   289:5</pre>	<pre>self-test 107:10     254:3 self-tester 106:12     257:3</pre>
127:1 137:10 170:14 188:4 191:12 192:8 194:19 201:21 223:16,18,20 224:21 228:9 301:18 302:6	<pre>seen 39:15 44:9 81:12 127:19 154:10 159:13 168:12 212:12 225:2 230:8 232:20 273:1</pre>	<pre>self-testers 102:20     293:1 self-testing 102:22     103:12 108:9     253:12 254:21 send 82:10 146:2</pre>
second-generation	<b>sees</b> 144:19	178:5 202:4 221:13
235:21 secondly 78:10 119:12 231:4 301:8 seconds 138:3,4 228:2 233:10,12 248:17,18,19 281:17,18 283:7,11	<pre>segment 177:9 segments 177:8 seismic 153:19,22 154:1,5 select 119:10 122:11 177:16</pre>	<pre>senior 101:2,10 sense 80:12 104:8 151:22 153:7 170:14 302:20 sensitive 157:16,18 203:3 216:2 238:13</pre>

250:4,6 296:5	serving 243:5
<pre>sensitivity 88:8 215:21 sensor 90:6,11 91:11 95:1,11 164:2 183:17 247:10</pre>	<pre>session 3:5,22 4:1,12 9:17 10:15 11:7 32:18 79:17,19 135:14,16 193:15,19,21 194:18,19 195:11 197:22 198:3</pre>
sensors 14:5 90:15	201:2,6 223:16,18
<b>sent</b> 150:6 159:22 167:8	277:14 281:12 305:17 306:1
sentence 81:11	<b>sessions</b> 3:3,21 4:6 296:9
<pre>Sentinel 6:17 separate 23:20     32:17 111:21,22     147:4 203:7 208:4     218:5 270:9 separated 73:14 separately 23:22</pre>	<pre>setting 9:12 35:15     36:4 37:1 45:20     51:19 52:1,2,6     109:13 111:1,3     139:19 142:9 146:1     152:14 185:10     255:6 269:9 305:6</pre>
76:14 119:14 September 5:13	<pre>settings 2:11 9:3 11:10 20:22</pre>
<pre>sequellae 22:1 series 81:22 121:12 266:10</pre>	23:5,13 37:12 38:10 39:5,11 46:5 47:11,17 109:2,6 158:7 180:3
<pre>serious 124:19 133:19 177:1 207:13,17 211:1</pre>	203:12,16 258:17 291:8 296:13,15 seven 172:2 301:10
213:18 215:9 222:21 223:8 seriously 139:20,21	<pre>seventeen 38:3 several 13:12 63:3</pre>
222:4 289:10 serum 75:14 228:7 245:12,15,17	81:17 84:16 138:1 198:22 211:19,20 212:18 225:18,21 234:9 239:6 252:13
262:13 served 6:13 13:12	254:6 258:7 267:5 281:11
194:9 253:7 Services 279:21	<pre>severe 58:22 59:10   60:2,13 67:15   197:4 211:2 215:9</pre>

**shape** 128:10 **share** 3:18 12:10,11 102:11 113:20 290:7 **shared** 254:19 **shares** 244:5 sharing 88:9 **shed** 12:10 **shelf** 196:3,4 **she's** 140:5 **shift** 79:1 99:14 100:6,7,13 **shifts** 233:1 **shipped** 221:18 **shock** 248:8,9,10 **short** 82:22 99:17 262:7 267:12 shortage 34:1 225:15 **shorter** 282:2 283:9 **shortly** 264:20 **shot** 98:11 141:8 174:9 **shots** 294:12 **showed** 28:4 29:4 47:6 98:13 99:13 **showing** 55:19 87:4 124:14,15 205:1 **shown** 17:16 57:12 62:8 90:6 96:6,8 106:20 107:7 118:16 119:1 124:3 207:20 249:1 **shows** 24:17 61:17 64:7 95:19 249:8

275:6,19 Shuren 2:15 5:10,19 6:13,20,21 100:22 **shut** 154:9 **shy** 136:22 141:11 **sic** 104:12 **sick** 76:21 159:11 273:7 **sign** 190:15 306:7 signal 212:19 significance 107:10 significant 3:5 15:20 18:15 34:20 36:2 41:9 51:20 67:12 105:22 106:6,14 155:19 196:4 198:15,17 230:15 265:7 273:17 significantly 24:11 57:9 67:9 120:14 135:3 137:9 237:14 282:20 **silico** 80:7 84:3,4,6,13 87:20 88:21 92:5 96:4 silkscreen-printed 125:8 **similar** 22:22 43:3 95:4 161:3 169:2 171:6 206:12 218:5 235:21 255:4 256:5 257:10 295:12,14,17 similarity 94:12 Similarly 117:9 Simmons 72:21 74:13

**simple** 12:19 53:1 92:1 139:11 140:9 167:3 246:14 278:21 279:3 simply 53:21 78:7 271:9 **simulate** 84:16 85:12,13,16,19 87:12 196:18 299:18 simulated 86:1 93:16 simulating 86:3 97:16 simulation 17:21 80:3 82:16 83:1,11,16 84:10 85:21 95:5 99:8 simulations 83:8 98:22 99:21 **simulator** 88:12,14 89:10 92:3 100:9 simulators 105:15 simultaneously 159:21 single 23:18 40:18 56:21 79:2 104:3 118:5 141:10 142:9 145:5 175:6 198:14 206:18 207:1,2 208:20 285:7 **sit** 54:9 **site** 24:9,14 28:9,12,15,17 35:7 104:16,17 234:14 235:22 250:2 **sites** 22:4 24:6,10

**sites** 22:4 24:6,10 35:9 43:7

**sits** 245:19 **sitting** 120:9 136:3 279:10 **situation** 145:12 186:11 223:6 241:17,19 279:10 287:3 situations 15:9 84:17 95:2 187:9 **six** 35:2,7 87:16 98:6 120:19 121:5,6 129:13 147:22 164:16 174:8,10 178:13 212:15 237:22 238:1 239:22 **size** 105:5 108:4 125:7,8 128:9 189:11 191:21 258:19 281:3 290:21 Skeens 222:18,19 264:7 **skills** 46:7 **slide** 20:4 29:4 83:10 215:4 243:20 249:6 **slides** 142:8 246:16 281:11 slightly 80:9 184:6 **slope** 189:16 **small** 17:7 25:21 42:5 45:7 113:19 115:15 125:7 141:16,20 143:9 172:13 213:15,21 214:5 246:3 251:17 258:2 281:15,16

