

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

U.S. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

FDA PUBLIC WORKSHOP

DEVELOPMENT OF INHALED ANTIBACTERIAL TREATMENTS FOR
CYSTIC FIBROSIS AND NON-CYSTIC FIBROSIS BRONCHIECTASIS

FDA White Oak Campus,
10903 New Hampshire Ave.,
Building 31 Great Room,
Silver Spring, MD 20993

Wednesday, June 27, 2018

Reported by: Michael Farkas
Capital Reporting Company

Page 2	Page 4
<p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2 Edward Cox, MD, MPH</p> <p>3 Director</p> <p>4 OAP</p> <p>5 OND, CDER, FDA, Silver Spring, MD</p> <p>6 Chip Hawkins</p> <p>7 Patient Representative - Cystic Fibrosis</p> <p>8 Baltimore, MD</p> <p>9 Juergen Froehlich, MD</p> <p>10 Chief Medical Officer</p> <p>11 Aradigm Corporation</p> <p>12 Hayward, CA</p> <p>13 James Chalmers, PhD</p> <p>14 Professor</p> <p>15 Department of Respiratory Medicine</p> <p>16 Ninewells Hospital and Medical School, University</p> <p>17 of Dundee</p> <p>18 British Lung Foundation Chair of Respiratory</p> <p>19 Research, Dundee, UK</p> <p>20 Alan Barker, MD</p> <p>21 Professor of Medicine, Division of Pulmonary and</p> <p>22 Critical Care Medicine</p>	<p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2 Pediatrics</p> <p>3 Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine</p> <p>4 Peter Kim, MD</p> <p>5 Medical Officer</p> <p>6 DAIP, OAP</p> <p>7 OND, CDER, FDA, Silver Spring, MD</p> <p>8 Timothy Aksamit, MD</p> <p>9 Associate Professor of Medicine</p> <p>10 Pulmonary Disease and Critical Care Medicine Mayo</p> <p>11 Clinic Rochester, MN</p> <p>12 Chris Kadoorie, PhD</p> <p>13 Statistical Reviewer</p> <p>14 Division of Biometrics IV</p> <p>15 Office of Biostatistics</p> <p>16 Office of Translational Sciences (OTS),</p> <p>17 CDER, FDA</p> <p>18 Greg Tino, MD</p> <p>19 Chief</p> <p>20 Department of Medicine Penn Presbyterian Medical</p> <p>21 Center Associate Professor of Medicine Perelman</p> <p>22 School of Medicine at the University of</p>
Page 3	Page 5
<p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2 Oregon Health & Science University</p> <p>3 Portland, OR</p> <p>4 Peadar Noone, MD</p> <p>5 Professor of Medicine</p> <p>6 University of North Carolina</p> <p>7 Chapel Hill, NC</p> <p>8 Nicole Hamblett, PhD</p> <p>9 Professor, Department of Pediatrics</p> <p>10 Adjunct Professor, Department of Biostatistics,</p> <p>11 University of Washington</p> <p>12 Co-Executive Director, Cystic Fibrosis</p> <p>13 Therapeutics Development Network (CF TDN)</p> <p>14 Coordinating Center, Seattle Children's Research</p> <p>15 Institute, Seattle, WA</p> <p>16 LaRee Tracy, PhD</p> <p>17 Statistical Reviewer</p> <p>18 Division of Biometrics IV</p> <p>19 Office of Biostatistics, OTS</p> <p>20 CDER, FDA, Silver Spring, MD</p> <p>21 Donald VanDevanter, PhD</p> <p>22 Adjunct Professor</p>	<p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2 Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA</p> <p>3 Patrick Flume, MD</p> <p>4 Professor</p> <p>5 Medicine and Pediatrics</p> <p>6 Medical University of South Carolina</p> <p>7 Charleston, SC</p> <p>8 Sumathi Nambiar, MD, MPH</p> <p>9 Director</p> <p>10 DAIP, OAP</p> <p>11 OND, CDER, FDA, Silver Spring, Maryland</p> <p>12 Thomas Smith, MD</p> <p>13 Clinical Team Leader</p> <p>14 DAIP, OAP</p> <p>15 OND, CDER, FDA, Silver Spring, MD</p> <p>16 David Nichols, MD</p> <p>17 Associate Professor of Pediatrics</p> <p>18 Pediatric Pulmonology</p> <p>19 Seattle Children's Hospital</p> <p>20 Medical Director</p> <p>21 CF TDN Coordinating Center</p> <p>22 Seattle Children's Research Institute</p>

Page 6	Page 8
<p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2 Seattle, WA</p> <p>3 Pamela Zeitlin, MD</p> <p>4 Silverstein Chair</p> <p>5 Department of Pediatrics</p> <p>6 Professor of Pediatrics</p> <p>7 National Jewish Health</p> <p>8 Denver, CO</p> <p>9 Jeff Alder, PhD</p> <p>10 Anti-Infective Consulting, LLC</p> <p>11 Margaretville, NY</p> <p>12 Susan Ellenberg, PhD</p> <p>13 Professor</p> <p>14 Biostatistics, Department of Biostatistics and</p> <p>15 Epidemiology</p> <p>16 University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine</p> <p>17 Philadelphia, PA</p> <p>18 Maria Allende, MD</p> <p>19 Medical Officer</p> <p>20 Division of Anti-Infective Products (DAIP),</p> <p>21 Office of Antimicrobial Products (OAP), Office of</p> <p>22 New Drugs (OND)</p>	<p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2 Knoxville, TN</p> <p>3 Deepika Lakhani, PhD</p> <p>4 Team Lead</p> <p>5 Respiratory and Pulmonary Devices Branch, Office</p> <p>6 of Device Evaluation</p> <p>7 Center for Devices and Radiologic Health, FDA</p> <p>8 Silver Spring, MD</p> <p>9 Jasan Zimmerman</p> <p>10 Patient Representative - Non-CF Bronchiectasis</p> <p>11 Palo Alto, CA</p> <p>12 Wen-Hung Chen, PhD</p> <p>13 Reviewer</p> <p>14 Clinical Outcome Assessment Staff</p> <p>15 OND, CDER, FDA, Silver Spring, MD</p> <p>16 Quynh Nguyen, PhD</p> <p>17 Associate Director for Human Factors</p> <p>18 Division of Medication Error Prevention and</p> <p>19 Analysis</p> <p>20 Office of Surveillance and Epidemiology</p> <p>21 CDER, FDA, Silver Spring, MD</p> <p>22 Angela Davis, MD</p>
Page 7	Page 9
<p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2 CDER, FDA, Silver Spring, Maryland</p> <p>3 Robert Lim, MD</p> <p>4 Lead Medical Officer</p> <p>5 Division of Pulmonary, Allergy, and</p> <p>6 Rheumatology Products</p> <p>7 OND, CDER, FDA, Silver Spring, MD</p> <p>8 Dean Follmann, PhD</p> <p>9 Chief</p> <p>10 Biostatistics Research Branch</p> <p>11 National Institute of Allergy and Infectious</p> <p>12 Diseases</p> <p>13 Bethesda, MD</p> <p>14 Shrimant Mishra, MD, MPH</p> <p>15 Medical Officer</p> <p>16 DAIP, OAP</p> <p>17 OND, CDER, FDA, Silver Spring, MD</p> <p>18 Rajiv Dhand, MD</p> <p>19 Professor and Chairman</p> <p>20 Department of Medicine</p> <p>21 University of Tennessee Graduate School of</p> <p>22 Medicine</p>	<p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2 Medical Director</p> <p>3 Grifols</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p>

Page 10		Page 12	
1	CONTENTS	1	CONTENTS
2	Page	2	(Continued)
3	Introductory Remarks and Panel Introduction	3	Page
4	Ed Cox, MD, MPH, FDA 11	4	Session Co-Chairs: Tom Smith (FDA),
5	Cross-Cutting Device and Human Factors Challenges and	5	Anne O'Donnell (Georgetown University)
6	Considerations	6	Non-Cystic Fibrosis Bronchiectasis: Historical
7	Quynh Nguyen, MS, FDA 18	7	Perspective of Product Development
8	Deepika Lakhani, PhD, FDA 28	8	Thomas Smith, MD, FDA 199
9	Session 1: Cystic Fibrosis: Current Landscape,	9	Care of the Bronchiectasis Patient: Current
10	Challenges and Case Studies 47	10	State
11	Session Co-Chairs: Sumathi Nambiar (FDA),	11	Greg Tino, MD 205
12	Patrick Flume (Medical University of South	12	Patient Speaker/Patient Perspective
13	Carolina)	13	Jasan Zimmerman 236
14	Inhaled Antimicrobial Therapy for Cystic	14	Break 246
15	Fibrosis: A Regulatory Evolution	15	Case Study on Developing an Inhalational Therapy
16	Shrimant Mishra, MD, FDA 47	16	for Non-Cystic Fibrosis Bronchiectasis
17	Inhaled Antibiotics in Cystic Fibrosis:	17	Part I: Patient Selection and Trial Duration
18	Current State and Future Considerations	18	Peter Kim, MD, FDA 246
19	David Nichols, MD 58	19	Part II: Endpoint Considerations
20	Patient Speaker/Patient Perspective	20	CDR LaRee Tracy, PhD, FDA 250
21	Chip Hawkins 79	21	Moderated Panel Discussion (with Audience Q&A)
22	Break 88	22	All Panelists 259
Page 11		Page 13	
1	CONTENTS	1	CONTENTS
2	(Continued)	2	(Continued)
3	Page	3	Page
4	Cystic Fibrosis Trial Designs of the Future:	4	Closing Remarks 340
5	Case Studies for CF Infection 88	5	
6	Prevention of Exacerbations/ Management of	6	
7	CF Patients Chronically Infected with	7	
8	Pseudomonas aeruginosa (5-7 minutes) - Moderated	8	
9	Panel Discussion	9	
10	Maria Allende, MD, FDA 89	10	
11	Overview and Issues: Developing Inhalational	11	
12	Products for the Treatment of Chronic MRSA	12	
13	Infection in Cystic Fibrosis (5-7 minutes) -	13	
14	Moderated Panel Discussion	14	
15	Shrimant Mishra, MD, FDA 138	15	
16	Lunch 180	16	
17	Formal Public Comments	17	
18	Amy Leitman (NTM Info and Research) 180	18	
19	Mary Kitlowski 187	19	
20	Cara Pasquale (COPD Foundation) 194	20	
21	Session 2: Non-CF Bronchiectasis: Current	21	
22	Landscape, Challenges and Case Study 199	22	

Page 14	Page 16
<p>1 PROCEEDINGS</p> <p>2 INTRODUCTORY REMARKS AND PANEL INTRODUCTION</p> <p>3 DR. COX: Great. Thanks. So I'm Ed Cox,</p> <p>4 director of the Office of Antimicrobial Products, and</p> <p>5 I'm going to start out by welcoming everybody to</p> <p>6 today's workshop on Developing Therapies for Treatment</p> <p>7 of Cystic Fibrosis and Nasally Inhaled Antibiotics for</p> <p>8 the Treatment of Cystic Fibrosis and also Non-CF</p> <p>9 Bronchiectasis.</p> <p>10 And I want to thank folks -- the folks that</p> <p>11 have come here in person, and I also I know there's a</p> <p>12 lot of folks that are joining online too.</p> <p>13 And, you know, folks that follow area are</p> <p>14 aware that there have been a number of development</p> <p>15 programs that have happened over the last several years</p> <p>16 and I think we've learned some, but we've also</p> <p>17 encountered some of the challenges of developing</p> <p>18 therapies in this area.</p> <p>19 So we thought given the experiences to-date,</p> <p>20 it will be a good chance to gather folks together to</p> <p>21 talk about trial design, to talk about endpoints, to</p> <p>22 talk about ways that we can overcome some of the</p>	<p>1 we'll start out by introducing the panelists and what</p> <p>2 we'll try and do is go around. And one other thing too</p> <p>3 I should say, lunch -- you can order lunch out there.</p> <p>4 I think it's just beyond the first conference room.</p> <p>5 There's a little window there. And they've asked that</p> <p>6 people who want to get lunch here through their</p> <p>7 services do so -- put their order in by the break time</p> <p>8 if you will.</p> <p>9 And let's see. Now, I'd like to have the</p> <p>10 panelists go around and introduce themselves, and I</p> <p>11 think we'll start with Mr. Hawkins. And just folks</p> <p>12 know, in the agenda in the back is a list of conflicts</p> <p>13 of interests and declaration of conflicts of interests.</p> <p>14 So that's available both in the paper form and on the</p> <p>15 web.</p> <p>16 So we'll ask folks to go around the table.</p> <p>17 We'll start with Mr. Hawkins. We'll work our way</p> <p>18 around. And I would ask that folks, you know, state</p> <p>19 their name and their affiliation. Mr. Hawkins?</p> <p>20 MR. HAWKINS: Hi. I'm Chip Hawkins. I'm a</p> <p>21 cystic fibrosis patient, and as a CF patient, I use a</p> <p>22 lot of the drugs that are in development or are</p>
Page 15	Page 17
<p>1 challenges that we encounter in developing drugs for CF</p> <p>2 and also for non-CF bronchiectasis.</p> <p>3 So we really look forward to an open</p> <p>4 discussion today. We've got a series of panels. And</p> <p>5 we'll start out first by talking about some of the</p> <p>6 device-related issues, then we'll move and talk some</p> <p>7 about drug development for CF, and then non-CF</p> <p>8 bronchiectasis will follow in a subsequent panel. So</p> <p>9 we look forward to an open discussion.</p> <p>10 And, you know, these workshops are valuable to</p> <p>11 us because of your all willingness to come and join us,</p> <p>12 you know, having your expertise from your various</p> <p>13 different experiences and disciplines from which you</p> <p>14 come. And contributing that to the discussion of the</p> <p>15 meeting really helps a lot as we try and develop ways</p> <p>16 to facilitate the development of drugs.</p> <p>17 And if we think about this, what this is</p> <p>18 really all about, is really about getting therapies out</p> <p>19 there to help patients. And I think that's everybody's</p> <p>20 shared goal and, you know, that's the key thing to keep</p> <p>21 in mind as we're working through the day.</p> <p>22 And I think at this point what we'll do is</p>	<p>1 available now. But I'm also -- I also take part in a</p> <p>2 good number of drug trials. I've been in 15 or 20 or</p> <p>3 so. So hopefully I have some perspective to add to</p> <p>4 this meeting from both the patient and participant part</p> <p>5 of the equation.</p> <p>6 DR. FROEHLICH: And I'm Juergen Froehlich,</p> <p>7 chief medical officer at Aradigm. I have been quite</p> <p>8 heavily involved in Phase III development for</p> <p>9 ciprofloxacin DI.</p> <p>10 DR. CHALMERS: My name is James Chalmers. I'm</p> <p>11 a respiratory physician from the University of Dundee</p> <p>12 in the U.K. and I also chair the European</p> <p>13 Bronchiectasis Network.</p> <p>14 DR. BARKER: I'm Alan Barker from Portland,</p> <p>15 Oregon at the Oregon Health & Science University. I've</p> <p>16 been involved in clinical research in bronchiectasis</p> <p>17 for a number of years.</p> <p>18 DR. NOONE: Peadar Noone. I'm at the</p> <p>19 University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill and I've</p> <p>20 been involved in CF care and non-CF antimycobacterial</p> <p>21 treatment for several years.</p> <p>22 DR. HAMBLETT: Nicole Hamblett, professor of</p>

Page 18	<p>1 biostatistics and pediatrics at the University of 2 Washington. I also co-direct the CF Therapeutics 3 Development Network coordinating center at Seattle 4 Children's Hospital. 5 DR. TRACY: LaRee Tracy. My background is in 6 statistics and epidemiology. I'm here at FDA in the 7 Office of Biostatistics. And I was the statistical 8 reviewer on the Aradigm ciprofloxacin product review. 9 DR. VANDEVANTER: Dutch VanDevanter. I'm an 10 adjunct professor of pediatrics at Case Western Reserve 11 University. I've been in CF trial design and analysis 12 for about 20 years. And I'm here representing Horizon 13 Pharma. 14 DR. KIM: Peter Kim, clinical team leader, 15 Division of Anti-Infective Products, FDA. 16 DR. AKSAMIT: Tim Aksamit, Mayo Clinic, 17 Rochester, Minnesota. I'm a respiratory physician and 18 involved in bronchiectasis and NTM and currently chair 19 of the U.S. Bronchiectasis and NTM Registry. 20 DR. KADOORIE: I'm Chris Kadoorie. I'm a 21 statistical reviewer here at FDA and I've had some, you 22 know, experience with both non-CF and CF submissions</p>	Page 20	<p>1 participated in CF clinical trials over many years, 2 even with Mr. Hawkins. 3 DR. ALDER: Good morning. I'm Jeff Alder, 4 founder of Anti-Infective Consulting. And about seven 5 months ago, I was the lead presenter for Bayer for 6 their Cipro DPI at the Advisory Committee as they tried 7 to gain approval. 8 DR. ELLENBERG: Susan Ellenberg, professor of 9 Biostatistics at the University of Pennsylvania School 10 of Medicine, with general expertise on clinical trials. 11 DR. ALLENDE: Maria Allende. I'm a medical 12 officer in the Division of Anti-Infective Products and 13 I have been the reviewer of inhaled therapies in the 14 last Advisory Committee meeting. 15 DR. LIM: I'm Bob Lim. I'm clinical team 16 leader, Division of Pulmonary, Allergy and Rheumatology 17 Products, FDA. 18 DR. FOLLMANN: I'm Dean Follmann, head of 19 Biostatistics at the National Institute of Allergy and 20 Infectious Diseases. 21 DR. MISHRA: Hi. I'm Shrimant Mishra and I'm 22 the medical officer in the Division of Anti-Infected</p>
Page 19	<p>1 and presented it at several AC meeting. 2 DR. TINO: Good morning. I'm Greg Tino. I'm 3 a pulmonary and a critical care physician at the 4 University of Pennsylvania and I've had longstanding 5 both clinical and research interest in bronchiectasis. 6 And I'm the principal investigator at Penn of the 7 Bronchiectasis Research Registry of the United States. 8 DR. FLUME: And I'm Patrick Flume at the 9 Medical University of South Carolina in Charleston. 10 I'm the CF center director there, but also have large 11 programs in both bronchiectasis and NTM. 12 DR. NAMBIAR: Good morning. I'm Sumathi 13 Nambiar, director, Division of Anti-Infective Products, 14 CDER, FDA. 15 DR. SMITH: Good morning. I'm Thomas Smith, 16 the clinical team leader in the Division of Anti- 17 Infective Products, FDA. 18 DR. NICHOLS: Dave Nichols, University of 19 Washington. I'm a CF provider and the medical director 20 of the TDN Coordinating Center. 21 DR. ZEITLIN: I'm Pam Zeitlin, chair of 22 Pediatrics at National Jewish Health and I have</p>	Page 21	<p>1 Products. 2 DR. DHAND: I'm Rajiv Dhand. I'm an adult 3 pulmonary and critical care physician at the University 4 of Tennessee in Knoxville. I've had a longstanding 5 interest in aerosolized therapies, including inhaled 6 antibiotics. 7 DR. LAKHANI: Good morning. I'm Deepika 8 Lakhani. I'm with the Respiratory Devices branch in 9 the Center for Devices. 10 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I'm Jasan Zimmerman. I'm the 11 non-CF bronchiectasis patient representative. I 12 participated on the Advisory Council for the Bayer and 13 the Aradigm submissions. 14 DR. CHEN: I'm Wen-Hung Chen. I'm the team 15 leader of the Clinical Outcome Assessment Staff at the 16 Office of New Drugs in CDER. 17 DR. COX: Great. Thank you all. So at this 18 point what we'll do is we'll move to the first talk, 19 and the first talk deals with some of the cost cutting 20 issues that deal with devices that are used to 21 essentially inhale antimicrobial agents. 22 So we'll start out with Quynh Nguyen and Quynh</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 22</p> <p>1 joins us from CDRH and we're grateful that -- did I get 2 that right? 3 DR. NGUYEN: (off mic) 4 DR. COX: CDER. Oh, you're a device person 5 from CDER. Our CDRH person will follow with the second 6 half of the talk. And we're glad that Quynh was able 7 to join us, because devices issues are certainly 8 something that we deal with in dealing with these 9 products. So, Quynh, thank you. 10 CROSS-CUTTING DEVICE AND HUMAN FACTORS CHALLENGES 11 AND CONSIDERATIONS 12 DR. NGUYEN: Good morning. My name is Quynh 13 Nguyen. I'm the associate director for Human Factors 14 with the Division of Medication Error Prevention and 15 Analysis. I'm pleased to be here to talk about CDER's 16 perspective in the role of human factors for inhalation 17 products design and development. 18 So in the next slide we'll show the 19 disclaimer, which was produced by government employees, 20 are freely reproduced and any product provided as 21 examples are for illustrative purposes only. 22 Next slide please. So let's first off start</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 24</p> <p>1 Next please. So who looks at medication 2 errors? So it's the Division of Medication Error 3 Prevention and Analysis. We were created in 1999. 4 We're comprised of scientists and healthcare 5 professionals with varying backgrounds. We have a 6 total of 53 employees. We are aligned by Office of New 7 Drugs therapeutic areas. And we lead the CDER's review 8 pertaining to medication error prevention and analysis 9 as well as human factors for drug and therapeutic 10 biologics. 11 Next please. This is where we sit in the 12 Center for Drug Evaluation and Research. We are in the 13 Office of f Medication Error and Prevention and Risk 14 Management, which is under the Office of Surveillance 15 and Epidemiology. 16 Next please. Our mission is to increase safe 17 use of drug products by minimizing use errors that are 18 related to product design, naming, labeling and 19 packaging. 20 Next please. To achieve our mission, we are 21 involved in all of the following. So we perform 22 assessments of proprietary names and we serve as</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 23</p> <p>1 defining medication error, what is a medication error? 2 A medication error is any preventable event that may 3 cause or lead to inappropriate medication use or 4 patient harm while the medication is in the hands of 5 the healthcare provider, patient or consumer. 6 So the figure on the right -- if you can just 7 go back please -- shows that while there are some 8 medication errors that may result in no harm and some 9 drug adverse events may result in non-preventable harm, 10 there's the intersection, as you can see in the middle, 11 where medication errors and adverse drug events 12 intersect and that's where there's preventable harm. 13 Next please. Then what is human factors? So 14 human factors is a scientific discipline that's 15 designed to evaluate the understanding of interactions 16 among human and elements of the system in order to 17 optimize human wellbeing and overall performance. 18 Next please. So human factors is really at 19 the core of medication error prevention. As we can 20 better understand how users interact with the system, 21 we can better prevent medication errors and therefore 22 optimize human wellbeing.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 25</p> <p>1 signatory for these reviews. We also perform labels, 2 labeling, packaging and product design to ensure safe 3 medication use. We also perform human factors 4 evaluations to ensure that the product is optimized and 5 ready for safe and effective use. We perform post- 6 market surveillance to identify safety signal and take 7 appropriate action as necessary. We also participate 8 in guidance development for FDA and industry. In 9 addition, we participate in work groups and advisory 10 committees. 11 Next please. So next I like to show a video. 12 So unfortunately, we are unable to play the video, but 13 you do have the links. So when you get a chance, you 14 can take a look at the video. It's a very interesting 15 video that illustrates -- yeah, we can try. 16 (video playing) 17 DR. NGUYEN: So as you can see from this 18 video, it illustrates the concept that users can use a 19 product in unexpected ways and the idea is to make sure 20 that we anticipate these usages as they occur and 21 prevent it from happening when the product gets in the 22 market. And in this particular instance, the product</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 26</p> <p>1 is in the hands of the patient and the patient did 2 commit a medication error. 3 Which brings me to the next set of 4 considerations with regards to reactive and proactive 5 approaches. Thank you. So historically some design 6 issues with drug products were not identified and 7 remedy until post-marketing, and in some cases, some of 8 these medication errors have already reached and harmed 9 the patients. 10 Today our approach is more proactive, where we 11 identify design issues proactively and address those 12 issues prior to marketing of the product to prevent 13 some medication errors from occurring. 14 So that proactive approach also applies to our 15 evaluations of combination products, where inhalation 16 products fall under. Here I provide a formal 17 definition for combination products, which you all are 18 familiar with. So combination products are therapeutic 19 and diagnostic products that combine more than one 20 constituent that's regulated by the FDA. It can 21 combine either a drug and a biologic, a drug and a 22 device or a drug and a biologic.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 28</p> <p>1 specifies the need to minimize use-related hazards. 2 So human factor studies may be needed to 3 demonstrate the elimination or minimization of use- 4 related hazards and medication errors. And the key 5 term here is "may be". So we don't always ask for 6 human factors for combination products, in particular 7 inhalation products. The determination on the human 8 factors data need is based on the use-related hazards. 9 So let me walk through the process in terms of 10 how human factors engineering can be used to optimize 11 the product. So, for example, a high-risk product 12 where you may start with the original design, and when 13 you apply the human factors engineering process, the 14 idea is to ensure that the product is more optimized 15 and that the design has been designed in a manner that 16 allows for safe and effective use. And the same 17 principles apply for a low-risk product as well. 18 So let me walk through the human factors 19 engineering process. First, we define the intended 20 users, use environments and user interface. So for 21 inhalation products the intended users may be patients 22 and caregivers using the product at home or healthcare</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 27</p> <p>1 And combination products can be physically 2 combined, for example, an auto-injector, or chemically 3 combined. They can also be co-packaged in a kit, for 4 example, a vial that's co-packaged in a prefilled 5 syringe. Or they can be separate and cross-labeled 6 products, for example, a specific drug product that's 7 intended for inhalation that specifies the need to use 8 that product with a specific device constituent. 9 Here's some examples of combination products 10 for which you are familiar with, prefilled syringes, 11 pen-injectors, auto-injectors, inhalation products, 12 transdermal patches, drug infusion devices, kits 13 containing drug administration devices. 14 So with respect to combination products and 15 the FDA's regulatory authority, it stems from device 16 regulation, which is 21 CFR 820.30, which specifies the 17 requirement for the device manufacturer to evaluate 18 use-related hazards and to validate the user interface. 19 It also stems from a drug regulation which is from the 20 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, which specifies the need 21 to reduce medication errors through improved product 22 design. In addition, we also have PDUFA goal, which</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 29</p> <p>1 providers using the product in a healthcare setting. 2 The use environments, as I mentioned, it can be at home 3 or a healthcare setting. And the user interface is of 4 course the device constituent of the product. 5 And next we identify use-related hazards. So 6 this step allows us to understand what potential 7 hazards could occur when a user is using the product 8 and allow us to understand what critical tests are 9 needed to be performed and evaluated. Then we evaluate 10 and implement risk mitigation control measures. And 11 then we conduct a human factors simulated-use 12 validation study to demonstrate safe and effective use. 13 Within this human factors validation study, we 14 can identify and conclude the use-related risks are 15 acceptable and/or new use-related hazards are not 16 introduced. If the conclusion is yes to both of those 17 questions, then we can go ahead and document the 18 process. Now, if the answer is no to either one of 19 those questions, then we need to go back to the step of 20 implementing additional risk control measures and 21 follow the next steps in the flowchart. 22 Just a few notes on the simulated-use, human</p>

Page 30

1 factors validation testing. The idea is to ensure that
 2 the testing is sufficiently realistic so that the
 3 results can be generalizable to actual use. In
 4 addition, test participants should be given the
 5 opportunity to use the product as independently and
 6 naturally as possible. Furthermore, if users have
 7 access to the product labeling, that product labeling
 8 should be provided during the testing. However, the
 9 participants can choose to use the product labeling
 10 when they need to, but they shouldn't be required to
 11 review the product labeling.

12 This slide shows the drug development process
 13 and where human factors engineering process fit in as
 14 well as where DMEPA can be involved. So DMEPA can be
 15 involved when the IND is filed, but we can be involved
 16 as early as the pre-IND phase. And the human factors
 17 engineering process should begin from preclinical
 18 testing and is carried through Phase IV and the risk
 19 analysis is continually updated based on the human
 20 factors evaluation and testing.

21 This is more of a reference slide, where I
 22 show specific guidance that mentions considerations for

Page 31

1 human factors for different regulatory pathways. For
 2 example, for a new drug the regulatory pathways can be
 3 505(b)(1), 505(b)(2), 351(a) and the applications types
 4 can be NDAs or BLAs. And in this space, we do have a
 5 draft guidance that was released in February 2016
 6 that's titled Human Factors Studies and Related
 7 Clinical Study Considerations for Combination Product
 8 Design and Development.

9 In the generic product space, the regulatory
 10 pathway can be 505(j) and the application type is ANDA.
 11 And we do have a draft guidance that was released in
 12 January of 2017 that's titled Comparative Analyses and
 13 Related Comparative Use Human Factors Studies for a
 14 Drug-Device Combination Product Submitted in an ANDA.

15 In the biosimilar space, the regulatory
 16 pathway is 351(k) and the application type is BLA. And
 17 in this space the same guidance that's applicable for a
 18 new drug can be used here.

19 Now, in the interchangeable space, which is
 20 351(k)(4) and the application type is BLA, we do have a
 21 draft guidance that was released in 2017 that provides
 22 considerations for demonstrating interchangeability

Page 32

1 with a reference product.

2 The next few slides provides the FDA release
 3 of guidance in terms of timeline for the last 17 years
 4 starting with 2000 and it goes through 2017. So I
 5 provided these for your reference. You can take a look
 6 when you have the time.

7 And I just like to conclude that ultimately
 8 FDA and industry are working collaboratively together
 9 to ensure that the outcome for the patient is safe and
 10 effective use of medical products.

11 DR. NAMBIAR: Thanks, Quynh. Are there any
 12 clarifying questions for Quynh? Thank you very much,
 13 Quynh. So our next speaker would be Deepika Lakhani.
 14 She's a team lead in the Respiratory and Pulmonary
 15 Devices Branch in the Office of Drug Evaluation --
 16 sorry, Office of Device Evaluation, Center for Devices
 17 and Radiologic Health. And the Division of Anti-
 18 Infective Products works closely with Deepika and her
 19 team when we review applications for inhale therapies.
 20 Welcome Deepika.

21 DR. LAKHANI: Good morning. Thank you for the
 22 introduction. I'll jump right in. The outline today

Page 33

1 for the next 15 minutes of my talk is I would go over
 2 how we classify medical devices, the respiratory
 3 products, with a specific focus on drug device
 4 development; the device review considerations for
 5 orally inhaled drug products; I'll present a brief case
 6 study wherein we collaborated with a sponsor to guide
 7 the regulatory development of their product; and have
 8 in the end some conclusions.

9 So from a regulatory standpoint, we divide
 10 medical devices into Class I and Class II and Class
 11 III. Class I are followed by general controls. They
 12 are exempt from any premarket clearance and they are
 13 very simple devices, for example, surgical gloves.

14 Class II are general controls and special
 15 controls, where most of these are devices that are
 16 involved with products that we are discussing today
 17 would be. They mostly require 510(k) if they are for
 18 general use and that would be like a nebulizer.

