

In The Matter Of:

*Doll, et al. VS. University Hospitals of
Cleveland, et al., No. 297828*

*Deposition of Clark H. Millikan, M.D.
November 6, 1997*

*Dennis A. Parise & Associates
Court Reporters
500 Park Plaza
1111 Chester Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 241-5950 FAX: (216) 241-5952*

*Original File millikan.txt, 78 Pages
Min-U-Script® File ID: 2060803796*

Word Index included with this Min-U-Script®

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

CUYAHOGA COUNTY

PATTY DOLL, ET AL.,)

Plaintiffs.)

vs.) Case No. 297828

UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS OF)

CLEVELAND, ET AL.,)

Defendants.)

DEPOSITION OF CLARK H. MILLIKAN, M.D.

Thursday, November 6, 1997

Deposition of CLARK H. MILLIKAN, M.D., called by the
Defendants for examination under the Ohio Rules of Civil
Procedure, taken before me, the undersigned, Mary Ann
Flynn, Registered Professional Reporter, a Notary Public
in and for the State of Ohio, at the offices of Becker &
Mishkind Co., L.P.A., Skylight Office Tower, Suite 660,
1660 West Second Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44113,
commencing at 11:10 a.m. the date and time above set
forth.

[1] CLARK H. MILLIKAN, M.D.
[2] called by the Defendants for examination under the Ohio
[3] Rules of Civil Procedure, after having been first duly
[4] sworn, as hereinafter certified, was examined and
[5] testified as follows:
[6] MR. MOSCARINO: The record should
[7] reflect this is discovery deposition of Dr.
[8] Clark H. Millikan who has been identified as
[9] an expert witness in the case of Doll versus
[10] University Hospitals of Cleveland.
[11]
[12] (Defendant's Exhibits A and B
[13] were marked for identification.)

EXAMINATION

BY MR. MOSCARINO:

[14]
[15]
[16] C : Dr. Millikan, we met just a second ago. My name
[17] is George Moscarino and I'm the attorney for
[18] University Hospitals of Cleveland, and I'm here just
[19] to ask you some questions about your opinions in this
[20] case and the reasons why you're saying what you're
[21] saying, fair enough?
[22] A: Yes, sir.
[23] Q: Every once in a while I drop off or I don't talk
[24] quite as loud as I should or I talk a little too fast.
[25]

Page 2

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of the Plaintiffs:

Howard D. Mishkind, Esq.

Becker & Mishkind Co., L.P.A.

Skylight Office Tower, Suite 660

1660 West Second Street

Cleveland, Ohio 44113

On Behalf of Defendant University Hospitals of

Cleveland:

George M. Moscarino, Esq.

Arter & Hadden

1100 Huntington Building

Cleveland, Ohio 44115

On Behalf of Defendants Michael T. Gyves, M.D. and

Partners in Women's Healthcare, Inc.:

Joseph Farchione, Esq.

Jacobson, Maynard, Tuschman & Kaiur

1001 Lakeside Avenue, Suite 1600

Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Page 4

1) Let me know if you don't understand my question, all
2) right?
3) A: Yes.
4) Q: You issued a report dated June 13, 1997 which
5) I've marked as Exhibit B; is that right?
6) A: Yes, sir.
7) Q: Is that your only report in this case?
8) A: Yes.
9) Q: Do you have any drafts of that report?
10) A: Nothing other than this.
11) C : Okay. Exhibit A which I've marked is a CV that
12) I believe you provided for us this morning?
13) A: Yes, sir.
14) Q: Is that current?
15) A: Not quite.
16) Q: Tell me what needs to be on there.
17) A: I'm no longer at the Medical College of Ohio. I
18) am now in Salt Lake City, Utah and I'm director of
19) academic affairs for the Inter Mountain Society for
20) Stroke Research. Inter Mountain Foundation for Stroke
21) Research.
22) Q: When did you move from Ohio to Utah?
23) A: September 1997.
24) Q: So it's a recent move, right?
25) A: Yes, sir.

Page 5

[1] Q: And give me the title of your current job again?
[2] A: I am director of academic affairs for the Inter
[3] Mountain Stroke Research Foundation.
[4] Q: And what are your duties in that job?
[5] A: My duties are to see patients in the outpatient
[6] department of the foundation, to see patients
[7] principally in Cottonwood Hospital as inpatients,
[8] mainly with stroke but with other neurologic
[9] conditions, to respond to calls from the emergency
[10] rooms of Cottonwood Hospital, LDS Hospital and Alta
[11] Vue Hospitals in Salt Lake City, to construct a
[12] program of education for nurses, physicians,
[13] physicians' assistants on stroke in these hospitals
[14] and throughout the Inter Mountain Health Care System
[15] of 21 hospitals.
[16] Q: So this Inter Mountain term is a hospital
[17] system?
[18] A: Yes, sir.
[19] Q: Are you, then, an employee of the Inter Mountain
[20] Hospital System?
[21] A: No, sir.
[22] Q: Who are you an employee of?
[23] A: I'm an employee of the Inter Mountain Stroke
[24] Research Foundation. We have a contractual
[25] relationship to Inter Mountain Health Care System.

Page 6

[1] Q: Doctor, how much of your time is spent seeing
[2] patients now that you're out in Utah?
[3] A: Between 60 and 65 percent.
[4] Q: And what is the balance of the time spent on?
[5] A: It is spent in the teaching activities and the
[6] construction of the teaching programs. I do editorial
[7] work for the Journal of Stroke and the Journal of
[8] Stroke and Cerebral Vascular Disease and review papers
[9] for other journals such as New England Journal of
[10] Medicine and Annals of Internal Medicine and Neurology
[11] and journals of that category.
[12] Q: Are all of the opinions that you have about the
[13] case involving Mrs. Doll and University Hospitals and
[14] the other doctors contained in this Exhibit B, your
[15] report of June 13?
[16] A: Yes, sir.
[17] Q: You haven't changed any of the opinions that
[18] have been set forth in that letter to Mr. Mishkind?
[19] A: Correct.
[20] Q: Now, since the time that you reviewed the
[21] materials that are set forth in that first paragraph,
[22] have you been furnished with some additional material
[23] regarding this case?
[24] A: Yes, sir.
[25] Q: Why don't you just tell me, for the record, what

Page 7

[1] additional materials you've been furnished.
[2] A: A report from Lawrence Wechsler, a report from
[3] Jeffrey King, a report from Thomas R. Price, the
[4] deposition is on the list but I have got a new copy, a
[5] deposition of Patty Doll, the deposition of John
[6] Nemunaitis, a deposition of Alan J. Lerner, the
[7] deposition of George Dewey Doll, a report of a
[8] neuropsychologic examination signed by Barry Layton, a
[9] report on a speech and language evaluation signed by
[10] Cloe Glasson and a letter to Mr. Mishkind dated
[11] October 14, 1997 signed by Alan J. Lerner.
[12] MR. MISHKIND: I think there is
[13] one other item in there, Dr. Riggs' report
[14] also, I'm not sure he mentioned that.
[15] A: A letter of August 6, 1997 signed by Dr. Jack
[16] Riggs.
[17] Q: Can I see that big pile of materials, please?
[18] A: Sure.
[19] Q: I take it from your answer to my previous
[20] question that the review of these additional materials
[21] didn't change or alter any of the opinions that you
[22] set forth in writing on Exhibit B?
[23] A: Yes, sir.
[24] Q: And this big black binder here, is this your
[25] copy of the records?

Page 8

[1] A: Yes, sir.
[2] Q: According to your report, you reviewed the
[3] labor, delivery and post partum records from
[4] University Hospitals and the St. Luke's records in
[5] their entirety, right?
[6] A: The records furnished to me, yes, sir.
[7] Q: Have you ever looked at the records from Meridia
[8] Huron Hospital or rehabilitation facility, which I
[9] will represent to you is the place where Mrs. Doll
[10] went from St. Luke's?
[11] A: No, sir.
[12] MR. MISHKIND: You don't mean
[13] Huron Road.
[14] MR. MOSCARINO: What do I mean?
[15] MR. MISHKIND: Euclid General.
[16] Q: Meridia Euclid. I'm sorry.
[17] MR. MISHKIND: That's okay. I
[18] knew what you were talking about.
[19] Q: The answer is the same, right?
[20] A: Correct, sir.
[21] Q: Thanks.
[22] MR. MISHKIND: We like to do that
[23] every once in a while, Doctor. You can
[24] disregard us.
[25] Q: What portion of these materials did you review

Page 9

[1] in preparation for today's proceedings?
[2] A: Close to all of them.
[3] Q: Did you look at the films again?
[4] A: Yes, sir.
[5] Q: When did you look at the films?
[6] A: This morning.
[7] Q: Which films did you look at?
[8] A: I looked at CT scans of the 16th, 19th, 21st
[9] MRI done in 1996. MRA done in 1996. I think those
[10] are the ones.
[11] Q: Doctor, is there an increased risk of stroke for
[12] women who are in the post partum period?
[13] A: Yes. The chance of stroke in the postpartum
[14] period is approximately one out of 12,000. If we
[15] define "post partum period" as six weeks following
[16] parturition, that is a bit higher than though there
[17] had not been parturition.
[18] Q: What was that last part? If there had not been,
[19] what, pregnancy?
[20] A: Pregnancy and delivery.
[21] Q: So what is the risk of stroke of someone who is
[22] a female of Patty Doll's age who is not in the post
[23] partum state?
[24] A: In the same period of time, about one in
[25] 100,000.

Page 10

[1] Q: If I ask you to tell me how many more times
[2] likely a woman who is in the post partum state is to
[3] have a stroke than someone who is not in the post
[4] partum state, what is your answer?
[5] A: The answer is, the relationship is between one
[6] out of 12,000 and one out of 100,000, so that's about
[7] eight to one.
[8] Q: Why is there an increased risk to women who are
[9] in the post partum state for stroke?
[10] A: I don't know.
[11] Q: Does anybody know?
[12] A: I don't think so.
[13] Q: It's your conclusion in this case that Mrs. Doll
[14] was septicemic?
[15] A: Yes, sir.
[16] Q: What does that term mean?
[17] A: Means an infection in the blood.
[18] Q: Is septicemia the same thing as bacteriemic?
[19] A: Not necessarily.
[20] Q: Bacteriemia means a bacterial infection in the
[21] blood?
[22] A: Yes.
[23] Q: Septicemia means what?
[24] A: Infection which can include a virus.
[25] Q: Do you have an opinion as to whether she was

Page 11

[1] bacteriemic?
[2] A: She had a positive blood culture which
[3] identified that she was bacteriemic.
[4] Q: It's your opinion in this case that - you tell
[5] me when I'm wrong. I read your report. If understand
[6] you correctly, it's your opinion that this lady had an
[7] embolus?
[8] A: Yes, sir.
[9] Q: And I take it from your report that you
[10] basically have two alternative theories as to the
[11] source of the embolus; am I right?
[12] A: There are more places than that. There are two
[13] questions involved. One is, what was the mechanism
[14] which produced the embolus, and, secondly, where did
[15] the embolus come from, and the embolus could come from
[16] a number of places. The mechanism remains uncertain.
[17] Q: On page two of your report you set forth two
[18] equally reasonable explanations for the stroke; am I
[19] right?
[20] A: Yes, sir.
[21] Q: Both of those explanations are premised on the
[22] fact that Mrs. Doll was septicemic, correct?
[23] A: Not necessarily, no.
[24] Q: Let me point you to -
[25] A: She may have platelet aggregation and clot

Page 12

[1] formation without being septicemic.
[2] Q: Okay. I'm just going to quote from your report
[3] and tell me where I'm wrong. You said, "Two equally
[4] reasonable explanations for this stroke exists, both
[5] directly related to her septicemia," correct?
[6] A: Yes, sir.
[7] Q: And my question to you was, are both of those
[8] explanations premised on the fact that she was
[9] septicemic?
[10] A: No, sir.
[11] Q: Why not?
[12] A: In her instance, there was septicemia but there
[13] can be a platelet aggregation, the formation of clot,
[14] the development of embolus or emboli from the clot,
[15] without there being septicemia.
[16] Q: It's your opinion, though, in this report that
[17] the stroke was related to the septicemia?
[18] A: Yes, there was a relationship, I think.
[19] Q: Is it your opinion that, at the time of the
[20] stroke, Mrs. Doll was dehydrated?
[21] A: Yes, to some degree.
[22] Q: Is it your opinion that the stroke is related to
[23] or linked to the dehydrated state?
[24] A: The dehydrated state is one of several factors.
[25] Q: What are the other factors?

Page 13

[1] A: The matter of the inflammatory reaction in
[2] general including the septicemia. When the operation
[3] was performed and the foreign body removed, it was
[4] noted that there was damage to the wall of the bowel,
[5] and this produces a chemical reaction and inflammatory
[6] responses.

[7] There was evidence in the white blood count,
[8] which went up to about 18,000. There was some
[9] decrease, a bit of a decrease, in the hemoglobin and
[10] hematocrit, which are changes that are produced in
[11] this fashion. There was a blood test called the
[12] D-Dimer, which is abnormal, which suggested that there
[13] is pathology in the fibrin fibrinogen complex.

[14] So these were all things that were abnormal and
[15] produced a modified disseminated intravascular
[16] coagulation state which is associated with clotting.

[17] Q: Getting back to this post partum state, is the
[18] post partum state itself a recognized cause of stroke?

[19] A: It is recognized that there is an increased
[20] incidence or frequency of stroke. The actual cause of
[21] the strokes during that period of time is generally
[22] not known.

[23] Q: I just want to make sure that I understand the
[24] way you're using some of the terms.

[25] A: Yes, sir.

Page 14

[1] Q: "Mechanism of the stroke" means what?

[2] A: Means the actual cause of the occlusion of the
[3] artery which produced the stroke.

[4] Q: So what are examples of actual causes of the
[5] occlusion of the artery which produced the stroke?

[6] A: The basic causes -

[7] MR. MISHKIND: Are you talking in
[8] general or are you talking about with
[9] specifics to this case?

[10] MR. MOSCARINO: No, I was trying
[11] to find out in general what examples are.

[12] MR. MISHKIND: Okay. Fine.

[13] A: Yes, sir. The basic cause of infarct, which is a
[14] stroke produced by a decrease in blood supply, the
[15] basic causes are occlusion of a vessel, commonly by
[16] thrombus or embolus; maybe a decrease in arterial
[17] perfusion pressure secondary to such things as trauma
[18] with shock; heart attacks with impaired cardiac
[19] output; maybe an inflammation of the blood vessel or
[20] blood vessels which stimulates the forming of a clot,
[21] which, in turn, occludes the vessel.

[22] Such inflammation may be in the form of a
[23] vasculitis. It may be secondary to an overt
[24] infection. It may be associated with something like
[25] meningitis. There is a disorder called lupus which is

Page 15

[1] associated with this kind of change.

[2] These are the actual ways in which the blood
[3] vessel gets occluded. I get back to the one we call a
[4] hemodynamic mechanism in which there is a marked drop
[5] in blood pressure and the person goes into shock and
[6] there is a narrowed vessel in the brain. There may
[7] then be a decrease in focal blood flow distal to that
[8] narrowing so that there is a stroke. Those are the
[9] mechanisms of an ischemic stroke.

[10] The other big type of stroke is bleeding, and
[11] that is due to customarily a break in the blood vessel
[12] or for some reason there is seeping of blood quickly
[13] out of the vessel and there is a hemorrhage, like one
[14] can bleed from a broken vessel in the skin, et cetera.

[15] Those are the two big categories of stroke.

[16] Q: Just so I'm clear, the two big categories are
[17] ischemic or, what, hemorrhagic stroke?

[18] A: Hemorrhagic, yes, sir.

[19] Q: And what did Mrs. Doll have, in your opinion?

[20] A: She had hemorrhagic transformation of a cerebral
[21] infarct.

[22] Q: Where does that fit in, hemorrhagic or ischemic
[23] stroke or neither?

[24] A: It fits basically into ischemic stroke.

[25] Q: What does it mean to have hemorrhagic

Page 16

[1] transformation of a cerebral infarct?

[2] A: It means that as the tissue dies, there is still
[3] some blood getting into the area, although a small
[4] amount, and as the tissue dies, the little blood
[5] vessels die, they seep blood and the appearance of
[6] that blood in the infarct then is called a hemorrhagic
[7] transformation.

[8] Q: And in what vessel did Mrs. Doll have this
[9] stroke?

[10] A: The general distribution of the middle cerebral
[11] artery on the left.

[12] Q: Are you able to tell me in which vessel the
[13] stroke originated?

[14] A: No, sir.

[15] Q: Why not?

[16] A: I simply don't know, sir.

[17] Q: How does one, whether you're a neurologist or a
[18] neuroradiologist or whomever, go back and make a
[19] determination as to which vessel the stroke originated
[20] in?

[21] A: Well, if you -

[22] MR. MISHKIND: Let me just object
[23] only because you said in which vessel the
[24] stroke. You mean in which vessel are you
[25] talking about the clot originated?

Page 17

[1] MR. MOSCARINO: If he doesn't
[2] understand me -

[3] MR. MISHKIND: Okay. I'm just
[4] objecting because I'm not sure -

[5] MR. MOSCARINO: Okay. That's
[6] fine.

[7] MR. MISHKIND: - what your
[8] question is.

[9] MR. MOSCARINO: You're allowed to
[10] object.

[11] MR. MISHKIND: Thanks. Every once
[12] in a while I do that.
[13] Go ahead, Doctor.

[14] A You asked about neuroradiologists.
[15] Neuroradiologists never make such a determination.

[16] Q: Who does make the determination, if anybody?

[17] A That determination is customarily made by a
[18] neurologist, general internist, family physician, et
[19] cetera.

[20] Q: And what tests do those doctors who practice in
[21] those disciplines use to make the determination as to
[22] where the stroke originated from?

[23] A: The testing begins with the physical
[24] examination, and one of the common sites of trouble is
[25] the heart, and so there may be the detection of

Page 18

[1] cardiac murmurs, of a change in the size of the heart
[2] or a change in the rhythm of the heart, a common
[3] change in the latter being auricular fibrillation,
[4] which, in turn, is associated with clot formation in
[5] the heart. So that the piece of material which
[6] becomes an embolus comes from the heart.

[7] We listen to the neck and we are listening for
[8] bruit or noises, which may indicate that there is some
[9] narrowing there, and the narrowing may be associated
[10] with clot formation. Many of us look in the eye and
[11] we search for tiny emboli, which are little pieces of
[12] material, and if we find such emboli, we recognize
[13] that statistically those emboli have come from a
[14] lesion, a clotting lesion, in the carotid artery or in
[15] the aorta.