291:2

<pre>smaller 11:14 20:20 34:15 104:11 105:5</pre>	260:17 280:16 293:12,14	<b>source</b> 145:5 200:9 225:1 237:14
127:21 156:15 282:13 290:22	<b>somehow</b> 204:10 207:1 235:22	<b>sources</b> 116:12 125:4,6 197:7
smallest 248:14	someone 137:1	200:2 250:10 277:7
<b>smart</b> 289:16 291:2	156:13 164:1	<b>south</b> 54:19 56:2
<b>SMBG</b> 85:17 92:4,13	275:20 303:12	66:11 260:10
93:5 95:4 96:6	somewhat 36:14	Southerland 171:21
97:11 176:8,21	205:3 239:4 258:4	173:19 174:15
177:4 247:11	somewhere 48:15	176:3
<b>SMBGs</b> 177:3	94:10 119:19	<b>space</b> 191:6 230:7
SmithKline 224:2	167:18	257:20
<b>soccer</b> 259:12	<b>son</b> 137:8,16	<b>span</b> 25:17 29:3
software 31:16	<b>son's</b> 172:4	31:2,3 87:22
84:7,11 87:17	sophisticated	<b>spare</b> 136:9
105:17 189:22	138:19	<pre>sparingly 248:4</pre>
267:8	<b>sorry</b> 61:5 71:8	<b>spark</b> 148:16 172:1
<b>sold</b> 205:10	73:22 113:15 148:9	<b>speak</b> 7:10 17:2
<b>Soldo</b> 51:10	169:13 293:11 296:2 305:2	55:8 101:20 108:16
113:15,17 114:6,12		192:7 193:16 305:3
268:15	<b>sort</b> 33:21 36:18 40:7 46:13 53:22	<b>speaker</b> 20:6 33:12
<b>sole</b> 97:7	40.7 40.13 53.22 54:3 118:16 127:21	54:14 55:17
<b>solely</b> 116:8	130:22 139:17	60:20,21 79:18 100:19 114:21
<b>solid</b> 279:15	140:4 141:20 149:6	115:20 116:6 201:6
solution 211:14	169:4 185:13 201:16 212:17	223:20 300:7
217:5 248:2 261:4	220:17 226:3,19	speakers 3:16
266:20 267:12	228:17 229:9,12	4:10,12 11:22
solutions 23:16	230:5 267:20	135:18 195:11
31:21 105:1 161:21	269:13 273:9,18	197:3 242:8 245:5 305:19
211:16 262:18 277:17 289:2	275:11 280:20 286:8	
solving 12:12	sorts 281:7	<b>speaking</b> 33:8 49:6
-		<b>speaks</b> 191:10
<b>somebody</b> 20:12 60:14 66:13 71:7	sought 48:1	<b>spec</b> 123:21
132:9 147:22	<b>sounds</b> 156:2 158:5 222:3,5	241:11,15
151:13,15 165:19		<b>special</b> 6:10 297:22
181:9 209:12	<b>soup</b> 78:18	<pre>specialized 79:22</pre>

**specific** 24:12 72:7 **spread** 25:5 42:19 111:6 112:2 113:21,22 118:9,19 83:21 97:14 99:22 43:11 90:16 279:16 119:15,19 122:20 108:12 109:5 291:13 126:10,11,21,22 128:21 146:21 **spring** 36:17 212:6 128:20 129:10 170:14 198:14 square 121:14 205:13 231:5 130:7,22 236:22 278:4 131:4,18,19 152:15 **squares** 121:15 180:17 183:17 281:22 **squeeze** 19:4,6 188:5 189:1 specifically 15:11 172:10 191:2,3,9,19,21 85:6 103:2 114:10 **St** 13:18 75:7 134:5 192:1 193:6 244:19 181:6 262:11 141:14 183:9 246:22 253:17 277:16 190:9,10 283:3 256:4 268:20 specifications 291:5 269:2,8 270:4 61:10 229:3 251:12 271:10,12 288:9,12 **stability** 105:11 290:11 specificity 227:17 236:10 303:12,14,16 304:8 229:17 230:18 stabilizer 211:17 231:19 236:16 standardization **stable** 28:14 92:5 249:11 40:21 55:2 175:2,5 227:19,20 231:4,15 194:8 199:9 299:15 specimen 196:8 236:14 237:1 197:8 234:4 standardize 199:10 299:22 298:14,22 specimens 22:2 **stack** 121:13 271:22 268:1 standardized stacking 270:13 128:17,22 129:1 spectrometry 245:7 199:13 256:21 **staff** 78:12 200:11 **spectrum** 148:20 216:19 221:19 standardizes 300:3 **speed** 190:13 283:16 **stage** 298:17 standardizing 199:8 **spelling** 19:16,17 **stages** 286:12 standards 10:3,8 206:9 14:19 24:16 25:14 staggering 8:9 **spend** 39:16 243:21 29:21 31:13 73:18 stakeholders 2:8 **spending** 15:1 260:8 75:22 76:11 90:12 297:11 108:17 110:10 **spent** 224:14 **standard** 10:1,13 111:5,7,14 118:10 **spiked** 25:21 25:13,14 26:15 119:17 132:18 37:9 51:13 152:10,14,15,17,18 **spoke** 49:5 78:16 89:11,14 90:17 153:10,12,16 154:3 250:3 254:8 101:17 102:21 164:14 166:6 181:8 **spoken** 249:10 103:5,10,12 183:12 192:19 **sporadic** 146:19 106:9,21 107:6 252:20 255:9 270:8 273:16 274:1,14 108:11,15 109:11 271:11 288:17 110:1,2,7,9,13,16 290:6,16,18 306:10 sporadically 273:16

standards-based	299:4,7	<pre>storage 35:1</pre>
288:5	<pre>stationary 248:8</pre>	<b>stores</b> 262:2
standing 84:4	<pre>statistic 263:2</pre>	<b>story</b> 73:11
<pre>standpoint 15:5</pre>	statistical 17:6	<b>STR</b> 296:7
<b>stands</b> 206:14	26:2 28:1 251:9,12	<pre>straight 29:17</pre>
<b>Star</b> 131:1	<pre>statistically 67:12</pre>	Strategic 6:19
<b>start</b> 3:2,5 34:11 40:10 45:22	<pre>statistics 8:12 138:16</pre>	<b>strategy</b> 228:17
46:2,20 48:13,18	status 81:3 179:3	<b>straw</b> 254:18
84:20 93:6 95:2	stay 61:4 216:18	<b>street</b> 190:18
123:12,13,21 125:2 137:3 161:6 173:7	_	strength 73:12
192:21 193:2	<pre>staying 200:8 stays 222:22</pre>	stress 16:16 136:14
270:13,16 277:16	-	<b>stretch</b> 83:11
306:5	steady 28:13 293:19	<b>Strfrom</b> 296:7
<pre>started 7:7,8 39:7 84:22 190:16 240:15</pre>	<pre>Steering 55:2 step 53:19 54:3</pre>	<b>stricter</b> 301:2 304:8
	85:6 142:3	strictly 3:2 15:3
<b>starting</b> 175:12 181:18 185:14	<b>Stephen</b> 100:20	- strides 102:16
190:20 278:22	<pre>steps 12:20 142:4     266:10,11 296:22</pre>	<b>strikes</b> 187:14
starts 92:5	Steve 101:9 184:13	strip 23:19,20
<b>startup</b> 113:19	185:12	31:21 36:16,17,20
224:3,8	stick 27:19 39:6	52:5 78:19 105:19 125:11,12 127:9,12
<pre>state 21:21 28:13     33:9 98:17 197:1</pre>	<b>sticker</b> 265:17	129:2 130:11 132:9
<b>stated</b> 34:14 81:10 269:8 285:20	<b>stickers</b> 265:16 267:7	146:22 162:11,12 163:8 164:20 172:11 190:2,5
statement 81:16	<pre>sticking 204:21</pre>	212:12 231:6
127:16 251:12	sticks 24:5	233:9,10,13
270:4 276:3	<b>stiffer</b> 154:15	249:15,16 250:19,20
statements 308:6	<pre>stipulating 160:14</pre>	251:6,11,21
<pre>state-of-the 63:7</pre>	<b>stood</b> 34:2 137:1	284:5,8 291:1
<pre>state-of-the-art 33:17</pre>	<b>stop</b> 131:21 193:9 291:20	<b>strips</b> 23:15 34:22 37:10 43:2
<pre>states 20:17 55:22 86:20 255:20</pre>	stopped 167:6	50:9,15,20 54:9 129:19,20 131:12,13 134:18

