1	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES - COMPLEX
3	
4	NC, A MINOR,
5	PLAINTIFF,
6	VS. CASE NO. 21STCV22822
7	HAIN CELESTIAL GROUP, INC.; BEECH-NUT NUTRITION COMPANY; CERTIFIED COPY
8	NURTURE, INC., PLUM, PBC, DBA PLUM ORGANICS; GERBER PRODUCTS
9	PLUM ORGANICS; GERBER PRODUCTS COMPANY; WALMART, INC.; SPROUT FOODS, INC.; RALPHS GROCERY
10	COMPANY; AND DOES 1 THROUGH 100, INCLUSIVE,
11	DEFENDANTS.
12	DEFENDANTO.
13	
14	
15	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
16	FEBRUARY 1, 2022
17	(DAY 2)
18	
19	
20	
21	BryceReporting
22	DIYGGROUILIIS
23	510.828.9404 • info@brycereporters.com
24	www.brycereporters.com
25	
26	
27	STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED BY: JEANESE JOHNSON, CSR NO. 11635
28	OFFICIAL PRO TEMPORE

```
1
              HELD BEFORE:
 2
              THE HONORABLE AMY D. HOGUE
 3
4
                     APPEARANCES
 5
                  (ALL APPEARANCES VIA REMOTE)
 6
 7
    FOR PLAINTIFF:
8
    BAUM, HEDLUND, ARISTEI & GOLDMAN, P.C.
9
     R. BRENT WISNER, ESQ.
10
     PEDRAM ESFANDIARY, ESQ.
     10940 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, 17TH FLOOR
11
     LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
     310.207.3233
12
     310.820.7444
                  FAX
    RBWISNER@BAUMHEDLUNDLAW.COM
13
     PESFANDIARY@BAUMHEDLUNDLAW.COM
14
15
16
    FOR DEFENDANT GERBER PRODUCTS COMPANY:
17
     WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY, LLP
18
     JOSEPH PETROSINELLI, ESQ.
     PAUL BOEHM, ESQ.
     725 TWELFTH STREET, N.W.
19
     WASHINGTON, DC 20005
20
     202.434.5547
     202.434.5029
                   FAX
     JPETROSINELLI@WC.COM
21
     PBOEHM@WC.COM
22
     - AND -
23
     WHITE & CASE, LLP
     BRYAN A. MERRYMAN, ESQ.
24
     J. TAYLOR AKERBLOM, ESQ.
25
     555 SO. FLOWER STREET, SUITE 2700
     LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071
26
     213.620.7700
     213.452.2329
                   FAX
27
    BMERRYMAN@WHITECASE.COM
     TAKERBLOM@WHITECASE.COM
28
                                                                   2
```

```
1
     FOR DEFENDANT PLUM PBC, PLUM ORGANICS:
 2
     DECHERT, LLP
HOPE S. FREIWALD, ESQ.
 3
     CIRA CENTRE
     2929 ARCH STREET
 4
     PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19104
     215.994.2514
 5
     215.994.2222
                   FAX
     HOPE.FREIWALD@DECHERT.COM
 6
 7
     ALSO FOR DEFENDANT PLUM PBC, PLUM ORGANICS:
 8
     MAYER BROWN
 9
     DALE J. GIALI, ESQ.
     350 SO. GRAND AVENUE, 25TH FLOOR
10
     LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071
     213.229.9500
11
     DGIALI@MAYERBROWN.COM
12
13
     FOR DEFENDANT HAIN CELESTIAL GROUP, INC.:
14
     COVINGTON & BURLING, LLP
     MICHAEL IMBROSCIO, ESQ.
15
     ONE CITY-CENTER
     850 TENTH STREET, NW
     WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4956
16
     202.662.6000
17
     MIMBROSCIO@COV.COM
18
     - AND -
19
     ALI MOJIBI, ESQ.
     1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS
20
     LOS ANGELES, CA 90067-4643
     424.332.4800
21
     AMOJIBI@COV.COM
22
23
     FOR DEFENDANT NURTURE, INC.:
24
     DLA PIPER, LLP
     ANGELA C. AGRUSA, ESQ.
25
     2000 AVENUE OF THE STARS, SUITE 400 NORTH TOWER
     LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067
26
     310.595.3000
     310.595.3300
27
     ANGELA. AGRUSA@US. DLAPIPER. COM
28
                                                                     3
```

1	FOR DEFENDANT BEECH-NUT NUTRITION COMPANY:
2	KING & SPALDING, LLP PETER HSIAO, ESQ.
3	633 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 1600 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071
4	213.443.4355 213.443.4310 FAX
5	PHSIAO@KSLAW.COM
6	
7	FOR DEFENDANT SPROUT FOODS, INC.:
8	FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH, LLP RORY F. COLLINS, ESQ.
9	SARAH L. BREW, ESQ. RITA MANSURYAN, ESQ.
10	1800 CENTURY PARK EAST, SUITE 1500 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067
11	310.203.4000 310.229.1285 FAX
12	RORY.COLLINS@FAEGREDRINKER.COM SARAH.BREW@FAEGREDRINKER.COM
13	RITA.MANSURYAN@FAEGREDRINKER.COM
14	
15	FOR DEFENDANT WALMART, INC.:
16	KIRKLAND & ELLIS, LLP SIERRA ELIZABETH, ESQ.
17	CHRISTOPHER KEEGAN, ESQ. MICHAEL WILLIAMS, ESQ.
18	2049 CENTURY PARK EAST, 37TH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067
19	310.552.4200 310.552.5900 FAX
20	SIERRA.ELIZABETH@KIRKLAND.COM CHRISTOPHER.KEEGAN@KIRKLAND.COM
21	MICHAEL.WILLIAMS@KIRKLAND.COM
22	
23	ALSO PRESENT:
24	CHRISTOPHER CLEE, TECHNICIAN
25	IAN ANDRYSZAK, TECHNICIAN
26	
27	
28	
	4

		1
1	INDEX	
2		
3	WITNESS: BEATE RITZ, M.D., PH.D.	
4	DIRECT (RESUMED) CROSS	
5	7 28	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10	EXHIBITS	
11	EXHIBIT NUMBER	REFERENCED
12	119	13
13	679	33
14	14	44
15	87	48
16	27	50
17	4	53
18	629	70
19	682	74
20	92	78
21	630	80
22	7	81
23	92	87
24	683	89
25	684	93
26	57	107
27		
28		
		5

1	TOG ANGELEG GALTEODNIA
1	LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA;
2	TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2022; 1:24 P.M.
3	BEFORE: HON. AMY D. HOGUE DEPARTMENT 7;
4	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
5	000
6	
7	
8	THE COURT: HELLO, IT'S JUDGE HOGUE SPEAKING.
9	CALLING THE NC MATTER.
10	MR. WISNER: YOUR HONOR, I'M HAVING A HARD TIME
11	HEARING YOU.
12	MR. PETROSINELLI, ARE YOU HAVING A HARD TIME
13	HEARING THE COURT?
14	THE COURT: MAYBE I'M NOT TALKING VERY LOUD.
15	CAN YOU HEAR ME BETTER NOW?
16	CAN YOU HEAR ME OKAY?
17	MR. PETROSINELLI: I CAN HEAR YOU FINE, JUDGE.
18	MR. WISNER: OKAY. THAT'S ON MY END. GIVE ME
19	ONE SECOND, YOUR HONOR. LET ME JUST FIX THE TECH
20	PROBLEM.
21	THE COURT: OKAY.
22	THE CLERK: YOUR HONOR, THIS IS THE CLERK. CAN
23	YOU HEAR ME?
24	THE COURT: YES, I CAN.
25	THE CLERK: OH, GREAT.
26	(OFF-RECORD COMMENTS)
27	MR. WISNER: SO WE ARE READY TO PROCEED
28	WHENEVER YOUR HONOR IS UNLESS THERE'S ANYTHING ELSE WE
	6

1	NEED TO COVER.
2	THE COURT: I DON'T THINK SO.
3	YOU MAY PROCEED.
4	MR. WISNER: GREAT.
5	DR. RITZ, I THINK YOU'RE ON MUTE. LET'S GET
6	YOU OFF MUTE. PERFECT.
7	THE WITNESS: NOW I AM.
8	
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION (RESUMED)
10	MR. WISNER:
11	Q ALL RIGHT. DOCTOR, I JUST HAVE A FEW LAST
12	THINGS I WANT TO COVER WITH YOU BEFORE WE HAND YOU OFF
13	TO OPPOSING COUNSEL FOR EXAMINATION. AND I WANT TO
14	COVER SOME THINGS THAT WERE SPECIFICALLY COVERED BEFORE
15	YOU TOOK THE STAND.
16	SPECIFICALLY, I WANT TO SHOW YOU SOME THINGS
17	THAT HAVE BEEN SAID ABOUT YOUR OPINIONS AND METHODOLOGY
18	AND I WANT TO JUST GET THE RECORD STRAIGHT, IF THAT'S
19	ACTUALLY WHAT YOU BELIEVE TO BE TRUE OR NOT OR WHATEVER
20	JUST SO WE CAN GET IT CLEARED UP.
21	SO THE FIRST THING I'M GOING TO SHOW YOU IS
22	THIS IS ACTUALLY A MOTION, DR. RITZ, THAT WAS FILED IN
23	THIS CASE. AND ON PAGE 39 OF THIS MOTION, THE
24	DEFENDANTS HERE AT THE VERY BOTTOM AND I'LL ZOOM IN
25	SO YOU CAN SEE IT. CAN YOU SEE IT? I KNOW IT GETS A
26	LITTLE FUZZY.
27	A YES, I CAN.
28	Q OKAY.

1	AND SO RIGHT HERE, IT SAYS, "BY DR. RITZ'S
2	ACCOUNT, HOWEVER, CONSISTENCY REFERS NOT TO
3	CONSISTENCY OF RESULTS, BUT THE CONSISTENCY
4	WITH WHAT SHE BELIEVES THE ANSWER TO BE."
5	DO YOU SEE THAT?
6	A YES.
7	Q AND, DOCTOR, THIS IS IN THE CONTEXT OF A
8	BRADFORD HILL ANALYSIS, AND I JUST LET ME JUST ASK
9	YOU VERY PLAINLY: IS THAT HOW YOU APPLIED THE
10	CONSISTENCY FACTOR IN YOUR ANALYSIS IN THIS CASE?
11	A ABSOLUTELY NOT. I DON'T HAVE BELIEFS. I MEAN,
12	THIS IS SCIENCE. THIS IS NOT ABOUT BELIEFS. THE ONLY
13	BELIEF WOULD COME IN IF I SAID, WELL, I BELIEVE THIS
14	ABOUT THE STUDY AND I TRY NOT TO SPECULATE.
15	GENERALLY, CONSISTENCY MEANS I GO TO THE
16	LITERATURE, I FIND OUT WHAT'S THERE, WHAT KIND OF FACTS,
17	AND I COMPARE, YOU KNOW, EVERYTHING THAT COMES IN WITH
18	WHAT I'VE ALREADY KNOWN THROUGH MY TRAINING. BUT THAT'S
19	NOT A BELIEF. THAT'S EVALUATING OF SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE
20	AND MAKING SURE THAT THERE IS CONSISTENCY WITH WHAT THE
21	STANDARDS ARE, WHAT MY SCIENCE TAUGHT ME TO LOOK OUT
22	FOR.
23	THAT'S THE KIND OF CONSISTENCY I'M LOOKING FOR,
24	THE CONSISTENCY IN THE SCIENTIFIC REASONING.
25	Q DOCTOR, I JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE.
26	IS ANYONE ELSE HAVING HER BREAK UP A LITTLE BIT
27	IN HER ANSWER, OR ARE YOU GUYS ALL HEARING IT CLEAN?
28	THE COURT: I COULD HEAR HER FINE.

1		MR. WISNER: OKAY. SO I'LL JUST CONTINUE,
2	THEN. G	REAT.
3	Q	ALL RIGHT. DOCTOR, I WANT TO SHOW YOU A SLIDE
4	THAT WAS	SHOWN TO THE COURT DURING THE OPENING STATEMENT
5	YESTERDA	Y BY THE DEFENDANTS.
6		AND THERE'S A QUOTE HERE FROM A DEPOSITION.
7		IT SAYS, "YOU SAY IT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE
8		EXPECTATION WITH RESPECT TO WHAT I THINK THE
9		ANSWER SHOULD BE. IF THE STUDY HAD BEEN DONE
10		CORRECTLY OR IF THE STUDY HAD BEEN DONE
11		UNBIASSED OR WHAT I KNOW FROM MECHANISMS, WHAT
12		I KNOW ABOUT THIS POPULATION, WHAT I KNOW ABOUT
13		THE EXPOSURE LEVEL, WHAT I KNOW ABOUT
14		CO-EXPOSURES AND WHAT I WOULD EXPECT TO SEE
15		GIVEN THE SIZE OF THE COHORTS, THE SIZE OF THE
16		STUDY."
17		DO YOU SEE THAT, DOCTOR?
18	A	YES.
19	Q	THEN DOWN HERE THERE'S A CITATION TO YOUR
20	DEPOSITI	ON AT PAGE 133.
21		DO YOU SEE THAT?
22	A	YES.
23	Q	LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT YOUR DEPOSITION.
24		AND I'LL GO TO PAGE 133 AND I'LL BLOW THIS UP
25	SO WE CA	N ALL SEE IT HERE.
26		AND ACTUALLY THE QUOTE THAT I JUST READ TO YOU
27	IS ACTUA	LLY FROM PAGE 134, STARTING ON LINE 5.
28		DO YOU SEE THIS AREA RIGHT HERE, DOCTOR?
		_

1	7\	YES, I DO.
2	0	OKAY.
3	Ž.	BUT I WANT TO GO OVER WHAT WAS SAID BEFORE THIS
4	TS WHAT	YOU SAID TO PUT THIS INTO CONTEXT.
5	10 11111	SO ON THE PRIOR PAGE THE QUESTION WAS PUT TO
6	THTS: W	ELL, IT ACTUALLY STARTS ON AN EARLIER PAGE.
7		IT SAYS, "OKAY, LET'S ASK THIS QUESTION: DID
8		THE NULL STUDIES THAT WE JUST TALKED ABOUT OF
9		ABDULLAH AND DOHERTY AND I THINK WE TALKED
10		ABOUT BEFORE SKOGHEIM, DO THEY SUPPORT YOUR
11		OPINION THAT THE CONSISTENCY CRITERION OF THE
12		BRADFORD HILL FACTORS WERE MET FOR 11 ASD?"
13		AND THEN I OBJECTED. THERE HAD BEEN A BUNCH OF
14	OBJECTIO	NS PRIOR TO THIS.
15		AND THEN FINALLY YOU RESPOND: "CONSISTENCY IS
16		A BROADER TERM IN THE BRADFORD HILL AS IT WOULD
17		MEAN, WELL, WHAT IS THE EXPECTATION, RIGHT? IS
18		IT CONSISTENT WITH MY EXPECTATION OF THIS
19		HYPOTHESIS?"
20		AND THEN YOU SAY RIGHT HERE: "IF I SEE A
21		NEGATIVE ASSOCIATION, IT WOULD DEFINITELY NOT
22		BE CONSISTENT WITH ANYTHING ELSE."
23		DO YOU SEE THAT?
24	А	YES.
25	Q	AND YOU GO ON.
26		"I KNOW ABOUT METALS OF THIS TYPE IN THE
27		LITERATURE AND ANIMAL STUDIES AND MECHANISTIC
28		STUDIES, ALL OF THOSE HAVE SHOWN THAT THESE

- 1 | METALS ARE NEUROTOXIC, SO I WOULD DEFINITELY
- 2 | NOT EXPECT TO SEE A NEGATIVE RESULT IN TERMS OF
- 3 | -- SO THEN I HAVE A STUDY THAT ACTUALLY SHOWS A
- 4 | NEGATIVE ASSOCIATION OR NO ASSOCIATION AND THEN
- 5 | I HAVE A STUDY -- STUDIES WHO SHOW POSITIVE
- 6 ASSOCIATIONS."
- 7 AND THEN YOU SAY, "I LOOK AT ALL OF THEM AND
- 8 I'M SAYING, WELL, IS THIS CONSISTENT? NOT, OH,
- 9 ONE NEGATIVE, ONE NULL, TWO POSITIVES MAY BE
- 10 | NULL OR SOMEWHERE NEXT TO NULL, NO, THAT'S NOT
- 11 | WHAT YOU DO."
- 12 | THEN THERE'S THAT QUOTE.
- 13 AND THEN YOU WENT ON TO SAY, "AND THAT IS
- 14 CONSISTENCY IN A SCIENTIFIC WAY. IT IS NOT
- 15 | CONSISTENCY CHECKMARK ONE STUDY, YES, ONE STUDY
- 16 NO, ONE STUDY NULL, THAT IS SIMPLISTIC AND
- 17 | THAT'S NOT SCIENCE."
- 18 THEN MR. PETROSINELLI ASKED YOU: "WHAT YOU
- 19 JUST EXPLAINED IS THE WAY THAT YOU UNDERSTAND
- 20 THE BRADFORD HILL CRITERION RE CONSISTENCY."
- 21 AND YOU SAY, "THAT IT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE
- 22 | EXPECTATION OF WHAT SCIENCE HAS TO SAY ABOUT
- 23 | THE DATA AND WHAT THE MEASURES THAT EACH OF THE
- 24 | STUDIES ARE USING ARE ACTUALLY TELLING ME AS A
- 25 | SCIENTIST, AND I'M NOT YOU, YOU KNOW, OTHERWISE
- 26 YOU COULD DO A COMPUTER ANALYSIS. I COULD SAY
- 27 OKAY, COMPUTER COUNT ONE, COUNT TWO, COUNT
- 28 THREE AND THEN WE TOOK AN AVERAGE. THAT'S NOT

1	HOW I DO MY ANALYSIS AND NOBODY HAS RECOMMENDED
2	THAT."
3	AND THEN MR. PETROSINELLI RESPONDED, "PERFECT."
4	DO YOU SEE THAT?
5	A YES.
6	Q ALL RIGHT.
7	SO I JUST WANT TO BE CLEAR, THAT QUOTE THAT THE
8	COURT THAT THEY WERE SHOWING THE COURT YESTERDAY
9	MORNING TRYING TO MAKE IT SEEM LIKE YOUR VIEW OF
10	CONSISTENCY IS, "DOES IT MATCH WHAT I EXPECT THE RESULTS
11	TO BE," CAN YOU PLEASE EXPLAIN WHAT YOU ACTUALLY SAID AT
12	YOUR DEPOSITION AND WHAT YOU DID HERE.
13	A WELL, THE EXPECTATION IS ACTUALLY A SCIENTIFIC
14	TERM. WE EVEN HAVE MEASURES WHERE WE CALCULATE THE
15	OBSERVED NUMBER OVER THE EXPECTED AND THAT'S CALLED AN
16	SMR IN OUR SCIENCE. AND WE GENERATE THE EXPECTED FROM
17	THE UNEXPOSED GROUP, SO HOW MANY CANCERS DO I EXPECT IF
18	THE EXPOSURE WOULD NOT EXIST AND I USE A POPULATION IN
19	WHOM THE EXPOSURE DOESN'T EXIST, THAT GIVES ME MY RATE.
20	THAT'S THE EXPECTED NUMBER I GET.
21	THEN I COUNT THE NUMBER OF CASES THAT WE
22	OBSERVE UNDER EXPOSURE, AND WE COMPARE THE OBSERVED TO
23	THE EXPECTED, SO THAT'S THE WAY I SEE EXPECTATION. IT'S
24	A VERY SCIENTIFIC WAY. IT'S A WAY IN WHICH WE MAKE SURE
25	THAT WE, YOU KNOW, USE SCIENTIFIC METHODS, ACTUALLY, AND
26	FORMULATE THE METHODS THAT WE ARE USING TO GENERATE THE
27	EXPECTED NUMBER AND THEN DEFEND THAT.
28	SO IT'S NOT MY OPINION. IT'S ACTUALLY THE WAY

THAT SCIENCE WORKS.
Q NOW, IN THE OPENING STATEMENT, THE COURT WAS
ALSO SHOWN THIS SLIDE WHICH CONTAINED QUOTES FROM
VARIOUS STUDIES, THE FIRST ONE BEING SKOGHEIM, 2021.
DO YOU SEE THAT?
A YES.
Q AND THIS WAS IN THE CONTEXT OF SAYING THAT, YOU
KNOW, THERE'S INCONSISTENT RESULTS AND THAT THE STUDIES
THEMSELVES ARE SAYING THERE'S A LACK OF CONSISTENCY.
NOW, I'D LIKE TO SHOW YOU THE SKOGHEIM PAPER.
SO I'M SHOWING YOU HERE, THIS IS EXHIBIT 119 IN
THE RECORD, AND DO YOU SEE THAT THIS IS IN FACT A COPY
OF THE SKOGHEIM PAPER, DOCTOR?
A YES, I SEE IT.
Q OKAY.
AND FIRST, THIS WAS A STUDY THAT WAS LOOKING AT
PRENATAL EXPOSURES, NOT POST-NATAL; IS THAT RIGHT?
A CORRECT.
Q WHAT, IF ANY, RELEVANCE DOES THAT HAVE TO YOUR
ANALYSIS?
A WELL, IT'S ALWAYS IMPORTANT TO LOOK AT EVERY
CINCLE CENCIDIVE DEDICE IN NEUDODEVELODMENT AND
SINGLE SENSITIVE PERIOD IN NEURODEVELOPMENT, AND
PRENATAL EXPOSURES ARE OF COURSE CAPTURING A VERY
· ·
PRENATAL EXPOSURES ARE OF COURSE CAPTURING A VERY
PRENATAL EXPOSURES ARE OF COURSE CAPTURING A VERY SENSITIVE PERIOD, BUT ANY KIND OF PRENATAL STUDY, YOU
PRENATAL EXPOSURES ARE OF COURSE CAPTURING A VERY SENSITIVE PERIOD, BUT ANY KIND OF PRENATAL STUDY, YOU HAVE TO BE, AS I TRIED TO EXPLAIN YESTERDAY, QUITE

OF WAYS. AND THERE ARE VERY SENSITIVE WINDOWS IN THE PRENATAL TIME, BUT THERE ARE SO-CALLED "POSSIBLE PARADOXICAL RESULTS YOU CAN GET WHERE ACTUALLY THE DOSE RESPONSE RELATIONSHIP DOESN'T LOOK LINEAR ALL. IT COULD LOOK -- IT COULD HAVE SOME WEIRD SHAPE.

2.4

AND THAT WEIRD SHAPE COMES ABOUT BECAUSE YOU'RE HITTING A FETUS AT CERTAIN VULNERABLE STAGES IN THEIR DEVELOPMENT AND YOU'RE NOT JUST PITTING ONE PART OF THE BRAIN OR, YOU KNOW, ONE PART OF THIS DEVELOPING CHILD, NO, YOU'RE HITTING THE WHOLE ORGANISM, AND SOME CHILDREN MAY NOT TAKE THE SAME AMOUNT OF TOXIC AGENTS IN THE WAY THAT OTHERS WOULD AND WE ACTUALLY GET A LOT OF ABORTIONS OR STILLBIRTHS; ACTUALLY LEAD HAS BEEN ASSOCIATED WITH STILL BIRTHS AND FETAL LOSS.

SO WE WOULD BE WORRIED THAT ACTUALLY AT VERY HIGH LEVELS OF EXPOSURE WE MIGHT SEE A DROP IN THE RATE OF CHILDREN WHO DEVELOP ADVERSE EFFECTS AFTER BIRTH AND I EXPLAINED THAT AS THE LIVE BIRTH BIAS.

HOWEVER, AT OTHER PARTS OF THE EXPOSURE SPECTRUM, YOU MIGHT EXACTLY SEE WHAT YOU WOULD EXPECT FOR THAT DEVELOPMENTAL PERIOD WHERE THE BRAIN IS, IT COULD BE BIRTH DEFECTS OF THE BRAIN IN THE FIRST TRIMESTER, IT COULD BE MAJOR FUNCTIONS THAT ARE AFFECTED IN THE SECOND TRIMESTER AND THEN MORE SYNAPTIC TYPE FUNCTIONS LIKE WHAT WE SEE IN AUTISM WHEN YOU GET LATER IN PREGNANCY.

SO I WOULD NEVER DISCOUNT ANY OF THESE STUDIES, BUT I NEED TO LOOK AT THEM WITH WHAT I KNOW ABOUT FETAL

1	DEVELOPMENT.
2	Q IN THE STUDY IN THE INTRODUCTION OF THE PAPER,
3	THEY QUOTED THIS SECTION RIGHT HERE THAT SAYS, "ALL
4	TOGETHER, THERE'S STILL LIMITED KNOWLEDGE ON
5	PRENATAL EXPOSURE TO METALS OR VARIATIONS OF
6	MATERNAL LEVELS OF ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS IN
7	CLINICIAN-BASED ASD AND ADHD DIAGNOSIS IN
8	CHILDHOOD. IN ADDITION, THERE ARE
9	INCONSISTENCIES REGARDING STUDY DESIGNS AND
10	FINDINGS."
11	DO YOU SEE THAT?
12	A YES.
13	Q NOW, IF YOU NOTICE THIS IS RIGHT IN THE
14	INTRODUCTION PORTION.
15	DO YOU SEE THAT?
16	A YES.
17	Q NOW, WHEN AN AUTHOR IS IN THE PROCESS OF
18	DISPLAYING AND THIS WAS RAISED IN THE BRIEFING, SO I
19	KIND OF WANT TO FLUSH THIS OUT A LITTLE BIT VERY
20	OFTEN IN THE PUBLISHED STUDIES, DO AUTHORS SET THE STAGE
21	FOR WHY THEIR PAPER IS RELEVANT?
22	A WELL, THAT'S ACTUALLY HOW WE TEACH OUR STUDENTS
23	TO DO IT WHEN THEY START WRITING THEIR FIRST PAPERS, AND
24	OF COURSE WHAT WE DO WHEN WE WRITE THESE PAPERS, AND
25	I'VE WRITTEN ABOUT 400 BY NOW, WE SET UP THE STAGE. AND
26	ONE WAY YOU SET UP THE STAGE FOR YOUR PAPER IS BY
27	BRIEFLY REVIEWING THE RELEVANCE OF THE SUBJECT MATTER
28	AND THEN OUTLINING WHERE THE GAPS ARE.

1		AND WHEN YOU HAVE CERTAIN AUTHORS PREFER
2	THERE AR	E DIFFERENT PREFERENCES OF HOW TO DO THAT. I
3	GENERALL'	Y LIKE TO TELL MY STUDENTS THAT THEY SHOULD NOT
4	SAY WE DO	ON'T KNOW MUCH BECAUSE WE MIGHT KNOW A LOT, BUT
5	WE MIGHT	NOT KNOW CERTAIN THINGS AND THAT'S WHY WE ARE
6	DOING TH	IS STUDY, WE ARE FILLING THIS GAP. BUT SOME
7	AUTHORS :	PREFER TO SAY, WELL, THEY HAVE A LOT OF
8	INCONSIS'	TENCY AND WE ARE NOW GOING TO CONDUCT A STUDY
9	THAT WIL	L GIVE YOU THE END-ALL OF, YOU KNOW, KNOWLEDGE
10	THAT WILL HELP YOU GO BEYOND THE INCONSISTENCY.	
11		NO ONE STUDY EVER DOES THAT, SO USUALLY
12	RECOMMEND NOT TO SAY THAT, BUT I DO SEE THAT.	
13	Q	OKAY.
14		SO THEN IN THE ACTUAL DISCUSSION IF YOU GO INTO
15	THE PAPE	R, THERE'S A SECTION ABOUT LEAD.
16		IS THIS HARD TO READ? PROBABLY IS. I'LL BREAK
17	IT UP.	
18	A	YEAH.
19	Q	SO IT STARTS OFF BY SAYING, "LEAD IS ANOTHER
20		WELL-KNOWN DEVELOPMENTAL NEUROTOXICANT WITH NO
21		KNOWN SAFE LEVELS OF EXPOSURE FOR
22		NEURODEVELOPMENT."
23		DOCTOR, THAT'S SOMETHING THAT YOU'VE AGREED AND
24	TESTIFIE	D ABOUT ALREADY?
25	A	YES.
26	Q	AND THEN IT TALKS ABOUT, "WE IDENTIFIED A NON
27		LINEAR U SHAPED ASSOCIATION WITH PRENATAL LEAD
28		EXPOSURE IN ASD."

1	DO YOU SEE THAT?
2	A YES.
3	Q THEN THAT WAS, AGAIN, THAT U SHAPE IS THAT
4	EXACTLY WHAT YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT WHERE LOWER LEVELS
5	AND REALLY HIGH LEVELS MIGHT SHOW UP, BUT MAYBE THE
6	MIDDLE LEVELS DON'T; RIGHT?
7	A YES.
8	Q AND THEN AT THE BOTTOM PART OF IT, IT GOES
9	REGARDING "WE ALSO DETECTED INCREASED RISK AT HIGHER
10	LEVELS OF LEAD WHICH IS IN LINE WITH THE
11	LITERATURE ALTHOUGH PROSPECTIVE STUDIES ARE
12	LACKING WHEN IT COMES TO PRENATAL LEAD EXPOSURE
13	IN ASD."
14	DO YOU SEE THAT?
15	A YES.
16	Q SO WHEN THEY SAY THIS IS IN LINE WITH THE
17	LITERATURE BUT THERE'S A LACK OF PROSPECTIVE DATA IN
18	PRENATAL LEAD EXPOSURE, WHAT DOES THAT TELL YOU AS A
19	EPIDEMIOLOGIST READING THIS?
20	A SO THAT MEANS THERE'S QUITE A BIT OF LITERATURE
21	OUT THERE ON LEAD AND ASD, BUT IT'S PROBABLY FOR THE
22	POST-NATAL PERIOD AND FOR THE PRENATAL PERIOD WE WISH WE
23	HAD MORE PROSPECTIVE STUDIES.
24	AND THAT'S HOW YOU WOULD ARGUE IN ORDER TO TELL
25	THE READER PLEASE PAY ATTENTION TO MY STUDY BECAUSE WE
26	ARE ONE OF THE FEW THAT ACTUALLY DOES WHAT IS MISSING.
27	THAT'S EMPHASIZING THE GAP THAT YOU'RE FILLING.
28	Q AND THEN IN THE CON OH, SORRY, I'M HAVING

AUDIO PRO	OBLEMS SO IF I INTERRUPT YOU IT'S BECAUSE I
	U'RE DONE AND YOU'RE NOT AND I APOLOGIZE.
A	YEAH.
0	IT SAYS RIGHT HERE IN THE FINAL CONCLUSION,
~	"RESULTS FROM THE PRESENT STUDY SHOW SEVERAL
	ASSOCIATIONS BETWEEN LEVELS OF METALS AND
	ELEMENTS DURING GESTATION AND ASD AND ADHD IN
	CHILDREN. THE MOST NOTABLE ONES INVOLVE
	ARSENIC, CADMIUM, COPPER, MERCURY, MANGANESE,
	MAGNESIUM AND LEAD. THE MEASURE OF BLOOD
	LEVELS OF TOXIC LEVELS WERE IN LINE WITH
	PREVIOUS STUDIES OF PREGNANT WOMEN IN NORWAY
	AND OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES."
	DO YOU SEE THAT?
А	YES.
Q	AND WHEN YOU WHEN YOU'RE SAYING THAT YOURS
AND I'	I GOES ON TO SAY: "INDICATING THAT EVEN
	POPULATION LEVELS OF THESE COMPOUNDS MAY HAVE
	NEGATIVE IMPACT ON NEURODEVELOPMENT."
	DO YOU SEE THAT?
A	YES.
Q	WHEN AN AUTHOR SAYS IT'S THIS LINE WITH OTHER
STUDIES,	PREVIOUS STUDIES, IS THAT ESSENTIALLY SAYING
IT'S CON	SISTENT?
A	YES, THAT'S WHAT THEY ARE SAYING.
	IT'S CONSISTENT WITH WHAT THEY EXPECT GIVEN THE
LITERATU	RE.
Q	OKAY.
	A Q AND I'A A Q STUDIES, IT'S CONSA

WE ALREADY TALKED ABOUT THE ARORA STUDY AND I
DON'T WANT TO SPEND TOO MUCH TIME THIS MORNING, I WANT
TO HAND YOU OVER TO OPPOSING COUNSEL, BUT LET'S QUICKLY
TAKE A LOOK AT THE WANG STUDY.
AGAIN, THEY HERE HAVE A QUOTE, "DUE TO THE LACK
OF CONSISTENCY AMONG THE VARIOUS STUDY FINDINGS
THE EFFECTS OF INORGANIC ARSENIC AND LEAD ON
ASD HAVE NOT BEEN ESTABLISHED."
DO YOU SEE THAT?
A YES.
Q ALL RIGHT. SO WE GO TO THE WANG STUDY.
WHERE THIS IS REFERRING TO IS, AGAIN, A QUOTE
FROM THE INTRODUCTION RIGHT HERE.
DO YOU SEE THAT QUOTE?
A YES.
Q OKAY. AND AGAIN, AND THEN THESE KIND OF
STATEMENTS IN THE INTRODUCTION, THEY ARE SETTING THE
STAGE FOR THE PUBLICATION AS WE DISCUSSED WITH THE
SKOGHEIM PAPER; RIGHT?
A CORRECT. YES, THAT'S WHAT THE PURPOSE IS.
Q SORRY.
NOW, DOCTOR, I KNOW YOU REVIEWED THE WANG STUDY
AND I KNOW YOU HAVE OPINIONS ABOUT IT.
GENERALLY, DO YOU THINK THAT THESE AUTHORS DID
A GOOD JOB WITH WHAT THEY PURPORT TO CLAIM IS A META
ANALYSIS?
A NO, THEY ACTUALLY DID NOT CONDUCT A META

POOLED ANALYSIS. AND TO DO THAT IN THIS CONTEXT IS
ACTUALLY RATHER STRANGE BECAUSE YOU ARE POOLING MEANS,
YOU'RE USING THE DATA AND YOU ARE JUST COMBINING ALL
CASES, ALL CASE DATA TOGETHER AND ALL CONTROL DATA
TOGETHER ACROSS STUDIES. SO YOU ARE NOT COMPARING CASES
AGAINST CONTROLS ANYMORE WITHIN A STUDY TO GENERATE A
SUMMARY ESTIMATE FOR THE STUDY WITH ALL ITS PROBLEMS OR
ALL ITS ADVANTAGES.

2.4

EACH STUDY ITSELF MAY HAVE ACTUALLY USED A LOT OF METHODOLOGIC APPROACHES THAT ARE SPECIFIC TO THE STUDY THAT ARE VERY IMPORTANT TO RETAIN BECAUSE THE CASES AND THE CONTROLS WERE TREATED IN EXACTLY THE SAME WAY. THAT'S NOT THE SAME WHEN YOU GO ACROSS STUDIES.

SO, FOR EXAMPLE, THE WAY THAT THE BLOOD LEAD WAS MEASURED MAY NOT -- WHICH LAB AND WHAT THE MINIMUM DETECTION LIMITS IN EACH LAB WERE ARE LIKELY DIFFERENT FROM STUDY TO STUDY, AND NOW YOU'RE BEHAVING AS IF THAT DOESN'T MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE, YOU CAN JUST SUMMARIZE ACROSS ALL CASES ACROSS ALL STUDIES AND ACROSS ALL CONTROLS ACROSS ALL STUDIES AND IGNORE ALL OF THESE METHODOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES.

AND THAT'S USUALLY NOT RECOMMENDED. THAT'S WHY
WE DO META ANALYSES IN THESE CASES, NOT POOLED ANALYSES
TO ACTUALLY PRESERVE THE SPECIFICS OF EACH STUDY IN
TERMS OF THESE ISSUES SO THAT WE ARE NOT COMPARING
APPLES AND ORANGES, BUT APPLES AND APPLES.

