1

Page 3 ITH B. ARMITAGE, M.D., a witness herein, for examination, as provided by the Ohio of Civil Procedure, being by me first duly , as hereinafter certified, was deposed and follows: MINATION OF KEITH B. ARMITAGE, M.D. R. BECKER: . Good morning, doctor. Would you tell ur full name, please. . Keith Barclay Armitage.
for examination, as provided by the Ohio of Civil Procedure, being by me first duly , as hereinafter certified, was deposed and follows: MINATION OF KEITH B. ARMITAGE, M.D. R. BECKER: . Good morning, doctor. Would you tell ur full name, please. . Keith Barclay Armitage. . (Thereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition Exhibit 1 was marked for purposes of identification.) . Doctor, handing you what's been d as Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, would you fy that for me, please. . This is a recent CV. . Are there any articles that you have red or co-authored that do not appear on itae? . No. . Would you tell me what your position
s at Humbrowster Warmital
Page 4 I'm on the I'm a member of the ious disease division. I'm on the faculty we Western Reserve University in the on of infectious diseases and in the ious disease division at University tal. I'm sort of overall in charge of the tional programs in the department of ine, which includes being the residency or director. I'm the co-training director medicine pediatric training program. I a clinical role and a teaching role. You have been identified as an expert half of the defendant in this matter and st trying to get a handle on your ience with taking care of newborns. Would ell me about that. Other than my own, not a lot of on experience. Well, can you tell me when was the me you had hands-on care with a newborn
aicheaceurtesisc

$\langle \uparrow \rangle$

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

Page 5	Page 7
1 A. None that come to mind.	1 that, I couldn't interpret it too well, your
2 Q. Are there any research interests by	2 handwriting is kind of like mine
3 you reflected on that vitae that are potentially	3 A. Probably worse.
4 relevant to this case?	4 Q. Okay would you for the record
5 A. Other than my background in	5 slowly interpret, starting from the top of
6 infectious diseases, I don't think there is any	6 Exhibit 2 and working your way down, exactly
7 specific research.	7 what your notes reflect and explain any
8 Q. Doctor, did you bring your complete	8 abbreviations, please.
9 file here today with you?	9 A. Honestly, I don't know what they all
10 A. Yes, I did.	10 mean at this point. There is just, you know,
11 Q. May I look at it?	11 things I was jotting.
12 A. Sure.	12 It says, 3-21, 9:32 a.m. I'm not
13 MR. BECKER: Could we go off the	13 sure what that means. Mother RH antibody. Two
14 record for a moment.	14 days increase bilirubin. 3-23, 100.6. LP white
15 MR. HERSCH: Off the record.	15 count looks like either 2 or 7. CSF, blood.
16 (Recess had.)	16 Positive GBS 3-24. 3-23 Timp, double lights.
17 MR. HERSCH: Back on the record.	17 And I think it says blankets. Peds 3-22 normal
18 Q. Doctor, thank you for giving me an	18 exam. 3-23, double photo, billi alert, good
19 opportunity to look at your file on this matter.	19 suck. 3-24, 0230. Abdomen distended, ticar,
20 I noted that there are no personal notes by you.	20 gent, and then it says amp 200 with an arrow
21 Is that accurate?	21 that says amp 400.
22 A. Correct. There is a few scribblings	22 And then in this corner it says
23 on the back of that letter which I know you	23 Adderral. I can't read it, 6 p.m. Called nurse,
24 didn't turn over.	24 food and mouth. Question, stiff.
25 Just random scribblings that I did	25 This must be some notes I took from
Page 6	Page 8
Page 6	Page 8
1 when I looked at the records, but	1 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. 	1 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 2 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says.
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that?
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition,
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. (Thereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. (Thereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked for 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. (Thereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked for purposes of identification.) 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th.
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. Chereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked for purposes of identification.) 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. (Thereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked for purposes of identification.) MR. HERSCH: Back on the record. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. 8 (Thereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked for purposes of identification.) MR. HERSCH: Back on the record. Q. Doctor, would you take a look at 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you.
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. Chereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked for purposes of identification.) MR. HERSCH: Back on the record. Q. Doctor, would you take a look at what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you. This is a question and answer session
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. (Thereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked for purposes of identification.) MR. HERSCH: Back on the record. Q. Doctor, would you take a look at what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2. Would you identify that for me, please? 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you. This is a question and answer session under oath. It's very important that you
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. (Thereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked for purposes of identification.) MR. HERSCH: Back on the record. Q. Doctor, would you take a look at what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2. Would you identify that for me, please? A. This is a letter that I think 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you. This is a question and answer session under oath. It's very important that you understand the question that I ask. If the
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you. This is a question and answer session under oath. It's very important that you understand the question that I ask. If the question doesn't make sense to you or is
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. (Thereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked for purposes of identification.) MR. HERSCH: Back on the record. Q. Doctor, would you take a look at what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2. Would you identify that for me, please? A. This is a letter that I think accompanied the medical records when they were sent to me to ask me to review them. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you. This is a question and answer session under oath. It's very important that you understand the question that I ask. If the question doesn't make sense to you or is inartfully phrased, I want you to stop me and
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you. This is a question and answer session under oath. It's very important that you understand the question that I ask. If the question doesn't make sense to you or is inartfully phrased, I want you to stop me and tell me so and I'd be pleased to attempt to
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. (Thereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition Exhibit 2 was marked for purposes of identification.) MR. HERSCH: Back on the record. Q. Doctor, would you take a look at what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2. Would you identify that for me, please? A. This is a letter that I think accompanied the medical records when they were sent to me to ask me to review them. Q. I understand your personal notes are on the back side of that letter from 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you. This is a question and answer session under oath. It's very important that you understand the question that I ask. If the question doesn't make sense to you or is inartfully phrased, I want you to stop me and tell me so and I'd be pleased to attempt to rephrase or restate the question. Fair enough?
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you. This is a question and answer session under oath. It's very important that you understand the question that I ask. If the question doesn't make sense to you or is inartfully phrased, I want you to stop me and tell me so and I'd be pleased to attempt to rephrase or restate the question. Fair enough? A. Okay.
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you. This is a question and answer session under oath. It's very important that you understand the question that I ask. If the question doesn't make sense to you or is inartfully phrased, I want you to stop me and tell me so and I'd be pleased to attempt to rephrase or restate the question. Fair enough? A. Okay. It's also very important that you
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you. This is a question and answer session under oath. It's very important that you understand the question that I ask. If the question doesn't make sense to you or is inartfully phrased, I want you to stop me and tell me so and I'd be pleased to attempt to rephrase or restate the question. Fair enough? A. Okay. Q. It's also very important that you answer verbally, because it's difficult for this
 1 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. 3 And I suppose that we are going to have to mark 4 this as an exhibit. 5 MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. 6 Off the record again, please. 7 8 (Thereupon, ARMITAGE Deposition 9 Exhibit 2 was marked for 10 purposes of identification.) 11 12 MR. HERSCH: Back on the record. 13 Q. Doctor, would you take a look at 14 what's been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 2. 15 Would you identify that for me, please? 16 A. This is a letter that I think 17 accompanied the medical records when they were 18 sent to me to ask me to review them. 19 Q. I understand your personal notes are 20 on the back side of that letter from 21 A. Yeah, this is just like a nervous, or 22 a habit I have of writing down things when I 23 look at the records. There is no specific 24 significance of anything written here. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you. This is a question and answer session under oath. It's very important that you understand the question that I ask. If the question doesn't make sense to you or is inartfully phrased, I want you to stop me and tell me so and I'd be pleased to attempt to rephrase or restate the question. Fair enough? A. Okay. Q. It's also very important that you answer verbally, because it's difficult for this lady to take down head nods, and so we fully
 when I looked at the records, but Q. You are right, I did not notice that. And I suppose that we are going to have to mark this as an exhibit. MR. BECKER: Let's do that, Vivian. Off the record again, please. 	 the deposition of the mother. Tried to feed 10:30 to 11:15. That's all it says. Q. Going back to the reference to the abdomen being distended, what time was that? A. These jottings are in juxtaposition, but I'm not sure there is any time attached to the abdomen distended. I think that's what the pediatric resident wrote after he came and saw the child in the middle of the night on the 24th. Q. I know that you have been deposed before, doctor. And I just want to review the ground rules with you. This is a question and answer session under oath. It's very important that you understand the question that I ask. If the question doesn't make sense to you or is inartfully phrased, I want you to stop me and tell me so and I'd be pleased to attempt to rephrase or restate the question. Fair enough? A. Okay. Q. It's also very important that you answer verbally, because it's difficult for this