147:10 161:17,19	289:9,19 293:17	success 205:3
162:9 163:9 181:5	studying 90:15	<pre>successfully 270:22</pre>
191:4 195:18,19,21	stuff 149:18 280:20	succession 134:14
196:1,2,5,7 197:19 205:10 212:9		
205:10 212:9 215:6,18,19	subcutaneously	<pre>sufficiently 286:5</pre>
216:7,9 217:16	86:21	<b>sugar</b> 16:15 19:20
218:12,19 219:1	<b>subject</b> 28:12 59:12	37:4 66:8 67:22
227:19,22 232:21	87:19 97:17,20,21	69:6 90:13
233:1 250:17	100:10 276:6	172:5,12,19 173:3
251:6,20 252:7,14	293:11	174:2,8 191:14,17
255:18	<pre>subjects 84:3,4</pre>	210:20 276:21
260:6,7,12,14,15	85:10 87:21 88:2	294:1
266:8 276:19	93:8 97:14,17,19	<b>sugars</b> 150:2 197:17
303:6,17	100:16 166:8	210:12,15,18
strong 45:17 73:7	167:11	211:13 217:11
110:1,14	submission 285:21	236:18 262:16
stronger 214:16	submissions 9:20	305:8
-	24:21,22 126:13	<b>suggest</b> 47:1 72:5
strongly 102:8 107:18	submit 7:20 76:4	76:8 122:14
	79:3 89:3	177:7,13 273:22
<b>struck</b> 289:3		274:4
<b>struggle</b> 163:14	<pre>subsequent 57:12</pre>	suggested 65:8
177:19,21 275:2	<pre>substance 165:14</pre>	118:20 160:10
struggled 214:1	199:6 221:3,16	303:12
struggling 73:1	276:13	<pre>suggesting 76:18</pre>
	<pre>substances 10:16</pre>	143:18,20 177:8
studied 81:21 95:3	30:4,6,8,10,12,13,	238:16
142:12 262:1	16 44:20 125:15	suggestion 42:1
studies 16:1 17:21	197:11 201:15	177:14 191:1,2
25:8,16 27:17	213:3 221:5,9	268:8 279:21
28:10 29:7 34:4	226:3 232:1 250:5 276:13,14 296:17	suggestions 34:7,11
37:17,20,21 38:2		76:22 275:13
39:3 40:10 44:16	substantial 130:1	<pre>suggests 133:2,21</pre>
45:10 46:22 50:2 52:3 57:21 66:6	131:11 251:18	149:4
81:17 82:7 86:3,7	<pre>substantially 22:18</pre>	
88:16,19 100:4	51:2 237:12	<b>suited</b> 112:19
106:20 144:21	substitutes 221:10	Sullivan 34:18
158:18 162:4,5	subsystem 83:21	<b>sum</b> 121:15
171:3,20 198:13	-	summarize 70:11
248:22 256:7 272:4	<b>succeed</b> 214:13	

114:8	SureStep 224:6	23:15,20,21
summary 32:10 131:9	236:2	26:3,4,5,7,16
<b>sun</b> 260:18	<pre>surface 168:6 236:2</pre>	42:12,16,18,19 43:10 81:3 85:8
sunset 301:12	surgical 52:13	96:20 98:6 110:3
302:12	66:20	128:2 145:12
<pre>superior 61:14</pre>	surprised 160:2	150:12 177:17 179:7 184:9 188:11
<pre>superiority 16:1</pre>	161:11 301:20	189:9 204:5,6
19:15	<pre>surprising 98:8</pre>	215:7 220:16 227:6
supplementary	<pre>surveillance 220:20</pre>	230:6 231:7,11,18
160:22	<b>survey</b> 17:12	232:6 233:7 235:5
<pre>supply 260:13,19</pre>	138:7,15	236:8,11 239:13,15,19
support 10:7 106:17	196:13,15,18 199:16	240:17 241:1 248:3
109:7,14		262:6 271:15
111:5,7,16 256:15	susceptibility	290:19 302:22
269:18 291:9	105:12 106:15 109:4	303:1
<pre>supportive 110:14</pre>		systemic 111:14
supports 103:13	susceptible 248:8	146:13 274:2
108:13 110:1	<b>suspect</b> 192:10	<b>systems</b> 15:4,17
253:13	272:10 281:4	20:1,17 21:4,15,17
supposed 66:4	sustain 108:2	22:16 24:17 32:20
140:22 166:7	sustained 186:17	80:3 83:14 102:3,5 216:21 218:12
268:10	<b>Sweden</b> 296:7	224:6 232:12,14
<pre>suppressing 238:19</pre>	<b>switch</b> 292:14	233:7 234:22 237:9
<b>sure</b> 7:13 32:3 34:4	<b>switched</b> 209:10	240:15 242:1 244:7
70:9 75:1 77:16	216:9	253:12 261:15
112:3 119:21 128:4		268:6
130:13 132:11,12	symbols 105:3	<b>system's</b> 261:5
135:12 136:15,17 145:1 146:3 160:10	symptoms 59:7,8	Systems 79:22
180:12 182:10	syndrome 160:16	<b>Syva</b> 224:1
184:15 193:1	234:12	
208:11 214:2	<b>synonym</b> 206:10	Т
218:7,13,22	<b>syringe</b> 113:1 148:2	table 257:19
241:3,7,17 261:7 263:20 267:9	155 <b>:</b> 21	tables 26:19
273:19 276:16	syringes 155:17	<b>tabular</b> 28:4,19
277:10 282:10	192:14	tackling 220:19
285:10 298:2 304:9	<b>system</b> 16:3 21:19	taking 118:5 137:12

139:21 148:10	176:1
169:18 210:21	194:2
221:16,20	226:8
<b>talk</b> 14:17 15:9	234:3
17:2 18:6 19:13	263:1
20:14 21:3 33:15	278:1
34:8 35:20 48:2	talks
55:3,9,10 57:19	tangen
60:6 65:20 74:2 76:13 80:4 82:21	target
89:8 91:2 98:3,9	19:8
100:3 101:5	70 <b>:</b> 8
115:10,17	117:1
116:3,10,13,14	target
117:1 119:9,13	279:1
128:9,10 134:8	target
138:7 140:4 147:7,13 152:17	Tarryt
175:14 184:10,20	task 3
185:12 189:2	taught
201:2,9,14,16,19	295 <b>:</b> 2
204:14 224:10	
231:19 232:2,19 237:3 280:4	teache
talked 18:12 32:10	team $1$
51:5 80:14 84:2	tease
95:17 118:8,12	techni
124:2 132:5,6	247:1
135:1 138:11	techni
157:15 250:12 273:7 293:15	techni
306:10	techni
talking 4:3 7:7,11	techni
15:1,2 17:22 20:1	140:2
80:10 89:19 100:14	251:1
112:11,20 114:7	techni
117:2 119:7,8	
125:1,2 128:12,13	<b>techno</b> 61:15
132:8 135:4 136:17 141:13 143:4	
141:13 143:4 144:17 147:8 156:1	techno:
158:10 172:13	14:12
174:10,18	techno