19 Class III are the highest risk devices that
 20 require general controls and premarket approval. They
 21 are more of implanted -- permanently implanted devices.
 22 So they require extensive review before they can be

Page 34	<p>1 introduced to the patient.</p> <p>2 The guidance here in front of us is regarding</p> <p>3 the 510(k) program that we follow at the CDRH to help</p> <p>4 the industry decide what is required or whether a</p> <p>5 device is suitable for a 510(k) and what kind of data</p> <p>6 needs to be submitted before a 510(k) can be cleared by</p> <p>7 the FDA.</p> <p>8 As Quynh also mentioned, combination products</p> <p>9 fall under the definition of the 21 CFR 3.2(e) and it's</p> <p>10 more than one regulated component. It could be a drug</p> <p>11 and a device like most of the inhaled products are. It</p> <p>12 could be a biologic and a device or a combination of</p> <p>13 all three.</p> <p>14 Because we are separate entities within the</p> <p>15 FDA, different centers work closely and collaboratively</p> <p>16 depending on the product to review such combination</p> <p>17 products. In case the sponsor is unsure where their</p> <p>18 product actually falls or who would be the lead center,</p> <p>19 there is a mechanism available on the FDA website that</p> <p>20 talks about how to write a request for designation that</p> <p>21 can help the sponsor to proceed with actually</p> <p>22 understanding where their device or their product can</p>	Page 36	<p>1 510(k) pathway. And when we come -- there's a database</p> <p>2 available to understand what has been cleared in the</p> <p>3 past. All you need to do is put in a product code,</p> <p>4 which is CAF for nebulizers, to understand if the</p> <p>5 device that is under development has previously been</p> <p>6 cleared or any version of it has been cleared or</p> <p>7 whether it can be used in an investigational study.</p> <p>8 A drug specific inhalation device, for</p> <p>9 example, the antibacterial drugs that are relevant to</p> <p>10 the talk today, can be filed under a device module in a</p> <p>11 NDA or it could be by seeking a separate 510(k) pathway</p> <p>12 with the Center for Devices to clear it.</p> <p>13 So as I have mentioned in a couple of slides</p> <p>14 back, orally inhaled drug product almost always involve</p> <p>15 multi-center review, because antibacterial the main</p> <p>16 mechanism of action is in the drug. CDER takes the</p> <p>17 lead and they send us a consult in CDRH to review the</p> <p>18 device component of the drug product. In case there</p> <p>19 are any biologics, CBER gets involved. And depending</p> <p>20 upon other constituents of the combination product,</p> <p>21 different parts of the FDA get involved in the review</p> <p>22 of the product.</p>
Page 35	<p>1 fall into and which center would be involved with the</p> <p>2 review of that product.</p> <p>3 So jumping into the inhalation devices that we</p> <p>4 see for orally inhaled drug product, we have the</p> <p>5 general indications or the drug specific indications</p> <p>6 nebulizers. The general indications nebulizers that I</p> <p>7 would follow on the next slide are cleared typically</p> <p>8 via the 510(k) pathway. The drug specific nebulizers,</p> <p>9 as we see in most of our NDAs relevant to the talk</p> <p>10 today, are approved typically via the NDA. There are</p> <p>11 of course the inhalers like the pressurized metered-</p> <p>12 dose inhalers, dry power inhalers, they are almost</p> <p>13 always drug specific and they are specifically approved</p> <p>14 via new drug applications.</p> <p>15 So what is a general use inhalation device?</p> <p>16 Examples of the drug classes that we consider for</p> <p>17 general use are beta-agonist bronchodilators like</p> <p>18 albuterol, anticholinergic bronchodilators like</p> <p>19 ipratropium or anti-inflammatory drugs like cromolyn</p> <p>20 sodium. Anything that falls outside of such general</p> <p>21 use is considered a drug specific indication.</p> <p>22 The general use indications are cleared by the</p>	Page 37	<p>1 From a device review consideration for an</p> <p>2 inhalation device, when it is at our end in CDRH, we</p> <p>3 look at the indications for use for that device; the</p> <p>4 device description; the performance of the device when</p> <p>5 teamed up with the drug; the bio compatibility; if the</p> <p>6 device has any electrical components, it's safety and</p> <p>7 EMC; if the device has any software, the software</p> <p>8 validation data; human factors of course; and the</p> <p>9 labeling of the device within that combination product.</p> <p>10 Indications for use is one of the most</p> <p>11 critical definition of what is actually that product;</p> <p>12 it's the intended use, what it intends to treat or</p> <p>13 mitigate; the patient population, is this drug and</p> <p>14 device labeled for adults, pediatrics, geriatrics,</p> <p>15 neonates, infants, because depending upon that it would</p> <p>16 define the performance required for that device when it</p> <p>17 is with the patient as well as the environment of use.</p> <p>18 If it's a home use device, a healthcare environment use</p> <p>19 device, can it be used in transport? Because that</p> <p>20 would impact again the testing required to support the</p> <p>21 safe use of the device.</p> <p>22 From a performance testing perspective, we</p>

Page 38	Page 40
<p>1 define an inhalation product to generate a respirable 2 fraction. But how do we actually understand if the 3 device and drug can interplay successfully to generate 4 that respirable fraction that will be inhaled? We use 5 a bench test -- well, we review the bench test that the 6 sponsor submits using cascade impaction.</p> <p>7 The figure on the right is an Andersen cascade 8 impactor, which is basically a set of sieves that would 9 partition the aerosol being generated by a device into 10 these various stages that are defined by various cut 11 offs. So anything less than 5 micron in size is 12 believed to actually reach the patient's lungs and get 13 absorbed and this test would help us understand that 14 the device can successfully generate an aerosol plume 15 that can reach the patient's lungs to get absorbed.</p> <p>16 We do request that the testing is done at 17 minimum, nominal and maximum flow rates that are 18 allowable by the device to predict all use scenarios 19 that the device can be used in once it's with the 20 patients.</p> <p>21 In case -- we also of course request that the 22 sponsor addresses variability, sufficient sample size,</p>	<p>1 guidance for industry that talks about the use of 2 10993, our standard for Biological Evaluation of 3 Medical Devices.</p> <p>4 If a device that is being considered for 5 inhalation is already out there in the market, there is 6 a process in which the sponsors provide us with just 7 material certification for formulation on processing 8 and the whole bench testing does not need to be done, 9 because then we leverage the data that is already 10 available for us to determine the safety of such 11 devices from a biocompatibility perspective.</p> <p>12 The particulate matters as well as the 13 volatile organic compounds that are getting generated 14 inside this device when they are being used also come 15 into play when we are reviewing the safety of such 16 devices. What kind of contact it has? Whether it's 17 being used with a humidifier? Because the kind of 18 contact would change when it's interplaying with the 19 drug solution, the humidifier, et cetera. So all these 20 considerations come into play for reviewing such type 21 of devices.</p> <p>22 If there are accessories involved, if, for</p>
Page 39	Page 41
<p>1 appropriate confidence level. But if there are spacers 2 being used or if there is a face mask being used, 3 especially for children less than five years of age, 4 our testing, our review consideration would also 5 involve that, that the testing should be done in 6 typical use scenario when the data is submitted.</p> <p>7 Biocompatibility is the safety of the material 8 of construction of that device that would interact with 9 the patient's lungs. Because anything that's getting 10 generated by these inhalers and nebulizers that are 11 actually going to get into the patient's lungs, we 12 consider them externally communicating with the 13 patient's lungs. The type of contact, for example, if 14 it's surface, if it's mucosal and for lungs it's 15 externally communicating, defines the kind of testing 16 the devices need to be provided with as well as the 17 contact duration. If a nebulizer is indicated for 20 18 minutes use one time, it would have a different type of 19 contact versus a nebulizer that is chronically 20 indicated for 20 minutes every day as long as the 21 patient needs it. So that defines the duration.</p> <p>22 To know more about biocompatibility there's a</p>	<p>1 example, a face mask is involved, biocompatibility 2 should be supported for the face mask also. And 3 finally, all testing that is included should be only on 4 finished device that is to be introduced into the 5 commercial market.</p> <p>6 As I mentioned before, most of our nebulizers 7 have electrical components, so we have a set of 8 standards provided on this slide that determine the 9 safety of these electrical components as well as the 10 EMC.</p> <p>11 In case there is a software involved in the 12 device, there is a set of testing that needs to be 13 submitted to the FDA. And this guidance for industry 14 in front of us talks about how we determine the level 15 of concern of the software that the device may have. 16 For example, a level of concern for a nebulizer may be 17 lower than the level of concern of a software in a 18 ventilator device. So this talks about how to 19 determine that and the kind of validation data that 20 needs to be provided, the cyber security that needs to 21 be provided to support the software in these devices.</p> <p>22 And finally, we had a very good discussion</p>

Page 42	Page 44
<p>1 about the human factors and I just want to mention that</p> <p>2 we've already talked about. But from a review</p> <p>3 perspective, we have seen that for inhalation products</p> <p>4 it's 10 percent medication and 90 percent patient</p> <p>5 interface to actually have a successful drug delivery</p> <p>6 to the lung when the device in the patient's hand.</p> <p>7 So the case study that I have in front was</p> <p>8 without actually discussing the sponsor. A sponsor</p> <p>9 developed a new nebulizer technology that was for</p> <p>10 delivery intended for this one specific drug and they</p> <p>11 came to us at the Center for Devices asking us that</p> <p>12 they would like to file a 510(k) for this. And they</p> <p>13 actually came in really early before the development</p> <p>14 and we had pretty early collaborative talks. And we</p> <p>15 were actually able to share with them that if your</p> <p>16 device is being indicated for this specific drug,</p> <p>17 you're not intending to indicate it for general use,</p> <p>18 you may able to file everything and submit all the data</p> <p>19 that you have specifically in the NDA if you choose to</p> <p>20 and not actually have to submit a 510(k) for a device,</p> <p>21 because that's a drug specific device now.</p> <p>22 And of course, this was an early communication</p>	<p>1 available to the public. Thank you.</p> <p>2 DR. NAMBIAR: Thanks, Deepika. Are there any</p> <p>3 questions for Deepika? Jeff has a question.</p> <p>4 DR. ALDER: I'd say probably the majority of</p> <p>5 people developing new inhalational therapies think they</p> <p>6 have a unique drug or a unique aspect and they seek to</p> <p>7 make use of an existing device, only to discover at</p> <p>8 some point that CDER has concerns about the device. So</p> <p>9 is there a process of a formal review of existing</p> <p>10 devices and how can we communicate that?</p> <p>11 DR. LAKHANI: So if you would just like to</p> <p>12 seek feedback for the device, for the drug device</p> <p>13 combination, the CDRH re-submission process is</p> <p>14 available wherein you directly contact CDRH and you</p> <p>15 reference the IND or the NDA that you've filed in CDER,</p> <p>16 which you don't need to go to CDER because we'll only</p> <p>17 be discussing the device. And of course, our 510(k)</p> <p>18 database would share what kind of general use devices</p> <p>19 are available.</p> <p>20 As far as the INDs that are using devices that</p> <p>21 are not yet publicly available, the information is hard</p> <p>22 for the sponsors to avail in a public domain. But if</p>
Page 43	Page 45
<p>1 example which was successful. And the methods that are</p> <p>2 available to actually do that for Center for Devices</p> <p>3 are through the pre-submission process. And for the</p> <p>4 Center for Drugs and Center for Biologics evaluation,</p> <p>5 we have Type A, Type B, Type C meetings that are</p> <p>6 available to interact with us early on.</p> <p>7 There is also a guidance that is available</p> <p>8 from CDRH and CBER that talks about the request for</p> <p>9 feedback on medical device submissions to help the</p> <p>10 sponsors so we can collaborate early and help guide the</p> <p>11 development.</p> <p>12 In conclusion, the inhalation drug delivery is</p> <p>13 dependent on a successful interplay between the drug,</p> <p>14 the device and of course the patient use. The review</p> <p>15 that we do at our end is grounded by the regulations --</p> <p>16 we have our Code of Federal Regulations -- it's</p> <p>17 grounded by the standards -- in fact at Center for</p> <p>18 Devices most of our review work is development of</p> <p>19 standards and that defines how we review the devices --</p> <p>20 and of course risk analysis of these devices when they</p> <p>21 are being used with the drugs. We strive to work with</p> <p>22 the sponsors to ensure safe and effective devices are</p>	<p>1 you have cross reference that this IND uses this device</p> <p>2 and the patient population, for example, is adults only</p> <p>3 as it has been used in a previous clinical trial and</p> <p>4 the environment of use is home or hospital only and the</p> <p>5 intended duration is similar, I think most of the time</p> <p>6 by only providing performance you can leverage all the</p> <p>7 data that has been used before for the previous</p> <p>8 approval. Is that helpful?</p> <p>9 DR. ALDER: Yeah, I think the message is early</p> <p>10 communication --</p> <p>11 DR. LAKHANI: Yes.</p> <p>12 DR. ALDER: -- both within FDA divisions and</p> <p>13 with the sponsor, because in some cases it has been</p> <p>14 late in the game that either a human factor or a</p> <p>15 performance issue has been discovered for a device that</p> <p>16 was already approved. And sponsors assume if a device</p> <p>17 is approved it must be okay and then they discover</p> <p>18 later that it's not okay and then try to retrofit human</p> <p>19 factor or other studies in.</p> <p>20 DR. LAKHANI: Yeah. And the primary reason</p> <p>21 for that is that the intended use at times is</p> <p>22 different. Although it is an inhalation product, we</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 46</p> <p>1 may have a change in the patient population; for 2 example, it's a switch from adults to pediatrics. So 3 the way we would look at the biocompatibility of a 4 pediatric, a device intended for pediatric use would be 5 slightly more safe testing versus when a device is 6 intended for adult use with respect to 7 biocompatibility. So it's just one example. 8 DR. ALDER: Well, for today it's actually the 9 other way around. It wouldn't be devices developed for 10 CF. So younger patients that are now being -- try to 11 use for NCFB, where the patients tend to be older. 12 DR. LAKHANI: Absolutely. 13 DR. ALDER: Yeah. 14 DR. LAKHANI: Yes, absolutely. Yeah. 15 DR. NAMBIAR: And, Jeff, there's also an 16 opportunity when a submission is sent to CDER to the 17 Review Division that you can ask device-related 18 questions. And there's an opportunity to get input 19 from CDRH very early in the process as well. So we do 20 consult our colleagues in CDRH and we've -- there's 21 many instances where we've had device-related questions 22 and discussions very early in development and that's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 48</p> <p>1 pediatrics than there is adults? 2 DR. LAKHANI: Just from a review -- just from 3 a device material perspective. And I can elaborate 4 that a little bit. The kind of testing that we would 5 need for a new material of construction of a device for 6 an adult would be slightly different than that for 7 pediatrics, because of the vulnerability of a pediatric 8 population is different than the adult. 9 The testing can -- like, for example, if the 10 sponsor is doing extractables and leachables testing to 11 support the safe use of the device and the material of 12 construction, the kind of risk assessment that you 13 would do would be different because the margin of 14 safety is different between the two sets of population. 15 So the guidance that I talked about talks -- 16 actually divulges way more into it than I could 17 actually get in for today's talk. Even from a 18 performance standpoint, the way a pediatric patient 19 inhales, the maneuver for that inhalation effort is 20 different than how a adult patient would inhale. So 21 when we are looking at performance testing even by 22 simple cascade impaction, the flow rate that we would</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 47</p> <p>1 something we would certainly encourage. 2 DR. LAKHANI: Yes, please? 3 DR. NAMBIAR: There's one more question for 4 you. 5 DR. AKSAMIT: And did I -- 6 DR. BARKER: You discuss therapeutics. What 7 about diagnostics? Specifically, I'm thinking of 8 pulmonary function equipment. I was discussing with a 9 manufacturer a month or two ago. They're developing a 10 new software program for pulmonary function and they 11 said that it had to be reviewed by the FDA. Does that 12 fall under your purview or is that somebody else? 13 DR. LAKHANI: If it's an in-vitro diagnostic, 14 we have a separate office for IVDs, in-vitro 15 diagnostics, that review it. And if it is something 16 like it's a device with a software, as you're 17 mentioning, for PFDs, it would again be a collaborative 18 review. So we would be looking at the device 19 specifically. Or if it's a software only for an IVD, 20 in-vitro diagnostics group would be looking at it. 21 DR. AKSAMIT: And did I understand you say 22 that there's a different safety threshold for</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 49</p> <p>1 be testing for an adult would be different than that 2 for a ped patient. So that's how we look at the 3 devices. 4 DR. NAMBIAR: I think, Deepika, there's one 5 more question for you. 6 DR. LAKHANI: Yes, please? 7 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Is there any patient input in 8 the early discussions during the drug development? 9 DR. LAKHANI: Not during early discussions. 10 Mostly when the sponsor comes in they have information 11 that they have discussed with the patient, they may 12 have an early study that they want to present and just 13 share data, but the patients are not involved at that 14 stage. 15 DR. NAMBIAR: I think there's one more 16 question for you. 17 MR. HAWKINS: Thank you. Is there a place for 18 patients to come and -- after the drug is already 19 approved? I have one drug that I take that I find very 20 difficult to use the device. How do we deal with that? 21 DR. LAKHANI: Most of the devices or products 22 that are cleared they carry a helpline number and we</p>

Page 50	Page 52
<p>1 have -- like it's up to the patient to actually contact 2 the manufacturer. And it is our understanding that the 3 manufacturer strives that the device is successfully 4 used by the patient. But over here also we have the 5 whole role of human factors that's coming in that 6 actually evaluate the use scenarios when they're 7 evaluating the data.</p> <p>8 And maybe when we're having the panel 9 discussion, we could bring up again what you're asking 10 and we could have Quynh involved with that answer.</p> <p>11 DR. NGUYEN: Yes. So I just like to add that 12 from a patient's use perspective, when applying human 13 factors engineering process, the patient's involvement 14 as the representative users of your intended product 15 will be starting at the beginning of the process. So 16 any feedback or discussions with respect to your use 17 experience can be captured there very early on the 18 design process.</p> <p>19 In the event where you have issues with a 20 product that's already on the market, like Deepika 21 said, you can contact the manufacturer and file a 22 complaint and that will go to the complaint database.</p>	<p>1 division and including several that have been indicated 2 for cystic fibrosis indications.</p> <p>3 So I want to talk very, very briefly just 4 about inhaled antimicrobial therapy for CF and 5 particularly just sort of point out some of the changes 6 that are happening in clinical practice that are sort 7 of making us as a regulatory division adapt to those 8 changes.</p> <p>9 So as I'm sure everybody knows here, the 10 approved inhaled antimicrobial products for CF is 11 pretty small. Obviously, TOBI was approved in 1997, 12 and since that time, there has been several nebulized 13 tobramycin products that have been approved, including 14 Bethkis. There was a Podhaler -- TOBI Podhaler that 15 was approved in 2013, which is basically just a dry 16 powder inhaler version of tobramycin. And then in 17 2010, we had an inhaled aztreonam, Cayston, and that 18 was improved. And both of these -- or I guess this 19 whole, you know, class of drugs essentially are meant 20 to manage patients who have CF, who have chronic 21 pseudomonas infections.</p> <p>22 Now, since that time we're seeing a little bit</p>
Page 51	Page 53
<p>1 And they would need to assess the complaints that they 2 receive and whether or not that rises to a level that 3 they need to report it to the FDA.</p> <p>4 DR. NAMBIAR: Okay, great. Thank you, Quynh, 5 and thank you, Deepika.</p> <p>6 DR. LAKHANI: Thank you for your time.</p> <p>7 SESSION 1: CYSTIC FIBROSIS: CURRENT LANDSCAPE, 8 CHALLENGES AND CASE STUDIES</p> <p>9 DR. NAMBIAR: So we move into our first 10 session, where we will focus on cystic fibrosis and 11 developing inhale therapies for cystic fibrosis. To 12 start us off is Dr. Mishra, who is a medical officer in 13 the Division of Anti-Infective Products and his busy 14 portfolio includes a fair number of products being 15 developed for cystic fibrosis. So welcome, Shrimant.</p> <p>16 INHALED ANTIMICROBIAL THERAPY FOR CYSTIC FIBROSIS: A 17 REGULATORY EVOLUTION</p> <p>18 DR. MISHRA: Hello. Hi. My name is Shrimant 19 Mishra. As Sumathi mentioned, I'm a medical officer in 20 the Division of Anti-Infective Products. I've worked 21 on a lot of -- or reviewed -- sorry. I've reviewed a 22 lot of inhaled products that have come through our</p>	<p>1 of an evolution in drug development; it's probably 2 mirroring to a certain degree what's happening in 3 current clinical practice. We're seeing different 4 pathogens that are being targeted. We're seeing 5 different drug regimens and combinations that are being 6 used. We're seeing changes in endpoints that are being 7 used in trials. And obviously all of that leads to 8 substantial trial design considerations for us.</p> <p>9 When you look at the question of pathogens, 10 you know, obviously all of the initial development 11 focused essential on chronic pseudomonas infections, CF 12 patients. Now of course we're seeing other CF- 13 associated pathogens that are being targeted, staph 14 aureus, whether it's MRSA, whether it's nontuberculous 15 mycobacteria or Burkholderia species. And these, you 16 know, are a little bit of a challenge for the agency 17 because in some cases the natural history of these 18 pathogens is not very well known and also its potential 19 impact is also not very well understood.</p> <p>20 So it gives us both opportunities as well as 21 challenges. Opportunities in the sense that in some of 22 these cases there's a little more flexibility in how</p>

Page 54	Page 56
<p>1 you can design your trial. So in some cases, you may</p> <p>2 be able to do placebo control trials. But there's also</p> <p>3 some challenges. So if you're going to do, you know, a</p> <p>4 comparator-based trail, how do you pick a comparator</p> <p>5 where there is no sort of known standard of care?</p> <p>6 Now, when you look at drug regimens, again</p> <p>7 historically when there's development happening for</p> <p>8 chronic pseudomonas infections, at that time we're</p> <p>9 pretty much looking at singular inhaled drugs or</p> <p>10 antimicrobial drugs that were targeting pseudomonas in</p> <p>11 28-day on and off cycles. And now we're obviously</p> <p>12 seeing much more diverse inhaled antimicrobial</p> <p>13 treatment patterns being used in clinical practice.</p> <p>14 You know, a patient may be on several</p> <p>15 antimicrobial therapies, simultaneously targeting a</p> <p>16 variety of pathogens for a variety of purposes. Just</p> <p>17 looking at chronic infection with pseudomonas alone,</p> <p>18 patients may be on continuous therapy, where they're</p> <p>19 cycling from one inhaled antimicrobial therapy to</p> <p>20 another from month to month. And obviously that means</p> <p>21 there's challenges from a patient standpoint because</p> <p>22 they're using quite a few different devices from</p>	<p>1 it was compared to placebo over 1 to 3 on and off</p> <p>2 cycles. And they were supported by important clinical</p> <p>3 endpoints, whether it was hospitalization frequency or</p> <p>4 time to antimicrobial use.</p> <p>5 However, now you are seeing more consideration</p> <p>6 when it comes to trials given to other primary</p> <p>7 endpoints, whether these are from patient reported</p> <p>8 outcome tools and you saw some evidence of that in the</p> <p>9 Cayston trials or whether it's the use of clinical</p> <p>10 event such as service of primary endpoint where there</p> <p>11 is exacerbations and we'll again probably talk in more</p> <p>12 detail about the challenges with the exacerbation</p> <p>13 definition and whether to talk about frequency of</p> <p>14 exacerbations or time to exacerbations or whether using</p> <p>15 endpoints that's based on antimicrobial use. So again,</p> <p>16 quite different from what was originally used for the</p> <p>17 earlier trials.</p> <p>18 So all of this basically gives us several</p> <p>19 basic trial design considerations. When can we ask for</p> <p>20 placebo controlled trials and for how long? How do we</p> <p>21 ensure the selection of a proper patient population?</p> <p>22 How do we separate the effects of being on multiple</p>
Page 55	Page 57
<p>1 different manufacturers.</p> <p>2 And just to give you an idea of, you know,</p> <p>3 again some of the things that are happening in clinical</p> <p>4 practice that we adapt to, you know, it's pretty much</p> <p>5 become standard of care to treat the initial</p> <p>6 acquisition of pseudomonas in patients with cystic</p> <p>7 fibrosis. Usually, this acquired in childhood and it's</p> <p>8 associated with long-term deterioration and pulmonary</p> <p>9 disease and survival. And basically, they've developed</p> <p>10 a standard of care at this point where they're using</p> <p>11 tobramycin inhaled 300 milligrams for a month and they</p> <p>12 follow the patient through serial sputum cultures or</p> <p>13 oropharyngeal cultures to monitor for both the</p> <p>14 eradication as well as recurrence.</p> <p>15 And again, these are the types of things that</p> <p>16 are happening in clinical practice that we have to</p> <p>17 adapt to when it comes to trial design.</p> <p>18 When it comes to endpoints, of course, you</p> <p>19 know, when you look at the TOBI trails, those were all</p> <p>20 based on relative change in FEV1 percent predicted.</p> <p>21 That was the basis for TOBI approval as well as all the</p> <p>22 similar drugs, you know, in that class. Historically,</p>	<p>1 therapies and just the most basic question, which</p> <p>2 endpoints best serves a particular trial and how long</p> <p>3 should a particular trial be? So again, we sort of</p> <p>4 look at all of these changes as both good and bad, it's</p> <p>5 just we have to adapt to it and I think again Dr.</p> <p>6 Nichols is going to talk in much more detail about</p> <p>7 these changes that are happening in clinical practice.</p> <p>8 Thank you.</p> <p>9 DR. FLUME: So thank you and I think we'll</p> <p>10 save questions to have for our discussion period unless</p> <p>11 there is something for clarification.</p> <p>12 MR. FOLLMANN: This might be clarification.</p> <p>13 So it seems like FEV1 is sort of falling out of favor,</p> <p>14 is that because it's viewed as a biomarker, not a</p> <p>15 measure of what a patient cares about or why is it not</p> <p>16 so in vogue now?</p> <p>17 DR. MISHRA: Right, so that's obviously an</p> <p>18 area of considerable debate. I think you are right. I</p> <p>19 think it has been viewed more recently as a biomarker</p> <p>20 and there is sort of difficulty in interpretation of</p> <p>21 what change in FEV1 percent predicted is actually</p> <p>22 clinically relevant. So I think we have seen a shift a</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 58</p> <p>1 little bit away from that. Of course, it's tricky 2 because of course we know physicians whether it's 3 pulmonary physicians, infectious disease physicians, 4 they actually are using FEV1 percent predicted to make 5 clinical decision. So it's a little bit of a tricky 6 area for us, but I think we have tried to move a little 7 bit more to more harder, I guess, clinical endpoints 8 than just sticking with FEV1. 9 DR. FLUME: Thank you. I think there will 10 probably be a lot more discussion about FEV1 when we 11 get there. So I'm going to invite Dave Nichols. Dave, 12 you've introduced yourself, is a pediatric and adult 13 clinician taking care of patients with CF and he is the 14 Medical Director of the CF TDN Coordinating Center in 15 Seattle leading several trials and he is going to talk 16 about current state and future considerations. 17 INHALED ANTIBIOTICS IN CYSTIC FIBROSIS: CURRENT 18 STATE AND FUTURE CONSIDERATIONS 19 DR. NICHOLS: Thanks, Patrick. Thanks to 20 those for the invite to present these thoughts today. 21 As my disclosures listed there as asked, the most 22 important disclosure is that a fair bit of this will be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 60</p> <p>1 leads to pretty high prescription rates in our 2 population. So here are our data from the CF registry, 3 this includes about 30000 patients, about half of those 4 on inhaled antibiotic therapy. On the x-axis there you 5 can see time from 1996 to the most recent data 6 available completed in 2016. What you can see is that 7 Tobramycin had rapid uptake since it was developed in 8 the late '90s and it has been used stably at about 75 9 percent of our patients for whom it is indicated. Then 10 Aztreonam came on about a decade later, again had very 11 rapid uptake and then has leveled off at about 45 12 percent of patients for whom it's indicated. So I 13 suggested that we believe there is ongoing benefit 14 despite couple of decades of exposure based in part on 15 data like this, the study looking retrospectively at 16 the registry. Again, across the x-axis you have years 17 of follow-up and then they asked, was there any effect 18 on mortality, perhaps our cleanest outcome measure and 19 long term analysis, the survival is on the y-axis there 20 and what we see after trying to control for baseline 21 differences in these groups, there is about a 35 22 percent reduction in mortality in the users of inhaled</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 59</p> <p>1 opinion, but I have endeavored to collect the opinion 2 of several and what I present today is the majority if 3 not consensus opinion in that regard and I'm sure it 4 will be a nice start for that of others. I want to 5 cover three main topics in the 25 minutes here. First 6 of all, an overview as asked and what's happening now 7 in the current state of CF care and then a view of what 8 are the greatest focus of unmet need may be in 9 developing new therapies in CF and then in that context 10 what may be feasible and also viewed as informative to 11 the CF community focused on key issues of study design. 12 So first topic, what's happening now. As was 13 mentioned a moment ago, there are really two FDA 14 approved inhaled options in CF, Tobramycin now 15 available in several forms and then Aztreonam called by 16 the name of Cayston. These were developed nearly 20 17 and 10 years ago respectively and they both target the 18 same pathogens, pseudomonas aeruginosa which is clearly 19 an important pathogen, but obviously not the only one 20 that we are concerned with at this point. Despite this 21 long term exposure, there is consensus opinion of 22 ongoing clinical benefit with these drugs and that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 61</p> <p>1 Tobramycin versus non-users. 2 Shifting then to how patients are using these 3 inhaled antibiotics, which was alluded to a moment ago. 4 Going back on 2009, you can see that the 5 aminoglycosides which is almost entirely Tobramycin in 6 our case significantly dominated use, Aztreonam was 7 just coming on board, shown there in yellow and then 8 Colistin which is more of a grandfather product, it's 9 actually very commonly used abroad, less so in our 10 country, but a fair number of patients do use Colistin. 11 What I'm going to show you is over time we are seeing 12 some shifts here. Tobramycin continues to be very 13 favorable and commonly used Aztreonam shown there in 14 yellow is increasing, but the overlap is important to 15 see. So there in the green and some of the other small 16 sections, you can see increasing use of more than one 17 agent by our patients. So the key point here is that 18 Tobramycin now available in multiple forms and generic 19 which is fairly recently made available and there is 20 some push by payers to use that version, is the most 21 common choice. We are seeing increasing use of 22 Aztreonam over the last decade. Colistin in remaining</p>