Q NOW, DOCTOR, IN THIS STUDY IT'S MY
UNDERSTANDING THAT THE -- THAT THEY FOUND PRETTY

1 CONSISTENT ASSOCIATIONS WITH ARSENIC BUT INCONSISTENT 2 RESULTS FOR DIFFERENT BIOMARKERS FOR LEAD; IS THAT 3 RIGHT? THAT'S CORRECT. 4 Α AND THAT SORT OF NOT SEEING A RESULT IN A 5 0 POOLED ANALYSIS IN LEAD, THEY SPECIFICALLY NOTED THAT 6 7 THERE WAS HETEROGENEITY IN IT; IS THAT RIGHT? 8 YES, YES. AND THAT'S THE OTHER PROBLEM WHEN, А 9 YOU KNOW, SOME HETEROGENEITY BETWEEN STUDY RESULTS MEANS 10 THAT THERE ARE VERY BIG DIFFERENCES IN THE AMOUNT OF 11 ASSOCIATION OR NOT ASSOCIATION THAT YOU'RE SEEING. SO BASICALLY IT SAYS WE INCLUDE SOME STUDIES 12 13 THAT DID NOT SEE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CASES AND CONTROLS, OTHERS THAT DID PLUS STUDIES THAT MAY HAVE SHOWN THE 14 15 OPPOSITE, BUT WE'RE INCLUDING THEM ALL. AND WHEN YOU 16 HAVE A VERY HIGH MEASURE OF HETEROGENEITY IN A META 17 ANALYSIS, THAT'S USUALLY APT TO TAKE CARE AND GIVE A 18 WARNING TO THE READER BECAUSE IT MIGHT NOT BE APPROPRIATE TO SUMMARIZE ACROSS THESE STUDIES. 19 THAT'S 20 WHY WE USE THIS MEASURE TO GIVE US AN IDEA WHETHER IT'S APPROPRIATE OR NOT APPROPRIATE TO ACTUALLY GENERATE THE 21 22 SUMMARY MEASURE. 23 WHAT WE TEACH AND WHAT I'VE BEEN TAUGHT IS THAT IN THIS CASE YOU'RE ACTUALLY LOOKING AT THESE STUDIES 2.4 THAT HAVE MAYBE OPPOSITE RESULTS MUCH MORE DEEPLY AND 25 26 YOU TRY TO UNDERSTAND WHY THEY CAME UP WITH OPPOSITE 27 RESULTS.

28

IS A THERE A BIAS IN ONE STUDY OR THE OTHER?

1	DID THEY LOOK AT DIFFERENT TYPES OF POPULATIONS AT
2	DIFFERENT TIME POINTS IN DEVELOPMENT? WHAT IS IT THAT
3	REALLY GENERATES THIS OBVIOUS HETEROGENEITY AND YOU TRY
4	TO UNDERSTAND SCIENTIFICALLY WHAT THAT MEANS AND NOT
5	JUST GENERATE A SUMMARY ESTIMATE. AND BASICALLY
6	BRUSHING OVER ALL THESE DIFFERENT DIFFERENCES ACROSS
7	STUDIES.
8	MR. WISNER: OKAY. YOUR HONOR, COULD WE JUST
9	HAVE A QUICK RECESS. I CAN'T HEAR HER RIGHT NOW. I'M
10	HAVING REAL BAD AUDIO PROBLEMS. CAN YOU JUST GIVE ME
11	TWO MINUTES TO FIX, I'M SORRY?
12	THE COURT: OF COURSE.
13	(OFF-RECORD COMMENTS)
14	MR. WISNER: ALL RIGHT.
15	Q WELL, DR. RITZ, SO IN THIS STUDY IT SAYS RIGHT
16	HERE. "AFTER CONSIDERING" LET ME SHOW YOU RIGHT
17	HERE. IT SAYS, "AFTER CONSIDERING STRENGTH AND
18	LIMITATIONS OF THE BODY OF RESEARCH, WE HAVE
19	CONCLUDED THAT THERE IS CONSISTENT EVIDENCE
20	SUPPORTING A POSITIVE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN EARLY
21	LIFE ARSENIC EXPOSURE AND DIAGNOSIS OF ASD AND
22	INCONSISTENT EVIDENCE FOR LEAD EXPOSURE AND
23	ASD."
24	DO YOU SEE THAT?
25	A YES.
	A YES. Q NOW, IT'S REALLY INTERESTING. THAT IF YOU GO
25	

1	THEY SAY, "THE EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT A
2	RELATIONSHIP FOR A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BODY
3	EXPOSURE TO LEAD AND ASD IS NOT CONSISTENT, BUT
4	OVERALL IT IS MORE SUPPORTIVE RATHER THAN
5	AGAINST IT."
6	DO YOU SEE THAT?
7	A YES.
8	Q AND I GUESS YOU HAVE YOUR CRITICISMS OF WHY THE
9	LEAD DATA IN THEIR META ANALYSIS OR POOL ANALYSIS DIDN'T
10	SHOW A RESULT OR NOT.
11	BUT WHEN THEY STATE HERE THAT IT'S MORE
12	SUPPORTIVE RATHER THAN AGAINST IT, I MEAN, IS THAT
13	ANOTHER WAY OF SAYING THAT IT'S MORE LIKELY THAN NOT?
14	A YES, THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT THEY ARE SAYING,
15	UM-HMM.
16	Q OKAY.
17	ALL RIGHT. DOCTOR, I WANT TO FINISH UP ON THE
18	REVERSE CAUSATION ISSUE.
19	AND IN THE DEFENSE OPENING SLIDES, THEY HAD
20	THIS DIAGRAM HERE DISCUSSING THE RESULTS OF THE ABDALLAH
21	AL-AYADHI PAPER, AND THIS ISN'T RENDERING PROBABLY
22	IT'S ACTUALLY IN THE ORIGINAL SLIDE IT SAYS IT UP THERE
23	IN THE HEADER, BUT IT'S NOT SHOWING RIGHT NOW, BUT IT'S
24	REFERRING TO THAT STUDY, OKAY, DOCTOR?
25	A YES.
26	Q AND THEY EXPLAIN HOW IN THAT STUDY THERE WAS
27	MEASUREMENTS TAKEN ON AVERAGE AT 8.8 YEARS AND THAT
28	CHILDREN ARE TYPICALLY, YOU KNOW, SYMPTOMATIC WITH ASD

1	AT 3, AND SO BETWEEN THIS PERIOD OF 3 AND 8.8 YEARS,
2	THEY WERE ARGUING THAT THE LEAD BURDEN THAT YOU'RE
3	SEEING IS REALLY A FUNCTION OF THESE THINGS THAT THEY
4	HAVE HIGHLIGHTED HERE; PICA, DECREASED ABILITY TO
5	METABOLIZE METAL AND NUTRITIONAL DEFECTS.
6	DO YOU SEE THAT?
7	A YES.
8	Q NOW, WE TALKED ABOUT PICA YESTERDAY. I DON'T
9	WANT TO TALK ABOUT IT AGAIN.
10	BUT LET'S TALK BRIEFLY ABOUT DECREASED ABILITY
11	TO METABOLIZE METALS, OKAY.
12	A UM-HMM.
13	Q IS THE DECREASED ABILITY TO METABOLIZE METAL IS
14	THAT REVERSE CAUSATION, DOCTOR?
15	A NO, THAT'S JUST THE ABILITY OR NON ABILITY TO
16	DEAL WITH WHAT COMES YOUR WAY. SO IF THERE WEREN'T ANY
17	EXPOSURES, THEN THE ABILITY, THE GENETIC OR PHYSIOLOGIC
18	ABILITY TO DEAL WITH THESE TOXINS WOULD BE IRRELEVANT,
19	RIGHT. THE TOXINS ONLY MATTER WHEN THEY HIT A
20	VULNERABLE ORGANISM. AND THIS JUST MEANS THERE'S A
21	VULNERABLE ORGANISM AND WE ARE HITTING IT NOW.
22	Q THEY EVEN CITE TO THIS QUOTE FROM THE STUDY.
23	"THE POSSIBLE EXPLANATION FOR THE RESULT IS
24	THAT AUTISTIC CHILDREN MIGHT LACK THE ABILITY
25	TO DETOXIFY TOXINS RESULTING IN AN ACCUMULATION
26	OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES IN THE BODY."
27	DO YOU SEE THAT?
28	A YES.
	24

1	Q SORRY. IS IT BLURRY?
2	A YEAH, THERE ARE, YEAH.
3	Q YOU NOTICE RIGHT THERE IN THE QUOTE, THOUGH,
4	THERE IS NO PERIOD.
5	DO YOU SEE THAT?
6	A YES, I DO.
7	Q SO I WENT AHEAD AND I ACTUALLY LOOKED UP THE
8	ORIGINAL STUDY. THIS IS THE AL-AYADHI STUDY FROM 2005.
9	DO YOU SEE THAT?
10	A YES. AL-AYADHI.
11	Q THANK YOU. I'M NOT GOING TO SAY THAT CORRECTLY
12	SO I WON'T EVEN TRY.
13	AND THEN WE HAVE HERE THAT PORTION THAT THEY
14	QUOTED FROM. AND I'LL SHOW YOU THE PORTION THAT THEY
15	HIGHLIGHTED THEY QUOTED, THEY SAID, IT'S A PORTION
16	IT WAS RIGHT HERE.
17	"THE POSSIBLE EXPLANATION FOR THIS IS THAT
18	AUTISTIC CHILDREN MIGHT LACK THE ABILITY TO
19	DETOXIFY TOXINS RESULTING IN AN ACCUMULATION OF
20	TOXIC SUBSTANCES SUBSTANCES IN BODY."
21	DO YOU SEE THAT THAT'S WHAT THEY QUOTED?
22	A YES.
23	Q I THINK WE SHOULD LOOK AT THE BEGINNING OF AND
24	AT THE END OF IT AND THEN SEE HOW IT RELATES TO REVERSE
25	CAUSATION.
26	THEY ACTUALLY START OFF BY TALKING ABOUT THE
27	MOST LIKELY EXPLANATION THAT IS AS MENTIONED EARLIER:
28	"DUE TO EXPOSURE TO TOXIC METALS THROUGH

1	DRINKING WATER, COMBUSTION EMISSIONS, SOIL,
2	PAINT CHIPS, FERTILIZER, FOOD, CAR EXHAUST, AND
3	SO FORTH; HOWEVER, A QUESTION MIGHT BE RAISED
4	CHILDREN WITH AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER ARE NOT
5	THE ONLY CHILDREN EXPOSED TO THESE TOXIC
6	HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS. NORMAL CHILDREN ARE ALSO
7	EXPOSED. THE POSSIBLE EXPLANATION FOR THIS IS
8	THAT AUTISTIC CHILDREN MIGHT LACK THE ABILITY
9	TO DETOXIFY TOXINS RESULTING IN AN ACCUMULATION
10	OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES IN THE BODY."
11	AND THEN IT GOES ON:
12	"AND LEADING TO ALTERATIONS IN BIOCHEMICAL
13	PROCESSES TAKING PLACE IN THE BODY."
14	DO YOU SEE THAT?
15	A YES.
16	Q THAT SECOND PART, THE "LEADING TO ALTERATIONS
17	IN THE BIOCHEMICAL PROCESS TAKING PLACE IN THE BODY" IS
18	THAT BEING AND THE FACT THAT THESE TOXIC METALS ARE
19	ACCUMULATING IN AUTISTIC CHILDREN, IS THAT A CASE FOR
20	REVERSE CAUSATION OR A CASE FOR CAUSATION, DOCTOR?
21	A YEAH, IT'S A CAUSE FOR CUMULATIVE CAUSATION.
22	SO IT'S WHERE YOU, YOU KNOW, OVER TIME, THE
23	BODY BECOMES MORE AND MORE VULNERABLE.
24	YOU COULD ARGUE WHY SHOULD THEY ALL OF A SUDDEN
25	AT THE AGE OF THREE HAVE STARTED TO BE VULNERABLE AND
26	NOT BEEN VULNERABLE BEFORE, RIGHT. SO BASICALLY IT'S
27	IF WE BELIEVE THESE KIDS ARE MORE VULNERABLE AND DON'T
28	DETOXIFY, THEY WOULD DO THAT AT ANY AGE SO THEY WOULD

1	HAVE ALREADY STARTED TO BE VULNERABLE AT BIRTH BECAUSE
2	THEY CAN'T DETOXIFY TOXINS.
3	IF YOU NOW EXPOSE THEM TO TOXINS WELL, THEY
4	CAN'T DETOXIFY, THEY ARE VULNERABLE, THEY HAVE THE
5	REACTIONS THEIR BODY WILL HAVE THE REACTIONS THAT WE
6	THEN SEE PLAY OUT IN THESE KIND OF SYMPTOMS.
7	Q ALL RIGHT. DOCTOR, I KNOW THERE'S BEEN SOME
8	ALLEGATIONS THAT YOU HAVE THAT YOU VIEW THE BRADFORD
9	HILL CRITERION AS BEING ARBITRARY.
10	LET ME JUST ASK YOU, DOCTOR, IS THAT EVEN
11	REMOTELY TRUE?
12	A NO. IF I MEAN, IF WE WOULD IF WE WOULD
13	THINK THEY ARE ARBITRARY, WE WOULDN'T BE USING THEM.
14	THEY ARE THE OPPOSITE OF ARBITRARY. THEY ARE ACTUALLY
15	GIVING US THE SCIENTIFIC GUIDE TO HOW WE CAN ARGUE ABOUT
16	CAUSALITY AND STILL UNDERSTAND EACH OTHER, STILL USE
17	FACTS, STILL USE SCIENTIFIC INSIGHT AND BE VERY
18	TRANSPARENT ABOUT IT. THAT'S THE OPPOSITE OF ARBITRARY.
19	Q AND, DOCTOR, JUST TO WRAP THIS UP: DID YOU
20	REACH A DEGREE TO A REASONABLE SCIENTIFIC CERTAINTY
21	ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT EARLY LIFE EXPOSURE TO LEAD CAN
22	CAUSE ASD AND OR ADHD?
23	A ABSOLUTELY. AND I'VE WRITTEN SO IN MY REPORT.
24	Q OKAY. AND THE SCIENTIFIC RIGOR WITH WHICH YOU
25	ARRIVED AT THOSE OPINIONS, IS THAT THE SAME SCIENTIFIC
26	RIGOR THAT YOU WOULD APPLY IN YOUR WORK AS AN
27	EPIDEMIOLOGIST AS YOU HAVE FOR THE LAST FEW DECADES?
28	A ABSOLUTELY. I WOULDN'T DO ANYTHING ELSE.

O CAME OUECUTON EOD ADCENTO AND ACD
Q SAME QUESTION FOR ARSENIC AND ASD.
DID YOU APPLY THE SAME PRINCIPLES AND METHODS THAT YOU USE IN YOUR REGULAR LIFE?
A I WOULDN'T KNOW HOW TO DO ANYTHING ELSE.
Q AND I GUESS IN THE LAST ONE, MERCURY AND ASD:
DID YOU ALSO USE THE SAME SCIENTIFIC RIGOR?
A YES. YES AND I LOOKED VERY CLOSELY AT MERCURY.
Q THANK YOU.
MR. WISNER: AT THIS TIME, YOUR HONOR, I HAVE
NO FURTHER QUESTIONS AND I PASS THE WITNESS.
THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.
CROSS EXAMINATION.
MR. PETROSINELLI: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. MAY
I PROCEED?
THE COURT: PLEASE.
CROSS EXAMINATION
MR. PETROSINELLI:
Q DR. RITZ, GOOD AFTERNOON. NICE TO SEE YOU
AGAIN.
A HELLO.
Q LET ME JUST JUMP RIGHT TO YOUR BRADFORD HILL
ANALYSIS.
THAT IS THE FRAMEWORK YOU USED TO REACH AN
OPINION ON WHETHER OR NOT THE EXPOSURE TO HEAVY METALS
COULD CAUSE ASD OR EXPOSURE TO LEAD COULD CAUSE ADHD; IS
THAT CORRECT?
A YES.

1	Q AND THE BRADFORD HILL FRAMEWORK INCLUDES NINE
2	FACTORS TO CONSIDER, DOES IT NOT?
3	A IT CON YES.
4	Q AND DO YOU AGREE THAT BEFORE APPLYING THE
5	BRADFORD HILL FACTORS TO ASSESS CAUSATION, THERE MUST BE
6	AN ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE EXPOSURE AND THE OUTCOME THAT
7	IS NOT EXPLAINED BY BIAS OR CONFOUNDING?
8	A I AM NOT SURE THAT I UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU MEAN,
9	BUT BIAS AND CONFOUNDING IS WHAT I ALWAYS CONSIDER AND
10	EVERY SCIENTIST IN MY AREA CONSIDERS, AND OF COURSE WE
11	ARE LOOKING AT EVERY STUDY VERY CLOSELY IN TERMS OF BIAS
12	AND CONFOUNDING.
13	BUT YOU CAN APPLY THE BRADFORD HILL CRITERIA
14	WITHOUT EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDIES. IT'S ACTUALLY DONE BY
15	THE AGENCY ON RESEARCH OF CANCER ON AND AGAIN, AT IARH,
16	THAT'S THE W-H-O ORGANIZATION THAT BRINGS OUT MONOGRAPHS
17	ON CARCINOGENICITY AND THEY USE CAUSALITY BASED ON
18	ANIMAL STUDIES AND MECHANISTIC STUDIES IF THERE ARE NO
19	EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDIES, BUT WHEN WE GO TO EPIDEMIOLOGIC
20	STUDIES, YES, WE ARE ALWAYS CONSIDERING BIAS.
21	Q NOW, MY QUESTION PERHAPS, DOCTOR, I PERHAPS
22	YOU DIDN'T HEAR ME, MY QUESTION WAS WHEN YOU'RE RELYING
23	ON EPIDEMIOLOGICAL STUDIES, BEFORE YOU APPLY THE
24	BRADFORD HILL FRAMEWORK, DON'T YOU HAVE TO BE SURE THERE
25	IS AN ASSOCIATION THAT IS NOT EXPLAINED BY BIAS OR
26	CONFOUNDING; CORRECT?
27	A I THINK IF YOU SAY IT THIS WAY, IT'S NOT
28	CORRECT, NO. ABSOLUTELY NOT.

1 WE, AS EPIDEMIOLOGISTS, ARE LEARNING TO 2 EVALUATE BIAS IN THE CONTEXT OF EVERY SINGLE STUDY WE 3 LOOK AT. THERE IS NOT ONE STUDY IN THE WORLD THAT YOU CAN SHOW ME, NOT EVEN IN RCT, A RANDOMIZED CONTROL 4 TRIAL, THAT IS COMPLETELY FREE OF BIAS. IT IS A QUESTION OF DEGREE. HOW MUCH BIAS IS 7 THERE AND IS THAT A BIAS THAT ACTUALLY MATTERS; MEANING, 8 THAT THE EFFECT ESTIMATE I'M SEEING IS REALLY FAR AWAY FROM THE TRUTH, FROM THE UNDERLYING TRUE ASSOCIATION OR 9 10 TRUE CAUSALITY, AND THAT WE EVALUATE IN EVERY ASPECT. YOU WILL NEVER EVER FIND A STUDY IN THE WORLD 11 12 THAT IS ABSOLUTELY FREE OF BIAS. AND IF YOU SHOW ME 13 ONE, THEN YOU PROBABLY ARE DESERVING THE NOBLE PRIZE. IT DOESN'T EXIST. 14

5

6

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

27

28

WHAT WE DO AS SCIENTISTS IS WE AGREE THAT WE ARE LOOKING AT SCIENCE WITH A CRITICAL EYE, AND THE CRITICAL EYE IN MY SCIENCE MEANS WE HAVE TO BE VERY CAREFUL ABOUT ASSESSING BIASES. AND EVERY SINGLE STUDY HAS BIASES. BUT SOME BIASES ACTUALLY ALLEVIATE EACH OTHER.

FOR EXAMPLE, THE PRINCIPLE OF CONFOUNDING, IT IS AN OVERARCHING CONCEPT, BUT THERE ARE CONFOUNDERS THAT PULL THE ESTIMATE IN ONE DIRECTION AND THERE ARE CONFOUNDERS THAT PULL THE ESTIMATE IN THE OPPOSITE ON AVERAGE THERE IS NO BIAS, OKAY, BUT THAT DIRECTION. WHAT WE DO WHEN WE EVALUATE STUDIES, WE LOOK AT EVERY SINGLE ONE AND WE GO THROUGH ALL OF THE BIASES, AND THAT'S ACTUALLY THE CLASS I'M TEACHING CURRENTLY AT UCLA

1	IN BASIC METHODS HOW YOU DO THAT.
2	Q DOCTOR, THAT WAS A VERY LONG ANSWER.
3	I JUST ASKED IS YOUR ANSWER NO THAT YOU DO
4	NOT BELIEVE AND IT'S FINE IF IT'S NO.
5	YOU DON'T BELIEVE LET ME STRIKE THAT.
6	YOU BELIEVE THAT YOU CAN APPLY THE BRADFORD
7	HILL CRITERIA WITHOUT FIRST FINDING AN ASSOCIATION THAT
8	IS NOT EXPLAINED BY BIAS OR CONFOUNDING; YES OR NO?
9	MR. WISNER: OBJECTION; ASKED AND ANSWERED AND,
10	FRANKLY, IMPROPER HYPOTHETICAL.
11	THE WITNESS: I DON'T THINK I UNDERSTAND YOUR
12	QUESTION. I TRIED TO EXPLAIN TO YOU.
13	MR. WISNER: DR DR. RITZ.
14	THE WITNESS: OKAY.
15	THE COURT: JUST A MOMENT. JUST A MOMENT. I
16	ACTUALLY THINK I DON'T UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION EITHER SO
17	PERHAPS YOU WOULD REPHRASE IT JUST A LITTLE BIT.
18	MR. PETROSINELLI: I WILL.
19	Q BEFORE YOU APPLY A BRADFORD HILL ANALYSIS,
20	THERE MUST BE AN ASSOCIATION BETWEEN AN EXPOSURE AND
21	OUTCOME; YOU AGREE WITH THAT?
22	A IF YOU HAVE NO ASSOCIATION, WHAT ARE YOU
23	EVALUATING? THAT'S WHAT I'M ASKING. YES, OF COURSE
24	THERE HAS TO BE ASSOCIATIONS.
25	Q OKAY.
26	AND THEN MY SO THEN MY NEXT QUESTION IS
27	BEFORE APPLYING A BRADFORD HILL ANALYSIS DOESN'T THERE
28	HAVE TO BE AN ASSOCIATION THAT IS NOT EXPLAINED BY BIAS

1	OR CONFOUNDING IN THE STUDIES?
2	THAT'S MY QUESTION.
3	A THAT'S WHERE I THINK WE ARE NOT UNDERSTANDING
4	EACH OTHER, BUT MAYBE IT'S ME, I CAN'T EXPLAIN IT WELL.
5	EVERY ASSOCIATION WE LOOK AT IN A STUDY IS MOST
6	LIKELY INFLUENCED BY SOME KIND OF BIAS, BUT
7	THE COURT: LET ME JUST INTERRUPT BECAUSE I
8	THINK WE'RE GOING AROUND IN CIRCLES. I THINK THE
9	PROBLEM IS THE NEGATIVE PHRASING OF THE QUESTION IS
10	CONFUSING.
11	THE WITNESS: RIGHT.
12	MR. PETROSINELLI: WELL, LET ME TRY THIS, YOUR
13	HONOR.
14	THE COURT: IF NO, GO AHEAD. SORRY.
15	MR. PETROSINELLI:
16	Q DO YOU AGREE I'LL MOVE ON DO YOU AGREE
17	THAT BEFORE APPLYING BRADFORD HILL FACTORS, THERE MUST
18	BE AN ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE EXPOSURE AND THE OUTCOME
19	THAT IS PERFECTLY CLEAR-CUT AND BEYOND WHAT WOULD BE
20	EXPLAINED BY CHANCE?
21	A CHANCE IS A VERY DIFFERENT CONCEPT FROM BIAS.
22	CHANCE IS A RANDOM CONCEPT OF IS THE STUDY BIG ENOUGH
23	THAT, YOU KNOW, CHANCE DOES NOT EXPLAIN WHAT I'M SEEING?
24	BIAS IS A SYSTEMIC ERROR. CHANCE IS A RANDOM
25	ERROR. SO THESE TWO CONCEPTS ARE COMPLETELY DIFFERENT
26	FROM EACH OTHER.
27	IF YOU SAY CHANCE, THEN YES, IT'S WE HAVE
28	STUDIES THAT ARE SO SMALL THAT THEY ARE NOT SHOWING AN

1	EFFECT AND EVERYTHING IS POSSIBLY RANDOM, THEN I DON'T
2	HAVE TO APPLY BRADFORD HILL.
3	Q OKAY.
4	LET'S LOOK AT THE BRADFORD HILL FACTORS.
5	LET ME PULL UP EXHIBIT 679, WHICH IS A
6	DEMONSTRATIVE THAT HAS THE NINE FACTORS.
7	GIVE ME ONE SECOND.
8	A OH, YOU'RE SHOWING ME?
9	Q YES SORRY.
10	A THANK YOU.
11	Q OKAY.
12	DOCTOR, THESE ON THE SCREEN, THESE ARE THE
13	BRADFORD HILL CRITERIA; CORRECT?
14	A YES.
15	Q AND IN CONDUCTING A BRADFORD HILL ANALYSIS, THE
16	SCIENTIST HAS TO CONSIDER ALL NINE OF THESE; CORRECT?
17	A WELL, WE CONSIDER ALL NINE OF THESE, BUT IF YOU
18	READ BRADFORD HILL'S PAPER, IT SAYS THAT, YOU KNOW, IT'S
19	NOT A CHECKLIST AT ALL, IT IS JUST A GUIDELINE OF HOW TO
20	ARRIVE AT A CAUSAL REASONING AND OPINION.
21	SO IT COULD BE THAT ANY ONE OF THESE DOES NOT
22	APPLY TO THE LITERATURE, BUT YOU STILL COME UP WITH A
23	CAUSAL INFERENCE.
24	Q THE ONE BRADFORD HILL FACTOR THAT ABSOLUTELY
25	MUST EXIST IN ORDER TO CONCLUDE THAT THE EXPOSURE TO A
26	SUBSTANCE CAN CAUSE A DISEASE IS TEMPORALITY; CORRECT?
27	A IT DEPENDS ON WHAT YOU MEAN BY TEMPORALITY.
28	GENERALLY, YES. WHEN WE SAY CAUSAL, ARE YOU

1	WHEN WE MAKE CAUSAL ARGUMENTS, WE WANT THE CAUSE TO
2	PRECEDE THE EFFECT, THAT'S ABSOLUTELY CORRECT. HOW WE
3	DO THAT IN OUR SCIENCE, HOWEVER, IS REALLY DEPENDENT ON
4	WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT, HOW DO WE ESTABLISH TEMPORALITY
5	IS DIFFERENT FROM DOES IT EXIST OR NOT.
6	Q AND NO MATTER WHAT THE OTHER EIGHT BRADFORD
7	HILL FACTORS WOULD SHOW, IF ONE CONCLUDES THAT
8	TEMPORALITY IS NOT MET, THEN THERE CAN BE NO FINDING OF
9	CAUSATION; CORRECT?
10	A I DON'T THINK I REALLY UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU MEAN
11	BY THIS.
12	MEAN DOES IT MEAN THAT I CANNOT ESTABLISH
13	TEMPORALITY AT ALL? OR THAT MY THAT I'M CONVINCED
14	THAT THE EFFECT PRECEDED THE CAUSE?
15	Q LET'S TRY THE LATTER. LET'S TRY BOTH OF THOSE.
16	IF YOU WELL, MY QUESTION REALLY WAS THE
17	SECOND ONE.
18	IF YOU CONCLUDE THAT TEMPORALITY CANNOT BE MET
19	NO MATTER WHAT THE OTHER EIGHT FACTORS SHOW, YOU CANNOT
20	CONCLUDE CAUSATION; CORRECT?
21	A WELL, IF I CAN IF I CAN CLEARLY SHOW THAT
22	THE EFFECT PRECEDED THE CAUSE, YES, THEN I WOULD SAY
23	THERE'S NO CAUSALITY.
24	Q ALL RIGHT.
25	LET ME TALK ABOUT A COUPLE OF THESE FACTORS
26	BEFORE WE TALK ABOUT TEMPORALITY IN A LITTLE MORE
27	DETAIL.
28	ONE OF THE FACTORS IS SPECIFICITY. IS THAT

1 RIGHT? 2 YES, I SEE IT. Α AND SPECIFICITY, THAT FACTOR MEANS THAT THE 3 0 EXPOSURE TO THE SUBSTANCE IS ASSOCIATED WITH A SPECIFIC 4 5 HEALTH OUTCOME; CORRECT? THAT'S GENERALLY HOW IT'S SEEN, YES. 6 7 AND IF THAT'S TRUE, IF THERE IS SPECIFICITY, 8 THEN IT'S MORE LIKELY THAT THERE'S A CAUSAL 9 RELATIONSHIP; CORRECT? 10 NO, IT'S JUST ONE OF THE CRITERIA AND ACTUALLY Α ONE OF THE CRITERIA THAT IS A LITTLE BIT UNFORTUNATE 11 BECAUSE WE KNOW THAT IT'S NOT CORRECT FOR MOST TOXIC 12 13 AGENTS BECAUSE THEY ARE DIRTY, THEY ARE DIRTY CHEMICALS. 14 SO, FOR EXAMPLE, IF YOU SAID SMOKING COULD ONLY 15 CAUSE LUNG CANCER AND THAT'S SPECIFIC, RIGHT, ONLY ONE TYPE OF LUNG CANCER, AND IF THAT'S ALL YOU WOULD EVER 16 17 PRESUME, THEN WE WOULD SAY, WELL, THEN, YOU KNOW, WE CAN'T CLAIM THAT SMOKING IS A CAUSE OF LUNG CANCER 18 BECAUSE WE ALSO SEE BLADDER CANCER AND WE SEE CERVICAL 19 20 CANCER, ET CETERA, ET CETERA. AND ALSO SMOKING CAUSES HEART DISEASE. 21 SMOKING CAUSES STROKE. THERE ARE SO MANY DIFFERENT DISEASES 22 23 THAT -- MISCARRIAGES, ET CETERA, ET CETERA, SO THERE'S NO SPECIFICITY. 2.4 25 UNFORTUNATELY, THIS CRITERIA ON SPECIFICITY IS 26 MORE LIKE IF I SEE IT THAT IT ONLY CAUSES ONE SPECIFIC 27 THING, THAT'S REALLY COOL, AND THEN I'M REALLY HAPPY AND 28 I PARADED AROUND LIKE ASBESTOSIS, I MEAN, THE WHOLE

1	ILLNESS IS CALLED AFTER THE AGENT, NOTHING ELSE CAN
2	CAUSE ASBESTOSIS BECAUSE IT'S ASBESTOS, RIGHT.
3	BUT THAT'S NOT HOW IT WORKS IN THE REAL WORLD
4	FOR MOST TOXINS, UNFORTUNATELY.
5	Q AND ISN'T IT TRUE, DOCTOR, THAT SPECIFICITY IS
6	NOT MET FOR ANY OF THE HEAVY METALS THAT YOU EVALUATED
7	IN ASD OR ADHD; CORRECT?
8	A WELL, SPECIFICITY IS NOT WHAT I WOULD EXPECT
9	FOR MOST OF THESE METALS. I WOULD ACTUALLY EXPECT THAT
10	THEY CAUSE A LOT OF DIFFERENT DAMAGE JUST LIKE SMOKING
11	DOES.
12	SPECIFICITY IS NOT THE CRITERIA TO THROW AT
13	METALS THAT HAVE SO MANY TOXIC EFFECTS ON AN ORGANISM.
14	Q OKAY.
15	A ESPECIALLY A BRAIN ORGANISM.
16	Q DOCTOR, I DIDN'T ASK YOU WHAT YOU EXPECT.
17	IS IT TRUE THAT IT IS NOT MET FOR ANY OF THE
18	HEAVY METALS THAT YOU EVALUATED IN THIS CASE AND ASD OR
19	ADHD? IS THAT TRUE?
20	A IF YOU MEAN SPECIFICITY IN TERMS OF THAT IT
21	ONLY KILLS ONE CELL TYPE, THAT IT ONLY IMPACTS ONE ORGAN
22	IN THE CELL, THAT IT ONLY AFFECTS ONE ORGAN ALONE, THEN
23	THERE IS NO SPECIFICITY BECAUSE WE KNOW THAT LEAD CAUSES
24	NOT ONLY COGNITIVE ISSUES, BEHAVIORAL ISSUES, IT CAUSES
25	KIDNEY DAMAGE, IT CAUSES A LOT OF OTHER DAMAGE IN THE
26	BODY.
27	Q AND LET'S LOOK AT ANOTHER BRADFORD HILL FACTOR;

28

EXPERIMENT.

1	IN THE CONTEXT OF BRADFORD HILL THAT MEANS
2	CLINICAL TRIALS OR TESTS INVOLVING HUMANS; CORRECT?
3	A THAT CAN MEAN THAT IN HUMANS EXPERIMENT IS
4	YOU NO, EXPERIMENT ACTUALLY MEANS THAT YOU ARE
5	CONTROLLING THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE EXPOSURE.
6	SO EXPERIMENT IS YOU PUT A RAT IN A CAGE, YOU
7	FEED IT A CERTAIN DIET, YOU GIVE IT A CERTAIN NUMBER OF
8	HOURS OF DAYLIGHT AND YOU CONTROL WHAT THIS ANIMAL'S
9	EXPOSURE IS IN EVERY DETAIL. THAT'S AN EXPERIMENT.
10	IN HUMANS WE DON'T DO THIS. THE ONLY
11	EXPERIMENT WE REALLY HAVE IS A RANDOMIZED CLINICAL
12	TRIAL, AND WITH TOXINS WE DO NOT DO THOSE BECAUSE WE
13	WOULD NOT EXPOSE SOMEBODY ON PURPOSE WITH A TOXIN AND
14	WAIT FOR EFFECTS.
15	Q AND SO WHEN YOU APPLY THE BRADFORD HILL
16	FACTORS, THE BRADFORD HILL FACTOR OF EXPERIMENT, YOU
17	INCLUDE ANIMAL STUDIES; DID I HEAR YOU JUST SAY THAT
18	CORRECTLY?
19	A YES, ANIMAL STUDIES DO INCLUDE ABSOLUTELY
20	INCLUDE HERE.
21	Q OKAY.
22	AND IS IT TRUE THAT FOR THE HEAVY METALS AT
23	ISSUE IN THIS CASE AND ASD OR ADHD, THE EXPERIMENT
24	FACTOR OF BRADFORD HILL IS NOT MET?
25	A I DON'T UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE ASKING ME
26	BECAUSE I JUST EXPLAINED THAT THERE ARE NO HUMAN
27	STUDIES.
28	IF I SAY ADHD AND ASD, THOSE ARE HUMAN

1	DISEASES, VERY SPECIFIC DISEASES TO THE BRAIN THAT HAVE
2	NO ANIMAL MODEL THAT IS COMPLETELY LIKE THE HUMAN, SO IF
3	WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HUMANS, THEN WE WOULDN'T HAVE
4	EXPERIMENTS, HOWEVER, WE DO HAVE EXPERIMENTS IN ANIMALS.
5	Q OKAY.
6	I'M JUST TRYING TO FIND OUT, DOCTOR, IN YOUR
7	BRADFORD HILL ANALYSES THAT YOU DID IN THIS CASE, DID
8	YOU FIND THAT THE EXPERIMENT FACTOR WAS MET OR NOT MET?
9	A NOT IN HUMANS. BUT IT'S NOT MET OR NOT MET.
10	EXPERIMENTS HOPEFULLY DON'T EXIST. IF YOU WOULD SEE
11	THEM IN HUMANS, I THINK THAT'S YOU KNOW THAT WOULD BE
12	A CRIME.
13	Q OKAY. LET'S TALK ABOUT CONSISTENCY.
14	SO AS I UNDERSTOOD YOUR TESTIMONY YESTERDAY AND
15	TODAY, YOU AGREE THAT THE DEFINITION OF CONSISTENCY FOR
16	PURPOSES OF A BRADFORD HILL ANALYSIS IS THAT THE
17	ASSOCIATION YOU'RE EVALUATING HAS BEEN REPEATEDLY
18	OBSERVED BY DIFFERENT PERSONS IN DIFFERENT PLACES,
19	CIRCUMSTANCES AND TIMES; CORRECT?
20	A CORRECT.
21	Q ALL RIGHT.
22	AND DO YOU AGREE THAT FOR PURPOSES OF JUDGING
23	THE BRADFORD HILL FACTOR OF CONSISTENCY, DIFFERENT
24	STUDIES THAT EXAMINE THE SAME EXPOSURE-DISEASE
25	RELATIONSHIP GENERALLY SHOULD YIELD SIMILAR RESULTS?
26	A THAT IS MUCH TOO GENERAL BECAUSE NO TWO STUDIES
27	ARE THE SAME. YOU HAVE STUDIES I MEAN, WE'RE NOT
28	THE COURT: SOMEONE NEEDS TO MUTE THEIR AUDIO.
	38

1	MAYBE MR. WILLIAMS. I CAN'T TELL.
2	THE WITNESS: IT'S ACTUALLY INTERESTING THAT
3	YOU TALK ABOUT CONSISTENCY AFTER WE JUST TALKED ABOUT
4	EXPERIMENTS BECAUSE IT IS EXPERIMENTS WHERE WE ARE
5	CONTROLLING THE EXPOSURE IN THE WAY THAT YOU ARE
6	EXPECTING IT TO HOLD FOR CONSISTENCY IN HUMAN STUDIES.
7	IT'S NOT THE CASE. THAT'S WHY OBSERVATIONAL
8	EPIDEMIOLOGY AND OBSERVATIONAL HUMAN STUDIES ARE VERY
9	DIFFERENT.
10	OBSERVATION STUDIES ARE OBSERVATIONAL BECAUSE
11	WE CANNOT CONTROL THE EXPOSURE. THAT MEANS THAT THE
12	LEVELS OF EXPOSURE ARE VERY DIFFERENT IN DIFFERENT
13	POPULATIONS. IT ALSO MEANS THAT WE ARE HITTING
14	DIFFERENT POPULATIONS WITH DIFFERENT LEVELS OF EXPOSURE
15	AND THESE POPULATIONS MAY BE MORE OR LESS SENSITIVE AT
16	THE TIME OF THEIR LIVES TO THESE EXPOSURES.
17	SO CONSISTENCY REALLY MEANS SOMETHING DIFFERENT
18	THAN THE WAY YOU'RE TRYING TO TELL ME IT SHOULD BE
19	INTERPRETED BECAUSE IT'S NOT AN EXPERIMENT, IT'S AN
20	OBSERVATIONAL STUDY IN AN OBSERVATIONAL ENVIRONMENT.
21	CONSISTENCY MEANS, DOES THE STUDY THAT HAS LOW
22	LEVEL OF LEAD SHOW ONE THING AND THE STUDY THAT HAS HIGH
23	LEVELS OF LEAD SHOW SOMETHING ELSE? OR DOES THE STUDY
24	WHERE LEAD EXPOSURE IS OUTSIDE A VULNERABLE PERIOD SHOW
25	SOMETHING DIFFERENT FROM THE STUDY WHERE THE LEAD
26	EXPOSURE HAPPENS DURING A VERY SENSITIVE TIME PERIOD?
27	SO THAT IS THE SCIENTIFIC AND CAUSAL

CONSISTENCY THAT WE WOULD BE EXPECTING.