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

1

Page 9	Page 11
1 to all questions. Fair enough? 2 A. Okay.	1 you are engaged in a lot of medical/legal work
	2 in the last few years?3 A. I don't know what the reference is in
3 Q. However, doctor, unless you indicate 4 otherwise to me, I'm going to assume that you	4 terms of a lot. I have been an expert mainly
5 fully understood the question that I posed and	5 for cases in Cleveland and northeast Ohio a few
6 you were giving me your best and most complete	6 times in the last few years.
7 answer today. Is that fair?	7 Q. When did you start doing
8 A. Sounds good.	8 medical/legal work? What year?
9 Q. Would you tell me what you have	9 A. I believe it was 1996.
10 reviewed in preparation for today's deposition?	10 Q. Right. And how many cases a year
11 A. I have reviewed the medical records	11 would you review?
12 from the birth and the subsequent events in the	12 A. I would estimate ten to 20.
13 hospital and reviewed depositions of Norma	13 Q. And has that been pretty consistent
14 Stalma, Joseph Stalma, Diane McKee, Lucinda	14 since 1996?
15 Osterhut, Linda Johnson, Constance Rose, Raymond	15 A. Probably in the last three or four
16 Buganski, Richard Vogarty, Jay Goldsmith, Judith	16 years. It probably wasn't that many in '96,
17 Lott, Gilbert Givens, and then Roger Faix.	17 '97.
18 Q. Okay. Did you do any research?	18 Q. It could have been five to ten in '96
19 A. No.	19 and '97?
20 Q. Did you review any journal articles	20 A. Potentially. I don't keep track.
21 or textbooks in preparation for today's	21 Q. Do you have any logs or anything on
22 deposition?	22 your computer where you reflect your active
23 A. No.	23 cases?
24 Q. Do you know any of the medical	24 A. No.
25 providers?	25 Q. Can you give me an idea of the
······································	
Page 10	Page 12
Page 10	Page 12 1 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the
1 A. No. 2 Q. Have you talked to any of the medical	
1 A. No.	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney?
1 A. No. 2 Q. Have you talked to any of the medical 3 providers? 4 A. No.	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, 1 guess,
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff.
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40?
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right.
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff,
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious?
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? A. As far as I know. 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious? A. Most of those cases are out of Ohio.
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? A. As far as I know. Q. Are you going to be rendering an 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious? A. Most of those cases are out of Ohio. I don't know if that probably 70 or 80
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? A. As far as I know. Q. Are you going to be rendering an sopinion in this case on standard of care as well 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious? A. Most of those cases are out of Ohio. I don't know if that probably 70 or 80 percent. I mean, usually, I think there is some
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? A. As far as I know. Q. Are you going to be rendering an sopinion in this case on standard of care as well as causation? 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious? A. Most of those cases are out of Ohio. I don't know if that probably 70 or 80 percent. I mean, usually, I think there is some idea, you know, what the issues are before
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? A. As far as I know. Q. Are you going to be rendering an sopinion in this case on standard of care as well as causation? A. No. 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious? A. Most of those cases are out of Ohio. I don't know if that probably 70 or 80 percent. I mean, usually, I think there is some idea, you know, what the issues are before reviewing the records.
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? A. As far as I know. Q. Are you going to be rendering an sopinion in this case on standard of care as well as causation? 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious? A. Most of those cases are out of Ohio. I don't know if that probably 70 or 80 percent. I mean, usually, I think there is some idea, you know, what the issues are before reviewing the records. Q. So would it be fair for me to
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? A. As far as I know. Q. Are you going to be rendering an sopinion in this case on standard of care as well as causation? A. No. Q. Just causation? A. Correct. 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious? A. Most of those cases are out of Ohio. I don't know if that probably 70 or 80 percent. I mean, usually, I think there is some idea, you know, what the issues are before reviewing the records. Q. So would it be fair for me to conclude that the plaintiff's cases that you
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? A. As far as I know. Q. Are you going to be rendering an sopinion in this case on standard of care as well as causation? A. No. Q. Just causation? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Before I get into your 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious? A. Most of those cases are out of Ohio. I don't know if that probably 70 or 80 percent. I mean, usually, I think there is some idea, you know, what the issues are before reviewing the records. Q. So would it be fair for me to conclude that the plaintiff's cases that you
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? A. As far as I know. Q. Are you going to be rendering an sopinion in this case on standard of care as well as causation? A. No. Q. Just causation? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Before I get into your 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious? A. Most of those cases are out of Ohio. I don't know if that probably 70 or 80 percent. I mean, usually, I think there is some idea, you know, what the issues are before reviewing the records. Q. So would it be fair for me to conclude that the plaintiff's cases that you review, you are contacted from people outside
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? A. As far as I know. Q. Are you going to be rendering an sopinion in this case on standard of care as well as causation? A. No. Q. Just causation? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Before I get into your opinions on causation, I need to talk to you 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious? A. Most of those cases are out of Ohio. I don't know if that probably 70 or 80 percent. I mean, usually, I think there is some idea, you know, what the issues are before reviewing the records. Q. So would it be fair for me to conclude that the plaintiff's cases that you review, you are contacted from people outside the state?
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? A. As far as I know. Q. Are you going to be rendering an sopinion in this case on standard of care as well as causation? A. No. Q. Just causation? A. Correct. Q. Okay. Before I get into your about your medical/legal work. 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious? A. Most of those cases are out of Ohio. I don't know if that probably 70 or 80 percent. I mean, usually, I think there is some idea, you know, what the issues are before reviewing the records. Q. So would it be fair for me to conclude that the plaintiff's cases that you review, you are contacted from people outside the state? Not exclusively, but I think I have
 A. No. Q. Have you talked to any of the medical providers? A. No. Q. Was there anything that you needed to complete your review that you had to pick up the phone and write Nancy a letter and say I still need X documents? A. No. Q. As far as you are concerned, all the medical records that you needed were initially provided to you? A. As far as I know. Q. Are you going to be rendering an opinion in this case on standard of care as well as causation? A. No. Q. Okay. Before I get into your opinions on causation, I need to talk to you about your medical/legal work. Your name has appeared quite a bit in 	 breakdown between contacts made on cases by the medical provider's attorney versus the patient's attorney? A. It's roughly 60 percent, I guess, cases that are for the defense and 40 percent for the plaintiff. Q. 60/40? A. Right. Q. Of the 40 percent of the cases that you have reviewed on behalf of the plaintiff, what percentage of those do you find meritorious? A. Most of those cases are out of Ohio. I don't know if that probably 70 or 80 percent. I mean, usually, I think there is some idea, you know, what the issues are before reviewing the records. Q. So would it be fair for me to conclude that the plaintiff's cases that you review, you are contacted from people outside the state? A. Not exclusively, but I think I have been a plaintiff have been a witness for an

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

Page 13	Page 15
rage 13	
1 outside the state.	1 you will not be rendering any opinions at the
2 Q. Can you give me the names of any	2 trial on this case relative to the issue of
3 plaintiff's attorneys, either in the State of	3 compliance in the standard of care by the
4 Ohio or outside the state?	4 hospital nurses; is that accurate?
5 A. Sure. Inside the state, Peter	5 A. Correct.
6 Voudouris, Stege and Associates.	6 Q. Okay. That just leaves causation, so
7 Q. Dick Stege Rick Stege?	7 tell me what your causation opinions are in this
8 A. People in Chicago have used me.	8 case.
9 Richard Rosenbaum. People in New Hampshire,	9 A. I guess that is an open ended
10 people in West Virginia. All the names are	10 question and obviously I will try to give it
11 escaping me, but, you know, I could try to think	11 that way for you.
12 of more later.	12 I think if you look at, based on my
	13 experience with infectious diseases, if you look
	14 at the child's clinical course, I think the
14 to you during this depo, please feel free to	
15 just tell me about them.	15 infection started probably sometime around 11:00
16 Any of the cases that you have	16 o'clock at night, around there.
17 reviewed on behalf of plaintiff involve group B	17 Q. On the 23rd?
18 strep?	18 A. On the 23rd. If you look at the
19 A. No.	19 child's vital signs, during the day, there is
20 Q. Any of the cases you have reviewed on	20 periods when they were normal. If you look at
21 behalf of the plaintiff where you found	21 the inflammatory response, certainly in the
22 meritorious where you gave an opinion to the	22 child's blood count, they drew blood at around
23 effect that timely administration of an	23 3:30 in the morning on the 24th and there was a
24 antibiotic would have avoided an injury?	24 normal blood count, a normal differential. They
25 A. Probably.	25 drew blood at 7:30, four hours later. There was
Page 14	Page 16
1 Q. Can you name any of those cases?	1 a shift to left. They drew blood I think the
2 A. I know that one case that was in	2 next day and there was quite an elevation in the
3 Cuyahoga County, I think it involved, it was a	3 white count.
4 staph infection in an older woman and I don't	4 So the child monitored, you know, an
5 remember my specific testimony, but it might	5 Intense inflammatory response in response to
6 have been along those lines.	6 this infection, but certainly the blood counts
7 Q. Would this have been for Stege?	7 didn't reflect any inflammatory response as of
8 A. Correct.	8 3:30 in the morning.
9 Q. Okay. Since you are reviewing cases	9 It takes three or four hours for the
10 for Stege, you don't have a rule that you don't	10 cytokines and the inflammatory mediators to kind
11 review cases on behalf of plaintiffs for	11 of crank up and cause increased white count,
12 northern Ohio then?	12 shift left, et cetera. That and I think the
13 A. You know, that was the first one, and	13 child's overall clinical stability, you know, a
14 I try to not review cases from Cleveland.	14 couple episodes notwithstanding, provide
15 Q. How long ago was that case for Stege?	15 evidence for when the infection occurred.
16 A. Probably maybe '99, 2000.	16 Q. I didn't hear would you repeat
17 Q. Did you give a deposition in that	17 that last sentence?
18 case?	
	18 A. I think the white count and then the
19 A. Yes, I did.	19 periods of clinical stability in the preceding
19 A. Yes, I did. 20 Q. Did it go to trial in that case?	19 periods of clinical stability in the preceding20 24 hours helped time the infection as occurring,
19A.Yes, I did.20Q.Did it go to trial in that case?21A.Yes, it did.	 periods of clinical stability in the preceding 24 hours helped time the infection as occurring, you know, three or four hours before 3:30 in the
 A. Yes, I did. Q. Did it go to trial in that case? A. Yes, it did. Q. Did you make a live appearance at 	 19 periods of clinical stability in the preceding 20 24 hours helped time the infection as occurring, 21 you know, three or four hours before 3:30 in the 22 morning.
 19 A. Yes, I did. 20 Q. Did it go to trial in that case? 21 A. Yes, it did. 22 Q. Did you make a live appearance at 23 trial? 	 periods of clinical stability in the preceding 24 hours helped time the infection as occurring, you know, three or four hours before 3:30 in the morning. Q. Okay. Any other opinions on
19A.Yes, I did.20Q.Did it go to trial in that case?21A.Yes, it did.22Q.Did you make a live appearance at23trial?24A.Yes, I did.	 19 periods of clinical stability in the preceding 20 24 hours helped time the infection as occurring, 21 you know, three or four hours before 3:30 in the 22 morning. 23 Q. Okay. Any other opinions on 24 causation?
 19 A. Yes, I did. 20 Q. Did it go to trial in that case? 21 A. Yes, it did. 22 Q. Did you make a live appearance at 23 trial? 	 periods of clinical stability in the preceding 24 hours helped time the infection as occurring, you know, three or four hours before 3:30 in the morning. Q. Okay. Any other opinions on

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

Dave 47	Dere 40
 Page 17 the form of the question, but doctor, if you can answer. If you want to be more specific. A. Yeah, I guess, I have been fairly specific with the timing, and I'm not sure what else. Q. Okay. Let me help you then. From that statement, would it be fair for me to conclude that it would be your opinion that had there been a sepsis workup at 4 to 6 p.m. on the 23rd, the culture would have been negative? A. Correct. Q. Hypothetically, doctor, had there been a sepsis workup between 4 and 6 p.m. or 6:30 p.m., on the 23rd, and well, let me back up. Would you agree that at the time of this particular delivery, it would be protocol at most hospitals that when there is a sepsis workup that would include the administration of antibiotics after cultures are drawn? A. I wouldn't agree. Q. What's the basis of that statement? A. Basing my familiarity with what 	 Page 19 earlier question? You answered it with certainty and I'm just trying to close that out. A. Yeah. I guess. I don't understand the legal terms, but Q. No opinion? A. Yeah, I don't think if antibiotics you know, I know in one of the earlier depositions the question was asked, if the child was put on antibiotics at birth, would it have made a difference, and I think it would have. I think it's I don't think antibiotics, I don't think anybody can say that the child wouldn't have had any consequences had antibiotics been started at 6:30 or ordered at 6:30. Q. Well, that sounds a little different than you don't have an opinion as to whether or not the antibiotics would have been effective. So you do have an opinion? A. I guess I don't think anybody could say with reasonable degree of medical certainty that antibiotics would have. That's my opinion. Q. And why couldn't someone say that? A. I just think it's hard to predict what the inflammatory response and the CSF is. And it's really the inflammatory response not
 Page 18 1 happens here and based upon, in reading the 2 depositions of the various experts in these 3 cases, I think it comes down to clinical 4 judgment, clinical suspicion. There is 5 certainly they are frequently given, but not 6 100 percent of the time. 7 Q. The majority of the time are they 8 given? 9 A. I would say so. 10 Q. Hypothetically, doctor, had IV 11 antibiotics been given roughly at 6:30 p.m. on 12 the 23rd, would you agree with me more likely 13 than not that this would have avoided the severe 14 consequences in this child? 15 A. I don't think that's an opinion that 16 I can give to a reasonable degree of medical 17 certainty. 18 Q. You don't have an opinion on that 19 issue? 20 A. No. 21 Q. You understand that there is a 22 difference between certainty and probability? 23 And would your answer be the same? 24 You do not have an opinion within a 25 reasonable degree of medical probability on that 	 Page 20 the bacteria itself that caused the damage, and kids are different. You know, I think in this case, and I'm not obviously a pediatric neurologist, but in looking at the record, it seemed that this child had a lot of seizures the first week and, you know, how much the seizures contributed to his outcome versus just the inflammation in the CSF. Q. Well, isn't it likely that the seizures were just simply a by-product of the initial insult? A. The seizures resulted from the there been a little less inflammation would he have still had seizures, and I think you can't say. Q. All right. Let's go over some definitions, doctor. Let's start with the concept of sepsis. What does what mean? A. Well, sepsis is a clinical term referring to an inflammatory response usually to infection, and people usually, especially for research purposes, define it on the basis of clinical variables.