Page 62	<p>1 mainly an add-on therapy and a lot more use of more 2 than one class of inhaled antibiotic by our patients. 3 At this point I want to point out for those 4 who may not be aware, inhaled antibiotics are used for 5 two primary purposes in CF and the first is actually 6 quite successful at eradicating early pseudomonas. 7 It's commonly done with one drug for one or possibly 8 two cycles. As was pointed out, a cycle is often four 9 weeks and that's about 85 percent effective at 10 eradicating the pseudomonas from the culture at least. 11 The second and the more commonly appreciated one would 12 be chronic suppressive therapy where this is now one or 13 often more drugs that are cycled. So if we ask, what 14 characterizes this group of users who are choosing to 15 use more than one class of inhaled antibiotics? So 16 they are not cycling so much on and off as on and on 17 and on and on, staying on those drugs. There are often 18 some adult, although that includes our adolescent 19 population, they have modestly lower lung functions, 20 FEV1 percent predicted of 70 percent or less. They 21 have consistently positive pseudomonas cultures, so we 22 are more confident that they are chronically infected</p>	Page 64	<p>1 hypothetical new drug study using these historical key 2 eligibility criteria to try to define new study 3 population. We would predict that four out of five 4 would come into that study using inhaled TOB clinically 5 and three out of five using inhaled Aztreonam and most 6 of those would be cycling between two drugs, often 7 these two drugs to avoid an off period. And then if we 8 restrict that to those who have interest and ability to 9 do randomized control trials, we get down to about 800 10 who are using CAT or continuous cycle therapy, another 11 500 who may be cycling on and off of a single agent. 12 All right. So we will revisit that in a 13 moment, but let's shift then to where we view the 14 greatest focus of unmet need may be in the current 15 area, in CF. First question might be eradication. I 16 have suggested to you a moment ago that this may not be 17 the greatest focus of unmet need because our current 18 approaches are actually quite successful and we have 19 care guidelines now and really two effective treatment 20 options that lead to eradication in 85 to 90 percent of 21 the cases. There are data really just emerging now to 22 suggest that at least with IV antibiotic therapy, you</p>
Page 63	<p>1 and not intermittently infected as we can see sometimes 2 and they may be experiencing pulmonary exacerbations 3 even as little as one or more per year. 4 The point I really want to hit home here with 5 this though is this group actually describes a fairly 6 typical or desirable study population for inhaled 7 antibiotics given what we have used in the past. So if 8 we were to take this 2016 registry data and apply this 9 very high level entry criteria, age greater than 12 or 10 more, FEV1 of 25 to 75 percent of predicted which has 11 been commonly used in studies, the DryPowder went up to 12 80 percent of predicted and then one or more acute 13 exacerbations in the last 12 months. You see that 14 there is even more overlap, more than one use of an 15 inhaled antibiotic product is now the majority 16 selection in this patient population. If we take that 17 and then ask how many have demonstrated an ability and 18 an interest to do clinical research, how many have 19 participated in a randomized control clinical trial 20 since 2010, the numbers get concerningly small at 21 times, there is even more overlap there. 22 So let's take an experience just briefly, a</p>	Page 65	<p>1 can help to rescue some of these who feel they will 2 eradicate with inhaled antibiotic therapy alone. It's 3 less clear to us in CF if the addition of oral 4 antibiotics adds significantly to that of inhaled 5 therapy alone. How about those who initially develop 6 persistent pseudomonas aeruginosa infection, but are 7 otherwise clinically doing okay. I would argue that 8 this is not the greatest focus of need because again we 9 have two safe and effective antibiotic options. We 10 actually have a number of delivery device options 11 including DryPowder, high efficiency nebulizer devices 12 et cetera. It's a point to note that additional agents 13 in this space I think could be appreciated and used 14 actually, but if we are asking what is the greatest 15 focus of unmet need, I would argue that this is not it. 16 However, those who have chronic pseudomonas and are 17 experiencing ongoing clinical decline, I would say yes, 18 this is our greatest focus of unmet need when we 19 consider how to develop additional therapies in CF 20 because as I have suggested a moment ago, they have 21 long term exposure to really all of their approved 22 agents and they are showing clinical decline suggesting</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 66</p> <p>1 that what they are receiving now is not entirely 2 effective and so we would clearly like the opportunity 3 to test new approaches to treat these patients. 4 Lastly how about other CF pathogens who may be 5 experiencing clinical decline and again, yes, I think 6 this is an area where we have unmet need. It is more 7 complicated and as was suggested a moment ago, there is 8 less certainty about some of the pathogenicity and even 9 more so the effect of treatment in this space, but 10 clearly an area of further study. Also, worth noting 11 that many of these patients are co-infected with 12 pseudomonas and so may be receiving treatment for their 13 pseudomonas pathogen. It's a little bit difficult to 14 get hard numbers on this, but I estimate based on what 15 I see that about 50 percent of our MRSA patients also 16 have pseudomonas. 17 So this is a snapshot taken down from the CF 18 Foundation registry, it's a portion of what we call a 19 drug development pipeline. The point I'm showing you 20 this today is to demonstrate that we in the CF 21 community have been able to partner with sponsors to 22 complete phase three clinical trial testing for a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 68</p> <p>1 data probably underestimate the overall prevalence 2 because they are based on culture and sometimes our 3 patients are unable to provide good samples for 4 culture. There are a number of others listed there and 5 so that's pointed out here, again taken from the 6 registry 2016 data. You can see over time on the x- 7 axis and then the percentage of individuals on the y- 8 axis. So we have drugs, FDA approved drugs for two I 9 would argue, pseudomonas and even MDR pseudomonas, but 10 none of these others that we tend to track and so 11 that's a clear and obvious area of continued 12 investigation. 13 So this limited availability of options plus 14 this perceived clinical need has been accompanied by 15 quite a bit of off label drug use. This is a snapshot 16 taken down from a very popular central pharmacy used in 17 CF around our country and I just want to point out that 18 this is described as safe for patients and is 19 compounding, not available commercially and then they 20 list 11 different antibiotics, commonly compounded for 21 providers and our patients. 22 To summarize this area of unmet need, again</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 67</p> <p>1 number of agents in recent years, some of them leading 2 to full FDA approval and more so the group there on the 3 bottom, a number of other drugs moving through who have 4 reached human testing where we in the community and the 5 sponsors are continuing to demonstrate an appetite for 6 new therapies that we developed in this space. It's 7 notable to me that a number of these additional agents 8 being developed are actually pathogen agnostic and that 9 may simplify some of the concerns about some of the 10 special pathogens that have prevalence rates that are 11 quite a bit lower. 12 To digress just for a moment, there has been a 13 lot of attention about the special pathogen. It's 14 worth noting we have seen increased prevalence of 15 these, we are paying close attention and some of us 16 have a particular focus on these MRSA, for example, 17 more than tripled in prevalence between 2001 and the 18 decade to follow, grateful to see that it seems to have 19 stabilized in the last five years. NTM is one that has 20 gained particular attention, we are seeing quite a bit 21 of interest and in fact attempts at drug development in 22 that space and the rate seem to be going up. These</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 69</p> <p>1 the limited approved options with nothing really 2 developed to approval for about 10 years is notable, 3 but this does seem to be largely meeting the needs for 4 eradication and even our early pseudomonas patients who 5 are otherwise doing okay and the real focus of need at 6 least in my view and those I speak with is those with 7 chronic pseudomonas and clinical decline because they 8 are using the available therapies that they have and 9 continuing to struggle with their health. Off-label 10 use in that full development pipeline, I think 11 underscores the desire and effect and ability for more 12 safe and effective options and then special pathogens 13 do deserve attention and they will have some unique 14 challenges and uncertainties that we will need to 15 address. 16 So then let's take that and shift to what may 17 be feasible and informative to the CF community. 18 Clearly this is an area of opinion. Hopefully it will 19 lead to further discussion today. The question has 20 come up about placebo controlled trials and again 28 21 days would be our typical intervention period or phase. 22 It's notable here that those who get placebo are going</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 70</p> <p>1 to be off of any active drug for longer than 28 days 2 and so we need to pay close attention to that run-in 3 period and very aggressively sure design might allow 4 two weeks which would ask for 42 days without an active 5 drug and more traditional design will be four weeks, 6 which will be at least 56 days without active drug. 7 That period after is also important. If you require no 8 drug therapy during the safety follow-up phase, you are 9 asking for a further or increased period of time 10 without active drug and those who get randomized to 11 placebo and therefore it's going to be even more 12 difficult to recruit patients to become interested in 13 such trials. 14 I have shown already that most patients will 15 be eligible and likely interested in these studies are 16 going to be on continuous cycle therapy. So they don't 17 have any breaks in their inhaled antibiotic period 18 during routine clinical use and that smaller population 19 who may be cycling on and off typically only go 28 days 20 without their inhaled antibiotics during regular 21 clinical use. So we have to focus on that run-in 22 period and the follow-up. Stretching this to a design</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 72</p> <p>1 and appearance of a nebulizer, that's much more 2 difficult than a tablet or an over-encapsulated product 3 and this is going to present high complexity and burden 4 not just for sponsors, but participants who are going 5 to be dealing with multiple dosing regimens, two versus 6 three times a day, multiple delivery devices and 7 cleaning regimens, keeping track of your dosing times, 8 that's going to challenge and increase the complexity 9 and it's going to risk the poor quality data. So this 10 needs to be considered if you want to think about 11 blinding. In truth, in my view and in the view of 12 those I talked to, it's probably not very viable or 13 feasible design at least a very long study in our 14 population. 15 Thirdly I want to point out that the effect 16 sizes in some of our key outcome measures, may be 17 diminishing and that doesn't necessarily suggest that 18 the drugs are less potent than the drugs that we have 19 currently available. So lung function, I'm glad to say 20 is increasing in our population, these are data from 21 2016, so now nearly two years old, but shows you this 22 is the adult median FEV1 has really approached 75</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 71</p> <p>1 that is more reflective of what we saw with TOBI where 2 we had, say, three cycles on and off and placebo 3 controlled studies is likely to be not feasible in US 4 or US like population. But I want to emphasize that 5 despite these challenges, we in the community view the 6 shorter placebo controlled trials focused on efficacy 7 as important to do and also feasible. 8 Second point I'd like to make regarding study 9 design is that blinding is going to be problematic for 10 active comparator studies. So if we were to consider a 11 blinded active comparator study, we would really be 12 talking about a double dummy current versus new drug 13 and that's not even bringing in the complication of 14 continuous cycle therapy and doubling up on inhaled 15 antibiotic during the cycle. So one would have to 16 initially recruit a population on a unified drug and 17 dosing regimen which is not going to be entirely 18 straightforward given the increase in options. It's 19 important to note here, the blinding may fail, our 20 group is very familiar with their inhaled products and 21 when you are nebulizing a product, there are much more 22 consideration about blinding, you have taste and smell</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 73</p> <p>1 percent of predicted in our adults and that is the 2 upper end of the entry criteria for many of our 3 historical trials. So if you stick with those 4 criteria, you are going to have some difficulty in 5 finding eligible patients, but more importantly the 6 point I want to make here is that higher FEV1 has been 7 associated with less movement or improvement in 8 response to inhaled antibiotics in the trials we have 9 seen. So this effect which is good to see may diminish 10 some of that FEV1 signal and if we think about 11 exacerbations, these are data showing age across the 12 bottom and then incidents, so an annual incidents and 13 asking did these patients have an exacerbation that 14 required IV antibiotic therapy in the last 12 months. 15 It's less than 50 percent on patients across all ages. 16 So you are often left with this choice, do you want a 17 large study predicting low incidence or do you want to 18 try to limit your eligibility to enrich based on a 19 history of exacerbations for example. I think it's 20 worth pointing out here that this is a fairly strict 21 definition of exacerbation requiring IV antibiotic 22 therapy and there is a greater incidence if you</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 74</p> <p>1 consider oral or other definition such as physician 2 decision to treat. 3 I also want to point out there we are now in a 4 very exciting phase of CFTR modulator drugs really 5 attacking the root problem in CF and we are glad to see 6 significant improvements in baseline health. Based on 7 what we have seen with the most effective drugs and 8 what we have seen now in the phase two studies which 9 are now an ongoing phase three studies, we reasonably 10 predict that 90 percent of our patients will have drug 11 indicated by their mutation that will lead to notable 12 improvements in their baseline health. Bumps in FEV1 13 that are actually not just significant, but dramatic 14 for us, 10 to 15 percent above baseline that's combined 15 with significant decrease in their symptoms and the 16 risk of exacerbation, further declining. 17 But these modulator drugs do not seem to be 18 eliminating at least in our established pseudomonas 19 population this challenge of ongoing chronic infection. 20 These are data looking at our most effective treatment 21 Ivacaftor in our most responsive population, those with 22 G551D mutation and this is under clinical care. So</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 76</p> <p>1 be informative to the CF community and also feasible 2 for us to obtain. I think we need to start with the 3 assumption that a candidate drug is going to come in 4 with strong non-clinical data that's going to indicate 5 clear antimicrobial class effect. I think it will be 6 ideal if that's done in some CF relevant models and 7 that's an entirely different discussion. 8 I think it's important that the drug should 9 have characteristics suggesting it's a good candidate 10 for inhaled delivery. We have remarkably good track 11 record of safety, two decades of inhaled antibiotics in 12 CF and we don't want to risk that. We could add to 13 that shorter placebo controlled trials as was mentioned 14 focused on efficacy and really building on class 15 effect. Despite some concerns about diminishing signal 16 in FEV1, I actually believe that that will continue at 17 least in the shorter placebo controlled and efficacy 18 focused studies continue to be an important outcome 19 measure. I think PROs are also potentially important 20 and have a role, but that also deserve some further 21 discussion today. And many of us believe that it's 22 important to conduct these kind of studies in US or</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 75</p> <p>1 there is a decline in the incidence of positive culture 2 over time. They had a few patients who seem to no 3 longer have positive cultures, but there is a big 4 caveat in these data because many of our patients, in 5 fact the large majority when they start these drugs go 6 what we call dry, they can no longer expectorate and so 7 the quality of our cultures diminishes and so we are 8 not as certain that they have truly eradicated and a 9 smaller study was done in a population with more 10 consistent and clear evidence of chronic pseudomonas 11 and they followed them more closely and over a longer 12 period of time getting good sputum samples and you can 13 see that they saw a similar pattern as we did in the 14 goal study on the left where there was an initial 15 decline in pseudomonas rates, but then there was a 16 tendency to rebound over time and following them out 17 just to about three years. It's a small group and this 18 data are at times consistent, at times inconsistent and 19 we are going to follow-up with some bigger studies to 20 figure this out. 21 So in view of what is clearly a persistent 22 need, but some challenges that we face, what data might</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 77</p> <p>1 similar populations and then they could be partnered 2 with longer duration open label active comparator 3 studies, but this is mainly to focus more on safety and 4 durability of effect. Safety signals I have shown 5 there which would be obvious and durability looking at 6 FEV1 over time and then you could pull in risk of 7 exacerbation to some degree. 8 This begs the question, non-inferiority 9 efficacy measures in some of these longer active 10 comparator studies and that will be clearly helpful and 11 could be assessed, but there are some important notable 12 limitations that need to be recognized when considering 13 this. First of all, as I've already mentioned it's 14 going to be very difficult to do these in a blinded way 15 and so you have to ask yourself at the beginning, are 16 you okay with non-inferiority assessments and unblinded 17 studies where you have long term exposure to the 18 standard of care. I think fundamentally that needs to 19 be addressed. Secondly, the effect sizes are going to 20 be challenging to predict and may be fairly modest. 21 Thirdly we lack data actually on our current common 22 standard of care being the continuous cycle therapy to</p>

Page 78	Page 80
<p>1 really define these in our margins, perhaps that could 2 be overcome, but that's going to be a notable challenge 3 in trying to develop these studies.</p> <p>4 So that I'll just summarize. First of all, I 5 want to emphasize that we do need and we in fact are 6 working to develop new inhaled antimicrobial drugs in 7 CF. I think sometimes there is a sense that CF has 8 left (ph), you know, we've been doing inhaled 9 antibiotic therapy for a while, that in fact is not the 10 case. Improving health and practice patterns 11 complicate feasibility of some of these designs, but 12 despite that shorter placebo controlled studies focused 13 on efficacy as well as longer unblinded comparative 14 studies are feasible and we would find these useful in 15 the CF community. Obviously, they'd have some 16 shortcomings in regards to the rigor when we compare 17 them to the original TOBI studies, but that's balanced 18 by an ongoing unmet need in our patients and it's 19 actually much better than what we have when making 20 choices around off-label drug use which is pretty 21 widespread and we'd prefer these to more traditional 22 studies that would be done in parts of the world where</p>	<p>1 topic that I know well and that is the burden of 2 treating CF on the patient. The awareness of the 3 treatment burden on CF patients is a topic that's 4 becoming more addressed in meetings such as this and 5 also in talks and lessons I take to or attend or take 6 part in at Johns Hopkins where I work. So in general, 7 this is a good thing. I thought I'd share my 8 experiences on the burden of treating CF from the 9 patient's perspective.</p> <p>10 I spend around two and a half to three hours 11 per day on CF care, taking nebulizations or airway 12 clearance or sterilizing the neb equipment. I also 13 work full time which I understand isn't the norm for 14 someone my age with CF, but I think more of us are 15 going to be doing that and I try to do at least some of 16 the exercise that my doctors are always bugging me to 17 do. So, yes, my daily CF routine is burdensome. Yes, 18 it is good that we are talking about this burden on 19 treatment care. However, I just want to make sure that 20 we all understand that it's much more burdensome to be 21 hospitalized or to need home IVs or just to get sick or 22 to deal with lung function decline. So no matter how</p>
Page 79	Page 81
<p>1 CF care is far less aggressive and the patient 2 population may be far less representative to our own.</p> <p>3 So with that I want to thank you for the 4 chance to speak today and those who really gave a lot 5 of critical input to help design this presentation.</p> <p>6 DR. FLUME: All right. Thank you, Dave. I 7 think there is probably a lot of questions that you 8 already laid out that we'll get to. So I think let's 9 move right on to our next speaker. I'd like to invite 10 Chip Hawkins up. So Chip lives with this every day, so 11 that's a very important voice to hear, but he also has 12 experience working with these regulatory meeting. So 13 Chip.</p> <p>14 PATIENT SPEAKER/PATIENT PERSPECTIVE</p> <p>15 MR. HAWKINS: Thank you. So first I'd like to 16 thank everyone involved with this meeting and most 17 especially you scientists and doctors who are working 18 here in this field. I'm 51 years old and as most of 19 you are aware that's above the average for CF and I 20 contribute a lot of that to the work that you guys are 21 doing and committing your lives to. Thank you. As a 22 CF patient, I thought I'll start by talking about the</p>	<p>1 much of a burden we think treatment may be or adding 2 another treatment may be, it's always going to be 3 better to add that treatment than to not based on a 4 perceived burden effect.</p> <p>5 So burden should never be a reason not to 6 develop a new therapy or to not approve a new therapy. 7 We can, however, talk about the formulation of what's 8 being added as far as burdens go. When I said that I 9 devote two and a half to three hours to CF care, what I 10 should have said was I spend two and a half or three 11 hours to CF care. I'm using TOBI DryPowder inhaler and 12 Cayston which are the two drugs available to me, the 13 TOBI powder takes may be a minute or two twice a day. 14 Those months are the two and a half hour months. 15 Cayston takes three to four minutes per dose three 16 times a day and that's pretty good compared to other CF 17 nebulized drugs, but still it's about 15 minutes a day 18 plus those nebs need to be sterilized. So it really is 19 that like a (inaudible) average two and a half or three 20 hours per day.</p> <p>21 I recognize that biochemistry or science 22 probably has a lot to do or most of what's involved</p>

Page 82

1 with choosing what form a new drug takes. However, as
 2 we are considering new drugs, we have to consider, is
 3 it the only factor, your cost involved or ease of
 4 producing the drug involved in these discussions.
 5 Any drug that requires three doses per day is
 6 a burden and any drug that requires nebulizing three
 7 drugs a day is a huge burden especially for those of us
 8 who work full time or go to school full time and more
 9 and more this is going to be the CF population. Before
 10 the TOBI Podhaler was developed, I used to spend 40 to
 11 50 minutes per day inhaling TOBI solution. I still
 12 remember even though it has been many years ago now
 13 when I first started taking the TOBI powder, that first
 14 day how fast it was and still being impressed at I have
 15 all this extra time available especially after work
 16 when I'm trying to getting on with my life after
 17 working a full day. Going to the dry powder form had a
 18 real impact on my life. For those of you who don't
 19 spent two and a half or three hours per day doing CF
 20 care or doing some other medical care, half hour may
 21 not seem like much. This is 14 hours per month on
 22 these Cayston months and quite a bit more hours per

Page 83

1 year.
 2 Another way to think about this especially for
 3 the -- from the commercial point of view is right now
 4 there are no choices for me. There are two drugs that
 5 meet my needs and I alternate between the two.
 6 However, to go to all this meeting and hopefully future
 7 development is to make additional choices and really
 8 all else being equal, as a patient I'm going to choose
 9 the choices that are less burdensome and for the most
 10 cases that's going to mean dry powder formulations over
 11 nebulized formulation and twice a day formulations over
 12 three times or more times per day formulations. So
 13 it's not trivial, it's the way the patients, the future
 14 consumers are going to think about how to add new drugs
 15 to their regime.
 16 Left phrase (ph), all else being equal, brings
 17 up another related issue to today's talk or today's
 18 meeting. I communicate with a lot of CF patients, same
 19 with the physicians during my various roles and I know
 20 there are a lot of patients who chose to skip doses of
 21 drugs or to even neglect their CF care. I've never had
 22 this problem. I like being healthy too much to risk it

Page 84

1 and I spend those two and a half to three hours
 2 reliably every day taking care of myself. I like
 3 feeling healthy too much. So far though this is made
 4 easier because there are no real choices. I take
 5 Pulmozyme because it's the only drug that does this
 6 role in what's available to me. Hypertonic saline may
 7 do something similar, but it's different enough that I
 8 take it as well and feel the benefit. I take the two
 9 available inhaled antibiotics and alternate between the
 10 two, so there is no choice there. However, the goal of
 11 today's meeting and future work is to make choices.
 12 This is a very desirable goal, but as a patient I'm
 13 going to want to know which choices are the best, not
 14 just that a drug works or appears to work and
 15 especially given how difficult it can be to even decide
 16 if the drug is working. What as a patient I'll want to
 17 know is if this drug is better than this drug, this is
 18 what's important to me. I get that it may not be
 19 possible to determine this during the drug development
 20 phases either due to the cost or logistics or even have
 21 enough patients to design studies that can address
 22 this.

Page 85

1 However, in that case I feel strongly that we
 2 need to develop ways to monitor this over time. I not
 3 being a scientist don't know how to do this or who
 4 should be doing it, whether it's the FDA or the Cystic
 5 Fibrosis Foundation or some other group, but it's
 6 important. Over time as more inhaled antibiotics come
 7 online and as an aside is more of the small molecule
 8 (inaudible) come online, we are going to have choices
 9 and without a formed scientifically informed way of
 10 letting patients know which to choose, we are going to
 11 end up choosing based on which is easiest to do or take
 12 or which is the cheapest or even worse which ones our
 13 insurance company says you have to take or even worse
 14 which ones have -- you know, companies that give out
 15 the best swag along with the drugs. And this is not
 16 the best thing for the patients. We really need to
 17 find a way as we develop new drugs to help patients and
 18 their physicians choose the best drugs for them.
 19 Finally, another thought on that logistics and
 20 feasibility question and this is something that I think
 21 about, I don't know how much other people with CF think
 22 about this, this is my thoughts. I have taken part in

Page 86

1 15 or 20 drug trials, enough that I've kind of
 2 forgotten some of them and I started doing them because
 3 I'm really curious, I find them interesting. I'm in
 4 science or in medicine, I work Johns Hopkins, so I do
 5 this because I think it's fun, but I realize that's not
 6 probably the norm and I'm a little bit weird this way.
 7 I also want to develop better or help develop better
 8 treatments. I want better treatments available to me
 9 and I suspect this is why most people with CF get
 10 involved with drug trials. However, not enough people
 11 with CF taking part in drug trials, drugs trials are
 12 burdensome, they are uncomfortable, they are painful
 13 even, but they are necessary. So I spent a lot of time
 14 thinking about why more CF patients don't get involved
 15 and I understand they are painful and they are
 16 burdensome and we are already doing two and a half or
 17 three hours of CF care. So one thought I had, this is
 18 my thought, is with every drug trial I've been in,
 19 there has been some kind of payment, it's always a
 20 small payment, it's not enough to have an effect on
 21 anyone's life as far as quitting your job and being a
 22 full time drug study patient. But it's there and it

Page 87

1 makes me wonder what it is there for, what's the goal
 2 of the payment. If it's a recruiting tool, it seem too
 3 small. If there isn't something that we're going to
 4 address today, may be this is something that we should
 5 address right now, this is something that we should
 6 start thinking about. We need the patients to take
 7 part in drug trials. How many drug trials are being
 8 held up because there aren't enough patients to take
 9 part. I know several just at Hopkins that I've been
 10 involved with that were held for me for months because
 11 I had other health issues and there weren't other
 12 patients available who are willing to take part in
 13 those drug trials. So how do we deal with this? One
 14 way is to actually pay patients for their time in a
 15 meaningful way. I don't know how it's decided, how
 16 much should be paid to patients for their part in drug
 17 trials. I don't know if there are ethical issues, it
 18 seems silly though to say it's okay to pay a little
 19 bit, but not too much. It also seem silly to me to
 20 say, you are the patient, this is for you, so you
 21 shouldn't get paid to take part when we all found out
 22 with vertex how much money is there to be made with a

Page 88

1 new drug being developed and to say if patient is a
 2 part of that process. So maybe it's time to start
 3 thinking about better ways or different ways to recruit
 4 CF patients and to consider them a necessary part of
 5 the process and a professional part of the process.
 6 Again, that's a thought, I don't do this for the money,
 7 I know that's what we all say, but I don't. The amount
 8 of money I make on a drug trial is much less than I'd
 9 make working those hours, but a lot of people with CF
 10 work full time. So this is something to start thinking
 11 about, we need more patients. Thank you.
 12 DR. FLUME: All right. Thank you, Chip. I
 13 think we are going to go ahead and take our break
 14 early, but I'm going to limit it to 15 minutes because
 15 we can have that time for our discussion because I'm
 16 fairly certain it will pretty robust. So I've got
 17 10:03, so 10:18. And for those who haven't ordered
 18 their lunch, now is your chance.
 19 BREAK
 20 CYSTIC FIBROSIS TRIAL DESIGNS OF THE FUTURE:
 21 CASE STUDIES FOR CF INFECTION
 22 DR. NAMBIAR: So we're moving to the next

Page 89

1 section of session one where we have two case studies.
 2 The first one would be presented by Dr. Allende. We'd
 3 focus our discussion on management of CF patients who
 4 are chronically infected with pseudomonas aeruginosa.
 5 So we've a brief presentation by Dr. Allende and then
 6 this time offer a panel discussion. That will be
 7 followed by a brief presentation by Dr. Mishra who'll
 8 focus on developing products for the treatment of
 9 chronic MRSA infection in patients with cystic
 10 fibrosis. So with that, so, Dr. Allende is a medical
 11 office in the division of anti-infective products and
 12 has been very involved in the development of several of
 13 these inhaled therapies primarily with non-CF
 14 bronchiectasis, but has also been involved with drugs
 15 being developed for cystic fibrosis patients. So,
 16 Maria.
 17 PREVENTION OF EXACERBATIONS/ MANAGEMENT OF
 18 CF PATIENTS CHRONICALLY INFECTED WITH
 19 PSEUDOMONAS AERUGINOSA
 20 DR. ALLENDE: Good morning. Thank you,
 21 Sumathi, for that presentation. My case is prevention
 22 of exacerbations or management of cystic fibrosis