1	MR. PETROSINELLI:
2	Q WELL, LET ME JUST SHOW YOU, DOCTOR, THE
3	STATEMENT WHERE I JUST THE REFERENCE YOU JUST READ IT
4	FROM.
5	LET ME PULL UP A DEMONSTRATIVE. THIS IS FROM
6	WHAT WE CALL THE REFERENCE MANUAL ON SCIENTIFIC
7	EVIDENCE.
8	SO LET ME ASK YOU IF YOU AGREE WITH SOME OF
9	THESE STATEMENTS. THIS IS FROM PAGE 604 OF THE
10	REFERENCE MANUAL.
11	THE FIRST HIGHLIGHTED STATEMENT SAYS: "IT IS
12	IMPORTANT THAT A STUDY BE REPLICATED IN
13	DIFFERENT POPULATIONS AND BY DIFFERENT
14	INVESTIGATORS BEFORE A CAUSAL RELATIONSHIP IS
15	ACCEPTED BY EPIDEMIOLOGISTS AND OTHER
16	SCIENTISTS."
17	DO YOU SEE WHERE I'M READING?
18	A YES.
19	Q AND DO YOU AGREE WITH THAT STATEMENT?
20	A IT'S A VERY GENERAL STATEMENT, AND AS GENERAL
21	AS IT IS, I CAN AGREE WITH IT.
22	Q OKAY.
23	NOW, LET ME GO DOWN TO THE STATEMENT I JUST
24	READ TO YOU.
25	"CONSISTENCY IN THESE FINDINGS IS AN IMPORTANT
26	FACTOR IN MAKING A JUDGMENT ABOUT CAUSATION.
27	DIFFERENT STUDIES THAT EXAMINE THE SAME
28	EXPOSURE-DISEASE RELATIONSHIP GENERALLY SHOULD
	40

YIELD SIMILAR RESULTS."
DO YOU SEE WHERE I JUST READ?
A YES.
Q DO YOU AGREE WITH THAT?
A YES. GENERALLY SHOULD YIELD. IF IT'S THE SAME
EXPOSURE-DISEASE RELATIONSHIP.
BUT AS I JUST EXPLAINED, IT WILL IN HUMAN
STUDIES NEVER BE THE SAME EXPOSURE BECAUSE THE EXPOSURE
IS NOT GIVEN AS A TREATMENT IN AN EXPERIMENT, IT IS
OBSERVED.
Q OKAY.
DOCTOR, DO YOU AGREE THAT WE CAN TAKE THAT
DOWN DO YOU AGREE THAT IN THIS CASE FOR LET'S TALK
ABOUT LEAD BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT YOUR TESTIMONY FOCUSED
ON. FOR LEAD AND ASD, WE HAVE SOME STUDY SHOWING A
POSITIVE ASSOCIATION, SOME STUDIES SHOWING NO
ASSOCIATION AND SOME STUDIES SHOWING A NEGATIVE
ASSOCIATION.
DO YOU AGREE WITH THAT?
A WELL, THAT'S VERY GENERAL, AND AS GENERAL AS
YOU STATED, THAT'S CORRECT. BUT THAT'S, YOU KNOW, THAT
MEANS NOTHING.
Q AND
A I DON'T HAVE COUNT THE STUDIES. I NEVER
RECOMMENDING COUNTING STUDIES.
Q AND
A I WOULD ACTUALLY BE SURPRISED IF THERE WEREN'T
STUDIES ON EACH END OF THE SPECTRUM BECAUSE, YOU KNOW,

IF YOU DO SCIENCE, YOU COME UP WITH DIFFERENT RESULTS.
Q AND THAT'S WHAT WE HAVE HERE: DIFFERENT
RESULTS; CORRECT?
A CAN YOU PUT THAT IN CONTEXT AGAIN?
Q YOU JUST SAID TO ME, IF WE HAVE SCIENCE, WE
HAVE DIFFERENT RESULTS. AND HERE WE HAVE DIFFERENT
RESULTS.
DO WE NOT?
A WHAT IS "HERE"?
Q THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE STUDIES STUDYING
LEAD AND ASD.
A THERE ARE SOME STUDIES SHOWING NO ASSOCIATION.
THERE ARE VERY FEW STUDIES SHOWING THE OPPOSITE OF AN
ASSOCIATION; MEANING, LEAD BEING, YOU KNOW, GOOD FOR
YOU. AND THERE ARE A MULTITUDE OF STUDY SHOWING
POSITIVE ASSOCIATIONS. YES, CORRECT.
Q NOW, LET ME
A IF YOU CONSIDER THAT INCONSISTENT, THAT'S UP TO
YOU.
Q WELL, THAT'S WHAT I WANT TO ASK YOU ABOUT.
ISN'T IT A FACT, DOCTOR, THAT IN MANY OF THE
STUDIES THAT YOU RELIED ON, THE AUTHORS THEMSELVES
DESCRIBE THE STATE OF THE SCIENCE AS TO LEAD AND ASD AS
INCONSISTENT; CORRECT?
A NO AUTHOR OF A STUDY OF ONE SINGLE STUDY WHO
HASN'T DONE A VERY CAREFUL META ANALYTIC SUMMARY SHOULD
EVER SAY SOMETHING LIKE THAT, EXCEPT FOR POINTING OUT
WHERE THEIR STUDY BELONGS BECAUSE THEY ARE FOR ANY

1 ONE STUDY, THEY ARE NOT USUALLY DOING WHAT I'M DOING 2 HERE, WHICH IS GO WITH A FINE-TOOTHED COMB THROUGH THE WHOLE LITERATURE AND COMING UP WITH A VERY THOROUGH AND 3 THOUGHTFUL REVIEW OF THIS LITERATURE. 4 GENERALLY, WHAT ANY ONE STUDY AUTHOR DOES IS 5 THEY LOOK INTO THE LITERATURE, THEY FIND REASONS TO MAKE 6 7 THEIR OWN STUDY SOUND LIKE IT WILL SOLVE A PROBLEM, AND 8 THEY SAY IN THEIR INTRODUCTIONS, THIS IS WHAT I DO MY STUDY, I DO IT BECAUSE I IDENTIFIED THIS GAP IN THE 9 10 LITERATURE AND THERE ARE STILL INCONSISTENCIES AND NOW I'M DOING THIS EXPERIMENT, I'M JUSTIFYING WHY I'M DOING 11 12 THIS STUDY AND WHY I'M TELLING YOU YOU SHOULD BE READING 13 AND THAT'S ALL THEY DO. THEY ARE NOT DOING MY REPORT. 14 A BRADFORD HILL. THEY ARE NOT TELLING YOU THAT, YOU 15 KNOW, THEY HAVE AN EXPERT OPINION. THEY ARE JUST POINTING OUT WHY THE READER SHOULD BE INTERESTED IN 16 17 THEIR MATERIAL. LET'S LOOK AT SOME OF THESE STUDIES, DOCTOR. 18 0 19 LET ME SHOW YOU A DEMONSTRATIVE OF THIS SOME OF 20 THESE STUDIES. ALL OF THESE ARE MARKED AS EXHIBITS. HOLD ON ONE SECOND. 21 LET'S -- I'VE ARRANGED THESE STUDIES -- I'VE 22 23 PICKED FIVE OF THEM CHRONOLOGICALLY. LET'S START AT THE TOP. 2.4 THERE'S A STUDY CALLED ABDULLAH. 25 26 YOU'VE READ THAT STUDY, DID YOU NOT, DOCTOR?

AND THIS IS A STUDY OF BABY TEETH WHERE THE

YES, I DID.

27

28

Α

1	AUTHORS LOOKED AT SHED BABY TEETH AND THEY LOOKED AT
2	EXPOSURES TO LEAD AND MERCURY THAT WOULD HAVE OCCURRED
3	BEFORE THE DIAGNOSIS OF ASD; CORRECT?
4	A THEY LOOKED AT BABY TEETH AND ASD, YES.
5	Q YEAH. OKAY.
6	AND THIS IS EXHIBIT 14 IS THE ABDULLAH
7	STUDY, AND THIS IS A QUOTE FROM PAGE 933 TO 934.
8	"THESE NULL FINDINGS ADD TO THE CONTRADICTORY
9	EVIDENCE REGARDING LEAD AND MERCURY EXPOSURE IN
10	ASD."
11	DO YOU SEE THAT?
12	A YES, I SEE THAT.
13	Q AND DO YOU AGREE THAT AS OF THIS STUDY IS
14	FROM 2012 DO YOU AGREE THAT AS OF 2012 THERE WAS
15	CONTRADICTORY EVIDENCE IN THE LITERATURE REGARDING LEAD
16	AND MERCURY EXPOSURE IN ASD?
17	A I ALSO RECALL THAT THEY ARE THEN GOING ON TO
18	SAY THAT THEIR STUDY JUST TELLS YOU WE NEED MORE STUDIES
19	AND DOES NOT CONTRADICT THE CAUSAL ANY CAUSAL
20	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THESE AGENTS AND ASD. AND IF YOU
21	WOULD LIKE, WE CAN GO TO THAT PART OF THEIR DISCUSSION
22	WHERE THEY ACTUALLY PUT THAT IN CONTEXT.
23	Q I'M JUST ASKING, DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS
24	STATEMENT, DR. RITZ, THAT'S ON THE SCREEN?
25	A I CANNOT AGREE. WITHOUT THE CONTEXT, I DON'T
26	AGREE WITH IT. I AGREE WITH IT THE WAY THE AUTHORS
27	ACTUALLY FORMULATED IT, WHICH WAS IN THE CONTEXT OF OUR
28	STUDY IS JUST ONE STUDY, WE SEE WHAT WE SEE, WE NEED

1	MORE WE NEED MORE STUDIES.
2	AND I'M SURE THEY WANTED MONEY TO DO MORE
3	STUDIES. AND THEY ARE CORRECT. WE SHOULD BE DOING MORE
4	STUDIES.
5	Q AND ONE OF THE THINGS YOU SAID EARLIER WHEN MR.
6	WISNER WAS ASKING YOU QUESTIONS IS THAT THESE STATEMENTS
7	WERE, I THINK YOU SAID THEY ARE IN THE INTRODUCTION AND
8	AUTHORS PUT THEM THERE TO SET THINGS UP WAS I THINK THE
9	PHRASE YOU USED. WAS THAT CORRECT?
10	A THEY SET THE STAGE FOR WHAT THEY ARE GOING TO
11	TELL THE READER, YES.
12	Q ALL RIGHT.
13	THIS STATEMENT BY ABDULLAH, THIS IS NOT IN THE
14	INTRODUCTION. THIS IS IN THE DISCUSSION, IS IT NOT?
15	A YOU NEED TO SHOW ME. I DON'T KNOW.
16	Q OKAY. LET'S
17	A I JUST SEE ONE SENTENCE.
18	Q ALL RIGHT. WE'LL LOOK AT THAT. WE'LL PULL UP
19	EXHIBIT 14.
20	A AM I SUPPOSED TO LOOK UP SOMETHING?
21	Q OH, WE'RE GOING TO HAVE IT ON THE SCREEN IN A
22	SECOND. AND WE'RE GOING TO GO TO PAGE 933.
23	OKAY. AND IF YOU SEE AT THE WE'RE GOING TO
24	BLOW IT UP THE BOTTOM PARAGRAPH ON THE RIGHT SIDE.
25	THIS IS IN THE DISCUSSION SECTION.
26	DO YOU SEE WHERE IT SAYS "DISCUSSION," DOCTOR?
27	A YES, I DO.
28	Q OKAY.

1		AND RIGHT AT THE BOTTOM AND THEN RUNNING OVER
2	TO PAGE 9	934.
3		"THESE NULL FINDINGS" WELL, LET ME START AT
4	THE BEGIN	NNING OF THE PARAGRAPH SO WE GET THE RESULTS OF
5	THE STUDY	Υ.
6		IN THIS STUDY THEY FOUND NO SIGNIFICANT
7	DIFFERENC	CES IN LEAD OR MERCURY CONCENTRATIONS IN THE
8	PRE- OR I	POST-NATAL REGION FOR CHILDREN WITH ASD'S OR
9	TYPICAL I	DEVELOPMENT.
10		DO YOU SEE THAT?
11	A	YES.
12	Q	AND THAT WAS THE RESULT OF THE STUDY. IT WAS A
13	NO ASSOC	IATION FOUND; CORRECT?
14	А	THAT'S CORRECT.
15	Q	AND THEN THEY SAY, "THESE NULL FINDINGS ADD TO
16		THE CONTRADICTORY EVIDENCE REGARDING LEAD AND
17		MERCURY AND EXPOSURE IN ASD'S."
18		AND THEN THEY CITE A NUMBER OF STUDIES.
19		DO YOU SEE THAT?
20	A	YES.
21	Q	OKAY.
22	A	BUT LET'S LET'S READ ON.
23		"THE MIXED CONCLUSIONS MAY BE ATTRIBUTABLE TO
24		DIFFERENCES IN SAMPLE TYPE, MEANS OF EXPOSURE
25		AND TIMING OF EXPOSURE; GIVEN THAT THERE ARE
26		MANY KNOWN ADVERSE DEVELOPMENTAL CONSEQUENCES
27		OF EXPOSURE OF LEAD, FURTHER INVESTIGATION OF
28		HEAVY METALS IN DIFFERENT BIOMARKERS AND TIMING

1	OF EXPOSURE MAY PROVIDE VALUABLE INFORMATION IN
2	THE ETIOLOGY OF DISPARATE NEUROBEHAVIORAL
3	DEVELOPMENTS."
4	SO THIS IS EXACTLY THE CONTEXT THAT I WAS
5	REFERRING TO. THESE AUTHORS ARE NOT SAYING, WE ARE THE
6	END-ALL OF THIS RESEARCH. THEY ARE SAYING, WELL, THIS
7	IS WHAT WE SEE, BUT THEY EVEN SAY THERE ARE OTHER
8	STUDIES OUT THERE, THERE ARE OTHER STUDIES SHOWING LEAD
9	IS NO GOOD FOR NEURODEVELOPMENT AND WE DEFINITELY NEED
10	TO KNOW MORE AND WE ARE WORRIED ABOUT IT.
11	THAT'S WHAT THIS SAYS TO ME.
12	Q OKAY.
13	LET'S GO BACK TO THE DEMONSTRATIVE THAT WE JUST
14	HAD ON THE SCREEN TO THE NEXT STUDY.
15	THIS IS KIM, ET AL.
16	YOU RELIED ON THE KIM STUDY, DID YOU NOT?
17	A KIM IF IT'S THE KIM STUDY FROM KOREAN ON
18	LEAD IN 8 YEAR OLDS.
19	Q YES.
20	A YES.
21	Q AND WHAT THE AUTHORS IN KIM SAID WAS: "THE
22	ASSOCIATION BETWEEN LEAD EXPOSURE AND
23	AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER IS INCONCLUSIVE.
24	PREVIOUS STUDIES EVALUATING THE ASSOCIATION
25	BETWEEN LEAD EXPOSURE AND AUTISM SPECTRUM
26	DISORDER HAVE REPORTED INCONCLUSIVE RESULTS
27	WITH EVIDENCE FOR POSITIVE, NULL AND NEGATIVE
28	ASSOCIATIONS."

1	DO YOU SEE THAT?
2	A YES.
3	Q AND DO YOU AGREE WITH THAT STATEMENT?
4	A CAN YOU SHOW ME THIS STATEMENT IN CONTEXT?
5	Q OF COURSE. THIS IS EXHIBIT 87.
6	AND WE'LL PULL THAT UP IN A SECOND.
7	WE'LL GO TO THE SECOND PAGE OF THE STUDY.
8	AND THAT FIRST FULL PARAGRAPH ON THE LEFT.
9	A YEAH, THAT'S THE INTRODUCTION. THAT'S EXACTLY
10	WHAT I TRIED TO EXPLAIN BEFORE THAT'S WHERE AUTHORS SET
11	UP THE STAGE AND TELL YOU WHY YOU, AS A READER, SHOULD
12	REALLY KEEP READING.
13	Q RIGHT.
14	AND MY QUESTION TO YOU IS DO YOU AGREE WITH THE
15	FIRST SENTENCE?
16	A I AGREE THAT THIS IS A REALLY GREAT WAY TO MAKE
17	ME WANT TO SEE WHAT THEY ARE SHOWING. BUT THIS IS NOT
18	AN EVALUATION OF EVERYTHING THAT'S OUT THERE IN THE
19	LITERATURE. THIS IS JUST A TEASER.
20	Q OKAY. IT'S A TEASER.
21	DOCTOR, THIS WAS A PEER-REVIEWED STUDY, WAS IT
22	NOT?
23	A OF COURSE.
24	Q AND YOU EXPLAINED YESTERDAY THE IMPORTANCE OF
25	PEER-REVIEW IN I THINK YOU SAID YOU ONLY LOOKED AT
26	PEER-REVIEWED OR ONLY RELIED ON PEER-REVIEWED
27	STUDIES; CORRECT?
28	A CORRECT.

1	YOU WANTED TO SHOW ME?
2	Q NO. I'M GOING TO DO ONE MORE.
3	ARORA, THAT IS A STUDY YOU TALKED ABOUT QUITE
4	AT LENGTH YESTERDAY.
5	DO YOU REMEMBER TALKING ABOUT THE ARORA STUDY?
6	A OF COURSE, YES.
7	Q OKAY.
8	AND THE ARORA STUDY, THE ONE WITH THE TWINS AND
9	THE BABY TEETH THAT YOU TALKED ABOUT YESTERDAY, THESE
10	AUTHORS SAID, "STUDIES OF TOXIC METALS AND NUTRITIONAL
11	ELEMENTS OF ASD HAVE YIELDED MIXED RESULTS
12	ALTHOUGH SEVERAL STUDIES REPORTED HIGHER
13	CONCENTRATIONS FOR TOXIC METALS IN ASD,
14	INCLUDING THE NEUROTOXIN LEAD, OTHERS FOUND NO
15	ASSOCIATION."
16	DO YOU SEE THAT?
17	A YES.
18	Q AND DO YOU AGREE THAT AS OF 2017, THE STUDIES
19	OF TOXIC METALS IN ASD YIELDED MIXED RESULTS?
20	A CAN YOU PUT THIS IN CONTEXT? WHERE THEY
21	Q YOU'D LIKE TO LOOK AT
22	A YEAH, I WANT TO SEE WHERE THEY
23	Q OKAY.
24	A SAY THAT.
25	Q THIS IS EXHIBIT 27. WE'LL PULL THAT UP.
26	IT'S THE FIRST TWO SENTENCES OF THIS PARAGRAPH
27	ARE THE ONES I JUST SHOWED YOU.
28	AND THEN IT TALKS ABOUT ACTUALLY, THE
	50

1	CONTEXT IS IT TALKS THE NEXT SENTENCE IS SAYING:
2	"PREVIOUS RESEARCH SHOWED METHODOLOGICAL
3	SHORTCOMINGS THAT LIMITED INTERPRETATION AND
4	GENERALIZE ABILITY OF THE FINDINGS."
5	AND THEN IT TALKS FURTHER ABOUT THOSE
6	SHORTCOMINGS.
7	DO YOU AGREE WITH THESE STATEMENTS, DOCTOR?
8	A WELL, CAN YOU SHOW ME IN WHAT PART OF THE PAPER
9	THIS IS?
10	Q THIS IS IN THE INTRODUCTION OF THE PAPER.
11	A EXACTLY. MY POINT.
12	THEY ARE, AGAIN, JUST, YOU KNOW, SETTING IT UP
13	AS THE STAGE FOR WHY THEIR STUDY IS SO MUCH BETTER THAN
14	EVERYTHING ELSE THAT WE HAVE IN THE LITERATURE AND YOU
15	SHOULD PLEASE READ THIS BECAUSE WE ARE GOING TO NOW HELP
16	SOLVE THIS GAP IN THE SCIENCE AND WE ARE GOING TO BE
17	BETTER THAN ALL THESE OTHERS.
18	THAT'S WHAT THEY ARE SAYING.
19	Q OKAY. BUT MY QUESTION TO YOU IS DO YOU AGREE
20	WITH THE AUTHORS THAT THERE'S A GAP IN THE SCIENCE?
21	A WELL, THAT'S WHAT THE AUTHORS ARE SAYING, BUT
22	THEY ARE SAYING THIS VERY GENERALLY, AND YOU KNOW, IT
23	DOESN'T MATTER WHETHER I AGREE WITH THEM OR NOT. IT'S
24	NOTHING BUT A TEASER. AND THEY ARE CALLING LEAD A KNOWN
25	NEUROTOXIN BY THE WAY.
26	Q YOU TALKED WITH MR. WISNER ABOUT THE SKOGHEIM
27	LET'S GO BACK TO THE DEMONSTRATIVE ONE MORE TIME
28	YOU TALKED TO HIM ABOUT THE SKOGHEIM STUDY TODAY.

1	DO YOU RECALL THAT?
2	A YES.
3	Q OKAY.
4	AND THIS IS THE QUOTE FROM THE SKOGHEIM STUDY
5	TALKING ABOUT INCONSISTENCIES REGARDING STUDY DESIGNS
6	AND FINDINGS.
7	DO YOU SEE THAT?
8	A YEAH.
9	Q OKAY.
10	AND IS IT YOUR TESTIMONY, DOCTOR, THAT THESE
11	STATEMENTS BY THE AUTHORS, THAT THEY DON'T HONESTLY
12	BELIEVE?
13	A NO, BUT THEY MIGHT BE FORMULATED TOO GENERALLY.
14	BECAUSE IF YOU, FOR EXAMPLE, READ SKOGHEIM VERY
15	CAREFULLY, WHAT THEY ARE SAYING IS ALL TOGETHER THERE'S
16	STILL LIMITED KNOWLEDGE ON PRENATAL EXPOSURE TO METALS,
17	SO THIS IS ACTUALLY MUCH MORE CAREFULLY FORMULATED THAN
18	SOME OF THE OTHER SENTENCES WHERE THEY ARE SAYING, OH,
19	IN GENERAL, WE DON'T KNOW ENOUGH.
20	NO, THAT'S NOT RIGHT. IN GENERAL WE KNOW A
21	LOT. BUT SPECIFICALLY WE DON'T KNOW ENOUGH YET. AND
22	EVERY EVERY SPECIFIC STUDY ADDS TO THE BIGGER
23	SCIENTIFIC PICTURE BECAUSE THEY GO INTO DETAIL AND THEY
24	ARE ADDING TO THE LITERATURE IN ONE SPECIFIC WAY.
25	THIS SKOGHEIM STUDY IS ABOUT PRENATAL
26	EXPOSURES, AND THAT'S WHAT THEIR CONTRIBUTION TO THE
27	LITERATURE IS, AND IN THAT AREA THEY WANT TO MAKE THEIR
28	OWN ENTRE INTO, YOU KNOW, WHAT IS KNOWN ABOUT THIS. AND

1	THAT'S WHAT THEY ARE SAYING THERE. THEY ARE ACTUALLY
2	MUCH MORE CAREFUL THAN THESE OTHER STATEMENTS.
3	Q ALL RIGHT. DOCTOR, LET'S LOOK AT YOUR EXPERT
4	REPORT. THIS IS EXHIBIT 4. AND WE'RE GOING TO LOOK AT
5	PAGE 30 TO YOUR REPORT WHICH IS YOUR BRADFORD HILL
6	ANALYSIS ON LEAD AND ASD.
7	AND I WANT TO LOOK AT YOUR ANALYSIS OF
8	CONSISTENCY, WHICH IS NEAR THE BOTTOM OF THE PAGE WHICH
9	WE'RE GOING TO BLOW UP IN A SECOND.
10	ALL RIGHT. THIS IS IN YOUR BRADFORD HILL OF
11	CONSISTENCY ON LEAD AND ASD, YOU SAID: "THIS CRITERION
12	IS MET SINCE POSITIVE ASSOCIATIONS HAVE BEEN
13	REPORTED FOR DIFFERENT POPULATIONS AND IN
14	DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS AND DIFFERENT TIME
15	PERIODS AS WELL AS DIFFERENT BIOLOGIC MATRICES
16	WHICH STRENGTHENS THE LIKELIHOOD OF A TRUE
17	EFFECT."
18	DO YOU SEE THAT?
19	A YES, I DO.
20	Q AND ISN'T THE SAME EXACT THING TRUE OF STUDIES
21	THAT FOUND NO ASSOCIATIONS BETWEEN LED AND ASD?
22	IN OTHER WORDS, STUDIES THAT HAVE FOUND NO
23	ASSOCIATIONS HAVE BEEN REPORTED FOR DIFFERENT
24	POPULATIONS AND IN DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIC REGIONS AND
25	DIFFERENT TIME PERIODS AS WELL AS DIFFERENT BIOLOGIC
26	MATRICIS; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
27	A I AM NOT SURE WHAT YOU'RE ASKING ME.
28	Q WELL, I'M ASKING YOU, YOU SAID HERE THAT THERE
	53

1 WERE STUDIES THAT FOUND POSITIVE ASSOCIATIONS THAT HAD 2 THE CHARACTERISTICS I JUST READ ABOUT, THE DIFFERENT POPULATIONS, AND SO ON. 3 4 Α RIGHT. MY QUESTION IS, ISN'T IT TRUE THAT THERE ARE 5 STUDIES FINDING NO ASSOCIATIONS BETWEEN LEAD AND ASD IN 6 7 DIFFERENT POPULATIONS AND IN DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIC 8 REGIONS AND DIFFERENT TIME PERIODS AS WELL AS DIFFERENT BIOLOGIC MATRICES; ISN'T THAT TRUE? 9 10 Α WELL, IF THERE ARE STUDIES, AND THERE ARE STUDIES, THAT ARE SHOWING NO ASSOCIATIONS OR NEGATIVE 11 12 ASSOCIATIONS, THEN THIS STATEMENT IS ALSO CORRECT BECAUSE IT'S MORE THAN ONE STUDY, SO THEY HAVE TO HAVE 13 BEEN IN DIFFERENT POPULATIONS OR IN DIFFERENT REGIONS OR 14 15 AT DIFFERENT TIME PERIODS. WHETHER THEY ARE IN DIFFERENT BIOLOGIC 16 17 MATRICES, I DON'T KNOW RIGHT NOW OFF THE TOP OF MY HEAD, BUT I IMAGINE YES, BECAUSE WE JUST LOOKED AT THE TOOTH 18 19 STUDY AND I KNOW THERE ARE SOME ON URINE OR HAIR AS 20 WELL. OKAY. 21 0 BUT THAT DOESN'T MEAN THERE'S NO ASSOCIATION. 22 Α 23 THAT'S JUST SOMETHING YOU WOULD EXPECT TO BE CORRECT IF THERE'S MORE THAN ONE STUDY THAT DOESN'T SHOW 2.4 AN ASSOCIATION. 25 26 AND IF -- THE MORE STUDIES YOU HAVE -- THE MORE 27 STUDIES YOU HAVE IN SCIENCE, THE MORE INFORMATION YOU 28 GENERATE, THE MORE KNOWLEDGE YOU GENERATE, THE MORE

1	STUDIES YOU ALSO WILL HAVE THAT JUST RANDOMLY DON'T SHOW
2	AN EFFECT, THAT ARE TOO SMALL TO SHOW AN EFFECT, THAT
3	USE METHODS THAT ARE INAPPROPRIATE THAT HAVE LOWER
4	LIMITS OF DETECTION THAT ARE NOT, YOU KNOW, SENSITIVE
5	ENOUGH, ET CETERA, ET CETERA.
6	SO, YES, THE MORE YOU ACTUALLY DO SCIENCE, THE
7	MORE YOU MIGHT ALSO GENERATE SOME BAD STUDIES.
8	Q OKAY. WE CAN TAKE THAT DOWN.
9	DOCTOR, LET ME TALK TO YOU ABOUT THE
10	TEMPORALITY FACTOR OF BRADFORD HILL.
11	AND PARTICULARLY I WANT TO ASK YOU, YESTERDAY
12	WHEN YOU WERE DOING YOUR EPI 101, I THINK YOU CALLED IT,
13	PRESENTATION, YOU TALKED ABOUT SOME DIFFERENT TYPES OF
14	STUDY DESIGNS.
15	DO YOU REMEMBER THAT?
16	A YES.
17	Q AND YOU TALKED ABOUT, AS I RECALL, THREE TYPES
18	OF STUDIES; COHORT STUDIES, CASE CONTROL STUDIES AND
19	CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDIES.
20	DO YOU REMEMBER TALKING ABOUT THOSE STUDIES
21	YESTERDAY?
22	A YES.
23	Q AND DO YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT ALMOST ALL OF THE
24	STUDIES ON AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDER TO DATE RELY ON CASE
25	CONTROL OR CROSS-SECTIONAL DESIGNS?
26	A NO, NOT ALMOST ALL.
27	Q OKAY. LET'S LOOK AT YOUR REPORT. THIS IS
28	EXHIBIT 4. AND PAGE 17 AT THE TOP. RIGHT AT THE TOP,

1	DOCTOR.
2	YOU SAID IN YOUR REPORT, "RATHER, ALMOST ALL
3	STUDIES OF ASD AND MOST ADHD STUDIES TO DATE
4	RELIED ON THE MUCH MORE EFFICIENT CASE CONTROL
5	OR CROSS-SECTIONAL DESIGN."
6	CORRECT?
7	A YEAH, CASE CONTROL, NOT CROSS-SECTIONAL.
8	I MEAN, YES, WE HAVE A TON OF CASE CONTROL
9	STUDIES.
10	SO WHAT IS YOUR QUESTION? WHAT IS YOUR
11	QUESTION? I DON'T GET IT.
12	Q OKAY.
13	MY QUESTION WAS SIMPLY, ISN'T IT TRUE THAT
14	ALMOST ALL OF THE STUDIES OF ASD TO DATE RELY ON THE
15	CASE CONTROL OR CROSS-SECTIONAL DESIGN; CORRECT?
16	A WHAT I'M SAYING HERE IS THAT THEY ARE RELYING
17	ON A MUCH MORE EFFICIENT DESIGN, WHICH IS THE CASE
18	CONTROL STUDY, THAN THE COHORT STUDY BECAUSE THE COHORT
19	STUDIES ARE REALLY, REALLY INEFFICIENT FOR RARE
20	DISORDERS LIKE ASD.
21	ADHD, WE HAVE A LOT MORE COHORT STUDIES. BUT
22	FOR ASD WE MOSTLY HAVE CASE CONTROL STUDIES FOR A GOOD
23	REASON BECAUSE THEY ARE THE MOST EFFICIENT STUDY DESIGN
24	WE HAVE WHEN IT COMES TO A REALLY RARE DISORDER WHICH
25	ASD IS.
26	Q OKAY. WE CAN TAKE THAT DOWN.
27	THANK YOU, DOCTOR.
28	ONE ADVANTAGE OF A LET'S TALK ABOUT THE

1	COHORT STUDY.
2	THE ADVANTAGE OF THE ONE ADVANTAGE OF A
3	COHORT STUDY IS THAT IT CAN BE USED TO ESTABLISH
4	TEMPORALITY; THAT IS, THE RESEARCHERS KNOW THAT THE
5	EXPOSURE IN QUESTION OCCURRED BEFORE THE OUTCOME THAT
6	YOU'RE STUDYING; CORRECT?
7	A THAT'S ONE ADVANTAGE, YES.
8	Q AND IN A CASE CONTROL STUDY, I THINK YOU
9	EXPLAINED THIS YESTERDAY, YOU BEGIN WITH A GROUP OF
10	INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE THE DISEASE HERE, LET'S SAY ASD,
11	AND THEN YOU COMPARE THEM TO PEOPLE WHO DON'T HAVE THE
12	DISEASE.
13	THOSE ARE THE CASES AND THE CONTROLS; CORRECT?
14	A THAT'S YEAH, THAT'S USUALLY HOW WE DESCRIBE
15	IT.
16	Q YEAH.
17	AND THEN WHEN THEN SOMETIME AFTER THE CASES
18	AND THE CONTROLS ARE SELECTED, THE RESEARCHER WILL
19	MEASURE LEVELS OF, IN THIS CASE, HEAVY METALS AND
20	COMPARE THE GROUPS; CORRECT?
21	A I'M NOT SURE WHAT YOU MEAN BY "SOMETIME AFTER"
22	BECAUSE CASE CONTROL STUDIES, THE ONLY REASON WHY
23	TEMPORALITY COMES IN HERE, IT DOESN'T MATTER WHEN THE
24	RESEARCHER DECIDES TO MEASURE; IT MATTERS WHAT THE
25	RESEARCHER MEASURES AND WHEN THAT MEASURE WAS ACTUALLY
26	TAKEN.
27	SO, FOR EXAMPLE, IF I HAVE A CASE CONTROL STUDY
28	WITH BLOOD SAMPLES STORED IN THE CALIFORNIA BIO BANK AND