18,19 182:18 22 202:7,8,11 8 228:2 231:20 3 239:21 18 275:22 11 283:5 296:9 161:16 175:3 tially 164:12 18:10,11,14 67:4 69:19 81:1 92:16,18 14 302:1 ing 83:20 18 **s** 16:17 own 72:21 9:10 79:2 294:10 20 **s** 163:10 71:21 254:20 251:19 cal 228:14 14 **cally** 182:5 **cian** 247:19 cians 246:11 que 126:1 21 141:3 10 ques 208:9 **logical** 12:18 5 115:9 logically logies 10:16

11:5 76:6 110:18 203:9 215:17 218:14 227:5,7 229:3,7 239:13 244:6 245:4 251:15 270:12 274:7 277:18 284:2 301:1 technologist 40:18 62:16 technologists 61:9,19 62:2,12,15,21 technology 25:14 53:6,7 101:11,18 102:8 103:15 105:14 106:6,17 114:22 116:13 126:5 136:6,7 153:1 154:20 172:18 201:12 210:9,11 218:21 219:1 225:3,5 227:10 230:13 238:10,12 247:11 259:16 268:18 269:17 270:20 276:16,17 278:1,2,13 279:6,7,10,14 281:12 284:4 289:9 291:12 298:6,8 teenagers 88:22 temperature 31:11 76:1 105:11 108:5 125:13 127:4 196:7 226:13,20 227:20 230:11 231:4 236:14 246:7

250:16,18 259:10,19 260:6 261:1 294:6

temperatures 196:8	282:1 286:13,16	testing 24:9,14
<b>ten</b> 3:10 7:6	295:18 303:17	28:10 35:8 43:17
14:12,14 37:21	terribly 275:7	68:20 71:18 72:6
63:20 81:18 82:5	<b>test</b> 00:0 02:15 10	78:4 80:2 103:21
91:15,17 95:5	test 22:9 23:15,19	104:16,17,20
117:21,22	31:20 50:10 66:17	105:2,6 106:2
118:2,3,4 120:19	76:6 83:14 84:17	107:20 108:20
121:2 122:2,5	104:11 105:16,18	111:8 116:15,18
123:8,14	108:3 123:13,16	123:19 127:18,20
126:11,18,22	129:14,20 134:16	128:1,4,20,21
133:9,14 154:6	137:13 142:11	129:12,18
158:11 174:12	146:22 149:7	130:17,19,20
176:10,14,18	156:5,11 161:17,19	131:18,19 137:5,17
181:17,22	162:7,8,9 163:8,9	139:7,9,14 141:12
183:1,4,7 184:22	166:7,19 167:11	146:14,17 147:15
185:16 186:13,14	172:11 173:20	148:18 164:2
212:22 249:1	195:18 197:19	208:17 213:22
281:17 301:4,21	200:18 204:2	214:10 218:18
	205:10 212:9,12	240:11 244:18
tend 81:15 146:2	214:2 215:6,18,19	246:3 248:10 251:5
152:17 160:3 169:3	216:6,9 217:15	254:10,15 255:2,4
233:4,5 235:12	218:11,12,19	256:22 298:21
247:15 277:7 305:8	222:13 226:14 227:19 228:1	299:1
tends 235:13 297:15	230:10 231:6	<b>tests</b> 112:5
term 26:3 31:18		133:9,11,18
77:17 96:12	232:21,22 233:9,10 238:18 246:13	200:17,19 205:11
244:10,11,15	247:1 248:3	207:7 246:10
267:12	249:15,16	252:9,11 255:5
	250:9,17,19,20	258:5,22 275:19
terminology 208:2	251:5,6,11,20,21	278:11 282:16
terms 34:12 35:9	252:6,14 258:20	<b>Texas</b> 112:18
81:12 82:3 96:7,9	259:12,14 261:4	
108:8 114:1 117:4	266:8 276:13,14,19	<b>text</b> 257:2
119:4 120:6 122:8	281:17 284:6 289:4	<b>TGC</b> 37:7,9,17 39:3
123:6 124:4 134:22	291:2,4 302:21	<b>thank</b> 6:21 7:15
144:17 147:20	303:6,17	13:4,6 14:11 20:15
150:10 153:1,2	tested 28:16 50:9	33:5,18 54:13
160:20 161:9 168:7	52:9 89:2 126:7	55:6,7 71:9 76:16
179:9 207:15 208:7	52:9 89:2 126:7 158:8 166:13	88:8 100:17,18
226:20 236:19	178:17 251:7 252:8	101:8,19 111:12
239:10 245:20	255:14	114:16,18 115:13
246:7 271:17		134:3 135:5,13
276:11 277:21	<b>testers</b> 133:4	148:6 165:1 167:12

176:3 193:7,8,10 194:15,17 201:13 220:10 223:9,10 224:13 240:1 242:7 243:14 252:16 259:22 260:2 261:6 264:1 266:2,3 268:7,14 283:1 285:9 290:5 304:21 305:19,21 307:9 thanks 155:13 193:14 220:11 that'll 261:5 that's 17:7 18:2,3 20:4 38:6 41:8 42:18 43:5 48:20 52:1 53:16 58:15 60:9 64:5 65:17 66:8 69:8,19 71:14 72:14 75:6,16 77:10 87:20 89:6 90:6 97:22 112:7 113:5,6,7,9 114:13,14 117:10,15,21 18:16 119:1 121:9,11 124:18 125:4 132:12 133:11 16 138:6	<pre>191:7,15 192:1,4,16 196:19 199:10 201:6 203:3 204:21 205:1 206:4,10 207:3,6 208:2 210:9 211:12,15 217:22 219:11 225:19 229:5 231:11 232:21 233:17 234:8 238:2,14,22 243:17 249:21 250:19 252:11 253:7 256:14 257:20 262:7,18 267:11 270:9 273:5,17,19 274:12,18 276:3 278:4 279:17 285:20 287:9 290:3 291:22 293:5 294:7 296:3 298:10,12,13,14 299:20,22 302:2,11 304:16 the-counter 23:12 205:8 theme 35:19 226:22</pre>	<pre>therapy 56:14,15     58:20 178:10,16     180:9 267:10 thereafter 308:7 therefore 231:15 there're 66:5 there's 3:4 19:9,18     33:22 34:15,16     35:8 44:13 54:9     55:22 62:3,15 63:4     66:13 68:9 75:5     97:2 118:18 122:19     125:22 126:1     134:17     141:10,17,18 143:6     149:3 166:11 175:4     187:17 198:17     204:19,21 205:15     206:3,15 211:4     213:9 222:16     225:9,13,15 226:2     233:5 235:10     236:13 248:5     249:11 253:10     256:6 258:1,6,17     261:3 269:2 272:9     279:22 280:5 281:1     283:20 286:9 290:2</pre>
125:4 132:12 133:11,16 138:6	themselves 9:2	283:20 286:9 290:2
140:6 143:4,13,17	63:14 81:15 116:16	294:22 295:3,14 298:13 299:4
144:2 146:4,6,21	162:2 190:5 240:19	300:10
147:19,20 150:21 151:1 152:11,16,22	241:18 264:19 267:10	thermistors 127:5
153:3,13 155:6	theoretic 156:13	<b>they'd</b> 281:16
156:8 159:6,16,18	<b>theory</b> 272:18	they'll 239:14,15
160:12 164:6,11,15	_	they're 3:18 21:10
166:10 167:5,10 168:14 169:15	<pre>therapeutic 30:17     197:13,16</pre>	36:9 44:12 47:19
170:7,10 171:8	·	48:11,12 49:22
173:2 177:13	Therapeutics 126:5	53:8 57:16 59:9
178:1,18	221:6	60:22 68:16 101:7
183:6,10,19 184:4	therapies 10:21	102:5 119:13
186:1,18 187:11		138:14 141:1