Page 90	Page 92
<p>1 patients chronically infected with pseudomonas 2 aeruginosa which as you heard from the previous talk 3 from Dr. Nichols, it might be the focus of unmet 4 medical need. So here is a hypothetical proposed 5 development plan, sponsor A is proposing to use a novel 6 inhaled antipseudomonal drug X to prevent exacerbations 7 or to manage patients with cystic fibrosis who are 8 chronically infected with pseudomonas aeruginosa and 9 the population would include pediatric, adolescents and 10 adult patients and the study design would be inhaled 11 study drug X versus the standard of care which is 12 inhalation and antibacterial therapy, for example, 13 Tobramycin or Aztreonam and as you heard from Dr. 14 Mishra's talk and Dr. Nichols also, these are the only 15 two drugs that we have approved in the management of 16 cystic fibrosis patients and they were approved in 20 17 and 10 years ago. 18 So here are the key protocol considerations, 19 potential efficacy endpoints, changes in percent of 20 percent predicted FEV from baseline as you heard from 21 previous talks from Dr. Nichols as well. Changes in 22 patient reported outcomes, CFRSD-CRISS or CFQR</p>	<p>1 predicted FEV1 is clinically meaningful, but it varies 2 according to the timing and the amount of drops to 3 consider, the rates of exacerbation vary by age and 4 there is no established definition of exacerbation 5 which also may vary by age group. Also, there is no 6 data on effectiveness of the current standard of care, 7 which is of a dynamic nature, continuously changing 8 with new additional inhaled therapies. 9 So the non-inferiority versus superiority 10 hypothesis have both the problem of difficulty in 11 establishing a margin, an NI margin and this CFRSD, the 12 CRISS scores are validated only in adults and children 13 older than 12 years of age. I've to clarify that the 14 two drugs that we have approved in cystic fibrosis, 15 TOBI and Cayston are approved for adults and children 16 older than six years of age. 17 And here are the panel questions, the first 18 one, what is or are the clinically meaningful 19 objectives for the trials. The lung function 20 preservation, improvement of symptoms, decrease 21 severity of exacerbations, decrease the number of 22 exacerbations, a combination of these, possibly other</p>
Page 91	Page 93
<p>1 questionnaires, scores from baseline, changes from 2 baseline, combination of the above or possibly other 3 endpoints such as frequency, severity of exacerbation, 4 prolongation of interval between exacerbations or time 5 to exacerbation I'd say. 6 So the proposed efficacy evaluation would 7 consist of a superiority or a non-inferiority 8 hypothesis of study drug X versus the standard of care 9 and the study population would select for high risk 10 patients based on the age, treatment experience, 11 baseline FEV1 and microbiology data. As Dr. Nichols 12 emphasized, it is important to select a homogenous 13 population with a unified regimen to allow for better 14 interpretation of results. And another point to 15 consider is the duration of the trial and the dosing 16 schedule to assess the primary endpoint and compare to 17 the standard of care, the current standard of care, 18 multiple cycles or continuous daily use for six months 19 or for more than a year. 20 So here I laid out some issues to consider, 21 it's not an exhaustive list. No endpoints are 22 validated with long term outcomes, although the percent</p>	<p>1 benefits. What selection criteria would best target 2 the study population most likely to demonstrate 3 treatment benefit? What is the optimal primary 4 endpoint and how long should patients be followed to 5 assess persistence of efficacy or duration of efficacy 6 and how should we monitor potential safety signals and 7 risks, for example, resistance, the role of co- 8 infections and emergent pathogens that will come up. 9 So with this I leave up to the discussion. Thank you. 10 DR. NAMBIAR: Thanks, Maria. Sunita, maybe we 11 can have the questions back up. It's the previous 12 slide I think. So while we are getting the questions 13 up, the way we thought we'd do it is we do have a full 14 questions that we have outlined and this should 15 essentially cover most of the important considerations 16 where one is developing a drug for treatment of this 17 patient population. So we can go through the 18 questions, welcome questions, comments from members of 19 the panel and also, we invite participation from 20 members of the audience if you have questions or 21 comments, please come up to the microphone. Dr. Flume, 22 would you like to make any comments?</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 94</p> <p>1 DR. FLUME: Yes, I'd agree that we should take 2 a pretty systematic approach to this and in my view, 3 some of these questions are dependent upon how we 4 address other questions, so to try to keep that in some 5 sort of order. I think we heard very clearly from Dave 6 and from Chip that there is clearly a need may be not 7 for all the patients and I like how the patient here 8 was presenting, that's probably the group that we are 9 most interested in and we are in an evolving landscape, 10 we learned this in the early phases of trying to do 11 eradication trials, we learned it in the CAP (ph) trial 12 and as we think about trial designs, feasibility will 13 always have to factor into it. The perfect, say, 14 design might not be able to enroll any patients, so we 15 have to keep that in mind. 16 So in my view, a critical question for the CF 17 issue is since we have approved products and you have 18 seen the utilization is you are either going to be 19 comparing to an active drug or you're going to be 20 comparing to a placebo and so one of the key issues 21 there is the blinding and so I'd just like open that up 22 as an issue and see if anybody would like to share</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 96</p> <p>1 secondary consideration to improving health, so. 2 DR. AKSAMIT: In a related I want to ask my 3 colleague, Dave, to expand on his slide about the 4 utilization rates of inhaled Tobramycin since its 5 inception and wide acceptance over this past 15 to 17 6 years there has been a flat usage even when the 7 introduction of Aztreonam came along as an add-on, the 8 utilization rates appear to have little impact. So 9 there wasn't any waning or a decrease in Tobramycin use 10 over that very extended period of durable utilization 11 if you will for a long period of time, which may impact 12 then how we approach additional (inaudible). 13 DR. NICHOLS: Yeah, I did want to comment. 14 Thank you. I agree that the large majority of our 15 patients would be unable to maintain a regimen where 16 they have multiple inhaled antibiotics at the same 17 time. Some of the complexity revolves around timing 18 and how you do those, so trying to do two twice-a-day 19 therapies or even a twice and a three times a day, it 20 just becomes quickly unfeasible. There are some issues 21 around the amount of inhaled liquid even being inhaled 22 at a certain time, and so -- and I think for practical</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 95</p> <p>1 their thoughts on blinding. 2 MS. ELLENBERG: So this relates to blind -- 3 it's not really a question on blinding, but it is a 4 question, this is perhaps naïve because I'm not an 5 expert in this area. But why nobody is talking about 6 doing add-on studies which is what are commonly done in 7 other disease areas where you have effective 8 treatments, it's difficult to do a non-inferiority 9 trial because you don't know what the margin is, but if 10 you see that adding a new treatment to existing 11 standard of care improves things, then you can conclude 12 effectiveness. So you're doing a superiority trial, is 13 that not a possible consideration in this disease? 14 DR. FLUME: So my first thought would be we 15 get at a feasibility issue because in your example, you 16 have a patient who is on TOBI and may be the question 17 is, I'm going to do TOBI and drug A versus placebo and 18 I think I heard loud and clear about the time that's 19 spent and so add-on I think would be an issue of 20 feasibility. I don't know if anyone else wants to add 21 to that. 22 MS. ELLENBERG: I also heard that burden is a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 97</p> <p>1 reasons, it's mainly the concern I agree that 2 statistically it would be advantageous I think to be 3 able to do that and I'm no statistical expert. 4 Quickly to the point, so this is my opinion, 5 but I think that inhaled Tobramycin benefited being a 6 drug where -- with which we had a long history of 7 safety and effectiveness. It's a systemic antibiotic. 8 We've used a lot and continued to use more commonly 9 than any other when treating patients for exacerbation. 10 There have been several products in more recent years 11 that have been developed. They have probably helped to 12 maintain 70 percent use rates, so the dry powder I 13 think give it a boost. There have been generic 14 products that have come to bear and smaller volume 15 nebulized products. 16 So now multiple options. Some of the peer 17 opinions or constraints come into place there too. So 18 I think that's part of why -- I think it's important 19 though to clearly state that I tried to show in the 20 mortality data, again these are retrospective and one 21 could ask questions around some of that, but the fact 22 is despite this long-term use, we see ongoing benefit</p>

Page 98	Page 100
<p>1 and clear outcomes such as mortality. And so there</p> <p>2 have been concerns raised for instance around the</p> <p>3 selecting for resistance and you can define that by</p> <p>4 MIC, so you can define that by a lack of clinical</p> <p>5 response. And we I think as a community have not seen</p> <p>6 that as an emerging problem today.</p> <p>7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want to thank --</p> <p>8 DR. ZEITLIN: Excuse me, I would like to add a</p> <p>9 couple of things.</p> <p>10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.</p> <p>11 DR. ZEITLIN: One is that inhaled</p> <p>12 aminoglycosides over time have been associated with</p> <p>13 hearing loss in our CF patients, and so I think</p> <p>14 considering newer chemical structures that don't have</p> <p>15 those risks would be important and the add-on could be</p> <p>16 as a third cycle. I haven't heard anyone talk about</p> <p>17 that. Either it's tobramycin, aztreonam and then the drug</p> <p>18 A, or you put one of the others and take it out for the</p> <p>19 time that you study it so that the patient is always on</p> <p>20 an antibiotic would be two options.</p> <p>21 DR. FLUME: So my question about blinding is</p> <p>22 if you are comparing to a placebo, and that's your sort</p>	<p>1 done in that way. I can't express enough how big a</p> <p>2 difference that was between the two formulations. Also</p> <p>3 with the case in the three times a day, it's</p> <p>4 burdensome, but I think having to sterilize and</p> <p>5 nebulize it in a day is probably the biggest burden.</p> <p>6 So if we could be using disposable neb cups, that would</p> <p>7 reduce a lot of the burden if you can use a, you know,</p> <p>8 a 3-minute duration time for the nebulization part.</p> <p>9 So I think it can be designed in such a way to</p> <p>10 add another antibiotic to your regimen without you</p> <p>11 greatly overwhelming us, if that's possible, you know,</p> <p>12 with the chemistry involved. Also thought I'd just</p> <p>13 mention as an aside in regards to blinding, I did a</p> <p>14 drug study last year in which I was off my -- one of my</p> <p>15 inhaled antibiotics for over a month, and I could feel</p> <p>16 the difference. So I don't think you could blind</p> <p>17 somebody just by giving them placebo because they're</p> <p>18 going to know that they're not -- it's that -- works</p> <p>19 that fast, at least with me not being on an antibiotic</p> <p>20 for a month after having used the double-regimen for</p> <p>21 years, I don't think you could hide that from the</p> <p>22 patient.</p>
Page 99	Page 101
<p>1 of usual issues of blinding to make sure it's matched</p> <p>2 and I think Dave laid it out about short placebo-</p> <p>3 control trials, but if you're designing studies that</p> <p>4 have an active comparator, that's where my question is</p> <p>5 about blinding because I think I would agree with Dave</p> <p>6 going to double-dummy, double-blinded is a real buzz-</p> <p>7 kill for patients.</p> <p>8 DR. DHAND: So, you know, we are only talking</p> <p>9 about drugs, but we heard about the burden of the</p> <p>10 disease for people who have -- take -- spend two and a</p> <p>11 half to three hours every day. So I think another</p> <p>12 option would be to look at newer devices and</p> <p>13 formulations which are more longer-acting. You know,</p> <p>14 we could have long-acting beta agonists now that goes</p> <p>15 for 24 hours. I don't see why we can't design</p> <p>16 antibiotic formulations that need to be taken once a</p> <p>17 day and what effect that has on the burden of the</p> <p>18 disease as well as the adherence to that I think would</p> <p>19 make a big difference.</p> <p>20 MR. HAWKINS: Yeah, I think I agree with what</p> <p>21 you just said. You know, a dry powder formulation</p> <p>22 would not really add much to the burden if it can be</p>	<p>1 DR. FLUME: I think that clearly speaks to</p> <p>2 some of the issues Dave brought up about the ethics or</p> <p>3 the stomach for doing longer placebo-control trials in</p> <p>4 those patients, but I'm talking about how do you</p> <p>5 compare a drug which is through an e-flow compared to</p> <p>6 TOBI which is through a Pari jet nebulizers. Dutch</p> <p>7 (phonetic)?</p> <p>8 MR. VANDEVANTER: We're kind of dancing around</p> <p>9 the question you asked which was about blinding and I</p> <p>10 think we can just assume that your super-inhaler is</p> <p>11 drug A. The question is how do we test it and I think</p> <p>12 it's a mistake to think that sponsors are trying to get</p> <p>13 the lowest burden best delivery possible, of course</p> <p>14 they are. But the reality is, is that we cannot blind</p> <p>15 these treatments because the patients are familiar with</p> <p>16 them and so you could give a patient their Tobramycin</p> <p>17 as a placebo, but they would know immediately that it</p> <p>18 was a placebo. The blind would be effectively broken</p> <p>19 immediately.</p> <p>20 In addition to the -- in addition to how the</p> <p>21 patient felt, it would be clear to them that it didn't</p> <p>22 taste right, it wasn't right. And so I mean we've come</p>

Page 102	<p>1 to the conclusion after going round and round on this</p> <p>2 that if we are -- and we do need extended safety data</p> <p>3 on these new drug A's, it's going to have to be</p> <p>4 obtained in an open-label fashion. It will ultimately</p> <p>5 be open-label whether we attempt to blind it or not.</p> <p>6 DR. O'DONNELL: Patrick, go ahead. I was just</p> <p>7 going to say, you know, we're stuck in this month</p> <p>8 on/month off, or month on cycle, you know, continuous</p> <p>9 cycle. What about thinking about some other, you know,</p> <p>10 2 weeks on, 2 weeks off, 3 drugs rather than just 2</p> <p>11 drugs? I mean, we've landed in this world on both the</p> <p>12 CF and non-CF side of cycling without really much</p> <p>13 evidence, right, to begin with. So I just throw that</p> <p>14 out there as another option. I don't think you're</p> <p>15 going to get the answer in the blinding.</p> <p>16 DR. FLUME: Yeah, so we know the history of</p> <p>17 how we landed at our precedent which we won't reiterate</p> <p>18 today. The -- and I guess what I'd like to do is maybe</p> <p>19 hear from the FDA because I heard from Dave that a</p> <p>20 short placebo-control trial might be tolerated and then</p> <p>21 a statement that, you know, there's going to have to be</p> <p>22 open-label comparator and how that would look in terms</p>	Page 104	<p>1 feasible where the drugs are -- have very distinctive</p> <p>2 side effects, I guess cancer, chemotherapy is the most</p> <p>3 obvious, one that we have managed to make a fair amount</p> <p>4 of progress. Nevertheless, I think the issue of</p> <p>5 blinding overlaps essentially with the issue of what</p> <p>6 the endpoint is because when you have endpoints that</p> <p>7 are very subjective, that's when, you know, not having</p> <p>8 a blinded study is most troublesome because the</p> <p>9 evaluation, whether -- especially if it's a patient-</p> <p>10 reported observation can certainly be affected by</p> <p>11 knowing whether or not you're on active treatment.</p> <p>12 If it's a physician evaluation, one can think</p> <p>13 about having the physician who's doing the evaluation</p> <p>14 blinded, not knowing what treatment the person is</p> <p>15 assigned to, I don't know how feasible that is. That</p> <p>16 would suggest, you know, people wouldn't be evaluated</p> <p>17 by their own physicians who would have to know what's</p> <p>18 going on, but the idea that you can't do it unless it's</p> <p>19 blinded, I mean there are many areas where we study</p> <p>20 things that are un-blinded and we -- but we have to try</p> <p>21 and find an endpoint that's reasonably objective that</p> <p>22 we think is less likely to be affected by, you know,</p>
Page 103	<p>1 of both efficacy or safety.</p> <p>2 MS. TRACY: Well, I'll just dive in here and</p> <p>3 say I think it's very important to understand what the</p> <p>4 objective is. Is it to preserve or improve? Is it</p> <p>5 maintenance or improving something? The patient</p> <p>6 commented that he felt a difference. I'm curious what</p> <p>7 you meant by that. Was that your lung function when</p> <p>8 you came off therapy?</p> <p>9 MR. HAWKINS: I felt, you know, people will</p> <p>10 see us get -- maybe split up our lungs and they felt</p> <p>11 chunkier, I felt like it was more difficult to inhale</p> <p>12 full breaths. It wasn't dramatic like I was like</p> <p>13 dragging, I was doing my normal activity, but when it</p> <p>14 involves breathing you just -- you can feel a</p> <p>15 difference. And now I knew I was off the antibiotic,</p> <p>16 so I could -- in other words I could have been fooling</p> <p>17 myself, but I perceived a real difference. The</p> <p>18 pulmonary function tests were blinded, so I don't know</p> <p>19 if there was a real difference, but I just felt that</p> <p>20 perception of there being a difference.</p> <p>21 MS. ELLENBERG: There are many areas, medical</p> <p>22 areas where we don't do blinded studies where it's not</p>	Page 105	<p>1 knowledge of what the treatment is.</p> <p>2 DR. FLUME: So in there, because you can</p> <p>3 almost get into a chick and egg scenario because if we</p> <p>4 talked about endpoints and have that, then is blinding</p> <p>5 going to be tolerable and so forth, but the other</p> <p>6 aspect of that particularly when you have a drug like</p> <p>7 TOBI which has been in for years, you're enrolling</p> <p>8 patients to remain on TOBI, they already have</p> <p>9 demonstrated an ability to tolerate a therapy given</p> <p>10 that an advantage over whatever the comparator might</p> <p>11 be. So I guess what I'm taking from that is that for</p> <p>12 some endpoints, blinding would be deemed to be</p> <p>13 preferred, that might be an objective endpoint, like</p> <p>14 FEV1, but PROs (phonetic) or exacerbations might not.</p> <p>15 MS. ELLENBERG: Well, yeah, I think for an</p> <p>16 objective endpoint, you could make a case that you</p> <p>17 could do it without blinding. And again that's -- I</p> <p>18 don't know how objective or subjective all of these</p> <p>19 things are, even things that are, you know, seem to be</p> <p>20 objective can be affected by, you know, somebody -- I</p> <p>21 myself have taken FEV tests, I think, you know, I might</p> <p>22 be affected on how I do on it depending on if I knew</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 106</p> <p>1 what treatment I was on. So it's hard to, you know, 2 it's hard to completely rule out subjectivity, but some 3 endpoints are clearly more objective than others. 4 MS. HAMBLETT: I think it's important to point 5 out I think we have sort of two straw men on the table. 6 We have maybe a more traditional duration study that 7 would be 6 months, and we can only achieve that if it 8 was active comparator versus a shorter placebo-control 9 trial. The longer duration active comparator trial, if 10 the active comparator that would likely be continuing 11 alternating therapy. In that situation, we are likely 12 talking a non-inferiority trial, I think it's safe to 13 say either with an FEV endpoint or exacerbation 14 endpoint, we're talking hundreds -- almost a thousand 15 patients probably for that size of a trial versus a 16 shorter placebo-control trial for superiority would be 17 a few hundred patients at most. And so I think we 18 should just keep that in perspective as we're 19 evaluating those two straw men in terms of the need and 20 trying to get, you know, the development forward. 21 DR. BARKER: Just a comment on the blinding, 22 some of this -- how difficult this is, we're involved</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 108</p> <p>1 then switch people who were originally on drug X to go 2 to standard of care and vice versa. 3 Such trials can be more efficient than regular 4 trials because each patient gets drug access as well as 5 standard of care and they sort of serve as their own 6 control and can sort of benefit from smaller numbers 7 and be more efficient. So it seemed to me sort of a 8 natural question to ask where this chronic disease 9 where the therapy doesn't linger for years, it's sort 10 of -- its benefit sort of stops when you stop it and 11 you know, I was just wondering if people had thought 12 about that or if that would be potentially feasible. 13 It seems to me you could interrogate the databases you 14 have and then sort of see how -- and then have a 15 thoughtful analysis of whether it was efficient or not 16 and work through the design because you have data to 17 show what would be the advantage of people acting as 18 their own control. 19 DR. TINO: Just in terms of the discussion 20 about the add-on, I guess it's important to really 21 define what you mean by add-on. The add-on to a 22 baseline drug, do you add a drug during the same cycle</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 107</p> <p>1 in the mucokinetic trial of Mannitol and there was huge 2 discussion before the trial about what an appropriate 3 blind -- placebo would be because Mannitol has a sweet 4 taste. And after much discussion, the end was to give 5 a very low dose of Mannitol as the blinding agent. So 6 we did the trial, it was a negative trial, but the 7 harshest criticism ended up being partly why was it a 8 negative trial is maybe a placebo was actually partly 9 effective. So you try to do the best you can and 10 that's what you may end up with. 11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Dean has a comment? 12 Yeah. 13 MR. FOLLMANN: Yeah, I had a comment about 14 blinding, but it's pretty much similar to what Susan 15 made that basically in an unblended setting you want to 16 have something that's objective and not so patient- 17 driven. Another thing though I wanted to bring up, 18 sort of related to Susan's comment about an add-on 19 trial is have people thought about crossover trials for 20 this setting, so for the trial Maria, you know, 21 proposed, you'd have drug X or Y followed by standard 22 of care. You could do that in principle for 6 months,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 109</p> <p>1 of TOBI, or do you do add-on in the month off. And I 2 guess what I want to bring up is what's the 3 tolerability of those two combined drugs. And I'm not 4 a CF doctor, but certainly the word on the street is 5 that cystic fibrosis patients can tolerate inhalation 6 therapy better than for example non-CF bronchiectasis 7 patients, but are there concerns about tolerability 8 with two inhaled drugs given at the same time, if add- 9 on means add on to baseline therapy. 10 I wasn't specifically talking about add-on, I 11 just, you know, because Susie was opening it up to more 12 general design. This would be drug acts alone versus 13 standard of care alone, and then switch over to the 14 opposite after a period of time. 15 DR. AKSAMIT: And I would express some caution 16 with using crossover design for bronchiectasis. 17 Oftentimes if the event rate or whatever the endpoint 18 is, is not a frequent enough event, it's really hard to 19 capture that, and there is a temporal relationship with 20 what's going on for the preceding 6 months going in, 21 say, if it was a yearlong study, and so I think that 22 would be problematic from a bronchiectasis standpoint.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 110</p> <p>1 DR. FLUME: So I'm going to continue with the 2 -- whether FEV1 satisfies as a objective enough 3 measurement to meet. They also heard they had proposed 4 a short placebo-controlled study and then a longer 5 open-label comparator study. Presumably that shorter 6 study would require endpoints that would be responsive 7 in the short term and that's not going to be 8 exacerbations. 9 MS. ELLENBERG: Would it be FEV1? 10 DR. FLUME: So could someone conceive of a new 11 product that can do a short placebo-controlled trial 12 with FEV1 as an endpoint for efficacy followed by 13 David's suggestions of a longer open-label extension to 14 give you some sense of durability and safety. 15 DR. NICHOLS: Yeah, I would argue I guess to 16 answer your question, most inhaled antibiotics studies 17 we've done and completed where they've been effective, 18 we've seen the FEV1 bump between 7 and 14 days after 19 starting and then a stability thereafter, sometimes a 20 modest decline between 2 and 4 weeks. So that in my 21 view is our most accessible short-term outcome measure. 22 I think that the quality of life signal can change,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 112</p> <p>1 necessarily. So it won't be adequate as an endpoint, 2 but certainly it's part of the valuation of the drug 3 overall. I did have a question. So Dr. Nichols, I 4 think you brought up the point about, you know, a short 5 placebo-control trial where one could do for short 6 term. But in our discussions with some sponsors, you 7 know, it has been mentioned to us that even that might 8 be a challenge, and I just wanted to get a feel for 9 what other panelists thought about the feasibility of 10 even doing such a trial for pseudomonas specifically. 11 I think staph aureus is a different discussion. 12 DR. NICHOLS: Just to see you've heard my 13 opinion, I'll let others come, and I would -- I do 14 believe that it's feasible if properly designed and not 15 too large. 16 MR. VANDEVANTER: And we've done a lot of work 17 trying to understand what our options are and I think 18 it's the least bad option. And as Dave pointed out, 19 really the 28 days off is not great. The problem lies 20 if the sponsor wants to wash patients out for 4 weeks 21 beforehand, and if they also want to have a 4-week 22 follow-up period, now you're talking about 3 months off</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 111</p> <p>1 it's just we're still working through validation of 2 some of those two, so either of those to me would be 3 the potential ideal outcomes in a low duration placebo- 4 controlled study. 5 MS. ELLENBERG: Yeah, so that would also make 6 Dean's thought of a crossover trial possibly feasible 7 too if you would see an effect on FEV1 that quickly. 8 DR. NOONE: What about a microbiologic -- we 9 haven't really talked about a microbiologic outcome. I 10 know it's not a perfect outcome, but is it worth -- 11 worthy of consideration in shortish to medium term? 12 DR. FLUME: Just based again, Dave had that 13 pointed out good for eradication studies. That 14 probably is the endpoint, but that wasn't really the 15 unmet need that was defined for chronic infections, I 16 don't typically think that the micro, unless you're 17 looking -- you know, CFU reduction is typically a phase 18 II clinical endpoint. 19 DR. NAMBIAR: Yeah, so we've certainly seen 20 the use of microbiologic in the reduction of colony 21 count as a suggestion that the drug works, but that 22 really has not translated into clinical benefit</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 113</p> <p>1 therapy, and it's just not acceptable. So I think 2 where there's room for some innovation might be in 3 actually taking patients as they're on inhaled 4 antibiotics, enrolling them directly over to active 5 versus placebo. And based upon what we've seen and 6 actually what Chip said, for these patients that are on 7 continuous therapy, if you take them off therapy for 28 8 days, there's some kind of signal there, and the 9 question is how can you capture that signal in a 10 randomized blinded population? 11 So I think our feeling is, is that these 12 different endpoints are -- all comprise class effects 13 for inhaled antibiotics, and the FEV1 change in and of 14 itself isn't necessarily the gold standard that it has 15 all of the benefits, but it's one of the class effects 16 that's reproducible. And we assumed that if we can run 17 a longer open-label study that we'll start to see these 18 other effects, effects on exacerbation. 19 MS. HAMBLETT: Obviously those studies, a 20 placebo-controlled study would need a built-in rescue 21 end-point that would have to be incorporated. And I 22 think, you know, why we haven't gone into crossover</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 114</p> <p>1 designs in the past is because we've been required to 2 show efficacy with the exacerbation endpoint which 3 requires a much longer duration follow-up. So if in 4 FEV1 endpoint is sufficient, then, you know, we would 5 be able to vet some of those designs and perhaps those 6 will be attractive to patients because they would, you 7 know, be guaranteed the drug. But also, a 20 days 8 study, you know, rolled into an open-label, you know, a 9 study would also make it attractive to the patients to 10 have that new therapy available.</p> <p>11 DR. NAMBIAR: So there was a comment and I 12 think, Dr. Nichols, you had made the preference to get 13 at least a reasonable number of patients that represent 14 the U.S. population, so I just want to get back to the 15 question of feasibility, so even in the United States, 16 it's still feasible to do at least a one 28-day period, 17 and whatever period we choose, that would be placebo- 18 controlled.</p> <p>19 DR. FLUME: I would think so, but I worry 20 about the watch and where we're going to call it, so 21 you heard Chip say that when he came off the drug, he 22 began to develop symptoms, and from some studies when</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 116</p> <p>1 endpoint, but there is still I believe a big 2 feasibility in that medicine and CF has moved way 3 beyond what we're doing in clinical development. 4 Majority of patients are on more than one 5 drug, they're often on head to tail aztreonam and TOBI, 6 or TOBI and Colistin or something, and now taking them 7 off, there'd be altogether, right, this people have 8 pointed out there's now a withdrawal and signs and 9 symptoms, so that washout period has to be minimized, 10 and the trial kept as short as possible. So I think 11 there's ethical considerations as well as trial design 12 considerations around a peer placebo. I think the add- 13 on idea on the other hand is very interesting of doing 14 head to tail TOBI plus something else versus TOBI 15 placebo for example. Now you are not mitigating the 16 standard of care, but expecting additional benefit. 17 The downside to that is now it's a superiority design 18 which has -- is we know pretty high hazard in the field 19 of failing.</p> <p>20 DR. NICHOLS: So we did that study. It was 21 called the "Cap Trial" and it failed because we 22 couldn't enroll, and the reason was is because patients</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 115</p> <p>1 that, you know, period before they had randomized, 2 there's a fair amount of screen fails often because of 3 exacerbation. So patients were clearly developing 4 symptoms. And so I don't know if it -- has been just a 5 sponsor reluctance or if there was comment from the 6 Agency about the notion of being on standard of care 7 therapy until the moment of randomization. So 8 technically if you put someone on placebo, they're now 9 on a withdrawal.</p> <p>10 MR. ALDER: Yeah, sure, you've thought about 11 doing placebo studies, but here is one consideration. 12 If you're putting patients on placebo and you know they 13 have an active infection, the reason for doing that is 14 you expect them to do worse than the comparator. 15 That's the point of a placebo trial with a superiority 16 design. So what -- however you define do worse, that 17 has to be rescueable, and then there better be some 18 benefit for the patients that are going to be in the 19 placebo, and you know, some people, we, you know, try 20 to minimize that by doing the 2-to-1 or 3-to-1 or 21 whatever, so, sure, placebos are attractive from 22 smaller patient numbers and more rapid meaning an</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 117</p> <p>1 were already doing a CAT (phonetic) regimen and their 2 clinicians deemed it unethical to now put them in a 3 randomized trial that might get placebo when they're 4 already doing it as therapy. Now we cut the study 5 short, we looked, there was a signal, but it didn't 6 meet statistical significance. But I think what that 7 showed is, is that the CAT regimen as a clinical trial 8 design was doomed for failure.</p> <p>9 MS. ELLENBERG: Taking a long view, and maybe 10 -- again, maybe this isn't realistic, but would it be 11 theoretically possible if you knew that another agent 12 was -- if you were able to do an add-on study, I 13 understand about all the burdens and all of that, but 14 if you found that you could give to at the same time, 15 is it conceivable that a combination product could be 16 developed so that people would only, you know, be 17 having one administration and not two? I mean, this 18 has been done in a lot of areas. I just was in a 19 conference on HIV where they compared, you know, 20 somebody holding a entire handful of pills that people 21 used to have to take and now it's one, you know, once a 22 day.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 So, you know, if it would be -- if it's</p> <p>2 theoretically possible that combination regimens could</p> <p>3 be developed or people would inhale two, you know, at a</p> <p>4 time in the same administration, then, you know, then</p> <p>5 one might think harder about going through the tough</p> <p>6 part of actually showing that the second one works in</p> <p>7 an add-on study.</p> <p>8 DR. FLUME: There is one example that was on</p> <p>9 Dave's slide of the pipeline. It's a combination of</p> <p>10 fosfomycin and tobramycin. The challenge you get in</p> <p>11 there is what are you targeting now because fosfomycin</p> <p>12 has activity against staph, for example, and then that</p> <p>13 gets into your patient selection and so forth. It</p> <p>14 becomes more challenging.</p> <p>15 DR. NICHOLS: Yeah, I think that would be</p> <p>16 obviously attractive if it could be done. There are --</p> <p>17 a lot of our inhaled products run up against osmolality</p> <p>18 restrictions, that's why they have to nebulize 5 or 4</p> <p>19 mls instead of 2 or 3. So -- and then issues of</p> <p>20 compatibility with the two products. So I agree that</p> <p>21 that would be a terrific step forward, but again I</p> <p>22 worry about some of the logistics of pulling that off,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 an ethical conduct of a short placebo-controlled study.</p> <p>2 DR. MISHRA: So my only comment would be in --</p> <p>3 you know, if you were going to accept the short</p> <p>4 placebo-controlled trial with a longer sort of a open-</p> <p>5 label follow-on is that, you know, I think sometimes we</p> <p>6 worry from our -- the Agency perspective is that, you</p> <p>7 know, the open-label follow-on which is really for</p> <p>8 safety purposes is just sort of like a forgotten part</p> <p>9 of the trial, you know, where there's a lot of laws to</p> <p>10 follow up. And you know, we're lucky at least right</p> <p>11 now because we've used inhaled drugs where you know a</p> <p>12 lot of the safety issues beforehand and I think as you</p> <p>13 mentioned, you know, you have hearing loss in some of</p> <p>14 these patients who have been taking Tobramycin for a</p> <p>15 long period of time.</p> <p>16 So you develop a product that's completely</p> <p>17 like a new molecular entity. You don't really know</p> <p>18 what the safety issue is, and really, you know, you're</p> <p>19 sort of telling these patients you're going to take</p> <p>20 these drugs for 20 -- you know, potentially 30 years,</p> <p>21 and all you have really is one sort of month that you</p> <p>22 did a comparative trial and maybe a little bit of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 not to mention sponsors having then potentially to</p> <p>2 collaborate in that way. I did want to comment back to</p> <p>3 the previous comment about ethical considerations of</p> <p>4 short placebo studies and clearly, I think we need to</p> <p>5 be mindful of that and in this way, I'm kind of cutting</p> <p>6 it both ways, but -- and explain how long-term exposure</p> <p>7 seems to still provide benefit, but we wouldn't be</p> <p>8 having this conversation if we didn't see perceived</p> <p>9 ongoing need in this population, right?</p> <p>10 And so we have two approved agents, so we can</p> <p>11 do CAT in our patients. If all of our patients felt</p> <p>12 like that was working for them, then maybe this</p> <p>13 wouldn't be such of an unmet need until -- the point</p> <p>14 I'm trying to make is that despite the fact that these</p> <p>15 drugs continue to work for fair numbers of our</p> <p>16 patients, there are still large numbers of our patients</p> <p>17 who perceive that one or two of these drugs are not</p> <p>18 working well for them and so their willingness to</p> <p>19 participate in a placebo-controlled study with the</p> <p>20 potential benefit of getting a new agent in the study,</p> <p>21 but more so available that may work for them clinically</p> <p>22 I think is an important area to consider in the idea of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 safety information. So my -- you know, I think it's</p> <p>2 very important that the open-label portion of that</p> <p>3 trial not be forgotten and you've got some very good</p> <p>4 comparative data that, you know, as much as you can</p> <p>5 that you can keep people on the trial to get that</p> <p>6 comparative data is very important.</p> <p>7 DR. BARKER: A comment back on FEV1, not a CF</p> <p>8 expert, but I think in the late 1990's with TOBI, the</p> <p>9 FEV1 delta was 10 to 14 percent. And 10 years later it</p> <p>10 was about half that, and I think more recently it's</p> <p>11 even less, the delta FEV1 in trials and our main</p> <p>12 argument for FEV1 has been sort of an old trend in</p> <p>13 reproducibility, but I'm wondering if we may be running</p> <p>14 out of sensitivity, that is our endpoint parameter.</p> <p>15 DR. FLUME: Let's take that conversation to</p> <p>16 the endpoint, but just to give you some view on that,</p> <p>17 the -- that change -- that delta was driven primarily</p> <p>18 by adolescent patients, and if you look at the adult</p> <p>19 patients involved in that study, it was a small margin,</p> <p>20 I can't remember if it was 2 percent. And then if you</p> <p>21 look at the clinical trials over time, the mean age of</p> <p>22 participants has continued to increase, so it's gone</p>