1	I GO BACK TO THE BIO BANK AND FIND A BLOOD SPOT FROM A
2	CHILD AND I MEASURE EXPOSURE IN THAT BLOOD SPOT, I KNOW
3	THAT TEMPORARILY THAT BLOOD SPOT'S EXPOSURE IS PRIOR TO
4	THE ONSET OF ANYTHING THAT HAPPENED AFTER BIRTH, AND
5	THAT'S A PERFECT TEMPORALITY I CAN ESTABLISH IN A CASE
6	CONTROL STUDY. IT DOESN'T MATTER WHEN THE RESEARCHER
7	DOES THAT. IT MATTERS WHEN THE EXPOSURE OR THE SAMPLE
8	IN WHICH I MEASURE THE EXPOSURE WAS ACTUALLY TAKEN.
9	Q ISN'T IT TRUE THAT, DOCTOR, IN THE CASE
10	CONTROLS ALMOST ALL OF THE CASE CONTROL STUDIES THAT
11	YOU RELIED ON IN CONNECTION WITH LEAD AND ASD, THE
12	EXPOSURE TO LEAD THAT'S BEING MEASURED OCCURRED AFTER
13	THE CHILDREN DEVELOPED ASD? ISN'T THAT CORRECT?
14	A THAT'S AN ASSUMPTION YOU'RE MAKING. NO. THE
15	SAMPLE WAS COLLECTED AFTER THE AFTER THE CASE WAS
16	DIAGNOSED. THAT WE KNOW.
17	SO THE BLOOD SAMPLE, THE HAIR SAMPLE, THE URINE
18	SAMPLE MAY HAVE BEEN TAKEN FROM THE CHILD OR WILL HAVE
19	BEEN TAKEN FROM THE CHILD AFTER THE CHILD WAS DIAGNOSED
20	AND AT THE SAME TIME A CONTROL SAMPLE WAS TAKEN. WHAT
21	THAT SAMPLE REPRESENTS DEPENDS ON WHAT IT ACTUALLY
22	WHAT IT GIVES YOU.
23	IN TERMS OF LEAD, THE BLOOD SAMPLE GIVES YOU
24	RELATIVELY RECENT EXPOSURE UNLESS THERE WAS NO RECENT
25	EXPOSURE. WHAT DO I MEAN BY THIS? WE KNOW LEAD IS
26	STORED IN THE BODY. LEAD IS STORED IN THE BONE. SO THE
27	CHILD CAN HAVE BEEN EXPOSED IN UTERO, CAN HAVE BEEN

EXPOSED IN THE FIRST, SECOND, THIRD YEAR OF LIFE, THE

1	LEAD GETS STORED IN THE BONE.
2	WHAT DOES LEAD DO? IT HAS AN EQUILIBRIUM WITH
3	THE BLOOD. SO WHAT YOU MEASURE IN THE BLOOD OF A THREE
4	YEAR OLD MAY ACTUALLY REFLECT THE EXPOSURE AT AGE ONE
5	BECAUSE UNLESS AT THREE YEARS OLD THE KID ALSO GETS
6	EXPOSED.
7	SO WHAT WE ARE MEASURING IN ONE BLOOD SAMPLE
8	MEANS VERY DIFFERENT THINGS DEPENDING ON WHETHER THERE'S
9	CURRENT EXPOSURE OR NOT. IF THERE'S NO CURRENT EXPOSURE
10	IN THE CASE, THEN IT ACTUALLY REFLECTS PAST EXPOSURE,
11	HISTORICAL EXPOSURE, BECAUSE THE LEAD LEECHES OUT THE
12	BONE OF THE CHILD INTO THE BLOOD, AND THAT'S WHAT I'M
13	MEASURING.
14	Q WELL, LET ME ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THAT.
15	FIRST LET'S SEE WHAT YOUR TESTIMONY WAS ON THIS
16	TOPIC. LET'S LOOK AT YOUR DEPOSITION AGAIN WHICH IS
17	EXHIBIT 7 AT PAGE 38.
18	AND IF YOU LOOK STARTING WITH THE QUESTION AT
19	LINE 9.
20	LET'S BLOW THAT UP. AND THE ANSWER.
21	I ASKED YOU, DOCTOR, THE QUESTION I JUST ASKED
22	YOU:
23	"IN CASE CONTROL STUDIES THAT YOU RELY ON IN
24	YOUR REPORT, FOR MOST OF THE STUDIES, THE
25	MEASUREMENT OF THE EXPOSURE OCCURRED AFTER THE
26	DIAGNOSIS OF ASD; CORRECT?"
27	YOU SAID, "FOR MOST OF THE STUDIES, NOT FOR
28	ALL."
	59

1	IS THAT TRUE?
2	A IT'S WHAT'S WRITTEN HERE, SO I IMAGINE IT'S
3	TRUE, YES.
4	Q OKAY.
5	NOW
6	A WHAT I MEANT IS WHAT I JUST EXPLAINED.
7	Q YOU MENTIONED SOMETHING ABOUT BONE.
8	THERE'S NO STUDIES NONE OF THE STUDIES YOU
9	RELY ON MEASURED LEAD LEVELS OF BONE IN CHILDREN;
10	CORRECT?
11	A NO, NONE OF THE STUDIES DID BECAUSE YOU COULD
12	DO THAT, HOWEVER, YOU HAVE TO MAKE A CHILD SIT STILL FOR
13	HALF AN HOUR. THAT'S A REALLY HEAVY HARD THING TO DO
14	ESPECIALLY IN AN AUTISTIC CHILD OR IN AN ADHD CHILD.
15	Q RIGHT.
16	SO WHEN YOU GAVE YOU JUST TESTIFIED A WHILE
17	AGO THIS COULD BE LEVELS OF LEAD THAT SEEPED OUT OF THE
18	BONE AND THEN WAS LATER REFLECTED IN THE BLOOD.
19	THERE'S NO STUDIES OF THAT THAT YOU RELIED ON
20	HERE; CORRECT?
21	A WELL, THAT IS WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT HOW LEAD
22	BEHAVES.
23	LEAD IS RARELY IT IS EXCRETED IN THE URINE.
24	IT DOES GET INTO THE HAIR. WE KNOW THAT. BUT WHAT IT
25	MOSTLY DOES IS IT IS IT BEHAVES LIKE CALCIUM AND IT
26	GETS STORED IN THE BONE, IT GETS STORED IN THE TIBIA IN
27	THE PATELLA. AND THEN WHILE THE CHILD IS GROWING, THE
28	BONE REMODELS, AND DURING THIS BONE REMODELLING, THE

1	LEAD GETS ACTIVATED AND THE LEAD GETS OUT INTO THE
2	BLOODSTREAM AGAIN.
3	SO IT'S A CONSTANT BALANCE BETWEEN WHAT'S IN
4	THE BONE AND WHAT'S IN THE BLOOD.
5	IF THE CHILD IS EXPOSED AT AGE ONE AND HAS NO
6	OTHER EXPOSURES AFTERWARDS, WHAT YOU ARE MEASURING AT
7	AGE 5 IS ACTUALLY WHAT HAPPENED AT AGE 1 BECAUSE OF THAT
8	BALANCE BETWEEN THE BONE LEAD AND THE BLOOD LEAD.
9	Q DOCTOR, NONE OF THE AUTHORS, NONE OF THE
10	AUTHORS OF THE STUDIES ON WHICH YOU RELY THAT USE
11	BIOMARKERS OF EXPOSURE IN CASE CONTROL STUDIES LIKE
12	BLOOD OR URINE SUGGESTED THAT THE LEAD LEVEL WAS FROM
13	LONG-TERM EXPOSURE FROM BONES; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
14	MR. WISNER: OBJECTION OBJECTION. OVERBROAD
15	AS TO EVERY STUDY, EVERYTHING HE SAID.
16	THE COURT: OVERRULED.
17	THE WITNESS: YEAH, I MEAN, WE WOULD NEED TO
18	LOOK AT HOW THEY
19	THE COURT: DR. RITZ
20	THE WITNESS: YEAH.
21	MR. WISNER: I'M SORRY, THIS ISN'T A
22	DEPOSITION. I'VE OBJECTED. THE COURT HAS TO RULE.
23	THE COURT: I'M SORRY. I SAID OVERRULED.
24	MR. WISNER: OKAY. THANK YOU.
25	MR. PETROSINELLI:
26	Q GO AHEAD, DOCTOR. WOULD YOU LIKE ME TO REPEAT
27	THE QUESTION?
28	A OH, YES. PLEASE.

O OKAY.

2.4

ISN'T IT TRUE THAT IN NONE OF THE STUDIES IN WHICH YOU RELIED, THE CASE CONTROL AND CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDIES, WHERE LEAD WAS MEASURED IN BLOOD OR URINE OR HAIR, DID THE AUTHORS SAY THAT THAT MEASUREMENT WAS REFLECTIVE OF EARLIER LEAD EXPOSURE THAT CAME FROM BONES; CORRECT?

A ACTUALLY, I CAN'T ANSWER THIS QUESTION IN THIS GENERAL WAY, BUT I DO RECALL THAT QUITE A FEW AUTHORS DO SAY, WHILE WE KNOW THAT THESE MATRICES HAVE DIFFERENT LENGTHS OF TIMING OR THEY REFLECT DIFFERENT LENGTHS OF TIMING, WE KNOW THAT TEETH OF COURSE REFLECT VERY EARLY LIFE, BUT WE ALSO KNOW THAT HAIR REFLECTS GIVEN THE LENGTH OF THE HAIR MONTHS OR YEARS OF EXPOSURE, AND YES, I'M PRETTY CERTAIN THAT ONE REASON WHY THEY TOOK BLOOD LEAD IS BECAUSE OF COURSE WE KNOW THAT BIOMARKERS AREN'T JUST BIOMARKERS OF WHAT'S HAPPENING YESTERDAY, THEY ARE BIOMARKERS OF WHAT HAPPENED HISTORICALLY IF THERE IS A STORAGE ORGAN.

AND WE ALL WHO DO LEAD STUDIES KNOW THE STORAGE ORGAN IS THE BONE. AND OF COURSE THERE IS COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE BONE AND THE BLOOD. AND IF THERE IS NO CURRENT EXPOSURE, THEN LEAD IN THE BLOOD REFLECTS PAST EXPOSURES.

Q NO. MY QUESTION WAS -- I UNDERSTAND THAT THAT'S YOUR THEORY.

MY QUESTION WAS --

A NOT MY THEORY. IT'S A FACT.

1	THE COURT: COUNSEL, I THINK SHE ANSWERED THE
2	QUESTION. SHE SAID SHE DIDN'T KNOW AND SHE TOLD YOU
3	WHAT SHE RECALLED AS BEST SHE COULD.
4	MR. PETROSINELLI: OKAY. OKAY. THANK YOU,
5	YOUR HONOR.
6	Q DOCTOR, IT'S ANOTHER TYPE OF A STUDY IS A
7	CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY AND YOU RELIED ON SOME OF THOSE IN
8	FORMULATING YOUR OPINIONS; CORRECT?
9	A YES.
10	Q AND DO YOU AGREE THAT IN CROSS-SECTIONAL
11	STUDIES IT'S NOT POSSIBLE TO ESTABLISH THE TEMPORAL
12	RELATION BETWEEN EXPOSURE AND DISEASE THAT WOULD BE
13	NECESSARY FOR DRAWING A CAUSAL INFERENCE?
14	A IT'S ACTUALLY THE SAME SITUATION THAT WE HAVE
15	IN THE CASE CONTROL STUDY. IT'S ONLY IT'S ONLY ON A
16	ON A HOW DO I SAY THIS? WE HAVE IN A
17	CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY, WE ARE AT THE SAME TIME
18	ESTABLISHING EXPOSURE LEVEL AND THE OUTCOME.
19	SO THE OUTCOME BY DEFINITION IS A PREVALENT
20	OUTCOME, MEANING, WE DON'T KNOW WHEN THE CHILD WAS
21	DIAGNOSED WITH THE DISORDER. IT COULD HAVE BEEN FIVE
22	YEARS AGO. IT COULD HAVE BEEN FIVE DAYS AGO. AND WE
23	ARE TAKING A BLOOD SAMPLE OR A HAIR SAMPLE OR A URINE
24	SAMPLE AT THAT TIME, THE SAME TIME THAT WE ARE
25	INVESTIGATING THE OUTCOME.
26	HOWEVER, WE CAN SAY THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, FOR THE
27	CHILDREN THAT WERE DIAGNOSED YESTERDAY, THE BLOOD LEAD
28	PROBABLY REFLECTS A FEW MONTHS PRIOR BECAUSE IT'S, YOU

1 KNOW, IT'S A CUMULATIVE MEASURE IN THE SAME WAY THAT I 2 JUST EXPLAINED. 3 AND HAIR DEFINITELY GOES BACK. SO THEORETICALLY, YOU COULD HAVE A 4 5 CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY THAT LIMITS TO THE DIAGNOSIS WITHIN A CERTAIN NUMBER OF MONTHS THAT TAKES HAIR 6 7 SAMPLES AND THE HAIR SAMPLES THEN WOULD REFLECT EXPOSURE 8 OF PRIOR TO THE ONSET OF THIS DISEASE BECAUSE OF WHAT WE 9 KNOW ABOUT THE BIOLOGY. 10 HOWEVER, YES, WE ARE WORRIED ABOUT CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDIES NOT BEING VERY CLEAR ABOUT 11 12 EXACTLY WHEN THE DIAGNOSIS WAS MADE, AND THEREFORE, THE 13 TEMPORALITY ISSUE IS NOT AS EASILY RESOLVABLE, BUT IT IS RESOLVABLE IF YOU PAY ATTENTION. 14 15 OKAY. WELL, LET ME SHOW YOU ONE MORE EXCERPT Q FROM WHAT WE CALL THE REFERENCE MANUAL ON SCIENTIFIC 16 17 EVIDENCE AND SEE IF YOU AGREE WITH WHAT THEY SAY ABOUT CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDIES. 18 19 ONE SECOND, DOCTOR. 20 THIS IS FROM THE REFERENCE MANUAL ON OKAY. SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE PAGES 560 TO 6 IS AND ON 21 CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDIES. 22 23 AND, DOCTOR, I'M GOING TO READ TO YOU THE FIRST 2.4 SENTENCE THAT'S HIGHLIGHTED: "BECAUSE BOTH EXPOSURE AND DISEASE ARE DETERMINED IN AN INDIVIDUAL AT 25 26 THE SAME POINT IN TIME, IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO ESTABLISH THE TEMPORAL RELATION BETWEEN 27 28 EXPOSURE AND DISEASE; THAT IS, THAT THE

1	EXPOSURE PRECEDED THE DISEASE WHICH WOULD BE
2	NECESSARY FOR DRAWING ANY CAUSAL INFERENCE."
3	DO YOU SEE WHERE I JUST READ FROM?
4	A YES.
5	Q DO YOU AGREE WITH THAT STATEMENT?
6	A IT IS SO BROAD AND SO NON SPECIFIC. IT IS
7	CORRECT IF REALLY WHAT YOU DO IN A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY
8	IS ESTABLISH EXPOSURE AT THAT POINT IN TIME; HOWEVER, IF
9	YOU ASK SOMEBODY TODAY, DID YOU SMOKE WHEN YOU WERE AGE
10	15, AND THAT PERSON DEVELOPED THEIR CANCER AT AGE 50,
11	AND THEY ANSWER YES, I ALREADY SMOKED AT AGE 15. I HAVE
12	TEMPORALITY, RIGHT.
13	SO A CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY IS VERY MUCH CAPABLE
14	OF ESTABLISHING TEMPORALITY, BUT IF YOU ASK QUESTIONS
15	LIKE, ARE YOU A SMOKER NOW, AND YOU ASSESS WHETHER OR
16	NOT SOMEBODY HAS CANCER NOW, THEN YOU CAN'T ESTABLISH
17	TEMPORALITY. AND THAT'S WHAT THIS SAYS AND I AGREE WITH
18	THAT.
19	IF YOU ARE GOING ABOUT IT A LITTLE SMARTER AND
20	YOU SAID SAY YOU ASK WHEN DID YOU START SMOKING,
21	WHAT WAS YOUR AGE, AND THE AGE IS IS PRIOR TO THE ONSET
22	OF DISEASE, YOU HAVE ESTABLISHED TEMPORALITY. IT MAKES
23	TOTAL SENSE, RIGHT.
24	Q OKAY.
25	AND THEN LET ME ASK YOU ABOUT THE BEFORE I
26	MOVE TO A DIFFERENT TOPIC, MAYBE WE'LL TAKE A BREAK
27	AFTER THIS. THE LAST SENTENCE IN THE REFERENCE MANUAL.
28	THIS IS ON THIS WOULD BE ON PAGE 561.

1	"CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDIES ARE INFREQUENTLY USED			
2	WHEN THE EXPOSURE OF INTEREST IS AN			
3	ENVIRONMENTAL TOXIC AGENT, BUT THESE STUDIES			
4	CAN PROVIDE VALUABLE LEADS FOR FURTHER			
5	DIRECTIONS TO FURTHER DIRECTIONS FOR			
6	RESEARCH."			
7	DO YOU SEE THAT?			
8	A YES.			
9	Q DO YOU AGREE WITH THAT?			
10	A ABSOLUTELY NOT BECAUSE WE HAVE A FEDERAL			
11	GOVERNMENT THAT SPENDS MILLIONS OF DOLLARS EVERY YEAR TO			
12	CONDUCT THE LARGEST CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY IN THE NATION			
13	CALLED NHNES, NATIONAL HEALTH AND NUTRITION EXAMINATION			
14	SURVEY, AND ALL THEY DO IS ESTABLISH ENVIRONMENTAL			
15	TOXINS. THERE'S A WHOLE LAB OF ANTONIO KALIFAT AT THE			
16	CDC THAT MEASURES EVERY TOXIN, EVERY PESTICIDES, EVERY			
17	METAL IN THESE INDIVIDUALS EXACTLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF			
18	FOR THESE KIND OF VERY INFORMATIVE CROSS-SECTIONAL			
19	STUDIES.			
20	WE WOULDN'T BE SPENDING SO MUCH MONEY AT CDC			
21	AND AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL TO CONDUCT THESE NHNES SURVEYS			
22	IF WE THOUGHT THEY WERE USELESS. THEY ARE NOT. THEY			
23	ARE VERY, VERY INFORMATIVE AND VERY WELL SUPPORTED BY			
24	NIH.			
25	MR. PETROSINELLI: OKAY. DOCTOR, WE CAN TAKE			
26	THAT DOWN.			
27	YOUR HONOR, I KNOW WE WERE GOING TO TAKE A			
28	BREAK AT ABOUT 3:00. WE'RE JUST BEFORE 3:00. I'M ABOUT			
	66			

1	TO MOVE TO A DIFFERENT TOPIC. WOULD THIS BE A GOOD		
2	TIME?		
3	THE COURT: YES, IT WOULD.		
4	LET'S BREAK, PLEASE, UNTIL 3:15.		
5	MR. PETROSINELLI: THANK YOU.		
6	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU.		
7	THANK YOU, DOCTOR.		
8	THE WITNESS: THANK YOU.		
9	(RECESS)		
10	THE COURT: LET'S MOVE ON FOR TODAY AND KEEP		
11	GOING.		
12	MR. PETROSINELLI: OKAY. THANK YOU, YOUR		
13	HONOR.		
14	Q DR. RITZ, LET ME SHOW YOU AGAIN YOUR REPORT		
15	WHICH IS EXHIBIT 4 ON PAGE 30.		
16	I WANTED TO SHOW YOU, THIS IS YOUR TEMPORALITY		
17	ANALYSIS ON LEAD AND ADHD.		
18	AND YOU SEE IT ON THE SCREEN HERE.		
19	YOU RECOGNIZE THIS, DO YOU NOT?		
20	A YES.		
21	Q OKAY.		
22	AND YOU SAY THAT YOU CITE THREE STUDIES TO		
23	SUPPORT TEMPORALITY. THE FIRST ONE SAYS, EARLY INFANCY		
24	AND BABY TEETH.		
25	THAT'S THE ARORA STUDY; CORRECT?		
26	A YES.		
27	Q AND THEN THE KOREAN CHILD COHORT STUDY, THAT'S		
28	THE KIM 2016 STUDY; CORRECT?		
	67		

1	A YES, WHERE THEY MEASURED LEAD AND AGE 8 AND THE	
2	AUTISTIC BEHAVIOR AT AGE 12.	
3	Q RIGHT.	
4	AND THEN THE THIRD STUDY, IT SAYS NORWEGIAN	
5	MOBA COHORT, THAT'S THE STUDY WHERE THE FIRST AUTHOR IS	
6	SKOGHEIM; CORRECT?	
7	A CORRECT.	
8	Q OKAY.	
9	A THAT'S THE PRENATAL EXPOSURE STUDY.	
10	Q OKAY. SO WHAT I WANT TO DO IS I WANT TO PUT UP	
11	THE CHART THAT YOU USED IN YOUR DIRECT YESTERDAY OF THE	
12	STUDIES ON LEAD AND ASD.	
13	THIS IS THE CHART THAT YOU USED DURING YOUR	
14	TESTIMONY YESTERDAY.	
15	DO YOU RECALL THAT?	
16	A YEAH, THAT'S NOT MY CHART, BUT THAT'S THE CHART	
17	I WAS ASKED TO GO OVER, YES.	
18	Q OH, I WAS JUST GOING TO ASK YOU. THAT WAS	
19	YOU YOU'VE ANTICIPATED MY FIRST QUESTION.	
20	DID YOU PREPARE THIS CHART?	
21	A NO.	
22	Q DID YOU REVIEW IT FOR ACCURACY BEFORE YOU	
23	TESTIFIED ABOUT IT?	
24	A NO, I WAS SHOWN THIS AS KIND OF AND AN AIDE TO	
25	WHAT'S OUT THERE.	
26	Q OKAY. SO LET'S LOOK AT IT.	
27	NOW, IN TERMS OF THE THREE STUDIES ON	
28	TEMPORALITY THAT YOU CITED FOR LEAD AND ASD, I WANT TO	

1	LOOK FOR THOSE ON THIS CHART AND SO WE'RE GOING TO DO			
2	SOME ANIMATION. THERE'S KIM AND THERE'S ARORA.			
3	DO YOU SEE THOSE TWO?			
4	A YES, UM-HMM.			
5	Q AND WHERE IS SKOGHEIM?			
6	A I DON'T KNOW.			
7	Q IN FACT, SKOGHEIM IS NOT ON THIS CHART; ISN'T			
8	THAT TRUE?			
9	A WELL, I I CAN'T SEE THE REST SO I DON'T			
10	KNOW.			
11	Q ALL RIGHT. WE'LL I'LL REPRESENT TO YOU JUST			
12	TO PUSH THIS ALONG THAT SKOGHEIM WAS NOT ON THIS CHART.			
13	SKOGHEIM SHOULD BE ON THIS CHART, RIGHT? THIS			
14	A STUDY ON LEAD AND ASD IN THE PEER-REVIEWED LITERATURE;			
15	TRUE?			
16	A CORRECT.			
17	Q AND IF WE PUT SKOGHEIM ON THIS CHART, WHICH			
18	WE'LL DO RIGHT NOW, IT WOULD BE HERE BECAUSE WITH			
19	RESPECT TO LEAD AND ASD, THE SKOGHEIM STUDY CALCULATED			
20	ODDS RATIOS THAT WERE NEGATIVE BUT NOT STATISTICALLY			
21	SIGNIFICANT; CORRECT?			
22	A I CAN'T REMEMBER. WE HAVE TO GO OVER THE			
23	STUDY.			
24	BUT WHAT I RECALL IS, I MEAN, THE DETAILS WE			
25	HAVE TO GO TO THE STUDY FOR. BUT WHAT I RECALL IS THAT			
26	THEY DESCRIBED A INVERSE U SHAPED RELATIONSHIP THAT YOU			
27	JUST CITED BEFORE IN ONE OF YOU OWN SLIDES WHERE LOWER			
28	LEVELS AND HIGH LEVELS HAD POSITIVE ASSOCIATIONS;			

1	WHETHER THAT'S STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT OR NOT, I CAN'T			
2	RECALL.			
3	Q ALL RIGHT. WELL, LET'S LOOK AT THAT STUDY AND			
4	NOT LEAVE ANY QUESTION ABOUT IT.			
5	THE SKOGHEIM STUDY IS EXHIBIT 629.			
6	WHICH WE'LL PULL UP HERE IS THE ACTUAL			
7	STUDY.			
8	AND LET'S GO TO FIRST OF ALL, LET ME JUST			
9	LET'S JUST SET UP WHAT THIS STUDY IS.			
10	THEY MEASURED MATERNAL BLOOD, IN OTHER WORDS,			
11	FOR THE WOMEN WHO WERE PREGNANT, THEY MEASURED METAL			
12	LEVELS IN THEIR BLOOD; CORRECT?			
13	A I BELIEVE SO, BUT WE HAVE TO GO TO THE METHODS			
14	TO LOOK THAT UP.			
15	Q OKAY.			
16	AND LET'S LOOK AT FIGURE 2 WHICH IS ON PAGE 7			
17	OF THE STUDY.			
18	NOW, YOU RECALL, DO YOU NOT, DOCTOR, THAT WHAT			
19	THEY DID HERE IS THEY DIVIDED THE LEVELS OF EXPOSURE TO			
20	THE METALS INTO QUARTILES; CORRECT?			
21	A THAT'S WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE BECAUSE THE Q			
22	PROBABLY MEANS QUARTILES AND THERE ARE FOUR, SO THAT			
23	WOULD BE CORRECT.			
24	Q ALL RIGHT. AND THE WAY TO READ THIS CHART, AND			
25	WE'VE HIGHLIGHTED THE FINDINGS ON LEAD.			
26	YOU SEE THE ABBREVIATION FOR LEAD PB; CORRECT?			
27	A YES.			
28	Q ALL RIGHT.			

1	AND THE WAY TO READ THIS CHART IS THAT THE			
2	FIRST QUARTILE IS THE REFERENCE LEVEL OF THE METAL IN			
3	THE MOTHER'S BLOOD, SO THAT'S AT THE LINE THAT'S EXACTLY			
4	AT ONE; CORRECT?			
5	A YES.			
6	Q AND THEN THE SUBSEQUENT THREE QUARTILES,			
7	QUARTILES TWO, THREE AND FOUR, THOSE ARE INCREASING			
8	LEVELS OF LEAD IN THE MOTHER'S BLOOD; CORRECT?			
9	A CORRECT.			
10	Q AND WHAT WE SEE FOR LEAD IN QUARTILES TWO,			
11	THREE AND FOUR, THOSE INCREASING LEVELS OF LEAD IN THE			
12	MOTHER'S BLOOD, IS THAT THE ODDS RATIO WHICH YOU TALKED			
13	ABOUT YESTERDAY FOR ALL THREE QUARTILES IS BELOW ONE;			
14	CORRECT?			
15	A CORRECT.			
16	Q AND THE CONFIDENCE INTERVALS WHICH ARE THOSE, I			
17	THINK YOU CALLED THE WHISKERS YESTERDAY, AROUND EACH OF			
18	THE POINT ESTIMATES, FOR EACH OF THOSE QUARTILES CROSS			
19	ONE; CORRECT?			
20	A CORRECT.			
21	Q AND SO WHAT YOU WOULD SAY IS THAT THIS STUDY			
22	SHOWED A NEGATIVE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN LEAD AND THESE			
23	QUARTILES OF THESE QUARTILES OF LEVELS OF LEAD IN THE			
24	MOTHER'S BLOOD AND ASD THAT WAS NOT STATISTICALLY			
25	SIGNIFICANT; CORRECT?			
26	A ACCORDING TO THIS ONE GRAPH, YES, BUT THAT'S			
27	NOT THE ONLY GRAPH THEY SHOWED.			
28	Q ALL RIGHT.			

1		LET'S GO BACK TO THE OR LET ME SHOW YOU ONE			
2	MORE THING IN THE SKOGHEIM STUDY WHERE THEY DISCUSS W				
3	THEIR RESULTS WERE. THIS IS ON PAGE 9 OF THE STUDY.				
4	AND THE FIRST THIS IS THE FIRST PARAGRAPH OF THE				
5	DISCUSSION SECTION OF THE STUDY.				
6	THEY SAID, "IN THIS LARGE PROSPECTIVE STUDY"				
7	BY THE WAY, LET ME BEFORE I READ FURTHER, THIS WAS A				
8	LARGE PROSPECTIVE STUDY; CORRECT?				
9	A IT WAS A PROSPECTIVE STUDY, YEAH, A BIRTH				
10	COHORT OF	R BETTER PREGNANCY COHORT.			
11	Q	RIGHT.			
12		"IN THIS LARGE PROSPECTIVE STUDY, WE FOUND			
13		ASSOCIATIONS INDICATING INCREASED RISK OF ASD			
14	IN CHILDREN WITH INCREASED MATERNAL LEVELS OF				
15	ARSENIC, CADMIUM AND MANGANESE AND INCREASED				
16		RISK OF ASD WITH INCREASED MATERNAL LEVELS OF			
17		CADMIUM AND MAGNESIUM."			
18		CORRECT?			
19	А	YES.			
20	Q	AND THEY DID NOT FIND INCREASED RISK OF ASD OR			
21	ADHD WITH LEAD ACCORDING TO THIS SENTENCE?				
22	А	IN THIS SENTENCE, NO. BUT WE CAN GO TO WHERE			
23	THEY DESC	CRIBE THEIR LEAD EXPOSURES.			
24	Q	OKAY.			
25		LET'S GO BACK TO THE DEMONSTRATIVE CHART.			
26		MR. WISNER: YOUR HONOR, I'M GOING TO HAVE TO			
27	ISSUE AN	OBJECTION. THE STUDY CLEARLY SAYS IT'S AN			
28	ASSOCIATION WITH LEAD IN THE LEAD SECTION. THIS IS				

1	CLEARLY MISLEADING.
2	THE COURT: OVERRULED.
3	MR. PETROSINELLI:
4	Q NOW, WE JUST DISCUSSED YOU HAD CITED THESE
5	THREE STUDIES; KIM, ARORA AND SKOGHEIM IN YOUR SUPPORT
6	FOR TEMPORALITY WITH LEAD.
7	I WANTED TO ASK YOU, DOCTOR, DO YOU AGREE WITH
8	ME THAT THERE ARE OTHER STUDIES OF LEAD AND ASD WHERE
9	THE LEAD MEASUREMENTS WERE TAKEN BEFORE ASD DEVELOPED SO
10	TEMPORALITY IS ESTABLISHED?
11	DO YOU AGREE WITH THAT?
12	A WELL, THESE WERE EXAMPLES, AND THAT'S HOW I
13	QUOTE MYSELF, RIGHT. THESE ARE EXAMPLES OF WHERE
14	TEMPORALITY IS WELL ESTABLISHED. IT DOESN'T MEAN THAT
15	YOU CAN'T COME TO THE CONCLUSION THAT TEMPORALITY CAN BE
16	ESTABLISHED IN OTHER STUDIES.
17	Q RIGHT.
18	I WAS JUST
19	A YES, YOU CAN DO THAT IN OTHER STUDIES TOO, YES.
20	Q RIGHT. THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT I WAS ASKING YOU.
21	AND I'M GOING TO SHOW YOU AND WE COUNTED
22	FIVE OTHER STUDIES OF LEAD AND ASD WHERE TEMPORALITY
23	COULD BE ESTABLISHED; DOHERTY, FRYE, LONG, ALAMPI AND
24	ABDULLAH, WHICH ARE SHOWED HERE.
25	DO YOU SEE THAT?
26	A YES.
27	Q AND DO YOU AGREE WITH ME LET ME PUT UP
28	ANOTHER DEMONSTRATIVE SO WE CAN FOCUS ON THESE STUDIES,

1	THESE TEMPORALITY STUDIES.
2	NO, THE OTHER. EXHIBIT 682. WE HAVE IT.
3	WE'RE GOING TO MARK IT.
4	OKAY. SO THESE ARE EIGHT STUDIES THAT WE JUST
5	TALKED ABOUT. LET'S LOOK AT THE CHARACTERISTICS OF
6	THESE STUDIES.
7	DO YOU AGREE WITH ME WITH RESPECT TO THESE
8	EIGHT STUDIES THAT FIVE OF THEM HAD AUTISM SPECIFICALLY
9	AS AN END POINT AND THREE OF THEM HAD AUTISTIC
10	BEHAVIORS?
11	A I BELIEVE YOU'RE CORRECT. I'M NOT RECALLING
12	ALAMPI, BUT I BELIEVE YOU. BUT YOU CAN SHOW ME.
13	Q OKAY.
14	A I CAN'T REMEMBER IF WHETHER IT'S ASD OR ASD
15	BEHAVIORS IN THAT STUDY.
16	THE REST I THINK, YES, THERE IS A DIAGNOSIS
17	BECAUSE FRYE, LONG, ARORA, ABDULLAH, THOSE ARE CASE
18	CONTROL STUDIES SO THEY WOULD BE ESTABLISH. AND
19	SKOGHEIM WE JUST LOOKED AT.
20	Q OKAY.
21	AND LET'S LOOK AT THE NEXT COLUMN ON THIS
22	CHART.
23	THESE ARE THE BIOMARKERS IN THESE STUDIES. YOU
24	CAN THEY RANGE FROM BABY TEETH TO AMNIOTIC FLUID TO
25	MATERNAL BLOOD TO MATERNAL AND INFANT TOENAILS.
26	IS IT CORRECT THAT THESE ARE THE BIOMARKERS
27	THAT THESE STUDIES MEASURED?
28	A AS FAR AS I RECALL, YES. I WOULD IMAGINE YOU

1	DID THIS CORRECTLY.
2	Q OKAY.
3	AND THIS IS WHY THESE STUDIES CAN SHOW
4	TEMPORALITY BECAUSE WHEN YOU MEASURE MATERNAL BLOOD OR
5	AMNIOTIC FLUID OR BABY TEETH AND THINGS LIKE THAT, THE
6	EXPOSURE THAT YOU'RE MEASURING PRE-DATES THE DEVELOPMENT
7	OF AUTISM; CORRECT?
8	A IT DEPENDS ON WHEN THEY ARE TAKEN AND HOW THE
9	MEASURES ARE DONE. AMNIOTIC FLUID IS CERTAINLY PRIOR TO
10	THE DIAGNOSIS. BABY TEETH PROBABLY ALSO MATERNAL BLOOD,
11	DEPENDS ON WHEN IT WAS TAKEN. MATERNAL TOENAILS,
12	DEPENDS ON WHEN THEY WERE TAKEN. CHILD BLOOD, DEPENDS
13	ON WHEN IT WAS TAKEN.
14	BUT YES, IF WE KNOW MORE ABOUT THESE STUDIES,
15	WE CAN PROBABLY AGREE THAT WE CAN ESTABLISH TEMPORALITY.
16	Q OKAY.
17	AND THEN LET ME SHOW YOU THE FINAL COLUMN.
18	WHETHER THE QUESTION IS WHETHER THERE WAS
19	THESE STUDIES SHOWED A SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION A
20	STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION THE EXPOSURE AND
21	EITHER THE ASD DIAGNOSIS OR THE ASD BEHAVIORS.
22	DO YOU AGREE WITH ME THAT SKOGHEIM, FRYE, LONG,
23	ABDULLAH, ALAMPI, DOHERTY DID NOT FIND A STATISTICALLY
24	SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION BETWEEN EXPOSURE TO LEAD IN THE
25	BIOMARKER THAT WAS MEASURED AND ASD?
26	A I TRIED TO EXPLAIN TO YOU IN MY DEPOSITION THAT
27	THE LAST THE LAST THING AN EPIDEMIOLOGIST IS TAUGHT
28	TO USE IS THE CRITERIA OF STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE. WE

1	LOOK AT THE DATA AS A WHOLE. WE LOOK AT EFFECT
2	ESTIMATES, CONFIDENCE INTERVALS AND BIASES.
3	I DO NOT LOOK AT STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE AS A
4	CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING STUDIES. IF YOU WANT ME TO LOOK
5	AT EVERY SINGLE ONE OF THESE, I'M HAPPY TO DO SO AND I'M
6	HAPPY TO TELL YOU WHAT I THINK ABOUT THE RESULTS.
7	Q DO YOU CAN YOU TELL ME YOU READ ALL THESE
8	STUDIES AND DISCUSSED THEM IN YOUR REPORT, DID YOU NOT?
9	A YES.
10	Q OKAY. AND CAN YOU AND I'LL TALK TO YOU
11	ABOUT STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE IN A MOMENT AND I
12	APPRECIATE YOUR POSITION ON THAT.
13	MY QUESTION IS SIMPLY, CAN YOU TELL ME THAT YOU
14	AGREE THAT THE STUDIES SIX OF THESE EIGHT STUDIES DID
15	NOT FIND A STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION BETWEEN
16	LEAD EXPOSURE AND ASD?
17	A I WOULD HAVE TO LOOK AT EVERY SINGLE STUDY AND
18	TELL YOU WHAT IT WHAT IT SHOWS. I CAN'T RECALL
19	STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE BECAUSE THAT'S NOT A CRITERION
20	I WOULD EVER USE.
21	Q ALL RIGHT.
22	WELL, LET'S LOOK WE'RE NOT GOING TO LOOK AT
23	ALL THESE STUDIES, BUT LET'S JUST DO A COUPLE OF THEM
24	JUST TO JUST AS A CHECK.
25	BY THE WAY, LET'S GO BACK TO THE DEMONSTRATIVE
26	WE JUST HAD ON THE SCREEN WHILE WE SO THAT WE CAN GO
27	THROUGH A COUPLE OF THESE.
28	BUT I JUST WANT TO ASK A QUESTION.