[16] So we kind of start with this physical
[17] examination matter. We have a variety of tests that
[18] we do. We make a distinction between hemorrhage and
[19] infarct by doing a CT scan. Do you want me to proceed
[20] with the -

[21] Q: Sure.

[22] A: We have a variety of tests that we do. We do a
[23] Doppler flow study in the neck to find out whether
[24] there appears to be some alteration in the flow
[25] patterns there. We do transcranial Doppler, and we

Page 19

[1] are now hunting for emboli with embolus-detection
[2] testing in the neck.

[3] We look at the contents of the blood. We know
[4] that people, for instance, with too many red blood
[5] cells may get clotting in various parts of the body or
[6] decrease in blood flow. So we look at the red blood
[7] count. We look at the white blood count as evidence
[8] of possible infection. We look at the hemoglobin
[9] because it may decrease the capacity of the blood to
[10] carry oxygen to the brain. We look at hematocrit.
[11] These are all a series of things that we do.

[12] Then we get into testing for coagulation
[13] mechanisms, and this testing can be extensive. We are
[14] hunting for evidence that the patient may have a
[15] hypercoagulable state. Now, that will not necessarily
[16] tell us, if we find same, where the embolus started,
[17] but it will tell us that there is a propensity for
[18] clotting, and, therefore, for embolus formation.

[19] We look at Factor-C. We look at Factor-S and we
[20] look at 3-A, 3-B. We look at phospholipid antibodies.
[21] We look for D-Dimer. We test fibrinogen, for
[22] instance. We go through a battery of items, including
[23] Factor 2, which is prothrombin, and we do plasma
[24] determinations to see whether there is any change in
[25] antithrombin 3 and a whole variety of things to see

Page 20

[1] whether there is too much of a tendency or an abnormal
[2] tendency for the person to develop clotting.
[3] So these are some of the things that we do as
[4] far as blood examination is concerned. We look for
[5] diabetes. We look at the lipid profile because we
[6] know that hyperlipidemia constitutes a risk factor for
[7] stroke.

[8] We go to things like the chest X-ray to see
[9] whether there is a change in cardiac outline. We get
[10] an EKG immediately in the ER to see whether there is a
[11] change in rhythm or there is any evidence of a
[12] previous heart attack, myocardial infarction, because
[13] if there is an idiodynamic segment in the heart, this
[14] is a source of clotting and embolus formation.
[15] We look for such things as pericarditis. We do
[16] a sedimentation rate to see whether there is any
[17] evidence, for instance, of periarteritis nodosa,
[18] which is a disorder of the blood vessel system, which
[19] can cause a stroke.

[20] In the last couple of decades, we often in the
[21] ER do a tox screen because ingesting of certain agents
[22] such as cocaine, heroin and so forth can be associated
[23] with blood vessel changes, which, in turn, can be
[24] associated with an increased tendency to clot. We look
[25] at all of those things.

Page 21

[1] In the history, **we** get into the background of
[2] whether an individual has had X number of strokes or
[3] heart attacks, in other words, vessel disease of
[4] various kinds. We, of course, measure the blood
[5] pressure to see whether the individual is hypertensive
[6] or not.
[7] We look at renal function, the function of the
[8] kidneys, to find out whether there has been any
[9] alteration there, which may indicate a background of
[10] vascular disease. We do a similar thing as far as the
[11] lung is concerned in our chest X-ray profile. We are
[12] looking for items such as sarcoidosis, for instance,
[13] which can turn up in the chest and can be associated
[14] with stroke production. These are a variety of items
[15] that we look at.
[16] We do the CT scan, as I mentioned, to
[17] distinguish between infarct and hemorrhage. There may
[18] be instances where subsequently arteriography is done.
[19] There are two general fashions in which that's
[20] performed. One **is** called MRA and the other is a
[21] so-called traditional arteriogram, and that's done,
[22] however, in a variety of ways and may be done in
[23] certain circumstances, particularly if we hear a noise
[24] in the neck or there is a change in the intracranial
[25] digital subtraction, et cetera.

Page 22

[1] So there are a whole variety of things that we do
[2] in an attempt to find out the mechanism and also the
[3] possible source, and in a fair number of instances,
[4] probably a third or more, we do not find the actual
[5] source and sometimes not the mechanism of the clot
[6] embolus formation.
[7] Q: You gave me a pretty long answer there on the
[8] variety and types of tests that you as a neurologist
[9] perform to try and find both the mechanism and the
[10] source of the stroke, right?
[11] A: Yes, sir.
[12] Q: In your report you state on page two, the first
[13] paragraph there, "She underwent multiple tests
[14] following the stroke to determine the etiology of
[15] same," correct?
[16] A: Yes, sir.
[17] Q: Your next sentence says, "According to Dr.
[18] Lerner, a definitive explanation for Ms. Doll's stroke
[19] could not be determined," correct?
[20] A: Correct.
[21] Q: And your source for that statement is what?
[22] A: His deposition.
[23] Q: What do you mean by the term "definitive
[24] explanation"?
[25] A: The word "definitive" means highly likely, high

Page 23

[1] probability.
[2] Q: Of the tests that you recited for me in that
[3] long answer, a great majority of those were performed
[4] at the ordering of Dr. Lerner; is that correct?
[5] A: Yes, sir.
[6] Q: And none of those tests gave an answer as to
[7] what the cause of the stroke was?
[8] A: They gave no answer as to the source of the
[9] embolus. There were abnormalities.
[10] Q: Was it Dr. Lerner's conclusion at the time of
[11] the hospitalization that there was an embolus, if you
[12] know?
[13] A: I believe he made a diagnosis of an embolic
[14] infarct with hemorrhagic transformation.
[15] Q: And even looking at this case afterward in
[16] retrospect, you're not able to tell me where this
[17] embolism came from, true?
[18] A: Correct, sir.
[19] Q: What is your reason for concluding that it was
[20] an embolus as opposed to a thrombus?
[21] A: The relative suddenness of the neurologic onset
[22] abnormality together with the nature of the first CT
[23] scan.
[24] MR. MOSCARINO: Can you repeat
[25] that answer for me?

Page 24

[1] MR. MISHKIND: Your question was
[2] why he's saying it's an embolus as opposed
[3] to a thrombus?
[4] MR. MOSCARINO: Right, that's what
[5] I asked him.
[6] MR. MISHKIND: Just wanted to make
[7] sure that's what you meant to ask him.
[8] A: Excuse me. I didn't hear the word "thrombus" in
[9] the question.
[10] MR. MISHKIND: That's why I raised
[11] it because I know what you're asking him
[12] but I think you are not stating it properly
[13] to get the answer that I think you want
[14] from him. I'm not going to touch it any
[15] further. I'm just going to leave it at
[16] that.
[17] Q: Do you want to add something to that answer,
[18] Doctor, after that discourse by Mr. Mishkind?
[19] A: No, sir.
[20] Q: Just to break it down so nobody's confused, you
[21] believe that there was an embolus here that traveled
[22] from some undetermined, unknown site to Mrs. Doll's
[23] brain, correct?
[24] A: Yes, sir.
[25] Q: And you believe that that embolus, although we

Page 25

don't know where it came from, lodged somewhere in the
[2] blood vessels or undetermined blood vessels of the
[3] brain, right?

[4] A: Yes, sir. Middle cerebral artery territory on
[5] the left.

[6] Q: When you say "middle cerebral artery territory,"
[7] that's the same thing as you told me before, general
[8] distribution of the middle cerebral artery?

[9] A: Yes, sir.

[10] Q: Is it your opinion that it actually lodged in
[11] the middle cerebral artery?

[12] A: Probably. High probability. 90/10.

[13] Q: And your reason for saying that is what?

[14] A: The extent of the damage to the brain
[15] anatomically.

[16] Q: Is there a test that you looked at in the form
[17] of some type of scan that lets you as a neurologist
[18] look back in time and say, "There it is in the middle
[19] cerebral artery," or is that your conclusion based on
[20] the reasons that you just told me?

[21] A: It is my conclusion based on the physical signs
[22] or neurologic abnormalities coupled with the first CT
[23] and subsequent CT scans.

[24] Q: Are there strokes that are caused by a thrombus
[25] as opposed to an embolus?

Page 26

[1] A: Yes, sir. Recall, if you will, that most emboli
[2] are made up of thrombus.

[3] Q: And excuse my lack of knowledge of medicine, but
[4] are there strokes that are caused by formation of clot
[5] in the actual artery or vein where the stroke happens
[6] as opposed to having that piece of blood clot, emboli
[7] or whatever travel from a more distal location?

[8] A: Yes, sir.

[9] Q: And my original question here was, what is your
[10] reason for saying that this was a stroke of what I'll
[11] call embolic cause as opposed to a clot that was
[12] caused by a thrombus in that vessel?

[13] A: I repeat, Number one, the severity and
[14] suddenness of onset of the neurologic abnormality.
[15] Number two, the nature of the changes in the CT scans,
[16] sir.

[17] Q: And specifically what nature, what changes?

[18] A: This was a picture in the CT scan that, by
[19] autopsy study in other patients down through the
[20] years, is characteristic of an infarct which has
[21] little tiny islands of blood in it, which we refer to
[22] as hemorrhagic transformation, and in experimental
[23] animal work as well as in autopsy in humans, that is
[24] characteristic of an embolus.

[25] Q: I take it you're telling me this was an arterial

Page 27

[1] stroke?

[2] A: Yes, sir.

[3] Q: Are there such things as venous strokes?

[4] A: Yes, sir.

[5] Q: Is it your opinion that this was not a venous
[6] stroke?

[7] A: Yes, sir.

[8] Q: And your reasons for saying that are what?

[9] A: The venous stroke has a different distribution
[10] in the vascular system and it also has a different
[11] method of onset, and the CT scan shows a different
[12] pattern of abnormality.

[13] Q: When you talk about the CT scans in answer to my
[14] last few questions regarding venous strokes and this
[15] being in the middle cerebral artery, are you speaking
[16] of the first CT scan done on 11/16?

[17] A: And subsequent CT scans.

[18] Q: And why is it that you can't tell us where this
[19] embolus came from?

[20] A: Simply because I don't know, sir.

[21] Q: Why do you conclude that the carotid artery had
[22] focal narrowing?

[23] A: Because of what I saw later on in the films in
[24] the MRA.

[25] Q: What tests were performed during the

Page 28

[1] hospitalizations that give any insight regarding the
[2] status of the carotid artery?

[3] A: Doppler examination.

[4] Q: And what was the result of that test?

[5] A: It was said to be normal.

[6] Q: Is the Doppler test something that's done by
[7] sound?

[8] A: Yes, sir, ultrasound.

[9] Q: Were there films then taken of the carotid
[10] artery?

[11] A: There is a type of film which is ordinarily
[12] made, yes, sir.

[13] Q: Does that film give insight as to the status of
[14] the carotid artery, whether it's open or whether it's
[15] stenosed?

[16] A: Yes, sir.

[17] Q: Did you review that film?

[18] A: No, sir.

[19] Q: And which film was it that led you to conclude
[20] that there was a focal narrowing of the carotid
[21] artery, the MRI or MRA?

[22] A: MRA.

[23] Q: "A" you said?

[24] A: Yes, sir.

[25] Q: What did you see in the MRA that led you to that

Page 29

[1] conclusion?

[2] A: There is some narrowing of the pattern in the
[3] internal carotid artery. This was in 1996, however.

[4] Q: And it's your opinion that that same narrowing
[5] was, therefore, present two years before?

[6] A: It's possible, sir. I think it's more likely
[7] than not, in other words, 75/25.

[8] Q: Okay, in response to that question, you used
[9] the word "possible." Then you used the term "75."

[10] A: Yes, sir.

[11] Q: Is it your opinion that it's more likely than
[12] not that Mrs. Doll had a focal narrowing of the
[13] carotid artery back in 1994 when she had the stroke?

[14] A: Yes, sir.

[15] Q: And the reason for your opinion is what you just
[16] told me about with respect to the MRA?

[17] A: Yes, sir.

[18] Q: Is it your opinion that Mrs. Doll was in a
[19] hypercoagulable state at the time of the stroke?

[20] A: Yes, sir.

[21] Q: What's your basis for that conclusion?

[22] A: The existence of the D-Dimer; the altered
[23] profile, for instance, of the white blood count, with
[24] so many blood cells; slightly low fibrinogen, and this
[25] is a DIC kind of stroke, disseminated intravascular

29

Page 30

[1] coagulation.

[2] Q: Is it your opinion she suffered from DIC?

[3] A: A distant form of it, yes.

[4] Q: What do you mean by that?

[5] A: DIC has a number of subdivisions or split-offs,
[6] like some other disorders, and I think she had an
[7] element of DIC present, not flagrant or full-blown
[8] DIC.

[9] Q: What are the tests that are normally done to
[10] confirm the presence of DIC?

[11] A: Well, D-Dimer is one of the principal ones -

[12] Q: What else?

[13] A: - that's been done in the last few years. We
[14] look at antithrombin-C. We look at S. We look at
[15] platelet aggregability. Those are other tests that are
[16] done.

[17] Q: Were those other tests in addition to the
[18] D-Dimer performed in this case?

[19] A: I don't think so. I don't think so. C, S and
[20] antithrombin-3 were done. I may be wrong about that,
[21] sir. I don't remember seeing them.

[22] MR. MISHKIND: If you want, he can
[23] look through the record and confirm that.

[24] MR. MOSCARINO: If you want to,
[25] you can. If not, it's fine with me.

[1] A: Yes, sir.

[8] Q: How many?

[9] A: I don't know.

[10] Q: Not trying to split hairs, but when you do a
[11] blood culture, does that mean, when she had one
[12] positive, that there was more than one culture
[13] positive? Did they do those in sets or should that
[14] sentence read "A blood culture was positive"?

[15] A: A blood culture was positive.

[16] Q: Do you know what the opinion was of the
[17] infectious disease consultants at St. Luke's with
[18] respect to the significance?

[19] A: I don't remember.

[20] Q: What is the incidence of contaminant with
[21] respect to strep viridans and positive blood cultures?

[22] A: I don't know.

[23] Q: Have you cared for a woman in the postpartum
[24] period who has suffered a stroke?

[25] A: Yes, sir.

Page 33

[1] Q: How many?

[2] A: Probably ten in the last 45 years. Ischemic
[3] stroke. I have cared for 40 or 50 with bleeding.

[4] Q: So total 50 to 60 women who have suffered
[5] strokes in the post partum period in your career?

[6] A: Yes, sir.

[7] Q: Have you cared for individuals who have suffered
[8] strokes subsequent to a retained foreign body in the
[9] abdomen?

[10] A: Yes, sir.

[11] Q: How many?

[12] A: One.

[13] Q: Can you tell me about that case?

[14] A: That was a man who was injured in a lumber mill
[15] accident in 1958 and had a piece of wood driven into
[16] his abdomen and that was not removed and healed. Then
[17] they got into trouble with his intestine and
[18] infection, had to, of course, have an operation, and
[19] in the course of these events, had a stroke.

[20] Q: Was that an embolic or thrombotic event?

[21] A: It appeared to us to be embolic secondary to
[22] thrombus formation.

[23] Q: Did you identify the site of the thrombus
[24] formation in that case?

[25] A: We were uncertain about it.

Page 34

[1] Q: Did Mrs. Doll's post partum state play a
[2] causative role in the stroke that she suffered
[3] subsequent to the removal of the laparotomy pad?

[4] A: I need further definition of the phrase "post
[5] partum state."

[6] Q: The fact that she was two weeks post-delivery,
[7] did that in and of itself play a causal role in the
[8] stroke that she suffered post-surgery?

[9] A: To me, that is a matter of relativity. Her
[10] course from the 6th until the 15th, except for the day
[11] of the 14th, was associated with general malaise, that
[12] is, feeling pretty lousy, with some nausea, abdominal
[13] discomfort. In other words, she wasn't well at all.

[14] Then on the 14th there she had a good day and on
[15] the 15th she had a return and exacerbation of the
[16] symptoms that she had been having between the 6th and
[17] the 14th. All of these things indicated that there
[18] was something significantly wrong with her, and she
[19] then appeared at St. Luke's Hospital and the diagnosis
[20] of a foreign body was made and the operation was
[21] performed.

[22] So there was an abnormal post partum state
[23] existing with the exception of one day between the 6th
[24] and the 15th.

[25] Q: Do you know a Dr. Sheldon Margulies?

Page 35

[1] A: No, sir.

[2] Q: Have you read his report in the case?

[3] A: No, sir.

[4] Q: He says in his report and he told us yesterday
[5] that there are several possible causes of Mrs. Doll's
[6] stroke, one of which is her post partum state. Do you
[7] agree with that?

[8] A: Well, I have tried to straightforwardly define
[9] what I mean by post partum state, and I'm not sure
[10] what Dr. Margulies means by that same phrase. I think
[11] her post partum state was caused by the presence of
[12] the foreign body, post partum state referring to her
[13] medical condition during the time between, let's say,
[14] the 2nd and 3rd and the 15th.

[15] Q: Well, these 50 to 60 patients that you have
[16] treated that have suffered strokes in the postpartum
[17] period, have you been able to determine a mechanism or
[18] etiology or cause of all of those strokes?

[19] A: Not all of them, but most of them, yes.

[20] Q: And when you determined the cause of those
[21] strokes, is one of the causative mechanisms the fact
[22] that they are in this post partum period, or do you
[23] just conclude that that's coincide?

[24] A: In some instances, both. For instance, several
[25] of the patients have had auricular fibrillation, and

Page 36

[1] this was years ago when we weren't paying quite as
[2] much attention to auricular fibrillation as we are
[3] now. Only one of those good many patients had the
[4] stroke following a cesarean section, which is another
[5] category.

[6] Q: Have you done research on the issue of strokes
[7] in the postpartum state?

[8] A: No, sir.

[9] Q: Are you familiar with the medical literature on
[10] the subject?

[11] A: Somewhat familiar with it, sir.

[12] Q: What articles would I look to to review this
[13] issue, what journals?

[14] MR. MISHKIND: Let me show an
[15] objection to the question.

[16] But you can go ahead and answer it.

[17] A: The textbook by Henry Barnett from Toronto has
[18] material about post partum state. Jim Toole's
[19] textbook has material about post partum state. My
[20] textbook has a little material about the post partum
[21] state. I forgot the name of my friend in England
[22] whose book has material about the post partum state
[23] and the occurrence of stroke.

[24] Q: How about, are there any leading journal
[25] articles on this topic?

Page 37

[1] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.

[2] Go ahead.

[3] A: There was an article in the New England Journal
[4] last year about post partum state stroke.

[5] Q: When I questioned Dr. Margulies on this topic
[6] yesterday, he directed me to the Kittner article in
[7] the New England Journal of Medicine.