	(	
144:19,22	<b>throw</b> 87:7 157:5	178:4 179:4 187:8
147:12,16,17 148:4	265:22	194:19 201:14
149:17 151:14,16	<b>Thus</b> 103:9	202:7,16 203:3,17
152:5 153:7,8		223:20 224:10
158:7,8 171:4	<b>tickets</b> 190:17	225:18 227:1 232:2
176:9 185:2 203:11	<b>tie</b> 139:6	234:9,14,16 237:4
205:13,14,17	ties 280:1	243:21 244:10
218:21,22 221:16		247:12 248:15,18
225:12,20 227:2,5	tight 4:3	251:10 253:10
233:17 235:5	11:9,12,20 37:1	254:7 256:6 257:18
241:18 246:7	53:21 54:7 55:15	269:18 284:5 289:3
248:10 252:21	58:16 62:15 65:20	290:6 291:11
253:5 254:2 258:16	66:3 67:4 70:17	293:3,6 296:9
259:13 262:3,11	74:3 76:7,19 77:3	297:8 304:2
269:21 270:18	80:17,18,20 81:1	306:6,10
276:12 277:5 278:15,16	89:10 109:8,12 111:2 117:10	<b>today's</b> 7:16
283:7,19,20 285:4	123:22 292:20,21	<b>tolerance</b> 151:3,11
292:22 297:6,14	306:13	155:20 190:16
302:18 304:3,4,6	tighten 176:1	tolerances 113:1
they've 141:21,22	tighter 10:5 45:4	<b>tolerant</b> 248:10
226:19 228:12	55:4 101:6,13	<b>tolerate</b> 183:18
229:20 230:14	115:11 116:4 154:4	
232:22	155:6 229:1 303:16	tolerated 19:16,17
<b>thigh</b> 24:8	time-consuming	<b>Tom</b> 261:8
<b>third</b> 11:7 49:17	245:12,15	tomorrow 2:18 4:3
60:20 78:15	timely 10:12	11:8 12:9,13 13:5
173:16,20 228:9	tissues 85:9 86:13	32:18 138:7 140:3
255:19		306:4,5,7,9,12
thirdly 231:6	<b>titrate</b> 52:17	307:7,8
Thirty 8:21	<b>Tobin</b> 141:13	tone 161:13
thoroughly 82:18	today 2:18 3:8,21	<b>tool</b> 83:1,12 89:8 99:9,21
thoughts 49:12	5:18 7:19 9:6	99:9,21 107:9,17,18
269:19	12:9,13 13:4 33:20	
	37:2 42:2 55:8	tools 83:9 278:14
thousand 147:10	85:18 98:13 101:20	top 57:1 145:10
289:21	106:19 111:13	200:8 207:20 233:9
<b>thousands</b> 8:14 70:5	115:10 116:6,8 117:16 130:4	topic 2:8 4:7 77:10
throughout 52:12	133:18 134:1 135:4	212:6 225:10 278:9
97:20	144:17 155:2	
	157:15 163:15	topics 4:5 9:16

280:2 187:15 92:2 93:3 94:13 96:9,11 109:3 **Torjman** 145:14 **traffic** 190:12 191:18 202:19 148:6 tragic 222:15 203:22 209:15 tossing 142:5 trained 61:9 200:8 treatments 67:9 total 17:2,4 26:5 246:11 247:19 102:7 45:18 65:1,4 98:6 265:6 **treats** 93:20 121:16 123:20 training 13:17 139:7 141:12,16 tremendous 102:16 54:19 115:6 264:16 165:11,17,18 185:8 150:11 **transcript** 308:8,11 194:22 195:1 tremendously 39:2 212:11 271:15,17 transcripts 45:14 184:3 272:1,13 274:5 3:9,12,15 trend 99:1,8,10 276:11 289:12 transform 95:18 172:21 179:1 **Touch** 224:5 236:2 102:5 204:20 219:9 touched 32:13 55:18 transforming 96:1 trends 20:1 204:19 102:5 to-use 239:19 205:7 208:7,12 transient 284:18 toward 229:12 299:6 trend's 173:4 transitioning towards 80:22 trial 15:19 56:10 242:20 181:14 196:3 107:4 191:5 243:10 237:21 271:6 transparent trials 85:20 277:17 74:14,22 88:16,17 107:3 **Town** 54:19 127:17 183:22 transportation 260:9 toxic 30:18 **tricks** 189:15 transported 260:14 Toxicology 2:3 tried 115:14 162:14 178:20 208:21 201:8 transports 249:15 215:16 222:4 **Toyota** 141:21 **Trauma** 52:13 270:10 280:13,15 traceability **treat** 21:22 92:15 283:6 304:19 299:2,5 300:1 93:9 94:4 165:19 tries 201:16 204:18 176:21 traceable 25:12 trifle 164:6 246:20 287:10 treated 56:6 57:14 triglycerides 58:21 67:10,13 tracers 86:9 125:17 275:10 69:2,20 210:17 **traces** 95:15 214:6 217:21 222:9 triple 86:9 track 159:3 treating 53:11 93:4 triplicate 49:11 tract 85:11 262:7 109:10 tromatography 245:8 tradeoff 231:14 treatment 15:7 trouble 7:2 51:16 84:16 85:21,22 tradeoffs 186:6

		-
174:2 177:1	Tufts 6:2	159:12,22 175:7
trucks 260:10	<b>tune</b> 37:13	202:12 203:1,6,7,9 211:10 215:17
true 29:14,16 59:22 68:15,17,22 69:18	<b>turn</b> 3:6 136:17 238:20 305:17	218:10 213:17 218:14 223:4 273:7 279:3 288:20
75:6 90:13,18,21 91:9 130:11 132:12	<pre>turnaround 78:2,7</pre>	typewriting 308:7
140:18 159:6	79:5	typical 23:2 223:5
164:14 165:5,20	turned 50:12	234:20 245:16
166:15 192:16 205:7 245:14 273:6	turning 235:6	247:16 248:16
281:4 284:8 285:18	turnover 213:11	typically 23:15 24:4 225:19 247:20
304:16 308:8	turns 120:13,20	
trueness 25:12	121:9,11,13,21,22	<b>typos</b> 289:15
<b>trust</b> 127:16	122:7 142:12,20 168:3 303:15	U
truth 26:5	<b>Twelve</b> 78:22	<b>U.S</b> 133:9 206:17
try 33:21 35:19	<b>twice</b> 69:7	252:10
80:11 82:22 141:9	type 8:2 14:3 17:12	<b>UC</b> 136:5
145:6 171:6 174:20	24:2 38:11 39:4	UCLA 154:12 300:8
208:11 210:7 211:22 214:12,20	56:12 59:5,6 63:18	ugly 86:18 87:2
218:20 233:20	80:6,14,15 85:6,9	<b>Ullman</b> 135:20
244:16 251:19	86:5,6 89:1 90:7 98:4 122:16,21	137:4,15 138:15
257:1 259:3 263:19 266:22 269:3	123:4 124:16	148:7 260:4,20
280:17,22	130:2,15 136:1	261:6
287:5,9,10 293:4	138:10 140:18	<b>ultimately</b> 246:20 274:8 276:16
301:17	158:9,12 159:13 162:4 170:10	
trying 17:19 54:3	171:14,22 172:2	unable 266:22
74:5 80:16,18 87:7 111:21 186:4,22	173:8 180:12,13	unacceptable 78:8
208:8 209:22 218:7	185:9 187:9 188:11 193:4 201:21 203:4	unaware 15:22
219:20 228:21	205:3,4 210:9	unawareness 59:6
230:12 233:19	218:21 219:8,9	60:11 144:13
236:20 238:20 239:17 240:14	220:5 276:5	<b>unbiased</b> 90:15 107:9
246:14 254:2	296:12,15 302:12 303:13	unclassified 40:8
271:22 274:6 280:2	typed 289:13	
284:10 286:10		unconscious 69:14
293:19 295:22 297:13 301:21	types 24:1,19 28:20 47:11 61:22 86:2	uncontrolled 247:22
297.10 001.21	104:9 145:8	unconvinced 282:19