1	THIS DEMONSTRATIVE YOU SHOWED YESTERDAY DURING
2	YOUR TESTIMONY, IT DID NOT HAVE ON IT ALAMPI, DOHERTY,
3	FRYE, LONG OR SKOGHEIM; CORRECT?
4	A I DON'T RECALL. I ONLY SAW THIS ON THE SCREEN
5	ONCE.
6	Q OKAY.
7	AND YOU AGREE THAT ALAMPI, DOHERTY, FRYE, LONG
8	AND SKOGHEIM BELONG ON THIS CHART, THEY ARE LEAD
9	STUDIES OF LEAD IN ASD IN THE PEER-REVIEWED LITERATURE;
10	CORRECT?
11	A YES, THEY ARE.
12	Q OKAY.
13	SO LET'S LOOK AT JUST ONE OF MAYBE ONE OR
14	TWO OF THESE.
15	LET'S LOOK AT DOHERTY.
16	OH, BY THE WAY, BEFORE WE DO THAT, LET ME JUST
17	ASK YOU ONE OTHER THING.
18	DO YOU SEE WHERE IT SAYS ARORA AND IT SAYS H?
19	A YES.
20	Q AND DO YOU SEE THE LEGEND, H IS COHORT STUDY?
21	A WHERE IS THAT?
22	Q UP ON THE TOP RIGHT, I'M SORRY.
23	A OH. OH, I NEVER LOOKED AT THAT. I WASN'T SURE
24	WHAT H MEANT. I THOUGHT IT WAS
25	Q OKAY. THAT'S WRONG. ARORA IS NOT A COHORT
26	STUDY. ARORA IS A CASE CONTROL STUDY?
27	A YES.
28	Q OKAY.

1	A IT'S ACTUALLY A TWIN STUDY. IT'S A VERY
2	SPECIAL DESIGN.
3	Q RIGHT.
4	BUT IT'S A CASE CONTROL DESIGN?
5	A YES, IT'S A SPECIAL KIND OF CASE CONTROL DESIGN
6	THAT'S USUALLY REFERRED TO AS A TWIN STUDY, YES.
7	Q RIGHT. OKAY.
8	SO THAT'S A MISTAKE ON THIS CHART. THAT SHOULD
9	NOT BE LABELED AS A COHORT STUDY; CORRECT?
10	A IF H MEANS COHORT, THEN NO. I THOUGHT IT WAS
11	TEETH.
12	Q ALL RIGHT.
13	LET'S LOOK AT THE LONG STUDY WHICH IS
14	EXHIBIT 92.
15	YOU READ THIS STUDY, DOCTOR, DID YOU NOT?
16	A I KNOW THIS GROUP VERY WELL BECAUSE I WORK WITH
17	THEM.
18	Q RIGHT.
19	THAT'S WHAT I RECALLED, I THINK, FROM YOUR
20	DEPOSITION.
21	A UM-HMM.
22	Q AND THIS IS A STUDY WHERE THEY MEASURE METALS
23	AND OTHER THINGS, CHEMICALS, IN AMNIOTIC FLUID OF
24	MOTHERS; CORRECT?
25	A I SEEM TO RECALL, YES.
26	Q ALL RIGHT.
27	AND ONE OF THE METALS THEY DETECTED IN AMNIOTIC
28	FLUID WAS LEAD; CORRECT?

1	A YES.
2	Q ALL RIGHT.
3	AND LET'S LOOK AT WHAT THEY FOUND.
4	ON PAGE 7 OF THE STUDY AND I'M GOING TO
5	DIRECT YOU, DOCTOR, UNDER THE HEADING UNDER "RESULTS,"
6	THE HEADING IS "LEVELS OF ELEMENTS AND HEAVY METALS,"
7	AND THEY FOUND, "SIMILAR METALS OF ELEMENTS IN HEAVY
8	METALS BETWEEN ASD CASES AND CONTROLS WERE OBSERVED."
9	DO YOU SEE THAT?
10	A YES.
11	Q AND THEN WE'LL GO WE'LL LOOK AT THE TABLE
12	JUST SO WE HAVE THE NUMBERS IN FRONT OF US.
13	IF YOU GO TO PAGE 10 OF THE STUDY, THIS IS
14	WHERE THEY LAY OUT THE RESULTS OF THESE VARIOUS METALS
15	THAT ARE ON THE LEFT AND THE LEVELS IN THE CASES AND THE
16	CONTROLS; CORRECT?
17	A YES.
18	Q AND THE LAST ONE IS LEAD; TRUE?
19	A CORRECT. UM-HMM.
20	Q AND WHAT THEY FOUND WAS NO STATISTICALLY
21	SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE CASES, THE KIDS WITH
22	ASD, AND THE CONTROLS, THE KIDS WITHOUT ASD, IN TERMS OF
23	LEAD; TRUE?
24	A YES. AND IN THIS CASE THEY HAVE 37 CASES AND
25	51 CONTROLS AND THEIR ODDS RATIO, OR 50 CONTROLS WITH
26	ADJUSTMENT, THEIR ODDS RATIO IS 1.3, THAT INDICATES A
27	30 PERCENT INCREASE IN RISK ACCORDING TO LEAD, HIGHER
28	LEAD, AND THEIR CONFIDENCE INTERVAL INCLUDES THE ONE,

1	BUT CLEARLY THE POINT ESTIMATE POINTS INTO THE DIRECTION
2	OF AN EFFECT; HOWEVER, WHEN YOU KNOW WHERE THESE KIDS
3	LIVE AND HOW LOW THE LEVELS ARE, YOU WOULD NEED 3,000
4	CHILDREN TO MAKE THIS ODDS RATIO STATISTICALLY
5	SIGNIFICANT IF THE TRUE ODDS RATIO WAS 1.3 INDICATING AN
6	INCREASE.
7	SO IT'S A COMPLETELY UNDERPOWERED STUDY.
8	Q BUT IT'S YOU AGREE MY QUESTION WAS YOU
9	AGREE THAT THERE'S NO STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT
10	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE CASES AND THE CONTROLS?
11	A WHICH IS COMPLETELY IRRELEVANT WHEN YOU HAVE A
12	STUDY THAT IS SO UNDERPOWERED THAT IT COULDN'T SEE
13	ANYTHING EVEN IF YOU TRIED.
14	Q OKAY.
15	LET'S LOOK AT ONE MORE OF THE STUDIES, A STUDY
16	CALLED DOHERTY, WHICH IS EXHIBIT 630.
17	THIS IS A STUDY THIS IS ACTUALLY ONE OF THE
18	FEW COHORT STUDIES OF LEAD AND ASD; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
19	A IT IS SIMILAR TO THE SKOGHEIM, BUT MUCH
20	SMALLER.
21	Q IT'S A
22	A A PRENATAL EXPOSURE STUDY, YES.
23	Q YES.
24	THIS IS WAS DONE IN NEW HAMPSHIRE; DO YOU
25	RECALL THAT?
26	A YES.
27	Q AND THE STUDY WAS FUNDED BY NIH, THE NATIONAL
ı	

1	A YES, AND IT WAS INTERESTED IN ARSENIC.
2	Q AND IT'S THIS STUDY HAD YOU'D
3	CHARACTERIZE THIS AS A MEDIUM SIZE STUDY, WOULDN'T YOU?
4	IT HAD 371 PARTICIPANTS?
5	A YEAH, FOR NO, ACTUALLY, FOR A COHORT STUDY,
6	IT'S VERY SMALL.
7	Q OKAY.
8	LET'S SEE HOW YOU CHARACTERIZE IT IN YOUR
9	DEPOSITION JUST FOR ONE SECOND.
10	LET'S GO TO THIS IS YOUR EXHIBIT 7, WHICH IS
11	YOUR DEPOSITION ON PAGE 169.
12	AND IF YOU LOOK AT LINES FROM LINES 10 TO 18
13	WHEN I ASKED YOU ABOUT THE DOHERTY STUDY, THE
14	PROSPECTIVE COHORT STUDY, IT'S 371 PARTICIPANTS.
15	AND I SAID: "AND SO WOULD YOU CHARACTERIZE
16	THAT AS A SMALL, MEDIUM OR A LARGE STUDY?"
17	YOU SAID "MEDIUM."
18	DO YOU SEE THAT, DOCTOR?
19	A YEAH.
20	Q IT'S A MEDIUM SIZED STUDY; DO YOU AGREE?
21	A WELL, I SAID MEDIUM THEN, BUT HONESTLY, WHEN
22	YOU COMPARE IT TO SKOGHEIM, IT SEEMS RATHER SMALL.
23	SKOGHEIM WAS A HUNDRED THOUSAND CHILDREN.
24	Q ALL RIGHT. WE'LL GO BACK TO THE STUDY AND
25	LET'S LOOK AT THE RESULTS.
26	IN THIS STUDY WHAT THEY DID BASICALLY IS TAKE
27	MEASURES OF LEAD AND OTHER METALS IN THE TOENAILS OF
28	MOTHERS, BOTH BEFORE OR AFTER BIRTH, AND THE CHILDREN

1	RIGHT AFTER BIRTH; CORRECT?
2	A I SEEM TO RECALL THAT. CAN YOU POINT OUT WHERE
3	YOU SEE THIS?
4	Q I SURE CAN.
5	THIS IS AT IF YOU LOOK AT THE METHODS IN THE
6	STUDY ON PAGE 2, IN THE BOTTOM LEFT IT SAYS EXPOSURE TO
7	METALS AND THEN WE CAN BLOW THAT UP.
8	AND DO YOU SEE RIGHT IN THAT FIRST SENTENCE
9	THEY MEASURED CONCENTRATIONS OF METALS IN TOENAIL
10	SAMPLES COLLECTED AT THREE TIME PERIODS, INCLUDING
11	MATERNAL TOENAILS AT A MEDIAN OF 27 GESTATIONAL WEEKS
12	AND A MEDIAN OF 4 WEEKS POST-PARTUM AND INFANT TOENAILS
13	COLLECTED AT A MEDIAN OF 6 WEEKS OF LIFE.
14	DO YOU SEE THAT?
15	A YES. UM-HMM.
16	Q ALL RIGHT. SO THAT'S HOW THEY DID THE STUDY.
17	AND THEY MEASURED FOR METALS IN THOSE TOENAILS;
18	TRUE?
19	A YES.
20	Q AND THEN THEY SAW WHICH OF THE CHILDREN
21	DEVELOPED ASD AND WHICH CHILDREN DID NOT DEVELOP ASD;
22	CORRECT?
23	A IT WASN'T REALLY ASD. IT WAS ASD BEHAVIORS,
24	RIGHT.
25	Q ASD BEHAVIORS. YOU'RE RIGHT. THANK YOU FOR
26	THAT CLARIFICATION.
27	BUT THEY COMPARED THOSE TO CHILDREN; CORRECT?
28	A THEY COM

1	Q TO TWO SETS OF CHILDREN?
2	A THEY COMPARED CHILDREN WITH MORE OR LESS
3	ASD-LIKE BEHAVIORS. THEY COMPARED THE EXPOSURES IN
4	CHILDREN WITH MORE OR LESS ASD-LIKE BEHAVIORS, YES.
5	Q RIGHT.
6	AND SO AND WHEN THEY LOOKED AT LEAD, THEY
7	FOUND NO RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EXPOSURES IN ANY OF
8	THESE TIME PERIODS, ANY OF THE TOENAIL SAMPLE TIME
9	PERIODS AND THESE ASD OR AUTISTIC BEHAVIORS; TRUE?
10	A YOU HAVE TO SHOW ME THE RESULTS.
11	Q ALL RIGHT.
12	A AND WE ARE TALKING PRENATAL BASICALLY, RIGHT.
13	Q WELL, DIDN'T THEY TAKE THE INFANT TOENAILS AT
14	SIX WEEKS OF LIFE?
15	A YEAH, BUT THEY ARE SAYING THAT IT REFLECTS
16	REALLY 6 TO 12 MONTHS IN ADULTS, AND IT PROBABLY
17	REFLECTS THE LAST TRIMESTER AND THE FIRST MONTH OF LIFE
18	IN CHILDREN.
19	Q ALL RIGHT.
20	AND WE'LL GO TO THEIR FINDINGS ON PAGE 6 OF THE
21	STUDY.
22	YOU SEE, I'M NOT GOING TO MAKE YOU READ THOSE
23	GRAPHS WHICH HAVE THE FINDINGS, BUT LET'S LOOK AT THE
24	TEXT AND SEE WHAT THEY SAY.
25	IN THE LEFT COLUMN STARTING WITH THE PARAGRAPH
26	I GUESS SAYING, "HOWEVER."
27	A YES, I SEE IT.
28	Q OKAY.

1	OKAY. AND DO YOU SEE IT SAYS, "IN ADDITION TO
2	THESE FINDINGS, WE ALSO OBSERVED ASSOCIATIONS
3	THAT ARE NOT SUPPORTED BY THE PRIOR LITERATURE,
4	INCLUDING THE LACK OF ADVERSE ASSOCIATIONS OF
5	LEAD."
6	DO YOU SEE THAT?
7	A YES. AND THEY WONDER WHY.
8	Q RIGHT.
9	SO WOULD YOU YOU WOULD AGREE WITH ME THAT
10	THIS IS A NULL STUDY?
11	A WELL, THEY ARE SAYING THEY ARE REALLY
12	WONDERING WHY THEY ARE NOT SEEING IT AND THEY ARE THEN
13	GOING INTO RESIDUAL CONFOUNDING BECAUSE THEIR STUDY WAS
14	REALLY AN ARSENIC STUDY AND SO THEY WONDERED WHETHER IT
15	WAS CONFOUNDED BY ARSENIC, I GUESS; AND "ADDITIONALLY,
16	SUCH RESULTS MAY BE OWING TO CHANCE AS WE DID NOT
17	CORRECT FOR MULTIPLE TESTING OWING TO THE DEPENDENCE
18	AMONG THE OUTCOMES."
19	SO THEY ARE SAYING, WELL, BASICALLY WE ARE
20	DOING A LOT OF TESTING HERE, STATISTICAL TESTING, AND
21	JUST BY CHANCE WE COULD SEE NO ASSOCIATION EVEN IF THERE
22	WAS ONE.
23	Q BUT YOU WOULD CHARACTERIZE THIS AS A NULL
24	STUDY; TRUE?
25	A YES.
26	Q OKAY. LET'S GO BACK TO THE DEMONSTRATIVE.
27	AND SO, DOCTOR, ARE YOU AWARE OF IF YOU LOOK
28	AT THESE EIGHT STUDIES THAT ARE HIGHLIGHTED HERE THAT
	84

1	PROVIDE TEMPORALITY IN THEIR MEASUREMENTS OF LEAD, ARE
2	YOU AWARE OF I'LL STRIKE THAT.
3	ISN'T IT TRUE THAT THE RESULTS OF THE STUDIES
4	THAT ON LEAD AND ASD WHERE LEAD IS MEASURED BEFORE
5	THE DEVELOPMENT OF ASD ARE TOTALLY INCONSISTENT; ISN'T
6	THAT TRUE?
7	A THERE'S STRONG INCONSISTENCY BETWEEN THIS
8	RESULT BETWEEN THESE STUDIES IN MANY WAYS; FOR
9	EXAMPLE, LONG SHOULD HAVE NEVER TRIED TO EVEN ESTIMATE
10	ANY DIFFERENCES GIVEN THEIR SAMPLE SIZE, SO THAT STUDY
11	IS COMPLETELY UNINFORMATIVE.
12	DOHERTY WONDERED THEMSELVES WHAT THEY HAD DONE
13	WRONG, SO I WONDER TOO WHAT THE PROBLEM IS WITH THE
14	STUDY.
15	ABDULLAH, I NEVER FIGURED OUT HOW THEY ACTUALLY
16	DREW THEIR CONTROLS. I TRIED VERY HARD, FOR THE TEETH,
17	AND I HAVE NO IDEA WHETHER THEIR CONTROL SELECTION WAS
18	ADEQUATE.
19	THEY ALSO EVEN IF IF WE ASSUME THAT THEIR
20	CONTROL SELECTION WAS ADEQUATE, THEY DIDN'T DO WHAT
21	ARORA DID WHICH WAS GO WAY BEYOND AND CONTROL FOR
22	GENETICS.
23	SO IF WE ALL AGREE THAT GENETICS INTERACT WITH
24	THE ENVIRONMENT, THEN ARORA IS THE STUDY YOU WANT TO
25	INTERPRET. ABDULLAH, YOU QUESTION WHAT THEY DID.
26	BUT YES, IT IS A NEGATIVE STUDY.
27	Q AND IS IT TRUE THAT WHEN YOU LOOK AT THESE
28	EIGHT STUDIES, THEY WERE DONE IN DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIES

1	USING DIFFERENT BIOMARKERS AND DIFFERENT STUDY DESIGNS;
2	TRUE?
3	A YES.
4	Q BY THE WAY, I THINK YOU JUST SAID ABOUT THE
5	LONG STUDY, THEY SHOULDN'T HAVE DONE THE STUDY BECAUSE
6	IT WAS TOO SMALL OR SOMETHING TO THAT EFFECT.
7	DID YOU SAY THAT?
8	A WELL, THE COMPARISONS THEY TRIED TO DO IN THE
9	WAY THEY DID IT, AND I KNOW THIS GROUP VERY WELL. AND
10	IF YOU LOOK AT THE AUTHORSHIP LIST, THEY WORKED WITH THE
11	BEST EPIDEMIOLOGISTS IN THE COUNTRY AND HIS NAME IS NOT
12	ON THIS. THAT'S YAN OLSEN. HE WAS PART OF THE STUDY
13	GROUP. SO YOU WONDER WHY HE'S NOT ON IT. PROBABLY
14	BECAUSE HE DISAGREED ON HOW THIS ANALYSIS WAS DONE AND
15	HOW IT WAS PRESENTED.
16	IT WAS A BUNCH OF TOXICOLOGISTS TRYING TO DO
17	EPIDEMIOLOGY AND PRESENTING RESULTS THAT, YOU KNOW, I
18	WOULD QUESTION IN THE WAY THEY ARE PRESENTED.
19	Q WELL, LET'S LOOK AT WHAT YOU SAID ABOUT THE
20	LONG STUDY IN YOUR REPORT.
21	LET'S GO TO EXHIBIT 4 AGAIN AT PAGE 23.
22	A I KNOW WHAT I SAID ABOUT IT. I SAID IT IS
23	SMALL AND IT HAS, YOU KNOW, WHATEVER IT HAS.
24	IT'S INTERESTING BECAUSE OF THE MARKERS. BUT
25	IT ISN'T PRESENTED IN THE WAY THAT I AS AN
26	EPIDEMIOLOGIST WOULD HAVE LIKED THEM TO DO IT.
27	Q LET'S LOOK AT EXACTLY WHAT YOU SAID. IT LOOKS
28	LIKE AT THE FIRST IT'S THE VERY FIRST STUDY YOU

1	DISCUSSED UNDER YOUR ANALYSIS OF LEAD AND ASD, AND SO
2	LET'S LOOK AT WHAT YOU SAID ABOUT IT.
3	"A CASE CONTROL STUDY OF AUTISM NESTED WITHIN
4	THE HISTORIC BIRTH COHORT AT STATENS SEREM
5	INSTITUTE IN DENMARK IS PARTICULARLY NOTEWORTHY
6	IN TERMS OF ACCURACY OF TIMING OF EXPOSURE AND
7	ESTIMATING EXPOSURE LEVELS DURING THE MOST
8	IMPORTANT AND SENSITIVE NEURODEVELOPMENTAL
9	PERIODS FOR ASD."
10	DO YOU SEE THAT?
11	A CORRECT.
12	Q AND WHEN YOU SAID, "DURING THE MOST IMPORTANT
13	AND SENSITIVE NEURODEVELOPMENT PERIODS FOR ASD," THE
14	MEASUREMENTS THAT WERE DONE OF THE AMNIOTIC FLUID, THE
15	AVERAGE WAS AT 15 WEEKS OF GESTATION; CORRECT?
16	A I THOUGHT IT WAS LATER, BUT I DON'T REMEMBER.
17	Q WHATEVER IT WAS, THAT PERIOD YOU VIEWED AS THE
18	MOST IMPORTANT AND SENSITIVE NEURODEVELOPMENTAL PERIOD
19	FOR ASD, CORRECT; THAT'S WHAT YOU SAID?
20	A THAT'S WHAT THIS SAYS. BUT I DON'T KNOW WHAT
21	THE TIMING WAS IN THAT STUDY. WE HAVE TO GO BACK TO IT.
22	Q ALL RIGHT. WELL, WE'LL TAKE A LOOK AT IT.
23	LET'S GO BACK TO EXHIBIT 92. AND WE'LL GO TO
24	PAGE 7. AND WE'LL GO UNDER "RESULTS," THE FIRST
25	PARAGRAPH, "CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY POPULATION."
26	AND YOU SEE THE SECOND THE THIRD SENTENCE:
27	"THE MAJORITY OF AMNIOTIC FLUID SAMPLES WERE
28	OBTAINED IN GESTATIONAL WEEK 15."
	87

1	DO YOU SEE THAT?
2	A YES.
3	Q AND SO THAT IS THE PERIOD THAT YOU SAID WAS THE
4	MOST IMPORTANT AND SENSITIVE NEURODEVELOPMENTAL PERIOD
5	FOR ASD; CORRECT?
6	A THAT'S WHAT I SAID.
7	Q ALL RIGHT.
8	OKAY. AND YOU YOU AGREE
9	A BUT I DIDN'T SAY 15 WEEKS. I DIDN'T SAY 15
10	WEEKS. I SAID THAT THE PRENATAL PERIOD IS THE MOST
11	SENSITIVE.
12	Q THE IN FACT, THE YOU AGREE THAT THE
13	PRENATAL PERIOD PRENATAL PERIOD IS STRONGLY
14	IMPLICATED IN AUTISM ETIOLOGY; CORRECT?
15	A IN NEURODEVELOPMENT. WHETHER YOU FOR
16	AUTISM, I ACTUALLY, NO.
17	Q OKAY.
18	A I MISSPOKE.
19	IT IS VERY, VERY IMPORTANT FOR
20	NEURODEVELOPMENT. NOBODY WOULD ASK THAT WOULD
21	QUESTION THAT BECAUSE YOU HAVE THE NEURAL TUBE DEFECTS
22	THAT ARE ACTUALLY HAPPENING IN THE FIRST TRIMESTER.
23	THEN YOU HAVE THE BRAIN BEING SET UP STRUCTURALLY IN A
24	MAJOR WAY AND THEN YOU HAVE SYNAPTIC FORMATION.
25	SO IT REALLY DEPENDS ON WHAT WE'RE TALKING
26	ABOUT HERE. ARE WE TALKING ABOUT STRUCTURAL DEFECTS OR
27	ARE WE TALKING ABOUT ASD AS A SPECTRUM?
28	AND I HAVE TO SAY I SHOULD I PROBABLY SHOULD

1	HAVE SAID AUTISM, NOT ASD, BECAUSE ASD IS A SPECTRUM AND
2	WE KNOW THAT NEURONS MATURE PRIOR TO BIRTH AND THEY
3	MATURE AFTER BIRTH, AND ON THE SPECTRUM THAT BRAIN
4	DEVELOPMENT GOES FAR INTO EARLY CHILDHOOD.
5	Q LET'S LOOK AT ONE OF YOUR PUBLICATIONS ON
6	AUTISM. IT'S EXHIBIT 683. IT'S THE LEAD AUTHOR IS
7	SOMEONE NAMED TRACY BECERRA.
8	DO YOU REMEMBER THAT PUBLICATION?
9	A YES.
10	Q OKAY. LET'S PULL THAT UP. THIS IS CALLED
11	"AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDERS AND RACE, ETHNICITY AND
12	NATIVITY, A POPULATION BASED STUDY."
13	DO YOU SEE THAT?
14	A YES.
15	Q AND YOU'RE ONE OF THE AUTHORS ON THE STUDY.
16	INDEED YOU'RE THE SENIOR AUTHOR ON THE STUDY; CORRECT?
17	A YES, IT LOOKS LIKE IT, UM-HMM.
18	Q AND LET'S LOOK AT THE SECOND PAGE OF THAT
19	STUDY. THE PARAGRAPH ON THE LEFT COLUMN THAT STARTS
20	WITH "THE PRENATAL PERIOD."
21	AND WHAT YOU AND YOUR CO-AUTHORS SAID IN THIS
22	STUDY IS WHAT I JUST ASKED YOU: "THE PRENATAL PERIOD IS
23	STRONGLY IMPLICATED IN ASD ETIOLOGY; " CORRECT?
24	A YES, AND I'M QUOTING THOSE CITATIONS.
25	Q RIGHT.
26	BUT IT'S IN YOUR IT'S IN YOUR THE STUDY
27	THAT YOU PUBLISHED IN A PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL; CORRECT?
28	A WELL, THIS IS WHERE I REVIEWED THE LITERATURE

1 AND I OUOTE THE LITERATURE 9 TO 11 THAT SAYS THE 2 PRENATAL PERIOD IS STRONGLY IMPLICATED. ACTUALLY, LATER IF YOU WOULD LOOK AT MY PAPERS, 3 THE EPIDEMIOLOGISTS WHO ACTUALLY THEN STARTED STUDYING 4 ASD AND ENVIRONMENT AND ACTUALLY FOR THE FIRST TIME WERE 5 ABLE TO LOOK AT DIFFERENT DEVELOPMENTAL PERIODS BECAUSE, 6 7 YOU KNOW, SCIENCE DEVELOPS. 8 YOU BELIEVE THAT, YOU KNOW, CERTAIN PERIODS ARE 9 MORE IMPORTANT THAN OTHERS, BUT PEOPLE HAVE REALLY NOT 10 COLLECTED ENOUGH DATA ON IT. NOW THAT WE HAVE COLLECTED A LOT MORE DATA, YOU KNOW, THIS WAS, YOU KNOW, 20 --11 WHAT WAS IT -- '13 OR 2014. 12 13 2014. 0 14 Α YEAH. 15 SO IN THE MEANTIME I'VE DONE A LOT OF OTHER STUDIES. I'VE LOOKED AT WHEN THE EXPOSURES WERE MOST 16 17 AFFECTING THE INCIDENCE OF ASD. AND WHEN I LOOK AT THOSE, MY OWN STUDIES THAT CAME LATER, THE AIR POLLUTION 18 19 STUDIES, I ACTUALLY REVISED MY OPINION TO IT'S MORE 20 LIKELY LATE PREGNANCY AND EARLY CHILDHOOD. 21 AND IF YOU LOOK AT MY DANISH STUDY WHERE I HAD THE BEST DATA TO EVALUATE THAT BECAUSE IT WAS A LOT --22 23 IT WAS THOUSANDS OF ASD CHILDREN, IT WAS CLEARLY LATE PREGNANCY AND DEFINITELY EARLY LIFE AND NOT -- NOT THIS 2.4 VERY EARLY PERIOD. 25 26 SO I CORRECTED MYSELF. 27 Q OKAY. LET'S SEE WHO YOU SAID -- YOU MENTIONED THAT 28

1	YOU CITED FOOTNOTE REFERENCES 9 TO 11
2	A YES.
3	Q FOR THIS PROPOSITION.
4	LET'S SEE WHO WOULD HAVE SAID SUCH A THING.
5	LET'S GO TO THE FOOTNOTES, WHICH ARE ON PAGE,
6	IT'S LABELED E70, I DON'T KNOW HOW TO IT'S THE SECOND
7	TO LAST PAGE OF THE STUDY AND LOOK AT FOOTNOTE
8	REFERENCES 9 TO 11.
9	ONE SECOND, DOCTOR.
10	A ARE YOU SHOWING ME THIS?
11	Q JUST ONE SECOND.
12	FOOTNOTE REFERENCE 10 IS HANNA GARDENER, ET
13	AL., THAT'S ONE THE STUDIES YOU CITED FOR THE
14	PROPOSITION THAT THE PRENATAL PERIOD IS STRONGLY
15	IMPLICATED IN ASD ETIOLOGY; CORRECT?
16	A YES.
17	Q ALL RIGHT.
18	WE CAN TAKE THAT DOWN.
19	A BUT AS I SAID
20	Q YOU
21	A THIS WAS 2014, AND YOU KNOW, SCIENCE GOES IN
22	LEAPS AND SPURTS, AND ALL OF SCIENCE ON AUTISM SPECTRUM,
23	THE EPIDEMIOLOGY OF AUTISM SPECTRUM HAS REALLY DEVELOPED
24	AFTER THE 2000S AND AFTER, YOU KNOW, THAT PERIOD.
25	I MEAN, MY FIRST STUDY WAS IN 2012. THIS ONE
26	YOU'VE JUST CITED WAS IN 2014. I HAVE A LOT MORE
27	PUBLICATIONS AFTERWARDS, AND YOU'RE NOT CITING THOSE,
28	WHERE I'M ACTUALLY CLEARLY SAYING IT IS LATE PREGNANCY

1	AND EARLY CHILDHOOD THAT THE EPIDEMIOLOGICAL DATA IS
2	POINTING TO NOW. WE ARE SURPRISED TO SEE THAT, BUT
3	THAT'S WHAT ALL OUR DATA SAYS. AND WE CORRECTED OUR
4	OPINION ACCORDING TO WHAT THE DATA SAYS, NOT WHAT OUR
5	PRIOR WHAT OUR PRIOR OPINION IS.
6	Q DIDN'T YOU COME TO BELIEVE, DOCTOR, THAT THE
7	THE ETIOLOGY OF ASD LIKELY ORIGINATES IN EARLY
8	PREGNANCY?
9	A THERE IS SOME AUTISM THAT DEFINITELY ORIGINATES
10	AT CONCEPTION EVEN BECAUSE WE KNOW THAT, YOU KNOW, THERE
11	ARE MONOGENIC FORMS, FRAGILE X SYNDROME IS ONE OF THEM,
12	GENETIC AUTISM IS CAUSED AT CONCEPTION OR THE CAUSE GOES
13	BACK TO CONCEPTION, AND THEN OF COURSE THE WHOLE
14	PREGNANCY NEURODEVELOPMENT THAT IS BASED ON THAT GENETIC
15	BLUEPRINT IS HAPPENING IN, YOU KNOW, IN FETAL
16	DEVELOPMENT EARLY ON AND THERE'S STRUCTURAL BRAIN
17	DEFECTS, THERE ARE CHILDREN WITH MICROCEPHALY WHO HAVE
18	AUTISM. THAT MEANS THEY HAVE A VERY SMALL BRAIN.
19	THAT'S A STRUCTURAL DEFECT THAT GOES BACK TO VERY EARLY
20	PREGNANCY.
21	THESE KIND OF THINGS DEVELOP AS I SAID, IN
22	2000 YOU COULD HAVE ASKED ME AND I WOULD HAVE SAID, OH,
23	AUTISM IS ALL GENETIC. BECAUSE THE ONLY STUDIES WE HAD
24	WERE GENETIC STUDIES. AND THAT'S WHAT GENETIC STUDIES
25	TOLD US.
26	IN THE MEANTIME, WE HAVE LEARNED MORE. WE HAVE
27	MOVED ON. WE HAVE DONE EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDIES AND WE
28	HAVE LEARNED THAT THERE ARE MANY DIFFERENT SENSITIVE

1	PERIODS,	AND DEPENDING ON WHAT AGENT WE ARE TALKING
2	ABOUT, TE	HESE SENSITIVE PERIODS ARE DIFFERENT ONES. AND
3	FOR AIR I	POLLUTION I NOW STRONGLY BELIEVE IT'S LATE
4	PREGNANCY	Y AND EARLY CHILDHOOD.
5		FOR OTHER AGENTS WE HAVE TO DISCUSS. FOR LEAD,
6	IT PROBA	BLY DEPENDS ON WHEN THE LEAD EXPOSURE IS THE
7	HIGHEST.	AS I TOLD YOU EARLIER, IF WE HAVE REALLY HIGH
8	LEAD EXPO	OSURE IN A MOTHER VERY EARLY IN PREGNANCY, SHE
9	PROBABLY	LOSES THE BABY. SHE PROBABLY HAS A MISCARRIAGE
10	OR A STII	LLBIRTH, SO WE WON'T EVEN SEE THE AUTISM.
11	Q	LET'S LOOK AT ONE OF YOUR LATER PUBLICATIONS.
12	IT'S A PU	UBLICATION WITH THE FIRST AUTHOR IS NAMED VIRK,
13	V-I-R-K.	
14		DO YOU RECALL THAT PUBLICATION?
15	А	YES, I
16	Q	ALL RIGHT.
17	A	THAT'S HERE, IF THAT'S WHAT YOU'RE ASKING.
18	Q	OKAY. THIS IS EXHIBIT 684.
19		IT'S CALLED "PRECONCEPTIONAL AND PRENATAL
20	SUPPLEMEN	NTARY FOLIC ACID AND MULTI VITAMIN INTAKE AND
21	AUTISM SI	PECTRUM DISORDERS."
22		AND AGAIN, YOU'RE THE SENIOR AUTHOR ON THE
23	ARTICLE;	CORRECT?
24	А	YES, SHE WAS MY POST DOC.
25	Q	ALL RIGHT. AND LET'S LOOK AT THE VERY FIRST
26	SENTENCE	OF THE ARTICLE UNDER "INTRODUCTION."
27		"THE ETIOLOGY OF AUTISM SPECTRUM DISORDERS
28		LIKELY ORIGINATES EARLY IN PREGNANCY, A TIME
		93

1 WHEN FOLATE, THYROID HORMONES SUCH AS IODINE 2 AND OTHER VITAMINS, HORMONES AND/OR OTHER TRACE ELEMENTS ARE CRITICAL FOR NEURODEVELOPMENT." 3 DO YOU SEE THAT? 4 AND THIS IS ONE OF THOSE EXAMPLES WHERE 5 YES. I'M TELLING YOU, YES, ASD IS CAUSED BY MANY, MANY 6 7 DIFFERENT THINGS. ONE OF THEM IS PROBABLY FOLATE 8 DEFICIENCY. AND LIKE WITH GENETIC CAUSES, THESE CAUSES, THESE OTHER CAUSES HAVE THEIR TIMING. 9 AND THE TIMING 10 FOR FOLATE IS EARLY IN PREGNANCY. THE TIMING FOR THYROID HORMONES CAN BE EITHER EARLY, AND IF THEY ARE 11 12 VERY EARLY, THEY MIGHT CONTRIBUTE TO STRUCTURAL DEFECTS 13 JUST LIKE FOLATE IN THE BRAIN. IF THEY ARE LATE, THEN IT'S THE ASD SPECTRUM ON 14 15 THE OTHER SIDE WHERE IT'S REALLY JUST SYNAPSE FORMATION -- NOT JUST -- IT'S SYNAPSE FORMATION, IT'S PRUNING 16 17 AFTER BIRTH, ET CETERA. SO THE TIMING IS SEVERE WHEN IT'S EARLY AND 18 19 MAYBE LESS SEVERE WHEN IT'S LATE OR IT IS OTHER TYPES OF 20 STRUCK -- OF EFFECTS IT HAS ON THE BRAIN. SO, IN ESSENCE, THE BRAIN IS AN ORGAN THAT 21 22 DEVELOPS OVER MANY, MANY, MANY YEARS, AND DEPENDING ON 23 WHEN YOU HIT IT WITH WHAT, YOU GET DIFFERENT TYPES OF AUTISM. 2.4 25 AND HERE WE WERE INTERESTED IN FOLATE, AND WE 26 KNOW THAT ONE PLACE WHERE FOLATE IS REALLY IMPORTANT IS 27 EARLY IN PREGNANCY AND THAT'S WHY THIS FIRST SENTENCE POINTS TO EARLY IN PREGNANCY BECAUSE THAT IS THE TIME WE 28

1	ARE INTERESTED IN NOW BECAUSE FOLATE IS RESPONSIBLE FOR
2	METHYLATION AND THE METHYLATION IN EARLY PREGNANCY, THE
3	METHYLATION OF THESE OF THE BRAIN IS REALLY IMPORTANT
4	EARLY IN PREGNANCY AND THAT'S WHAT THIS POINTS OUT.
5	Q OKAY.
6	A BUT THAT DOESN'T MEAN THERE ARE NO REASONS TO
7	THINK THAT, YOU KNOW, OTHER AGENTS MAY AFFECT THE BRAIN
8	LATER IN TIME.
9	THERE'S NOT ONLY ONE TIME.
10	Q OKAY. DOCTOR, BUT THANK YOU FOR THAT ANSWER.
11	LET'S I WANT TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE ARORA
12	STUDY WHICH YOU'VE REFERRED TO SEVERAL TIMES IN THE TWIN
13	TEETH STUDY THAT YOU REFERRED TO SEVERAL TIMES IN YOUR
14	TESTIMONY YESTERDAY AND A COUPLE OF TIMES TODAY.
15	AND YOU THIS STUDY YOU SAID GREATLY
16	INFLUENCED YOUR CONCLUSIONS ABOUT METALS AND AUTISM
17	DEVELOPMENT; ISN'T THAT TRUE?
18	A YES.
19	Q AND AS YOU DESCRIBED YESTERDAY, THIS STUDY THAT
20	GREATLY INFLUENCED YOUR CONCLUSIONS MEASURED LEVELS OF
21	METALS IN SHED TEETH OF WHAT ARE CALLED DISCORDANT TWIN
22	PAIRS IN SWEDEN; CORRECT?
23	A YES, THEY WERE BOTH. THEY WERE CONCORDANT AND
24	DISCORDANT.
25	Q RIGHT.
26	AND I WANT TO ASK YOU ABOUT SOME OF THE
27	STATEMENTS THAT THE AUTHORS MADE IN THIS STUDY.
28	LET'S GO TO THE SECOND PAGE.