[8] A: That was in September 1996.

[9] Q: Is that the article you're referring to?

[10] A: Yes, sir.

[11] Q: He also mentioned some other article that
[12] concerns some type of similar study by a group of
[13] doctors in France.

[14] A: Yes.

[15] Q: What is the name of that article?

[16] A: I don't know.

[17] Q: Did you review the Kittner article at all in
[18] preparation for your deposition today?

[19] A: Not in preparation for the deposition, but I
[20] have seen it.

[21] Q: Did you conduct any medical research as part of
[22] your engagement by Mr. Mishkind in this case?

[23] A: No, sir.

[24] Q: What was the source of your statistics when I
[25] asked you at the beginning of the deposition of the

Page 38

[1] increased risk of stroke in the post partum period?

[2] A: The Kittner article.

[3] Q: Is the Kittner article the leading article on
[4] the discussion of the incidence of stroke in post
[5] partum women?

[6] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.

[7] A: I don't know.

[8] Q: Do you hold yourself out as an expert in the
[9] incidence of stroke in post partum women?

[10] A: Only in my experience.

[11] Q: Do you know any of the other experts who have
[12] been identified in this lawsuit?

[13] A: Yes.

[14] Q: Which ones do you know, or which one?

[15] A: I know Dr. Wechsler just a bit and I know Dr.
[16] Price very, very well.

[17] Q: How about Dr. Riggs? Do you know him?

[18] A: No.

[19] Q: How do you know Dr. Wechsler a bit?

[20] A: Via contacts in neurology and at stroke meetings
[21] and at the American Academy of Neurology and American
[22] Neurologic Association.

[23] Q: And how do you know Dr. Thomas Price?

[24] A: I know him through work in stroke going back 30
[25] years and we have served on committees together, on

Page 39

[1] NIH study section. We have worked on the nomenclature
[2] committee of stroke which I chaired and I've just seen
[3] a great deal of him in stroke meetings and one thing
[4] or another in the last 25 years.

[5] Q: I see. Is he a recognized or respected
[6] neurologist within the subspecialty of stroke?

[7] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.

[8] A: Yes, sir.

[9] THE WITNESS: Excuse me.

[10] MR. MISHKIND: That's okay. You

[11] can still answer the question even though
[12] my objection is stated.

[13] Q: You respect his opinion on matters concerning
[14] stroke?

[15] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.

[16] A: Yes.

[17] Q: Do you know if he was involved at all in the
[18] work that is summarized in the Kittner article?

[19] A: I think he was mentioned but not listed as an
[20] author. I think he was by-lined or something. I'm
[21] sorry. It's been a long time since I've seen that,
[22] but I believe his name was - but I don't believe he
[23] was a co-author.

[24] Q: What do you have to do to be a co-author on one
[25] of these journal articles like appear in the New

Page 40

[1] England Journal of Medicine and other peer-reviewed
[2] journals?

[3] A: Take some part in the accumulation of the data.

[4] Q: Did you say you read the deposition of George
[5] Doll, Mrs. Doll's husband?

[6] A: Yes, sir.

[7] Q: Do you agree that a woman can have a stroke for
[8] no other reason than being in the post partum state
[9] and the related changes that occur to a woman's body
[10] in that time period?

[11] THE WITNESS: Would you read that
[12] question back?

[13] (Record read.)

[14] MR. MISHKIND: Let me just show an
[15] objection before the doctor answers just to
[16] the question as put in terms of "Can," but
[17] certainly the doctor can answer the
[18] question.

[19] A: No, I don't agree.

[20] Q: And the reason that you disagree with that
[21] statement is what?

[22] A: The matter of, most of the patients who have
[23] been studied carefully at our place, we find a cause
[24] other than the bearing of a child, causes, for
[25] instance, such as atrial fibrillation, cardiac

Page 41

[1] myopathy, lesions in the carotid artery, dissection,
[2] lupus, erythematosus, some kind of a mechanism other
[3] than, quote, "postpartum period," close quote.

[4] Q: And were there patients, in your experience, who
[5] suffered strokes in the post partum period where you
[6] were not able to find a definitive explanation?

[7] A: Yes, sir.

[8] Q: And what, then, was your conclusion with respect
[9] to those patients who suffered those strokes of
[10] undetermined origin in the post partum state?

[11] A: Exactly the same as it is in the stroke
[12] population in general. Where in some 30 percent we
[13] find no literal mechanism for the stroke, we simply
[14] have to answer that we do not know.

[15] Q: And in those cases, if those patients were in
[16] the post partum state, you would not tell those
[17] patients that one of the reasons or a reason for their
[18] stroke was the fact that they were post partum?

[19] A: Correct. The inquiry, in my experience, has
[20] come up on a number of occasions should they have
[21] another child, and several of them have gone on to
[22] have another child and had no more trouble and we
[23] never found out what the mechanism was for the stroke.

[24] Q: Are there any studies on that issue, that being
[25] the risk of second stroke for a woman who has suffered

Page 42

[1] one stroke in the post partum period?

[2] A: I don't remember any.

[3] Q: You are not going to be giving opinions at the
[4] trial of this case regarding the issue of the standard
[5] of care as it relates to either the hospital personnel
[6] or the OB/GYN; am I right?

[7] A: Correct, sir.

[8] Q: Are you or have you been asked to express any
[9] opinions regarding the extent or permanency of Mrs.
[10] Doll's injuries from the stroke?

[11] A: Yes, sir.

[12] Q: Is that contained in your report?

[13] A: Yes, sir.

[14] Q: Where is that contained?

[15] A: "Ms. Doll has suffered extensive damage to her
[16] brain as demonstrated by the studies which you
[17] submitted to me."

[18] Q: And are you going to be giving opinions other
[19] than that sentence, that she has extensive damage to
[20] her brain?

[21] MR. MISHKIND: Let me object.

[22] I'm going to ask him questions for him to
[23] explain the substance of that. He's not
[24] going to be limited to just saying that
[25] sentence, and if you want to ask him

Page 43

[1] questions about the nature of that
[2] extensive damage and the significance of
[3] that, that's the purpose of that sentence.

[4] MR. MOSCARINO: Yes, I hear that.

[5] As the lawyer for the hospital, I just want
[6] the record to be clear that he has gone
[7] through a two-page explanation of whatever
[8] his opinions are regarding the etiology of
[9] the stroke. I don't know that that one
[10] line is good enough but -

[11] MR. MISHKIND: Well, let me just
[12] state to you that the case law is very
[13] clear that a report doesn't have to outline
[14] the entire substance of an expert's opinion
[15] as long as it identifies the subject
[16] matters, and one of the subject matters is
[17] the nature of the damage. We can deal with
[18] that.

[19] MR. FARCHIONE: To cut to the
[20] chase from my standpoint, you've got Layton
[21] coming in, Nemunaitis, Lerner, Lystad, all
[22] coming in, treating individuals, to talk
[23] about damages. Is he going to be getting
[24] into the specifics of her current condition
[25] and that or are you talking just in general

Page 44

[1] based on the films there is damage to this
[2] area and that can lead to those types of
[3] things, then the other people come in and
[4] talk about the specifics of her damage?

[5] MR. MISHKIND: Generally your
[6] statement is accurate.

[7] MR. FARCHIONE: That's what I
[8] wanted to know.

[9] MR. MISHKIND: He's not going to
[10] be testifying from a clinical standpoint
[11] how she is doing. He will testify based
[12] upon the pathology, what significance that
[13] is as demonstrated, and he has had a chance
[14] to review some of the reports.

[15] So if you want to ask him questions,
[16] I don't think it's going to take that long
[17] for him to tell you the extent of what he
[18] is comfortable testifying to and to the
[19] extent he's not comfortable testifying.

[20] Q: Have you examined Mrs. Doll?

[21] A: No, sir.

[22] Q: Have you met her?

[23] A: No, sir.

[24] Q: Are you familiar with what the state of her
[25] recovery is from the stroke that was suffered in

Page 45

[1] November of 1994?

[2] A: I am familiar to the extent of reviewing the

[3] testing done and reading the deposition of her husband

[4] and those things contained in the description of her

[5] behavior, her work situation, et cetera.

[6] Q: Will you agree with me that she has made a

[7] tremendous recovery?

[8] A: She has made a remarkable recovery, yes, sir.

[9] Q: I take it you're not going to be giving any

[10] opinions regarding her future course of events or

[11] prognosis?

[12] A: I have an opinion, yes.

[13] MR. MOSCARINO: And that one of

[14] the opinions you're going to be eliciting

[15] from him?

[16] MR. MISHKIND: Yes.

[17] MR. MOSCARINO: Well, I object to

[18] that.

[19] Q: But since we are in a discovery deposition, go

[20] ahead and tell me what that is.

[21] MR. FARCHIONE: I will enter an

[22] objection also.

[23] A: My opinion is that she has permanent, lifelong

[24] brain damage and that she will not return to normal.

[25] Q: Are you going to be giving any opinion as to

Page 46

[1] whether she is going to continue to improve?

[2] A: Yes, sir.

[3] Q: What is your opinion on that?

[4] MR. MOSCARINO: Same objection,

[5] but I'm here for his discovery deposition.

[6] A: We are now three years out, and, for instance,

[7] her homonymous hemianopsia, her visual defect, will

[8] not improve. Her aphasia at this point in time will,

[9] in general, not improve.

[10] Q: What is aphasia?

[11] A: Aphasia is a defect in language reception and

[12] language production produced by a focal brain lesion.

[13] Q: Are you aware of the fact that she is back at

[14] the same job that she had before?

[15] A: Yes, sir.

[16] Q: Are you aware of the fact that she has received

[17] at least, I believe, two pay increases and positive

[18] job reviews?

[19] A: Yes, sir.

[20] Q: Are you surprised by that?

[21] A: No, sir.

[22] Q: Do you have any reason to doubt that she will

[23] continue to perform in her job?

[24] A: No, sir.

[25] Q: Do you have any reason to doubt that she **may** not

Page 47

[1] receive a promotion?

[2] A: No, sir.

[3] Q: Do you have any opinions that she shouldn't be

[4] rearing children?

[5] A: No, sir.

[6] Q: Do you know that she can balance her checkbook?

[7] A: I've been told that.

[8] Q: Does that surprise you?

[9] A: Yes, sir.

[10] Q: Why?

[11] A: Because of the nature of the brain lesions as

[12] displayed in the CT and MRI examinations.

[13] Q: Specifically what?

[14] A: The evidence of brain damage, focal brain

[15] damage. It is possible that she has ability on the

[16] non-dominant side, because there are some people who

[17] do, and that may be an explanation for her ability to

[18] work with the checkbook.

[19] Now, I don't know whether that ability is

[20] predicated on simply using a computer to add,

[21] subtract, et cetera, or whether she can literally do

[22] those things like we do them as normal people. I

[23] don't know the answer to that because I haven't seen

[24] her. I haven't examined her.

[25] Q: You mean computer or calculator?

Page 48

[1] A: Calculator.

[2] Q: As a neurologist, do you look at these scans and

[3] then make predictions as to future prognosis based

[4] upon the, quote, unquote, "Damageto the brain" that

[5] you see on the film?

[6] A: I inter-relate what I see in the film with the

[7] examination of the patient. The examination of the

[8] patient is the number one issue in all of this kind of

[9] work. Number **two** has to do with the films. As I just

[10] mentioned, there are some individuals who have some

[11] cross-over, what we call dominant lobe phenomenon into

[12] the other side, and that can't be determined by the CT

[13] or MRI. The actual ability must be determined by

[14] testing the patient.

[15] Q: And do some patients just simply do better than

[16] you, as a neurologist, predict they would do given

[17] your review of the scans and even your examination?

[18] A: Yes, sir.

[19] Q: You're not ruling out that Mrs. Doll will not

[20] continue to improve with respect to her job

[21] performance and her aphasia -

[22] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.

[23] Q: - as the years go on?

[24] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.

[25] Go ahead.

Page 49

[1] A: I'm not ruling it out. I think the odds are
[2] 95/5 that she has reached her summit of improvement as
[3] far as formal testing is concerned which identifies
[4] the severity of the cognitive defect.

[5] Q: Given what you told me about the importance of
[6] the examination, do you feel that you need to actually
[7] examine her and confer with her and make a personal
[8] judgment on her before issuing opinions regarding her
[9] extent of injuries and future prognosis?

[10] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.

[11] A: I feel comfortable with the quality of the
[12] reports that I have read and the films, but
[13] particularly with the quality of the
[14] neuropsychological testing and the testing for
[15] aphasia.

[16] Q: So the answer is, no, you don't think you need
[17] to examine her?

[18] A: Right.

[19] MR. MOSCARINO: I need to take a
[20] two-minute break.

[21] MR. MISHKIND: That's fine.

[22] (Recess taken.)

[23] Q: To what degree was the carotid artery narrowed?

[24] A: To what degree?

[25] Q: Yes, sir.

Page 50

[1] A: 20 percent.

[2] Q: And how did you come to that conclusion?

[3] A: By looking at it.

[4] Q: Just by visualization?

[5] A: Yes.

[6] Q: Is there any kind of test that somebody performs
[7] that gives you that calculation?

[8] A: No, sir.

[9] Q: So it was 20 percent in 1986?

[10] A: '96, sir.

[11] Q: '96. I'm sorry.

[12] What was your opinion, then, as to what it was
[13] in 1994?

[14] A: Probably similar, More than about 75 percent
[15] likelihood.

[16] Q: About 75 percent likelihood that it was 20
[17] percent in '94?

[18] A: Yes, sir.

[19] Q: You talk about an embolic event from the pelvic
[20] region on page two of your report.

[21] A: Yes, sir.

[22] Q: You go on to state, "Even though the tests
[23] performed did not produce evidence of same."

[24] A: Sir?

[25] Q: You also go on to state in that report, "Even

Page 51

[1] though the tests performed did not produce evidence of
[2] same." Am I right?

[3] A: Yes, sir.

[4] Q: What tests are you talking about?

[5] A: I believe there is an examination by a vascular
[6] surgeon who found no evidence of that trouble.

[7] Q: Was it your opinion that there was an embolus
[8] from the pelvic area?

[9] A: I don't know, sir. It's possible.

[10] Q: Is that an opinion you hold to a reasonable
[11] degree of medical probability?

[12] A: Yes, sir.

[13] MR. MISHKIND: That it's possible?

[14] A: That it's possible.

[15] Q: No. Do you believe to a reasonable degree of
[16] medical probability that Mrs. Doll had an embolic
[17] event from the pelvic region or are you just stating
[18] that as a possibility?

[19] A: I'm stating it as a possibility, sir.

[20] Q: So that the record is clear, when we go to trial
[21] in this case, you will not be testifying to a
[22] reasonable degree of medical probability that Mrs.
[23] Doll had an embolic event from the pelvic region?

[24] A: Correct, sir.

[25] Q: Is your delineation of possibility and

Page 52

[1] probability the same when it comes to the comment that
[2] you have in that same paragraph regarding the carotid
[3] artery?

[4] A: No, sir.

[5] Q: Tell me why it's different.

[6] A: In the instance of the abnormality in the
[7] pelvis, the pathway is to the heart and then through a
[8] patent foramen ovale, and that's the right side of the
[9] heart and then into the left side of the heart and
[10] thence to the cerebral circulation.

[1] On TEE there was no demonstration of a patent
[2] foramen ovale. However, the foramen ovale may not
[3] have opened up at the time of the TEE. This lack of
[4] opening of the foramen ovale has been
[5] well-demonstrated in people who ultimately proved to
[6] have such a defect.

[7] In contrast, the sources of emboli to the brain
[8] are much more likely to be intracardiac or carotid
[9] system than from a pelvic lesion where there is no
[10] demonstrable way for the emboli to cross from right
[11] heart to left heart.

[12] Q: Dr. Margulies told us yesterday, in view of the
[13] TEE test result, it was impossible for a pelvic
[14] embolus to travel to Mrs. Doll's brain. Do you agree
[15] with that?

Page 53

111 A: I do not agree that the TEE absolutely rules out
[2] a possible cross-over.
[3] Q: Mrs. Doll's treating physicians back in 1994
[4] ruled this cause out, correct?
[5] A: I understand. Yes, sir, correct.
[6] Q: Basically you're agreeing with them?
[7] A: I do not agree that a negative TEE absolutely
[8] rules out the possibility of a patency between the two
[9] sides of the heart.
[10] Q: You agree -
[11] A: Although the statistics of that probability are
[12] less than five percent.
[13] Q: Would you agree with me that it's highly
[14] unlikely that in this case an embolus from the pelvic
[15] region traveled through Mrs. Doll's heart and caused
[16] the stroke?
[17] A: Yes, sir.
[18] Q: Now, what about the other explanation that you
[19] pose in this paragraph, that being the carotid artery?
[20] Do you agree that's also highly unlikely in this case?
[21] A: No, I don't.
[22] Q: Is it your opinion to a reasonable degree of
[23] medical probability that there was a clot that formed
[24] in the carotid artery that traveled to Mrs. Doll's
[25] brain?

Page 54

[1] A: I don't know where the clot formed, as I have
[2] mentioned. I think the most likely site was
[3] someplace in the carotid circulation, probably
[4] internal carotid circulation.
[5] Q: Is this speculation on your behalf?
[6] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.
[7] A: No, it's not speculation, definitely not
[8] speculation. This is a result of 45 years of
[9] experience, of study and activity in 'trying to find
[10] out about such cases.
[11] Q: Okay. And I'm just trying to uncover your
[12] opinions as the lawyer for the hospital.
[13] A: Yes, sir.
[14] Q: You have no opinion to a reasonable degree of
[15] medical probability as to the source of the embolus?
[16] MR. MISHKIND: Objection. Asked
[17] and answered about five times.
[18] But go ahead and answer a sixth time.
[19] A: You are correct, sir.
[20] Q: By the way, before we took this break, we had
[21] started to talk about your opinions regarding the
[22] extensive damage to her brain. Did I receive all your
[23] opinions regarding that issue?
[24] A: I believe so.
[25] Q: Have you asked for any additional information

Page 55

[1] regarding this case that you are not to be provided
[2] with?
[3] A: No, sir.
[4] Q: Have you read Dr. Price's report?
[5] A: Yes, sir.
[6] Q: Do you disagree with that or do you have any
[7] comments regarding it?
[8] A: I disagree with the opinion concerning the cause
[9] of her stroke.
[10] Q: I take it by your prior answers to questions
[11] that you agree with me that Dr. Price is qualified to
[12] opine on the issues that are at hand in this case?
[13] A: Yes, sir.
[14] Q: Just as though you would tell me. I take it,
[15] based on your CV and experience, that you are
[16] qualified to opine on the issues that are at hand in
[17] this case?
[18] A: Yes, sir.
[19] Q: How commonplace is it that experts in the area
[20] of a specialty like neurology will differ on the
[21] interpretation of medical records -
[22] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.
[23] Q: - and things of this nature?
[24] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.
[25] A: In my experience, it's fairly common. Dr. Price

Page 56

[1] and I have disagreed about nomenclature extensively as
[2] committee members and continue to regard each other
[3] highly.
[4] MR. MOSCARINO: I'm going to stop
[5] my questioning at this point in time and
[6] defer to Mr. Farchione with the reservation
[7] that I may have some additional questions.
[8] Fair enough?
[9] MR. MISHKIND: Uh-huh.
[10]
[11] EXAMINATION
[12] BY MR. FARCHIONE:
[13] Q: Doctor, my name is Joe Farchione. I represent
[14] Dr. Gyves in this lawsuit. I want to follow up on
[15] where Mr. Moscarino left off with regard to Dr. Price.
[16] You've indicated that you've read his report
[17] and are familiar with his opinions, correct?
[18] A: Yes, sir.
[19] Q: Are you here today to rule out 100 percent Dr.
[20] Price's opinion or is this just simply a difference of
[21] opinion between two experts in the area of stroke?
[22] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.
[23] A: The former.
[24] Q: The former?
[25] A: (Nods affirmatively.)