under-bolus 94:1 under-dose 290:21 underestimated 93:19 under-hydrated 157:9 161:9 under-measure 93:22 underreported 205:12,13,14,17 208:16 understand 76:14 83:21 129:3 134:12,16 144:7,8 182:6 186:22 218:21 257:3 266:15 281:14 282:18 283:4,14 304:17 understanding 14:1 83:18 84:21 134:18 166:12 237:7 284:15,17 understood 234:8 251:17 undetected 75:4 unethical 82:10 170:19 **unfair** 42:11 unfortunately 157:13 222:12 unidentifiable 146:9 UNIDENTIFIED 173:18 292:10 294:8 **uniform** 251:20 unimportant 120:7 122:9

unintentionally 32:14 **unique** 11:4 22:13 **unit** 16:22 18:2,13 53:11 73:14 75:21 76:3,5,13 77:21 105:8 147:20 148:7,10,11,12 155:18,20 170:7 192:3,17 305:8 **United** 20:17 55:22 255:20 299:4,6 **units** 9:4 16:9 17:22 21:1 22:5 35:16 37:13 70:17 73:12 87:15 120:19 121:5,6 141:17 147:22 148:4,10 159:1 160:5 173:22 203:13,14 universal 105:3 universities 86:7 university 5:21 6:4,5 13:9,15,16,18 33:14 42:22 54:15,21 79:21 115:5 134:5 145:15 156:11 161:12 190:11 223:22 242:14,15,16 243:4 267:13 **unknown** 209:2 **unless** 53:14 191:13 unlike 248:5 299:17 unlikely 239:14 unnecessary 220:8 unquestionable 8:21

215:6,11 unreported 262:21 unresponsive 216:13 unsubstantiated 262:3 **unusual** 183:11 **update** 109:21 110:20 updated 110:15 170:4 212:7 255:8 updating 10:13 108:18 **upon** 32:13 48:14 98:4 122:13,15 124:5 167:19 169:18 180:6 216:17 252:21 **upper** 24:7 151:9 234:20 **UPS** 260:9 **urate** 125:17 **uric** 164:22 250:7 270:15 urine 15:16 172:10 usability 103:1,16,18,22 104:1,2,6,21 105:7,10 106:3,8,13 108:6 111:9 244:22 290:9,20 **usage** 38:22 **useful** 13:21 96:15 118:6 119:5,9,10 170:22 225:12