1	THE PARAGRAPH THAT BEGINS WITH "STUDIES OF
2	TOXIC METALS."
3	SO WE TALKED ABOUT THE FIRST COUPLE OF
4	SENTENCES OF THIS PARAGRAPH. I WANTED TO ASK YOU ABOUT
5	A COUPLE OF THE OTHER SENTENCES.
6	THE THIRD SENTENCE SAYS, "PREVIOUS RESEARCH
7	SHOWS METHODOLOGICAL SHORTCOMINGS THAT LIMIT
8	INTERPRETATION AND GENERALIZABILITY OF THE
9	FINDINGS; FIRST, ELEMENTAL EXPOSURE HAS
10	FREQUENTLY BEEN ESTIMATED USING CONCENTRATIONS
11	IN BLOOD OR OTHER BIOMARKERS POST DIAGNOSIS."
12	DO YOU SEE THAT?
13	A YES. HE'S CITING 11. WHO IS THAT?
14	Q WELL, LET ME BEFORE I SHOW YOU THAT, LET ME
15	ASK YOU A QUESTION.
16	THAT WHAT THAT SENTENCE IS REFERRING TO IS
17	THE TEMPORALITY PROBLEM, THAT ELEMENTS HAVE BEEN
18	MEASURED USING CONCENTRATIONS IN BLOOD OR OTHER
19	BIOMARKERS POST DIAGNOSIS OF THE DISEASE; CORRECT?
20	A I DON'T KNOW WHETHER I WOULD INTERPRET IT IN
21	THIS WAY. I SAW IT MORE AS HIM WORRIED ABOUT THE TOOTH
22	BEING A LONGER TERM, MORE TIME-DEFINED MEASURE THAN
23	BLOOD.
24	Q OKAY.
25	THEY SAY DOWN LATER, "ASSESSING" IN THE
26	THIRD "ASSESSING THE CONTRIBUTION OF ENVIRONMENTAL
27	FACTORS IN THE ETIOLOGY OF ASD NEEDS CONTROL
28	FOR GENETIC FACTORS."

1	DO YOU SEE THAT?
2	A WHERE IS THAT?
3	Q I'M SORRY, IT SAYS THAT RIGHT THERE.
4	A OH, YEAH. UM-HMM, YES.
5	Q AND DO YOU AGREE WITH THAT?
6	A WELL, THAT'S HIS OPINION. AND YES, GENERALLY,
7	IT IS A GOOD IDEA TO CONTROL FOR GENETIC FACTORS BECAUSE
8	WE KNOW THAT THERE'S DIFFERENCE SUSCEPTIBILITIES.
9	WHETHER YOU CAN DO THAT IN EVERY STUDY IS
10	ANOTHER QUESTION.
11	SO GENERALLY WHAT THAT MEANS IS IF YOU CANNOT
12	CONTROL AND THEY COULD CONTROL. THAT'S WHY HE SAYS
13	OUR STUDY IS SO MUCH BETTER THAN ALL THE OTHERS, AND I
14	WOULD AGREE WITH THAT THE PROBLEM IS WHEN YOU CAN'T
15	CONTROL FOR GENETIC FACTORS, THEN YOU ARE MIXING TYPES,
16	AND WHEN YOU'RE MIXING TYPES, IT'S THAT SIGNAL TO NOISE
17	RATIO.
18	SO IF YOU CANNOT CONTROL FOR GENETIC FACTORS,
19	MOST LIKELY YOU WON'T SEE ANYTHING, AND THAT'S THE
20	PROBLEM WITH MOST ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES. THAT'S
21	ACTUALLY WHY IN THE LAST 20 YEARS I HAVE ALSO PIVOTED
22	TOWARDS WHAT IS CALLED GENE ENVIRONMENT INTERACTION
23	STUDIES SO I CAN CONTROL FOR GENES WHEN I'M MEASURING
24	ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS, BUT THAT'S REALLY EXPENSIVE AND
25	NOT POSSIBLE IN EVERY CASE.
26	Q ALL RIGHT. AND THE WAY THAT THEY TRIED TO
27	CONTROL FOR GENERIC FACTORS HERE, ONE WAY TO DO IT AS IT
28	SAYS IN THE NEXT SENTENCE WOULD BE HAVING MONOZYGOTIC

1	TWINS, IN OTHER WORDS, IDENTICAL TWINS THAT ARE
2	DISCORDANT FOR ASD; MEANING, ONE HAS ASD AND ONE
3	DOESN'T; CORRECT?
4	A YES.
5	Q OKAY.
6	NOW, DOCTOR, ISN'T IT TRUE THAT IN THIS STUDY
7	THEY ONLY HAD THREE DISCORDANT MONOZYGOTIC TWIN PAIRS?
8	A CAN YOU SHOW ME?
9	Q SURE.
10	THE NEXT PAGE, ACTUALLY, THERE'S A CHART WHICH
11	IS A FLOW CHART OF THEIR NUMBERS AND METHODS.
12	AND DO YOU SEE AT THE BOTTOM AND UNDER
13	A UM-HMM.
14	Q WHEN THEY DESCRIBE WHAT NUMBER OF ASD
15	DISCORDANT TWINS THEY HAD, THEY ONLY HAD THREE
16	DISCORDANT MONOZYGOTIC TWINS; CORRECT?
17	A YES, BUT THEY ALSO HAD FIVE CONCORDANT
18	MONOZYGOTIC TWINS AND THEN NINE MONOZYGOTIC TWINS WITH
19	PAIRED WITH SOMEONE ELSE; SO THEY ARE NOT JUST
20	COMPARING MONOZYGOTIC TWINS TO EACH OTHER, THEY ARE
21	ACTUALLY DOING A MUCH BROADER COMPARISON WHICH IS VERY,
22	VERY USEFUL BECAUSE IT TELLS YOU SOMETHING ABOUT
23	GENETICS AS WELL AS THE ENVIRONMENTS AND WHAT IT DOES
24	TOGETHER.
25	Q RIGHT.
26	A AND THAT'S WHY ACTUALLY THIS IS ACTUALLY SUCH A
27	BRILLIANT STUDY AND WAS PUBLISHED IN A GOOD JOURNAL.
28	Q RIGHT.

1	AND IN TERMS OF THE NUMBER OF TWIN PAIRS WHERE
2	THE ONE TWIN HAD ASD THE NUMBER OF IDENTICAL TWIN
3	PAIRS WHERE ONE HAD ASD AND ONE DIDN'T IS A TOTAL OF
4	THREE?
5	A THAT'S WHAT IT LOOKS LIKE, YES.
6	Q ALL RIGHT.
7	AND THEY FOUND BETWEEN THOSE SEVEN DISCORDANT
8	TWIN PAIRS THAT ARE SHOWN THERE, THE THREE MONOZYGOTIC
9	PLUS THE FOUR DIZYGOTIC, THAT MEANS NON IDENTICAL TWINS;
10	CORRECT?
11	A YES, THEY SHARE THE UTERUS, BUT NOT THE GENES
12	THEY ARE LIKE SIBLING.
13	Q JUST LIKE SIB
14	A YEAH, IN THAT SENSE THEY ARE ACTUALLY ARE
15	CONTROLLING FOR GENETICS BECAUSE SIBLINGS ARE SO MUCH
16	CLOSER IN THEIR GENETICS THAN ANYONE ELSE IN THE WORLD
17	EXCEPT FOR THE PARENTS.
18	Q AND THEY FOUND AN ASSOCIATION BETWEEN IN
19	THESE SEVEN TWIN PAIRS, THE THREE MONOZYGOTIC AND THE
20	TWO DIZYGOTIC I MEAN, FOUR DIZYGOTIC TWIN PAIRS
21	THEY FOUND AN ASSOCIATION BETWEEN LEAD LEVELS AND THE
22	AUTISM THE TWIN THAT HAD AUTISM ONLY ONLY AT THE
23	TIME 10 TO 20 WEEKS POST-NATALLY; CORRECT?
24	A NO. THEY LOOKED AT THE WHOLE TIME PERIOD AND
25	IT WASN'T ALWAYS STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT, BUT WHEN YOU
26	LOOK AT THE PATTERNS, THE HIGHER LEAD LEVEL WAS FAIRLY
27	CONSISTENT THROUGHOUT. BUT FOR SOME REASON THERE WAS
28	YOU CAN GO TO THE FIGURES FOR SOME REASON IT WASN'T

1 ALWAYS STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT, SO THEY WERE VERY 2 CAREFUL IN THEIR DESCRIPTIONS. WELL, LET'S SEE HOW THE AUTHORS DESCRIBED THEIR 3 4 OWN RESULTS. 5 LET'S GO TO PAGE 4 OF THE STUDY. THIS IS UNDER THE "RESULTS" SECTION WHERE THE 6 7 AUTHORS SAY WHEN THEY COMPARED DISCORDANT TWINS WITH 8 NON, THEY FOUND LEAD LEVELS WERE CONSISTENTLY HIGHER IN ASD CASES FROM 20 WEEKS BEFORE BIRTH TO 30 WEEKS AFTER 9 10 BIRTH; HOWEVER, AFTER ADJUSTING FOR INTER-TWIN 11 CORRELATIONS, THIS ASSOCIATION WAS ONLY EVIDENT BETWEEN 12 10 TO 20 WEEKS POST-NATALLY; CORRECT? 13 Α YES. NOW, DOCTOR, IF YOU THINK ABOUT THE 30 WEEKS 14 15 POST-BIRTH IN THIRDS, THEY FOUND NO STATISTICALLY 16 SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION BETWEEN BIRTH AND WEEK 10, NO 17 STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION BETWEEN WEEKS 20 AND 30, AND ONLY A STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATION 18 19 BETWEEN WEEKS 10 AND 20; IS THAT CORRECT? 20 WELL, WHEN YOU HAVE THESE KIND OF NUMBERS AND Α YOU ADJUST, LIKE THEY SAY HERE FOR ALL THE THESE 21 CORRELATIONS, THAT IS WHAT I WOULD EXPECT TO HAPPEN 22 23 BECAUSE YOU NEEDED A LARGER SAMPLE SIZE TO MAKE THE 2.4 OTHER DIFFERENCES. IF WE GO TO THE FIGURES, YOU'LL SEE THEY ARE 25 26 ALL ABOVE. THE TWIN WITH ASD ALWAYS HAS HIGHER LEAD 27 LEVELS, BUT THEY DON'T REACH THE LEVEL OF STATISTICAL 28 SIGNIFICANCE WHEN YOU DO ALL THIS CO-ADJUSTMENT.

1	IT DOESN'T MEAN IT'S NOT MEANINGFUL. IT
2	DOESN'T MEAN IT'S NOT CONSISTENT. IT JUST MEANS I WISH
3	WE HAD MORE NUMBERS, MORE NUMBERS OF THESE KIDS TO
4	COMPARE.
5	Q AND BY THE WAY, EVEN THE SIGNIFICANT THING THEY
6	SAW, IF YOU LOOK AT THE NUMBERS THERE, THE 95 PERCENT
7	CONFIDENCE INTERVAL IS .0.9 TO 2.5 SO IT CROSSES ONE.
8	EVEN THAT IS NOT STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT;
9	CORRECT?
10	A I DON'T KNOW WHAT YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT. CAN
11	YOU SHOW ME THAT?
12	Q IT'S RIGHT ON THE SCREEN.
13	IT SAYS WITH THE GREATEST DIFFERENCE WAS
14	OBSERVED AT 15 WEEKS POST-NATALLY WHEN LEAD LEVELS IN
15	ASD CASES WERE 1.5 TIMES HIGHER AND THEN THEY HAD THE
16	95 PERCENT CONFIDENCE INTERVAL .9 0.9 TO 2.5.
17	DO YOU SEE THAT?
18	A YES. BUT AGAIN, YOU KNOW, IT INDICATES THERE
19	IS QUITE A LOT A 1.5 FOLD HIGHER, AND YOU KNOW, WHEN
20	YOU HAVE THESE NUMBERS, I'M REALLY AMAZED THAT THEY CAN
21	SEE ANYTHING.
22	SO THE MOST LIKELY RESULT FROM A STUDY LIKE
23	THIS WOULD BE SEEING ABSOLUTELY NOTHING. AND THAT THEY
24	SEE A 1.5 FOLD HIGHER AND THAT THEY CAN EVEN BON-FERRONI
25	CORRECT AND THE CONFIDENCE INTERVAL IS .9, THAT'S PRETTY
26	CLOSE TO ONE, I FIND QUITE SURPRISING.
27	SO THIS TO ME IS RELATIVELY STRONG DATA GIVEN
28	σταρ πρίπ, μον παμω

1	Q ALL RIGHT.	
2	WELL, LET'S SEE HOW THE AUTHORS CHARACTERIZE	
3	THEIR CONCLUSIONS IN THIS STUDY.	
4	LET ME START ON PAGE 7 OF THE STUDY.	
5	A WELL, THEY SAID UP THERE "CONSISTENTLY HIGHER,	11
6	RIGHT.	
7	Q I WAS LOOKING AT PAGE 7 OF THE STUDY. AT THE	
8	FIRST PARAGRAPH THERE.	
9	A YES.	
10	Q LET ME ASK YOU SOMETHING.	
11	THE AUTHORS SAY, "EARLY SIGNS OF ASD FIRST	
12	MANIFEST 6 TO 12 MONTHS AFTER BIRTH SUGGESTING	
13	A NARROW WINDOW FOR ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS TO	
14	CONTRIBUTE TO ASD RISK."	
15	DO YOU SEE THAT?	
16	A YES. AND THEY ARE CITING A REFERENCE .9 FOR	
17	THAT. WHAT'S THAT?	
18	Q I WELL, LET ME BEFORE I SHOW YOU THE	
19	REFERENCE, DO YOU AGREE WITH THE AUTHORS THAT EARLY	
20	SIGNS OF ASD FIRST MANIFEST 6 TO 12 MONTHS AND THAT	
21	SUGGEST A NARROW WINDOW FOR ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS TO	
22	CONTRIBUTE TO ASD RISK?	
23	A WELL, WE PROBABLY AGREE THAT ASD IS A SPECTRUM	
24	DISEASE AND THAT THERE ARE VERY DIFFERENT AGES AT FIRST	
25	MANIFESTATION; AND YES, THERE ARE CHILDREN WHO FIRST	
26	MANIFEST EARLY, VERY EARLY IN LIFE.	
27	THERE ARE CERTAINLY CHILDREN WHO ALSO MANIFEST	
28	MUCH LATER IN LIFE. AND YOU KNOW, THAT NARROW WINDOW	

1	BECOMES QUITE WIDE IF WE'RE LOOKING AT KIDS WHO HAVE ASD
2	FIRST DIAGNOSED LATER, THEN, YOU KNOW, THE WINDOW ISN'T
3	AS NARROW. BUT FOR THE KIDS WHO MANIFEST THIS EARLY
4	YES, IT'S NARROW. I AGREE.
5	Q OKAY.
6	AND THEN LET'S LOOK AT THE CONCLUSION SECTION
7	OR THE CONCLUSION PARAGRAPH.
8	THIS IS ON PAGE 8 OF THE STUDY RIGHT AT THE TOP
9	PARAGRAPH WHERE THEY TALK ABOUT STRENGTHS AND
10	WEAKNESSES.
11	SO ONE LIMITATION OF THIS STUDY WAS A RELATIVE
12	IT WAS A RELATIVELY SMALL NON RANDOM SAMPLE; CORRECT?
13	A YES. WHY THEY SAY NON RANDOM, I HAVE NO IDEA
14	WHAT THEY MEAN BY THAT.
15	Q OKAY.
16	A IT'S SMALL. IT'S RELATIVELY SMALL. I AGREE
17	WITH THAT.
18	Q AND THEN IF YOU GO DOWN IN THAT PARAGRAPH WITH
19	STARTING WITH THE WORDS "NEVERTHELESS," THIS IS WHAT
20	AT AUTHORS SAY ABOUT THEIR FINDINGS.
21	"NEVERTHELESS, CAUTION SHOULD BE EXERCISED WHEN
22	GENERALIZING OUR FINDINGS AND ADDITIONAL
23	STUDIES ARE NEEDED IN DIFFERENT POPULATIONS,
24	PARTICULARLY LARGER NON TWIN ASD SAMPLES TO
25	CORROBORATE OUR FINDINGS AND DIFFERENTIATE
26	GENETIC AND NON GENETIC CONTRIBUTIONS IN
27	UNDERSTANDING THE RELATION BETWEEN METALS AND
28	ASD."

1	DO YOU SEE THAT?
2	A YES, I SEE THAT.
3	Q AND DO YOU AGREE WITH THE AUTHORS'
4	INTERPRETATION OF THEIR HOW THEIR FINDINGS SHOULD BE
5	USED?
6	A YES, AND I REALLY APPLAUD THEM FOR THIS VERY,
7	VERY CAUTIOUS STATEMENT BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT WE WOULD
8	LIKE TO SEE AUTHORS DO, THAT THEY ARE, YOU KNOW,
9	ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT THEIR RESULTS, BUT SAY, WELL, WE'D
10	BETTER BE CAUTIOUS. THAT'S GREAT. AND OF COURSE IF WE
11	WANT TO DIFFERENTIATE GENETICS FROM NON GENETICS, WE
12	NEED MUCH LARGER STUDIES BECAUSE IT IS REALLY HARD.
13	AS SOON AS YOU GO INTO DIFFERENTIATING BETWEEN
14	DIFFERENT CAUSES AND YOU ARE TARGETING MORE THAN ONE
15	CAUSE IN ONE STUDY, YOU NEED AT LEAST FOUR TIMES THE
16	SAMPLE SIZE, AND THAT'S BASICALLY WHAT THEY ARE
17	ACKNOWLEDGING HERE.
18	SO FOR THESE
19	Q AND
20	A DIFFERENTIATIONS, WE NEED LARGER SAMPLE
21	SIZE, BUT THAT
22	Q AND WHEN I
23	A BUT THAT DOESN'T MEAN THEY DIDN'T SHOW THAT
24	ENVIRONMENT CONTRIBUTED.
25	Q AND WHEN I ASKED YOU ABOUT THIS VERY STATEMENT
26	IN YOUR DEPOSITION, DIDN'T YOU TELL ME THAT MANISH ARORA
27	PUT THE STATEMENT IN THERE BECAUSE HE WANTED MORE MONEY
28	FOR MORE STUDIES? ISN'T THAT WHAT YOU TOLD ME?

1	A I DON'T RECALL THIS. MAYBE I DID. BUT THAT'S
2	USUALLY WHAT WE ARE SAYING WHEN WE ARE PROMOTING OUR
3	SCIENCE, WE WANT MORE BECAUSE WE'RE NEVER, YOU KNOW,
4	WE'RE NEVER HAPPY JUST WITH ONE STUDY. AND THIS IS A
5	NEW METHOD THAT HE'S USED ON THESE TEETH. IT'S AN
6	EXCITING METHOD.
7	AND YES, I WISH HAD HE GOTTEN MORE MONEY SO HE
8	COULD DO THIS AGAIN AND DO IT IN MORE CHILDREN AND, YOU
9	KNOW, FIND OUT MORE AND TELL US MORE.
10	Q ALL RIGHT. WELL, LET'S WE HAVE ONLY A FEW
11	MINUTES REMAINING. LET'S SEE EXACTLY WHAT YOU SAID AND
12	THEN I WANT TO ASK YOU ONE MORE QUESTION ABOUT THE
13	STUDY.
14	LET'S GO TO YOUR DEPOSITION, EXHIBIT 7 ON
15	PAGE 222.
16	MR. WISNER: YOUR HONOR, I'M JUST GOING TO
17	OBJECT TO THE RELEVANCE OF ANY OF THIS.
18	THE COURT: OVERRULED.
19	MR. WISNER: OKAY.
20	MR. PETROSINELLI:
21	Q AND SO WHEN I READ YOU THIS STATEMENT, WHICH IS
22	AT THE TOP, AND THE QUESTION, AND I ASKED YOU IF YOU
23	AGREED WITH IT, RIGHT AT THE BOTTOM STARTING AT LINE 13,
24	YOU SAID, "THAT'S WHAT WE ALWAYS TEACH OUR STUDENTS TO
25	SAY, RIGHT. YOU NEVER CONCLUDE ANYTHING FROM
26	JUST ONE STUDY. YOU ALWAYS ASK FOR MORE
27	RESEARCH AND YOU ASK FOR MORE STUDIES AND NON
28	TWINS. AND GUESS WHAT, MANISH" THAT'S

1	MANISH ARORA "WANTED MORE MONEY FOR MORE
2	STUDIES AND THIS IS ONE THE ARGUMENTS YOU
3	MAKE."
4	YOU TESTIFIED THAT'S WHAT YOU SAY?
5	A YEAH, THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT I JUST SAID.
6	Q OKAY.
7	A AND I WISH HE HAD GOTTEN MORE MONEY BECAUSE I
8	WISH HE WOULD DO MORE OF THOSE.
9	Q LAST QUESTION I WANT YOU TO ASK YOU ABOUT THE
10	ARORA STUDY ON THAT SAME WE WERE AT; AGAIN, THIS IS
11	PAGE 8 IN THE CONCLUSIONS OF THE STUDY,
12	"FURTHERMORE," THIS IS WHAT THE AUTHORS SAID
13	"WHILE THE DIFFERENCES WE OBSERVE BETWEEN CASES
14	AND CONTROLS PRECEDE THE ONSET OF ASD SYMPTOMS"
15	IN OTHER WORDS, THEY HAVE ESTABLISHED
16	TEMPORALITY "THESE DATA DO NOT ESTABLISH
17	CAUSALITY."
18	DO YOU SEE THAT?
19	A YES.
20	Q AND YOU CERTAINLY AGREE WITH THAT?
21	A NO ONE STUDY ESTABLISHES CAUSALITY, NO.
22	Q OKAY.
23	A AND THAT'S WHY I'M SAYING THESE AUTHORS ARE
24	VERY CAREFUL IN HOW THEY INTERPRET THEIR RESULTS AND I
25	REALLY APPLAUD THEM FOR IT. AND I WISH WE HAD MORE
26	CAREFUL CAREFULLY DONE STUDIES BY PEOPLE WHO ARE SO
27	HUMBLE AND STATE WHAT THEY SAID.
28	Q OKAY.

1	THERE WAS ONE MORE STUDY YOU MENTIONED
2	YESTERDAY THAT I THINK I'LL CONCLUDE WITH FOR TODAY, AND
3	THAT IS A STUDY CALLED FILON, F-I-L-O-N, WHICH IS
4	EXHIBIT 57.
5	DO YOU RECALL TALKING ABOUT THAT STUDY
6	YESTERDAY?
7	A I THINK WE DID, YES.
8	Q ALL RIGHT. AND I WANT TO THIS IS A CASE
9	CONTROL STUDY FROM ONE REGION IN POLAND; TRUE?
10	A LET ME SEE. YELINSTOCK, YES.
11	Q OKAY.
12	AND I WANT TO ASK YOU ABOUT SOME OF THE
13	STATEMENTS THAT THE AUTHORS MAKE IN THIS STUDY STARTING
14	ON PAGE 2.
15	IN THE BOTTOM PARAGRAPH, THIS IS IN THE
16	BACKGROUND SECTION.
17	IT SAYS, "ASD IS A NEURODEVELOPMENTAL DISORDER
18	THIS SUGGESTS A POSSIBLE ROLE OF HEAVY METALS
19	IN ITS UNDERLYING CAUSE CONDUCTION; HOWEVER,
20	INVESTIGATIONS ON ASSOCIATIONS BETWEEN ASD AND
21	NEUROTOXIC HEAVY METALS ARE INCONCLUSIVE. OVER
22	THE LAST DECADES, NUMEROUS STUDIES HAVE
23	REPORTED A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ASD AND LEAD
24	AND ARSENIC EXPOSURE, HOWEVER, THERE ARE ALSO
25	SOME REPORTS THAT CONCLUDE THAT HEAVY METAL
26	EXPOSURE IS NOT A RISK FACTOR FROM ASD,
27	THEREFORE, AN ACCURATE EVALUATION OF THE
28	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ASD AND HEAVY METALS NEEDS

1 MORE SPECIFIC RESEARCH." 2 DO YOU SEE THAT? YES. 3 Α AND THIS STUDY THAT WE'RE LOOKING AT WAS 4 0 5 PUBLISHED IN THE YEAR 2020; TRUE? CAN WE LOOK AT THAT? 6 WHERE IS THIS --7 Q SURE. 8 Α -- PARAGRAPH FROM? THE INTRO, RIGHT? 9 0 YEAH. YOU CAN LOOK AT, I GUESS, RIGHT AT THE TOP AND THE TOP LEFT. 10 11 Α YES. 12 0 DO YOU SEE THE CITATION? "2020"? YEAH, ACTUALLY THEY ARE DOING EXACTLY WHAT I 13 TOLD YOU EVERY AUTHOR DOES WHO WANTS HIS ARTICLE IN A 14 15 GOOD JOURNAL, AND BMC IS A GOOD JOURNAL. THEY SAY, WELL, THERE'S STILL SOMETHING WE NEED TO ADDRESS. 16 TAHW 17 IS IT? WELL, THERE ARE LOTS AND LOTS STUDIES SHOWING 18 THESE EFFECTS, BUT GUESS WHAT, THERE ARE ALSO SOME WHO 19 DON'T. SURPRISE. SURPRISE. NOBODY WOULD BE SURPRISED 20 ABOUT THAT. 21 BUT THEN THE NEXT SENTENCE THEY SAID THAT IF 22 YOU DIDN'T READ WAS THAT THERE IS NO STUDY IN POLAND, 23 AND THAT IS ACTUALLY AN ARGUMENT THAT IS MADE AGAIN AND AGAIN, WHERE, YOU KNOW, PEOPLE SAY, OKAY, THIS HAS BEEN 2.4 SHOWN IN THIS PART OF THE WORLD, BUT THAT DOESN'T APPLY 25 26 TO US, SO THEIR NEXT ARGUMENT THERE WAS WE REALLY NEED A 27 POLISH STUDY BECAUSE IN ORDER TO SET STANDARDS IN POLAND 28 WE NEED TO POLISH DATA AND THAT'S WHAT THEY WERE TRYING

1 TO SAY HERE. 2 WELL, LET'S SEE -- AFTER THEY DID THE 0 OKAY. 3 STUDY, LET'S SEE WHAT THEY SAID ABOUT THE RESULTS. LET'S GO TO PAGE 6 OF THE STUDY. 4 IN THE LEFT COLUMN, IT'S RIGHT AT END OF THE 5 DISCUSSION SECTION UNDER THE WORD -- THE PARAGRAPH 6 7 "DESPITE." 8 Α YEAH. WE'LL HIGHLIGHT THAT FOR YOU FOR A SECOND. 9 0 10 "DESPITE A NUMBER OF STUDIES AND ANALYSES, AUTISM IS STILL NOT UNDERSTOOD BY SCIENTISTS 11 BECAUSE NO SPECIFIC FACTOR CAUSING THIS 12 CONDITION HAS BEEN FOUND. EACH EXPERIMENT 13 PROVIDES NEW VALUABLE DATA BUT FAILS TO 14 15 DELIVER AN EXPLANATION FOR SYMPTOM OCCURRENCE." DO YOU SEE THAT? 16 17 Α YEAH. THAT IS SO NON SPECIFIC AND SO WRONG THAT I DON'T EVEN KNOW WHAT TO SAY ABOUT THIS BECAUSE WE 18 19 HAVE SPECIFIC CAUSES, THEY ARE CALLED GENES, MONOGENETIC 20 GENETIC DISORDERS CAUSE AUTISM AND NOT ONLY DO THEY --21 DO WE KNOW THIS, WE ALSO KNOW THAT THOSE GENES HAVE 22 CERTAIN EFFECTS ON THE BRAIN, AND YOU KNOW, STRUCTURAL 23 EFFECTS ON THE BRAIN. AND THAT IS ONE TYPE OF AUTISM. HOWEVER, AS WE ALSO AGREED, AUTISM IS A 2.4 SPECTRUM DISORDER, AUTISM SPECTRUM DISEASE; MEANING, 25 26 THERE ARE VERY SEVERE FORMS, STRUCTURAL DEFECTS, AND 27 THERE ARE VERY MINOR FORMS WITH AUTISM-LIKE SPECTRUM 28 BEHAVIOR. AND THEY HAVE DIFFERENT CAUSES. AND YES, WE

1	DON'T KNOW ALL THE CAUSES.
2	BUT SPECIFICITY, I THINK I ARGUED AGAINST THAT
3	BEFORE.
4	Q SO YOU SAY YOU DON'T KNOW WHERE TO BEGIN
5	BECAUSE IT'S SO WRONG. BUT THIS IS A STUDY THAT YOU
6	DISCUSSED YESTERDAY IN YOUR DIRECT TESTIMONY.
7	DO YOU REMEMBER THAT?
8	A YES, BUT I CAN, NEVERTHELESS, DISAGREE WITH A
9	SENTENCE IN THE DISCUSSION, RIGHT. I CAN EVEN STRONGLY
10	DISAGREE
11	Q OKAY.
12	A WITH A SENTENCE IN THE DISCUSSION, BUT THE
13	DATA IS ALWAYS VALUABLE. I'M NOT I WOULD NEVER THROW
14	OUT ANY DATA. THE DATA THEY ARE GIVING ME IS VALUABLE
15	EVEN IF I DISAGREE WITH THE SENTENCE IN THE DISCUSSION.
16	Q OKAY. WE CAN TAKE THAT DOWN.
17	YOUR HONOR, I'M ABOUT TO MOVE TO A DIFFERENT
18	TOPIC. I SEE IT'S 4:25. SHALL WE BREAK FOR THE DAY AND
19	THEN MR. WISNER AND I CAN TALK ABOUT SCHEDULING WITH DR.
20	RITZ?
21	THE COURT: OKAY. LET'S EXCUSE THE WITNESS FOR
22	NOW.
23	THANK YOU VERY MUCH, DOCTOR. I APPRECIATE YOUR
24	PATIENCE.
25	AND LET'S JUST TALK AMONG THE THREE OF US FOR A
26	MINUTE ABOUT SCHEDULING.
27	HOW MUCH MORE DO YOU THINK YOU HAVE?
28	MR. PETROSINELLI: I WOULD SAY, I MEAN, THE

1	ANSWERS HAVE BEEN QUITE LONG, BUT I WOULD SAY, AS I
2	THINK YOUR HONOR HAS SEEN, I WOULD SAY WITH REASONABLY
3	RESPONSIVE ANSWERS, 30 MINUTES AT THE PROBABLY 30
4	MINUTES OR SO.
5	THE COURT: OKAY. GOOD. SO THAT SOUNDS
6	MANAGEABLE. IT'S SORT OF LIKE WHAT FELL OVER/LEFT OVER
7	WAS LEFT OVER FROM MR. WISNER.
8	SO THE NEXT TIME THAT I HAVE SET ASIDE IS WHEN?
9	TODAY IS TUESDAY. DO I HAVE TOMORROW AFTERNOON WITH YOU
10	AS WELL?
11	MR. PETROSINELLI: YES.
12	THE COURT: OKAY. SO IF WE START WITH BUT
13	DR. RITZ CANNOT DO TOMORROW, THAT'S THE ISSUE.
14	MR. WISNER: THAT'S CORRECT.
15	MR. PETROSINELLI: WE HAVE ANOTHER WITNESS I
16	THINK MR. WISNER HAS HIS OTHER EPIDEMIOLOGIST TOMORROW.
17	THE COURT: RIGHT.
18	MR. PETROSINELLI: AND I THINK WE COULD GO
19	FORWARD WITH HER. AND THEN THE QUESTION WOULD BE IS DR.
20	RITZ AVAILABLE ON FRIDAY MORNING OR SOMETIME FRIDAY TO
21	FINISH UP HER TESTIMONY.
22	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU. THE OTHER
23	POSSIBILITY BECAUSE I HAVE NOTHING AT ALL NEXT WEEK AND
24	THEN I'M
25	MR. WISNER: THE TRIAL WENT OFF.
26	THE COURT: WE THINK.
27	MR. WISNER: OH, OKAY.
28	THE COURT: I'D BETTER CHECK. WAIT. I'D
	111

1	BETTER CHECK. I AM JUST BARELY ABOVE WATER FROM
2	DAY-TO-DAY HERE LET ME TELL YOU.
3	MR. WISNER: I CAN IMAGINE, YOUR HONOR.
4	THE COURT: THE NEXT WEEK, YEAH, THAT TRIAL IS
5	GOING OFF, YES, BUT ANYWAY, THEN I'M THE COURTROOM IS
6	DARK AND I'M GONE UNTIL THE DAY AFTER PRESIDENTS' DAY
7	WHICH IS THE 22ND AND ON THAT DAY I HAVE A JURY TRIAL
8	RIGHT NOW. IT'S SET TO GO.
9	ANYWAY, SO I SUPPOSE AS A DEFAULT WHAT THE
10	PARTIES COULD DO IS RECORD THE LAST HOUR HALF-HOUR OF
11	HER TESTIMONY WHEN IT'S CONVENIENT TO YOU AND THEN PLAY
12	IT TO THE COURT OR GIVE IT TO THE COURT TO PLAY SOMETIME
13	CONVENIENT TO ME SINCE WE HAVE SO LITTLE LEFT. THAT
14	SEEMS LIKE IT WOULD BE GOOD ENOUGH. WHAT DO YOU THINK?
15	MR. WISNER: THAT'S FINE WITH ME, YOUR HONOR.
16	I'M SURE WE CAN WORK SOMETHING OUT. IF YOU ARE
17	AVAILABLE NEXT WEEK
18	THE COURT: OKAY.
19	MR. WISNER: I HAVE TO CHECK WITH DR. RITZ,
20	BUT MAYBE WE CAN YOU OH, YOU'RE NOT AVAILABLE.
21	THE COURT: NO, NEXT WEEK IS CRAZY.
22	MR. WISNER: OH, I'M SORRY. I MISHEARD YOU.
23	I'M SORRY, YOUR HONOR.
24	THE COURT: OKAY. THE TRIAL WENT AWAY. WELL,
25	NO, ACTUALLY, I MAY BE SPEAKING TOO STRONGLY HERE. LET
26	ME JUST LOOK FOR A MINUTE. OKAY. LET'S SEE. YEAH, I'M
27	YEAH, I IT'S NOT AS BAD AS I THOUGHT BECAUSE,
28	YOU'RE RIGHT, A LOT OF THE MARKS ARE FOR THE TRIAL THAT