Page 57

[1] Q: How is it that you can rule out Dr. Price's
[2] opinion 100percent?
[3] A: I believe that his opinion did not include the
[4] fact that there was a cesarean section, that there was
[5] a retained foreign body and a series of days during
[6] which there was abdominal discomfort with nausea and
[7] marked worsening on the 15th, and that he has not put
[8] all of those items into the formulation of his
[9] statement that the, quote, "Cause of her stroke was
[10] her post partum state," close quote.
[11] Q: Let me see if I understand what you just said.
[12] If I'm wrong, please correct me.
[13] It's your belief that Dr. Price did not
[14] consider the cesarean section, the retained foreign
[15] body, the abdominal discomfort, the increase on the
[16] 15th. He did not evaluate that properly in his
[17] opinion?
[18] A: In my opinion, correct, sir.
[19] Q: I guess what I'm getting back to is, assuming
[20] Dr. Price had all the records that you had in this
[21] particular case, and I understand what your opinion is
[22] and you understand what his opinion is, is this just a
[23] difference of opinion between two experts?
[24] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.
[25] Go ahead, Doctor.

Page 58

[1] A: It is certainly a difference of opinion between
[2] two experts. I am trying to identify, in response to
[3] your inquiry, what I think is the background reason
[4] for his opinion being so markedly different than mine.
[5] Q: Dr. Lerner's workup of this patient following
[6] the stroke, do you have any criticism of that at all?
[7] A: No, sir.
[8] Q: Would you consider that to be a complete workup
[9] of the situation?
[10] A: When we get to the technicalities of such a
[11] workup, one can get into the issue of searching with
[12] modern equipment for embolus detection. I don't think
[13] that would have added anything to this workup. I
[14] don't think that Compound S, Compound C,
[15] antithrombin-3, frequent determinations would have
[16] really added anything. I am not critical of his
[17] workup, sir.
[18] Q: And anything additional that could have been
[19] performed, it's your belief that it wouldn't have
[20] added anything to the conclusions reached by Dr.
[21] Lerner at the time?
[22] A: Correct, sir.
[23] Q: Was there any way to predict when this patient
[24] was rehospitalized, hospitalized for the removal of
[25] the sponge, that she would suffer a stroke?

Page 59

[1] A: No, sir.
[2] Q: Was there any way that it could have been
[3] prevented once she was hospitalized for the removal of
[4] the sponge?
[5] MR. MISHKIND: Are you talking
[6] about deferring the surgery?
[7] MR. FARCHIONE: Any way.
[8] A: From the time of the hospitalization on the 15th
[9] until it happened on the 16th?
[10] Q: Correct.
[11] A: I don't believe so, sir.
[12] Q: At what point between the time of her cesarean
[13] section and the time of the stroke did it become more
[14] likely than not that she was going to suffer a stroke?
[15] A: I don't know, sir.
[16] Q: Could it have been just as likely within a few
[17] hours of the cesarean section as it would be a few
[18] hours before the rehospitalization, or you can't tell?
[19] A: I don't think so, but I cannot tell.
[20] Q: To a probability you could not tell which end of
[21] the spectrum would be more likely?
[22] A: I think over half. We would say toward the end
[23] of that period of time because of the inflammatory
[24] changes that were taking place around the foreign body
[25] and into the wall of the intestine.

Page 60

[1] Q: But for the two items that you just mentioned,
[2] would the stroke have been avoided to a probability?
[3] MR. MISHKIND: I'm not sure I
[4] understand your question, Joe, the two
[5] items being the inflammatory process into
[6] the -
[7] MR. FARCHIONE: The bowel.
[8] Q: Maybe you're putting those two together. The
[9] answer that you just gave me, the inflammatory
[10] process, what exactly were you referring to?
[11] A: I'm referring to the fact that there was
[12] alteration in the white blood count and there was a
[13] change, a bit of change, in fibrinogen and D-Dimer at
[14] the time of the operative procedure. There was a
[15] tissue reaction including adherence of material to the
[16] wall of the intestine so that that material had to be
[17] dissected away, and I believe another surgeon was
[18] called in to look at this and assist a bit with it.
[19] All of these phenomena indicate a change in what
[20] we call the immune response to the introduction, in
[21] this instance, of a foreign body into the patient.
[22] Q: Let me ask it to you this way. Maybe that will
[23] be clearer. If she had the sponge removed 24 hours
[24] after the cesarean section, do you have an opinion to
[25] a probability whether she would have suffered the

Page 61

Page 63

[1] stroke?
[2] A: Yes, I do.
[3] Q: And what is that opinion?
[4] A: She would have been much less likely,
[5] significantly less likely, to have the stroke.
[6] Q: Does that mean to a probability she would not
[7] have had the stroke?
[8] A: Yes, sir.
[9] Q: What about 48 hours after the cesarean section?
[10] A: Same answer.
[11] Q: 72?
[12] A: The inflammation, of course, is now beginning to
[13] happen as far as the tissue is concerned. I think the
[14] answer is still the same. Where in that spectrum it
[15] changes, crosses over the line, I'm not sure.
[16] Q: Well, that's what I want to try and narrow it
[17] down as to where does it get to the point where you
[18] don't know. So far you have given me three days after
[19] the section, if the sponge had been removed, to a
[20] probability she would not have suffered the stroke.
[21] Let's try day four.
[22] A: I don't know. From this point in time out I
[23] don't know, sir.
[24] Q: I think you mentioned that there were ten
[25] patients you had in the post partum period who had

Page 62

Page 64

[1] suffered a stroke, correct?
[2] A: Correct, sir.
[3] Q: Of those ten, how many were you able to
[4] determine a precise cause? And I believe atrial
[5] fibrillation is one of the causes you -
[6] A: Is I recall, about eight. None of these were
[7] following cesarean section.
[8] Q: Would the rate of stroke in a post partum period
[9] be higher in a woman who has undergone a cesarean
[10] section as opposed to a vaginal delivery?
[11] A: I don't know data on that separately.
[12] Q: The two women who suffered the stroke for whom
[13] you could not find a cause, what role did you play
[14] specifically with each of those two patients?
[15] A: I was the neurologist involved.
[16] Q: When were you called into the case?
[17] A: Immediately.
[18] Q: Were you involved with the hospitalization from
[19] that point forward?
[20] A: Yes, sir.
[21] Q: Was it a similar type of stroke to what we have
[22] in this particular case?
[23] A: Not as severe, sir.
[24] Q: How long ago was your experience with those two?
[25] A: This is 25 years ago.

[1] Q: Women two weeks following a cesarean birth, can
[2] you tell me what range one would expect for the white
[3] blood cell count?
[4] A: No, sir, I can't.
[5] Q: Can you tell me what the range would be for the
[6] hematocrit or hemoglobin in the two weeks following a
[7] cesarean birth?
[8] A: No, sir.
[9] Q: If a D-Dimer test had been run on a post partum,
[10] post-section patient within two weeks of that section,
[11] can you tell me what range you would expect for that
[12] time of a patient?
[13] A: I would expect it to be negative.
[14] Q: The two patients that you were involved with 25
[15] years ago, do you recall what their D-Dimer was?
[16] A: We didn't have the test.
[17] Q: Did you have a test that was similar to that at
[18] that time?
[19] A: No.
[20] Q: Were you able to complete 25 years ago any type
[21] of coagulation study, PT, PTT?
[22] A: Those were done, yes, sir.
[23] Q: Do you remember what those were?
[24] A: The platelet agglutinations were done. Those
[25] were all normal in those two persons.

[1] Q: How does inflammation affect the clotting?
[2] A: Inflammation, particularly when it gets into the
[3] wall of the blood vessel and affects the endothelium
[4] of the blood vessel, decreases the ability of the
[5] endothelium to form intrinsic TPA, which is
[6] anticlotting, and the inflammation then produces a
[7] situation where platelets may adhere to the vessel
[8] wall, and when the platelets adhere to the vessel
[9] wall, they cast out chemicals which may induce other
[10] platelets to stick to them without sticking to the
[11] wall, and aggregation of platelets then begins and
[12] this is the initiation of the clotting process.
[13] Now, all of this is a dynamic, highly dynamic,
[14] kind of process. This is going on all of the time,
[15] but when a vessel gets inflamed, it changes the
[16] likelihood of such things happening.
[17] Q: If the source of the embolic stroke, as you've
[18] opined in this case, if it was in the carotid, which
[19] was one of the two possibilities you've given earlier,
[20] how did the inflammation affect the carotid?
[21] A: The inflammation can be a reaction, of course,
[22] that goes on in the blood stream or is induced through
[23] the blood.
[24] Q: From the septicemia?
[25] A: Through the business of septicemia and the

Page 65

[1] changes in the chemistry of the blood produced by
[2] infection.
[3] Q: So if this patient was not, in your opinion,
[4] septic, did not have septicemia, then that would rule
[5] out the carotid source?
[6] A: Not necessarily. We have patients who get
[7] inflammatory reactions as in cranial periarteritis and
[8] periarteritis nodosa and lupus without inflammatory
[9] reactions in vessels secondary to an infection that is
[10] localized elsewhere from the body without literally
[11] producing any septicemia.
[12] Q: Why did she get better on Monday?
[13] A: I don't know, sir.
[14] Q: Did you find that unusual, that she was able to
[15] get up and go out to McDonald's and eat?
[16] A: Yes.
[17] Q: Why?
[18] A: I don't know. I literally don't know why she
[19] got so much better.
[20] Q: Women in the post partum period who suffer
[21] strokes when there's no known source found, are those
[22] more often than not arterial strokes or venous
[23] strokes?
[24] A: Arterial.
[25] Q: What do you base that on, the Kittner article?

Page 66

[1] A: Well, in my experience, see, if we look at the
[2] question of stroke, in my experience, more than half
[3] of the patients I have seen have had ruptured
[4] intracranial aneurysms.
[5] Q: Well, then, a source for a stroke would be the
[6] aneurysm?
[7] A: The mechanism.
[8] Q: Correct. I'm talking about, for instance, the
[9] two patients who you had which you could not find a
[10] source for. Under those circumstances, is it more
[11] arterial or is it more venous?
[12] A: More arterial, sir.
[13] Q: And the reason for that?
[14] A: I don't know, other than if we look at all
[15] strokes, the weighting is significantly towards
[16] arterial pathology in contrast to venous pathology.
[17] Q: What was the cause for this narrowing that you
[18] noted, the 20 percent narrowing of the carotid?
[19] A: I don't know, other than a constriction like
[20] this is produced by fragments of fibromuscular
[21] dysplasia or a bit of erythematous change. We
[22] literally don't know without tissue examination
[23] because it happens.
[24] Q: This evaluation, the 20 percent that you
[25] reached, that was from an MRA in 1996?

Page 67

[1] A: Yes, sir.
[2] Q: Could that have been spasm of the carotid as
[3] opposed to an actual narrowing?
[4] A: It is possible. I don't think it's likely but
[5] it's possible.
[6] Q: Why don't you think it is likely that it was a
[7] spasm?
[8] A: It was bilateral and it had a contour of a
[9] lesion in the wall of the artery rather than a
[10] constriction of the muscles.
[11] Q: Did you mention that you reviewed articles for
[12] the New England Journal of Medicine?
[13] A: I have, yes.
[14] Q: Were you asked to review the Kittner article?
[15] A: No, sir.
[16] Q: Do you have any criticism of the Kittner
[17] article?
[18] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.
[19] A: No, sir.
[20] Q: Any disagreements with the Kittner article?
[21] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.
[22] MR. MISHKIND: Do you understand
[23] what he means when he says "disagreement"?
[24] THE WITNESS: No.
[25] Q: You and Dr. Price disagree on your opinions in

Page 68

[1] this case. That's disagreement.
[2] A: Yes, sir.
[3] Q: Okay. Is there anything that stood out in the
[4] Kittner article that you disagreed with?
[5] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.
[6] Go ahead.
[7] A: No, sir.
[8] Q: Either the methodology used or the conclusions
[9] that were reached?
[10] MR. MISHKIND: Same objection.
[11] Go ahead.
[12] A: Well, I think the methodology was sloppy. Now,
[13] based on that methodology, I have no reason to
[14] disagree with their statistical analysis of the data
[15] they produced in their tables and so forth.
[16] Q: When you say "sloppy," what do you mean?
[17] A: Well, they simply went to 45 hospitals, I think,
[18] most of them in Maryland, and went to the record rooms
[19] and got the records of individuals who had had stroke
[20] following parturition and also some individuals who
[21] were in the same age category, female, and didn't have
[22] stroke following the birth of a baby.
[23] Having chaired record committees and looked at
[24] statistical data with some epidemiologists, I know how
[25] varied in accuracy and completeness these records from

Page 65

[1] changes in the chemistry of the blood produced by
[2] infection.
[3] Q: So if this patient was not, in your opinion,
[4] septic, did not have septicemia, then that would rule
[5] out the carotid source?
[6] A: Not necessarily. We have patients who get
[7] inflammatory reactions as in cranial periarteritis and
[8] periarteritis nodosa and lupus without inflammatory
[9] reactions in vessels secondary to an infection that is
[10] localized elsewhere from the body without literally
[11] producing any septicemia.
[12] Q: Why did she get better on Monday?
[13] A: I don't know, sir.
[14] Q: Did you find that unusual, that she was able to
[15] get up and go out to McDonald's and eat?
[16] A: Yes.
[17] Q: Why?
[18] A: I don't know. I literally don't know why she
[19] got so much better.
[20] Q: Women in the post partum period who suffer
[21] strokes when there's no known source found, are those
[22] more often than not arterial strokes or venous
[23] strokes?
[24] A: Arterial.
[25] Q: What do you base that on, the Kittner article?

Page 66

[1] A: Well, in my experience, see, if we look at the
[2] question of stroke, in my experience, more than half
[3] of the patients I have seen have had ruptured
[4] intracranial aneurysms.
[5] Q: Well, then, a source for a stroke would be the
[6] aneurysm?
[7] A: The mechanism.
[8] Q: Correct. I'm talking about, for instance, the
[9] two patients who you had which you could not find a
[10] source for. Under those circumstances, is it more
[11] arterial or is it more venous?
[12] A: More arterial, sir.
[13] Q: And the reason for that?
[14] A: I don't know, other than if we look at all
[15] strokes, the weighting is significantly towards
[16] arterial pathology in contrast to venous pathology.
[17] Q: What was the cause for this narrowing that you
[18] noted, the 20 percent narrowing of the carotid?
[19] A: I don't know, other than a constriction like
[20] this is produced by fragments of fibromuscular
[21] dysplasia or a bit of erythematous change. We
[22] literally don't know without tissue examination
[23] because it happens.
[24] Q: This evaluation, the 20 percent that you
[25] reached, that was from an MRA in 1996?

Page 67

[1] A: Yes, sir.
[2] Q: Could that have been spasm of the carotid as
[3] opposed to an actual narrowing?
[4] A: It is possible. I don't think it's likely but
[5] it's possible.
[6] Q: Why don't you think it is likely that it was a
[7] spasm?
[8] A: It was bilateral and it had a contour of a
[9] lesion in the wall of the artery rather than a
[10] constriction of the muscles.
[11] Q: Did you mention that you reviewed articles for
[12] the New England Journal of Medicine?
[13] A: I have, yes.
[14] Q: Were you asked to review the Kittner article?
[15] A: No, sir.
[16] Q: Do you have any criticism of the Kittner
[17] article?
[18] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.
[19] A: No, sir.
[20] Q: Any disagreements with the Kittner article?
[21] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.
[22] MR. MISHKIND: Do you understand
[23] what he means when he says "disagreement"?
[24] THE WITNESS: No.
[25] Q: You and Dr. Price disagree on your opinions in

Page 68

[1] this case. That's disagreement.
[2] A: Yes, sir.
[3] Q: Okay. Is there anything that stood out in the
[4] Kittner article that you disagreed with?
[5] MR. MISHKIND: Objection.
[6] Go ahead.
[7] A: No, sir.
[8] Q: Either the methodology used or the conclusions
[9] that were reached?
[10] MR. MISHKIND: Same objection.
[11] Go ahead.
[12] A: Well, I think the methodology was sloppy. Now,
[13] based on that methodology, I have no reason to
[14] disagree with their statistical analysis of the data
[15] they produced in their tables and so forth.
[16] Q: When you say "sloppy," what do you mean?
[17] A: Well, they simply went to 45 hospitals, I think,
[18] most of them in Maryland, and went to the record rooms
[19] and got the records of individuals who had had stroke
[20] following parturition and also some individuals who
[21] were in the same age category, female, and didn't have
[22] stroke following the birth of a baby.
[23] Having chaired record committees and looked at
[24] statistical data with some epidemiologists, I know how
[25] varied in accuracy and completeness these records from

Page 69

Page 71

[1] 45 hospitals are going to be about the nature of the
[2] stroke, whether the CTs were done and when they were
[3] done, how the patients were worked up, how many of
[4] them had TEEs, et cetera, et cetera.

[5] I've been through this matter of epidemiologic
[6] studies, particularly in drug trials, that is,
[7] treatment trials, and can simply say that, from my
[8] experience with such kinds of compilations of
[9] material, **we** just get kind of an overall shotgun
[10] opinion of how many this is and that is.