Page 122	Page 124
<p>1 from 18 years of age to 25 to 32, and so your focus on 2 adult -- a population. And then in the study in which 3 Aztreonam was compared to TOBI, a common slide shown 4 was the flat response, the attained response to the 5 Tobramycin, and an attempt, an argument was made that, 6 see, it's lost its effect.</p> <p>7 But you can't know that because you didn't 8 take them away from drug. That would require 9 withdrawal study and you might have seen them get worse 10 actually. So it doesn't mean that the drug isn't 11 working. But let's talk about FEV1 and a comment then.</p> <p>12 MR. HAWKINS: I was just going to comment, 13 when the burden that get real quickly, you have people 14 taking -- involved in a drug trial expect to be 15 burdened. So we did the add-on of even 20 or 30 16 minutes per dose, it isn't what I was referring to when 17 I was discussing the burden. I was referring to what 18 the eventual therapy is going to add to our lives. So 19 I don't think we should worry too much if, you know, a 20 doubling-up type effect. I -- strategy is what we 21 choose that the patients who are going to take part in 22 these studies are not going to be doing it by that, I</p>	<p>1 outcomes, you know, independent of sponsors or provide 2 data for post-marketing studies as well.</p> <p>3 DR. NAMBIAR: So I would like to hear from the 4 clinicians. I mean, I think it looks like the 5 population that we really need new therapies for are 6 treatment-experienced patients because those we do have 7 some options. So in that group of patients, what kind 8 of benefit are we likely to see even with a single -- 9 you know, a one period where they can -- we can get 10 some placebo in terms of FEV1 or other potential 11 endpoints because I think the point that was made 12 earlier, you know, is very true. In the earlier 13 studies that were done the magnitude of treatment 14 effect was much larger, but over the course of the 15 years, you're seeing that magnitude is much smaller. 16 So even if move towards an FEV1 endpoint, do we 17 anticipate that there would be a reasonable treatment 18 benefit in that highly treatment-experienced patient 19 populations?</p> <p>20 DR. FLUME: So that's -- always the question 21 is when -- what's the magnitude of benefit that's 22 clinically significant. And as a clinician of course</p>
Page 123	Page 125
<p>1 don't think, so back to the FEV1, sorry.</p> <p>2 MS. HAMBLETT: No, I mean I was just going to 3 comment that FEV1 offers us a large opportunity to do a 4 feasible placebo-controlled trial and that -- 5 recognizing the ethical issues when we weigh that 6 against the size of that trial, and then need to, you 7 know, how many patients we would have to recruit, you 8 know, that could be around 125 patients that that could 9 be done. And if we're looking at a drug that would 10 need to have a robust effective, say 5 percent or 11 something.</p> <p>12 And so I think that that, you know, makes that 13 more feasible, you know, paired with obviously you need 14 a lot more data on safety that -- so it's not 15 sufficient just to roll over those patients into an 16 open-label study, you would need to recruit additional 17 patients for safety, for long-term safety. Paired with 18 that, I think, you know, we also have a robust CF 19 registry, patient registry that offers even longer 20 follow-up and as well as data across the entire CF 21 population that would eventually be on these therapies 22 that offers us the opportunity to look at long-term</p>	<p>1 every day that they don't drop is a good day. So 2 anything greater than zero is better. But then you 3 look for precedent and I'll just look to the recent CF 4 tier modulator studies in which the magnitude of 5 benefit was in the range of 2 to 3 percent. And that 6 wasn't raised as an issue in the evaluation of that 7 panel as whether that was clinically significant. So 8 does that establish a new bar? I don't know.</p> <p>9 Obviously, you'd like to have other compelling 10 endpoints that add on to it that shows there's another 11 clinical benefit besides just a 2 or 3 percent change.</p> <p>12 And that was in actual -- absolute FEV1, not 13 with a relative whereas those earlier studies, that 10- 14 plus percent that was relative change in FEV1, was it 15 not? And Pulmozyme was approved with a 5 percent 16 change in relative FEV1. So that would equate to 17 roughly about a 2.5 percent absolute change. So 18 although commissions may have as number 5 in their 19 head, the actual number probably is in the 2 to 3 20 percent range.</p> <p>21 DR. O'DONNEL: Can I ask project -- my CF 22 colleagues here, I mean could you have a trial to</p>

Page 126

1 enroll the failures on the current treatment, the --
 2 whoever you deem to be CAT failures, or intolerant of
 3 the current regimen? Because that's who you're looking
 4 for, right, but are there enough of those patients and
 5 you could --
 6 DR. FLUME: I'm going to toss that question to
 7 Dutch because he had done an analysis on exacerbations,
 8 and in a recent example of one of the products that is
 9 in that pipeline which was inhaled levofloxacin where
 10 exacerbations was used as the endpoint and didn't hit,
 11 but then looking at the history of exacerbations, and
 12 so I think it's kind of getting to question number 2
 13 here which is trying to lean towards who you're trying
 14 to recruit for the study.
 15 MR. VANDEVANTER: Yes. Hi Ann. So what we
 16 see in this population is even amongst patients that
 17 are receiving continuous inhaled antibiotics, there's a
 18 sub-population that continues to experience pulmonary
 19 exacerbations. And we -- and it's not clear that a
 20 more effective antibiotic therapy would reduce that,
 21 but that's certainly the population where both the
 22 patients and the clinicians are seeking alternatives.

Page 127

1 But defining of failures sort -- short of complete
 2 intolerance or allergy is actually pretty difficult in
 3 this population. They have a lot of morbidity. These
 4 are patients that have advanced lung disease. They've
 5 had -- they suffer exacerbations frequently, and so
 6 they don't present themselves as obvious failures, but
 7 if you look at their chart over the past couple of
 8 years, you can see that there's definitely room for
 9 improvement. The challenge there however is that we
 10 don't have a good feeling for how effective their
 11 current therapy is, so comparing this therapy to that,
 12 so in any kind of non-inferiority setting is really
 13 difficult.
 14 MS. TRACY: That's superior.
 15 MR. VANDEVANTER: Well, superiority be great.
 16 MS. TRACY: Yeah, just to jump in there, I
 17 mean that sounds like a population that you want to see
 18 an improvement in symptoms, and so that would be a
 19 superiority design presumably?
 20 MR. VANDEVANTER: True, but we would be
 21 looking for the superiority based upon longer term
 22 outcomes, exacerbations or something, so not in a FEV1

Page 128

1 setting necessarily.
 2 DR. DHAND: So one population might be the
 3 people who use the triple antibiotics regimen and you
 4 know, instead of inhaled Colistin could be use drug X
 5 to see if that improves the exacerbation rates or
 6 functional decline.
 7 DR. LIM: That is -- this is Rob Lim from
 8 DPARP. I just wanted to add a point of clarification,
 9 Dr. Flume's point regarding the CFTR modulator with a 2
 10 percent -- 2 to 3 percent improvement in FEV1. I
 11 think, you know, it is true that that was a primary
 12 endpoint at one on that, but the advantage we had in
 13 those studies, if I assume you're talking about
 14 lumacaftor --
 15 DR. FLUME: Yeah.
 16 DR. LIM: -- is that those trials were long
 17 enough when we could look at other clearly clinically
 18 meaningful endpoints, it wasn't just a 2 or 3 percent
 19 improvement in FEV1, we saw improvements in other
 20 parameters, and in my mind one of the important ones
 21 was improvement in exacerbations, so it wasn't just
 22 that -- just that number alone, it was -- it had a lot

Page 129

1 of other supportive data which was really only
 2 attainable because the trial was long.
 3 DR. FLUME: And I understand and I agree with
 4 that, and -- but if you're left with you can't do a 6-
 5 month placebo-control trial, can you have a short so
 6 you hit your -- look at your FEV1 endpoint and then
 7 you're looking at your other endpoints from open-label
 8 comparator, and that's where it gets tough because now
 9 you're looking at exacerbations or PROs, and you know,
 10 maybe you can look at FEV1, but there's a lot of things
 11 that flex into that. So is there any comment on these
 12 other endpoints?
 13 DR. NICHOLS: Yeah, just lastly on FEV1,
 14 that's an important point. What I've taken away from
 15 that lumacaftor/ivacaftor study in part is that we know
 16 these modulator drugs can have significant impacts on
 17 FEV. We see with ivacaftor 10 to 15 percent and so
 18 with luma-iva we saw about a 3 percent absolute
 19 increase and yet that led to nearly 50 percent
 20 reduction in exacerbations, 30 to 50 percent and that
 21 is notable for us and so I don't know that one can
 22 easily extrapolate from the modulators to inhale an

Page 130

1 antibiotic therapy, but that's a notable kind of link
 2 there that I find interesting. I think regarding the
 3 FEV1 though, Patrick, to your point, I expect that
 4 providers who would consider these drugs and patients
 5 who would consider taking them would have a different
 6 threshold for what kind of FEV signal they would
 7 consider significant.
 8 It's not going to be, you know, what we saw in
 9 the trials has a total because the populations have
 10 shifted and baseline care has shifted, baseline health
 11 status has shifted. If we are going to allow a
 12 somewhat less challenging path forward, I think it's
 13 reasonable to expect some convincing FEV signal if
 14 that's what we're going to hang our head on and a
 15 placebo control to be present, I think that's at least
 16 worth mentioning.
 17 DR. FLUME: So we're going to run out of time
 18 to -- if we get the next ones, so Tim and then I want
 19 to bring up exacerbations.
 20 DR. AKSAMIT: And if I could just ask Dr. Lim
 21 once again, so there was supporting data on the 2-3
 22 percent improvement in FEV1, but a priority was to

Page 131

1 determine that a 2 percent or 3 percent change as a
 2 primary endpoint would suffice as is clinically
 3 significant endpoint going into the study?
 4 DR. LIM: No, it was not. In our last --
 5 DR. AKSAMIT: What was our percent that was a
 6 predetermined a priority going into that?
 7 DR. LIM: In the DPARP, we don't really have a
 8 magic number, so no.
 9 DR. FLUME: There was a power analysis done
 10 without doubt, but the -- can we just -- we have little
 11 bit more time to talk about exacerbations. We heard
 12 that there isn't a firm definition, there's multiple
 13 definitions being used, but there's time to event,
 14 there's frequency of event, this may become more
 15 relevant in our afternoon discussion, but does anyone
 16 comment about exacerbations as an endpoint? Maybe I
 17 could start with saying does the agency have problems
 18 with that in an open label comparator study?
 19 DR. NAMBIAR: I think our biggest problem
 20 really has been the definition of exacerbation and the
 21 varying definitions used. So as long as the protocol
 22 specifies and it's only a doubt ahead of time, I don't

Page 132

1 think that per se would be a problem, but as was
 2 pointed out earlier is how many of these criteria that
 3 go into the definition of exacerbation are all
 4 subjective and what are the components of the
 5 definition, that's what's important.
 6 MR. FOLLMANN: So in terms of exacerbation it
 7 seems to me looking at like multiple counts of
 8 exacerbation would be more statistically efficient than
 9 just using the first -- the time to first exacerbation
 10 and it sort of more meaningfully, I think, describes
 11 long-term behavior, the patient or the drugs, so I
 12 think you could count these as sort of recurrent events
 13 where recurrent exacerbations would seem to be
 14 preferred to just using time to first.
 15 DR. AKSAMIT: And I can't comment for the CF
 16 cohort, but I would just share to add into this that
 17 when we did our retrospective analysis for the respire
 18 program looking at the definition of exacerbation using
 19 a less stringent definition, it did not have a positive
 20 impact on data. So there was a little bit of change in
 21 signal presented at a post-ready TS (ph) in May, but it
 22 didn't change the primary data or outcomes, it wouldn't

Page 133

1 have made the primary endpoints even with less
 2 stringent definitions so the -- although most of us
 3 think that sometimes if we liberalize the definition of
 4 exacerbation, we may actually find ourselves making
 5 endpoints when in fact at least our data from that
 6 study wouldn't support that.
 7 DR. FLUME: So the endpoint used in maybe all
 8 of the CF trials that then an evidence of a change was
 9 actually physician decision to treat and I'll start
 10 with the very first one which was the Pulmozyme study
 11 which was where the Fuchs criteria came from and the
 12 definite -- the endpoint was actually IV antibiotics
 13 and the Fuchs criteria were only intended to validate
 14 that it was -- the antibiotics were for the treatment
 15 of respiratory complications. So it was never intended
 16 to be those criteria, those symptom lists was actually
 17 defining the event, it was the IV antibiotics.
 18 MS. HAMBLETT: I have two comments. The first
 19 is I think for an exacerbation endpoint and an active
 20 comparator study that sort of gives me heartache, it
 21 makes me very nervous because I think that the effect
 22 size will be quite small and so an expectation that,

Page 134

1 you know, we're going to find a difference that would
 2 take a lot of patients on top of an active comparator
 3 for that endpoint. On the second, in response to
 4 Dean's comment, time to versus frequency, I would say
 5 it's complicated. From a statistical standpoint one
 6 would expect that you would have more power with
 7 recurrent events. I will say that that's not always
 8 the case.

9 We have seen that sometimes the effect size is
 10 a bit attenuated with frequency of exacerbations. In
 11 one of our CF trials of azithromycin, we have looked at
 12 the data both ways. And so doing, you know, recurrent
 13 event analysis versus time to, they're different. So
 14 if we use that data to plan a future trial, it's quite
 15 a difference in sample size, you know, in terms of
 16 which endpoint would be the primary endpoint. If time
 17 to is the endpoint we probably need a trial of about
 18 300 patients in 6 months versus the rate. It's a
 19 harder endpoint to achieve, it's a little bit -- it
 20 could be harder to achieve. From a long-term clinical
 21 perspective, it made more clinical sense, but the
 22 sample size, you know, based on some of our data

Page 135

1 indicates we need a longer duration study and quite
 2 possibly more patients.

3 MR. FOLLMANN: So for that analysis, you could
 4 like analyze using time to first event and you get a P
 5 value and you could analyze using multiple events,
 6 recurrent events and get another P value and you're
 7 saying the P value was smaller for time to first event
 8 compared to you think recurrent events?

9 MS. HAMBLETT: The P value was larger using
 10 recurrent events.

11 MR. FOLLMANN: Right, okay.

12 MS. HAMBLETT: Yes, than as compared to a
 13 smaller more significant P value using time to event
 14 and the effect size was attenuated using recurrent
 15 events. So I just -- my point is just it's
 16 complicated.

17 DR. NAMBIAR: So I think in the interests of
 18 time, LaRee, you have a quick comment? Shrimant, you
 19 had some?

20 MS. TRACY: No, just a few on that. I mean
 21 you certainly can enrich your population to ensure that
 22 you observe an adequate amount of events and I can't

Page 136

1 speak to this as an expert, but in the cardiovascular
 2 arena they certainly look at time to recurrent event as
 3 an endpoint frequently, no pun intended on that, but
 4 often and then furthermore it's what -- it's not just
 5 peeled eyes (ph) where we want to model and analyze
 6 what's happening that the patient over the course of
 7 the clinical trial and that to me is what's most
 8 important is we're capturing every event or adequately
 9 accounting for those events as well as the time of the
 10 event.

11 DR. MISHRA: Yeah, just a very quick comment;
 12 I mean I think the open-label issue is, you know,
 13 something you can't completely discount. I think even
 14 whether you're using exacerbation definition or, you
 15 know, looking at whether a physician is going to treat
 16 because obviously I think those things can be
 17 influenced by knowing the treatment that you're on. I
 18 think, you know, if you have no choice but to do these
 19 trials, that's okay, but I think the burden then
 20 becomes sort of on the agency I guess to really look
 21 much more closely at the trial conduct and make sure
 22 there's not any sort of weird things popping up where

Page 137

1 you're seeing certain sites, you know, sort of doing
 2 things in tandem, and you know, making decisions where
 3 it looks like bias is influencing them. But as you
 4 think -- you know, again I don't think we can totally
 5 discount that. Open-label, you know, is not without
 6 its faults, but it's more just a feasibility thing, but
 7 I think it can influence, you know, the way that the
 8 trial is done.

9 DR. NAMBIAR: Let's just see, are there any
 10 comments?

11 MR. KADOORIE: I agree with Dr. Hamblett that
 12 in these active control trials that looking at an
 13 exacerbation endpoint is you don't have very much
 14 power. I don't think you should give up on that
 15 endpoint. I think what you can do is look at a pooled
 16 analysis across trials, you know, and have that as a
 17 requirement to see if they can meet that endpoint.

18 DR. NAMBIAR: Let's see, are there any
 19 questions or comments from the audience before we move
 20 on to the next session? No? So I think we'll move on
 21 in the interest of time to the next discussion which is
 22 around chronic MRSA infection in patients with cystic

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 138</p> <p>1 fibrosis. So Shrimant, I think it's your turn again.</p> <p>2 Thank you.</p> <p>3 OVERVIEW AND ISSUES:</p> <p>4 DEVELOPING INHALATIONAL PRODUCTS FOR THE TREATMENT OF</p> <p>5 CHRONIC MRSA INFECTION IN CYSTIC FIBROSIS</p> <p>6 DR. MISHRA: It's me again. Hopefully it's</p> <p>7 the last time you'll hear -- see me up here, but I'm</p> <p>8 just going to very briefly talk about again developing</p> <p>9 inhalational products for the treatment of chronic MRSA</p> <p>10 infection in cystic fibrosis. I think some of the</p> <p>11 issues -- or a lot of the issues actually overlap with,</p> <p>12 you know, what we've already been talking about, but</p> <p>13 there are some sort of unique features, you know,</p> <p>14 related to this indication. Just quickly saying the</p> <p>15 problem I think Dr. Nichols has already sort of</p> <p>16 discussed this beforehand; there is an increasing</p> <p>17 prevalence with staph aureus infection both, you know,</p> <p>18 with MSSA as well as in MRSA in CF patients is roughly</p> <p>19 a 70 percent prevalence for MSSA and 26 percent for</p> <p>20 MRSA. And you're seeing a transition that, you know,</p> <p>21 much, you know, with staph aureus in general to</p> <p>22 community-acquired MRSA in small colony variance which</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 140</p> <p>1 safety properties, that's even better because you may</p> <p>2 be able to limit the systemic exposure. But again,</p> <p>3 you're also adding to the inhaled therapy burden of CF</p> <p>4 patients, so I think you really want to be sure of the</p> <p>5 benefit of the inhaled drug. So again, just to talk</p> <p>6 about some of the trials on considerations, I think</p> <p>7 we've discussed a lot of this already. I think</p> <p>8 placebo-controlled and in this setting a little bit</p> <p>9 different than what's been discussed with pseudomonas,</p> <p>10 obviously there are issues with ethics and feasibility</p> <p>11 and obviously the limits on the duration of the placebo</p> <p>12 trial, but it seems as if it may be a little bit more</p> <p>13 feasible from our understanding to do it just because</p> <p>14 there's a little bit -- there's not quite a standard of</p> <p>15 care out there yet in the clinical setting and there</p> <p>16 may be a lot patients who for, you know, this therapy</p> <p>17 is not standard. And obviously if you could do that</p> <p>18 trial, superiority could be more easily demonstrated</p> <p>19 and I think something that becomes important for us is</p> <p>20 that you would like to show definitive evidence of</p> <p>21 treatment for, you know, against a placebo before</p> <p>22 something become standard of care in the clinical</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 139</p> <p>1 can be a little bit more difficult to treat and may be</p> <p>2 associated with biofilm development.</p> <p>3 Generally, you see the highest rates in sort</p> <p>4 of the young -- the adolescent young adult population,</p> <p>5 so between 10 and 30 years old and I know there's, you</p> <p>6 know, some debate about this, but it seems as if there</p> <p>7 is some clinical data that suggests that chronic MRSA</p> <p>8 infection is associated with declines in pulmonary</p> <p>9 function, increases in mortality and less return to</p> <p>10 baseline post-exacerbation. A really important point</p> <p>11 is that, you know, how this is treated I think in the</p> <p>12 clinical setting from our understanding is pretty</p> <p>13 variable. There's some patients who are taking</p> <p>14 nebulized, you know, Vancomycin chronically, there are</p> <p>15 other patients who are only treated when they have an</p> <p>16 exacerbation, whether that's through a combination of</p> <p>17 systemic therapy with oral medications or a combination</p> <p>18 of oral and nebulized, but again there's quite a bit of</p> <p>19 diversity in how it's treated in the clinical setting.</p> <p>20 So obviously a targeted inhaled therapy could</p> <p>21 be a benefit because it would act locally with less</p> <p>22 systemic exposure and if you have a drug with known</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 141</p> <p>1 setting and you don't really have a clear idea of what</p> <p>2 the benefit of this sort of standard of care comparator</p> <p>3 actually is.</p> <p>4 I think the issue of choosing a comparator is</p> <p>5 inability to demonstrate superiority, establish non-</p> <p>6 inferiority margin, but again it may be easier to do</p> <p>7 the trial and for longer. I think it's already been</p> <p>8 mentioned, you know, the paradigm for all the CF trials</p> <p>9 is basically at this point to do 28-day on/off</p> <p>10 paradigm, but I think -- you know, so one thing we need</p> <p>11 to consider is should we look at continuous therapy,</p> <p>12 should we look at shorter cycles, shorter on/off cycles</p> <p>13 or do we need to really follow this 28-day on/off</p> <p>14 paradigm, especially when you're pursuing a different</p> <p>15 indication. And how can we enrich this population?</p> <p>16 Can we target subjects depending on the endpoint? Of</p> <p>17 course, that may limit generalizability.</p> <p>18 So again, we've already discussed a lot of</p> <p>19 this, but the potential endpoints might be clinical</p> <p>20 whether using exacerbation, time to hospitalization,</p> <p>21 but again how do you define it and what's the study</p> <p>22 duration needed to capture the number of events with</p>

Page 142

1 something like exacerbation is there and you need it
 2 all to connect that to long-term clinical data such as
 3 mortality data. Could you look at microbiologic
 4 endpoints in the case of eradication? If it's not
 5 eradication we're talking about, then what would be
 6 sort of a feasible definition of reduction, or is that
 7 even feasible at all? If we're going to look at
 8 biomarkers in circuits, you could look at FEV1 percent
 9 predictive.

10 Again, we've talked about what's a clinically
 11 relevant change, and you know, can we correlate that
 12 with long and short-term clinical improvement and of
 13 course PROs, you know, first we need our validated PROs
 14 really available and again what's a clinically relevant
 15 change.

16 Do we think that can stand alone as a primary
 17 endpoint if it's not supported by microbiologic or
 18 pulmonary function changes? And a lot of these issues
 19 with these definitions overlap, so just -- again just
 20 how do you define each of these endpoints. Some are
 21 obviously specific to the endpoint itself, especially
 22 when you're talking about the age of use for PROs or

Page 143

1 PFTs and some endpoints maybe best suited for
 2 particular groups such as mortality in adults with
 3 severe disease.

4 And just some final quick thoughts, obviously
 5 we can't address everything today, so I think some
 6 basic questions for considerations, I think, you know,
 7 what is the most value when you're looking at this
 8 indication for the particular patient population? What
 9 is their risk threshold in terms of the trials that
 10 they think that patients would be willing to
 11 participate and what kinds of data are they requesting?
 12 You know, do they just want short-term data or much
 13 more long-term data considering they're going to be on
 14 medication potentially for a very long time. So how do
 15 we ensure an adequate safety database and what's the
 16 biggest barriers for investigators in doing these
 17 trials? And again, it has been noted there is a lot of
 18 information in CF registry, so how do we leverage those
 19 registries, you know, to get the information we need?
 20 Thanks.

21 DR. NAMBIAR: Thank you Shrimant. Did we have
 22 Sunita (ph)? Did we have questions for this session?

Page 144

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

2 DR. NAMBIAR: Not specifically, okay. So you
 3 know, I can start the discussion, would be interested
 4 to hear thoughts from the panel. I think in contrast
 5 to what we've seen with chronic pseudomonas infections,
 6 I think our assessment has been that placebo-control
 7 trials are potentially doable. I think what we would
 8 like feedback from clinicians is, you know, is it --
 9 are we still looking at maybe a shorter term like a one
 10 cycle or is this a patient population because there is
 11 no standard of care, we don't have approved therapies
 12 to treat their infections by inhaled route, you know,
 13 is it -- it's a doable, is it potentially feasible to
 14 do longer term studies? What might these studies look
 15 like and I think often we might have to also deal with
 16 co-infection because there is a fair number overlap
 17 between -- MRSA infection also having pseudomonas
 18 infection. So I would welcome thoughts from the panel
 19 and certainly lot of it overlaps with what we've
 20 discussed with regard to endpoints as well.

21 DR. FLUME: So I will start by saying that
 22 although staph was the bug that was introduced here,

Page 145

1 you could potentially take any of our bugs and insert
 2 them and ask the same questions, it works for
 3 pseudomonas, would have worked here. But the first
 4 question that's to be answered is what's the evidence
 5 that the bug is doing harm and then what's the evidence
 6 that treating that bug results in improvement? So
 7 you'd like to have greater confidence of that and that
 8 unfortunately takes time and effort as opposed to just
 9 assuming that, well, you have stentrophomonas,
 10 therefore I must suppress it. And those are the steps
 11 that take time that have to do. What we have right now
 12 is registry data that demonstrates an association
 13 between worst outcomes and certain pathogens many of
 14 whom might take the blame because it might be the other
 15 bug that's present there. Nonetheless, staph is the
 16 one that has had the most attention, there have been
 17 eradication trials and there is ongoing suppression
 18 trial.

19 So just for your other question about
 20 feasibility, I think number 1 in this round, you
 21 absolutely have to have a placebo because there isn't a
 22 reliable comparator. Interestingly for staph and for

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 146</p> <p>1 some of the other bugs there are other oral agents 2 unlike for pseudomonas, but I still do like the idea of 3 avoiding systemic exposure so it's still a legitimate 4 approach that you may have cheap oral therapy that 5 would not meet the same standard. 6 You'd like to see durable response, not just 7 the short one, but the other problem is in recruiting 8 patients to a study. They like shorter studies. They 9 like studies to start and finish and they also like the 10 opportunity to be able to have access to the drug. So 11 having open-label extensions is a very attractive 12 aspect for those patients. So if you came in and said, 13 well, we're going to do a 2-year study, I think we 14 would -- we'd be failed before we can start it because 15 that's just too long for people to want to be involved 16 in a study like that. Six months became sort of the 17 precedent because that's what was done with TOBI and 18 case II was two cycles in an open label for third cycle 19 I think or might have been three cycles on the active 20 comparator, but that's sort of the precedent. 21 In terms of the decision about cyclic, it's 22 the same complaint that we have with pseudomonas. I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 148</p> <p>1 but they probably are not in a clinical state where 2 there's -- it's obvious that they would benefit and 3 that's at the sponsors' risk to run those studies. 4 DR. NAMBIAR: I think we've also heard that in 5 some institutions inhaled therapies are being offered 6 for patients, you know, some drugs are being compounded 7 and used, and so that is seen as an impediment to being 8 able to enroll in these trials and I don't know how 9 true that is, how prevalent such use might be across 10 institutions, so would be interested in the outcomes. 11 MR. VANDEVANTER: It's certainly true a case 12 that there's patients on inhaled vancomycin and they 13 would not be for instance, for the -- a trial they 14 wouldn't be good candidates to randomized off and I'm 15 sure it's true at other institutions and it's a, you 16 know, clinical decision that empiric observations that 17 these patients tend to be stabilized if they're on some 18 sort of anti-staph therapy. So that's the best 19 indication that there may be a role for these drugs is 20 the empiric observation, but those patients 21 unfortunately are not good trial candidates. 22 DR. FLUME: But they might be not just on</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 147</p> <p>1 don't see the logic to a cyclic therapy, but that's 2 just me. 3 MR. VANDEVANTER: Given the lack of natural 4 history for these other bugs relative to pseudomonas, 5 in fact these other bugs were the background when 6 pseudomonas was shown to be a problem, many of these 7 patients were staph carriers. I don't know how you can 8 avoid asking sponsors to demonstrate a long-term 9 benefit of suppression and I think the challenge the 10 sponsors will tell you is that anecdotally we know 11 there are patients now that really do benefit from 12 staph suppression. These are patients that are almost 13 impossible to enroll in long placebo control trials, so 14 we end up enrolling patients that are culture-positive, 15 but maybe not clinically in need. 16 And so it's similar to our challenge in 17 pseudomonas in that we know who the patients are with 18 the most unmet need, but those patients really can't 19 afford to go off of their therapies in order for us to 20 demonstrate benefit. So I think what you'll find is 21 that there is a large population of patients with staph 22 that could be involved in a placebo-controlled trial,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 149</p> <p>1 inhaled vancomycin, there's a fair amount of Bactrim, 2 Doxycycline, clindamycin utilization out there. We 3 don't track that in the registry, but they are being 4 used. 5 MR. HAWKINS: Is the use of a compounded 6 antibiotic recorded in the registry? I don't know if 7 it is. And could that be used to help indicate a need 8 or not a need? 9 DR. FLUME: Only if it's asked for. So we 10 capture colistin which is non-approved product in the 11 U.S. I don't know if we capture ceftazidime or other, 12 it's just those three. 13 MR. HAWKINS: It seems like it would be useful 14 to start asking them to ask for that as an aside. I 15 mean, if it's -- people are using the whole list and we 16 have this whole big registry, it sounds like it would 17 be a good thing to capture. 18 MR. VANDEVANTER: So not so much excitement 19 about the other bugs I guess. The -- that sort of 20 alluded to identifying the patient population and so on 21 the one hand if you use a marker, you have the bug, 22 that may not be sufficient, so trying to define the</p>

Page 150

1 patients who are most likely to benefit is that history
 2 of exacerbations treated for staph or --
 3 MR. FOLLMANN: I had a question I guess it
 4 relates to inclusion criteria. So you mentioned that
 5 some of these patients are infected with the unusual
 6 bug like MRSA as well as pseudomonas. Do you restrict
 7 to just patients who are infected only -- who are not
 8 infected with pseudomonas or do you take all comers,
 9 some of that have implications for efficiency of the
 10 trial?
 11 MR. VANDEVANTER: They are included and all
 12 comers because if you exclude them, your pool gets much
 13 smaller, so feasibility plummets. What is attempted is
 14 to synchronize. If they're on inhaled antibiotics
 15 targeting pseudomonas to try and understand how that
 16 fits into the measurements of the endpoints which is a
 17 challenge if they're not on cyclic therapy. And then,
 18 of course, to stratify across, you know, to stratify in
 19 your treatment arms.
 20 DR. NICHOLS: Patrick, I think to your
 21 question about defining the patient population at -- to
 22 me the NTM model among these special pathogens (ph) may