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

	1	
	Page 21	Page 23
1 It doesn't necessarily mean th	at 1	Q. No idea?
2 there is bacteria in the blood, so sepsi		A. I mean, I'm sure it's something that
3 occur with or without bacteria in the		occurs relatively frequently, but I couldn't
4 it's a clinical definition.	4	give you a number.
5 Q. You are saying for sepsis the	re 5	Q. Do you have any knowledge how
6 doesn't have to be bacteria in the bloc		frequently sepsis workups occur in the NIC unit?
7 A. Correct. Especially in the wa	-	A. No.
8 people use the term in research, it's ju		Q. Can you give me an estimate of the
9 of a spectrum of clinical conditions.		likely ratio between positive and negative
10 inflammatory response, sepsis. Sepsis		
11 often occurs in response to infection a 12 most cases there is positive blood cult		A. Again, the majority of sepsis workups
12 most cases there is positive blood cult13 there doesn't have to be.	ures, but 12	· ·
14 Q. Isn't it a systemic response,		
15 body's response to an infection, isn't	1	
16 sepsis means?	16	
17 A. Correct. But it's a clinical	17	school.
18 definition, not a microbiologic definiti		
19 Q. Okay. And how would you	distinguish 19	A. I think I did my pediatric rotation
20 sepsis from bacteremia?	20	
21 A. Well, patients can be bactere		Q. Do you have any recall about that
22 without sepsis, and, you know, every		
23 brush our teeth, we probably have so		
24 bacteremia, although it's not clinically		
25 significant.	25	Children's Hospital in Denver and recall taking
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	Bogo 22	Page 24
	Page 22	
Patients can have clinically	1	care of children where sepsis was suspected.
2 significant bacteremia without having,		Q. Do you recall in 1985 in Denver
3 meeting the definition for sepsis.	3	what hospital was that in Denver?
4 Sepsis is a clinical entity that 5 reflects the body's response to the inf	lammatory 5	A. I actually did my pediatric rotation
6 condition usually provoked by an infe		at the University Hospital, so the University of Colorado Medical School.
7 Q. All right. And what is meni		Q. Do you recall being a resident and
8 A. Meningitis is an inflammation		working in the NIC unit whether they had a care
9 meninges, which is the membrane that		pathway or algorithms of when one was to engage
10 brain that contains the cerebral spinal		
11 Q. What does the phrase sepsis		A. I'm pretty sure they didn't in 1985.
12 mean?	12	Q. Have you ever created you have an
13 A. Sepsis workup means evaluat	ting for 13	the substance of the second
14 potential sources of infection. In ped		A. Correct.
15 it usually means doing blood cultures	with or 15	A. Correct.Q. Have you ever developed a care
15 it usually means doing blood cultures16 without a spinal tap, urine culture, so	with or 15 metimes 16	 A. Correct. Q. Have you ever developed a care pathway or an algorithm for sepsis workups in
15 it usually means doing blood cultures16 without a spinal tap, urine culture, so17 chest x-ray.	with or 15 metimes 16 17	A. Correct. Q. Have you ever developed a care pathway or an algorithm for sepsis workups in adult patients?
 15 it usually means doing blood cultures 16 without a spinal tap, urine culture, so 17 chest x-ray. 18 Q. And I think we can agree the 	with or 15 metimes 16 17 at the 18	 A. Correct. Q. Have you ever developed a care pathway or an algorithm for sepsis workups in adult patients? A. Not for sepsis, no.
 15 it usually means doing blood cultures 16 without a spinal tap, urine culture, so 17 chest x-ray. 18 Q. And I think we can agree the 19 majority of the time it's followed by 	with or 15 metimes 16 17 at the 18 19	 A. Correct. Q. Have you ever developed a care pathway or an algorithm for sepsis workups in adult patients? A. Not for sepsis, no. Q. Do you have an explanation for this
 15 it usually means doing blood cultures 16 without a spinal tap, urine culture, so 17 chest x-ray. 18 Q. And I think we can agree th 19 majority of the time it's followed by 20 institution of IV antibiotics? 	with or 15 metimes 16 17 at the 18 19 20	 A. Correct. Q. Have you ever developed a care pathway or an algorithm for sepsis workups in adult patients? A. Not for sepsis, no. Q. Do you have an explanation for this child's temperature instability on the 23rd of
 15 it usually means doing blood cultures 16 without a spinal tap, urine culture, so 17 chest x-ray. 18 Q. And I think we can agree the 19 majority of the time it's followed by 20 institution of IV antibiotics? 21 A. Correct. 	with or 15 metimes 16 17 at the 18 19 20 21	 A. Correct. Q. Have you ever developed a care pathway or an algorithm for sepsis workups in adult patients? A. Not for sepsis, no. Q. Do you have an explanation for this child's temperature instability on the 23rd of March?
 15 it usually means doing blood cultures 16 without a spinal tap, urine culture, so 17 chest x-ray. 18 Q. And I think we can agree th 19 majority of the time it's followed by 20 institution of IV antibiotics? 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. Do you have any knowledge 	with or 15 metimes 16 17 at the 18 19 20 21 • as to how 22	 A. Correct. Q. Have you ever developed a care pathway or an algorithm for sepsis workups in adult patients? A. Not for sepsis, no. Q. Do you have an explanation for this child's temperature instability on the 23rd of March? A. It's my understanding the child was
 15 it usually means doing blood cultures 16 without a spinal tap, urine culture, so 17 chest x-ray. 18 Q. And I think we can agree the 19 majority of the time it's followed by 20 institution of IV antibiotics? 21 A. Correct. 	with or 15 metimes 16 17 at the 18 19 20 21 • as to how 22 ersity 23	 A. Correct. Q. Have you ever developed a care pathway or an algorithm for sepsis workups in adult patients? A. Not for sepsis, no. Q. Do you have an explanation for this child's temperature instability on the 23rd of March? A. It's my understanding the child was under two lights to treat the high bilirubin and
 15 it usually means doing blood cultures 16 without a spinal tap, urine culture, so 17 chest x-ray. 18 Q. And I think we can agree th 19 majority of the time it's followed by 20 institution of IV antibiotics? 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. Do you have any knowledge 23 often the, in the nursery here at Univ 	with or 15 metimes 16 17 at the 18 19 20 21 • as to how 22 ersity 23	 A. Correct. Q. Have you ever developed a care pathway or an algorithm for sepsis workups in adult patients? A. Not for sepsis, no. Q. Do you have an explanation for this child's temperature instability on the 23rd of March? A. It's my understanding the child was under two lights to treat the high bilirubin and this is what the treating pediatrician thought,
 15 it usually means doing blood cultures 16 without a spinal tap, urine culture, so 17 chest x-ray. 18 Q. And I think we can agree th 19 majority of the time it's followed by 20 institution of IV antibiotics? 21 A. Correct. 22 Q. Do you have any knowledge 23 often the, in the nursery here at Univ 24 Hospital, they engage in sepsis worku 	with or 15 metimes 16 17 at the 18 19 20 21 as to how 22 ersity 23 ps? 24	 A. Correct. Q. Have you ever developed a care pathway or an algorithm for sepsis workups in adult patients? A. Not for sepsis, no. Q. Do you have an explanation for this child's temperature instability on the 23rd of March? A. It's my understanding the child was under two lights to treat the high bilirubin and this is what the treating pediatrician thought,

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

6

Page 25	Page 27
 course, I think that 2:30 p.m. temperature was due to sepsis or infection, the child wouldn't have had would have defervesced and wouldn't have had normal vital signs the majority of the time for the next 12 hours. Q. Okay. So you attribute the temperature instability to the phototherapy? A. Correct. Q. Do you recall when abdominal distention was first charted by the nurses? A. I believe it was around 2:30 in the morning. Q. Okay. Where does the Stalma child fall within your spectrum? A. I think there is a spectrum. Q. And when did this child have meningitis, in your mind? A. I think the meningitis, again, probably started in two to three hours before 3:30 in the morning, as evidenced by the 	 and normal differential at 3:30 in the morning. Q. Well, so in general you are familiar with the phenomenon that as the infection progresses, it will cause initially an elevation of WB white blood count and then it will cause the white blood count to drop? A. I think we are talking about two things. Sometimes an overwhelming infection, the white blood can drop drastically low. In general with infection, the first few days the white count is high. As you successfully treat the infection over days not hours but over days the white count will decrease. Q. Are you familiar with the phenomenon where there is a backflow after meningitis is really set in place which causes a significant increase in white blood cell count? A. I have not seen that. Q. Are you familiar with any literature on that? A. Not specifically, no. Q. Do you have within your chart the medication records for March 24th?
Page 26 1 Q. So roughly the meningitis was 2 began around midnight? 3 A. In that time frame. 4 Q. And what's the basis for that 5 opinion? 6 A. Again, looking at the relative 7 clinical stability up until that time, looking 8 at the normal blood counts at 3:30 in the 9 morning. 10 Q. Are you familiar with the phenomenon 11 where with an infection bacteremia going down to 12 meningitis there could be an elevated white 13 blood count and then as the infection goes on, 14 the white blood count goes down? 15 A. Well, sometimes with overwhelming 16 infections, the white blood count would drop to 17 abnormally low levels, and so I think if you 18 look at this case, you see at 3:30 in the 19 morning, you have a normal white count, normal 20 differential. If the 7:30 a.m. white count was 21 one or two, you could see a white count that's 22 trending down. But that's not what you see here 23 The 7 a.m. white count was 9 with a left shift. 24 So, I don't think you could invoke that 25 pathogenesis to explain the normal white count	 Page 28 A. I would assume I do. Q. Would you check. MS. MOODY: I don't think that we have ever been able to find the particular med sheet for that date, but please check. A. I don't recall specifically. Q. All right. You don't recall as we sit here now, since that issue has been raised just a few minutes ago, whether or not those records were actually missing? A. I don't recall. Q. Can we enter into a stipulation, Nancy, on that, that those records are not available today? MS. MOODY: To my knowledge, they are not available. I think that amounts to one page of medication records, if I'm not mistaken. We have just never been able to locate them. Q. Do you think in this case, doctor, this child was likely bacteremic before meningitis set in? A. I don't think that the cerebral spinal fluid was inoculated directly. It