[11] For instance, I didn't see anything in there
[12] about stroke following cesarean section, which is the
[13] situation we are dealing with in the patient that we
[14] are discussing. **So** that immediately raises the
[15] question how extrapable is the statistical analysis of
[16] these patients from 40 plus different hospitals to the
[17] one patient that we are discussing today.

[18] Q: Have you seen the protocols that were used for
[19] the study in terms of which patients would be
[20] included, which patients would be excluded?

[21] A: No, I have not seen the protocols.

[22] Q: Discuss that with Dr. Price at all?

[23] A: Have I?

[24] Q: Yes.

[25] A: No, sir.

Page 70

[1] Q: Your criticism of the study, have you verbalized
[2] that criticism or written that criticism other than
[3] what you've just said here today?

[4] A: No, sir.

[5] Q: You said that the patient was dehydrated when
[6] she presented to the hospital. Was she any more
[7] dehydrated than a patient, any normal patient, two
[8] weeks post-cesarean section, a week **actually**?

[9] A: I don't know.

[10] MR. MISHKIND: It's actually two
[11] weeks.

[12] MR. FARCHIONE: Two?

[13] MR. MISHKIND: Yes. November 2 to
[14] 15.

[15] MR. FARCHIONE: Okay.

[16] A: I don't know.

[17] MR. MISHKIND: 13 days.

[18] Q: You don't know?

[19] A: No.

[20] Q: The dehydration that you see in this patient, is
[21] that in and of itself enough to have a patient
[22] hospitalized?

[23] A: No, sir.

[24] Q: Do you agree it was mild dehydration at best?

[25] A: Yes, sir.

[1] Q: But for the dehydration, would the outcome have
[2] been different?

[3] THE WITNESS: Would you read
[4] that, please?

[5] (Record read.)

[6] MR. MISHKIND: Before you answer
[7] the question, you mean everything else
[8] stays as is, just take the dehydration
[9] away?

[10] MR. FARCHIONE: Yes.

[11] MR. MISHKIND: Okay.

[12] A: I don't believe so.

[13] Q: You don't believe the outcome would have been
[14] different?

[5] A: Correct.

[6] Q: What are the signs of septicemia? And symptoms.
[7] Put them both together.

[8] A: Variable. One is malaise, that is, feeling
[9] badly; fever of various degrees; sometimes chills;
[10] interference with appetite; sometimes actual
[11] shivering; blotchiness of the skin sometimes,
[12] depending on the site of the cause; nausea; vomiting.

[13] Q: But for the septicemia in this case, would the
[14] outcome have been different?

[15] A: I think the septicemia played a significant role

Page 72

[1] in producing the hypercoagulability.

[2] Q: Let me take that to the next step. If the
[3] patient was not septic, did not have septicemia, would
[4] it be fair to state, then, to a probability the stroke
[5] wouldn't have occurred?

[6] A: I don't think so. I think the stroke would have
[7] occurred.

[8] Q: Why do you think the stroke would have occurred
[9] absent the septicemia?

[10] A: I think there were phenomena going on in this
[11] complex coagulation-lysis system that were triggered
[12] by the chemical phenomena produced by the inflammatory
[13] reaction around and adjacent to the foreign body.

[14] I do believe that there was interaction of a
[15] number of factors, including the existence of the
[16] septicemia, but there can be, as I mentioned earlier,
[17] an inflammation, particularly of blood vessel walls,
[18] without having septicemia, meaning bacteremia or
[19] viremia, et cetera.

[20] Q: You mentioned some textbooks, one of them being
[21] Toole's text. Is that T-O-O-L'S?

[22] A: T-O-O-L-E.

[23] Q: And what's the textbook entitled?

[24] A: Cerebral Vascular Disease.

[25] Q: Cerebral Vascular Disease?

Page 73	Page 75
[1] A: Yes. [2] Q: Barnett is spelled how? [3] A: B-A-R-N-E-T-T. [4] Q: And his text is entitled what? [5] A: Stroke. [6] Q: And your friend in England, has that name come [7] back to you, or perhaps the name of his textbook? [8] A: Cerebral Vascular Disease. [9] Q: Same title as Dr. Toole's book? [10] A: Yes, sir. [11] Q: And the name of your textbook? [12] A: Stroke. [13] Q: Any other writings, publications that you have [14] in your curriculum vitae that you feel would be [15] applicable to this particular case? [16] A: Yes, sir. [17] Q: Which ones would those be? Do you have your CV [18] numbered by page? If you can just give me the page [19] number with the number of the article or book, that [20] would be sufficient. [21] MR. MOSCARINO: Off the record. [22] (Discussion had off the record.) [23] A: Page 15, item 92; page 16, item 99; page 18, [24] item 137; page 19, item 145; page 19, item 153; page [25] 21, item 183; page 22, item 199; page 22, item 207;	[1] [2] FURTHER EXAMINATION [3] BY MR. MOSCARINO: [4] Q: Doctor, how much time do you spend in reviewing [5] cases, medical-legal matters? [6] A: Oh, probably less than two percent of my time [7] maybe, Well, less than two percent of my time. [8] Q: Have you ever worked with Mr. Mishkind before? [9] A: No, sir. [10] Q: Ever work with his law firm before? [11] A: No, sir. [12] Q: Tell me if you agree with this statement. The [13] extremely high relative risk of stroke during the post [14] partum period suggests a causal role for the large [15] decrease in blood volume or the rapid changes in [16] hormonal status that follows a live birth or still [17] birth. [18] A: I do not agree with that statement. [19] Q: What part of that statement do you disagree [20] with? [21] A: First part. [22] Q: The part that says there is an extremely high [23] relative risk of stroke during the post partum period? [24] A: Yes, sir. [25] Q: Because you just don't believe there is such a
Page 74	Page 76
[1] page 22, item 209. Conclusion. [2] Off the record? I thought of the name of the [3] author of that book. [4] Q: Let's put it on the record. [5] A: The name of the Englishman authoring a book on [6] Cerebral Vascular Disease is Ross Russell. [7] Q: When this patient was admitted to remove the [8] sponge, if she was not dehydrated and if she did not [9] have septicemia, would the outcome to a probability [10] have been different? [11] MR. MISHKIND: Objection. Asked [12] and answered. [13] MR. FARCHIONE: I asked it [14] individually. Just so it's clear, I asked [15] individually if there was no dehydrated; [16] individually if there is no septicemia. [17] Q: Just so it's clear, Doctor, if there was no [18] dehydration and no septicemia when she was admitted, [19] all else being equal, would the stroke have probably [20] occurred? [21] A: Yes, sir. [22] Q: And it comes down to the inflammatory response [23] from the retained foreign body? [24] A: Yes, sir. [25] MR. FARCHIONE: That's all I have.	[1] risk? [2] A: Well, the risk of stroke in the post partum [3] period is one out of about 12,000. I do not think [4] that's a high risk. [5] Q: Is the risk for the women who are in that post [6] partum state as opposed to women who are not in the [7] post partum state high in relation to that? Do you [8] understand my question? [9] A: Yes, sir. The risk in the post partum state, as [10] I just mentioned, is about one in 12,000. For the [11] same age woman not in the post partum state, it's [12] about one in 100,000. [13] Q: So are those two risks when compared, or stated [14] another way, when you compare the non-post partum to [15] the post partum women, do you have, then, an extremely [16] high relative risk of stroke? [17] MR. MISHKIND: Objection. [18] A: It depends on the definition of "extremely [19] high." If one looks at a difference between one in [20] 12,000 and one in 100,000, why, that's approximately [21] eight to one. I think that a risk of one in 12,000 is [22] a very, very slight risk. [23] Q: Well, then, do you agree that that risk, whether [24] slight or extremely high, suggests a causal role for [25] the large decrease in blood volume or the rapid

Page 77

{1} changes in hormonal status that follows a live birth
{2} or still birth?
{3} MR. MISHKIND: Objection.
{4} A: Go ahead.
{5} A: There is possibly a relationship. I don't know
{6} technically, and we are not talking about
{7} post-cesarean section, of course.
{8} Q: That's your opinion?
{9} A: The numbers that I gave are not post-cesarean.
{10} They are just post partum, normal deliveries.
{11} Q: So your assumption is that the Kittner articles
{12} deal solely with natural deliveries?
{13} A: Yes, sir.
{14} MR. MOSCARINO: That's all I have.
{15} MR. MISHKIND: The doctor will
{16} read it. I will take a copy.
{17}
{18} (Deposition concluded at 1:27p.m.)
{19}
{20}
{21}
{22}
{23} Clark H. Millikan, M.D.

Page 78

The State of Ohio,)
) SS: CERTIFICATE
County of Cuyahoga.)
I, Mary Ann Flynn, Notary Public within and for the
State of Ohio, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby
certify that the within-named CLARK H. MILLIKAN, M.D. was by
me first duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth,
and nothing but the truth in the cause aforesaid; that the
testimony then given by him/her was by me reduced to
stenotypy in the presence of said witness, afterwards
transcribed upon a computer, and that the foregoing is a true
and correct transcript of the testimony so given by him/her
as aforesaid.
I do further certify that this deposition was taken at
the time and place in the foregoing caption specified and was
completed without adjournment.
I do further certify that I am not a relative, counsel
or attorney of either party or otherwise interested in the
event of this action.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and
affixed my seal of office at Cleveland, Ohio on this 7th
day of November, 1997.
Mary Ann Flynn, Notary Public
in and for the State of Ohio.
My commission expires 10-21-01.

Mary Ann
Flynn

1 100 56:19; 57:2 100,000 9:25; 10:6; 76:12, 20 11/16 27:16 12,000 9:14; 10:6; 76:3, 10, 20, 21 134:4; 6:15; 70:17 13773:24 147:11 14573:24 14th 34:11, 14, 17 1570:14; 73:23 153 73:24 15th 34:10, 15, 24; 35:14; 57:7, 16; 59:8 1673:23 16th 9:8; 59:9 1873:23 18,000 13:8 18373:25 1973:24, 24 195833:15 198650:9 19973:25 199429:13; 45:1; 50:13; 53:3 19969:9, 9; 29:3; 37:8; 66:25 1997 4:4, 23; 7:11, 15 19th 9:8 1:27 77:18	48 61:9	added 58:13, 16, 20 addition 30:17 additional 6:22; 7:1, 20; 54:25; 56:7; 58:18 adhere 64:7, 8 adherence 60:15 adjacent 72:13 admitted 74:7, 18 affairs 4:19; 5:2 affect 64:1, 20 affects 64:3 affirmatively 56:25 afterward 23:15 again 5:1; 9:3 age 9:22; 68:21; 76:11 agents 20:21 agglutinations 63:24 aggregability 30:15 aggregation 11:25; 12:13; 64:11 ago 3:17; 36:1; 62:24, 25; 63:15, 20 agree 35:7; 40:7, 19; 45:6; 52:24; 53:1, 7, 10, 13, 20; 55:11; 70:24; 75:12, 18; 76:23 agreeing 53:6 ahead 17:13; 36:16; 37:2; 45:20; 48:25; 54:18; 57:25; 68:6, 11; 77:4 Alan 7:6, 11 allowed 17:9 Alta 5:10 alter 7:21 alteration 18:24; 21:9; 60:12 altered 29:22 alternative 11:10 although 16:3; 24:25; 53:11 American 38:21, 21 amount 16:4 analysis 68:14; 69:15 anatomically 25:15 aneurysm 66:6 aneurysms 66:4 animal 26:23 Annals 6:10 answered 54:17; 74:12 antibodies 19:20 anticlotting 64:6 antithrombin 19:25 antithrombin-3 30:20; 58:15 antithrombin-C 30:14 anybody 10:11; 17:16 aorta 18:15 aphasia 46:8, 10, 11; 48:21; 49:15 Apparently 31:12 appear 39:25 appearance 16:5	appeared 33:21; 34:19 appears 18:24 appetite 71:20 applicable 73:15 approximately 9:14; 76:20 area 16:3; 44:2; 51:8; 55:19; 56:21 around 59:24; 72:13 arterial 14:16; 26:25; 65:22, 24; 66:11, 12, 16 arteriogram 21:21 arteriography 21:18 artery 14:3, 5; 16:11; 18:14; 25:4, 6, 8, 11, 19; 26:5; 27:15, 21; 28:2, 10, 14, 21; 29:3, 13; 41:1; 49:23; 52:3; 53:19, 24; 67:9 article 37:3, 6, 9, 11, 15, 17; 38:2, 3, 3; 39:18; 65:25; 67:14, 17, 20; 68:4; 73:19 articles 36:12, 25; 39:25; 67:11; 77:11 assist 60:18 assistants 5:13 associated 13:16; 14:24; 15:1; 18:4, 9; 20:22, 24; 21:13; 34:11 Association 38:22 assuming 57:19 assumption 77:11 atrial 40:25; 62:4 attack 20:12 attacks 14:18; 21:3 attempt 22:2 attention 36:2 attorney 3:18 August 7:15 auricular 18:3; 35:25; 36:2 author 39:20; 74:3 authoring 74:5 autopsy 26:19, 23 avoided 60:2 aware 46:13, 16 away 60:17; 71:9	bacteriemic 10:18; 11:1, 3 badly 71:19 balance 6:4; 47:6 Barnett 36:17; 73:2 Barry 7:8 base 65:25 based 25:19, 21; 44:1, 11; 48:3; 55:15; 68:13 basic 14:6, 13, 15 basically 11:10; 15:24; 53:6 basis 29:21 battery 19:22 bearing 40:24 become 59:13 becomes 18:6 beginning 37:25; 61:12 begins 17:23; 64:11 behalf 54:5 behavior 45:5 belief 57:13; 58:19 believe 4:12; 23:13; 24:21, 25; 39:22, 22; 46:17; 51:5, 15; 54:24; 57:3; 59:11; 60:17; 62: 71:12, 13; 72:14; 75:25 best 70:24 better 48:15; 65:12, 19 big 7:17, 24; 15:10, 15, 16 bilateral 67:8 binder 7:24 birth 63:1, 7; 68:22; 75:16, 17; 77:1, 2 bit 9:16; 13:9; 38:15, 19; 60:13, 18; 66:21 black 7:24 bleed 15:14 bleeding 15:10; 33:3 blood 10:17, 21; 11:2; 13:7, 11; 14:14, 19, 20; 15:2, 5, 7, 11, 12; 16:3, 4, 5, 6; 19:3, 4, 6, 6, 7, 9; 20:4, 18, 23; 21:4; 25:2, 2; 26:6, 21; 29:23, 24; 31:20; 32:1, 3, 11, 14, 15, 21; 60:12; 63:3; 64:3, 4, 22, 23; 65:1; 72:17; 75:15; 76:25 blotchiness 71:21 body 13:3; 19:5; 33:8; 34:20; 35:12; 40:9; 57:5, 15; 59:24; 60:21; 65:10; 72:13; 74:23 book 36:22; 73:9, 19; 74:3, 5 Both 11:21; 12:4, 7; 22:9; 35:24; 71:17 bowel 13:4; 60:7 brain 15:6; 19:10; 24:23; 25:3, 14; 42:16, 20; 45:24; 46:12; 47:11, 14, 14; 48:4; 52:17, 24; 53:25; 54:22 break 15:11; 24:20; 49:20; 54:20
	5			
	50 33:3, 4; 35:15			
	6			
	6 7:15 60 6:3; 33:4; 35:15 65 6:3 6th 34:10, 16, 23			
	7			
	72 61:11 75 29:9; 50:14, 16 75/25 29:7			
	9			
	90/10 25:12 92 73:23 94 50:17 95/5 49:2 96 50:10, 11 99 73:23			
	A			
2 2 19:23; 31:5; 70:13 20 50:1, 9, 16; 66:18, 24 20773:25 209 74:1 21 5:15; 73:25 21st 9:8 22 73:25, 25; 74:1 24 60:23 25 39:4; 62:25; 63:14, 20 2nd 35:14	abdomen 33:9, 16 abdominal 34:12; 57:6, 15 ability 47:15, 17, 19; 48:13; 64:4 able 16:12; 23:16; 35:17; 41:6; 62:3; 63:20; 65:14 abnormal 13:12, 14; 20:1; 31:2; 34:22 abnormalities 23:9; 25:22 abnormality 23:22; 26:14; 27:12; 52:6 absent 72:9 absolutely 53:1, 7 academic 4:19; 5:2 Academy 38:21 accident 33:15 According 8:2; 22:17 accumulation 40:3 accuracy 68:25 accurate 44:6 activities 6:5 activity 54:9 actual 13:20; 14:2, 4; 15:2; 22:4; 26:5; 48:13; 57 3; 71:20 actually 25:10; 49:6; 70:8, 10 add 24:17; 47:20			
	3			
	3 19:25 3-A 19:20 3-B 19:20 30 38:24; 41:12 3rd 35:14			
	4			
	40 33:3; 69:16 45 33:2; 54:8; 68:17; 69:1			
	B B 3:12; 4:5; 6:14; 7:22 B-A-R-N-E-T 73:3 baby 68:22 back 13:17; 15:3; 16:18; 25:18; 29:13; 38:24; 40:12; 46:13; 53:3; 57:19; 73:7 background 21:1, 9; 58:3 bacterial 10:20 Bacteriemia 10:20; 72:18			