Page 151

1 have a special place, not to use that word too much,
 2 but the point being I think we have more data, more
 3 evidence to suggest pathogenicity in response to
 4 treatment there and yet we still see a need when we're
 5 trying to develop studies around the NTM to have a
 6 unified approach to defining those who are just
 7 infected as opposed to those who have NTM pulmonary
 8 disease and need to be treated. And if a similar kind
 9 of approach could be taken to some of these other
 10 special pathogens, if you will, to define those as
 11 Dutch said who aren't just perhaps colonized or
 12 infected without clinical decline, I think that would
 13 be an important step forward.
 14 MR. FOLLMANN: How can you -- what methods are
 15 there to distinguish between colonization of the
 16 special pathogens versus being causative of the
 17 disease?
 18 DR. NICHOLS: It's a CFF-funded project being
 19 run out of Colorado right now, but basically applying
 20 the ATS criteria for pulmonary disease to the NTM
 21 population and there -- and we're finding about a third
 22 of our patients go on to develop disease. Just very

Page 152

1 briefly be a little more specific, those who are
 2 showing evidence of clinical decline which can be a
 3 greater rate of loss of lung function or exacerbation
 4 frequency and are not responding to treatment for their
 5 usual suspect pathogens, so they appear to be declining
 6 and we're treating them for everything but NTM and
 7 they're still declining. It's fairly loose, I
 8 appreciate that, but that's how it -- there's some
 9 radiology brought in, that's a little bit squishy in CF
 10 because of the background.
 11 MR. VANDEVANTER: But as I mentioned earlier
 12 it's largely empiric observation that if you go after
 13 particular pathogen and you see patient improvement,
 14 you infer that that pathogen was involved in the
 15 process. It's indirect, but it's really the best data
 16 that's available at the patient level.
 17 DR. FLUME: And we recognize that we use
 18 macrolides in our patients, in patients who have
 19 pseudomonas knowing full well that that's perhaps not
 20 the target. But I think since we had a little of
 21 silence there, I'd like to shift to the one question
 22 that didn't get looked up, but the one question that

Page 153

1 didn't get addressed because it might be highly
 2 relevant for this afternoon's conversation and that's
 3 the safety issues. We can talk a little bit about
 4 resistance, but Anne?
 5 DR. O'DONNEL: Yeah, I mean I was going to ask
 6 again, you don't know from your registry how many
 7 patients are being treated chronically for staph? I
 8 mean, you said something like 26 percent have Staph?
 9 MR. VANDEVANTER: I think the answer is we
 10 don't confidently know that.
 11 DR. FLUME: I don't think we capture that.
 12 It's pretty large registry, so anything we add to the
 13 registry, we have to find something we can subtract.
 14 MS. O'DONNEL: And I was going to ask about
 15 resistance, because you CF people think it doesn't
 16 matter and we haven't really talked about that yet, so.
 17 DR. FLUME: So just so you know I have feet in
 18 the bronchiectasis camp as well. Maybe as an
 19 introduction to this section, I just want to tell you
 20 about an ongoing project.
 21 The -- and it came from discussions with the
 22 bronchiectasis community. And in fact, Tim was the one

Page 154	Page 156
<p>1 that asked the question or maybe he requested</p> <p>2 something. But it was about we keep talking that the</p> <p>3 resistance doesn't matter and we never say it in public</p> <p>4 or won't put it in publication.</p> <p>5 And so we have a project that's been funded by</p> <p>6 the CF Foundation, The European CF Society, UK Trust,</p> <p>7 CF Canada and CF Australia to pull together clinicians,</p> <p>8 pediatricians, internist, pulmonologist, infectious</p> <p>9 disease pharmacists, microbiologists to address the</p> <p>10 issues, and there is a five-pronged approach.</p> <p>11 The first of which has already been submitted</p> <p>12 for publication. That's just establishing definitions</p> <p>13 so we know what we're talking about when we say</p> <p>14 resistance and the inadequacy, if you will, of the</p> <p>15 methodologies used to culture bugs and so -- and know</p> <p>16 about susceptibility.</p> <p>17 The second prong actually is led by Dutch, is</p> <p>18 a systematic review of the literature that -- to</p> <p>19 identify what is the prognostic value of microbiologic</p> <p>20 data with clinical outcomes. So we recognize there's a</p> <p>21 discordance between susceptibility, test results and</p> <p>22 outcomes.</p>	<p>1 So with that -- there is a discordance between</p> <p>2 clinical outcomes and microbiological data. And people</p> <p>3 often want to go to the culture results to help them</p> <p>4 have guidance in terms of how to manage it.</p> <p>5 And a common story will be, well, when I</p> <p>6 change the antibiotics the patient tends to do better,</p> <p>7 so it's got to be a resistance issue to which I would</p> <p>8 reply. Sure.</p> <p>9 The question is how did your culture result</p> <p>10 inform you of that? Because it's equally likely that</p> <p>11 that bug was resistant to the drug you were using or</p> <p>12 susceptible to the drug you've used, but now resistant</p> <p>13 to the one that you're choosing to use. Or your</p> <p>14 patient responded to a drug in which the bug that you</p> <p>15 identified was already resistant.</p> <p>16 So it's a much more complex issue than dealing</p> <p>17 with, say, a pneumonia where you may have a clonal</p> <p>18 organism that is planktonic and responds well to the</p> <p>19 antibiotics that you use. But in CF, the experience is</p> <p>20 very different.</p> <p>21 And issues that were raised at the recent AD</p> <p>22 Panels regarding susceptibility and fear of selection</p>
Page 155	Page 157
<p>1 The third is the Delphi approach with this</p> <p>2 group trying to come to some consensus about statements</p> <p>3 that can be made about how to use the microbiologic</p> <p>4 testing.</p> <p>5 The fourth is an engagement with the</p> <p>6 antimicrobial stewardship community. They have</p> <p>7 basically stayed away from the CF world, but we need to</p> <p>8 find common ground so that -- the issue is not whether</p> <p>9 you shouldn't use antibiotics, it's how best to use</p> <p>10 antibiotics.</p> <p>11 And then the final piece is about the</p> <p>12 communication of all this, the education for patients,</p> <p>13 for families, for industry, for clinicians, for the</p> <p>14 agencies to try to -- how do we share that information.</p> <p>15 So the first piece is already completed and it</p> <p>16 will get up for publication. The next two pieces will</p> <p>17 be finalized in September and then we will begin the</p> <p>18 programs in October, going public with the rest of the</p> <p>19 information.</p> <p>20 So it's trying to at least establish the</p> <p>21 current state of knowledge of what we know about</p> <p>22 response to treatment and microbiological data.</p>	<p>1 of resistance we sort of lived with 20 years ago. And</p> <p>2 the reality is 75 percent of the eligible patients are</p> <p>3 still on inhaled tobramycin. IV tobramycin is still</p> <p>4 the most common used medication in the treatment of</p> <p>5 exacerbations. So it's okay to be fearful of it, but</p> <p>6 the empiric observations are that it hasn't been an</p> <p>7 issue.</p> <p>8 MS. O'DONNELL: Then, for example, why is</p> <p>9 anybody on Colistin with CF.</p> <p>10 DR. FLUME: Well, first --</p> <p>11 MS. O'DONNELL: If that's like your backup</p> <p>12 drug. I mean, is it because the bugs are resis -- turn</p> <p>13 resistant or it's just a clinical decision in CF?</p> <p>14 DR. FLUME: So typically antibiotics are</p> <p>15 chosen because patients didn't respond to something</p> <p>16 else or they couldn't tolerate it. So it's the rare</p> <p>17 circumstance, at least in the U.S., that Colistin will</p> <p>18 be the first drug chosen.</p> <p>19 I can also -- and I can invite Dutch to</p> <p>20 comment on this that what you get in the culture isn't</p> <p>21 necessarily what you're using in the person and notions</p> <p>22 of no resistance for Colistin is sort of farfetched.</p>

Page 158

1 MR. VANDEVANTER: So I have to say coming from
 2 case, it also depends on where you were trained,
 3 whether you use Colistin or not. So Cleveland is
 4 notorious for Colistin use and it's not necessarily
 5 objective medicine. It's just the way people were
 6 trained.

7 I think it's important when we're having this
 8 discussion to just discriminate between resistance for
 9 inhaled antibiotics where this is a topical treatment
 10 and we know that parenteral breakpoints or systemic
 11 breakpoints are really not relevant.

12 The concern is, is that we will create
 13 organisms using this topical therapy that then will be
 14 recalcitrant to treatment with systemic therapy. And
 15 again, what we know from when we use systemic therapies
 16 in these chronic pulmonary infections, whether it be
 17 non-CFBE or CF.

18 We're treating a pulmonary exacerbation where
 19 our goal is not to eradicate the organism. It's to --
 20 it's basically a palliative treatment to get patients
 21 symptoms reduced and to get them back to their normal
 22 baseline.

Page 159

1 We know and we do publish occasionally, Tim,
 2 that susceptibility testing really is not predictive of
 3 response either way. So patients can have susceptible
 4 organisms by culture and not respond to a certain
 5 therapy and vice versa.

6 I think the important precedent is to look at
 7 Tobramycin, which at the time that TOBI was approved,
 8 was the cornerstone inhaled antibiotic -- I mean, IV
 9 antibiotic for treatment of pulmonary exacerbations.
 10 20 years later, still 70 percent of patients on inhaled
 11 Tobramycin and Tobramycin continues to be cornerstone
 12 IV treatment for pulmonary exacerbation.

13 So I don't mean to imply that there is no
 14 selection for reduced susceptibility in that
 15 population, there has to be, because we're giving
 16 antibiotics and we're not eliminating organisms. But
 17 what hasn't happened is we haven't lost the ability to
 18 use these classes as systemic therapies.

19 And as far as I can tell we've seen the same
 20 thing with Aztreonam. Aztreonam wasn't necessarily as
 21 useful as an IV treatment before it was approved as an
 22 inhaled drug, but I don't know that it's gotten

Page 160

1 particularly less useful since.

2 And I think we just need to accept that
 3 traditional in vitro susceptibility testing is just --
 4 it's no more useful than an X-ray for determining
 5 whether a patient is going to respond or not and that's
 6 the reality of the situation.

7 DR. MISHRA: Sorry. Can I just ask a very
 8 quick silly question maybe? So when you're talking
 9 about nonresponse, I mean what does that patient look
 10 like? Is that a patient whose pulmonary function is
 11 essentially remaining stable and they also are not
 12 showing any sort of reduction in their colony counts
 13 when it comes to the organism or how are you guys
 14 defining that? I'm just trying to --

15 MR. VANDEVANTER: So I will say that colony
 16 counts are irrelevant. It's -- whatever the clinical
 17 presentation was that dictated that there'd be
 18 intervention that tends to be the -- does tend to be
 19 the response elements that clinicians are looking for.

20 And often what will happen is a susceptibility
 21 test will go in at the time of admission to hospital
 22 and they won't get those results for five or six days.

Page 161

1 And during those five or six days the clinician knows
 2 full well whether the patient is responding to the
 3 treatment or not.

4 And so, if they're not responding then they
 5 can look at that micro result and say, oh aha. But
 6 often what happens is, is the patient's responding,
 7 they ignore that. And so it really is -- and I defer
 8 to Dr. Flume and other clinicians.

9 But it's pretty evident within four or five
 10 days that you have symptom reduction and that -- this
 11 is a patient you've worked with again and again and
 12 again. You have a -- there's a patient/physician dyad
 13 there. And so it's pretty clear when response has
 14 happened and that response tends to be irrespective of
 15 the micro results.

16 DR. FLUME: So we would respond to a variety
 17 of signals actually in publication now is those
 18 patients whose lung function drops precipitously and
 19 nothing is done. And now we know better that those
 20 patients do poorly, later on they lose their lung
 21 function.

22 So hopefully we'll see greater intervention

Page 162

1 based on FEV1 alone. These are generally people with
 2 very high functioning BFTs.
 3 But even if your patient doesn't have a change
 4 in lung function, but they're telling you, doc I don't
 5 feel well. We hear that and we look to do something to
 6 make them feel better.
 7 And we're trying to struggle with is it a need
 8 for an antibiotic or is it a need for an anti-
 9 inflammatory or would airway clearance be the ticket
 10 there to try to figure out what they are needing? And
 11 if you're not having success with something you're
 12 looking for something else. So we're hopefully highly
 13 responsive to what patients tell us.
 14 DR. ZEITLIN: To that end -- and I risk you're
 15 being upset with me. But we often find fungus as an
 16 ideology in pediatric CF and that complicates the
 17 response. And I know you didn't want to talk about
 18 that.
 19 DR. FLUME: Yeah, the fungi are a whole
 20 another subject and they're in that sort of entity that
 21 historically people thought Canada means nothing.
 22 Aspergillus, you got some people that think it's a

Page 163

1 culprit and others haven't found a benefit even
 2 treating patients that demonstrated.
 3 And then you've got all the other fungi, we're
 4 finding like Scedosporium others that people are
 5 worried about. But they're sort of parked in that same
 6 thing, like well what's the evidence for Steno and
 7 Achromobacter and others.
 8 MS. O'DONNELL: I mean I know we're going to
 9 talk more this afternoon, but this has been the bugaboo
 10 in -- from the FDA's point of view, at least part of it
 11 -- right -- the development of resistance.
 12 So I know we clinicians do what you say, but
 13 how we're going to show this in a trial that it's safe
 14 if the bug becomes resistant? I mean, that's your --
 15 part of the FDA's concern and is the ADCOM concern.
 16 DR. FLUME: So, I'll --
 17 DR. ALLENDE: I just wanted to -- talking
 18 about resistance, in the last Advisory Committee we
 19 received important feedback regarding this as a broader
 20 impact. And they asked us to monitor the colonization
 21 of non-respiratory sites, for example, the
 22 gastrointestinal tract because of the impact on future

Page 164

1 infections and also for reducing the number of
 2 treatment options for those other infections that
 3 patients might have and be colonized with.
 4 For example, the NTM colonization and the
 5 continuous exposure and what happens with the non-
 6 respiratory sites as a potential risks to monitor.
 7 That was a concrete advice we had for future trials.
 8 DR. FLUME: That was from infectious disease
 9 docs without any doubt. The challenge -- we understand
 10 the fear, right. You just don't know -- you don't
 11 know. But you have to pay attention to your empiric
 12 observations, the realities of what's going on.
 13 The first question one should ask is what is
 14 the evidence that resistance is bad? Now if your bug
 15 is causing disease and you don't have a drug to treat
 16 it, then we will agree that it's a bad thing.
 17 But resistance is the interaction between a
 18 drug and a bug. Virulence is the interaction between a
 19 bug and a person. And so you could, and we frequently
 20 do have highly resistant pathogens which are slugs
 21 (phonetic 3:01:44), they're not doing much of anything.
 22 And so, although Time and Newsweek can put

Page 165

1 resistance on the front cover and say that is a
 2 horrible thing. That doesn't mean that's the issue.
 3 And the other part is, we're focusing on a
 4 select population and ignoring issues like the
 5 agricultural use of antibiotics and the big global
 6 picture.
 7 DR. COX: Yeah. So maybe just to sort of
 8 expand that a little bit. At least there's a couple of
 9 different things that I think you're mentioning,
 10 Patrick.
 11 One is that you have a resistant organism
 12 that's not a pathogens, so maybe you've got to
 13 colonizer, right. Because if it's highly resistant and
 14 your antibiotic doesn't work against it, but it doesn't
 15 matter because it's not causing a problem.
 16 I mean if it's truly a virulent organism and
 17 it's resistant and it doesn't respond to your
 18 antibiotic, than if it's really causing something and
 19 it really is a problem that the antibiotic isn't
 20 anything than you're not treating the condition that is
 21 a problem.
 22 So it may just be that you've got a hodgepodge

Page 166

1 of different organisms, some of which are resistant,
 2 some of which you're finding, some of which you are not
 3 and it's a little bit in the dark and you don't quite
 4 know what's going on, and that's what's making it
 5 challenging.
 6 Because I do have to respond to the comment,
 7 that resistance is a problem. We see patients out
 8 there that have resistant organisms, who have few
 9 treatment choices left. No doubt that there is a
 10 mixture of different organisms there and what role any
 11 one particular organism is playing in a particular
 12 patient at a particular infection can be hard to sort
 13 out. But resistance is an issue. If we lose the
 14 effective antibiotics, we sort of know where we are.
 15 DR. FLUME: And I'm not going to be so
 16 facetious to saying I don't care about resistance.
 17 That the -- but a slide -- chronic infection is not
 18 merely just CF it's going to be important in the
 19 bronchiectasis discussion.
 20 The -- we know now from microbiome analyses
 21 that this is a complex community of organisms. And the
 22 slide I used is from Where's Waldo?, where you've got

Page 167

1 all these people on there and you don't know which ones
 2 are the bad guys. And what you get in culture is some
 3 of that information. And the issue is how is that
 4 information informing you about the care of your
 5 patients.
 6 So the general assumption is that if I put a
 7 patient on chronic suppressive antibiotics and I get a
 8 resistant bug then I've done something bad. I would
 9 argue actually it's just demonstrating that your
 10 antibiotic is doing what you asked it to do, because
 11 you've perhaps taken care of those that are at greater
 12 risk. The only bug that should be left -- right --
 13 should be relatively resistant to your bug.
 14 But the most amazing thing is that we've had
 15 TOBI, what for 20 years and we don't have 95 percent
 16 resistance. And so that's why I say we have to focus
 17 on the empiric observations and not just make the
 18 assumption that a resistance in my culture is doomed
 19 for my patients, my CF population or for that matter
 20 the community that surrounds them, because I'm not
 21 aware of any outbreaks of multidrug resistant
 22 pseudomonas in hospitals that have CF centers.

Page 168

1 MR. VANDEVANTER: I just want to say that
 2 resistance is bad, I'm there with you. But the problem
 3 is a semantic one that we talk about resistance and
 4 we're referring to an isolate with an R and we say
 5 that's resistant.
 6 And I think what we're trying to say is that
 7 all kinds of CF patients have isolates with Rs, but
 8 they're not refractory to treatment. And they don't
 9 seem to be getting infections in other sites. And they
 10 don't seem to be contributing to community outbreaks of
 11 resistant organisms, so they are their own microcosm
 12 internally.
 13 And it may be that by antibiotic classes some
 14 antibiotics do reduce virulence in association with
 15 resistance and that may be the Macrolides (phonetic
 16 3:05:43) claim to fame.
 17 But where we get -- where we run into problems
 18 is when we talk about, when we conflate Rs and Ss with
 19 the little R, resistance. And that's what I've seen in
 20 AD panels is this concern that we've looked for a year
 21 and what we see is that the number of Rs continues to
 22 go up. So, therefore, at some point we have a problem

Page 169

1 and we need to extend these trials out for longer and
 2 longer.
 3 And we're asking -- we're using a measure that
 4 doesn't provide insight into the clinical situation.
 5 It's not useful for the clinicians. And so of course
 6 we will collect it. But it cannot be used to determine
 7 a risk associated with the drugs in that patient
 8 population. It just cannot.
 9 DR. COX: And just on the breakpoint issue. I
 10 mean -- the breakpoints are designed for systemic
 11 therapy which -- compared to local maybe different.
 12 But -- I mean, it does seem -- I understand your point.
 13 You're not seeing the issue. But I mean it does seem
 14 that ideally you wouldn't want to have more
 15 colonization with resistant organisms than not.
 16 I mean, at some point if those things do sneak
 17 into the bloodstream and you're using a systemic
 18 antibiotic to treat them, if they're resistant, I mean
 19 the expectation would be is that you're going to have a
 20 higher likelihood of failure.
 21 MR. VANDEVANTER: Yeah. But we don't -- these
 22 bugs -- we don't see bacteremias in these patients.

Page 170

1 DR. COX: So if you're not seeing the
 2 bacteremias that's a different -- then you're not going
 3 to have a disease. But if there should be an infection
 4 that would occur, you would expect that that would be -
 5 - if you have resistance in particular organism and
 6 using a systemic drug, it's going to be tougher to
 7 treat those patients.

8 MR. VANDEVANTER: It's true. But I think you
 9 need to step back and look at the risk-benefit of a
 10 population that's now doubled its median predicted
 11 survival. And we -- I guess it's a risk we've been
 12 willing to take.

13 DR. COX: Yeah. No question there's a risk-
 14 benefit. If you're -- if there's a very low frequency
 15 of disease condition that you're going to have more
 16 difficulty treating and there's clear benefit from
 17 using, yeah, than it's a benefit risk that would be in
 18 the favor of treating, no question.

19 And the reason I'm responding is probably just
 20 because I do think resistance matters and that's what I
 21 thought was important to put it in the equation.

22 DR. NICHOLS: Can I -- I just wanted to ask,

Page 171

1 because I struggled with this too like you've heard
 2 from the other clinicians, because of this lack of
 3 association between resistance and clinical outcomes.

4 So in my view resistance is an indicator that
 5 your drugs should no longer work. And in CF we've
 6 demonstrated now for two decades that the drugs do
 7 continue to work when given inhaled and when given
 8 systemically.

9 The other risk may extend to the community of
 10 risk spreading contagion with resistant bugs to the
 11 community. But I don't see any evidence of that.

12 And so sincerely I would like to hear in the
 13 context of CF in inhaled and a microbial therapy where
 14 is the focus of that risk? Is it developing new drugs
 15 that may not follow same pattern we've seen over the
 16 last two decades or is it more a philosophical concern
 17 with increasing the MICs?

18 DR. COX: So I understand the issue of -- you
 19 can continue to treat, you continue to see benefit, but
 20 at some point, it would seem that you would get to a
 21 point where your antibiotic would not work.

22 I mean if the organism is resistant that by

Page 172

1 definition means it's not responding to the antibiotic.
 2 The antibiotic is not active.

3 So the breakpoints that you may be looking at
 4 on the lab reports are probably those that are designed
 5 for systemic therapy. So what's going on in the lung
 6 may be more complex and it -- and the levels that are
 7 attained there may be completely different than what
 8 you get with systemically available therapy.

9 I mean as a basic principle, if the antibiotic
 10 is not active, you're not going to expect a clinical
 11 response. You're saying that -- I mean that is almost
 12 by definition. You're saying that you're still seeing
 13 a response which suggests that the antibiotic is still
 14 active.

15 If you think that the antibiotic isn't active
 16 against an organism that's completely resistant then I
 17 think if you asked yourself the question of, is this an
 18 antibacterial drug in this setting?

19 MR. VANDEVANTER: And so -- but what -- the
 20 problem with that construct is you take an isolate from
 21 a polymicrobial, polyclonal population and you read the
 22 MIC and you say, ah, this characterizes the infection.

Page 173

1 And what we know is that it doesn't.

2 So I'm not talking about inhaled antibiotics.
 3 I'm talking about systemic treatment of pulmonary
 4 exacerbations where the Rs and Ss just do not predict -
 5 - S doesn't predict response any more than R predicts
 6 lack of response. It just doesn't in that setting.

7 And it's about the test. It's not about
 8 whether -- I agree with you. The point that you
 9 populate the lung with resistant organisms, it's no
 10 different than populating them with an intrinsically
 11 resistant organism. Yeah, you're not going to have an
 12 effect.

13 But the challenge here is we conflate doing a
 14 standard micro measure that works very well for
 15 bacteremia, for urinary tract infection, highly
 16 efficient. CLSI has this all figured out and we think
 17 that that extends over the treatment of pulmonary
 18 exacerbations -- it just doesn't.

19 DR. COX: And that's fair. And I think we've
 20 made this point a little bit earlier on, which you may
 21 not be culturing the actual pathogen that's causing the
 22 problem. What is actually the cause of the patient

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 174</p> <p>1 tissue? What's the virulent organism? 2 And I think if you think about this little bit 3 more and try and tie it into the discussion that we 4 started with, it argues pretty strongly for having good 5 clinical endpoints, because absent good clinical 6 endpoints it may be hard to figure out whether we're 7 actually benefiting patients or not. 8 And empiric observation, I think, can be 9 helpful when it's an event that you just simply would 10 never see. But in settings where those differences are 11 more -- they're not that large or there is variability, 12 it really does argue again for well controlled trials. 13 So -- and it's really important -- I mean, we 14 have seen instances where well controlled trials are 15 not done and the field kind of gets beyond the well- 16 controlled trials. And you don't really know the basis 17 for what you're doing. 18 And it can be -- it cannot be good for 19 patients, because you don't really know exactly what 20 you're doing. It gets adopted, it become standard of 21 care and it becomes difficult for new therapies to 22 develop, that may truly help patients. You may be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 176</p> <p>1 other hand, like my other colleagues. But you're all 2 wrong kind of thing, is how that goes. 3 I would like to expand on just a couple of 4 points. The first is not to overstate the importance 5 of longitudinal analysis and whether that's an acute, 6 subacute setting or more chronic setting about what the 7 specific pathogens are. 8 And we wrestle with this all the time, whether 9 it's pseudomonas, staph, fungi or the NTM that we do 10 need to take this in the context of clinical symptoms 11 in addition to other components of the data, whether 12 it's a definition for NTM pulmonary disease or 13 otherwise. 14 We need -- sometimes need several days before 15 we can determine, I think that this is an operative 16 pathogen or a need a month or I need three months or 17 six months for NTM disease sometimes in that situation. 18 So longitudinal is analysis of important. 19 Having said that, if we start thinking about 20 this impact more long-term on this diversity, community 21 of organisms, I think, to address your concern about 22 what happens in other sectors, this would be best</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 175</p> <p>1 doing some things that don't actually provide benefit 2 to patients. So it really is important. 3 And this is not a criticism of the CF field. 4 I mean, we've seen this in a variety of different 5 fields and so it really argues for the importance of 6 well controlled trials for really -- for benefiting 7 patients, so. 8 MR. VANDEVANTER: I mean, part of our problem 9 at CF is that we have a lot of that that's going on 10 that now is our standard of care. So if we're using 11 active comparators, it's very difficult to know what -- 12 if there is efficacy with those. I agree. 13 DR. COX: And a very fair point. And we're all 14 human beings, we all want to do something to help 15 immediately and it really is important and I appreciate 16 your comment, your willingness to actually say it that 17 sometimes we get a little bit ahead of ourselves and we 18 don't really know where we are and that's not the best 19 situation for patients, so appreciate your honesty. 20 DR. AKSAMIT: As the accused instigator of 21 this -- at least for the non-CF group, I would also say 22 in for the record that resistance does matter on the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 177</p> <p>1 served in a formal post marketing analysis requirement. 2 Because right now none of this monitoring is being done 3 and this would be a great opportunity for us to move 4 forward and inform ourselves are there signals arising 5 that we should take note of. 6 And again, along your line of rationale that 7 are markers that maybe we are creating problems and you 8 say, well, how best to do that. And it probably would 9 be best served to do that in post marketing analysis. 10 And I think then we think about this in the 11 context of this diversity of products and of organisms 12 in communities with the microbiome and all the other 13 factors that go in. 14 And so as was mentioned is, is that single 15 organism that's isolated on a micro report really 16 reflective of that phenotypic presentation of what's 17 going on with the patient. And the PCR microbiome 18 analysis would suggest probably not it's an 19 oversimplification of a lot of things going on. 20 So we have to think in when you say resistance 21 is that necessarily correlate with what's going on 22 phenotypically with that patient. They may or may not</p>

Page 178

1 when it's a bacteremia, for sure, when it's pneumonia
 2 with a very monoclonal population, for sure.
 3 But for bronchiectasis in this group of this
 4 diversity of organisms -- and anything we and you have
 5 to get down to the boxes many of you you've heard me
 6 kind of promote is to think about this in broader
 7 terms.
 8 We may get to the point where we have inhaled
 9 organisms to repopulate diversities of organisms. Who
 10 would have think that you'd do a fecal transplant to
 11 help a person for C. difficile, for example and it can
 12 be a very effective strategy?
 13 So, I mean, the point I just want to share is
 14 that we have to think about out of the box. And along
 15 I think both of your points, more in common than
 16 dissimilar, that it's not just necessarily about a
 17 single organism in a single event with a single R or S
 18 on it that really then translates into what's going on
 19 with the patient and he has an impact, as Chip says, on
 20 how they feel. So it just raises all those all-
 21 important complicated issues. Thank you.
 22 DR. FLUME: All right. With that, I'm going

Page 179

1 to let Chip have one more word and then we're going to
 2 close it down for lunch.
 3 DR. FROEHLICH: Thank you, Patrick. I wanted
 4 to share a perspective from a drug development point of
 5 view as well. Talking about resistance is very
 6 important and this is very important to us as well.
 7 What I think we should discuss what is the
 8 right balance between the clinical data that you
 9 observe and then potential risk of resistance and when
 10 would or should a new inhaled antibiotic made available
 11 for therapy, but we see appropriate post marketing
 12 measures to test long-term safety and resistance
 13 development.
 14 For me it's difficult to understand why you
 15 would refrain from making a drug available because you
 16 are concerned what might happen five, ten years down
 17 the road in the patient. And I think this is better
 18 served, as Tim said, in an appropriate, well controlled
 19 post marketing setting.
 20 DR. FLUME: All right. Thank you. And with
 21 that, we'll close this session and break for lunch and
 22 then reconvene at 1:00 o'clock for the afternoon

Page 180

1 session.
 2 LUNCH
 3 DR. SMITH: Okay, we're going to start this
 4 afternoon with some formal public comments. We have
 5 three speakers. They each are going to have roughly
 6 five minutes or so for their comments. And we'll take
 7 them in the order that they're presented in the agenda.
 8 So if I could ask Amy Leitman please to come to the
 9 podium.
 10 FORMAL PUBLIC COMMENTS
 11 MS. LEITMAN: Good afternoon and thank you for
 12 the opportunity to address everyone here today. My
 13 name is Amy Leitman. I'm the director of Policy and
 14 Advocacy for NTM Info and Research, a non-profit
 15 patient advocacy organization for those with pulmonary
 16 tuberculosis mycobacterial -- nontuberculous
 17 mycobacterial disease. I'm also the stepdaughter of a
 18 courageous and loving bronchiectasis patient who died
 19 only a few years ago from complications of her disease.
 20 In my job, I speak from two vantage points,
 21 that of a patient advocate and that of a surviving
 22 child and caregiver of a patient. I've had the benefit

Page 181

1 of learning from personal experience as well as from
 2 the patients and leading experts in this field, several
 3 of whom are participants in this workshop today. Many
 4 patients I've had the privilege of helping have had
 5 serious pulmonary infections such as pseudomonas.
 6 These patients cannot be placed in silos. They may
 7 have pulmonary infections, but the root cause of the
 8 problem is their underlying pulmonary disease.
 9 This includes my late stepmom, Fern Leitman.
 10 Though she also had NTM lung disease later in life, she
 11 spent most of her life as a bronchiectasis patient,
 12 starting at the age of 14 after suffering an episode of
 13 hemoptysis.
 14 In the 32 years that she was my parent, she
 15 was on antibiotics many times due to exacerbations with
 16 pseudomonas in particular. This cruel and vicious
 17 cycle would repeat itself for 54 years before her
 18 kidneys finally failed from nearly a lifetime of
 19 systemic antibiotic use to combat the infections she
 20 had because of her bronchiectasis. She was one of those
 21 patients with a significant unmet need who could have
 22 benefited from better therapies.