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

Page 29	Page 31
1 requires the bacteria to get through the blood	1 the first real seizures?
 2 into the cerebral spinal fluid. 3 Q. Would you refer then to this type of 	2 A. There is an arched back. The child 3 was stiff.
4 infection as fulminant?	4 Again, I think we know that the child
5 A. I'm not sure I would use the term	5 had meningitis based on subsequent data. So if
6 fulminant. I think I said a few minutes ago	6 you track back in time, we know the child was
7 this was an aggressive infection.	7 very sick then, so it all fits.
8 Q. Okay. If a child is overheated due	8 And the nurses' description.
9 to either phototherapy or overbundling and the	9 Obviously the nurses were concerned enough about
10 child is removed from that environment or a	10 how the child looked that they called a resident
11 child is 1 don't know if there is a word	11 on call to come see him.
12 unbundled, do you have any idea how long it	12 Previously I think these relatively
13 takes a child's core temperature to get back to	13 experienced nurses thought the child looked
14 reflect what's actually going on, in terms of 15 minutes?	14 normal. The nurses talked to Dr. Buganski at15 9 p.m. and there wasn't any question about a
16 A. I think most of the pediatricians in	15 9 p.m. and there wasn't any question about a 16 seizure then.
17 this case have said it's minutes to an hour.	17 Q. Is vomiting in a newborn a sign of
18 Q. Minutes to an hour; correct?	18 can vomiting be a sign of sepsis?
19 A. Correct.	19 A. Well, I think it's very, very common
20 Q. Did this child develop shock, this	20 for newborns to regurgitate. And so can it be?
21 newborn?	21 I suppose it can, but it's, the vast majority of
22 A. In the early morning hours of the	22 times it's not.
23 24th, there was evidence of some decreased	23 Q. The first CBC done on this child, l
24 tissue perfusion.	24 think at three hours of life, would you pull the
25 Q. Would that be roughly 2:30 or 3 a.m.?	25 results of that?
Page 30	Page 32
1 A. I think after that.	1 A. Sure.
2 Q. 4 a.m.?	1 A. Sure. 2 Q. And tell me if you feel that was
2 Q. 4 a.m.? 3 A. Around there.	1 A. Sure. 2 Q. And tell me if you feel that was 3 normal.
 2 Q. 4 a.m.? 3 A. Around there. 4 Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was
 Q. 4 a.m.? A. Around there. Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? A. Right. 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The
 2 Q. 4 a.m.? 3 A. Around there. 4 Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? 5 A. Right. 6 Q. What is your opinion as to the first 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st.
 2 Q. 4 a.m.? 3 A. Around there. 4 Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? 5 A. Right. 6 Q. What is your opinion as to the first 7 time seizures presented with this child? 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated?
 2 Q. 4 a.m.? 3 A. Around there. 4 Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? 5 A. Right. 6 Q. What is your opinion as to the first 7 time seizures presented with this child? 8 A. 2:30 in the morning. 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct.
 2 Q. 4 a.m.? 3 A. Around there. 4 Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? 5 A. Right. 6 Q. What is your opinion as to the first 7 time seizures presented with this child? 8 A. 2:30 in the morning. 9 Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated?
 2 Q. 4 a.m.? 3 A. Around there. 4 Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? 5 A. Right. 6 Q. What is your opinion as to the first 7 time seizures presented with this child? 8 A. 2:30 in the morning. 9 Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities?
 2 Q. 4 a.m.? 3 A. Around there. 4 Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? 5 A. Right. 6 Q. What is your opinion as to the first 7 time seizures presented with this child? 8 A. 2:30 in the morning. 9 Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? 10 A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 11 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I 12 guess the question is, there is an incident when 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No.
 2 Q. 4 a.m.? 3 A. Around there. 4 Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? 5 A. Right. 6 Q. What is your opinion as to the first 7 time seizures presented with this child? 8 A. 2:30 in the morning. 9 Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? 10 A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 11 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I 12 guess the question is, there is an incident when 13 the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct.
 2 Q. 4 a.m.? 3 A. Around there. 4 Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? 5 A. Right. 6 Q. What is your opinion as to the first 7 time seizures presented with this child? 8 A. 2:30 in the morning. 9 Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? 10 A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 11 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I 12 guess the question is, there is an incident when 13 the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's 14 probably what you are referring to. 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct. Q. What do you attribute that to?
 Q. 4 a.m.? A. Around there. Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? A. Right. Q. What is your opinion as to the first time seizures presented with this child? A. 2:30 in the morning. Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I guess the question is, there is an incident when the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's probably what you are referring to. You know, I think if that was a 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct. Q. What do you attribute that to? A. The RH reaction.
 Q. 4 a.m.? A. Around there. Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? A. Right. Q. What is your opinion as to the first time seizures presented with this child? A. 2:30 in the morning. Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I guess the question is, there is an incident when the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's probably what you are referring to. You know, I think if that was a seizure due to infection, the child would not 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct. Q. What do you attribute that to? A. The RH reaction. Q. Do you know whether or not most
 Q. 4 a.m.? A. Around there. Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? A. Right. Q. What is your opinion as to the first time seizures presented with this child? A. 2:30 in the morning. Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I guess the question is, there is an incident when the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's probably what you are referring to. You know, I think if that was a seizure due to infection, the child would not have been stable for the ensuing, you know, 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct. Q. What do you attribute that to? A. The RH reaction. Q. Do you know whether or not most hospitals, when jaundice is present and they are
 Q. 4 a.m.? A. Around there. Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? A. Right. Q. What is your opinion as to the first time seizures presented with this child? A. 2:30 in the morning. Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I guess the question is, there is an incident when the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's probably what you are referring to. You know, I think if that was a seizure due to infection, the child would not have been stable for the ensuing, you know, eight or ten hours. And the nurse's notes and 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct. Q. What do you attribute that to? A. The RH reaction. Q. Do you know whether or not most hospitals, when jaundice is present and they are attributing it to RH incompatibility, whether
 Q. 4 a.m.? A. Around there. Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? A. Right. Q. What is your opinion as to the first time seizures presented with this child? A. 2:30 in the morning. Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I guess the question is, there is an incident when the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's probably what you are referring to. You know, I think if that was a seizure due to infection, the child would not have been stable for the ensuing, you know, eight or ten hours. And the nurse's notes and the nurses' deposition in that incident reflect 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct. Q. What do you attribute that to? A. The RH reaction. Q. Do you know whether or not most hospitals, when jaundice is present and they are
 Q. 4 a.m.? A. Around there. Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? A. Right. Q. What is your opinion as to the first time seizures presented with this child? A. 2:30 in the morning. Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I guess the question is, there is an incident when the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's probably what you are referring to. You know, I think if that was a seizure due to infection, the child would not have been stable for the ensuing, you know, eight or ten hours. And the nurse's notes and the nurses' deposition in that incident reflect that after suctioning the child, the child 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct. Q. What do you attribute that to? A. The RH reaction. Q. Do you know whether or not most hospitals, when jaundice is present and they are attributing it to RH incompatibility, whether they engage in any type of serial blood counts? A. I don't know.
 Q. 4 a.m.? A. Around there. Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? A. Right. Q. What is your opinion as to the first time seizures presented with this child? A. 2:30 in the morning. Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I guess the question is, there is an incident when the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's probably what you are referring to. You know, I think if that was a seizure due to infection, the child would not have been stable for the ensuing, you know, eight or ten hours. And the nurse's notes and the nurses' deposition in that incident reflect 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct. Q. What do you attribute that to? A. The RH reaction. Q. Do you know whether or not most hospitals, when jaundice is present and they are attributing it to RH incompatibility, whether they engage in any type of serial blood counts? A. I don't know.
 Q. 4 a.m.? A. Around there. Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? A. Right. Q. What is your opinion as to the first time seizures presented with this child? A. 2:30 in the morning. Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I guess the question is, there is an incident when the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's probably what you are referring to. You know, I think if that was a seizure due to infection, the child would not have been stable for the ensuing, you know, eight or ten hours. And the nurse's notes and the nurses' deposition in that incident reflect that after suctioning the child, the child returned to being, appeared normal to them within ten minutes. I don't think that's consistent with a seizure. 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct. Q. What do you attribute that to? A. The RH reaction. Q. Do you know whether or not most hospitals, when jaundice is present and they are attributing it to RH incompatibility, whether they engage in any type of serial blood counts? A. I don't know. Q. Would you call this an early onset group B strep infection? A. It's sort of on the borderline. You
 Q. 4 a.m.? A. Around there. Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? A. Right. Q. What is your opinion as to the first time seizures presented with this child? A. 2:30 in the morning. Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I guess the question is, there is an incident when the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's probably what you are referring to. You know, I think if that was a seizure due to infection, the child would not have been stable for the ensuing, you know, eight or ten hours. And the nurse's notes and the nurses' deposition in that incident reflect that after suctioning the child, the child returned to being, appeared normal to them within ten minutes. I don't think that's consistent with a seizure. Q. And what is it about the 2:30 a.m. 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct. Q. What do you attribute that to? A. The RH reaction. Q. Do you know whether or not most hospitals, when jaundice is present and they are attributing it to RH incompatibility, whether they engage in any type of serial blood counts? A. I don't know. Q. Would you call this an early onset group B strep infection? A. It's sort of on the borderline. You know, some people say 48 hours. I think it
 Q. 4 a.m.? A. Around there. Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? A. Right. Q. What is your opinion as to the first time seizures presented with this child? A. 2:30 in the morning. Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I guess the question is, there is an incident when the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's probably what you are referring to. You know, I think if that was a seizure due to infection, the child would not have been stable for the ensuing, you know, eight or ten hours. And the nurse's notes and the nurses' deposition in that incident reflect that after suctioning the child, the child returned to being, appeared normal to them within ten minutes. I don't think that's consistent with a seizure. 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct. Q. What do you attribute that to? A. The RH reaction. Q. Do you know whether or not most hospitals, when jaundice is present and they are attributing it to RH incompatibility, whether they engage in any type of serial blood counts? A. I don't know. Q. Would you call this an early onset group B strep infection? A. It's sort of on the borderline. You
 Q. 4 a.m.? A. Around there. Q. Between 3 and 4 a.m., shock? A. Right. Q. What is your opinion as to the first time seizures presented with this child? A. 2:30 in the morning. Q. And what's the basis of that opinion? A. Well, I think the description at 2:30 in the morning sounds typical for a seizure. I guess the question is, there is an incident when the mother was feeding the baby at 6:30. That's probably what you are referring to. You know, I think if that was a seizure due to infection, the child would not have been stable for the ensuing, you know, eight or ten hours. And the nurse's notes and the nurses' deposition in that incident reflect that after suctioning the child, the child returned to being, appeared normal to them within ten minutes. I don't think that's consistent with a seizure. Q. And what is it about the 2:30 a.m. 	 A. Sure. Q. And tell me if you feel that was normal. A. I believe it was, the white count was elevated, which is normal for newborns. The white count was 20.3 at 2210 on the 21st. Q. Okay. The white count was elevated? A. Correct. Q. Any other shifts or abnormalities? A. No. Q. This child was jaundice within the first 24 hours? A. Correct. Q. What do you attribute that to? A. The RH reaction. Q. Do you know whether or not most hospitals, when jaundice is present and they are attributing it to RH incompatibility, whether they engage in any type of serial blood counts? A. I don't know. Q. Would you call this an early onset group B strep infection? A. It's sort of on the borderline. You know, some people say 48 hours. I think it

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

r	
Page 33	Page 35
 Q. Do you have an opinion as to etiology of this pathogen? A. Yes. Q. What is it? A. Group B strep can be a normal colonizer of the birth canal and during normal vaginal delivery, children can become colonized and then subsequently become infected. Q. Would you categorize this as a typical presentation of a group B strep infection? A. I don't know if there is a prototype. I think it's consistent with the way newborns present at 48 to 72 hours. Q. So you feel this child became, was, had septicemia by 10 or 11 p.m. on the 23rd? A. I would say more between 11 and 12. Well, I think again, I guess septicemia is a clinical diagnosis. I think the bacteremia probably started around, you know, 11 or 12. It takes you know, again, bacteremia in and of itself doesn't make you sick. Usually it's the inflammatory response that produces the signs of sepsis and that takes 	 Q. Well, do you have any criticism of any of the caregivers here? A. No. Q. Whether a resident or a doctor or an attending? A. No. Q. Had IV antibiotics been started in this child by 7 p.m. on the 23rd, you are saying that you cannot state whether more likely than not that would have had an impact on this kid's clinical course? A. Correct. Q. And once again, what's the basis for that opinion? A. Again the MS. MOODY: Objection. Asked and answered, but go ahead, doctor. A the damages due to the inflammatory response, not the bacteria. So the only way to have no inflammatory response is to have no bacteria at all. It's not really the amount of bacteria, it's the inflammatory response in the cerebral spinal fluid that causes the damage. Q. Right. But isn't the size of the
 Page 34 a few hours. You have to manufacture inflammatory mediators. There is a process that takes three or four hours. Q. Well, when was the signs of sepsis first apparent to you in the chart? A. Obviously at 2:30 the child appeared ill to the caregivers. Q. I think you told me earlier that's when meningitis had already set in as well; correct? A. Correct. Q. So is it routine that a child, a newborn will strike that. Is it unusual that a newborn will not demonstrate any signs of sepsis prior to the first signs of meningitis? A. They can often occur simultaneously. You know, I think in this case the pediatrician that was called initially suspected intraabdominal infection based upon the note and based upon the antibiotics it shows. Q. What time was that? A. At 3:30 in the morning. Q. You mean the resident? A. The resident, correct. 	 Page 36 quantity of the inflammatory response in many ways dependent on the number of bacteria present at the time antibiotics are given? A. That's one factor. Q. Okay. And are you familiar with any type of doubling rate, or doubling time for antibiotics or excuse me, for pathogens? A. You know, I think Dr. Faix was asked about this. I think I have the same answer he does; that I don't have a specific doubling time for group B strep. Q. Can we agree, doctor, that the longer a bacteria is present in a child's bloodstream, the more bacteria will grow? A. In general, yes. Q. Can we agree, doctor, that it's much better to treat sepsis early rather than later for relative to outcome? A. As a general statement, that's true. A lot of patients are there is some data that the patients are going to do poorly in the first 24 to 48 hours. And you know, antibiotics don't change that. That's why there has been so much research over the years looking for other therapies; that antibiotics alone don't do it.