broken 15:14 bruit 18:8 business 64:25 by-lined 39:20	73:8; 74:6 certain 20:21; 21:23; 31:22 certainly 40:17; 58:1 certified 3:4 cesarean 36:4; 57:4, 14; 59:12, 17; 60:24; 61:9; 62:7, 9; 63:1, 7; 69:12 cetera 15:14; 17:19; 21:25; 45:5; 47:21; 69:4, 4 72:19 chaired 39:2; 68:23 chance 9:13; 44:13 change 7:21; 15:1; 18:1, 2, 3; 19:24; 20:9, 11; 21:24; 60:13, 13, 19; 66:21 changed 6:17 changes 13:10; 20:23; 26:15, 17; 40:9; 59:24; 61:15; 64:15; 65:1; 75:15; 77:1 characteristic 26:20, 24 chase 43:20 checkbook 47:6, 18 chemical 13:5; 72:12 chemicals 64:9 chemistry 65:1 chest 20:8; 21:11, 13 child 40:24; 41:21, 22 children 47:4 hills 71:19 circulation 52:10; 54:3, 4 circumstances 21:23; 66:10 City 4:18; 5:11 Civil 3:3 >LARK 3:1, 8; 77:23 clear 15:16; 43:6, 13; 61:20; 74:14, 17 clearer 60:23 Cleveland 3:10, 19 clinical 44:10 Loe 7:10 lose 9:2; 41:3; 57:10 lot 11:25; 12:13, 14; 4:20; 16:25; 18:4, 10; 0:24; 22:5; 26:4, 6, 11; 3:23; 54:1 lotting 13:16; 18:14; 9:5, 18; 20:2, 14; 64:1, 12 o-author 39:23, 24 oagulation 13:16; 9:12; 30:1; 31:1, 3; 63:21 oagulation-lysis 72:11 ocaine 20:22 ognitive 49:4 oincide 35:23 ollege 4:17 omfortable 44:18, 19; 9:11 oming 43:21, 22 omment 52:1 omments 55:7	committee 39:2; 56:2 committees 38:25; 68:22 common 17:24; 18:2; 55:25 commonly 14:15 commonplace 55:19 compare 76:14 compared 76:13 compilations 69:8 complete 58:8; 63:20 completeness 68:25 complex 13:13; 72:11 Compound 58:14, 14 computer 47:20, 25 concerned 20:4; 21:11; 49:3; 61:13 concerning 39:13; 55:8 concerns 37:12 conclude 27:21; 28:19; 35:23 concluded 77:18 concluding 23:19 conclusion 10:13; 23:10; 25:19, 21; 29:1, 21; 41:8; 50:2; 74:1 conclusions 58:20; 68:8 condition 35:13; 43:24 conditions 5:9 conduct 37:21 confer 49:7 confirm 30:10, 23 confused 24:20 consider 57:14; 58:8 constitutes 20:6 constriction 66:19; 67:10 construct 5:11 construction 6:6 consultants 32:17 contacts 38:20 contained 6:14; 42:12, 4; 45:4 contaminant 32:20 contents 19:3 continue 46:1, 23; 48:20; 66:2 ontour 67:8 ontractual 5:24 ontrast 52:17; 66:16 opy 7:4, 25; 77:16 orrectly 11:6 ottonwood 5:7, 10 ount 13:7; 19:7, 7; 9:23; 31:21; 60:12; 63:3 ouple 20:20 oupled 25:22 ourse 21:4; 33:18, 19; 4:10; 45:10; 61:12; 4:21; 77:7 ranial 31:24; 65:7 ritical 58:16 riticism 58:6; 67:16;	70:1, 2, 2 cross 52:20 cross-over 48:11; 53:2 crosses 61:15 CT 9:8; 18:19; 21:16; 23:22; 25:22, 23; 26:15, 18; 27:11, 13, 16, 17; 47:12; 48:12 CTs 69:2 culture 11:2; 32:11, 12, 14, 15 cultures 32:2, 3, 21 current 4:14; 5:1; 43:24 curriculum 73:14 customarily 15:11; 17:17 cut 43:19 CV 4:11; 55:15; 73:17	demonstrated 42:16; 44:13 demonstration 52:11 department 5:6 depending 71:22 depends 76:18 deposition 3:7; 7:4, 5, 5, 6, 7; 22:22; 37:18, 19, 25; 40:4; 45:3, 19; 46:5; 77:18 description 45:4 detection 17:25; 58:12 determination 16:19; 17:15, 16, 17, 21 determinations 19:24; 58:15 determine 22:14; 35:17; 62:4 determined 22:19; 35:20; 48:12, 13 develop 20:2 development 12:14 Dewey 7:7 diabetes 20:5 diagnosis 23:13; 34:19 DIC 29:25; 30:2, 5, 7, 8, 10 die 16:5 dies 16:2, 4 differ 55:20 difference 56:20; 57:23; 58:1; 76:19 different 27:9, 10, 11; 52:5; 58:4; 69:16; 71:2, 14, 24; 74:10 digital 21:25 directed 37:6 directly 12:5 director 4:18; 5:2 disagree 40:20; 55:6, 8; 57:25; 68:14; 75:19 disagreed 56:1; 68:4 disagreement 67:23; 68:1 disagreements 67:20 disciplines 17:21 discomfort 34:13; 57:6, 15 discourse 24:18 discovery 3:7; 45:19; 66:5 Discuss 69:22 discussing 69:14, 17 discussion 38:4; 73:22 Disease 6:8; 21:3, 10; 2:17; 72:24, 25; 73:8; 4:6 disorder 14:25; 20:18 disorders 30:6 isplayed 47:12 isregard 8:24 issected 60:17 issection 41:1 isseminated 13:15; 9:25				
C								
C 30:19; 58:14 calculation 50:7 calculator 47:25; 48:1 call 15:3; 26:11; 48:11; 60:20 called 3:2; 13:11; 14:25; 16:6; 21:20; 60:18; 62:16 calls 5:9 came 23:17; 25:1; 27:19 Can 7:17; 8:23; 10:24; 12:13; 15:14; 19:13; 20:19, 22, 23; 21:13, 13; 23:24; 30:22, 25; 31:21, 23, 23, 24; 33:13; 36:16; 39:11; 40:7, 16, 17; 43:17; 44:2; 47:6, 21; 57:1; 58:11; 63:1, 5, 11; 64:21; 69:7; 72:16; 73:18 capacity 19:9 cardiac 14:18; 18:1; 20:9; 40:25 Care 5:14, 25; 42:5 cared 32:23; 33:3, 7 career 33:5 carefully 40:23 carotid 18:14; 27:21; 28:2, 9, 14, 20; 29:3, 13; 41:1; 49:23; 52:2, 18; 53:19, 24; 54:3, 4; 64:18, 20; 65:5; 66:18; 67:2 carry 19:10 case 3:9, 21; 4:7; 6:13, 23; 10:13; 11:4; 14:9; 23:15; 30:18; 33:13, 24; 35:2; 37:22; 42:4; 43:12; 51:21; 53:14, 20; 55:1, 12, 17; 57:21; 62:16, 22; 64:18; 68:1; 71:23; 73:15 cases 41:15; 54:10; 75:5 cast 64:9 categories 15:15, 16 category 6:11; 36:5; 68:21 causal 34:7; 75:14; 76:24 causative 34:2; 35:21 cause 13:18, 20; 14:2, 13; 20:19; 23:7; 26:11; 35:18, 20; 40:23; 53:4; 55:8; 57:9; 62:4, 13; 66:17; 71:22 caused 25:24; 26:4, 12; 35:11; 53:15 causes 14:4, 6, 15; 35:5; 40:24; 62:5 cell 31:21; 63:3 cells 19:5; 29:24 Cerebral 6:8; 15:20; 16:1, 10; 25:4, 6, 8, 11, 19; 27:15; 52:10; 72:24, 25;					D			
D-Dimer 13:12; 19:21; 29:22; 30:11, 18; 60:13; 63:9, 15 damage 13:4; 25:14; 42:15, 19; 43:2, 17; 44:1, 4; 45:24; 47:14, 15; 48:4; 54:22 damages 43:23 data 40:3; 62:11; 68:14, 24 dated 4:4; 7:10 day 34:10, 14, 23; 61:21 days 57:5; 61:18; 70:17 deal 39:3; 43:17; 77:12 dealing 69:13 decades 20:20 decrease 13:9, 9; 14:14, 16; 15:7; 19:6, 9; 75:15; 76:25 decreases 64:4 defect 46:7, 11; 49:4; 52:16 Defendant's 3:12 Defendants 3:2 Defer 56:6 Deferring 59:6 Define 9:15; 35:8 Definitely 54:7 Definition 34:4; 76:18 Definitive 22:18, 23, 25; 61:6 Degree 12:21; 49:23, 24; 61:11, 15, 22; 53:22; 54:14 Degrees 71:19 Dehydrated 12:20, 23, 64; 31:16; 70:5, 7; 74:8, 15 Dehydration 31:7, 14; 60:20, 24; 71:1, 8; 74:18 Delineation 51:25 Deliveries 77:10, 12 Delivery 8:3; 9:20; 62:10 Demonstrable 52:20								

distal 15:7; 26:7
distant 30:3
distinction 18:18
distinguish 21:17
distribution 16:10; 25:8;
27:9
Doctor 6:1; 8:23; 9:11;
17:13; 24:18; 40:15, 17;
56:13; 57:25; 74:17; 75:4;
77:15
doctors 6:14; 17:20;
37:13
Doll 3:9; 6:13; 7:5, 7; 8:9;
10:13; 11:22; 12:20;
15:19; 16:8; 29:12, 18;
31:9, 16; 40:5; 42:15;
44:20; 48:19; 51:16, 23
Doll's 9:22; 22:18; 24:22;
34:1; 35:5; 40:5; 42:10;
52:24; 53:3, 15, 24
dominant 48:11
done 9:9, 9; 21:18, 21, 22;
27:16; 28:6; 30:9, 13, 16,
20; 36:6; 45:3; 63:22, 24;
69:2, 3
Doppler 18:23, 25; 28:3,
6
doubt 46:22, 25
down 24:20; 26:19;
61:17; 74:22
Dr 3:7, 17; 7:13, 15;
22:17; 23:4, 10; 31:15;
34:25; 35:10; 37:5; 38:15,
15, 17, 19, 23; 52:22; 55:4,
11, 25; 56:14, 15, 19; 57:1,
13, 20; 58:5, 20; 67:25;
69:22; 73:9
drafts 4:9
driven 33:15
drop 3:24; 15:4
drug 31:22; 69:6
dry 31:13
due 15:11
duly 3:3
during 13:21; 27:25;
35:13; 57:5; 75:13, 23
duties 5:4, 5
dynamic 64:13, 13
dysplasia 66:21

E

each 56:2; 62:14
earlier 64:19; 72:16
eat 65:15
editorial 6:6
education 5:12
eight 10:7; 62:6; 76:21
either 42:5; 68:8
EKG 20:10
element 30:7
elevated 31:20
eliciting 45:14
else 30:12; 71:7; 74:19

elsewhere 65:10
emboli 12:14; 18:11, 12,
13; 19:1; 26:1, 6; 52:17, 20
embolic 23:13; 26:11;
33:20, 21; 50:19; 51:16,
23; 64:17
embolism 23:17
embolus 11:7, 11, 14, 15
15; 12:14; 14:16; 18:6;
19:16, 18; 20:14; 22:6;
23:9, 11, 20; 24:2, 21, 25;
25:25; 26:24; 27:19; 51:7;
52:24; 53:14; 54:15; 58:12
embolus-detection 19:1
emergency 5:9
employee 5:19, 22, 23
end 59:20, 22
endothelium 64:3, 5
engagement 37:22
England 6:9; 36:21; 37:3,
7; 40:1; 67:12; 73:6
Englishman 74:5
enough 3:22; 43:10;
56:8; 70:21
enter 45:21
entire 43:14
entirety 8:5
entitled 72:23; 73:4
epidemiologic 69:5
epidemiologists 68:24
equal 74:19
equally 11:18; 12:3
equipment 58:12
ER 20:10, 21
erythematosis 41:2
erythematous 66:21
et 15:14; 17:18; 21:25;
5:5; 47:21; 69:4, 4; 72:19
etiology 22:14; 35:18;
3:8
Euclid 8:15, 16
evaluate 57:16
valuation 7:9; 66:24
even 23:15; 39:11; 48:17;
0:22, 25
vent 33:20; 50:19;
1:17, 23
vents 33:19; 45:10
very 3:24; 8:23; 17:11
everything 71:7
vidence 13:7; 19:7, 14;
0:11, 17; 47:14; 50:23;
1:1, 6
exacerbation 34:15
exactly 41:11; 60:10
examination 3:2, 15; 7:8;
7:24; 18:17; 20:4; 28:3;
3:7, 7, 17; 49:6; 51:5;
5:11; 66:22; 75:2
examinations 47:12
examine 49:7, 17
examined 3:4; 44:20;
5:24

examples 14:4, 11
except 34:10
exception 34:23
excluded 69:20
Excuse 24:8; 26:3; 39:9
Exhibit 4:5, 11; 6:14; 7:22
Exhibits 3:12
existence 29:22; 72:15
existing 34:23
exists 12:4
expect 63:2, 11, 13
experience 38:10; 41:4,
19; 54:9; 55:15, 25; 62:24;
66:1, 2; 69:8
experimental 26:22
expert 3:9; 38:8
expert's 43:14
experts 38:11; 55:19;
56:21; 57:23; 58:2
explain 42:23
explanation 22:18, 24;
41:6; 43:7; 47:17; 53:18
explanations 11:18, 21;
12:4, 8
express 42:8
extensive 19:13; 42:15,
19; 43:2; 54:22
extensively 56:1
extent 25:14; 42:9; 44:17,
9; 45:2; 49:9
extrapolable 69:15
extremely 75:13, 22;
'6:15, 18, 24
eye 18:10

F

facility 8:8
act 11:22; 12:8; 34:6;
5:21; 41:18; 46:13, 16;
7:4; 60:11
factor 19:23; 20:6; 31:4
factor-C 19:19
factor-S 19:19
actors 12:24, 25; 72:15
air 3:22; 22:3; 56:8; 72:4
airly 55:25
amiliat 36:9, 11; 44:24;
5:2; 56:17
amily 17:18
ar 20:4; 21:10; 49:3;
1:13, 18
ARCHIONE 43:19;
4:7; 45:21; 56:6, 12, 13;
9:7; 60:7; 70:12, 15;
1:10; 74:13, 25
ashion 13:11
ashions 21:19
ast 3:25
el 49:6, 11; 73:14
eling 31:12; 34:12;
1:18
male 9:22; 68:21

fever 71:19
few 27:14; 30:13; 59:16,
17
fibrillation 18:3; 35:25;
36:2; 40:25; 62:5
fibrin 13:13
fibrinogen 13:13; 19:21;
29:24; 60:13
fibromuscular 66:20
film 28:11, 13, 17, 19;
48:5, 6
films 9:3, 5, 7; 27:23;
28:9; 44:1; 48:9; 49:12
find 14:11; 18:12, 23;
19:16; 21:8; 22:2, 4, 9;
40:23; 41:6, 13; 54:9;
62:13; 65:14; 66:9
Fine 14:12; 17:6; 30:25;
49:21
firm 75:10
first 3:3; 6:21; 22:12;
23:22; 25:22; 27:16; 75:21
Fit 15:22
Fits 15:24
Five 53:12; 54:17
flagrant 30:7
flow 15:7; 18:23, 24; 19:6
focal 15:7; 27:22; 28:20;
19:12; 46:12; 47:14
follow 56:14
following 9:15; 22:14;
6:4; 58:5; 62:7; 63:1, 6;
18:20, 22; 69:12
follows 3:5; 75:16; 77:1
foramen 52:8, 12, 12, 14
foreign 13:3; 33:8; 34:20;
5:12; 57:5, 14; 59:24;
0:21; 72:13; 74:23
forgot 36:21
form 14:22; 25:16; 30:3;
4:5
normal 49:3
formation 12:1, 13; 18:4,
0; 19:18; 20:14; 22:6;
6:4; 33:22, 24
formed 53:23; 54:1
former 56:23, 24
forming 14:20
formulation 57:8
forth 6:18, 21; 7:22;
1:17; 20:22; 68:15
forward 62:19
found 41:23; 51:6; 65:21
foundation 4:20; 5:3, 6,
4
four 61:21
fragments 66:20
france 37:13
frequency 13:20
frequent 58:15
friend 36:21; 73:6
full 31:3
full-blown 30:7

function 21:7, 7
furnished 6:22; 7:1; 8:6
further 24:15; 34:4; 75:2
future 45:10; 48:3; 49:9

G

gave 22:7; 23:6, 8; 60:9;
77:9
General 8:15; 13:2; 14:8,
11; 16:10; 17:18; 21:19;
25:7; 34:11; 41:12; 43:25;
46:9
generally 13:21; 44:5
George 3:18; 7:7; 40:4
gets 15:3; 64:2, 15
given 48:16; 49:5; 61:18;
64:19
gives 50:7
giving 42:3, 18; 45:9, 25
Glasson 7:10
goes 15:5; 64:22
good 34:14; 36:3; 43:10
great 23:3; 39:3
group 37:12
guess 57:19
gyves 56:14

H

H 3:1, 8; 77:23
hairs 32:10
half 59:22; 66:2
hand 55:12, 16
happen 31:23, 24, 24;
61:13
happened 59:9
happening 64:16
happens 26:5; 66:23
haven't 6:17; 47:23, 24
healed 33:16
Health 5:14, 25
hear 21:23; 24:8; 43:4
heart 14:18; 17:25; 18:1,
2, 5, 6; 20:12, 13; 21:3;
52:7, 9, 9, 21, 21; 53:9, 15
hematocrit 13:10; 19:10;
63:6
hemianopsia 46:7
hemodynamic 15:4
hemoglobin 13:9; 19:8;
63:6
hemorrhage 15:13;
18:18; 21:17
hemorrhagic 15:17, 18,
20, 22, 25; 16:6; 23:14;
26:22
Henry 36:17
hereinafter 3:4
heroin 20:22
high 22:25; 25:12; 75:13,
22; 76:4, 7, 16, 19, 24