I THINK IS GOING AWAY.
OKAY. SO IT WOULD BE AGAIN AFTERNOONS. OR THE
10TH IS A PRETTY GOOD DAY.
MR. WISNER: OKAY. LET ME CHECK WITH DR. RITZ
AND MAKE SURE THE TIME WORKS FOR HER. OBVIOUSLY THE
SOONER THE BETTER BECAUSE IT'S STILL FRESH AND THERE'S
STUFF I WANT TO REDIRECT ON AND EVERYTHING, SO, AND
OBVIOUSLY I DON'T WANT TO BE TALKING WITH HER WHILE
SHE'S STILL UNDER THE RUBRIC OF CROSS, BUT I DO HAVE TO
INTERACT WITH HER QUITE A BIT BECAUSE SHE'S ONE OF OUR
EXPERTS IN OUR CASE AND WE'RE STILL MOVING ALONG. SO
WE'LL NAVIGATE THAT ACCORDINGLY.
SO LET GET BACK TO THE COURT. I'LL MEET AND
CONFER WITH COUNSEL. I'M SURE WE CAN GET YOU A TIME AND
MAKE SURE TO CLEAR IT WITH THE COURT TOMORROW MORNING OR
TOMORROW AFTERNOON WHEN WE MEET.
THE COURT: YEAH. SO I WILL JUST SEE YOU
TOMORROW AFTERNOON AND THE WITNESS IS GOING TO BE DR.
GARDENER.
MR. WISNER: THAT'S CORRECT, YOUR HONOR.
THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. VERY GOOD.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I APPRECIATE THAT YOU'RE ALL
WORKING VERY HARD.
{TIME NOTED: 4:29 P.M.}

1	STENOGRAPHIC REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION
2	
3	I, JEANESE JOHNSON, CERTIFIED SHORTHAND
4	REPORTER, OFFICIAL REPORTER PRO TEMPORE, IN AND FOR THE
5	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY:
6	THAT THE FOREGOING PROCEEDINGS WERE
7	REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME;
8	THAT THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE RECORD OF THE
9	PROCEEDINGS TAKEN AT THAT TIME.
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I AM NOT ATTORNEY
11	OR COUNSEL OF ANY OF THE PARTIES, NOR AM I A RELATIVE OR
12	EMPLOYEE OF ANY ATTORNEY OR COUNSEL OF ANY PARTY
13	CONNECTED WITH THE ACTION, NOR AM I FINANCIALLY
14	INTERESTED IN THE ACTION.
15	
16	
17	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE SUBSCRIBED MY NAME THIS
18	3RD DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2022.
19	() My Sam
20	JEANESE JOHNSON, CSR NO. 11635, CLR
21	CERTIFIED STENOGRAPHIC REALTIME REPORTER OFFICIAL REPORTER PRO TEMPORE
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

ADDITIONAL	AFTERNOONS	ALAMPI 73:23	ANIMALS 38:4	34:1 106:2
49:12 103:22 ADDITIONALLY 84:15 ADDRESS	113:2 AGE 26:25,28 59:4 61:5,7 65:9,10,11,21	74:12 75:23 77:2,7 ALLEGATIONS 27:8	ANIMATION 69:2 ANSWERS 111:1,3	ARORA 19:1 50:3,5,8 67:25 69:2 73:5 74:17 77:18,25,26
108:16	68:1,2 AGENCY 29:15	ALLEVIATE 30:19	ANTICIPATED	85:21,24 95:11 104:26 106:1,10
ADDS 52:22 ADEQUATE	AGENT 36:1	ALTERATIONS	68:19 ANTONIO 66:15	ARRANGED 43:22
85:18,20	66:3 93:1 AGENTS 14:11	26:12,16 AMAZED	ANYMORE 20:6	ARRIVE 33:20
ADHD 15:7 18:7 27:22 28:26	35:13 44:20 93:5 95:7	101:20 AMNIOTIC	49:13,14 APOLOGIZE	ARRIVED 27:25 ARSENIC 18:9
36:7,19 37:23, 28 56:3,21 60:14 67:17 72:21	AGES 102:24 AGREE 29:4 30:15 31:21	74:24 75:5,9 78:23,27 87:14, 27	18:2 APPLAUD 104:6 106:25	19:7 21:1 22:21 28:1 72:15 81:1 84:14,15 107:24
ADJUST 100:21	32:16 38:15,22 40:8,19,21 41:4,	AMOUNT 14:11 21:10	APPLES 20:26	ARTICLE 93:23, 26 108:14
ADJUSTING 100:10	12,13,19 44:13,	AMY 6:3	APPLY 27:26	ASBESTOS
ADJUSTMENT 79:26	14,23,25,26 48:3,14,16 50:18 51:7,19, 23 55:23 63:10	ANALYSES 20:23 38:7 109:10	28:2 29:13,23 31:6,19 33:2,22 37:15 108:25	36:2 ASBESTOSIS 35:28 36:2
ADULTS 83:16 ADVANTAGE 56:28 57:2,7	64:17 65:5,17 66:9 73:7,11,27 74:7 75:15,22	ANALYSIS 8:8, 10 11:26 12:1	APPLYING 29:4 31:27 32:17	ASD 10:12 15:7 16:28 17:13,21
ADVANTAGES 20:8	76:14 77:7 80:8, 9 81:20 84:9 85:23 88:8,12	13:20 19:26,28 20:1 21:6,17 23:9 28:23	20:10 APT 21:17	18:7 19:8 22:21, 23 23:3,28 27:22 28:1,5,26
ADVERSE 14:17 46:26 84:4	97:5,14 102:19, 23 103:4,16 104:3 106:20	31:19,27 33:15 38:16 53:6,7 67:17 86:14	ARBITRARY 27:9,13,14,18	36:7,18 37:23, 28 41:15 42:11, 23 44:3,4,10,16,
AFFECT 95:7	AGREED 16:23 105:23 109:24	87:1 ANALYTIC	AREA 9:28 29:10 52:27	20 49:17 50:11, 13,19 53:6,11, 21 54:6 56:3,14,
14:23	AHEAD 25:7	42:26 AND/OR 94:2	ARGUE 17:24 26:24 27:15	20,22,25 57:10 58:11,13 59:26
AFFECTING 90:17	32:14 61:26 AIDE 68:24	ANGELES 6:1	ARGUED 110:2	68:12,28 69:14, 19 71:24 72:13,
AFFECTS 36:22	AIR 90:18 93:3	ANIMAL 10:27 29:18 37:17,19	ARGUING 24:2	16,20 73:8,9,22 74:14 75:21,25
AFTERNOON 28:19 111:9 113:16,18	AL-AYADHI 23:21 25:8,10	38:2 ANIMAL'S 37:8	108:23,26	76:16 77:9 79:8, 22 80:18 82:21,
			ARGUMENTS	23,25 83:9 85:4,

5 87:1,9,13,19 84:2,4 107:20 23 93:10,21,27 **BASIC** 31:1 19,27 76:2 88:5,27 89:1,23 94:24 95:16 **ASSUME** 85:19 **BASICALLY BIG** 21:10 32:22 90:5, 17, 23 99:22 109:11, 21:12 22:5 49:21 ASSUMPTION 91:15 92:7 94:6. 20,23,24,25 26:26 81:26 58:14 **BIGGER** 52:22 14 96:27 98:2, **AUTISM-LIKE** 83:12 84:19 14 99:2,3 100:9, ATTENTION **BIO** 57:28 58:1 109:27 104:16 26 101:15 17:25 64:14 **BIOCHEMICAL AUTISTIC** 24:24 BECERRA 89:7 102:11,14,20, **ATTORNEY** 26:12,17 25:18 26:8,19 22,23 103:1,24, **BEGIN** 57:9 114:10,12 60:14 68:2 74:9 28 106:14 **BIOLOGIC** 110:4 83:9 107:17,20,23, **ATTRIBUTABLE** 53:15.25 54:9. **BEGINNING** 26.28 46:23 **AVERAGE** 16 25:23 46:4 **ASD'S** 46:8,17 11:28 23:27 **AUDIO** 18:1 BIOLOGY 64:9 **BEGINS** 96:1 30:25 87:15 22:10 38:28 **ASD-LIKE** 83:3. **BIOMARKER BEHAVES AWARE** 84:27 **AUTHOR** 15:17 75:25 60:22,25 85:2 18:22 42:25 **ASPECT** 30:10 **BIOMARKERS** 43:5 68:5 89:6, **BEHAVING** 21:2 46:28 **ASSESS** 29:5 16 93:12,22 В 20:17 61:11 62:16,17, 65:15 108:14 **BEHAVIOR** 68:2 18 74:23,26 ASSESSING **BABY** 43:28 **AUTHORS** 109:28 86:1 96:11,19 44:1.4 50:9 30:18 96:25,26 15:20 16:1,7 **BEHAVIORAL BIRTH** 14:17,18, 67:24 74:24 19:24 22:27 ASSOCIATION 36:24 22 27:1 58:4 75:5,10 93:9 42:22 44:1.26 10:21 11:4 72:9 81:28 82:1 **BEHAVIORS** 45:8 47:5.21 **BACK** 22:27 16:27 21:11 87:4 89:2.3 74:10.15 75:21 48:10 50:10 47:13 51:27 22:20 29:6.25 94:17 100:9,10, 82:23,25 83:3,4, 51:20.21 52:11 58:1 64:3 72:1, 30:9 31:7,20,22, 16 102:12 61:9,10 62:5,9 28 32:5.18 25 76:25 81:24 **BIRTHS** 14:14 89:15 95:27 84:26 87:21,23 38:17 41:16,17, **BELIEF** 8:13,19 100:3,7 102:2, 92:13,19 113:13 18 42:12.14 **BIT** 8:26 15:19 **BELIEFS** 8:11, 11,19 103:20 46:13 47:22.24 17:20 22:28 **BACKGROUND** 12 104:8 106:12,23 50:15 54:22,25 31:17 35:11 107:16 107:13 71:22 72:28 **BELIEVES** 8:4 113:10 BAD 22:10 55:7 75:19,20,24 **AUTHORS' BELONG** 77:8 **BLADDER** 112:27 76:15 84:21 104:3 35:19 99:18,21 **BELONGS** BALANCE 61:3. **AUTHORSHIP** 42:28 100:11,16,17,18 **BLOOD** 18:10 86:10 20:14 57:28 **BIAS** 14:18 **ASSOCIATIONS BANK** 57:28 58:1,2,3,17,23 **AUTISM** 14:25 11:6 18:6 21:1 21:28 29:7,9,11, 58:1 59:3,7,12 60:18 26:4 47:23,25 31:24 42:16 20,25 30:2,5,6, 61:4,8,12 62:4, 55:24 74:8 75:7 **BARELY** 112:1 47:28 49:20 7,12,25 31:8,28 15,22,23 63:23, 87:3 88:14.16 53:12,21,23 32:6,21,24 **BASED** 29:17 27 70:10,12 89:1,6,11 91:22, 54:1.6.11.12 89:12 92:14 **BIASES** 30:18. 71:3,8,12,24 23 92:9.12.18. 69:28 72:13

74:25 75:4,10, 88:23 89:3 **CALLED** 12:15 79:24 87:3 **CERTIFY** 114:5, 12 96:11,18,23 92:16,18 94:13, 36:1 43:25 97:25 107:8 10 55:12 66:13 113:11 20,21 95:3,7 BLOODSTREAM **CERVICAL** 109:22,23 71:17 80:16 **CASES** 12:21 35:19 61:2 89:10 93:19 **BREAK** 8:26 20:4,5,12,19,23 **CETERA** 35:20, **BLOW** 9:24 95:21 97:22 16:16 65:26 21:13 57:13,17 45:24 53:9 23 55:5 94:17 107:3 109:19 66:28 67:4 79:8,15,21,24 59:20 82:7 **CHANCE** 32:20. 110:18 CALLING 6:9 80:10 100:9 BLUEPRINT 21,22,23,24,27 101:15 106:13 51:24 **BRIEFING** 15:18 92:15 84:16,21 **CANCER** 29:15 CAUSAL 33:20. **BRIEFLY** 15:27 BLURRY 25:1 **CHARACTERIS** 35:15,16,18,19, 23,28 34:1 35:8 24:10 **TICS** 54:2 74:5 20 65:10,16 39:27 40:14 **BMC** 108:15 **BRILLIANT** 87:25 44:19 63:13 **CANCERS BODY** 22:18 98:27 65:2 **CHARACTERIZ** 12:17 23:2 24:26 **BRINGS** 29:16 E 81:3,8,15 CAUSALITY 25:20 26:10,13, CAPABLE 84:23 102:2 27:16 29:17 **BROAD** 65:6 17,23 27:5 65:13 30:10 34:23 36:26 58:26 **CHART** 68:11, **BROADER CAPTURING** 106:17,21 13,16,20 69:1,7, **BON-FERRONI** 10:16 98:21 13:23 12,13,17 70:24 CAUSATION 101:24 **BRUSHING** 22:6 **CAR** 26:2 71:1 72:25 23:18 24:14 **BONE** 58:26 74:22 77:8 78:8 25:25 26:20,21 **BUNCH** 10:13 CARCINOGENIC 59:1,12 60:7,9, 98:10.11 29:5 34:9.20 86:16 **ITY** 29:17 18.26.28 61:4.8 40:26 **CHECK** 76:24 BURDEN 24:2 **CARE** 21:17 62:21,22 111:28 112:1,19 **CAUSED** 92:12 **BONES** 61:13 CAREFUL 13:26 113:4 94:6 C 62:7 30:18 42:26 **CHECKLIST CAUSING** 53:2 100:2 **BOTTOM** 7:24 33:19 109:12 **CADMIUM** 18:9 106:24,26 17:8 45:24 46:1 72:15,17 **CHECKMARK** CAUTION 53:8 82:6 98:12 **CAREFULLY** 11:15 103:21 **CAGE** 37:6 105:23 107:15 52:15,17 106:26 **CHEMICALS CAUTIOUS CALCIUM** 60:25 **CASE** 7:23 8:10 **BRADFORD** 8:8 35:13 78:23 104:7,10 20:4 21:24 10:12,16 11:20 CALCULATE 27:8 28:22 29:1, 26:19,20 36:18 **CHILD** 14:9 CDC 66:16.20 12:14 37:23 38:7 39:7 5,13,24 31:6,19, 58:2,18,19,27 **CELL** 36:21,22 **CALCULATED** 41:13 49:22 27 32:17 33:2,4, 59:12 60:12,14, 69:19 13,15,18,24 55:18,24 56:4,7, **CERTAINTY** 27 61:5 63:20 34:6 36:27 37:1, 8, 15, 17, 22 57:8, 27:20 67:27 75:12 **CALIFORNIA** 15,16,24 38:7, 19,22,27 58:5,9, 6:1.4 57:28 **CERTIFICATION** CHILDHOOD 16,23 43:14 10,15 59:10,23 114:5 15:8 89:4 90:20 114:1 53:5,10 55:10 61:11 62:3 92:1 93:4 **CALL** 40:6 **CERTIFIED** 63:15 74:17 **BRAIN** 14:9,21, 64:16 114:3,21 **CHILDREN** 77:26 78:4.5 22 36:15 38:1

14:10,17 18:8 23:28 24:24 25:18 26:4,5,6, 8,19 46:8 49:24 58:13 60:9 63:27 72:14 80:4 81:23,28 82:20,21,27 83:1,2,4,18 90:23 92:17 102:25,27 105:8 CHIPS 26:2 CHRONOLOGIC ALLY 43:23 CIRCLES 32:8 CIRCUMSTANC ES 38:19 CITATION 9:19 108:12 CITATIONS 89:24 CITE 24:22 46:18 67:22 CITED 68:28 69:27 73:4 91:1, 13,26 CITING 91:27 96:13 102:16 CLAIM 19:25	CLEARED 7:20 CLERK 6:22,25 CLINICAL 37:2, 11 CLINICIAN- BASED 15:7 CLOSE 101:26 CLOSELY 28:7 29:11 CLOSER 99:16 CLR 114:20 CO- ADJUSTMENT 100:28 CO-AUTHORS 89:21 CO-EXPOSURES 9:14 COGNITIVE 36:24 COHORT 49:23 55:18 56:18,21 57:1,3 67:27 68:5 72:10 77:20,25 78:9, 10 80:18 81:5, 14 87:4	20:3 COMBUSTION 26:1 COMMENTS 6:26 22:13 COMMUNICATI ON 62:21 COMPARE 8:17 12:22 57:11,20 81:22 101:4 COMPARED 82:27 83:2,3 100:7 COMPARING 20:5,25 98:20 COMPARISON 98:21 COMPARISON 98:21 COMPARISON 86:8 COMPLETELY 30:5 32:25 38:2 80:7,11 85:11 COMPOUNDS 18:18 COMPUTER 11:26,27 CON 17:28 29:3	33:25 34:18,20 105:25 107:2,25 CONCLUDED 22:19 CONCLUDES 34:7 CONCLUSION 18:4 22:27 73:15 103:6,7 CONCLUSIONS 46:23 49:3 95:16,20 102:3 106:11 CONCORDANT 95:23 98:17 CONDITION 109:13 CONDITION 26:6 CONDUCT 16:8 19:27,28 66:12, 21 CONDUCTING 33:15 CONDUCTION 107:19 CONFIDENCE	84:13 CONFUSING 32:10 CONNECTED 114:13 CONNECTION 58:11 CONSEQUENCE S 46:26 CONSIDERS 29:10 CONSISTENCY 8:2,3,10,15,20, 23,24 10:11,15 11:14,15,20 12:10 13:9 19:6 38:13,15,23 39:3,6,17,21,28 40:25 53:8,11 CONSISTENT 9:7 10:18,22 11:8,21 18:24, 26 21:1 22:19 23:3 99:27 101:2 CONSISTENTLY 100:8 102:5 CONSTANT 61:3
96:13 102:16 CLAIM 19:25 35:18 CLARIFICATION 82:26 CLASS 30:28 CLEAN 8:27 CLEAR 12:7 64:11 113:15 CLEAR-CUT 32:19	' '	CON 17:28 29:3 CONCENTRATI ONS 46:7 50:13 82:9 96:10,18 CONCEPT 30:22 32:21,22 CONCEPTION 92:10,12,13 CONCEPTS 32:25 CONCLUDE	CONFER 113:14 CONFIDENCE 71:16 76:2 79:28 101:7,16, 25 CONFOUNDED 84:15 CONFOUNDERS 30:22,24 CONFOUNDING 29:7,9,12,26 30:21 31:8 32:1	

44:19 **COPPER** 18:9 **CORROBORAT CRIME** 38:12 23:9 76:1 90:10, E 103:25 11,22 92:1,3,4 CONTRADICTO **COPY** 13:12 CRITERIA 29:13 101:27 106:16 **RY** 44:8,15 COUNSEL 7:13 31:7 33:13 CORRECT 108:28 109:14 19:3 63:1 35:10,11,25 46:16 13:18 19:20 110:13,14 113:14 114:11, 36:12 75:28 21:4 28:27 CONTRIBUTE **DATE** 55:24 12 76:4 49:9 94:12 29:26,28 33:13, 56:3,14 102:14,22 16,26 34:2,9,20 **COUNT** 11:27 CRITERION 12:21 41:24 10:11 11:20 **DAY** 110:18 35:5,9,12 36:7 CONTRIBUTED 37:2 38:19,20 27:9 53:11 112:6,7 113:3 104:24 COUNTED 41:21 42:3,16, 76:19 114:18 73:21 CONTRIBUTION 24 44:3 45:3,9 CRITICAL **DAY-TO-DAY** 52:26 96:26 COUNTING 46:13,14 48:27, 30:16,17 94:3 112:2 41:25 28 49:5 54:12, CONTRIBUTION **CRITICISMS DAYLIGHT** 37:8 24 56:6,15 57:6, **S** 103:26 **COUNTRIES** 23:8 13.20 58:13 18:13 **DAYS** 63:22 CONTROL 20:4 59:26 60:10.20 CROSS 28:12, **COUNTRY** 30:4 37:8 39:11 **DEAL** 24:16,18 62:7 63:8 65:7 17 71:18 113:9 49:22 55:18,25 86:11 67:25,28 68:6,7 **DECADES** CROSS-56:4,7,8,15,18, 69:16,21 70:12, **COUPLE** 34:25 27:27 107:22 22 57:8,22,27 **SECTIONAL** 20,23,26 71:4,8, 76:23,27 95:14 **DECIDES** 57:24 58:6,10,20 55:19,25 56:5,7, 9,14,15,19,20, 96:3,5 59:23 61:11 15 62:3 63:7,10, 25 72:8,18 **DECREASED COURT** 6:4,8, 62:3 63:15 17 64:5,11,18, 74:11,26 75:7 24:4,10,13 13.14.21.24 7:2 22 65:7,13 66:1, 74:18 77:26 77:3,10 78:9,24, **DEEPLY** 21:25 8:28 9:4 12:8 78:4,5 85:17,20, 12,18 28 79:16,19 13:2 22:12 21 87:3 96:27 80:28 82:1,22, **DEFAULT** 112:9 **CROSSES** 28:11.15 31:15 97:7,12,15,18, 27 84:17 87:11. 101:7 **DEFECT** 92:19 32:7,14 38:28 23,27 107:9 15,19 88:5,14 61:16,19,22,23 CSR 114:20 **DEFECTS** 14:22 89:16.23.27 CONTROLLING 63:1 67:3,6,10 24:5 88:21.26 91:15 93:23 **CUMULATIVE** 37:5 39:5 99:15 73:2 105:18 92:17 94:12 95:22 96:19 26:21 64:1 CONTROLS 110:21 111:5, 109:26 98:3,16 99:10, **CURRENT** 59:9 20:6,12,20 12,17,22,26,28 23 100:12,19 **DEFEND** 12:27 62:23 21:13 57:13,18 112:4,12,18,21, 101:9,25 103:12 58:10 79:8.16. 24 113:13,15, **DEFENDANTS** 111:14 113:20 22,25 80:10 17,21 7:24 9:5 D CORRECTED 85:16 106:14 COURTROOM **DEFENSE** 23:19 90:26 92:3 **DAMAGE** 36:10. CONVENIENT 112:5 **DEFICIENCY** CORRECTLY 25 112:11,13 **COVER** 7:1,12, 94:8 9:10 25:11 **DANISH** 90:21 CONVINCED 14 37:18 75:1 **DEFINITION** 34:13 **DARK** 112:6 COVERED 7:14 38:15 63:19 **CORRELATION** COOL 35:27 **S** 100:11,22 **DATA** 11:23 **CRAZY** 112:21 **DEGREE** 27:20 17:17 20:3,4 30:6

DELIVER 109:15	55:14,25 86:1	59:26 64:5,12 74:16 75:10,21	DISCUSS 72:2 93:5	23:17,24 24:14 26:20 27:7,10,
DEMONSTRATI VE 33:6 40:5	DETAIL 34:27 37:9 52:23	96:11,19 DIAGRAM 23:20	DISCUSSED 19:18 73:4 76:8	19 29:21 31:2 33:12 36:5,16
43:19 47:13 51:27 72:25 73:28 76:25	DETAILS 69:24 DETECTED 17:9 78:27	DIET 37:7 DIFFERENCE 20:18 79:21	87:1 110:6 DISCUSSING 23:20	38:6 40:2 41:12 42:21 43:18,26 45:26 48:21 51:7 52:10 53:3
77:1 84:26 DENMARK 87:5	DETECTION 20:16 55:4	80:10 79:21 80:10 97:8 101:13	DISCUSSION 16:14 44:21	55:9 56:1,27 58:9 59:21 61:9,
DEPARTMENT 6:3	DETERMINED 64:25	DIFFERENCES 20:21 21:10,13	45:14,25,26 72:5 109:6	26 63:6 64:19, 23 66:25 67:7
DEPENDENCE 84:17 DEPENDENT	DETOXIFY 24:25 25:19 26:9,28 27:2,4	20:21 21:10,13 22:6 46:7,24 85:10 100:24 106:13	110:9,12,15 DISEASE 33:26 35:21 57:10,12	70:18 73:7 78:15 79:5 81:18 84:27 91:9 92:6 95:10
34:3 DEPENDING	DEVELOP 14:17 82:21 92:21	DIFFERENTIAT E 103:25 104:11	63:12 64:8,25, 28 65:1,22 96:19 102:24	98:6 100:14 110:23
59:8 93:1 94:22 DEPENDS 33:27 58:21	58:13 65:10 73:9 82:21 91:23	DIFFERENTIATI NG 104:13 DIFFERENTIATI	109:25 DISEASES 35:22 38:1	73:23 75:23 77:2,7,15 80:16 81:13 85:12
75:8,11,12 88:25 93:6 DEPOSITION	DEVELOPING 14:9	ONS 104:20 DIRECT 7:9 68:11 79:5	DISORDER 26:4 47:23,26 55:24 56:24 63:21	DOLLARS 66:11
9:6,20,23 12:12 59:16 61:22	DEVELOPMENT 14:8 15:1 22:2	110:6	107:17 109:25	DOSE 14:3 DRAWING
75:26 78:20 81:9,11 104:26	46:9 75:6 85:5 89:4 92:16	DIRECTION 30:23,25 80:1	DISORDERS 56:20 89:11 93:21,27 109:20	63:13 65:2
105:14 DESCRIBE	95:17 DEVELOPMENT	DIRECTIONS 66:5	DISPARATE	DRAWN 49:3 DREW 85:16
42:23 57:14 72:23 98:14	AL 14:21 16:20 46:26 90:6	DIRTY 35:13 DISAGREE	47:2 DISPLAYING	DRINKING 26:1
DESCRIPTIONS 100:2	DEVELOPMENT S 47:3	110:8,10,15	15:18 DIVIDED 70:19	DROP 14:16 DUE 19:5 25:28
DESERVING 30:13	DEVELOPS 90:7 94:22	BISCORDANT	DIZYGOTIC 99:9,20	E
DESIGN 56:5,	DIAGNOSED	DISCORDANT 95:21,24 98:2,7, 15 16 99:7	DOC 93:24	E70 91:6
15,17,23 78:2,4, 5 DESIGNS 15:9	58:16,19 63:21, 27 103:2 DIAGNOSIS	15,16 99:7 100:7 DISCOUNT	DOCTOR 7:11 8:7,25 9:3,17,28 13:13 16:23	EARLIER 10:6 25:27 45:5 62:6 93:7
49:22 52:5	15:7 22:21 44:3	14:27	19:22 20:27	

EARLY 22:20 **ENSURE** 49:3 **ESSENTIAL EVALUATED** 87:23 89:6 27:21 62:12 15:6 36:6,18 93:18 105:14 **ENTHUSIASTIC** 67:23 89:4 107:4 104:9 **ESSENTIALLY EVALUATING** 90:20,24,25 18:23 8:19 31:23 **EXHIBITS** 43:20 **ENTIRE** 49:4 92:1,7,16,19 38:17 47:24 **ESTABLISH EXIST** 12:18,19 93:4,8,28 94:10, **ENTRE** 52:28 76:4 34:4,12 57:3 30:14 33:25 11,12,18,27,28 **ENVIRONMENT** 58:5 63:11 **EVALUATION** 34:5 38:10 95:2,4 102:11, 37:5 39:20 64:27 65:8,16 48:18 107:27 19,26 103:3 **EXPECT** 9:14 85:24 90:5 66:14 74:18 **EVIDENCE** 8:19 11:2 12:10,17 **EASILY** 64:13 97:22 104:24 75:15 106:16 22:19.22 23:1 14:20 18:26 EFFECT 30:8 **ENVIRONMENT ESTABLISHED** 40:7 44:9,15 36:8,9,16 54:23 33:1 34:2,14,22 AL 66:3.14 19:8 65:22 46:16 47:27 100:22 53:17 55:2 76:1 96:26 97:20,24 73:10,14,16,23 64:17,21 **EXPECTATION** 80:2 86:6 102:13,21 106:15 **EVIDENT** 9:8 10:17.18 EFFECTS 14:17 **ENVIRONMENT ESTABLISHES** 100:11 11:22 12:13,23 19:7 36:13 **S** 98:23 106:21 **EXACT** 53:20 **EXPECTED** 37:14 94:20 **EPA** 80:28 **ESTABLISHING** 12:15,16,20,23, 108:18 109:22, **EXAMINATION** 63:18 65:14 27 23 **EPI** 55:12 7:9,13 28:12,17 ESTIMATE 20:7 66:13 **EXPECTING EFFICIENT EPIDEMIOLOGI** 22:5 30:8,23,24 39:6,28 56:4,17,23 **C** 29:14,19 **EXAMINE** 38:24 80:1 85:9 92:27 40:27 **EXPENSIVE ELEMENTAL ESTIMATED** 97:24 96:9 **EPIDEMIOLOGI EXAMPLES** 96:10 CAL 29:23 92:1 **EXPERIMENT** 73:12,13 94:5 **ELEMENTS ESTIMATES** 36:28 37:3.4.6. 15:6 18:7 50:11 **EPIDEMIOLOGI EXCERPT** 64:15 71:18 76:2 9.11.16.23 38:8 79:6.7 94:3 ST 17:19 27:27 **EXCITING** 105:6 39:19 41:9 96:17 75:27 86:26 **ESTIMATING** 43:11 109:13 **EXCRETED** 111:16 87:7 **EMISSIONS** 60:23 **EXPERIMENTS** 26:1 **EPIDEMIOLOGI ETHNICITY** 38:4,10 39:4 **STS** 30:1 40:15 **EXCUSE** 110:21 89:11 **EMPHASIZING** 86:11 90:4 **EXPERT** 43:15 17:27 **EXERCISED** ETIOLOGY 47:2 53:3 **EPIDEMIOLOGY** 88:14 89:23 103:21 **EMPLOY** 49:22 39:8 86:17 91:15 92:7 **EXPERTS** 49:1 EXHAUST 26:2 **EMPLOYEE** 91:23 93:27 96:27 113:11 114:12 **EXHIBIT** 13:11 **EQUILIBRIUM EUROPEAN EXPLAIN** 12:11 33:5 44:6 45:19 END 6:18 25:24 59:2 13:25 22:28 18:13 48:5 50:25 53:4 41:28 74:9 23:26 31:12 **ERROR** 32:24, 55:28 59:17 **EVALUATE** 109:5 32:4,23 48:10 30:2,10,26 67:15 70:5 74:2 25 **END-ALL** 16:9 75:26 78:14 80:16 90:22 **ESSENCE** 94:21 47:6 81:10 86:21 **EXPLAINED**

11:19 14:18 29:7,25 31:8,28 32:20 37:26 41:7 48:24 57:9 60:6 64:2 EXPLANATION 24:23 25:17,27 26:7 109:15 EXPOSE 27:3 37:13 EXPOSED 26:5, 7 58:27,28 59:6 61:5 EXPOSURE 9:13 12:18,19, 22 13:26 14:16, 19 15:5 16:21, 28 17:12,18 22:21,22 23:3 25:28 27:21 28:25,26 29:6 31:20 32:18 33:25 35:4 37:5, 9 39:5,11,12,14, 24,26 41:8 44:9, 16 46:17,24,25, 27 47:1,22,25 52:16 57:5 58:2, 3,7,8,12,24,25 59:4,9,10,11,25 61:11,13 62:6, 14,23 63:12,18 64:7,24,28 65:1, 8 66:2 68:9 70:19 75:6,20, 24 76:16 80:22 82:6 87:6,7 93:6,8 96:9 107:24,26 EXPOSURE-	EXPOSURES 13:17,23,28 24:17 39:16 44:2 52:26 61:6 62:24 72:23 83:3,7 90:16 EYE 30:16,17 F F-I-L-O-N 107:3 FACT 13:12 26:18 42:21 62:28 69:7 88:12 FACTOR 8:10 33:24 35:3 36:27 37:16,24 38:8,23 40:26 55:10 107:26 109:12 FACTORS 10:12 29:2,5 32:17 33:4,6 34:7,19,25,28 37:16 96:27,28 97:7,15,18,24, 27 102:13,21 FACTS 8:16 27:17 FAILS 109:14 FAIRLY 99:26 FEBRUARY 6:2 114:18 FEDERAL 66:10,21 FEED 37:7	26:2 FETAL 14:14,28 92:15 FETUS 14:7 FIELD 49:2 FIGURE 70:16 FIGURED 85:15 FIGURES 99:28 100:25 FILED 7:22 FILLING 16:6 17:27 FINAL 18:4 75:17 FINALLY 10:15 FINANCIALLY 114:13 FIND 8:16 30:11 38:6,8 43:6 58:1 72:20 75:23 76:15 101:26 105:9 FINDING 31:7 34:8 54:6 FINDINGS 15:10 19:6 40:25 44:8 46:3,15 51:4 52:6 70:25 83:20,23 84:2 96:9 103:20,22, 25 104:4 FINE 6:17 8:28 31:4 49:15 112:15	FINISH 23:17 111:21 FIX 6:19 22:11 FLOW 98:11 FLUID 74:24 75:5,9 78:23,28 87:14,27 FLUSH 15:19 FOCUS 73:28 FOCUSED 41:14 FOLATE 94:1,7, 10,13,25,26 95:1 FOLD 101:19,24 FOLIC 93:20 FOOD 26:2 FOOTNOTE 91:1,7,12 FORTHOTES 91:5 FOREGOING 114:6,8 FORMATION 88:24 94:15,16 FORMS 92:11 109:26,27 FORMULATE 12:26 FORMULATED 44:27 52:13,17 FORMULATING 63:8 FORWARD	46:6,13 50:14 53:21,22 54:1 72:12 79:3,7,20 83:7 99:7,18,21 100:8,15 109:13 FRAGILE 92:11 FRAMEWORK 28:24 29:1,24 FRANKLY 31:10 FREE 30:5,12 FREQUENTLY 96:10 FRESH 113:6 FRIDAY 111:20 FRONT 79:12 FRYE 73:23 74:17 75:22 77:3,7 FULL 48:8 FUNCTION 24:3 FUNCTIONS 14:23,25 FUNDED 80:27 FUZZY 7:26 G GAP 16:6 17:27 43:9 51:16,20 GAPS 15:28 GARDENER 91:12 113:19 GAVE 60:16 GENE 97:22
93:6,8 96:9 107:24,26	66:10,21	31:4 49:15	63:8	GAVE 60:16

41:20 52:19,20 **GIVE** 6:18 16:9 HEARING 6:11, **HISTORICALLY** Н 62:9 21:17,20 22:10 13 8:27 62:18 33:7 37:7 49:12 **GENERALIZABI HEART** 35:21 HIT 24:19 94:23 **HAIR** 54:19 112:12 **LITY 96:8 HEAVY** 28:25 **HITTING** 14:7. 58:17 60:24 **GIVING** 27:15 **GENERALIZE** 10 24:21 39:13 62:5,13,14 36:6,18 37:22 110:14 46:28 57:19 51:4 63:23 64:3,6,7 **HOGUE** 6:3,8 **GOOD** 19:25 60:13 79:6.7 **GENERALIZING HALF** 60:13 **HOLD** 39:6 28:19 42:14 107:18,21,25,28 103:22 HALF-HOUR 43:21 47:9 56:22 67:1 **HETEROGENEI GENERALLY** 97:7 98:27 112:10 **HON** 6:3 **TY** 21:7,9,16 8:15 16:3 19:24 108:15 111:5 **HAMPSHIRE** 22:3 **HONESTLY** 33:28 35:6 112:14 113:3.21 80:24 52:11 81:21 HIGH 14:16 17:5 38:25 40:28 **GOVERNMENT HAND** 7:12 19:3 41:5 43:5 51:22 21:16 39:22 **HONOR** 6:10. 66:11 52:13 97:6.11 69:28 93:7 **HANNA** 91:12 19.22.28 22:8 **GRAPH** 71:26, 28:9,13 32:13 **GENERATE HIGHER** 17:9 **HAPPEN** 100:22 27 63:5 66:27 12:16,26 20:6 50:12 79:27 **HAPPENED** 67:13 72:26 21:21 22:5 **GRAPHS** 83:23 99:26 100:8,26 58:4 61:7 62:18 105:16 110:17 54:28 55:7 101:15,19,24 **GREAT** 6:25 7:4 111:2 112:3,15, 102:5 **HAPPENING** 9:2 48:16 **GENERATES** 23 113:20 62:17 88:22 104:10 HIGHEST 93:7 22:3 92:15 **HORMONES GENERIC** 97:27 **GREATEST HIGHLIGHT** 94:1,2,11 **HAPPY** 35:27 101:13 109:9 **GENES** 97:23 76:5,6 105:4 **HOUR** 60:13 99:11 109:19,21 **GREATLY HIGHLIGHTED** 112:10 **HARD** 6:10,12 24:4 25:15 95:15,20 GENETIC 24:17 16:16 60:13 **HOURS** 37:8 40:11 64:24 92:12,14,23,24 **GROUP** 12:17 85:16 104:12 70:25 84:28 **HUMAN** 37:26. 94:8 96:28 97:7, 57:9 78:16 86:9, 113:23 28 38:2 39:6,8 15,18 103:26 13 HILL 8:8 10:12, **HAZARDOUS** 41:7 109:20 16 11:20 27:9 **GROUPS** 57:20 26:6 28:22 29:1,5,13, **HUMANS** 37:2, **GENETICS GROWING** 24 31:7.19.27 **HEAD** 54:17 3,10 38:3,9,11 85:22.23 98:23 60:27 32:17 33:2,4,13, 99:15,16 104:11 **HEADER** 23:23 HUMBLE 15.24 34:7 **GUESS** 23:8 106:27 **GEOGRAPHIC** 36:27 37:1,15, **HEADING** 79:5, 28:5 83:26 53:14,24 54:7 16,24 38:7,16, 6 HUNDRED 84:15 105:28 23 43:14 53:5, 81:23 **GEOGRAPHIES** 108:9,18 **HEALTH** 35:5 10 55:10 85:28 66:13 80:28 **HYPOTHESIS GUIDE** 27:15 HILL'S 33:18 10:19 **GESTATION HEAR** 6:15,16, **GUIDELINE** 18:7 87:15 HISTORIC 87:4 17,23 8:28 22:9 **HYPOTHETICAL** 33:19 29:22 37:17 31:10 **GESTATIONAL HISTORICAL GUYS** 8:27 82:11 87:28 59:11