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

ſ	
Page 37	Page 39
 So the patients are going to have the worst outcome. The data isn't that convincing antibiotics make a difference. In general I would agree with the statement, however. Q. And the same question relative to meningitis. The earlier you treat meningitis, the better the outcome, in general? A. Again, I would respond the same way. People in kids, hemophilus influenza, the meningitis used to be a severe problem before there was a successful vaccine, and despite antibiotics given early, a lot of children did poorly and there was a lot of research on steroids, for instance, because antibiotics alone didn't seem to be the answer, despite, you know, when they were given. Q. So you agree in general that the earlier you treat meningitis, the better the outcome, or you disagree with that general statement? 	 a positive blood culture for group B strep. Yes, 3-24, 0300, group B strep. Q. Any other data given to you in that culture other than that it was positive for group B strep? The number of colonies or the severity of that infection? A. No. Q. Okay. A. Not on this page, nothing like that. Q. Okay. Would you look at the CSF. When was the CSF sample? A. The CSF sample looks like it was obtained on 3-24 at 3:30 in the afternoon. Q. And what were the results of that? A. It says a rare colony identification confirmed, which would indicate that there wasn't a lot of bacteria in the CSF at that time. Q. Could you go over the variables or the counts that are noted in the CSF and tell me if there are any abnormalities on them?
 A. In a general statement with the, you know, the provisos that I gave; that it's not a cut and dry situation. Q. But in general, you agree with it? 	 A. You are talking about the chemistries? Q. Yes. A. Okay. So the protein looks like the
Page 38 1 A. Correct. 2 Q. What is your recollection of what, 3 since you don't take of newborns, what a newborn 4 fever is? 5 A. It's 100, 100.4. 6 Q. Now, is that by rectal temperature or 7 axillary? 8 A. By rectal. 9 Q. Is the rectal temperature generally 10 higher than what the axillary temperature is in 11 a newborn? 12 A. Yes. 13 Q. Is it generally one degree or have 14 you heard that range? 15 A. Well, I think again, this comes 16 out both with kids and adults. I think a lot of 17 that data, a lot of that idea is based on old 18 data. With modern digital temperatures done	Page 40 1 24th at almost 5:00 o'clock was 340 and the 2 glucose was 14. 3 Q. Protein 340 and glucose 14? 4 A. Correct. 5 Q. All right. Can you draw any 6 conclusions from those two chemistry values as 7 to how long that bacteria had been present? 8 A. You can't. And again, I think these 9 values were taken more than 12 hours after the 10 child became III. So it's impossible to you 11 can't draw any line. There is no linear 12 relationship between how high the protein is and 13 the time. This shows a marked inflammatory 14 response. And this is about 12 hours after the 15 child became III. 16 Q. Any other abnormalities other than 17 the protein and glucose?
19 correctly, it's probably not a degree, it's	18 A. The white cell count was 7900.

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

SEPTEMBER 9, 2002

KEITH B. ARMITAGE, M.D.

Stalma v. Toledo Hospital

Page 41 1 was positive and the CSF. 2 Q. Did you mention in your notes 3 something about CSF having a bloody result? In 4 your notes right in front of you there. I 5 thought I heard that earlier in the deposition. 6 A. No. It's CSF and blood culture 7 positive for group B strep. 8 Q. I misunderstood you. 9 A. CSF, blood is what my little scribble 10 there says. 11 Q. Okay. Doctor, are you familiar with 12 any literature that stands for the proposition 13 of how long bacteria, bacteremia will be present 14 in group B strep, likely to be present in group	Page 43 1 AFFIDAVIT 2 I have read the foregoing transcript from 3 page 1 through 42 and note the following 4 corrections: 5 PAGE LINE REQUESTED CHANGE 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14
 14 In group B strep, likely to be present in group 15 B strep before it develops and goes on to 16 meningitis? 17 A. No. 18 MR. BECKER: That's all I have. 19 MS. MOODY: John, do you have any 20 questions? 21 MR. WASUNG: No. Thank you. 22 MS. MOODY: Doctor, you have right to 23 read the deposition and sign if you would like 24 to do that. 25 THE WITNESS: Whatever is 	15 16 17 KEITH B. ARMITAGE, M.D. 18 19 20 Subscribed and sworn to before me this 21 day of , 2002. 22 23 Notary Public 24 25 My commission expires
Page 42 1 appropriate. 2 MS. MOODY: We will reserve 3 signature. 4 MR. BECKER: Thank you for your 5 time, doctor. 6 7 (Deposition concluded at 9:05 a.m.) 8 (Signature not waived.) 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	1 CERTIFICATE 2 State of Ohlo, 3 SS: 5 County of Cuyahoga. 6 I, Vivian L. Gordon, a Notary Public within and for the State of Ohlo, duly commissioned and 9 qualified, do hereby certify that the within named KEITH B. ARMITAGE, M.D. was by me first 10 duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth in the cause 11 aforesid; that the testimony as above set forth was by me reduced to stenotypy, afterwards 12 transcribed, and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of the testimony. 13 I do further certify that this deposition 14 was taken at the time and place specified and was completed without adjournment; that I am not 15 a relative or attorney for either party or otherwise interested in the event of this 16 action. I am not, nor is the court reporting firm with which 1 am affiliated, under a 17 contract as defined in Civil Rule 28 (D). 18 N WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and afficed my seal of office at Cleveland, 19 Ohio, on this 10th day of September, 2002. 10 Mathem Mas of September, 2002. 12 Within and for the State of Ohio 13 Within and f

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

Page 45 I INDEX 2 DEPOSITION OF KEITH B. ARMITAGE, M.D. 3 BY MR. BECKER:	

12 (Page 45)

SEPTEMBER 9, 2002

Page 1

1				
Α	along 14:6	attributing 32:18	41:15 43:20	35:2
abbreviations 7:8	already 34:9	authored 3:21 4:24	began 26:2	case 1:6 4:3,25 5:4
abdomen 7:19 8:4,7	although 21:24	available 28:14,16	behalf 1:16 2:2,7,11	10:15 14:2,15,18
abdominal 25:9	amount 35:22	Avenue 2:4,9,13	4:13 12:10,24	14:20 15:2,8 20:3
able 28:4,18	amounts 28:16	avoided 13:24	13:17,21 14:11	26:18 28:19 29:17
abnormalities 32:9	amp 7:20,21	18:13	being 3:3 4:8 8:4	34:18
39:21 40:16,20	answer 8:14,23 9:7	axillary 38:7,10	24:7 30:21	cases 11:5,10,23
abnormally 26:17	17:2 18:23 36:9	a.m 1:22 7:12 26:20	believe 11:9 25:11	12:1,5,9,13,19
about 4:16 10:22	37:16	26:23 29:25 30:2	32:4	13:16,20 14:1,9
13:15 23:21 27:7	answered 19:1	30:4,24 42:7	best 9:6	14:11,14 18:3
30:24 31:9,15	35:17		better 36:17 37:8	21:12
36:9 39:22 40:14	antibiotic 13:24	B	37:19	categorize 33:9
41:3	antibiotics 17:22	B 1:11,14 3:1,6	between 12:1 17:15	category 32:25
above 1:23 44:11	18:11 19:6,9,11	13:17 25:13 32:22	18:22 23:9 30:4	causation 10:16,18
accompanied 6:17	19:13,17,21 22:20	33:5,10 36:11	33:17 40:12	10:21 15:6,7
accurate 5:21 15:4	34:21 35:7 36:3,7	39:1,2,5 40:24,25	bilirubin 7:14	16:24
action 44:16	36:22,25 37:3,13	41:7,14,15 43:17	24:23	cause 16:11 27:4,6
active 11:22	37:15	44:9 45:2	billi 7:18	44:10
actually 24:4 28:10	antibody 7:13	baby 30:13	birth 9:12 19:9 33:6	caused 20:1
29:14	antigen 40:25	back 5:17,23 6:12	bit 10:23	causes 27:16 35:24
Adderral 7:23	anybody 19:12,19	6:20 8:3 17:16	blankets 7:17	CBC 31:23
adjournment 44:14	anything 6:24 10:5	23:22 29:13 31:2	blood 7:15 15:22,22	cell 27:17 40:18
administration	11:21	31:6	15:24,25 16:1,6	cells 40:21
13:23 17:21	apparent 34:5	backflow 27:15,18	21:2,3,6,12 22:15	cerebral 22:10
adult 24:13,17	appear 3:21	background 5:5	25:25 26:8,13,14	28:24 29:2 35:23
adults 38:16	appearance 14:22	bacteremia 21:20	26:16 27:5,6,9,17	certainly 15:21
AFFIDAVIT 43:1	APPEARANCES	21:24 22:2 26:11	29:1 32:19 38:22	16:6 18:5
affiliated 44:16	2:1	33:20,23 41:13	39:1 41:6,9	certainty 18:17,22
affixed 44:18	appeared 10:23	bacteremic 21:21	bloodstream 36:13	19:2,20
aforesaid 44:11	30:21 34:6	28:20	bloody 41:3	CERTIFICATE
after 8:8 17:22	appropriate 42:1	bacteria 20:1 21:2	body's 21:15 22:5	44:1
27:15 30:1,20	arched 31:2	21:3,6 29:1 35:19	borderline 32:23	certified 3:4
40:9,14	Armitage 1:11,14	35:21,22 36:2,13	both 38:16	certify 44:9,13
afternoon 39:13	3:1,6,10,12 6:8	36:14 39:17 40:7	brain 22:10	cetera 16:12
afterwards 44:11	43:17 44:9 45:2	40:23 41:13	breakdown 12:1	change 36:23 43:5
again 6:6 23:11	around 15:15,16,22	Barclay 3:10	brief 6:25	charge 4:6
25:22 26:6 31:4	25:11 26:2 30:3	Barry 2:16	bring 5:8	chart 27:24 34:5
33:18,22 35:13,15	33:20	based 15:12 18:1	brush 21:23	charted 25:10
37:9 38:15 40:8	arrow 7:20	31:5 34:20,21	Buganski 2:11 9:16	check 28:2,5
aggressive 25:19	articles 3:20 4:23	38:17	31:14	chemistries 39:23
29:7	9:20	Basing 17:25	Building 1:21 2:4,8	chemistry 40:6
ago 14:15 28:9 29:6	asked 19:8 35:16	basis 17:24 20:24	by-product 20:11	chest 22:17
agree 17:18,23	36:8	26:4 30:9 35:13	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Chicago 13:8
18:12 22:18 36:12	Associates 13:6	became 33:15	<u>C</u>	child 8:9 16:4 18:14
36:16 37:4,18,25	assume 9:4 10:25	40:10,15	call 31:11 32:21	19:8,12 20:6
agreement 1:20	28:1	Becker 2:3,3 3:7	called 1:15 3:2 7:23	24:22 25:2,17,20
ahead 35:17	attached 8:6	5:13 6:5 41:18	31:10 34:19	28:20 29:8,10,11
al 1:7	attempt 8:19	42:4 45:3 Booker Hoves 2:4	came 8:8	29:20 30:7,16,20
alert 7:18	attending 35:5	Becker-Hayes 2:4	canal 33:6	30:20 31:2,4,6,10 31:13,23 32:11
algorithm 24:16	attorney 12:2,3 44:15	become 33:7,8	care 4:15,20 10:15 15:3 23:24 24:1,8	33:15 34:6,12
algorithms 24:9	attorneys 13:3	before 1:17 8:12 10:20 12:16 16:21	24:15	35:8 40:10,15
almost 40:1	attribute 25:6	25:23 28:20 37:11	caregivers 34:7	children 24:1 33:7
alone 36:25 37:16	32:14	23.23 28:20 37:11	Laicgivers 34./	37:13
	32.17	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	L1.1L