useless 68:8

unrecognized 205:18

28:2 31:2088:4166:12 241:1232:13,15 33:4validation 88:6290:18variable 148:536:19 47:11290:18validity 83:14variables 196:21103:15 105:8 108:6value 31:7 42:15,17230:8 261:2146:744:10 53:18 60:969:4 117:11146:769:4 117:1174:11 125:6 127:6186:8 188:19 191:3118:2,5,6,14241:13199:11,20 200:2123:22variations 68:15204:10 224:19124:13,14,15125:7 251:17225:1 244:11,12,14145:18 146:4,8125:7 251:17257:21 258:17156:3,4 165:5varies 235:2 280:21289:4,8,11,18167:6,20 170:2,3,4195:6 243:7 246:4291:1 303:22180:18,19 184:4195:6 243:7 246:4users 9:12 23:437:5 38:19 39:2240:5,7,11,1426:8 27:16 28:1137:5 38:19 39:2240:5,7,11,1436:12 41:6 52:741:5 15 1010:4:6 119:17 161:8
36:1947:11Validation 88:636:1947:11290:1850:5,7,1654:6,11290:18103:15105:8108:6140:15144:12value 31:7146:744:10146:744:10146:769:4173:5,9,10,2169:4186:8188:19199:11,20200:2204:10224:19225:1244:11,12,14247:22256:7289:4,8,11,18167:6,20291:1303:22180:18,19184:4198:10241:6198:10241:626:827:1628:1240:5,7,11,14
50:5,7,16 54:6,11290:18validity 83:14103:15 105:8 108:6value 31:7 42:15,17146:744:10 53:18 60:9173:5,9,10,2169:4 117:11186:8 188:19 191:3118:2,5,6,14199:11,20 200:2123:22204:10 224:19124:13,14,15225:1 244:11,12,14145:18 146:4,8247:22 256:7150:19 151:6,14257:21 258:17156:3,4 165:5289:4,8,11,18167:6,20 170:2,3,4291:1 303:22180:18,19 184:4198:10 241:6195:6 243:7 246:426:8 27:16 28:1137:5 38:19 39:2236:12 41:6 52:740:5,7,11,14
103:15 105:8 108:6validity 83:14variables 196:21140:15 144:12value 31:7 42:15,17230:8 261:2146:744:10 53:18 60:99173:5,9,10,2169:4 117:11186:8 188:19 191:3118:2,5,6,14199:11,20 200:2123:22204:10 224:19124:13,14,15225:1 244:11,12,14145:18 146:4,8247:22 256:7150:19 151:6,14257:21 258:17156:3,4 165:5289:4,8,11,18167:6,20 170:2,3,4291:1 303:22180:18,19 184:4users 9:12 23:4values 29:11 36:2126:8 27:16 28:1137:5 38:19 39:2236:12 41:6 52:740:5,7,11,14
140:15 144:12value 31:7 42:15,17230:8 261:2146:744:10 53:18 60:9variation 25:6 63:8173:5,9,10,2169:4 117:11125:6 127:6186:8 188:19 191:3118:2,5,6,14241:13199:11,20 200:2123:2224:10 224:1925:1 244:11,12,14145:18 146:4,825:7 251:17257:21 258:17156:3,4 165:5125:7 251:17289:4,8,11,18167:6,20 170:2,3,4161:4,10 167:11291:1 303:22180:18,19 184:4198:10 241:6users 9:12 23:4values 29:11 36:21250:6 258:1726:8 27:16 28:1137:5 38:19 39:22various 6:6 41:1336:12 41:6 52:740:5,7,11,14104:6 119:17 161:8
146:744:10 53:18 60:9variation 25:6 63:8173:5,9,10,2169:4 117:1174:11 125:6 127:6186:8 188:19 191:3118:2,5,6,14241:13199:11,20 200:2123:2224:10 224:19204:10 224:19124:13,14,15125:7 251:17225:1 244:11,12,14145:18 146:4,8125:7 251:17247:22 256:7150:19 151:6,14varies 235:2 280:21289:4,8,11,18167:6,20 170:2,3,424:15 26:2291:1 303:22180:18,19 184:4161:4,10 167:11users 9:12 23:4values 29:11 36:21250:6 258:1726:8 27:16 28:1137:5 38:19 39:22various 6:6 41:1336:12 41:6 52:740:5,7,11,14104:6 119:17 161:8
186:8188:19191:3199:11,20200:2204:10224:19225:1244:11,12,14247:22256:7257:21258:17289:4,8,11,18167:6,20291:1303:22user-induced36:11users9:1223:223:426:827:1628:1241:622:2123:22180:12118:2,5,6,14123:22123:22145:18146:4,8156:3,4165:5150:19151:6,14156:3,4165:5167:6,20170:2,3,4198:10241:6198:10241:6198:10241:626:827:1628:1136:1236:1241:652:740:5,7,11,14
199:11,20 200:2123:22204:10 224:19124:13,14,15225:1 244:11,12,14145:18 146:4,8247:22 256:7150:19 151:6,14257:21 258:17156:3,4 165:5289:4,8,11,18167:6,20 170:2,3,4291:1 303:22180:18,19 184:4user-induced 36:11198:10 241:6users 9:12 23:4values 29:11 36:2126:8 27:16 28:1137:5 38:19 39:2236:12 41:6 52:740:5,7,11,14
204:10224:19124:13,14,15125:7251:17225:1244:11,12,14145:18146:4,8125:7251:17247:22256:7150:19151:6,14varies235:2280:21257:21258:17156:3,4165:5variety9:320:22289:4,8,11,18167:6,20170:2,3,424:1526:2291:1303:22180:18,19184:4161:4,10167:11user-induced36:11198:10241:6195:6243:7246:426:827:1628:1137:538:1939:22various6:641:1336:1241:652:740:5,7,11,14104:6119:17161:8
204:10224:19124:13,14,15125:7251:17225:1244:11,12,14145:18146:4,8125:7251:17247:22256:7150:19151:6,14125:7280:21257:21258:17156:3,4165:5variety9:320:22289:4,8,11,18167:6,20170:2,3,4161:4,10167:11291:1303:22180:18,19184:4161:4,10167:11user-induced36:11198:10241:6195:6243:7246:426:827:1628:1137:538:1939:22various6:641:1336:1241:652:740:5,7,11,14104:6119:17161:8
225:1 244:11,12,14145:18 146:4,8247:22 256:7150:19 151:6,14257:21 258:17156:3,4 165:5289:4,8,11,18167:6,20 170:2,3,4291:1 303:22180:18,19 184:4user-induced 36:11198:10 241:6users 9:12 23:4values 29:11 36:2126:8 27:16 28:1137:5 38:19 39:2236:12 41:6 52:740:5,7,11,14
257:21258:17156:3,4165:5variety9:320:22289:4,8,11,18167:6,20170:2,3,424:1526:826:827:1628:11users9:1223:4values29:1136:2137:538:1939:22various6:641:1336:1241:652:740:5,7,11,14104:6119:17161:8
289:4,8,11,18167:6,20 170:2,3,424:15 26:2291:1 303:22180:18,19 184:4161:4,10 167:11user-induced 36:11198:10 241:6195:6 243:7 246:4users 9:12 23:4values 29:11 36:21250:6 258:1726:8 27:16 28:1137:5 38:19 39:22various 6:6 41:1336:12 41:6 52:740:5,7,11,14104:6 119:17 161:8
291:1303:22180:18,19184:4161:4,10167:11user-induced36:11198:10241:6195:6243:7246:4users9:1223:4values29:1136:21250:6258:1726:827:1628:1137:538:1939:22various6:641:1336:1241:652:740:5,7,11,14104:6119:17161:8
user-induced 36:11198:10 241:6195:6 243:7 246:4users 9:12 23:4values 29:11 36:21250:6 258:1726:8 27:16 28:1137:5 38:19 39:22various 6:6 41:1336:12 41:6 52:740:5,7,11,14104:6 119:17 161:8
users       9:12       23:4       values       29:11       36:21       250:6       258:17         36:12       41:6       52:7       40:5,7,11,14       104:6       119:17       161:8
users       9:12       23:4       values       29:11       30:21         26:8       27:16       28:11       37:5       38:19       39:22       various       6:6       41:13         36:12       41:6       52:7       40:5,7,11,14       104:6       119:17       161:8
36:12       41:6       52:7       40:5,7,11,14       104:6       119:17       161:8
30.12 11.0 32.7
111:17 130:1 41:7,15 42:12 182:21 196:8
140:15 186:4 43:8,14,18,20 249:22 250:2
199:16,17,18 44:3,6,8,11,14,22 <b>vary</b> 9:14 35:17
200:10,17     203:11     46:10,13     49:3     50:4     104:3     203:12
204:7       205:14       57:3       60:6,8       237:11       261:1         218:5       6       219:7       65:11,19       68:13       68:13
218:5,6       219:7       65:11,19       68:13         240:13       246:11       70:4,7       110:6       vegetables       261:19
248:3     256:14     265:5     117:6,13       vein     178:21     234:13
275:1       289:21       118:13,14,15         124:12       147:14       veins       294:14
usually 39:4 61:8 156:2 181:15 185:3 295:3,9
150:13 178:11
216:1 274:1 Van 37:15 38:1 29:14 20:1 2 6
utilized 240:16 44:18 157:11
<b>Wanderbilt</b> 13:16         159:22         197:8         234:5
variabilities 235:9,17 293:16,21
251:16 295:7 296:1
vague 198:9 217:9 variability 16:16 venous/arterial
<b>valid</b> 76:17 113:6 45:16,18,20 70:20 157:14
walidate         %4:5         87:22         93:15         verification         264:16
validate         84:8         94:7         96:10         97:16         280:19         290:17           98:1         100:11,12         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19         290:17         280:19

		0
verify 88:11 216:22	<b>Vitamin</b> 250:5	warranted 213:20
versatile 239:18	275:22	wash
<pre>versatility 240:14 version 256:4</pre>	<pre>vitamins 276:1 vitro 21:18 34:19 136:12 290:14</pre>	142:11,13,16,22 145:2 162:22 173:18,19
<pre>versus 16:1 45:8,12 52:19 67:10,13 84:14 99:2 138:4 159:2 180:3 196:3 197:7,8 241:2 247:18,19,22 251:2 281:18 297:16 vertical 62:9 64:8</pre>	<pre>vivo 84:8,9,14     88:1,13 100:13 voice 105:15 voices 254:5 voltage     189:6,10,17,19</pre>	<pre>washing 146:20     162:21 163:3 164:9     250:1 Washington 13:17     33:14 42:22     54:15,21 134:5     254:11</pre>
<b>via</b> 7:18	<b>volts</b> 189:7,10	wasn't 166:15 222:12
<pre>viable 153:2 vial 162:8 163:7,9 192:15 257:17 260:17</pre>	<pre>volume 34:22 168:4   190:14 196:9   208:16 281:16 volumes 156:15</pre>	<pre>water 163:2   233:5,12 wave 139:9,13</pre>
<b>vice</b> 101:10 115:1 135:20 242:21	246:3 252:6 vulnerable 305:7	ways 89:2 168:5 183:10 187:1,4 207:20 220:3 252:2
<pre>vice-president 100:20</pre>	W	255:22
view 4:22 5:8 76:15	Wahl 225:11	weak 99:12
125:22 126:1 185:17,20,21	<pre>waived 140:7 wake 61:4</pre>	wears 192:11 web 7:18
191:13,18 192:6,19 253:13 274:18 297:1,2	<pre>walk 190:19 209:21 walked 142:17 walking 0 00 76 0</pre>	<pre>webcast 7:16 website 3:14 34:16 200:16</pre>
<pre>viewing 7:18</pre>	walking 2:22 76:9	websites
<b>Views</b> 65:22	wall 156:17	200:15,20,21
<b>viral</b> 262:5	Waltham 298:5	we'd 117:14 171:16
<b>Virginia</b> 13:10,11	ware 280:19	185:17 210:3 255:2
79:21 virtually 48:4 viscosity 233:3	<pre>warm 193:14 warming 294:4 warning 212:8 213:2</pre>	<pre>week 7:2 17:16   63:21 95:9 98:11   101:3,4 141:15   100:20 260:0</pre>
visits 8:14	214:8 287:20	190:20 260:9 weeks 222:22 260:18
visually 105:16	warnings 32:16	weighed 103:3