Page 182	Page 184
<p>1 She personally told you about this 6 years ago</p> <p>2 at an FDA workshop on issues in the design of clinical</p> <p>3 trials for antibacterial drugs for the treatment of</p> <p>4 non-CF bronchiectasis. She pointed out that you treat</p> <p>5 the patient, not the test result, to underscore the</p> <p>6 importance of designing clinical trials in a way that</p> <p>7 will have meaningful impact in real world clinical</p> <p>8 settings. It's increasingly obvious that the clinical</p> <p>9 trial design paradigm doesn't easily apply to</p> <p>10 bronchiectasis patients.</p> <p>11 In the ongoing discussion about the length of</p> <p>12 clinical trials, drug resistance is a subject that</p> <p>13 keeps coming up. Clinical trials should last as long</p> <p>14 as -- should last long enough to evaluate both safety</p> <p>15 and efficacy. But given that pre-trial safety studies</p> <p>16 are also conducted to suggest building a longer trial</p> <p>17 to evaluate drug resistance is neither useful nor</p> <p>18 ethical. The issue of addressing the long-term</p> <p>19 development of resistance would be better served with</p> <p>20 post-marketing analysis using structured monitoring</p> <p>21 that currently does not exist. To enforce a</p> <p>22 prospective requirement on clinical trials already in</p>	<p>1 position of either recommending a patient enroll a</p> <p>2 clinical trial, which may see them on a placebo for 2</p> <p>3 years, which is 2 more years of damage and destruction</p> <p>4 to their lungs, or to advise against it because of the</p> <p>5 risk of 2 years of placebo, making it virtually</p> <p>6 impossible to enroll for such a clinical trial. Let me</p> <p>7 put it to you in another way. My stepmom, Fern, spoke</p> <p>8 at the FDA Workshop in September of 2012. She died in</p> <p>9 October of 2014. And that is the difference that 2</p> <p>10 years can make.</p> <p>11 The FDA's Patient-Focused Drug Development,</p> <p>12 PFDD, program may also significantly impact clinical</p> <p>13 trial design for bronchiectasis patients. Two weeks</p> <p>14 ago, the FDA issued its draft of the first of four</p> <p>15 methodological PFDD guidance documents for industry,</p> <p>16 FDA staff and other stakeholders. The document</p> <p>17 outlines methodology for collecting patient experience</p> <p>18 data as defined and codified under federal law.</p> <p>19 Within the list of measurable patient</p> <p>20 experience data is, among other things, the burden of</p> <p>21 participating in clinical studies. This should include</p> <p>22 more than just practical day to day burdens. To</p>
Page 183	Page 185
<p>1 progress or concluded brings drug development grinding</p> <p>2 to a halt.</p> <p>3 There is a practical consideration to this as</p> <p>4 well. Nearly half of all Phase 2 protocol amendments</p> <p>5 are avoidable and one-quarter of those are due to</p> <p>6 recruitment difficulty or feedback from sites and</p> <p>7 investigators. Protocol amendments are costly,</p> <p>8 averaging half a million dollars and a 3-month delay.</p> <p>9 In the real world when a non-CF bronchiectasis</p> <p>10 patient is sick, they receive treatment with systemic</p> <p>11 antibiotics and off-label use of inhaled antibiotics.</p> <p>12 Well-trained clinicians will not stop treating them</p> <p>13 regardless of concerns over eventually developing drug</p> <p>14 resistance.</p> <p>15 Or as one of the patient panelist from our</p> <p>16 Bronchiectasis Research Consortium said: "Don't plan a</p> <p>17 clinical trial design that you won't approve of once</p> <p>18 the trial is completed."</p> <p>19 Forcing patients to endure excessively longer</p> <p>20 trials when it is unclear they are -- when it is clear</p> <p>21 they are the least able to participate in them is</p> <p>22 unethical. It puts physicians in the untenable</p>	<p>1 properly assess whether the correct endpoints are</p> <p>2 ultimately used in a clinical trial, patient concerns</p> <p>3 should be heard and incorporated into clinical trials</p> <p>4 from the beginning when they are designed. If the</p> <p>5 clinical trial endpoints do not ultimately yield the</p> <p>6 product which addresses patient concerns, then neither</p> <p>7 the study nor the product hold as much value for the</p> <p>8 patient.</p> <p>9 The draft guidance also addresses sample size.</p> <p>10 The FDA recommends that if the sample size is limited</p> <p>11 due to practical considerations, e.g., rare diseases,</p> <p>12 the research objectives should be adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>13 I'm not sure how this can be practically</p> <p>14 achieved. Regardless of patient population size, if</p> <p>15 there is information about those patients that needs to</p> <p>16 be gathered, then we still need the data whether it's</p> <p>17 from 20 patients out of a total of 250 or 1,000</p> <p>18 patients out of a total of 100,000.</p> <p>19 The challenges that arise in rare disease</p> <p>20 population studies also impact sampling frame. In the</p> <p>21 case of bronchiectasis, not all doctors are created</p> <p>22 equal. There is a select group of physicians who</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 186</p> <p>1 specialize in treating these patients. They are 2 frankly better at it than many of their colleagues and 3 patients tend to gravitate to them. This clustering 4 effect may also have an impact on random sampling, but 5 it does not necessarily follow that this renders the 6 study less accurate for this patient population. 7 I thank the FDA for convening this workshop. 8 It's an important step forward in determining the 9 challenges associated with designing clinical trials 10 for what has repeatedly been described as a 11 heterogeneous population and exploring possible 12 solutions for that. We all benefit from the opinions 13 and expertise of other. 14 It's my hope that everything we learn today 15 will help design a roadmap for clinical trials that can 16 accelerate effective drug development. This is 17 progress that Fern advocated for and that so many other 18 bronchiectasis patients needed prior to their deaths 19 and it is progress that will help countless others 20 facing this long and difficult journey. 21 I'd like to leave you with one more thought. 22 I mentioned earlier that patients cannot be placed in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 188</p> <p>1 I'm speaking today because I -- because having 2 studies that properly assess the efficacy of treatments 3 and encourages the research and treatments of 4 bronchiectasis is very important to me. 5 I've been frustrated by the continued failure 6 of non-CF bronchiectasis studies, especially having 7 taken part in some of these trials and experiencing un- 8 improvement. I believe that the majority of these 9 studies have failed in part due to several factors. 10 The first is the heterogeneous nature of non-CF 11 bronchiectasis. This includes not just the etiology of 12 non-CF bronchiectasis, but also the prescribed 13 treatments. 14 So the first slide shows a wide range of 15 causes for non-CF bronchiectasis. There are so many 16 unrelated causes, yet trials are created to treat them 17 all the same. 18 The next slide shows how these trials are set 19 up. As we can see from this analogy, tests in CF 20 patients are performed on like subjects -- I know there 21 are some differences, but very similar -- whereas non- 22 CF bronchiectasis trials are set up on everybody else</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 187</p> <p>1 silos, categorized as one disease state only. 2 Comorbidities play an enormous part in defining the 3 scope and nature of illness and this is particularly 4 true of bronchiectasis patients. 5 When the FDA evaluates any new product using 6 the benefit-risk assessment utilized in the PFDD 7 program, doing so with patient input in order to more 8 specifically calibrate the benefit-risk assessment will 9 ultimately help lead to patient-focused drug 10 development that fits within the agency's framework and 11 yields better products for patients. 12 These are new frontiers for everyone, 13 regulators and industry, patients and advocates, 14 providers and researchers. It's a steep learning 15 curve, and this is a benefit because it means we are 16 moving forward, which is how we innovate. Thank you. 17 DR. SMITH: Thank you, Ms. Leitman. Now we'll 18 have Mary Kitlowski come to the podium please. 19 MS. KITLOWSKI: Hi. My name is Mary Kitlowski 20 and I'm from Loch Hill, Maryland. I have 21 bronchiectasis as a result of a rare disease called 22 primary ciliary dyskinesia or PCD.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 189</p> <p>1 with bronchiectasis. So to me this is like having a 2 trial: "Will a baseball bat consistently hit a baseball 3 past the infield?" And then for non-CF: "Will a 4 baseball bat consistently hit every other style of ball 5 past the infield?" 6 When we look at the patients that are enrolled 7 in these trials, we can see that the CF trials are 8 fairly similar. Whereas with the non-CF 9 bronchiectasis, we're not sure what percentage of 10 patients with the different etiologies are going to be 11 included. 12 Now you might think that this trial would have 13 succeeded based on the last slide because we have 14 softball and a tennis ball in here. But if you look at 15 the actual participants, no tennis ball signed up for 16 this trial. 17 This is a poster showing -- comparing -- from 18 the bronchiectasis registry looking at different 19 disease groups, primary ciliary dyskinesia being one of 20 them. And the conclusion -- sorry; I learned how to 21 use this. So the conclusion over here states that 22 patients with PCD within the BRR are more significantly</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 190</p> <p>1 younger and that's by 30-plus years, more often report 2 having respiratory symptoms, exacerbations and 3 hospitalizations compared to the other groups. 4 So this is just an example of how these 5 different disease groups within the bronchiectasis 6 community -- we're not sure how that affects the 7 overall studies that are being set up. And there are 8 other differences that are not taken into account here. 9 In this slide again instead of saying that 10 these are the different types of disease groups, we 11 could even say these are the different patients -- the 12 treatments the patients are on. We don't know if all 13 the patients are doing airway clearance, what type of 14 airway clearance that they use, are there other drugs 15 that they are on for the other diseases that they might 16 have. And we don't know how this affects the outcome 17 of the study. 18 So the second issue is the rigidity of the 19 endpoint set up for these trials. Unproven endpoints 20 continue to be used as well as improperly applying data 21 analysis to endpoints that misrepresent the endpoint as 22 failing. The primary endpoint time to first</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 192</p> <p>1 they should be evaluated. So in evaluating just the 2 first one and the last one, you can see that the 3 patients did 14 other surveys or 14 total surveys. So 4 12 surveys were not used in determining whether the 5 quality of life improved. 6 So to me using the first and the last is like 7 a cholesterol trial, where you test the patients' 8 cholesterol levels before the drug is administered. 9 Then you test the cholesterol levels again several 10 months after they've had the last dose and determine 11 the drug to have failed because the cholesterol levels 12 have gone back up to where they were before they 13 started the trial, despite evidence that their 14 cholesterol levels had dropped while they were on the 15 drug. 16 So a quick look. Again, this is one of the 17 Aradigm slides. If you look along the vertical axis, 18 that shows the quality of life survey. And you can see 19 that while the patients were on the drug, they all said 20 that their quality of life was better, versus down here 21 when they were off the drug and the quality of life 22 went down. Yet for the trial only two endpoints when</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 191</p> <p>1 exacerbation would not be a proper endpoint for me. I 2 always have an exacerbation in the fall and this is not 3 uncommon for non-CF bronchiectasis patients. At 4 certain times of the year we retreat from society 5 because that's when we are the most susceptible. 6 There's also a problem with how The Quality of 7 Life-Bronchiectasis is evaluated, in particular in the 8 Aradigm study when determining that the quality of life 9 endpoint failed. 10 According to The Quality of Life- 11 Bronchiectasis expert, Dr. Quittner, the endpoint was 12 improperly determined using only the first quality of 13 life survey before the patient started on the drug 14 compared with the last one after they've been off the 15 drug for 28 days. The survey only asked for a recall 16 of 7 days. So both of these surveys were comparing the 17 patients when they were off the drug. So a few slides 18 from the Aradigm trial, and this was just to show how 19 the QOL-B was used. 20 Now, Dr. Quittner was asked how to set up 21 these survey -- you know, how the survey should be used 22 throughout the trial. He actually was not asked how</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 193</p> <p>1 the patients were not on the drugs. 2 Frankly saying that the quality of life 3 endpoint failed in this trial, I think is misleading. 4 And since an expert was not used in how to 5 quantitatively analyze this data -- and I think this 6 misrepresents to the patients. And I think frankly 7 having them do the survey 14 times and not even looking 8 at the other surveys was a waste of the patients' time. 9 Quality of life should be a primary endpoint 10 and it should be used correctly. If these trials have 11 shown anything, it is that we don't know what a good 12 qualitative measure is for these trials. If patients 13 are feeling better while on the medication, shouldn't 14 that account for something, even if we can't figure out 15 why? 16 My concern is that these continued failures 17 without flexibility and adjustment to the set up and 18 endpoints will deter patients from enrolling in these 19 studies, and more importantly, discourage companies 20 from putting resources into bronchiectasis research. 21 Thank you for your time. 22 DR. SMITH: Thank you. The final public</p>

Page 194	<p>1 speaker will be Cara Pasquale.</p> <p>2 MS. PASQUALE: Hi. My name is Cara Pasquale</p> <p>3 and I'm speaking today on behalf of the COPD</p> <p>4 Foundation, a non-profit organization with a mission to</p> <p>5 prevent and cure COPD. The foundation also provides</p> <p>6 research, education and support for the bronchiectasis</p> <p>7 community, a closely related lung disease and a common</p> <p>8 comorbidity of COPD.</p> <p>9 The foundation started and operates a</p> <p>10 bronchiectasis and NTM registry, a consolidated</p> <p>11 database of non-CF bronchiectasis and/or NTM patients</p> <p>12 to support collaborative research and assist in the</p> <p>13 planning of multi-center clinical trials for the</p> <p>14 treatment of these diseases.</p> <p>15 We are grateful to the FDA for convening</p> <p>16 today's workshop to discuss inhaled antibiotics for</p> <p>17 non-CF bronchiectasis. There is significant unmet need</p> <p>18 in the patient population and the recent Antimicrobial</p> <p>19 Advisory Committee reviews of treatments indicated for</p> <p>20 those with non-CF bronchiectasis with the presence of</p> <p>21 pseudomonas were met with optimism and excitement in</p> <p>22 the patient community.</p>	Page 196	<p>1 presence of other comorbid conditions, exposures in the</p> <p>2 patient's daily life, exacerbation risk factors and</p> <p>3 more.</p> <p>4 We partnered with the NTM Info and Research to</p> <p>5 better understand the outcomes that patients</p> <p>6 prioritize. In a preliminary survey following the</p> <p>7 recent Advisory Committee Meetings, 284 patients ranked</p> <p>8 frequency of exacerbations as the second highest</p> <p>9 priority outcome, closely behind overall lung function,</p> <p>10 something highly impacted by the frequency of</p> <p>11 exacerbations. In a follow-up survey, quality of life</p> <p>12 was ranked first by a small margin over frequency of</p> <p>13 exacerbations. In each instance, time to first</p> <p>14 exacerbation was by far the lowest ranked priority.</p> <p>15 Patients ultimately want to feel better and</p> <p>16 these surveys have demonstrated that the most important</p> <p>17 indicators of this are how they are breathing and</p> <p>18 living, whether or not they are avoiding the frequent</p> <p>19 flare-ups.</p> <p>20 In addition to issues regarding the most</p> <p>21 appropriate outcome, there has been a great deal of</p> <p>22 discussion surrounding the most appropriate length of</p>
Page 195	<p>1 Understandably, the decision to not approve</p> <p>2 either application was met with disappointment in fear</p> <p>3 of what comes next, especially for those with severe</p> <p>4 disease who have few other places to turn for hope.</p> <p>5 For these reasons, the discussions taking</p> <p>6 place here today are critical to the patient community,</p> <p>7 recognizing that the FDA's mission to ensure the safety</p> <p>8 and efficacy of new treatments is of the utmost</p> <p>9 importance.</p> <p>10 We would also like to stress the importance of</p> <p>11 considering the needs, priorities and preferences of</p> <p>12 the patient community as discussions move forward.</p> <p>13 We understand there are questions regarding</p> <p>14 the most appropriate outcome to use as primary and</p> <p>15 secondary endpoints in pivotal clinical trials. The</p> <p>16 most recent examples of inhaled cipro have been</p> <p>17 measured based on whether or not the drug improved the</p> <p>18 time to first exacerbation after the patient started</p> <p>19 the drug. This outcome may not adequately reflect if</p> <p>20 patients truly do and feel better on the new treatment</p> <p>21 as there are many treatments which can influence this</p> <p>22 outcome such as existing off-label antibiotic use,</p>	Page 197	<p>1 clinical trials in non-CF bronchiectasis, with some</p> <p>2 suggesting that trials should be a minimum of 2 years</p> <p>3 or more in an effort to determine if the treatment</p> <p>4 effect is reduced over time or if antibiotic resistance</p> <p>5 becomes a more significant issue.</p> <p>6 In the most recent patient survey, only 22</p> <p>7 percent of patients said they would be willing to</p> <p>8 participate in a trial that involved the chance of</p> <p>9 receiving a placebo medication for 2 years and about 25</p> <p>10 percent of patients indicated they would not</p> <p>11 participate in any trial involving a placebo medication</p> <p>12 regardless of the trial length. About 56 percent of</p> <p>13 patients selected they would be willing to participate</p> <p>14 in a trial with placebo if the trial length was 12</p> <p>15 months or less.</p> <p>16 It is known that non-CF bronchiectasis</p> <p>17 patients who have frequent exacerbations consume heavy</p> <p>18 doses of oral and IV antibiotics. In the survey we</p> <p>19 conducted, patients have recorded between 1 and 12</p> <p>20 exacerbations a year, highlighting the great</p> <p>21 variability in how the disease affects this population.</p> <p>22 Patients described the regular use of antibiotics and</p>

Page 198	Page 200
<p>1 noted many instances where they would need to adjust</p> <p>2 how their exacerbations were treated when they no</p> <p>3 longer responded to some treatments or when they</p> <p>4 experienced severe side effects.</p> <p>5 Reducing overall systemic antibiotic use</p> <p>6 ranked as the third most important outcome in our first</p> <p>7 patient survey. Patients expressed a desire to have an</p> <p>8 inhaled option that can lower the overall amount of</p> <p>9 systemic antibiotics and deliver more targeted</p> <p>10 benefits. They understand that there is a risk of</p> <p>11 developing resistance to any antimicrobial treatment,</p> <p>12 but they also faced the urgency of preventing even one</p> <p>13 more exacerbation, which could sadly turn out to be</p> <p>14 their last.</p> <p>15 We understand that the long-term safety</p> <p>16 profile of potential non-CF bronchiectasis is an</p> <p>17 important consideration. However, given the serious</p> <p>18 unmet need in this population, the patients existing</p> <p>19 use of systemic antibiotics and the danger that is</p> <p>20 posed to patients by participating in a placebo</p> <p>21 controlled trial for long periods of time should also</p> <p>22 be considered as an important factor.</p>	<p>1 because of the unfortunate situation that we don't have</p> <p>2 anything approved for the treatment of non-CF</p> <p>3 bronchiectasis.</p> <p>4 Studies of -- previous studies of inhaled</p> <p>5 antibacterial drugs, which I'll be showing on the next</p> <p>6 couple of slides, have yielded mixed results, and there</p> <p>7 are a lot of uncertainties regarding the duration of</p> <p>8 treatment and the frequency of administration and</p> <p>9 appropriate endpoints for this use. There are no</p> <p>10 animal -- relevant animal models of non-CF</p> <p>11 bronchiectasis to explore dosing regimens, duration of</p> <p>12 therapy or to provide supportive information.</p> <p>13 You'll notice this is just a sampling of some</p> <p>14 of the trials of inhaled antibacterials for non-CF</p> <p>15 bronchiectasis. And what you'll notice here is there</p> <p>16 are a variety of treatment regimens that have been</p> <p>17 studied, there are different endpoints -- primary</p> <p>18 endpoints that have been looked at, and there's -- the</p> <p>19 studies by and large are small studies and there are</p> <p>20 lot of inconsistencies in the treatment effects that</p> <p>21 have been observed.</p> <p>22 In the studies of tobramycin, for instance,</p>
Page 199	Page 201
<p>1 We applaud the FDA for your commitment to</p> <p>2 increasing the use of patient perspectives in your</p> <p>3 decision-making and urge you to strongly consider the</p> <p>4 severity of disease burden and current unmet need as</p> <p>5 conveyed by the community as the agency determines how</p> <p>6 best to move forward.</p> <p>7 We remain committed to working with the FDA as</p> <p>8 you seek to address the immense unmet medical need in</p> <p>9 the non-CF bronchiectasis population and look forward</p> <p>10 to discussing how to better identify and integrate</p> <p>11 patient perspectives in the regulatory review process.</p> <p>12 Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>13 DR. SMITH: Thank you.</p> <p>14 SESSION 2: NON-CF BRONCHIECTASIS:</p> <p>15 CURRENT LANDSCAPE, CHALLENGES AND CASE STUDY</p> <p>16 DR. O'Donnell: So Dr. Smith from the FDA is</p> <p>17 going to address the historical perspective of product</p> <p>18 development in non-CF bronchiectasis.</p> <p>19 NON-CYSTIC FIBROSIS BRONCHIECTASIS: HISTORICAL</p> <p>20 PERSPECTIVE OF PRODUCT DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>21 DR. SMITH: Thank you. You'll notice that</p> <p>22 this talk is only 5 minutes in length and that's</p>	<p>1 you know, there was some decrease in pseudomonas</p> <p>2 sputum, in the sputum at 4 weeks and something that was</p> <p>3 termed improved medical condition, but there were no</p> <p>4 differences in FEV1 percent predicted and more adverse</p> <p>5 events with tobramycin. And the same kind of pattern</p> <p>6 holds true for some of these other antibacterials that</p> <p>7 have been studied.</p> <p>8 We had a workshop 6 years ago that addressed</p> <p>9 issues in the design of clinical trials for non-CF</p> <p>10 bronchiectasis and there was a lot of discussion about</p> <p>11 the patient populations, and again, as we just heard,</p> <p>12 you know, the heterogeneity of the non-CF</p> <p>13 bronchiectasis patient population was discussed in</p> <p>14 terms of the etiologies, in terms of the patient</p> <p>15 presentations and the clinical course of patients.</p> <p>16 There was also discussion about whether the</p> <p>17 objectives of trials and therapies should be to treat</p> <p>18 exacerbations as opposed to prevention of</p> <p>19 exacerbations. There were presentations about disease-</p> <p>20 specific patient-reported outcome measure, The Quality</p> <p>21 of Life-Bronchiectasis measure; discussion about</p> <p>22 pulmonary exacerbations and how to define them and what</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 202</p> <p>1 the best endpoint in terms of evaluating exacerbations 2 would be, and this would include time to exacerbation, 3 frequency of exacerbations or whether there were other 4 analyses that might be more appropriate. 5 The issue of safety has to do with trying to 6 sort out with adverse events whether they are due to a 7 problem with the drug tolerability of inhaled therapy 8 versus progression of disease. And often these adverse 9 events confound the analysis of the primary endpoint in 10 trials that are directed towards preventing 11 exacerbations. 12 We've had two Advisory Committee Meetings in 13 the past year. These were to discuss the ciprofloxacin 14 dry powder for inhalation and ciprofloxacin dispersion 15 for inhalation. These programs were similar in that 16 they were 48-week phase 3 trials of intermittent cycles 17 of inhaled ciprofloxacin and placebo. The primary 18 endpoint for both programs was time to first 19 exacerbation. The secondary endpoints included 20 frequency of exacerbation, patient-reported outcome 21 measures and FEV1 percent predicted. 22 And what you see here -- and those of you who</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 204</p> <p>1 Advisory Committee included that the time to first 2 exacerbation may not be the best primary endpoint and 3 that frequency of exacerbations was clinically more 4 meaningful. They recommended considering additional 5 measures such as the severity of exacerbations, 6 hospitalizations, the need for intravenous therapy, 7 total days of antimicrobial therapy, changes in 8 pulmonary functions and quality of life measures. 9 Regarding the duration of trials, you know, 10 the difficulty with the frequency of exacerbation 11 endpoint is that a 1-year trial may not be of 12 sufficient duration to detect treatment differences. 13 There were recommendations to try to reduce 14 the heterogeneity of the patient population by 15 attempting to standardize adjunctive therapies or to 16 require a minimum number of exacerbations within, say, 17 the previous year for enrollment. 18 And the committee did note that antimicrobial 19 resistance was a major concern that might limit -- you 20 know, in terms of the durability of the treatment 21 effect and limit the utility of the parent drug for 22 more severe infections.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 203</p> <p>1 attended the committee heard this, committee meetings - 2 - for the ciprofloxacin dry powder for inhalation, the 3 primary endpoint was not met for 3 of the 4 test arms. 4 There was a lack of replication of findings across 5 trials and a lack of consistency of findings across 6 endpoints within the same trial. For the ciprofloxacin 7 dispersion for inhalation, there was one failed trial 8 and a lack of clear explanation for discordant findings 9 between the two trials. 10 The issues that were discussed at the Advisory 11 Committee Meetings included the clinical relevance of 12 the observed treatment effects when the risks such as 13 adverse reactions and the development of resistance 14 were considered. There was a discussion about the 15 durability of the efficacy and safety findings over 16 time, which included the development of resistance. 17 And there were concerns that the long-term use of 18 inhaled ciprofloxacin could limit the utility of 19 systemic fluoroquinolones for the treatment of severe 20 exacerbations or pneumonia in non-CF bronchiectasis 21 patients. 22 Some of the comments that we received from the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 205</p> <p>1 So what we'll do for the rest of the 2 afternoon, we're going to have Dr. Tino discuss the 3 state-of-the-art in non-CF bronchiectasis care. We 4 have a presentation from Jasan Zimmerman, who has 5 participated in the last couple of Advisory Committee 6 Meetings from the patient perspective. And then we 7 will have a case study and discussion focusing on 8 patient selection and endpoint considerations. Thank 9 you. 10 DR. O'Donnell: Dr. Tino -- Greg Tino from the 11 University of Pennsylvania will give us an update on 12 the care of patients with bronchiectasis. 13 CARE OF THE BRONCHIECTASIS PATIENT: 14 CURRENT STATE 15 DR. TINO: Thanks, Anne. And I'd like to -- 16 before I start, I like to thank the FDA for bringing 17 this workshop together and for asking me to 18 participate. 19 So my job over the next 30 minutes or so is to 20 give you an overview of the treatment approaches in 21 2018 for our patients with bronchiectasis not related 22 to cystic fibrosis.</p>

Page 206	Page 208
<p>1 Perfect, thank you. These are my disclosures.</p> <p>2 And by way of a brief introduction, bronchiectasis is</p> <p>3 characterized pathologically by airway inflammation and</p> <p>4 permanent bronchial dilatation, and clinically by</p> <p>5 profound respiratory symptoms, including cough and</p> <p>6 chronic sputum production.</p> <p>7 And as been mentioned before, it's a</p> <p>8 heterogeneous entity with multiple etiologies. And</p> <p>9 there is data now both from the United States as well</p> <p>10 as from Europe that its prevalence is increasing year</p> <p>11 to year, especially in the older populations. And</p> <p>12 importantly, the clinical course is punctuated by</p> <p>13 exacerbations, which, as generally defined, are really</p> <p>14 acute respiratory tract infections that require</p> <p>15 systemic or other therapies for resolution.</p> <p>16 And importantly, this is a syndrome that's</p> <p>17 associated with notable impairment of quality of life</p> <p>18 as well as significant mortality and morbidity.</p> <p>19 And this is a slide that illustrates the</p> <p>20 adverse impact of bronchiectasis on overall quality of</p> <p>21 life. So this slide looks at the St. George's</p> <p>22 Respiratory Questionnaire, which is a longstanding and</p>	<p>1 of our time in the clinics, discussing the options to</p> <p>2 do that -- reduce mortality; and finally, to reduce the</p> <p>3 cost of care.</p> <p>4 Now, while it's easy to come up with a list of</p> <p>5 treatments or at least a list of goals of treatment,</p> <p>6 what becomes more challenging in this disease is to</p> <p>7 really establish these particular endpoints as</p> <p>8 endpoints for clinical trial and the assessing of the</p> <p>9 efficacy of treatment modalities on some of these goals</p> <p>10 and some of these endpoints.</p> <p>11 For example, in terms of lung function, it's</p> <p>12 very clear that FEV1 is an important number. The lower</p> <p>13 the FEV1 has been associated with adverse natural</p> <p>14 history and advanced morbidity and mortality and it</p> <p>15 clearly is important one assesses the safety of</p> <p>16 delivery of inhaled drugs. But in general, the FEV1</p> <p>17 does not appear to improve with therapy. So that -- in</p> <p>18 general our aim is to stabilize lung function as</p> <p>19 possible over time.</p> <p>20 Quality of life, we spent some time talking</p> <p>21 about. Unfortunately, there is no fully validated</p> <p>22 method of assessment and we clearly need additional</p>
Page 207	Page 209
<p>1 oft-used quality of life measurement for lung diseases.</p> <p>2 And if you compare bronchiectasis to other more common</p> <p>3 and more devastating or previously thought to be more</p> <p>4 devastating lung diseases like idiopathic pulmonary</p> <p>5 fibrosis, advanced COPD, cystic fibrosis and server</p> <p>6 asthma, you'll see that the impact of this disease on</p> <p>7 the quality of life is akin to what we see in those</p> <p>8 other conditions. And importantly, we'll come back to</p> <p>9 this.</p> <p>10 If you look at the left-hand bar of the slide,</p> <p>11 in those patients who have bronchiectasis who also have</p> <p>12 concurrent chronic pseudomonas infections, and that</p> <p>13 accounts for about 30 percent of our patients, that</p> <p>14 impairment of quality of life is even more profound.</p> <p>15 Now, as a clinician, it's important for me to</p> <p>16 establish the goals of therapy for my patients, and</p> <p>17 this is best done obviously in conjunction and in</p> <p>18 discussion with our patients. So potential goals of</p> <p>19 therapy in bronchiectasis include to control symptoms,</p> <p>20 particularly cough and sputum characteristics; to</p> <p>21 maintain lung function; to improve quality of life; to</p> <p>22 reduce exacerbations -- and this is where we spend lots</p>	<p>1 help in this area.</p> <p>2 Exacerbations, which have been the focus of</p> <p>3 most of our clinical trials, as I'll describe, the</p> <p>4 definition has been difficult to establish. I think</p> <p>5 we've made some progress and I'll present that to you,</p> <p>6 but we've got some other work to do to hone down on the</p> <p>7 definition and then really assess what are those</p> <p>8 endpoints that we need to look at, time to exacerbation</p> <p>9 versus frequency -- and I'll tell you my opinion later</p> <p>10 on. And finally, mortality obviously is difficult to</p> <p>11 study in relatively short-term trials.</p> <p>12 So in terms of pulmonary exacerbations, again</p> <p>13 this has been a bedeviling topic for those of us who do</p> <p>14 work both clinically and in the research arena for</p> <p>15 bronchiectasis.</p> <p>16 What I'd like to show you is a recent</p> <p>17 publication from the European Respiratory Journal,</p> <p>18 which was really the coming together of international</p> <p>19 experts to come up with a consensus definition using</p> <p>20 the Delphi approach to define a pulmonary exacerbation.</p> <p>21 So what we came up with is, and which was</p> <p>22 published in the European Respiratory Journal in 2017,</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 210</p> <p>1 is that the definition of a bronchiectasis pulmonary 2 exacerbation for clinical trials is a person with 3 bronchiectasis who exhibits a deterioration in three or 4 more of the following key symptoms for at least 48 5 hours: cough, sputum volume and/or consistency, sputum 6 purulence, breathlessness and/or exercise intolerance, 7 systemic symptoms like fatigue and/or malaise, and the 8 last is haemoptysis. And importantly, an important 9 part of this definition is that a clinician determines 10 that a change in bronchiectasis treatment is required. 11 So that summarized the current state of 12 therapy of bronchiectasis. Unfortunately, as has been 13 mentioned, there are no approved therapies, and 14 available clinical guidelines regarding management 15 options or really based on low to very low quality of 16 evidence. And the clinical trials for many of the 17 pillars of treatment that I will talk to you about are 18 lacking today. 19 I always like to start with a case 20 presentation, a brief case presentation. This is a 21 patient whose case I've presented in many different 22 forums because I think he illustrates and his course</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 212</p> <p>1 declining. 2 Again, these are the challenges: recurrent 3 exacerbations, chronic gram-negative infection, 4 impairment of quality of life and voluminous sputum 5 production. 6 So when I approached the treatment of 7 bronchiectasis, what I used as a conceptual framework 8 is the viscous cycle framework that was proposed back 9 in the late '80s by Dr. Peter Cole to really simplify 10 the approach of the pathogenesis of bronchiectasis. 11 So the viscous circle or the viscous cycle 12 hypothesis starts with an inciting event, usually an 13 infection in the susceptible person, which leads to 14 neutrophilic inflammation, protease activation and the 15 development of airway destruction, i.e., 16 bronchiectasis, which leads then to abnormal mucus 17 clearance, which sets up the opportunity for chronic -- 18 bacterial colonization and chronic infection. And this 19 viscous cycle of infection and inflammation propagates 20 airway injury. 21 So when I approach the options of therapy, I 22 look at how can we interrupt different parts of the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 211</p> <p>1 illustrates some of the important challenges that our 2 patients face. 3 So this is a 77-year-old gentleman who was 4 actually diagnosed with bronchiectasis at age 12 after 5 developing pneumonia as a young child. This is what 6 his scan looks like, and as you can see, very advanced 7 cystic bronchiectasis involving his entire left lung as 8 well as the right middle lobe. 9 Interestingly, he did well for many years and 10 he was managed with regimens that included rotating 11 systematic antibiotics, which was quite commonly used 12 in previously years, and as well as airway clearance. 13 But the last several years have really not 14 been kind. And I've outlined here and underlined some 15 of the major changes that have impacted him and that 16 characterize many of our patients. He now has a 17 quinolone-resistant chronic pseudomonas aeruginosa 18 infection. He has frequent exacerbations, three to 19 four per year that often require hospitalization and 20 intravenous antibiotics. He produces large volumes of 21 purulent sputum, up to 40 milliliters per day, and he 22 clearly perceives that his quality of life is</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 213</p> <p>1 cycle. So the mainstay of the treatment of 2 bronchiectasis is antimicrobial therapy, both systemic 3 to treat exacerbations -- and we'll talk about inhaled 4 antibiotics -- in a chronic suppressive fashion. Anti- 5 inflammatory or immunomodulatory therapy can be 6 employed. We'll talk about macrolides and a little bit 7 about systemic inhaled corticosteroid therapy. 8 Airway clearance to deal with the sequel (ph) 9 of abnormal mucus clearance is very commonly and should 10 be very commonly applied in these patients. And then 11 for a smaller number of patients, surgery can be 12 applied in certain circumstances, and I'll describe 13 that to you in a little bit. 14 And then finally, when an underlying condition 15 is identified that has caused the bronchiectasis, the 16 treatment of that underlying condition obviously when 17 appropriate is a very important part of the therapeutic 18 approach to these patients. 19 Now, the Bronchiectasis Research Registry of 20 the United States has been instructive in a number of 21 ways. And this is our first publication describing our 22 first look at our registry. And this was a report of</p>