SEPTEMBER 9, 2002

Page 2

1				
Children's 23:25	contributed 20:7	damages 35:18	difficult 8:23	29:9 44:15
child's 15:14,19,22	convincing 37:2	data 31:5 36:20	digital 38:18	elevated 26:12 32:5
16:13 24:20,25	core 29:13	37:2 38:17,18	Diplomate 1:18	32:7
29:13 36:13	corner 7:22	39:3	directly 28:25	elevation 16:2 27:4
Civil 3:3 44:17	correct 5:22 10:19	date 1:23 28:5	director 4:9,9	Elyria 2:5
CI011505 1:6	14:8 15:5 17:13	day 1:22 15:19 16:2	disagree 37:20	ended 15:9
Cleveland 1:21,21	21:7,17 22:21	43:21 44:19	disease 4:2,5	engage 22:24 24:9
11:5 14:14 44:18	24:13,14 25:8	days 7:14 27:10,12	diseases 4:4 5:6	32:19
clinical 4:11 15:14	29:18,19 32:8,13	27:13	15:13	engaged 11:1 23:14
16:13,19 18:3,4	34:10,11,25 35:12	decrease 27:13	distended 7:19 8:4	enough 8:20 9:1
20:21,25 21:4,9	38:1 40:4,25	decreased 29:23	8:7	31:9
21:17 22:4 24:25	44:12	defendant 2:7,11	distention 25:10	ensuing 30:17 enter 28:12
26:7 33:19 35:11	corrections 43:4	4:13 Defendente 1.9	distinguish 21:19	entity 22:4
clinically 21:24	correctly 38:19	Defendants 1:8	division 4:2,4,5	environment 29:10
22:1	counsel 1:15,20	defense 12:5	doctor 3:8,16 5:8	episodes 16:14
close 19:2 colonies 39:5	count 7:15 15:22,24	defervesced 25:3 define 20:24	5:18 6:13 8:12 9:3 17:1,14 18:10	escaping 13:11
colonies 39:5 colonized 33:7	16:3,11,18 26:13	defined 44:17	20:19 28:19 35:4	especially 20:23
	26:14,16,19,20,21	definition 21:4,18	35:17 36:12,16	21:7
colonizer 33:6 colony 39:15	26:23,25 27:5,6 27:11,13,17 32:4	21:18 22:3	41:11,22 42:5	ESQ 2:3,8,13
Colorado 24:6	32:6,7 40:18	definitions 20:19	documents 10:8	estimate 11:12 23:8
come 5:1 13:13	counts 16:6 26:8	degree 18:16,25	doing 10:24 11:7	et 1:7 16:12
31:11	32:19 39:20	19:20 38:13,19,20	22:15	etiology 33:1
comes 18:3 38:15	County 1:2 14:3	delivery 17:19 33:7	done 31:23 38:18	evaluating 22:13
commencing 1:22	44:5	demonstrate 34:15	double 7:16,18	event 44:15
commission 43:25	couple 10:24 16:14	DeNardis 2:12	doubling 36:6,6,10	events 9:12
44:24	course 15:14 25:1	Denver 23:25 24:2	down 6:22 7:6 8:24	ever 23:14 24:12,15
commissioned 44:8	35:11	24:3	18:3 26:11,14,22	28:4
common 1:1 31:19	court 1:1 44:16	department 4:7	Dr 31:14 36:8	every 21:22
complete 5:8 9:6	covered 40:19	dependent 36:2	drastically 27:9	evidence 16:15
10:6	co-authored 3:21	depo 13:14	draw 40:5,11	29:23
completed 44:14	4:24	deposed 3:4 8:11	drawn 17:22 38:22	evidenced 25:24
compliance 15:3	co-training 4:9	deposition 1:11,14	38:25	exact 23:12
computer 11:22	crank 16:11	3:12 6:8 8:1 9:10	drew 15:22,25 16:1	exactly 7:6
concept 20:20	created 24:12	9:22 14:17 30:19	drop 26:16 27:6,9	exam 7:18
concerned 10:10	criticism 35:1	41:5,23 42:7	Drutchas 2:12	examination 1:16
31:9	CSF 7:15 19:24	44:13 45:2	dry 37:24	3:2,6
conclude 12:19	20:9 27:18 39:10	depositions 9:13	due 25:2 29:8 30:16	exclusively 12:22
17:9	39:11,12,17,20	18:2 19:8	35:18	excuse 36:7
concluded 42:7	41:1,3,6,9	description 30:10	duly 3:3 44:8,10	exhibit 3:13,17 6:4
conclusions 40:6	culture 17:11 22:16	31:8	during 13:14 15:19	6:9,14 7:6 45:4,5
condition 22:6	38:21 39:1,4 41:6	despite 37:12,16	33:6	experience 4:15,18
conditions 21:9	cultures 17:22	develop 29:20	E	15:13
confirmed 39:16	21:12 22:15	developed 24:15		experienced 31:13
consequences 18:14	cut 37:24	develops 41:15	earlier 19:1,7 34:8	expert 4:12 11:4 12:24
19:13 consistent 11:13	Cuyahoga 14:3	diagnosis 33:19 Diane 9:14	37:7,19 41:5 early 29:22 32:21	experts 18:2
30:23 33:13 40:24	44:5 CV 3:19	Dick 13:7	36:17 37:13	expires 43:25 44:24
Constance 9:15	cytokines 16:10	difference 18:22	educational 4:7	explain 7:7 26:25
contacted 12:20	Lytokines 10.10	19:10 37:3	effect 13:23	explanation 24:19
contacts 12:1	D	different 19:15	effective 19:17	vapinimiton 23.17
contains 22:10	D 2:8 44:17	20:2	eight 30:18	F
contract 44:17	damage 20:1 35:24	differential 15:24	either 7:15 13:3	factor 36:4
Concrace TT.1/	umme 20.1 55.27	26:20 27:1		
I				<u>I</u>

Page 3

r				
faculty 4:2	29:10 40:6 43:2	handing 3:16	incompatibility	J
fair 8:20 9:1,7	front 41:4	handle 4:14	32:18	jaundice 32:11,17
10:25,25 12:18	full 3:9	hands-on 4:18,20	increase 7:14 27:17	Jay 9:16
17:8	fully 8:24 9:5	handwriting 7:2	increased 16:11	John 2:13 41:19
fairly 17:4	fulminant 25:14	happens 18:1	INDEX 45:1	Johnson 9:15
Faix 9:17 36:8	29:4,6	hard 19:23	indicate 9:3 39:16	Joseph 1:4 9:14
fall 25:18	further 44:13	having 22:2 41:3	infected 33:8	jotting 7:11
falls 32:25		head 8:24	infection 14:4	jottings 8:5
familiar 26:10 27:2	G	hear 16:16	15:15 16:6,15,20	journal 9:20
27:14,21 36:5	gave 13:22 37:23	beard 38:14 41:5	20:23 21:11,15	JR 1:4
41:11	GBS 7:16	help 17:7	22:6,14 25:2,14	judgment 18:4
familiarity 17:25	general 27:2,10	helped 16:20	26:11,13 27:3,8	Judith 9:16
far 10:10,13	36:15,19 37:4,8	hemophilus 37:10	27:10,12 29:4,7	June 44:24
feed 8:1	37:18,20,22,25	hereinafter 3:4	30:16 32:22 33:11	just 4:14 5:25 6:21
feeding 30:13	generally 38:9,13	hereunto 44:18	34:20 39:6	7:10 8:12 10:18
feel 13:14 32:2	gent 7:20	Hersch 2:16 5:15	infections 26:16	13:15 14:25 15:6
33:15	Gilbert 9:17	5:17 6:12	infectious 4:2,4,5	19:2,23 20:8,11
fever 38:4	give 11:25 13:2	high 24:23 27:11	5:6 15:13	21:8 23:23 28:9
few 5:22 11:2,5,6	14:17 15:10 18:16	40:12	inflammation 20:8	28:18
27:10 28:9 29:6	23:4,8,12	higher 38:10	20:15 22:8	juxtaposition 8:5
34:1 40:21	given 18:5,8,11	him 31:11	inflammatory	
file 5:9,19	24:25 36:3 37:13	Honestly 7:9	15:21 16:5,7,10	<u> </u>
final 38:24	37:17 39:3	hospital 1:7 2:7	19:24,25 20:22	keep 11:20
find 12:11 28:4	Givens 9:17	3:25 4:6 9:13	21:10 22:5 25:25	Keith 1:11,14 3:1,6
38:21	giving 5:18 9:6	15:4 22:24 23:25	33:24 34:2 35:19	3:10 43:17 44:9
firm 44:16	glucose 40:2,3,17	24:3,5	35:21,23 36:1	45:2
first 3:3 14:13 20:6	go 5:13 14:20 20:18	hospitals 1:20	40:13	kids 20:2 37:10
25:10 27:10 30:6	35:17 39:19	17:20 32:17	influenza 37:10	38:16
31:1,23 32:12	goes 26:13,14 41:15	hour 29:17,18	initial 20:12	kid's 35:10
34:5,16 36:22	going 6:3 8:3 9:4	hours 15:25 16:9,20	initially 10:11 27:4	kind 7:2 16:10
44:9	10:14 16:25 26:11	16:21 25:5,23	34:19	Kitch 2:12
fits 31:7	29:14 36:21 37:1	27:12 29:22 30:18	injury 13:24	know 5:23 7:9,10
five 11:18 12:24 fluid 22:10 28:25	Goldsmith 9:16	31:24 32:12,24	inoculated 28:25 Inside 13:5	8:11 9:24 10:13
29:2 35:24	good 3:8 7:18 9:8 Gordon 1:17 44:8	33:14 34:1,3 36:22 40:9,14		11:3 12:14,16,25
followed 22:19	44:22	Hypothetically	instability 24:20 25:7	13:11 14:2,13
following 43:3	grade 25:14	17:14 18:10	instance 37:15	16:4,13,21 19:7,7
follows 3:5	gram 40:22	17.14 10.10	institution 22:20	20:3,7 21:22
food 7:24	ground 8:13		insult 20:12	23:23 29:11 30:15
foregoing 43:2	group 13:17 25:13	idea 11:25 12:16	intense 16:5	30:17 31:4,6
44:12	32:22 33:5,10	23:1 29:12 38:17	intensive 23:24	32:16,20,24 33:12
form 17:1	36:11 39:1,2,5	identification 3:14	interested 44:15	33:20,22 34:18
forth 1:23 44:11	40:24,25 41:7,14	6:10 39:15	interests 5:2	36:8,22 37:17,23
found 13:21	41:14	identified 4:12	interpret 7:1,5	knowledge 22:22
four 11:15 12:24	grow 36:14	identify 3:18 6:15	intraabdominal	23:5 28:15
15:25 16:9,21	guess 12:4 15:9	ill 34:7 40:10,15	34:20	L
34:3	17:4 19:3,19	impact 35:10	invoke 26:24	L 1:17 44:8,22
frame 26:3	30:12 33:18	important 8:15,22	involve 13:17	lady 8:24
free 13:14		impossible 40:10	involved 14:3	last 4:20 10:24 11:2
frequently 18:5	H	inartfully 8:18	issue 15:2 18:19	11:6,15 16:17
23:3,6	habit 6:22	incident 30:12,19	28:8	later 13:12 15:25
from 6:20 7:5,25	Hampshire 13:9	include 17:21	issues 12:16	36:17
9:12 12:20 14:14	hand 44:18	includes 4:8	IV 18:10 22:20 35:7	leaves 15:6
17:8 20:13 21:20				
L	I	1	1	I