111:10	265:5,7,13,14	whatsoever 269:15
welcome 2:4 5:8	266:19 268:12	276:18
14:9 223:17	269:1,3 271:5,9	whenever 51:8 68:4
	272:7,21 273:1,12	
welcoming 6:20	275:16,22 279:4	<b>whereas</b> 72:11
194:13	281:9 283:5	164:16 252:17
we'll 4:8 20:13	287:17,19 292:9	277:2
40:10 81:18	293:6 296:10	where's 174:4,13
116:9,10 119:13	297:5,11,12 299:20	whether 9:12 10:2
127:1 171:15	305:14 306:12	
199:22	wet 163:8	39:9 51:12,19,20
223:11,12,16 284:6		58:10 69:15
291:18 292:15	we've 2:20 11:21	73:9,15 75:5 101:7
297:10 307:3	35:2 39:15 42:22	116:15,18 129:9
well-known 243:17	54:2 89:11 96:6,8	145:16 157:1 175:4
	118:8,12 137:17	179:19 197:9
we're 2:6 5:18 6:19	146:14 154:10	199:17,18 204:19,20 209:6
9:6 11:18 14:22	157:14 158:10	216:17 218:8 220:4
15:9 16:11 19:2	172:9 176:8 184:1	226:1 230:9 241:2
43:10,19 50:3	187:14 195:17	
54:6,7,8 72:11	196:17 197:1	258:12 261:20 264:11 271:12
85:17 89:18	198:2,20 199:7	
90:15,16 112:20	202:7,13 203:10	276:7 277:4
114:7 117:2,11	212:12,17 213:6	white 7:3 94:21,22
124:22 125:1,5	220:21 222:1	134:4 183:9 283:2
126:3 128:13 130:5	225:2,17 226:15	293:10 294:4
133:2 135:3 136:2	227:20 231:22	295:19 305:2
137:21 142:1	234:8,14 236:17	whole 23:4 24:4
147:4,8,14	237:4 239:21	39:16 44:18
149:9,17 152:19	249:22 250:12	71:15,19,21 126:6
153:5,15 155:1,3	253:10 259:1	141:7 167:17
156:16 158:9	261:10,15 264:16	168:20 197:10
170:16,19 171:15	277:17 297:8	228:6,7 237:7,19
174:8,9,10	299:13 300:11,22	240:9 242:5 244:2
183:14,16 184:21	306:3	246:1 247:8 258:6
185:1,14,22 186:22	<b>whatever</b> 79:15	262:3 267:18 284:4
193:9 195:10	137:19 178:6,13	299:21
197:2,19 202:11	202:10 251:20	whom 216:12 308:4
208:8 219:3,5,20	258:12,13 269:12	
228:1,4 231:20	272:19 282:4	who's 173:8 280:16
239:21 246:12,13	283:11 301:14	303:12 306:6
253:16 257:3 258:6	302:15	whose 149:21
259:11 261:9	What'll 154:13	
264:3,4		1

<pre>who've 116:1 280:20 wide 68:15 113:2    161:3,10 258:16    262:3 widely 77:5</pre>	82:19,20 84:22 111:13 116:1 127:12 155:9 174:19,20 176:4 178:8 214:12 226:18 228:22	<pre>worse 41:6 58:6     202:16 worst 75:4 175:21 worth 191:13 229:5     295:16</pre>
<pre>wider 105:10 width 230:7 willing 3:18 137:11     188:17,21 283:15 window 19:9 236:4</pre>	226:18 228:22 233:21 246:8 251:20 254:17 257:11 258:8 300:12 worked 85:4 101:1 114:2 116:1 221:22 261:10 282:4	<pre>vrite 257:2 writing 78:20 written 7:20 32:8     35:5 wrong 60:8 96:14     98:10 204:1 230:11</pre>
windows 7:5 74:19 228:19	workers 213:11	269:16
<pre>wing 114:19 winters 156:19 wipe 34:21 wipes 23:17</pre>	<pre>working 80:22 110:10 112:10 113:11 114:3,14 146:12 194:8 208:8 219:3 236:20</pre>	wrote 39:8 65:22 Wyckoff 47:22 Wyeth 101:2
<pre>wiping 224:22 wise 96:13 wish 136:22 258:8     280:15</pre>	243:6,8 253:16,18,21 254:2 261:5 270:8 271:5 273:12 277:16 278:15	xylose 125:20 197:18 210:13 215:22 217:7 261:14,18
<pre>withstand 154:8   155:4 Witness 274:3</pre>	<pre>works 135:21 252:8 workshop 9:15 12:3,16</pre>	Y year-old 148:8,11 yelling 7:13
<pre>women 58:9 Women's 54:18 wonder 127:22 282:5</pre>	<pre>workup 150:5 world 55:19 72:11     164:8 255:19 256:1     265</pre>	<pre>yellow 119:2 238:8 yet 8:3 266:14,16 292:18</pre>
wondered 164:7	265:8 289:1 world's 101:22	<b>yield</b> 250:8
<pre>wonderful 164:5 193:14 305:22 wondering 113:20 137:7 139:6 145:16</pre>	<pre>worldwide 8:6,9 115:1 242:22 252:7 304:20 worried 187:21</pre>	<pre>you'll 36:3 40:13    144:4 206:19    235:18 293:13 young 192:10 289:22</pre>
156:13 157:1,3 164:22 182:3 work 14:7 55:9	213:20 worrisome 262:1	yourself 5:4 youth 14:8
57:17 78:22	worry 188:13	<b>you've</b> 7:3 47:8,9

	0
87:19 98:19 111:20 134:7 137:4 138:11 145:15 180:1 194:21 195:9 197:5 203:2 222:21 228:16 230:8 238:1 241:19 259:21 291:22	
<b>YSI</b> 25:11 184:2,17 185:7 240:8,10 241:10 242:4 268:10	
<b>YSR (ph</b> 85:16	
Z	
Zealand 66:21	
<b>zero</b> 92:9 93:13,22 118:1 152:20 155:2	
<b>zone</b> 19:7 46:10,11 94:11,13,15	
<b>zones</b> 94:14	