	INCLUDING 21:15 50:14	32:6 95:16,20 INFORMATION	INTERVAL 79:28 101:7,16,	JOB 19:25 JOHNSON
IARH 29:15	82:10 84:4 INCONCLUSIVE	47:1 49:9,13 54:27	25 INTERVALS	114:3,20
IDEA 21:20 85:17 97:7	47:23,26 107:21	INFORMATIVE	71:16 76:2	JOURNAL 89:27 98:27
103:13 IDENTICAL 98:1	INCONSISTENCI ES 15:9 43:10 52:5	66:18,23 INFREQUENTLY	INTRO 108:8 INTRODUCTION	108:15 JUDGE 6:8,17
99:2,9	INCONSISTENC	66:1	15:2,14 19:13, 17 45:7,14 48:9	JUDGING 38:22
16:26 43:9	Y 16:8,10 85:7 INCONSISTENT	19:7	51:10 93:26 INTRODUCTION	JUDGMENT 40:26
IGNORE 20:20 ILLNESS 36:1	13:8 21:1 22:22 42:18,24 85:5	INSIGHT 27:17 INSTITUTE 87:5	S 43:8 INVERSE 69:26	JUMP 28:22 JURY 112:7
IMAGINE 54:18	INCREASE 79:27 80:6	INTAKE 93:20	INVESTIGATING	JUSTIFYING
60:2 74:28 112:3	INCREASED 17:9 72:13,14,	100:10	63:25 INVESTIGATION	43:11
IMPACT 18:19 IMPACTS 36:21	15,16,20	85:23 113:10	46:27 INVESTIGATION	KALIFAT 66:15
IMPLICATED 88:14 89:23	INCREASING 71:7,11	INTERACTION 97:22	S 107:20 INVESTIGATOR	KALIFA 1 66.15
90:2 91:15	INDEPENDENT 49:1	INTEREST 66:2	S 40:14	KIDNEY 36:25
IMPORTANCE 48:24 IMPORTANT	INDICATING 18:17 72:13 80:5	1NTERESTED 43:16 81:1 94:25 95:1	INVOLVE 18:8 INVOLVING 37:2	KIDS 26:27 79:21,22 80:2 101:3 103:1,3
13:21 20:11 40:12,25 87:8,	INDIVIDUAL	114:14 INTERESTING	IODINE 94:1	KILLS 36:21 KIM 47:15,16,
12,18 88:4,19 90:9 94:26 95:3	64:25 INDIVIDUALS	22:26 39:2 86:24	IRRELEVANT 24:18 80:11	17,21 67:28 69:2 73:5
IMPROPER 31:10	57:10 66:17 INEFFICIENT 56:19	INTERPRET 85:25 96:20 106:24	ISSUE 23:18 37:23 64:13 72:27 111:13	KIND 8:16,23 13:24 15:19
INAPPROPRIAT E 55:3	INFANCY 67:23	INTERPRETATI	ISSUES 20:25	19:16 27:6 32:6 66:18 68:24
INCIDENCE 90:17	INFANT 74:25 82:12 83:13	ON 51:3 96:8 104:4	36:24	78:5 92:21 100:20
INCLUDE 21:12 37:17,19,20	INFERENCE 33:23 63:13	INTERPRETED 39:19	J	KNOWLEDGE 15:4 16:9 52:16
INCLUDES 29:1 79:28	65:2 INFLUENCED	INTERRUPT 18:1 32:7	JEANESE 114:3,20	54:28 KOREAN 47:17 67:27

L LAB 20:15,16 66:15 LABELED 78:9 91:6 LACK 13:9 17:17 19:5 24:24 25:18 26:8 84:4 LACKING 17:12 LARGE 72:6,8, 12 81:16 LARGER 100:23 103:24 104:12, 20 LARGEST 66:12 LATE 90:20,23 91:28 93:3 94:14,19 LAY 79:14 LEAD 14:13 16:15,19,27 17:10,12,18,21 18:10 19:7 20:14 21:2,6 22:22 23:3,9 24:2 27:21 28:26 36:23 39:22,23,24,25 41:14,15 42:11, 14,23 44:2,9,15 46:7,16,27 47:8, 18,22,25 50:14 51:24 53:6,11 54:6 58:11,12, 23,25,26 59:1,2, 11 60:9,17,21, 23,61:1 8:12	63:27 67:17 68:1,12,28 69:14,19 70:25, 26 71:8,10,11, 22,23 72:21,23, 28 73:6,8,9,22 75:24 76:16 77:8,9 78:28 79:18,23,27,28 80:18 81:27 83:6 84:5 85:1,4 87:1 89:6 93:5, 6,8 99:21,26 100:8,26 101:14 107:23 LEADING 26:12, 16 LEADS 66:4 LEAPS 91:22 LEARNED 92:26,28 LEARNING 30:1 LEAVE 70:4 LED 53:21 LEECHES 59:11 LEFT 48:8 79:15 82:6 83:25 89:19 108:10 109:5 111:7 112:13 LEGEND 77:20 LENGTH 50:4 62:14 LENGTHS 62:11 LEVEL 9:13 39:22 61:12 63:18 66:21 71:2 99:26	LEVELS 14:16 15:6 16:21 17:4, 5,6,10 18:6,11, 18 39:12,14,23 57:19 60:9,17 69:28 70:12,19 71:8,11,23 72:14,16 79:6, 15 80:3 87:7 95:20 99:21 100:8,27 101:14 LIFE 22:21 27:21 28:3 58:28 62:13 82:13 83:14,17 90:24 102:26,28 LIKELIHOOD 53:16 LIMIT 96:7 LIMITATION 103:11 LIMITATIONS 22:18 LIMITED 15:4 51:3 52:16 LIMITS 20:16 55:4 64:5 LINEAR 14:4 16:27 LINES 81:12 LIST 86:10 LITERATURE 8:16 10:27 17:11,17,20 18:27 33:22 43:3,4,6,10 44:15 48:19 49:8 51:14 52:24 27 69:14	90:1 LIVE 14:18 80:3 LIVES 39:16 LONG 31:2 73:23 74:17 75:22 77:3,7 78:13 85:9 86:5, 20 111:1 LONG-TERM 61:13 LONGER 96:22 LOOKED 25:7 28:7 44:1,4 48:25 54:18 74:19 77:23 83:6 90:16 99:24 LOS 6:1 LOSES 93:9 LOSS 14:14 LOT 13:28 14:12 16:4,7 20:9 36:10,25 52:21 56:21 84:20 90:11,15,22 91:26 101:19 112:28 LOTS 13:26 108:17 LOUD 6:14 LOW 39:21 80:3 LOWER 17:4 55:3 69:27 LUNG 35:15,16, 18	MADE 49:4 64:12 95:27 108:23 MAGNESIUM 18:10 72:17 MAJOR 14:23 88:24 MAJORITY 87:27 MAKE 8:25 12:9,24 20:18 34:1 43:6 48:16 52:27 60:12 80:4 83:22 100:23 106:3 107:13 113:5,15 MAKES 65:22 MAKING 8:20 40:26 58:14 MANAGEABLE 111:6 MANGANESE 18:9 72:15 MANIFEST 102:12,20,26,27 103:3 MANIFESTATIO N 102:25 MANISH 104:26 105:28 106:1 MANUAL 40:6, 10 64:16,20 65:27 MANUSCRIPT 49:2 4
51:24 53:6,11 54:6 58:11,12, 23,25,26 59:1,2,	LEVEL 9:13 39:22 61:12	18:27 33:22 43:3,4,6,10 44:15 48:19	LUNG 35:15,16,	10 64:16,20 65:27

MARK 74:3 101:2 MENTIONED **METHODOLOG MOMENT** 31:15 **Y** 7:17 25:27 60:7 76:11 **MARKED** 43:20 **MEANT** 60:6 90:28 107:1 77:24 **METHODS MONEY** 45:2 MARKERS MERCURY 18:9 12:25,26 28:2 66:20 104:27 86:24 **MEANTIME** 31:1 55:3 70:13 28:5,7 44:2,9,16 105:7 106:1,7 90:15 92:26 **MARKS** 112:28 46:7,17 82:5 98:11 MONOGENETIC **MEASURE MATCH** 12:10 MET 10:12 34:8. **METHYLATION** 109:19 18:10 21:16,20, 18 36:6,17 95:2,3 **MATERIAL** 22 57:19,24,25 **MONOGENIC** 37:24 38:8,9 43:17 **MICROCEPHAL** 58:2,8 59:3 64:1 92:11 53:12 75:4 78:22 **Y** 92:17 MATERNAL **MONOGRAPHS** 96:22 **META** 19:25,27 15:6 70:10 **MIDDLE** 17:6 29:16 20:23 21:16 72:14.16 74:25 **MEASURED MILLIONS** 66:11 MONOZYGOTIC 23:9 42:26 75:4,10,11 20:15 58:12 97:28 98:7,16, 82:11 **MINIMUM** 20:15 60:9 62:4 68:1 **METABOLIZE** 18,20 99:8,19 70:10,11 74:27 24:5,11,13 MATRICES MINOR 109:27 **MONTH** 83:17 75:25 82:9,17 53:15 54:9,17 **METAL** 24:5,13 **MINUTE** 110:26 85:4 95:20 **MONTHS** 62:14 62:10 66:17 70:11 112:26 96:18 63:28 64:6 71:2 107:25 **MATRICIS MINUTES 22:11 MEASUREMENT** 83:16 102:12,20 53:26 **METALS** 10:26 105:11 111:3,4 59:25 62:5 MORNING 12:9 11:1 15:5 18:6 MATTER 6:9 MISCARRIAGE 19:2 111:20 **MEASUREMENT** 24:11 25:28 15:27 24:19 93:9 113:15 **S** 23:27 73:9 26:18 28:25 34:6.19 51:23 85:1 87:14 36:6,9,13,18 **MISCARRIAGES** 57:23 58:6 **MOTHER** 93:8 37:22 46:28 35:23 **MEASURES** MATTERS 30:7 **MOTHER'S** 50:10,13,19 11:23 12:14 **MISHEARD** 57:24 58:7 71:3,8,12,24 52:16 57:19 57:25 66:16 112:22 70:20 78:22,27 **MATURE** 89:2.3 **MOTHERS** 75:9 81:27 79:6.7.8.14 **MISLEADING** 78:24 81:28 MEANING 30:7 **MEASURING** 81:27 82:7,9,17 73:1 42:14 63:20 **MOTION** 7:22. 59:7,13 61:6 95:16,21 96:2 **MISSING** 17:26 98:2 109:25 23 75:6 97:23 103:27 107:18, **MISSPOKE** MEANINGFUL 21,28 **MOVE** 32:16 **MECHANISMS** 88:18 101:1 65:26 67:1,10 9:11 **METHOD** 105:5, 110:17 MISTAKE 78:8 **MEANS** 8:15 6 **MECHANISTIC** 17:20 20:2 21:9 **MOVED** 92:27 10:27 29:18 **MIXED** 46:23 **METHODOLOGI** 22:4 24:20 50:11,19 **C** 20:10 **MOVING** 113:11 **MEDIAN** 82:11, 30:17 35:3 37:1, 12,13 **MIXING** 97:15, METHODOLOGI **MULTI** 93:20 4 39:11,13,17, CAL 20:21 51:2 16 21 41:22 46:24 **MEDIUM** 81:3, MULTIPLE 96:7 49:1 59:8 70:22 16,17,20,21 **MOBA** 68:5 84:17 78:10 92:18 **MEET** 113:13,16 **MODEL** 38:2 MULTITUDE 97:11 99:9

42:15 **NEURODEVELO NUMBERS** 109:15 36:13,15 PMENTAL 87:8, 79:12 98:11 **MUTE** 7:5,6 **ODDS** 69:20 ORGANIZATION 18 88:4 107:17 100:20 101:3,6, 38:28 71:12 79:25,26 29:16 20 **NEURONS** 89:2 80:4,5 **ORIGINAL NUMEROUS** Ν **NEUROTOXIC** OFF-RECORD 23:22 25:8 107:22 11:1 107:21 6:26 22:13 **ORIGINATES NAMED** 89:7 **NUTRITION NEUROTOXICA OFFICIAL** 92:7.9 93:28 93:12 66:13 **NT** 16:20 114:4,21 **OUTCOME** 29:6 NARROW **NUTRITIONAL OLDS** 47:18 **NEUROTOXIN** 31:21 32:18 102:13,21,28 24:5 50:10 50:14 51:25 35:5 57:5 63:18. **OLSEN** 86:12 103:3,4 19.20.25 **NHNES** 66:13. **NATION** 66:12 0 **ONSET** 58:4 21 **OUTCOMES** 64:8 65:21 **NATIONAL** 84:18 **NICE** 28:19 106:14 **OBJECT** 105:17 66:13 80:27 **OUTLINING** NIH 66:24 80:27 **OBJECTED OPENING** 9:4 **NATIVITY** 89:12 15:28 10:13 61:22 13:2 23:19 **NOBLE** 30:13 NAVIGATE OVER/LEFT **OPINION** 10:11 **OBJECTION NOISE** 97:16 113:12 111:6 31:9 61:14 12:28 28:25 **NC** 6:9 NORMAL 26:6 72:27 33:20 43:15 **OVERARCHING** 90:19 92:4,5 30:22 **NORWAY** 18:12 **NEEDED** 100:23 **OBJECTIONS** 97:6 103:23 10:14 **OVERBROAD** NORWEGIAN **OPINIONS** 7:17 61:14 **NEGATIVE** 68:4 OBSERVATION 19:23 27:25 10:21 11:2,4,9 39:10 **OVERRULED** NOTABLE 18:8 63:8 18:19 32:9 61:16,23 73:2 **OBSERVATION NOTED** 21:6 41:17 47:27 **OPPOSING** 7:13 105:18 **AL** 39:7,8,10,20 113:26 49:20 54:11 19:3 **OWING** 84:16. 69:20 71:22 **OBSERVE NOTEWORTHY OPPOSITE** 17 85:26 12:22 106:13 87:5 21:15.25.26 NESTED 87:3 **OBSERVED** 27:14,18 30:24 **NOTICE** 15:13 Р 12:15,22 38:18 42:13 25:3 **NEURAL** 88:21 41:10 79:8 84:2 **ORANGES** P.M. 6:2 113:26 NULL 10:8 11:9. **NEUROBEHAVI** 101:14 20:26 10.16 44:8 46:3. **ORAL** 47:2 **PAGES** 64:21 **OBTAINED** 15 47:27 84:10, **ORDER** 17:24 **PAINT** 26:2 **NEURODEVELO** 87:28 23 33:25 108:27 **PMENT** 13:22 **PAIRED** 98:19 **OBVIOUS** 22:3 **NUMBER** 12:15, 16:22 18:19 **ORGAN** 36:21, 20,21,27 37:7 47:9 87:13 **OCCURRED PAIRS** 95:22 22 62:19,21 46:18 64:6 98:7 99:1,3,8, 44:2 57:5 58:12 88:15,20 92:14 94:21 98:14 99:1,2 19,20 94:3 59:25 **ORGANISM** 109:10 **PAPER** 13:10, OCCURRENCE 14:10 24:20,21 13 15:2,21,26

16:15 19:19 **PB** 70:26 73:3 105:20 POOLING 20:2 106:14 23:21 33:18 110:28 111:11, PEER-REVIEW **POPULATION PRECEDED** 51:8,10 15,18 48:25 49:1 9:12 12:18 34:14,22 65:1 **PAPERS** 15:23, **PHRASE** 45:9 18:18 87:25 PEER-**PRECONCEPTI** 24 90:3 89:12 PHRASING 32:9 **REVIEWED ONAL** 93:19 **POPULATIONS PARADED** 48:21,26 69:14 **PHYSIOLOGIC PREFER** 16:1,7 35:28 77:9 89:27 22:1 39:13,14. 24:17 **PREFERENCES** 15 40:13 53:13, PARADOXICAL **PEOPLE** 57:11 **PICA** 24:4,8 16:2 24 54:3,7,14 14:3 90:9 106:26 103:23 **PICKED** 43:23 **PREGNANCY** 108:24 **PARAGRAPH PORTION** 15:14 14:26 72:10 **PICTURE** 52:23 **PERCENT** 79:27 45:24 46:4 48:8 90:20.24 91:28 25:13,14,15 50:26 72:4 101:6.16 PITTING 14:8 92:8,14,20 93:4, 83:25 87:25 **POSITION** 76:12 PERFECT 7:6 8,28 94:10,27, **PIVOTED** 97:21 89:19 96:1,4 12:3 58:5 POSITIVE 11:5 28 95:2,4 102:8 103:7,9, **PLACE** 26:13,17 22:20 41:16 **PERFECTLY PREGNANT** 18 107:15 108:8 94:26 42:16 47:27 32:19 18:12 70:11 109:6 49:19 53:12 **PLACES** 38:18 **PERIOD** 13:22, **PRENATAL PARENTS** 99:17 54:1 69:28 PLAINLY 8:9 24 14:21 17:22 13:17,23,24,26, **PART** 14:8,9 POSITIVES 11:9 24:1 25:4 39:24, 28 14:2 15:5 **PLAY** 27:6 17:8 26:16 26 87:17,18 **POSSIBILITY** 16:27 17:12,18, 112:11,12 44:21 51:8 88:3,4,10,13 111:23 22 52:16.25 86:12 108:25 **POINT** 49:8,11 89:20,22 90:2, 68:9 80:22 POSSIBLY 33:1 51:11 64:26 **PARTICIPANTS** 25 91:14,24 83:12 88:10,13 65:8 71:18 74:9 **POST** 93:24 81:4,14 99:24 89:20.22 90:2 80:1 82:2 96:11,19 91:14 93:19 **PARTIES PERIODS** 53:15. **POINTING POST-BIRTH PREPARE** 112:10 114:11 25 54:8.15 42:27 43:16 100:15 82:10 83:8,9 68:20 **PARTS** 14:19 92:2 87:9,13 90:6,8 **POST-NATAL** PRESENT 18:5 **PARTY** 114:12 93:1,2 **POINTS** 22:2 13:17 17:22 **PRESENTATION** 80:1 94:28 95:4 **PASS** 28:10 46:8 **PERSON** 65:10 55:13 **POLAND** 107:9 **PAST** 59:10 **POST-NATALLY PERSONS PRESENTED** 108:22.27 99:23 100:12 62:23 38:18 86:15,18,25 101:14 **POLISH** 108:27, **PATELLA** 60:27 **PESTICIDES PRESENTING** 28 **POST-PARTUM** 66:16 **PATIENCE** 86:17 82:12 **POLLUTION** 110:24 **PETROSINELLI PRESERVE** 90:18 93:3 **PRE-** 46:8 6:12,17 11:18 **PATTERNS** 20:24 12:3 28:13,18 **POOL** 23:9 PRE-DATES 99:26 PRESIDENTS' 31:18 32:12,15 75:6 **POOLED** 20:1, **PAY** 17:25 112:6 40:1 61:25 63:4 23 21:6 64:14 PRECEDE 34:2 66:25 67:5.12

PRESUME PROSPECTIVE 10,13,18,23 13 **REAL** 22:10 35:17 17:11,17,23 36:3 QUESTION RANDOMIZED 72:6,8,9,12 **PRETTY** 20:28 10:5,7 26:3 28:1 30:4 37:11 REALTIME 81:14 62:15 101:25 29:21,22 30:6 114:21 RANDOMLY PROVIDE 47:1 113:3 31:12,16,26 **REASON** 56:23 55:1 66:4 85:1 32:2,9 34:16 **PREVALENT** 57:22 62:15 **RANGE** 74:24 48:14 51:19 63:19 **PRUNING** 94:16 99:27,28 54:5 56:10,11, **RARE** 56:19,24 **PREVIOUS PUBLICATION** REASONABLE 13 57:5 59:18, **RARELY** 60:23 18:12.23 47:24 19:18 49:3 89:8 27:20 21 61:27 62:8. 51:2 96:6 93:12.14 25,27 63:2 **RAT** 37:6 REASONING 68:19 70:4 **PRINCIPLE PUBLICATIONS** 8:24 33:20 **RATE** 12:19 75:18 76:13,28 30:21 89:5 91:27 14:16 REASONS 43:6 80:8 85:25 93:11 **PRINCIPLES** 95:6 86:18 88:21 **RATIO** 71:12 **PUBLISHED** 28:2 96:15 97:10 79:25,26 80:4,5 **RECALL** 44:17 15:20 89:27 105:12,22 106:9 97:17 52:1 55:17 62:9 **PRIOR** 10:5,14 98:27 108:5 111:19 58:3 63:28 64:8 68:15 69:24,25 **RATIOS** 69:20 65:21 75:9 84:3 PULL 30:23,24 70:2,18 74:28 **QUESTIONS RCT** 30:4 89:2 92:5 33:5 40:5 45:18 76:18 77:4 28:10 45:6 48:6 50:25 70:6 78:25 80:25 59:14 65:14 **REACH** 27:20 **PRIZE** 30:13 89:10 82:2 93:14 28:24 100:27 **QUICK** 22:9 PRO 114:4,21 105:1 107:5 **PURPORT** REACTIONS **QUICKLY** 19:3 PROBLEM 6:20 19:25 **RECALLED** 27:5 21:8 32:9 43:7 63:3 78:19 **QUOTE** 9:6.26 **PURPOSE READ** 9:26 49:7 85:13 11:12 12:7 19:5, 19:20 37:13 **RECALLING** 16:16 33:18 96:17 97:14,20 12.14 24:22 66:17 74:11 40:3,24 41:2 25:3 44:7 52:4 **PROBLEMS** 43:26 46:22 **PURPOSES RECENT** 58:24 73:13 90:1 18:1 20:7 22:10 51:15 52:14 38:16,22 **RECESS** 22:9 **QUOTED** 15:3 54:2 64:23 65:3 PROCEED 6:27 **PUSH** 69:12 67:9 25:14,15,21 70:24 71:1 72:7 7:3 28:14 76:7 78:15 **PUT** 10:4,5 37:6 RECOGNIZE **QUOTES** 13:3 **PROCEEDINGS** 83:22 105:21 42:4 44:22 45:8 67:19 114:6,9 **QUOTING** 89:24 50:20 68:10 108:22 RECOMMEND **PROCESS** 69:17 73:27 **READER** 17:25 16:12 15:17 26:17 104:27 R 21:18 43:16 RECOMMENDE **PROCESSES** 45:11 48:11 **D** 12:1 20:22 **RACE** 89:11 26:13 Q **READING** 17:19 RECOMMENDIN **RAISED** 15:18 PROMOTING 40:17 43:12 **QUARTILE** 71:2 **G** 41:25 26:3 48:12 49:13,26 105:2 **QUARTILES** RECORD 7:18 **RANDOM** 32:22. **READY** 6:27 **PROPOSITION** 70:20,22 71:6,7, 13:12 112:10 24 33:1 103:12, 91:3,14

114:8 38:25 40:14,28 **REPHRASE RESPOND REVIEWED** 41:6 42:10 31:17 10:15 19:22 49:2 REDIRECT 44:20 69:26 89:28 113:7 REPLICATED RESPONDED 83:7 107:23,28 40:12 **REVIEWER** 49:6 12:3 **REFER** 19:28 **RELATIVE REPORT** 27:23 **RESPONSE REVIEWING** REFERENCE 103:11 114:11 43:13 53:4,5 14:4 15:27 40:3,6,10 64:16, **RELEVANCE** 55:27 56:2 20 65:27 71:2 RESPONSIBLE **REVISED** 90:19 59:24 67:14 13:19 15:27 91:12 102:16,19 95:1 **RIGOR** 27:24,26 105:17 76:8 86:20 **RESPONSIVE REFERENCES** 28:6 **RELEVANT** REPORTED 91:1.8 111:3 15:21 47:26 50:12 **RISK** 17:9 REFERRED **REST** 69:9 72:13.16.20 53:13.23 107:23 **RELIED** 42:22 78:6 95:12.13 74:16 79:27 102:14,22 114:7 47:16 48:26 107:26 REFERRING RESULT 11:2 56:4 58:11 REPORTER **RITZ** 7:5.22 19:12 23:24 60:19 62:3 63:7 21:5 23:10 114:4,21 47:5 96:16 24:23 46:12 22:15 28:19 **RELY** 55:24 REPORTER'S 85:8 101:22 31:13 44:24 REFERS 8:2 56:14 59:23 114:1 61:19 67:14 RESULTING 60:9 61:10 REFLECT 59:4 **REPORTS** 110:20 111:13, 24:25 25:19 62:11,12 64:7 **RELYING** 29:22 107:25 20 112:19 113:4 26:9 56:16 REFLECTED REPRESENT **RITZ'S** 8:1 RESULTS 8:3 60:18 REMAINING 69:11 **ROLE** 107:18 12:10 13:8 14:3 105:11 REFLECTIVE **REPRESENTS** 18:5 21:2.9.25. **RUBRIC** 113:9 62:6 58:21 27 23:20 38:25 REMEMBER **RULE** 61:22 41:1 42:1.3.6.7 50:5 55:15.20 **REFLECTS** RESEARCH 69:22 74:14 46:4 47:26 59:10 62:13,23 **RUNNING** 46:1 22:18 29:15 87:16 89:8 49:19.20 50:11. 63:28 83:15.17 47:6 51:2 66:6 110:7 19 72:3 76:6 96:6 105:27 S REGION 46:8 79:5,14 81:25 REMODELLING 108:1 107:9 83:10 84:16 60:28 **SAFE** 16:21 RESEARCHER 85:3 86:17 REGIONS REMODELS 57:18,24,25 87:24 100:4,6 **SAMPLE** 46:24 53:14.24 54:8. 58:6 60:28 104:9 106:24 49:23 58:7,15, 14 109:3 17,18,20,21,23 REMOTELY **RESEARCHERS** REGULAR 28:3 59:7 63:23.24 27:11 57:4 RESUMED 7:9 **RELATES** 25:24 83:8 85:10 RENDERING RESIDUAL **RETAIN** 20:11 100:23 103:12 RELATION 23:21 84:13 104:16,20 **REVERSE** 23:18 63:12 64:27 **REPEAT** 61:26 RESOLVABLE 24:14 25:24 103:27 SAMPLES 64:13,14 26:20 57:28 64:7 REPEATEDLY **RELATIONSHIP** 82:10 87:27 38:17 RESPECT 9:8 REVIEW 43:4 14:4 23:2 35:9 103:24 69:19 74:7 68:22

SPECIFIC 20:10 8:21 108:27 **STATUTES STRUCTURALL** 23 103:23 35:4,15,26 38:1 80:28 Y 88:23 104:12,28 **START** 15:23 52:22,24 65:6 105:27 106:2,26 25:26 43:23 **STENOGRAPHI STUDENTS** 107:22 108:17 108:1 109:12. 46:3 65:20 C 114:1,21 15:22 16:3 17,19 109:10 105:24 102:4 111:12 **STENOGRAPHI SPECIFICALLY STUDY** 8:14 9:9, **STARTED** 26:25 **CALLY** 114:7 **STUDIES** 10:8, 7:14,16 21:6 10,16 11:3,5,15, 27:1 90:4 27,28 11:5,24 **STILLBIRTH** 52:21 74:8 16 13:16,24 13:4,8,26 14:27 STARTING 9:27 93:10 15:2,9 16:6,8,11 SPECIFICITY 15:20 17:11,23 59:18 83:25 17:25 18:5 19:1, **STILLBIRTHS** 34:28 35:3,7,24, 18:12,23 20:5, 103:19 105:23 4,6,11,22 20:6, 14:13 25 36:5,8,12,20, 13,19,20 21:12, 107:13 7,9,11,17,24,27 23 110:2 14,19,24 22:7 STORAGE 21:9,28 22:15, **STARTS** 10:6 29:14,18,19,20, 62:19,20 **SPECIFICS** 27 23:24,26 16:19 89:19 23 30:26 32:1. 20:24 24:22 25:8 **STORED** 57:28 28 37:17,19,27 **STATE** 6:4 29:11 30:2,3,11, **SPECTRUM** 58:26 59:1 38:24.26.27 23:11 42:23 18 32:5,22 60:26 14:20 26:4 39:6,8,10 40:27 106:27 114:5 39:20,21,22,23, 41:28 47:23,25 41:8,16,17,24, STRAIGHT 7:18 25 40:12 41:15 **STATED** 41:21 55:24 88:27 25,28 42:10,12, 42:15,25,28 STRANGE 20:2 89:1,3,11 91:22, 13,22 43:18,20, STATEMENT 43:1,5,7,9,12, 23 93:21,27 STRENGTH 22 44:18 45:1.3. 9:4 13:2 40:3, 25,26,28 44:7, 94:14 102:23 4 46:18 47:8.24 22:17 11,19,20,23 13,18,28 46:5,6, 109:25,27 48:27 49:18,19, 44:24 45:13 **STRENGTHENS** 12 47:14,16,17 22,23 50:10,12, 48:3,4 54:12 **SPECULATE** 53:16 48:7.21 49:9.12. 18 53:20.22 65:5 104:7,25, 8:14 20,23,24,25,27, **STRENGTHS** 54:1,6,10,11,26, 27 105:21 28 50:3,5,8 **SPEND** 19:2 103:9 27 55:1,7,18,19, 51:13,28 52:4,5, **STATEMENTS** 20,24 56:3,9,14, **SPENDING STRIKE** 31:5 22,25 54:13,19, 19:17 40:9 45:6 19.21.22 57:22 66:20 85:2 24 55:14 56:18, 49:4 51:7 52:11 58:10 59:23,24, 23 57:1,3,8,27 **SPENDS** 66:11 53:2 95:27 **STROKE** 35:22 27 60:8.11.19 107:13 58:6 61:15 63:6, 61:10,11 62:2,4, **SPOT** 58:1,2 **STRONG** 85:7 7,15,17 64:5 20 63:11 64:11, STATENS 87:4 101:27 **SPOT'S** 58:3 65:7,13 66:12 18,22 66:1,3,19 **STATISTICAL** 67:25,27,28 **STRONGLY SPURTS** 91:22 67:22 68:12,27 75:28 76:3,11, 68:4,5,9 69:14, 88:13 89:23 73:5,8,16,19,22, **STAGE** 15:20, 19 84:20 100:27 19,23,25 70:3,5, 90:2 91:14 93:3 28 74:1,4,6,8, 25,26 19:18 7,9,17 71:21 110:9 112:25 STATISTICALLY 18,23,27 75:3, 45:10 48:11 72:2,3,5,6,8,9, 69:20 70:1 14,19 76:4,8,14, **STRUCK** 94:20 49:25 51:13 12.27 74:15 71:24 75:20,23 23 77:9 80:15. **STRUCTURAL** 76:17 77:20,26 **STAGES** 14:7 76:15 79:20 18 84:28 85:3,8, 78:1,6,9,13,15, 88:26 92:16,19 80:4.9 99:25 28 90:16,18,19 **STAND** 7:15 22 79:4,13 80:7, 94:12 109:22,26 100:1,15,17,18 91:13 92:23,24, 12,15,17,22,27 **STANDARDS** 101:8 27 96:1 97:20. 81:2,3,5,13,14,

## Times and series and series are series as a series are series are series as a series are series a	TOLD 63:2 92:25 93:7 104:28 108:14 TOMORROW 111:9,13,16 113:15,16,18 TON 56:8 TOOTH 54:18 96:21 TOP 43:24 54:17 55:28 77:22 103:8 105:22 108:10 TOPIC 59:16 65:26 67:1 110:18 TOTAL 65:23 99:3 TOTALLY 85:5 TOXIC 14:11 18:11 24:26 25:20,28 26:5, 10,18 35:12 36:13 50:10,13, 19 66:3 96:2 TOXICOLOGIST S 86:16 TOXIN 37:13 66:16 TOXINS 24:18, 19,25 25:19 26:9 27:2,3 36:4 37:12 66:15 TRACE 94:2 TRACY 89:7 TRAINING 8:18 TRANSPARENT 27:18	TREATED 20:12 TREATMENT 41:9 TRIAL 30:5 37:12 111:25 112:4,7,24,28 TRIALS 37:2 TRIMESTER 14:23,24 83:17 88:22 TRUE 7:19 27:11 30:9,10 35:7 36:5,17,19 37:22 53:16,20, 26 54:5,9 56:13 58:9 60:1,3 61:13 62:2 69:8, 15 79:18,23 80:5,18 82:18 83:9 84:24 85:3, 6,27 86:2 95:17 98:6 107:9 108:5 114:8 TRUTH 30:9 TUBE 88:21 TUESDAY 6:2 111:9 TWIN 78:1,6 95:12,21 98:7 99:1,2,8,19,20, 22 100:26 103:24 TWINS 50:8 98:1,15,16,18, 20 99:9 100:7 105:28 TYPE 10:26 14:24 35:16 36:21 46:24 63:6 109:23	TYPES 22:1	61:12 62:4 63:23 USELESS 66:22 UTERO 58:27 UTERUS 99:11 V V-I-R-K 93:13 VALUABLE 47:1 66:4 109:14 110:13, 14 VARIATIONS 15:5 VIEW 12:9 27:8 VIEWED 87:17 VIRK 93:12 VITAMIN 93:20 VITAMINS 94:2 VULNERABLE 14:7 24:20,21 26:23,25,26,27 27:1,4 39:24 W W-H-O 29:16 WAIT 37:14 11:28 WANG 19:4,11, 22 WANTED 45:2 50:1 67:16 73:7 96:4 104:27 106:1 WARNING 21:18
--	--	--	------------	--

WATER 26:1 WONDERED 62:14 63:22 112:1 84:14 85:12 94:22 97:21 YELINSTOCK **WAYS** 14:1 85:8 WONDERING 84:12 107:10 WEAKNESSES **WORD** 109:6 **YESTERDAY** 103:10 9:5 12:8 13:25 **WEEK** 87:28 **WORDS** 53:22 24:8 38:14 100:16 111:23 70:10 98:1 48:24 50:4,9 112:4,17,21 103:19 106:15 55:11,21 57:9 **WORK** 27:26 **WEEKS** 82:11. 62:17 63:27 12,13 83:14 78:16 112:16 68:11,14 71:13, 87:15 88:9,10 17 77:1 95:14, **WORKED** 86:10 99:23 100:9,12, 19 107:2,6 WORKING 14,17,19 101:14 110:6 113:23 **WEIRD** 14:5,6 **YIELD** 38:25 **WORKS** 13:1 41:1,5 WELL-KNOWN 36:3 113:5 16:20 **YIELDED** 50:11, **WORLD** 30:3,11 19 WHEREOF 36:3 99:16 114:17 108:25 Ζ **WHISKERS WORRIED** 71:17 14:15 47:10 **ZOOM** 7:24 64:10 96:21 **WIDE** 103:1 WILLIAMS 39:1 **WRAP** 27:19 **WRITE** 15:24 WINDOW 102:13,21,28 **WRITING** 15:23 103:2 **WRITTEN** 15:25 WINDOWS 14:1 27:23 60:2 **WISNER** 6:10. **WRONG** 77:25 18,27 7:4,10 9:1 85:13 109:17 22:8.14 28:9 110:5 31:9,13 45:6 51:26 61:14,21, Υ 24 72:26 105:16,19 YAN 86:12 110:19 111:7, 14,16,25,27 **YEAR** 47:18 112:3,15,19,22 58:28 59:4 113:4,20 66:11 108:5 **WOMEN** 18:12 **YEARS** 13:28 70:11 23:27 24:1 59:5