Page 4

left 16:1,12 26:23	majority 18:7	might 14:5	newborn 4:20	office 44:18
legal 19:4	22:19 23:11 25:4	mind 5:1 25:21	23:15,16 29:21	often 21:11 22:23
less 20:15 38:20	31:21	mine 7:2	31:17 34:13,14	34:17
let 17:7,16	make 8:17 14:22	minutes 28:9 29:6	38:3,11	Ohio 1:2,19,21 2:5
letter 5:23 6:16,20	33:23 37:3	29:15,17,18 30:22	newborns 4:15	2:8,9,14 3:2 11:5
10:7	manufacture 34:1	Mishkind 2:3	31:20 32:5 33:13	12:13 13:4 14:12
Let's 6:5 20:18,19	many 11:10,16 36:1	missing 28:10	38:3	44:3,8,19,23
levels 26:17	March 24:21 27:25	mistaken 28:17	next 16:2 25:5	Okay 6:25 7:4 8:21
life 31:24	mark 6:3	misunderstood	NIC 23:6 24:8	9:2,18 10:20
lights 7:16 24:23	marked 3:13,17 6:9	41:8	night 8:9 15:16	13:13 14:9 15:6
like 6:21 7:2,15	6:14 40:13 45:4,5	modern 38:18	nods 8:24	16:23 17:7 21:19
39:9,12,25 40:22	Marshall 2:7	moment 5:14	None 5:1	25:6,17 28:23
41:23	matter 4:13,25 5:19	MONDAY 1:12	Norma 9:13	29:8 32:7 36:5
likely 18:12 20:10	May 5:11	monitored 16:4	normal 7:17 15:20	39:8,10,25 41:11
23:9 28:20 30:25	maybe 14:16	MOODY 2:8 16:25	15:24,24 25:4	old 38:17
35:9 41:14	McKee 9:14	28:3,15 35:16	26:8,19,19,25	older 14:4
Linda 9:15	mean 7:10 12:15	41:19,22 42:2	27:1 30:21 31:14	once 35:13
line 40:11 43:5	20:20 21:1 22:12	more 13:12 17:3	32:3,5 33:5,6	one 14:2,13 19:7
linear 40:11	23:2,23 34:24	18:12 25:19 33:17	northeast 11:5	24:9 25:14,14
lines 14:6 22:9	means 7:13 21:16	35:9 36:14 40:9	northern 14:12	26:21 28:16 36:4
listed 40:22	22:13,15	morning 3:8 15:23	Notary 1:18 43:23	38:13
literature 27:21	med 28:4	16:8,22 25:12,24	44:8,22	only 35:20
41:12	mediators 16:10	26:9,19 27:1	note 30:25 34:20	onset 32:21
little 19:15 20:15	34:2	29:22 30:8.11	43:3	open 15:9
41:9	medical 4:22 6:17	34:23 38:23	noted 5:20 39:20	opinion 10:15
live 14:22	9:11,24 10:2,11	most 9:6 12:13	notes 5:20 6:19 7:7	13:22 17:9 18:15
locate 28:18	12:2 18:16,25	17:20 21:10,12	7:25 30:18 41:2,4	18:18,24 19:5,16
logs 11:21	19:20 23:16,22	29:16 32:16	nothing 39:9 44:10	19:18,21 26:5
long 14:15 29:12	24:6	mother 7:13 8:1	notice 6:2	30:6,9 33:1 35:14
40:7 41:13	medical/legal 10:22	30:13	notwithstanding	opinions 10:21 15:1
longer 36:12	10:24 11:1,8	mouth 7:24	16:14	15:7 16:23
look 5:11,19 6:13	medication 27:25	much 20:7 36:16,24	number 23:4 36:2	opportunity 5:19
6:23 15:12,13,18	28:17	must 7:25	39:5	ordered 19:14
15:20 26:18 39:10	medicine 4:8,10	M.D 1:11,15 3:1,6	nurse 7:23	Osterhut 9:15
looked 6:1 31:10,13	meeting 22:3	43:17 44:9 45:2	nursery 22:23	other 4:17,21 5:5
looking 20:5 26:6,7	Mellhorn 2:7		nurses 15:4 25:10	13:13 16:23 32:9
36:24	member 4:1	N	30:19 31:8,9,13	36:24 39:3,4
looks 7:15 39:12,25	membrane 22:9	name 3:9 10:23	31:14	40:16,16
40:22	meninges 22:9	14:1	nurse's 30:18	otherwise 9:4 44:15
lot 4:17 11:1,4 20:6	meningitis 20:14	named 44:9	l	out 12:13 19:2
36:20 37:13,14	22:7,8 25:21,22	names 13:2,10,13	0	27:18 38:16
38:16,17 39:17	26:1,12 27:15	Nancy 2:8 10:7	oath 8:15	outcome 20:8 36:18
Lott 9:17	28:21 31:5 34:9	28:13	object 16:25	37:2,8,20
low 25:14 26:17	34:16 37:7,7,11	necessarily 21:1	Objection 35:16	outside 12:20 13:1
27:9	37:19 41:16	need 10:8,21	obtained 39:13	13:4
LP 7:14	mention 41:2	needed 10:5,11	obviously 15:10	over 5:24 20:18
LUCAS 1:2	meritorious 12:12	negative 17:12 23:9	20:4 31:9 34:6	27:12,12 36:24
Lucinda 9:14	13:22	23:12	occur 21:3 23:6	39:19
	MICHAEL 2:3	neonatal 23:24	34:17	overall 4:6 16:13
M	microbiologic	nervous 6:21	occurred 16:15	overbundling 29:9
made 12:1 19:10	21:18	neurologist 20:4	occurring 16:20	overheated 29:8
Madison 2:9,13	middle 2:4 8:9	never 28:18	occurs 21:11 23:3	overwhelming
mainly 11:4	midnight 26:2	New 13:9	off 5:13,15 6:6	26:15 27:8
	I	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>

SEPTEMBER 9, 2002

Page 5

T	I			
own 4:17,21	please 3:9,18 6:6,15	Public 1:19 43:23	red 40:21	reviewed 9:10,11
o'clock 1:22 15:16	7:8 8:25 13:14	44:8,22	reduced 44:11	9:13 12:10 13:17
38:22 40:1	28:5	pull 31:24	refer 29:3	13:20
	pleased 8:19	purposes 3:14 6:10	reference 8:3 11:3	reviewing 12:17
P	point 7:10	20:24	referring 20:22	14:9
page 28:16 38:25	poorly 36:21 37:14	pursuant 1:19	30:14	RH 7:13 32:15,18
39:9 43:3,5	posed 9:5	put 19:9	reflect 7:7 11:22	Richard 9:16 13:9
part 21:8	position 3:24	p.m 7:23 17:11,15	16:7 29:14 30:19	Rick 13:7
particular 17:19	positive 7:16 21:12	17:16 18:11 25:1	reflected 5:3	right 6:2 11:10 12:8
28:4	23:9 39:1,4 41:1	31:15 33:16 35:8	reflects 22:5	14:25 20:18 22:7
party 44:15	41:7		Registered 1:18	28:7 30:5 35:25
pathogen 33:2	potential 22:14	Q	regurgitate 31:20	40:5 41:4,22
pathogenesis 26:25	potentially 4:24 5:3	qualified 44:9	relationship 40:12	Roger 9:17
pathogens 36:7	11:20	quantity 36:1	relative 15:2 26:6	role 4:11,11
pathway 24:9,16	practice 24:13	question 7:24 8:14	36:18 37:6 44:15	Rose 9:15
patients 21:21 22:1	preceding 16:19	8:16,17,20 9:5	relatively 23:3	Rosenbaum 13:9
24:17 36:20,21	predict 19:23	15:10 17:1 19:1,8	31:12	rotation 23:19 24:4
37:1	preparation 9:10	20:14 30:12 31:15	relevant 4:25 5:4	roughly 12:4 18:11
patient's 12:2	9:21	37:6	remember 14:5	26:1 29:25
pediatric 4:10 8:8	present 2:15 32:17	questions 9:1 41:20	removed 29:10	routine 34:12
20:4 23:19 24:4	33:14 36:2,13	quite 10:23 16:2	rendering 10:14	rule 14:10 44:17
pediatrician 24:24	40:7,23 41:13,14	R	15:1 noncet 16:16	rules 3:3 8:13
34:19	presentation 25:19		repeat 16:16	<u> </u>
pediatricians 29:16	33:10	raised 28:8	rephrase 8:20	same 18:23 36:9
pediatrics 22:14	presented 30:7	random 5:25	Reporter 1:18	37:6,9
Peds 7:17	pretty 11:13 24:11 Proviously 21:12	range 38:14	reporting 44:16 REQUESTED 43:5	sample 39:12
people 12:20 13:8,9	Previously 31:12	rare 39:15	requires 29:1	sampled 39:12
13:10 20:23 21:8	prior 34:15	rate 36:6 rather 36:17	requires 29:1 research 5:2,7 9:18	sampled 59:11
32:24 37:10	probability 18:22 18:25		20:24 21:8 36:24	saw 0.0 saying 21:5 35:8
percent 12:4,5,9,15 18:6	probably 4:22 7:3	ratio 23:9,13 Raymond 9:15	37:14	says 7:12,17,20,21
percentage 12:11	11:15,16 12:14	reaction 32:15	reserve 4:3 42:2	7:22 8:2 38:25
perfusion 29:24	13:25 14:16 15:15	read 7:23 41:23	residency 4:8	39:15 41:10
periods 15:20 16:19	21:23 25:23 30:14	43:2	resident 8:8 24:7	school 4:22 23:17
personal 5:20 6:19	33:20 38:19,20	reading 18:1	31:10 34:24,25	23:22 24:6
Peter 13:5	problem 37:11	real 31:1	35:4	scribble 41:9
phenomenon 26:10	Procedure 3:3	really 19:25 27:16	respond 8:25 37:9	scribblings 5:22,25
27:3,14	process 34:2	35:22	response 15:21	seal 44:18
phone 2:11 10:7	produces 33:25	reasonable 18:16	16:5,5,7 19:24,25	see 26:18,21,22
photo 7:18	program 4:10	18:25 19:20	20:22 21:10,11,14	31:11 40:22
phototherapy 25:7	programs 4:7	recall 23:21,25 24:2	21:15 22:5 25:25	seem 37:16
29:9	progresses 27:4	24:7 25:9 28:6,7	33:24 35:19,21,23	seemed 20:5
phrase 22:11	proposition 41:12	28:11	36:1 40:14	seen 27:20
phrased 8:18	protein 39:25 40:3	recent 3:19	rest 12:25	seizure 30:11,16,23
pick 10:6	40:12,17	Recess 5:16	restate 8:20	31:16
place 27:16 44:14	protocol 17:19	recollection 38:2	result 38:21,24 41:3	seizures 20:6,7,11
plaintiff 1:5,16 2:2	prototype 33:12	record 5:14,15,17	resulted 20:13	20:13,16 30:7
12:6,10,23,24	provide 16:14	6:6,12 7:4 14:25	results 23:10 31:25	31:1
13:17,21	provided 3:2 10:12	20:5	39:14	sense 8:17
plaintiffs 14:11	providers 9:25 10:3	records 6:1,17,23	returned 30:21	sent 6:18
plaintiff's 3:17 6:14	provider's 12:2	9:11 10:11 12:17	review 6:18,25 8:12	sentence 16:17
12:19 13:3	provisos 37:23	27:25 28:10,13,17	9:20 10:6 11:11	sepsis 17:10,15,20
PLEAS 1:1	provoked 22:6	rectal 38:6,8,9	12:20 14:11,14	20:20,21 21:2,5