higher 9:16; 62:9 highly 22:25; 53:13, 20; 56:3; 64:13 history 21:1 hold 38:8; 51:10 homonymous 46:7 hormonal 75:16; 77:1 Hospital 5:7, 10, 10, 16, 20; 8:8; 34:19; 42:5; 43:5; 54:12; 70:6 hospitalization 23:11; 59:8; 62:18 hospitalizations 28:1 hospitalized 58:24; 59:3 70:22 Hospitals 3:10, 19; 5:11, 13, 15; 6:13; 8:4; 68:17; 69:1, 16 hours 59:17, 18; 60:23; 61:9 humans 26:23 hunting 19:1, 14 Huron 8:8, 13 husband 40:5; 45:3 hypercoaguabiliy 72:1 hypercoagulable 19:15; 29:19 I identification 3:13 identified 3:8; 11:3; 38:12 identifies 43:15; 49:3 identify 33:23; 58:2 idiodynamic 20:13 immediately 20:10; 62:17; 69:14 immune 60:20 impaired 14:18 importance 49:5 impossible 52:23 improve 46:1, 8, 9; 48:20 improvement 49:2 incidence 13:20; 32:20; 38:4, 9 include 10:24; 57:3 included 69:20 including 13:2; 19:22; 50:15; 72:15 increase 57:15 increased 9:11; 10:8; 3:19; 20:24; 38:1 increases 46:17 indicate 18:8; 21:9; 60:19 indicated 34:17; 56:16 individual 21:2, 5 individually 74:14, 15, 6 individuals 33:7; 43:22; 8:10; 68:19, 20	induce 64:9 induced 64:22 infarct 14:13; 15:21; 16:1, 6; 18:19; 21:17; 23:14; 26:20 infarction 20:12 infection 10:17, 20, 24; 14:24; 19:8; 31:21; 33:18; 65:2, 9 infectious 32:17 inflamed 64:15 inflammation 14:19, 22; 61:12; 64:1, 2, 6, 20, 21; 72:17 inflammatory 13:1, 5; 59:23; 60:5, 9; 65:7, 8; 72:12; 74:22 information 54:25 ingesting 20:21 initiation 64:12 injured 33:14 injuries 42:10; 49:9 inpatients 5:7 inquiry 41:19; 58:3 INR 31:5 insight 28:1, 13 instance 12:12; 19:4, 22; 20:17; 21:12; 29:23; 31:22; 35:24; 40:25; 46:6; 52:6; 60:21; 66:8; 69:11 instances 21:18; 22:3; 35:24 'nter 4:19, 20; 5:2, 14, 16, 19, 23, 25 nter-relate 48:6 nteraction 72:14 nterference 71:20 nternal 6:10; 29:3; 54:4 nternist 17:18 nterpretation 55:21 ntestine 33:17; 59:25; 50:16 nto 15:5, 24; 16:3; 19:12; 21:1; 33:15, 17; 43:24; 58:11; 52:9; 57:8; 58:11; 59:25; 60:5, 21; 62:16; 54:2 ntoxication 31:23 ntracardiac 52:18 ntracranial 21:24; 66:4 ntravascular 13:15; 59:25 ntrinsic 64:5 ntroduction 60:20 nvolved 11:13; 39:17; 2:15, 18; 63:14 nvolving 6:13 schemic 15:9, 17, 22, 4; 33:2 slands 26:21 ssue 31:7; 36:6, 13; 1:24; 42:4; 48:8; 54:23; 8:11 ;sued 4:4	issues 55:12, 16 issuing 49:8 item 7:13; 73:23, 23, 24, 24, 24, 25, 25, 25; 74:1 items 19:22; 21:12, 14; 57:8; 60:1, 5 itself 13:18; 34:7; 70:21 J J 7:6, 11 Jack 7:15 Jeffrey 7:3 Jim 36:18 job 5:1, 4; 46:14, 18, 23; 48:20 Joe 56:13; 60:4 John 7:5 Journal 6:7, 7, 9; 36:24; 37:3, 7; 39:25; 40:1; 67:12 journals 6:9, 11; 36:13; 40:2 judgment 49:8 June 4:4; 6:15 K kidneys 21:8 kind 15:1; 18:16; 29:25; 41:2; 48:8; 50:6; 64:14; 59:9 kinds 21:4; 31:22; 69:8 King 7:3 Kittner 37:6, 17; 38:2, 3; 39:18; 65:25; 67:14, 16, 20; 68:4; 77:11 knew 8:18 knowledge 26:3 known 13:22; 65:21 L labor 8:3 laboratory 31:8 lack 26:3; 52:13 lady 11:6 lake 4:18; 5:11 language 7:9; 46:11, 12 laparotomy 34:3 large 75:14; 76:25 last 9:18; 20:20; 27:14; 10:13; 33:2; 37:4; 39:4 later 27:23 latter 18:3 law 43:12; 75:10 lawrence 7:2 lawsuit 38:12; 56:14 lawyer 43:5; 54:12 layton 7:8; 43:20 LDS 5:10 lead 44:2	leading 36:24; 38:3 least 46:17 leave 24:15 led 28:19, 25 left 16:11; 25:5; 52:9, 21; 56:15 Lerner 7:6, 11; 22:18; 23:4; 43:21; 58:21 Lerner's 23:10; 31:15; 58:5 lesion 18:14, 14; 46:12; 52:19; 67:9 lesions 41:1; 47:11 less 53:12; 61:4, 5; 75:6, 7 lets 25:17 letter 6:18; 7:10, 15 Leukemia 31:22 lifelong 45:23 likelihood 50:15, 16; 54:16 likely 10:2; 22:25; 29:6, 11; 52:18; 54:2; 59:14, 16, 21; 61:4, 5; 67:4, 6 limited 42:24 line 43:10; 61:15 inked 12:23 lipid 20:5 list 7:4 listed 39:19 listen 18:7 listening 18:7 literal 41:13 literally 47:21; 65:10, 18; 56:22 literature 36:9 little 3:25; 16:4; 18:11; 26:21; 36:20 live 75:16; 77:1 lobe 48:11 localized 65:10 location 26:7 odged 25:1, 10 ong 22:7; 23:3; 39:21; 3:15; 44:16; 62:24 onger 4:17 ook 9:3, 5, 7; 18:10; 19:3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 19, 19, 20, 20, 1; 20:4, 5, 15, 24; 21:7, 5; 25:18; 30:14, 14, 14, 3; 36:12; 48:2; 60:18; 6:1, 14 ooked 8:7; 9:8; 25:16; 8:23 ooking 21:12; 23:15; 0:3 ooks 76:19 oud 3:25 ousy 34:12 ow 29:24 uke's 8:4, 10; 31:9; 2:17; 34:19 umber 33:14	lung 21:11 lupus 14:25; 41:2; 65:8 Lystad 43:21 M M.D 3:1; 77:23 mainly 5:8 majority 23:3 malaise 34:11; 71:18 man 33:14 many 10:1; 18:10; 19:4; 29:24; 32:3, 8; 33:1, 11; 36:3; 62:3; 69:3, 10 Margulies 34:25; 35:10; 37:5; 52:22 marked 3:13; 4:5, 11; 15:4; 57:7 markedly 31:10; 58:4 Maryland 68:18 material 6:22; 18:5, 12; 36:18, 19, 20, 22; 60:15, 16; 69:9 materials 6:21; 7:1, 17, 20; 8:25 matter 13:1; 18:17; 34:9; 10:22; 69:5 natters 39:13; 43:16, 16; 75:5 nay 11:25; 14:22, 23, 24; 15:6; 17:25; 18:8, 9; 19:5, 2, 14; 21:9, 17, 22; 30:20; 16:25; 47:17; 52:12; 56:7; 54:7, 9 maybe 14:16, 19; 60:8, 12; 75:7 McDonald's 65:15 mean 8:12, 14; 10:16; 5:25; 16:24; 22:23; 30:4; 2:11; 35:9; 47:25; 61:6; 58:16; 71:7 meaning 72:18 Means 10:17, 20, 23; 4:1, 2; 16:2; 22:25; 35:10; 7:23 neant 24:7 neasure 21:4 nechanism 11:13, 16; 4:1; 15:4; 22:2, 5, 9; 5:17; 41:2, 13, 23; 66:7 nechanisms 15:9; 9:13; 35:21 medical 4:17; 35:13; 6:9; 37:21; 51:11, 16, 22; 3:23; 54:15; 55:21 medical-legal 75:5 medicine 6:10, 10; 26:3; 7:7; 40:1; 67:12 meetings 38:20; 39:3 members 56:2 membranes 31:13 meningitis 14:25 mention 67:11 mentioned 7:14; 21:16;
--	--	---	---	--

37:11; 39:19; 48:10; 54:2; 60:1; 61:24; 72:16, 20; 76:10 Meridia 8:7, 16 met 3:17; 44:22 method 27:11 methodology 68:8, 12, 13 middle 16:10; 25:4, 6, 8, 11, 18; 27:15 mild 70:24 mill 33:14 MILLIKAN 3:1, 8, 17; 77:23 mine 58:4 Mishkind 6:18; 7:10, 12; 8:12, 15, 17, 22; 14:7, 12; 16:22; 17:3, 7, 11; 24:1, 6, 10, 18; 30:22; 36:14; 37:1, 22; 38:6; 39:7, 10, 15; 40:14; 42:21; 43:11; 44:5, 9; 45:16; 48:22, 24; 49:10, 21; 51:13; 54:6, 16; 55:22, 24; 56:9, 22; 57:24; 59:5; 60:3; 67:18, 21, 22; 68:5, 10; 70:10, 13, 17; 71:6, 11; 74:11; 75:8; 76:17; 77:3, 15 modern 58:12 modified 13:15 Monday 65:12 more 10:1; 11:12; 22:4; 26:7; 29:6, 11; 32:12; 41:22; 50:14; 52:18; 59:13, 21; 65:22; 66:2, 10, 11, 12; 70:6 morning 4:12; 9:6 MOSCARINO 3:6, 16, 18; 8:14; 14:10; 17:1, 5, 9; 23:24; 24:4; 30:24; 43:4; 45:13, 17; 46:4; 49:19; 56:4, 15; 73:21; 75:3; 77:14 most 26:1; 35:19; 40:22; 54:2; 68:18 Mountain 4:19, 20; 5:3, 14, 16, 19, 23, 25 move 4:22, 24 MRA 9:9; 21:20; 27:24; 28:21, 22, 25; 29:16; 66:25 MRI 9:9; 28:21; 47:12; 48:13 Mrs 6:13; 8:9; 10:13; 11:22; 12:20; 15:19; 16:8; 24:22; 29:12, 18; 31:9, 16; 34:1; 35:5; 40:5; 42:9; 44:20; 48:19; 51:16, 22; 52:24; 53:3, 15, 24 much 6:1; 20:1; 36:2; 52:18; 61:4; 65:19; 75:4 mucous 31:13 multiple 22:13 murmurs 18:1 muscles 67:10 must 48:13 myocardial 20:12	myopathy 41:1 N name 3:17; 36:21; 37:15; 39:22; 56:13; 73:6, 7, 11; 74:2, 5 narrow 61:16 narrowed 15:6; 49:23 narrowing 15:8; 18:9, 9; 27:22; 28:20; 29:2, 4, 12; 66:17, 18; 67:3 natural 77:12 nature 23:22; 26:15, 17; 43:1, 17; 47:11; 55:23; 69:1 nausea 34:12; 57:6; 71:22 necessarily 10:19; 11:23; 19:15; 65:6 neck 18:7, 23; 19:2; 21:24 need 34:4; 49:6, 16, 19 needs 4:16 negative 53:7; 63:13 neither 15:23 Nemunaitis 7:6; 43:21 neurologic 5:8; 23:21; 25:22; 26:14; 38:22 neurologist 16:17; 17:18; 22:8; 25:17; 39:6; 48:2, 16; 62:15 Neurology 6:10; 38:20, 21; 55:20 neuropsychologic 7:8 neuropsychological 49:14 neuroradiologist 16:18 neuroradiologists 17:14, 15 New 6:9; 7:4; 37:3, 7; 39:25; 67:12 next 22:17; 72:2 NIH 39:1 nobody's 24:20 nodosa 20:17; 65:8 nods 56:25 noise 21:23 noises 18:8 nomenclature 39:1; 56:1 non-dominant 47:16 non-post 76:14 none 23:6; 62:6 normal 28:5; 31:2, 6; 5:24; 47:22; 63:25; 70:7; 7:10 normally 30:9 noted 13:4; 66:18 nothing 4:10 November 45:1; 70:13 number 11:16; 21:2; 2:3; 26:13, 15; 30:5; 1:20; 48:8, 9; 72:15; 3:19, 19	numbered 73:18 numbers 77:9 nurses 5:12; 31:12 O OB/GYN 42:6 object 16:22; 17:10; 42:21; 45:17 objecting 17:4 objection 36:15; 37:1; 38:6; 39:7, 12, 15; 40:15; 45:22; 46:4; 48:22, 24; 49:10; 54:6, 16; 55:22, 24; 56:22; 57:24; 67:18, 21; 68:5, 10; 74:11; 76:17; 77:3 occasions 41:20 occluded 15:3 occludes 14:21 occlusion 14:2, 5, 15 occur 40:9 occurred 72:5, 7, 8; 74:20 occurrence 36:23 October 7:11 odds 49:1 off 3:24; 56:15; 73:21, 22; 74:2 often 20:20; 65:22 Ohio 3:2; 4:17, 22 once 3:24; 8:23; 17:11; 59:3 one 7:13; 9:14, 24; 10:5, 5, 7; 11:13; 12:24; 15:3, 13; 16:17; 17:24; 21:20; 26:13; 30:11; 32:4, 11, 12; 33:12; 34:23; 35:6, 21; 36:3; 38:14; 39:3, 24; 41:17; 42:1; 43:9, 16; 45:13; 48:8; 58:11; 62:5; 63:2; 64:19; 69:17; 71:18; 72:20; 76:3, 10, 12, 19, 19, 20, 21, 21 ones 9:10; 30:11; 32:5; 38:14; 73:17 only 4:7; 16:23; 36:3; 38:10 inset 23:21; 26:14; 27:11 open 28:14 opened 52:13 opening 52:14 operation 13:2; 33:18; 34:20 operative 60:14 opine 55:12, 16 opined 64:18 opinion 10:25; 11:4, 6; 2:16, 19, 22; 15:19; 15:10; 27:5; 29:4, 11, 15, 8; 30:2; 31:15; 32:16; 39:13; 43:14; 45:12, 23, 15; 46:3; 50:12; 51:7, 10; 3:22; 54:14; 55:8; 56:20, 11; 57:2, 3, 17, 18, 21, 22,	23; 58:1, 4; 60:24; 61:3; 65:3; 69:10; 77:8 opinions 3:20; 6:12, 17; 7:21; 42:3, 9, 18; 43:8; 45:10, 14; 47:3; 49:8; 54:12, 21, 23; 56:17; 67:2; opposed 23:20; 24:2; 25:25; 26:6, 11; 62:10; 67:3; 76:6 ordering 23:4 ordinarily 28:11 origin 41:10 original 26:9 originated 16:13, 19, 25; 17:22 out 6:2; 9:14; 10:6, 6; 14:11; 15:13; 18:23; 21:8; 22:2; 38:8; 41:23; 46:6; 48:19; 49:1; 53:1, 4, 8; 54:10; 56:19; 57:1; 61:22; 64:9; 65:5, 15; 68:3; 76:3 outcome 71:1, 13, 24; 74:9 outline 20:9; 43:13 outpatient 5:5 output 14:19 ovale 52:8, 12, 12, 14 over 59:22; 61:15 overall 69:9 overt 14:23 oxygen 19:10 P p.m 77:18 pad 34:3 page 11:17; 22:12; 32:1; 50:20; 73:18, 18, 23, 23, 23, 24, 24, 24, 25, 25; 74:1 papers 6:8 paragraph 6:21; 22:13; 52:2; 53:19 part 9:18; 37:21; 40:3; 75:19, 21, 22 particular 57:21; 62:22; 73:15 particularly 21:23; 49:13; 64:2; 69:6; 72:17 Darts 19:5 partum 8:3; 9:12, 13, 15, 13; 10:2, 4, 9; 13:17, 18; 32:23; 33:5; 34:1, 5, 22; 35:6, 9, 11, 12, 16, 22; 36:7, 18, 19, 20, 22; 37:4; 38:1, 5, 9; 40:8; 41:3, 5, 10, 16, 18; 42:1; 57:10; 51:25; 62:8; 63:9; 65:20; 75:14, 23; 76:2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 14, 15; 77:10 parturition 9:16, 17; 38:20 latency 53:8 patent 52:8, 11 pathology 13:13; 44:12; 16:16, 16	pathway 52:7 patient 19:14; 48:7, 8, 14; 58:5, 23; 60:21; 63:10, 12; 65:3; 69:13, 17; 70:5, 7, 7, 20, 21; 72:3; 74:7 patients 5:5, 6; 6:2; 26:19; 35:15, 25; 36:3; 40:22; 41:4, 9, 15, 17; 48:15; 61:25; 62:14; 63:14; 65:6; 66:3, 9; 69:3, 16, 19, 20 pattern 27:12; 29:2 patterns 18:25 Patty 7:5; 9:22 pay 46:17 paying 36:1 peer-reviewed 40:1 pelvic 50:19; 51:8, 17, 23; 52:19, 23; 53:14 pelvis 52:7 people 19:4; 44:3; 47:16, 22; 52:15 percent 6:3; 41:12; 50:1, 3, 14, 16, 17; 53:12; 56:19; 57:2; 66:18, 24; 75:6, 7 perform 22:9; 46:23 performance 48:21 performed 13:3; 21:20; 23:3; 27:25; 30:18; 31:9; 34:21; 50:23; 51:1; 58:19 performs 50:6 perhaps 73:7 periarteritis 20:17; 31:24, 25; 65:7, 8 pericarditis 20:15 period 9:12, 14, 15, 24; 3:21; 32:24; 33:5; 35:17, 12; 38:1; 40:10; 41:3, 5; 42:1; 59:23; 61:25; 62:8; 55:20; 75:14, 23; 76:3 permanency 42:9 permanent 45:23 person 15:5; 20:2 personal 49:7 personnel 42:5 persons 63:25 phenomena 60:19; 2:10, 12 phenomenon 48:11 phospholipid 19:20 phrase 34:4; 35:10 physical 17:23; 18:16; 15:21 physician 17:18 physicians 5:12, 13; 3:3 picture 26:18 piece 18:5; 26:6; 33:15 pieces 18:11 pile 7:17 place 8:9; 40:23; 59:24 places 11:12, 16 plasma 19:23 platelets 64:7, 8, 10, 11
--	--	---	---	--

platlet 11:25; 12:13;
30:15; 63:24
play 34:1, 7; 62:13
played 71:25
please 7:17; 57:12; 71:4
plural 32:2
plus 69:16
point 11:24; 46:8; 56:5;
59:12; 61:17, 22; 62:19
population 41:12
portion 8:25
pose 53:19
positive 11:2; 32:2, 3, 6,
12, 13, 14, 15, 21; 46:17
possibilities 64:19
possibility 51:18, 19, 25;
53:8
possible 19:8; 22:3; 29:6;
9; 35:5; 47:15; 51:9, 13,
14; 53:2; 67:4, 5
possibly 77:5
post 8:3; 9:12, 13, 15, 22;
10:2, 3, 9; 13:17, 18;
32:23; 33:5; 34:1, 4, 22;
35:6, 9, 11, 12, 16, 22;
36:7, 18, 19, 20, 22; 37:4;
38:1, 4, 9; 40:8; 41:3, 5,
10, 16, 18; 42:1; 57:10;
61:25; 62:8; 63:9; 65:20;
75:13, 23; 76:2, 5, 7, 9, 11,
15; 77:10
post-caesarean 70:8;
77:7, 9
post-delivery 34:6
post-section 63:10
post-surgery 34:8
practice 17:20
precise 62:4
predicated 47:20
predict 48:16; 58:23
predictions 48:3
pregnancy 9:19, 20
premised 11:21; 12:8
preparation 9:1; 37:18,
19
presence 30:10; 35:11
present 29:5; 30:7
presented 70:6
pressure 14:17; 15:5;
21:5
pretty 22:7; 34:12
prevented 59:3
previous 7:19; 20:12
Price 7:3; 38:16, 23;
55:11, 25; 56:15; 57:13,
20; 67:25; 69:22
Price's 55:4; 56:20; 57:1
principal 30:11
principally 5:7
prior 55:10
probability 23:1; 25:12;
51:1, 16, 22; 52:1; 53:11,
23; 54:15; 59:20; 60:2, 25;
61:6, 20; 72:4; 74:9

probably 22:4; 25:12;
33:2; 50:14; 54:3; 74:19;
75:6
Procedure 3:3; 60:14
proceed 18:19
proceedings 9:1
process 60:5, 10; 64:12,
14
produce 50:23; 51:1
produced 11:14; 13:10,
15; 14:3, 5, 14; 46:12;
65:1; 66:20; 68:15; 72:12
produces 13:5; 64:6
producing 65:11; 72:1
production 21:14; 46:12
profile 20:5; 21:11;
29:23; 31:4
profiles 31:1
profusion 14:17
prognosis 45:11; 48:3;
49:9
program 5:12
programs 6:6
promotion 47:1
propensity 19:17
properly 24:12; 57:16
prothrombin 19:23; 31:5
protocols 69:18, 21
proved 52:15
provided 4:12; 55:1
PT 63:21
PTT 63:21
publications 73:13
purpose 43:3
put 40:16; 57:7; 71:17;
74:4
putting 60:8