Page 6

21:10,10,16,20,22	sources 22:14	successfully 27:11	8:7 12:15,22	trying 4:14 19:2
22:3,4,11,13,24	specific 5:7 6:23	suck 7:19	13:11 14:3 15:12	turn 5:24
23:6,10,11,14,22	14:5 17:3,5 36:10	suctioning 30:20	15:14 16:1,12,18	two 7:13 24:23
24:1,10,16,18	specifically 27:23	Suite 2:9,13	18:3,15 19:6,10	25:13,23 26:21
25:2 31:18 33:25	28:6	suppose 6:3 31:21	19:11,11,12,19,23	27:7 40:6
34:4,15 36:17	specified 44:14	sure 5:12 7:13 8:6	20:3,16 22:18	type 29:3 32:19
September 1:12	spectrum 21:9	13:5 17:5 23:2	23:19 24:25 25:1	36:6
44:19	25:16,18	24:11 29:5 32:1	25:16,22 26:17,24	types 25:13
septicemia 33:16	spent 23:23	38:25 40:21	27:7 28:3,16,19	typical 30:11 33:10
33:19	spinal 22:10,16	suspected 24:1	28:24 29:6,16	
serial 32:19	28:25 29:2 35:24	34:19	30:1,10,15,22	U
session 8:14	spring 23:20	suspicion 18:4	31:4,12,19,24	unbundled 29:12
set 1:23 27:16 28:21	SS 44:4	sworn 3:4 43:20	32:24 33:13,18,19	under 1:16 8:15
34:9 44:11,18	stability 16:13,19	44:10	34:8,18 36:8,9	24:23 44:16
severe 18:13 37:11	26:7	systemic 21:9,14	38:15,16 40:8	understand 6:19
severity 39:6	stable 30:17		thought 24:24	8:16,25 18:21
sheet 28:5	stain 40:23	T	31:13 41:5	19:3
shift 16:1,12 26:23	Stalma 1:4 9:14,14	take 6:13 8:24 38:3	three 11:15 16:9,21	understanding
shifts 32:9	25:17	taken 1:17 40:9	25:23 31:24 34:3	24:22 25:15
shock 29:20 30:4	standard 10:15	44:14	through 29:1 43:3	understood 9:5
showed 40:23	15:3	takes 16:9 29:13	ticar 7:19	unit 23:6,24 24:8
shows 34:21 40:13	stands 41:12	33:22,25 34:3	time 4:20 8:4,6	University 1:20
sick 31:7 33:24	staph 14:4	taking 4:15 23:25	16:20 17:18 18:6	3:25 4:3,5 22:23
side 6:20	start 11:7 20:19	talk 10:21	18:7 21:22 22:19	24:5,5
sign 31:17,18 41:23	started 15:15 19:14	talked 10:2 31:14	23:23 25:5 26:3,7	unless 9:3
signature 42:3,8	25:23 33:20 35:7	talking 27:7 39:22	30:7 31:6 34:22	until 26:7
significance 6:24	starting 7:5	tap 22:16	36:3,6,10 39:18	unusual 34:14
significant 21:25	state 1:19 12:21,25	teaching 4:11	40:13 42:5 44:14	urine 22:16
22:2 27:16	13:1,3,4,5 35:9	teeth 21:23	timely 13:23	use 21:8 29:5
signs 15:19 25:4	44:3,8,23	tell 3:8,24 4:16,19	times 11:6 12:25	used 13:8 37:11
33:25 34:4,15,16	statement 17:8,24	8:19 9:9 13:15	31:22	usually 12:15 20:22
simply 20:11	36:19 37:5,21,22	15:7 32:2 39:20	timing 17:5	20:23 22:6,15
simultaneously	statute 1:17	tells 30:25	Timp 7:16	33:24
34:17	Stege 13:6,7,7 14:7	temperature 24:20	tissue 29:24	V
since 6:25 11:14	14:10,15	25:1,7 29:13 38:6	today 5:9 9:7 28:14	
14:9 23:16 28:8	stenotypy 44:11	38:9,10	today's 9:10,21	vaccine 37:12
38:3	steroids 37:15	temperatures 38:18	told 34:8	vaginal 33:7
sit 28:8	stiff 7:24 31:3	ten 11:12,18 30:18	Toledo 1:7 2:7,9,14	Valitutti 2:12
situation 37:24	still 10:7 20:16	30:22	top 7:5	values 40:6,9
size 35:25	stipulation 28:12	term 20:21 21:8	track 11:20 31:6	variables 20:25
slowly 7:5 some 7:25 12:15	stop 8:18	29:5	training 4:9,10 transcribed 44:12	39:19 various 18:2
20:18 21:23 29:23	strep 13:18 25:13 32:22 33:5,10	terms 11:4 19:4 29:14	transcript 43:2	various 18:2 vast 31:21
32:24 36:20 40:23	36:11 39:1,2,5	testify 44:10	transcription 44:12)
somehow 20:14	40:24,25 41:7,14	testimony 14:5	treat 24:23 27:11	verbally 8:23,25 versus 12:2 20:8
someone 19:22	41:15	44:11,12	36:17 37:7,19	very 8:15,22 31:7
something 23:2	strike 34:13	textbooks 9:21	treating 24:24	31:19,19
41:3	subject 4:25	thank 5:18 41:21	trending 26:22	videographer 2:16
sometime 15:15	Subscribed 43:20	42:4	trial 14:20,23 15:2	videotaped 1:11,14
sometimes 22:16	subsequent 9:12	therapies 36:25	Tried 8:1	Virginia 13:10
26:15 27:8	31:5	things 6:22 7:11	true 36:19 44:12	vitae 3:22 5:3
sort 4:6 32:23	subsequently 33:8	27:8	truth 44:10,10,10	vital 15:19 25:4
sounds 9:8 19:15	successful 37:12	think 5:6 6:16 7:17	try 13:11 14:14	Vivian 1:17 6:5
30:11	Gentertertertertertertert in die	ama 2.0 0.10 /.1/	15:10	* # * BOARS 4.1. / U.U
	l	1	1	1

SEPTEMBER 9, 2002

Page 7

1				<u> </u>
44:8,22	wouldn't 17:23	2004 44:24	7	
Vogarty 9:16	19:12 25:2,3	21st 32:6	7 7:15 26:23 35:8	
vomiting 31:17,18	write 10:7	2210 32:6	7:30 15:25 26:20	
Voudouris 13:6	writing 6:22	23rd 15:17,18	70 12:14	
vs 1:6	written 6:24	17:11,16 18:12	72 33:14	
	wrote 8:8	24:20 33:16 35:8	7900 40:18	
W		24 16:20 32:12		
Wagner 2:12	X	36:22	8	
waived 42:8	X 10:8	24th 8:10 15:23	8 44:24	
want 8:12,18 17:3	x-ray 22:17	27:25 29:23 40:1	8:00 1:22	
wasn't 11:16 31:15		28 44:17	80 12:14	
39:17	<u> </u>		5	
WASUNG 2:13	Yeah 6:21 17:4	3	9	
41:21	19:3,6	3 29:25 30:4	9 1:12 26:23 31:15	
way 7:6 15:11 21:7	year 11:8,10 23:18	3-21 7:12	9:05 42:7	
33:13 35:20 37:9	years 10:24 11:2,6	3-22 7:17	9:32 7:12	
ways 36:2	11:16 36:24	3-23 7:14,16,18	96 11:16,18	
WB 27:5	A	3-24 7:16,19 39:2	97 11:17,19	
Wearn 1:21	0	39:13	99 14:16	
week 20:6	0230 7:19	3:00 38:22		
well 4:19 7:1 10:15	0300 39:2	3:13 45:4		
13:13 17:16 19:15		3:30 15:23 16:8,21		
20:10,21 21:21		25:24 26:8,18		
26:15 27:2 30:10	1 3:13,17 43:3 45:4	27:1 34:23 39:13		
31:19 33:18 34:4	10 33:16	3:7 45:3		
34:9 35:1 38:15	10th 44:19	340 40:1,3		
were 6:17 9:6 10:11	10:30 8:2	4		
	100 18:6 38:5	4 17:10,15 30:2,4		
31:9 37:17 39:14 40:9,21	100.4 38:5	40 12:5,9		
West 13:10	100.6 7:14 11 33:16,17,20	400 7:21		
West 15.10 Western 4:3	11:00 15:15	405 2:13		
WHEREOF 44:18	11:15 8:2	419-243-4006 2:14	j	
white 7:14 16:3,11	1100 2:9	419-249-7100 2:10		
16:18 26:12,14,16	12 25:5 33:17,21	42 43:3		
26:19,20,21,23,25	40:9,14	420 2:9		
27:5,6,9,11,13,17	134 2:4	43604 2:9		
32:4,6,7 40:18	14 40:2,3	43604-1235 2:14		
whole 44:10	1500 2:13	440-323-7070 2:5		
witness 1:15 3:1	1985 23:20 24:2,11	44035 2:5	-	
12:23 41:25 44:18	1996 11:9,14	48 32:24 33:14		
woman 14:4		36:22		
word 29:11	2	100 May 101 May		
work 10:22,24 11:1	2 6:9,14 7:6,15 45:5	5		
11:8	2:30 25:1,11 29:25	5:00 40:1		
working 7:6 24:8	30:8,10,24 34:6			
workup 17:10,15	38:22	6		
17:21 22:11,13	20 11:12	6 7:23 17:10,15		
23:10,15,22	20.3 32:6	6:30 17:16 18:11		
workups 22:24	200 7:20	19:14,14 30:13		
23:6,11 24:10,16	2000 14:16	6:9 45:5		
worse 7:3	2002 1:12 43:21	60 12:4		
worst 37:1	44:19	60/40 12:7		
	ð			