Q

qualified 55:11, 16
quality 49:11, 13
questioned 37:5
questioning 56:5
quickly 15:12
quite 3:25; 4:15; 36:1
quote 12:2; 41:3, 3; 48:4;
57:9, 10

R

r 7:3
raised 24:10
raises 69:14
range 63:2, 5, 11
rapid 75:15; 76:25
rate 20:16; 62:8
rather 67:9
reached 49:2; 58:20;
56:25; 68:9
reaction 13:1, 5; 60:15;

64:21; 72:13
reactions 65:7, 9
read 11:5; 32:14; 35:2;
40:4, 11, 13; 49:12; 55:4;
56:16; 71:3, 5; 77:16
reading 45:3
really 31:4; 58:16
rearing 47:4
reason 15:12; 23:19;
25:13; 26:10; 29:15; 40:8,
20; 41:17; 46:22, 25; 58:3;
66:13; 68:13
reasonable 11:18; 12:4;
51:10, 15, 22; 53:22; 54:14
reasons 3:21; 25:20;
27:8; 41:17
Recall 26:1; 62:6; 63:15
receive 47:1; 54:22
received 46:16
recent 4:24
reception 46:11
Recess 49:22
recited 23:2
recognize 18:12
recognized 13:18, 19;
39:5
record 3:6; 6:25; 30:23;
40:13; 43:6; 51:20; 68:18,
23; 71:5; 73:21, 22; 74:2, 4
records 7:25; 8:3, 4, 6, 7;
55:21; 57:20; 68:19, 25
recovery 44:25; 45:7, 8
red 19:4, 6
refer 26:21
referring 35:12; 37:9;
50:10, 11
reflect 3:7
regard 56:2, 15
regarding 6:23; 27:14;
28:1; 31:16; 42:4, 9; 43:8;
45:10; 49:8; 52:2; 54:21,
43; 55:1, 7
region 50:20; 51:17, 23;
33:15
rehabilitation 8:8
rehospitalization 59:18
rehospitalized 58:24
elated 12:5, 17, 22; 40:9
elates 42:5
elation 76:7
elationship 5:25; 10:5;
2:18; 77:5
elative 23:21; 75:13, 23;
616
elativity 34:9
elavant 31:18
emains 11:16
emarkable 45:8
emember 30:21; 31:3;
2:19; 42:2; 63:23
emoval 34:3; 58:24;
9:3
emove 74:7

removed 13:3; 33:16;
60:23; 61:19
renal 21:7
repeat 23:24; 26:13
report 4:4, 7, 9; 6:15; 7:2,
2, 3, 7, 9, 13; 8:2; 11:5, 9,
17; 12:2, 16; 22:12; 32:1;
35:2, 4; 42:12; 43:13;
50:20, 25; 55:4; 56:16
reports 44:14; 49:12
represent 8:9; 56:13
Research 4:20, 21; 5:3,
24; 36:6; 37:21
reservation 56:6
respect 29:16; 31:7;
32:18, 21; 39:13; 41:8;
48:20
respected 39:5
respond 5:9
response 29:8; 58:2;
50:20; 74:22
responses 13:6
result 28:4; 52:23; 54:8
retained 33:8; 57:5, 14;
74:23
retrospect 23:16
return 34:15; 45:24
review 6:8; 7:20; 8:25;
28:17; 36:12; 37:17;
14:14; 48:17; 67:14
reviewed 6:20; 8:2; 67:11
reviewing 45:2; 75:4
reviews 46:18
rhythm 18:2; 20:11
Riggs 7:13, 16; 38:17
right 4:2, 5, 24; 8:5, 19;
11:11, 19; 22:10; 24:4;
25:3; 42:6; 49:18; 51:2;
52:8, 20
risk 9:11, 21; 10:8; 20:6;
18:1; 41:25; 75:13, 23;
16:1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 16, 21, 22,
43
isks 76:13
load 8:13
ole 34:2, 7; 62:13; 71:25;
5:14; 76:24
ooms 5:10; 68:18
loss 74:6
ule 56:19; 57:1; 65:4
uled 53:4
ules 3:3; 53:1, 8
uling 48:19; 49:1
un 63:9
uptured 66:3
ussell 74:6

S

s 30:14, 19; 58:14
alt 4:18; 5:11
ame 8:19; 9:24; 10:18;
9:16; 22:15; 25:7; 29:4;

35:10; 41:11; 46:4, 14;
50:23; 51:2; 52:1, 2; 61:10,
14; 68:10, 21; 73:9; 76:11
sarcoidosis 21:12; 31:23
saw 27:23
saying 3:21, 22; 24:2;
25:13; 26:10; 27:8; 31:4;
42:24
scan 18:19; 21:16; 23:23;
25:17; 26:18; 27:11, 16
scans 9:8; 25:23; 26:15;
27:13, 17; 48:2, 17
screen 20:21
search 18:11
searching 58:11
second 3:17; 41:25
secondary 14:17, 23;
33:21; 65:9
secondly 11:14
section 36:4; 39:1; 57:4,
14; 59:13, 17; 60:24; 61:9,
19; 62:7, 10; 63:10; 69:12;
70:8; 77:7
sedimentation 20:16
seeing 6:1; 30:21; 31:3
seep 16:5
seeping 15:12
segment 20:13
sentence 22:17; 32:14;
42:19, 25; 43:3
separately 62:11
September 4:23; 37:8
septic 65:4; 72:3
septicemia 10:18, 23;
12:5, 12, 15, 17; 13:2;
64:24, 25; 65:4, 11; 71:16,
23, 25; 72:3, 9, 16, 18;
74:9, 16, 18
septicemic 10:14; 11:22;
12:1, 9
series 19:11; 57:5
served 38:25
set 6:18, 21; 7:22; 11:17
sets 32:13
several 12:24; 35:5, 24;
11:21
severe 62:23
severity 26:13; 49:4
Sheldon 34:25
shivering 71:21
shock 14:18; 15:5
shotgun 69:9
shouldn't 47:3
show 36:14; 40:14
shows 27:11
side 47:16; 48:12; 52:8, 9
sides 53:9
signed 7:8, 9, 11, 15
significance 32:18; 43:2;
44:12
significant 71:25
significantly 34:18; 61:5;
66:15

signs 25:21; 71:16
similar 21:10; 37:12;
50:14; 62:21; 63:17
simply 16:16; 27:20;
41:13; 47:20; 48:15;
56:20; 68:17; 69:7
site 24:22; 33:23; 54:2;
71:22
sites 17:24
situation 45:5; 58:9;
64:7; 69:13
six 9:15
sixth 54:18
size 18:1
skin 15:14; 31:13; 71:21
slight 76:22, 24
slightly 29:24
sloppy 68:12, 16
small 16:3
so-called 21:21
Society 4:19
solely 77:12
somebody 50:6
someone 9:21; 10:3
someplace 54:3
something 14:24; 24:17;
28:6; 34:18; 39:20
sometimes 22:5; 71:19,
20, 21
Somewhat 36:11
somewhere 25:1
sorry 8:16; 39:21; 50:11
sound 28:7
source 11:11; 20:14;
22:3, 5, 10, 21; 23:8;
37:24; 54:15; 64:17; 65:5,
21; 66:5, 10
sources 31:20; 52:17
spasm 67:2, 7
speaking 27:15
specialty 55:20
specifically 26:17;
47:13; 62:14
specifics 14:9; 43:24;
44:4
spectrum 59:21; 61:14
speculation 54:5, 7, 8
speech 7:9
spelled 73:2
spend 75:4
spent 6:1, 4, 5
split 32:10
split-offs 30:5
sponge 58:25; 59:4;
60:23; 61:19; 74:8
St 8:4, 10; 31:9; 32:17;
34:19
standard 42:4
standpoint 43:20; 44:10
start 18:16
started 19:16; 54:21
state 9:23; 10:2, 4, 9;
12:23, 24; 13:16, 17, 18;

19:15; 22:12; 29:19; 34:1,
5, 22; 35:6, 9, 11, 12; 36:7,
18, 19, 21, 22; 37:4; 40:8;
41:10, 16; 43:12; 44:24;
50:22, 25; 57:10; 72:4;
76:6, 7, 9, 11
stated 39:12; 76:13
statement 22:21; 40:21;
44:6; 57:9; 75:12, 18, 19
stating 24:12; 51:17, 19
statistical 68:14, 24;
69:15
statistically 18:13
statistics 37:24; 53:11
status 28:2, 13; 75:16;
77:1
stays 71:8
stenosed 28:15
step 72:2
stick 64:10
sticking 64:10
still 16:2; 39:11; 61:14;
75:16; 77:2
stimulates 14:20
stood 68:3
stop 56:4
straightforwardly 35:8
stream 64:22
strep 32:2, 21
Stroke 4:20, 20; 5:3, 8,
13, 23; 6:7, 8; 9:11, 13, 21;
10:3, 9; 11:18; 12:4, 17,
20, 22; 13:18, 20; 14:1, 3,
5, 14; 15:8, 9, 10, 15, 17,
23, 24; 16:9, 13, 19, 24;
17:22; 20:7, 19; 21:14;
22:10, 14, 18; 23:7; 26:5,
10; 27:1, 6, 9; 29:13, 19,
25; 32:24; 33:3, 19; 34:2,
8; 35:6; 36:4, 23; 37:4;
38:1, 4, 9, 20, 24; 39:2, 3,
6, 14; 40:7; 41:11, 13, 18,
23, 25; 42:1, 10; 43:9;
44:25; 53:16; 55:9; 56:21;
57:9; 58:6, 25; 59:13, 14;
60:2; 61:1, 5, 7, 20; 62:1,
8, 12, 21; 64:17; 66:2, 5;
68:19, 22; 69:2, 12; 72:4,
6, 8; 73:5, 12; 74:19;
75:13, 23; 76:2, 16
strokes 13:21; 21:2;
25:24; 26:4; 27:3, 14; 33:5,
8; 35:16, 18, 21; 36:6;
41:5, 9; 65:21, 22, 23;
66:15
studied 40:23
studies 41:24; 42:16;
69:6
study 18:23; 26:19;
37:12; 39:1; 54:9; 63:21;
59:19; 70:1
subdivisions 30:5
subject 36:10; 43:15, 16
submitted 42:17
subsequent 25:23;
27:17; 33:8; 34:3

subsequently 21:18
subspecialty 39:6
substance 42:23; 43:14
subtract 47:21
subtraction 21:25
suddenness 23:21;
26:14
suffer 58:25; 59:14;
65:20
suffered 30:2; 32:24;
33:4, 7; 34:2, 8; 35:16;
41:5, 9, 25; 42:15; 44:25;
60:25; 61:20; 62:1, 12
sufficient 73:20
suggested 13:12; 31:14
suggests 75:14; 76:24
summarized 39:18
summit 49:2
supply 14:14
supported 31:8, 11
sure 7:14, 18; 13:23;
17:4; 18:21; 24:7; 35:9;
60:3; 61:15
surgeon 51:6; 60:17
surgery 59:6
surprise 47:8
surprised 46:20
sworn 3:4
symptoms 34:16; 71:16
System 5:14, 17, 20, 25;
20:18; 27:10; 52:19; 72:11

T

T-O-O-L-S 72:21
T-O-O-L-E 72:22
tables 68:15
talk 3:24, 25; 27:13;
43:22; 44:4; 50:19; 54:21
talking 8:18; 14:7, 8;
16:25; 43:25; 51:4; 59:5;
56:8; 77:6
teaching 6:5, 6
technicalities 58:10
technically 77:6
TEE 52:11, 13, 23; 53:1, 7
TEEs 69:4
telling 26:25
ten 33:2; 61:24; 62:3
tendency 20:1, 2, 24
term 5:16; 10:16; 22:23;
29:9
terms 13:24; 40:16; 69:19
territory 25:4, 6
test 13:11; 19:21; 25:16;
28:4, 6; 50:6; 52:23; 63:9,
16, 17
estified 3:5
estify 44:11
estifying 44:10, 18, 19;
11:21
esting 17:23; 19:2, 12,
3; 45:3; 48:14; 49:3, 14,

14
tests 17:20; 18:17, 22;
22:8, 13; 23:2, 6; 27:25;
30:9, 15, 17; 31:6, 8;
50:22; 51:1, 4
textbook 36:17, 19, 20;
72:23; 73:7, 11
textbooks 72:20
Thanks 8:21; 17:11
thence 52:10
theories 11:10
therefore 19:18; 29:5
third 22:4
Thomas 7:3; 38:23
though 9:16; 12:16;
39:11; 50:22; 51:1; 55:14
thought 74:2
three 46:6; 61:18
thrombic 33:20
thromboplastin 31:5
thrombus 14:16; 23:20;
24:3, 8; 25:24; 26:2, 12;
33:22, 23
throughout 5:14
times 10:1; 54:17
tiny 18:11; 26:21
tissue 16:2, 4; 60:15;
61:13; 66:22
title 5:1; 73:9
today 37:18; 56:19;
69:17; 70:3
today's 9:1
together 23:22; 38:25;
60:8; 71:17
told 25:7, 20; 29:16; 35:4;
47:7; 49:5; 52:22
took 54:20
Toole's 36:18; 72:21;
73:9
topic 36:25; 37:5
Toronto 36:17
total 33:4
touch 24:14
toward 59:22
towards 66:15
tox 20:21
TPA 64:5
traditional 21:21
transcranial 18:25
transformation 15:20;
16:1, 7; 23:14; 26:22
trauma 14:17
travel 26:7; 52:24
traveled 24:21; 53:15, 24
treated 35:16
treating 43:22; 53:3
reatment 69:7
remendous 45:7
rial 42:4; 51:20
rials 69:6, 7
ried 35:8
riggered 72:11

trouble 17:24; 33:17;
41:22; 51:6
true 23:17
try 22:9; 61:16, 21
trying 14:10; 32:10; 54:9,
11; 58:2
turgor 31:13
turn 14:21; 18:4; 20:23;
21:13
two 11:10, 12, 17, 17;
12:3; 15:15, 16; 21:19;
22:12; 26:15; 29:5; 32:1;
34:6; 46:17; 48:9; 50:20;
53:8; 56:21; 57:23; 58:2;
60:1, 4, 8; 62:12, 14, 24;
63:1, 6, 10, 14, 25; 64:19;
66:9; 70:7, 10, 12; 75:6, 7;
76:13
two-minute 49:20
two-page 43:7
type 15:10; 25:17; 28:11;
37:12; 62:21; 63:20
types 22:8; 44:2

U

ultimately 52:15
ultrasound 28:8
uncertain 11:16; 33:25
uncover 54:11
under 3:2; 66:10
undergone 62:9
underwent 22:13
undetermined 24:22;
25:2; 41:10
University 3:10, 19; 6:13;
8:4
unknown 24:22
unlikely 53:14, 20
unquote 48:4
unusual 65:14
up 13:8; 21:13; 26:2;
41:20; 52:13; 56:14;
65:15; 69:3
upon 44:12; 48:4
use 17:21
used 29:8, 9; 68:8; 69:18
using 13:24; 47:20
Utah 4:18, 22; 6:2

V

vaginal 62:10
Variable 71:18
varied 68:25
variety 18:17, 22; 19:25;
21:14, 22; 22:1, 8
various 19:5; 21:4; 71:19
vascular 6:8; 21:10;
27:10; 51:5; 72:24, 25;
73:8; 74:6
iasculitis 14:23
rein 26:5

venous 27:3, 5, 9, 14;
65:22; 66:11, 16
verbalized 70:1
versus 3:9
vessel 14:15, 19, 21;
15:3, 6, 11, 13, 14; 16:8,
12, 19, 23, 24; 20:18, 23;
21:3; 26:12; 64:3, 4, 7, 8,
15; 72:17
vessels 14:20; 16:5;
25:2, 2; 65:9
Via 38:20
view 52:22
viremia 72:19
viridans 32:2, 21
virus 10:24
visual 46:7
visualization 50:4
vitae 73:14
volume 75:15; 76:25
vomiting 71:22
Vue 5:11

W

wall 13:4; 59:25; 60:16;
64:3, 8, 9, 11; 67:9
walls 72:17
way 13:24; 52:20; 54:20;
58:23; 59:2, 7; 60:22;
76:14
ways 15:2; 21:22
Wechsler 7:2; 38:15, 19
week 70:8
weeks 9:15; 34:6; 63:1, 6,
10; 70:8, 11
weighting 66:15
well-demonstrated
52:15
weren't 36:1
What's 29:21; 72:23
white 13:7; 19:7; 29:23;
31:20; 60:12; 63:2
whole 19:25; 22:1
whomever 16:18
whose 36:22
within 39:6; 59:16; 63:10
without 12:1, 15; 64:10;
65:8, 10; 66:22; 72:18
witness 3:9; 39:9; 40:11;
67:24; 71:3
woman 40:7; 41:25; 62:9;
76:1 1
woman's 40:9
women 9:12; 10:2, 8;
32:23; 33:4; 38:5, 9; 62:12;
63:1; 65:20; 76:5, 6, 15
wood 33:15
word 22:25; 24:8; 29:9
words 21:3; 29:7; 34:13
work 6:7; 26:23; 38:24;
39:18; 45:5; 47:18; 48:9;
75:10

worked 39:1; 69:3; 75:8
workup 58:5, 8, 11, 13,
17
worsening 57:7
writing 7:22
writings 73:13
written 70:2
wrong 11:5; 12:3; 30:20;
34:18; 57:12

X

X 21:2
X-ray 20:8; 21:11

Y

year 37:4
years 26:20; 29:5; 30:13;
33:2; 36:1; 38:25; 39:4;
46:6; 48:23; 54:8; 62:25;
53:15, 20
yesterday 35:4; 37:6;
52:22

6 7

[illegible]