Page 214	<p>1 our first 1,826 patients with a physician-established</p> <p>2 diagnosis of bronchiectasis who were enrolled between</p> <p>3 the years of 2008 and 2014.</p> <p>4 And what I've pulled out from here is really</p> <p>5 to illustrate the variability with which some of the</p> <p>6 therapeutic options are applied across a group of</p> <p>7 centers with expertise in this disease.</p> <p>8 So airway clearance is applied in only half of</p> <p>9 our patients. Antimicrobial drugs are used in about 40</p> <p>10 percent of the time just to treat exacerbations. About</p> <p>11 40 percent of the time antibiotics are used in</p> <p>12 suppressive fashion, 10 percent in aerosol delivery and</p> <p>13 7 percent with rotating oral regimens.</p> <p>14 And then you'll see here inhaled</p> <p>15 bronchodilators, inhaled corticosteroids and systemic</p> <p>16 corticosteroids are applied in a fairly robust group of</p> <p>17 patients in the absence of any data suggesting</p> <p>18 efficacy. So again, we've got treatment options out</p> <p>19 there, but they are applied variably across the</p> <p>20 landscape in this country.</p> <p>21 So let's focus on some of the specific</p> <p>22 measures, and the first is airway clearance. An airway</p>	Page 216	<p>1 sputum rheology. A phase 3 trial was convened and</p> <p>2 accomplished. Unfortunately, there was no significant</p> <p>3 reduction in exacerbation rates, which was the primary</p> <p>4 endpoint. And this is not available for clinical use.</p> <p>5 Hypertonic saline, which is now an established</p> <p>6 modality in cystic fibrosis. Unfortunately, has not</p> <p>7 been studied in large-scale clinical trials. There's</p> <p>8 one small trial that suggested an improvement in sputum</p> <p>9 rheology, an improvement in St. George's Respiratory</p> <p>10 Questionnaire and a decrement in annual antibiotic</p> <p>11 usage. But the quality and the size of this trial</p> <p>12 really, I think prevents clear-cut evidence-based</p> <p>13 application of this in a confident fashion.</p> <p>14 With regard to other pharmacologic agents, I</p> <p>15 just wanted to mention the fact that bronchodilators,</p> <p>16 as I mentioned to you, are commonly used, but there is</p> <p>17 really no long-term randomized controlled trial data to</p> <p>18 suggest efficacy as an airway clearance drug. And the</p> <p>19 use of bronchodilators I think should be restricted to</p> <p>20 those conditions where bronchodilator therapy is</p> <p>21 indicated, including COPD and underlying asthma.</p> <p>22 And I put up mucolytics here and specifically</p>
Page 215	<p>1 clearance refers to a group of techniques that are</p> <p>2 designed to enhance mucociliary clearance. As an</p> <p>3 expert in this field, I think that we will all agree</p> <p>4 that these measures are considered mainstays of</p> <p>5 management of patients with bronchiectasis. And yet</p> <p>6 there's very little data establishing the efficacy of</p> <p>7 airway clearance in general or some of the modalities</p> <p>8 specifically.</p> <p>9 Now, there are a number of modalities that are</p> <p>10 in use, both mechanical and pharmacologic. The</p> <p>11 vibratory PEP devices -- and you can see several of the</p> <p>12 devices that are in use clinically here. And it turns</p> <p>13 out that PEP valve use is most common in our U.S.</p> <p>14 Bronchiectasis Registry. There are also a number of</p> <p>15 what I call higher tech options, including high-</p> <p>16 frequency chest wall oscillators that are in use across</p> <p>17 the United States.</p> <p>18 With regard to pharmacologic agents, there has</p> <p>19 been a focus on hyperosmolar agents, number one,</p> <p>20 inhaled mannitol. As you know, inhaled mannitol is</p> <p>21 bronchoprovocational agent, but in some early studies</p> <p>22 it was found to have a profoundly important impact on</p>	Page 217	<p>1 referring to rh DNase to really remind you that the</p> <p>2 lessons learned for cystic fibrosis cannot always be</p> <p>3 applied across the board to non-CF bronchiectasis. And</p> <p>4 this is a case in point. Rh DNase was studied -- very</p> <p>5 well studied in cystic fibrosis and is now a part of</p> <p>6 the treatment armamentarium. But in a large-scale</p> <p>7 clinical trial that Anne O'Donnel did a number of years</p> <p>8 ago, rh DNase was not only not effective in non-CF</p> <p>9 bronchiectasis, but potentially deleterious. And</p> <p>10 again, we've got to keep that in mind that works in</p> <p>11 cystic fibrosis may not necessarily work in non-cystic</p> <p>12 fibrosis-related bronchiectasis.</p> <p>13 So what's the current state of airway</p> <p>14 clearance? The recommendations are that those patients</p> <p>15 that are targeted should be symptomatic patients with</p> <p>16 chronic cough and sputum production, those who have</p> <p>17 difficulty expectorating sputum, those who have</p> <p>18 impairment of quality of life and frequent acute</p> <p>19 exacerbations.</p> <p>20 You see that this was discussed in the</p> <p>21 recently published European Respiratory Society</p> <p>22 Guidelines. In this group, airway clearance received a</p>

Page 218

1 weak recommendation based on low level of evidence. In
 2 general, and practical terms what we typically
 3 recommend is a modality that will maximize patient
 4 adherence and typically that's one of the PEP valves
 5 and on occasion hypertonic saline.

6 I won't spend a lot of time discussing
 7 systemic antimicrobial therapy for exacerbations. I
 8 just want to make a couple of points. One is that
 9 sputum analysis is critical. This is something we
 10 spend a lot of time teaching our trainees and
 11 collaborating with our community-based physicians.

12 And the bacteriology of bronchiectasis can be
 13 summarized. Here, you'll see that haemophilus
 14 influenza and pseudomonas account for the two most
 15 commonly isolated bugs in these patients, about a third
 16 of the time. And you can see the rest of the
 17 distribution there.

18 But I think you also see on the slide that in
 19 a fairly sizeable group of patients about 20 percent to
 20 25 percent of the time a dominant pathogen is not
 21 identified and it underscores the importance of empiric
 22 antibiotic choice in these patients. And more recently

Page 219

1 our experience from the Bronchiectasis Registry, again,
 2 pseudomonas aeruginosa accounted for 33 percent of the
 3 isolates and staph aureus about 11 percent.

4 So the general principles I wanted to leave
 5 you with is that there are some very challenging
 6 pathogens, including pseudomonas and staph,
 7 particularly MRSA, that in general the empiric
 8 antibiotic choice should be directed at those common
 9 pathogens with adjustment and narrowing of the
 10 antibiotic choice of a specific pathogen as isolated.

11 In terms of the optimal duration, the current
 12 recommendations based on again ERS' guideline is a 14-
 13 day course. This is a conditional recommendation again
 14 based on very low level of evidence. But in general, a
 15 longer course is often utilized, 21 to 28 days, as
 16 dictated by the clinical response.

17 Now, turning to inhaled therapy, inhaled
 18 antibiotic therapy, obviously we've had a lot of
 19 discussions today about its use -- or the use of these
 20 drugs in cystic fibrosis. In non-CF bronchiectasis,
 21 there has been a lot of focus on this, primarily in use
 22 as a chronic suppressive approach to chronic infection

Page 220

1 in patients with bronchiectasis.

2 The focus and the targets of inhaled
 3 antibiotics have been patients who have chronic
 4 infection with gram-negative organisms, particularly
 5 pseudomonas, and those who have frequent exacerbations
 6 with the goal of reducing those exacerbations.

7 And frankly, as I look at the data, I think
 8 that the targeting and the choosing of those targets I
 9 think is well-founded based on some of the things I'm
 10 going to show you in a second.

11 So first is bacterial load. It is very clear
 12 that chronic infection is associated with high
 13 bacterial load and these high bacterial load, high CFUs
 14 lead to risk of future exacerbations, increased risk of
 15 hospitalization for exacerbations and higher and more
 16 profound elevations of markers of lung inflammation.
 17 This was done in a very nice study by Dr. Chalmers back
 18 in 2012. And we know that antibiotics, both systemic
 19 and inhaled, can have a profound impact on markers of
 20 lung inflammation, in reducing colony forming units,
 21 and we hope, in reducing exacerbations and
 22 hospitalizations among other endpoints.

Page 221

1 Now, we spent a couple of minutes talking
 2 about the fact that this is a heterogeneous disease
 3 with many different etiologies, but one of the
 4 developments of the last several years is really a face
 5 shift not so much away from looking at specific
 6 etiologies, but really trying to establish phenotypes.
 7 And a phenotype is really a group of clinical
 8 characteristics that really define a clinical
 9 condition.

10 And in a very elegant paper that was recently
 11 published in the Blue Journal, Dr. Chalmers and his
 12 collaborators really defined and identified a frequent
 13 exacerbator phenotype. This was based on a study of
 14 2,500 patients from 10 sites in Europe and Israel. In
 15 this cohort, about 40 percent of the patients only had
 16 zero or one exacerbation over a period of follow-up,
 17 and 37 percent had three or more on a yearly basis.
 18 And it turns out that prior and frequent exacerbations
 19 were the strongest predictors of future exacerbations.

20 Other independent predictors of this frequent
 21 exacerbated phenotype, including those who had chronic
 22 infection with haemophilus and with pseudomonas, those

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 222</p> <p>1 who had severe diminutions in FEV1, those with 2 multifocal bronchiectasis and radiographically severe 3 bronchiectasis and those who had co-existing COPD. 4 Importantly, frequent exacerbators also had 5 worse quality of life, high disease severity as 6 assessed by the bronchiectasis severity index and 7 increased mortality across the board. 8 I've described to you that gram-negative 9 infections have been the focus of a lot of the work 10 with the use of inhaled antibiotics, but specifically 11 pseudomonas aeruginosa. 12 And this is again data published from Europe 13 that looked at the impact of chronic pseudomonas 14 infection on hospitalization and mortality over a 15 period of several years. And if you look on the left, 16 you can see that people who are chronically infected 17 with pseudomonas have a sevenfold higher risk of 18 hospitalization over the period of follow-up as 19 compared to other pathogens or in comparison to those 20 patients who don't have a dominant pathogen identified. 21 And the same holds true for mortality, with a threefold 22 higher rate of mortality in patients with chronic</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 224</p> <p>1 a robust discussion on resistance and I'm sure this 2 will continue this afternoon. 3 Now, inhaled antibiotics are very commonly 4 used or commonly used as we saw in the U.S. 5 Bronchiectasis Research Registry. But if you look at a 6 deeper dive at our registry, if you look at patients 7 who have frequent exacerbations, again about 30 percent 8 of the patients in the registry have been treated with 9 inhaled antibiotics. And the rest of the data 10 underscores the fact that patients with frequent 11 exacerbations continue to have exacerbations and are 12 predictive of future exacerbations and have a higher 13 rate of hospitalization, as indicated on the slide. 14 Now, there a number of published guidelines 15 about inhaled antibiotics from Spain, from the U.K. and 16 from New Zealand and Australia. I am not going to go 17 through these in detail. But the common theme is that 18 inhaled antibiotics should be considered for patients 19 who have frequent exacerbations -- and we can discuss 20 how we describe the severity or the number of frequency 21 of exacerbations -- and those who have got chronic 22 pseudomonas infections. That's a recurrent theme in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 223</p> <p>1 pseudomonas infections relative to others. 2 But if you look at the second bar in each of 3 the graphs, other gram-negative infections, 4 stentrophomonas, chromobacterium (ph), et cetera, 5 those are bad actors as well, pseudomonas being the 6 baddest actor. But those other gram-negative rods are 7 something that we pay a lot of attention to. 8 And then finally, obviously as we've talked 9 about, inhaled antibiotics have been the standard of 10 care in CF patients and tobramycin and aztreonam have 11 been in clinical use. And the hope had been that we 12 can establish the efficacy of inhaled antibiotics in 13 non-CF bronchiectasis as well. 14 Obviously, there are many attractive features 15 of inhaled antibiotics. They definitely develop high 16 concentration in the airway, reduced systemic 17 absorption is pretty commonly seen, and this leads, we 18 think, to reduced systemic toxicity. And when you're 19 dealing with a group of patients in an older age group, 20 this is a particularly attractive group of pros. There 21 are some cons, obviously, airway side effects, which 22 are well described. And again, we've had the start of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 225</p> <p>1 the application of inhaled antibiotics. 2 Now, the good news is over the last several 3 years we've had a number of clinical trials that have 4 been accomplished and published in the literature, and 5 I think Dr. Smith has already touched on briefly a 6 couple of them and I would like to touch on the ones 7 that are highlighted here. 8 Now, there have been several trials of inhaled 9 tobramycin. You can see the references on my slide. 10 And I will just by the way of summary just say that 11 what has been shown is a profound microbiologic impact 12 on pseudomonas aeruginosa with profound decrements in 13 colony forming units while patients were on inhaled 14 drug, without the obvious emergence of clinically 15 meaningful resistant organisms. There has been 16 improvement in clinical symptoms and quality of life 17 that have been suggested. 18 But unfortunately for a number of reasons the 19 efficacy as either to maintenance therapy, chronic 20 suppressive therapy or in one study where it was looked 21 at for the treatment of acute exacerbation, this has 22 not yet been established and there are clearly adverse</p>

Page 226

1 effects -- what we call airway symptoms, characterized
 2 by cough, dyspnea, bronchospasm -- have been well
 3 described. In many cases, these adverse airway effects
 4 are nuisances and in some patients, it results in
 5 discontinuation of a drug.

6 More recently, the experience with inhaled
 7 colistin -- this was a study published several years
 8 ago -- the experience of 144 patients with chronic
 9 pseudomonas infection who were randomized to get
 10 inhaled colistin versus placebo on a daily basis for up
 11 to 6 months. These folks were enrolled within 21 days
 12 of an acute exacerbation. The primary endpoint in this
 13 trial was time to exacerbation. The secondary endpoint
 14 was time to exacerbation based on adherence, bacterial
 15 density, St. George's Respiratory Questionnaire, as
 16 well as other safety parameters.

17 The primary endpoint in this trial was not met
 18 in the intention-to-treat group, but there were some
 19 signals there: there was a significant reduction in
 20 pseudomonas colony forming units at 4 and 12 weeks,
 21 there was an improvement in the St. George's
 22 Respiratory Questionnaire of about ten and a half

Page 227

1 units, which is thought to be clinically significant;
 2 and the drug was well tolerated.

3 If you look at a subset of patients, in
 4 adhering patients, that is who were found to be able to
 5 take more than 80 percent of their doses, the median
 6 time to exacerbation was increased 168 days in the
 7 colistin group versus 103 days in the placebo group.
 8 And you can see the 'p' value there. The exacerbation
 9 rate was 50 percent in the colistin group and 72
 10 percent in the placebo group. And as a result of this
 11 trial, there's now a convened international,
 12 multinational trial of inhaled colistin in non-CF
 13 bronchiectasis which is ongoing.

14 The RESPIRE 1 and 2 trial and the ORBIT 1 and
 15 2 trials are very well known to this committee and to
 16 this group. These were recently presented. The data
 17 was recently discussed at two Advisory Committee
 18 Meetings, two separate Advisory Meetings.

19 Just to get us on the same page, the RESPIRE 1
 20 and 2 trials were phase 3 double-blinded trials of
 21 twice daily ciprofloxacin DPI either on a 14 or 28 day
 22 on or off regimen for 1 year -- 48 weeks. Patients

Page 228

1 enrolled had greater than two exacerbations in the
 2 preceding 12 months, which was stringently defined;
 3 seven pre-specified pathogens, including pseudomonas.
 4 You can see the FEV1 parameters there. The primary
 5 endpoints were time to first exacerbation and number of
 6 exacerbation events.

7 And the results with regard to the primary
 8 endpoints -- and these were published more recently by
 9 Dr. Aksamit and his colleagues in ERJ -- you can see
 10 that in RESPIRE 1 there was a significant increase in
 11 median time to first exacerbation and a 39 percent
 12 reduction in frequency exacerbations. But this was not
 13 replicated with regard to the primary endpoint in
 14 Respire 2.

15 Then ORBIT 3 and 4, again these were phase 3
 16 identical trials using once daily liposomal
 17 ciprofloxacin, 48 weeks on, with six cycles of 28 days
 18 on and off and then a 28 open-label extension. This
 19 was specifically targeting chronic pseudomonas
 20 infection with at least two exacerbations in the
 21 preceding 12 months. Exacerbations and severity was
 22 defined in the protocol. And you can see the primary

Page 229

1 endpoint was time to first exacerbation. The secondary
 2 endpoint was frequency over a 48-week period.

3 And again, these data have been presented in
 4 abstract form and in the Advisory Committee. And you
 5 can see that in Orbit 4, there was a significant
 6 increase in median time to first exacerbation and a
 7 reduction in frequency of exacerbations that were seen
 8 in the pool data as well. But again, could not be
 9 replicated in ORBIT 3. What was demonstrated was
 10 pretty consistent, that there was a decrement in sputum
 11 density of pseudomonas patients who were on the drug.

12 So what is the current state of affairs in
 13 inhaled antibiotics? Well, there's a clear
 14 microbiologic effect, but unfortunately the clinical
 15 efficacy based on traditionally used endpoints has not
 16 been proven conclusively. There are none that have
 17 currently received approval by regulatory agencies.
 18 And we'll talk about this. But the emergence of
 19 clinically meaningful resistant pathogen has not been
 20 observed thus far in these clinical trials.

21 So where do we stand in terms of target
 22 populations? Typically, it's those who have chronic

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 230</p> <p>1 gram-negative infection, particularly pseudomonas; 2 those who have frequent exacerbations, 2 to 3 year; and 3 who have other therapeutic options optimized, but lots 4 of unanswered questions, including daily versus on or 5 off regimens; and the relationship to chronic 6 macrolides again has not been established. 7 I'm going to turn to chronic macrolide 8 therapy. This is really a very interesting 9 development. The macrolides have myriad of anti- 10 inflammatory and immunomodulatory properties, which 11 really give it scientific plausibility when implied to 12 bronchiectasis. And you can see the list of those 13 anti-inflammatory, immunomodulatory properties. And 14 certainly, there is precedence for use in other airways 15 disease like CF, diffuse panbronchiolitis, post- 16 transplant obliterative bronchiolitis as well as COPD. 17 Now, there have been three large -- relatively 18 large clinical trials that have been performed, and 19 published and this slide summarizes the three trials, 20 EMBRACE, BAT and the BLESS trials. You can see the 21 number of patients enrolled in each of the trial. 22 There were clearly differences in enrollment criteria.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 232</p> <p>1 exacerbations, who will have no underlying cardiac 2 disease and normal electrocardiograms. In general, the 3 recommendations are that we avoid the use of macrolides 4 in patients with known or strongly suspected anti-M 5 infection. This becomes particularly problematic if 6 you practice in Southeastern Pennsylvania, where we see 7 lots of nontuberculous mycobacterial infections. And 8 the duration of therapy has not been established beyond 9 what we've seen in clinical trials. 10 I'm going to skip this slide for the sake of 11 time. Now, I just like to spend some time telling you 12 what's not recommended. One of those is inhaled 13 corticosteroid therapy. One would think that this is 14 an inflammatory airways disease so there may be some 15 role for inhaled corticosteroids. Well, there is 16 really no convincing data to support the routine use of 17 inhaled corticosteroids in patients with bronchiectasis 18 and there is some recent publication suggesting a 19 possible increased risk of nontuberculous mycobacterial 20 infection in patients with bronchiectasis treated with 21 inhaled corticosteroids. 22 I alluded to the fact that my patient had</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 231</p> <p>1 One study focused on those who had at least one 2 exacerbation in the past year and one on more than 3 three exacerbations. Two of the studies uses 4 azithromycin; one used erythromycin. And you can see 5 the endpoints that were looked at in the different 6 trials. 7 But suffice it to say that all three trials, 8 all three studies which were published in high-quality 9 journals reported significant decrement in 10 exacerbations in patients with non-CF bronchiectasis. 11 Now, of course there are concerns about the 12 longer use of macrolides, concerns about the 13 development of bacterial resistance for commensal 14 organisms in the respiratory tract, a concern about the 15 potential for macrolide resistance in patients who have 16 concurrent nontuberculous mycobacterial infection. 17 There's well-described cardiac risk, specifically in 18 those who have cardiac comorbidities, and obviously 19 other adverse effects, including GI tract symptoms and 20 ototoxicity in the long term. 21 So the current state of affairs and where we 22 target macrolides is patients who have frequent</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 233</p> <p>1 received rotating systemic antibiotics. And in 2 general, as of now there is no evidence-based data to 3 support the use of systemic non-macrolide suppressive 4 or maintenance therapy. And again, in terms of chronic 5 systemic corticosteroids, there is no mandate to use 6 those on routine basis, except to supply it for 7 specific populations, for example, for those with 8 allergic bronchopulmonary aspergillosis. 9 I mentioned surgery as an option. Again, this 10 is really applied in the minority of patients and the 11 current state of affairs is that this is an option for 12 patients who have got localized bronchiectasis who have 13 frequent exacerbations despite medical therapy. It has 14 been used successfully as adjunct to medical therapy 15 for those with anti-M infection and occasionally is 16 necessary in patients with refractory and massive 17 hemoptysis. 18 Now, there are no trials comparing medical 19 therapy to surgical therapy in these patients, but 20 those surgical trails that have been published have 21 shown that in fact that surgery in patients with 22 bronchiectasis in that target population can be</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 234</p> <p>1 performed with acceptable morbidity and low mortality.</p> <p>2 Obviously, other supportive measures, specific</p> <p>3 therapy when appropriate, systemic corticosteroid</p> <p>4 therapy for allergic bronchopulmonary aspergillosis,</p> <p>5 immunoglobulin replacement therapy for</p> <p>6 immunodeficiency, et cetera, are a very, very important</p> <p>7 part of what we do.</p> <p>8 We will use some short-course systemic</p> <p>9 steroids for some exacerbations that are associated</p> <p>10 with significant bronchospasm, aerobic exercise and</p> <p>11 pulmonary rehabilitation, supplemental oxygen in those</p> <p>12 who require it and lung transplant can be performed</p> <p>13 successfully. So the treatment of bronchiectasis again</p> <p>14 includes some of the stuff we talked about, but</p> <p>15 supportive measures are of particular importance.</p> <p>16 I'm going to skip this as well. So at the</p> <p>17 risk of sounding self-serving, this is an editorial</p> <p>18 that I wrote in conjunction to Dr. Chalmers' paper</p> <p>19 about frequent exacerbations and this I think</p> <p>20 summarizes the state of affairs in bronchiectasis. And</p> <p>21 the sobering reality is that our patients with</p> <p>22 bronchiectasis suffer significant mortality and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 236</p> <p>1 the next few minutes -- and importantly, to identify</p> <p>2 new targets for treatment.</p> <p>3 So I thank you very much for your attention.</p> <p>4 Again, look forward to our discussion and the panel</p> <p>5 discussion.</p> <p>6 DR. O'DONNELL: Okay, thanks, Greg, for that</p> <p>7 talk. And next is -- we want to hear the patient</p> <p>8 perspective. The patient speaker is Jasan Zimmerman,</p> <p>9 who is going to present the perspective of a patient</p> <p>10 with bronchiectasis.</p> <p>11 PATIENT SPEAKER/PATIENT PERSPECTIVE</p> <p>12 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Thank you to the FDA for</p> <p>13 inviting me and thank you to Dr. Tino for that great</p> <p>14 overview. Thank you to everyone who is participating</p> <p>15 today and thank you to the audience for watching, those</p> <p>16 who are in the room and those who are online,</p> <p>17 especially my wife and my parents.</p> <p>18 I want to preface this by saying I'm only one</p> <p>19 person, and as we've learned today, this disease is so</p> <p>20 varied and variable that you're getting my perspective</p> <p>21 and hopefully some perspectives of other things that</p> <p>22 I've learned, but it's ultimately only my perspective.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 235</p> <p>1 morbidity and yet can be offered few proven effective</p> <p>2 therapies. And ultimately, we need better</p> <p>3 characterization of our patients; more high-quality</p> <p>4 clinical trials to further define this entity; and most</p> <p>5 crucially, better therapies, antimicrobial or</p> <p>6 otherwise; and the process of adoption of this orphan</p> <p>7 disease by clinicians and researchers needs to be</p> <p>8 accelerated.</p> <p>9 But where there are challenges, there are</p> <p>10 opportunities and we as a community of physicians and</p> <p>11 researchers and patients have the opportunity to better</p> <p>12 characterize the epidemiology and natural history of</p> <p>13 this disease, to strengthen and support for and expand</p> <p>14 patient registries. We've seen the results from the</p> <p>15 European Respiratory Society and from the European</p> <p>16 Bronchiectasis Registry, EMBARC, as well as our United</p> <p>17 States bronchiectasis registry. We're making major</p> <p>18 inroads in establishing some of the epidemiologic and</p> <p>19 natural history characteristic.</p> <p>20 Again, we need to rethink endpoints for</p> <p>21 clinical trials and address some of the regulatory</p> <p>22 challenges -- and I look forward to our discussion in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 237</p> <p>1 I really appreciated Mary's sports and balls</p> <p>2 analogy. I thought that was great. Some days I'm a</p> <p>3 baseball, some days I may be a tennis ball, some days I</p> <p>4 may be a shot put, and it just depends on how I feel</p> <p>5 that day and it's really indicative of the variability</p> <p>6 of the disease.</p> <p>7 I've had lung issues my whole life. When I</p> <p>8 was really young, I was diagnosed with asthma,</p> <p>9 constantly wheezing, having asthma attacks. In 1984,</p> <p>10 when I was 8 years old, I had a partial lower left</p> <p>11 lobectomy. That part of the lung was filled with</p> <p>12 abscesses. No bacteria or viruses were cultured, but</p> <p>13 it was some kind of an infection.</p> <p>14 So I dealt with that growing up. And then, in</p> <p>15 2011, I had pneumonia on the right side -- in the right</p> <p>16 lung. I will go into that a little bit more, but</p> <p>17 that's when my bronchiectasis was diagnosed. I was 35-</p> <p>18 years-old. I have a pretty big spot of bronchiectasis</p> <p>19 on the right side and I have areas of consolidation</p> <p>20 throughout the rest of the -- both of my lungs.</p> <p>21 In 2013, I was diagnosed with allergic</p> <p>22 bronchopulmonary aspergillosis. Maybe that contributed</p>

Page 238

1 to the bronchiectasis, who knows? I think it's again
 2 indicative of the different paths to the disease.
 3 My concerns are varied and many. I always get
 4 nervous when I'm around sick people. Lots of people
 5 come to work sick and I hear them coughing and hacking
 6 and that makes me nervous to get sick myself.
 7 Travelling is always difficult. You're trapped in a
 8 plane -- yesterday my flight from SFO was about 5
 9 hours, trapped in a plane with who knows, what kind of
 10 sick people or not.
 11 I'm also concerned about my lung function and
 12 exacerbations: Am I going to be able to continue my
 13 life as I live it now without making many lifestyle
 14 changes? Can I still ride my bike to work? Can I
 15 still exercise?
 16 And like I mentioned, pneumonia is a big
 17 concern for me. I have a long history of pneumonia as
 18 well. Growing up as a kid, I had it several times.
 19 And then when I went to college, I began this period of
 20 getting pneumonia when I was very stressed and highly
 21 anxious, lack of sleep, lack of exercise, probably poor
 22 eating as well.

Page 239

1 So I got -- the first time I was diagnosed
 2 with pneumonia right before spring break of my freshman
 3 year in college and then during spring break of my
 4 first year at grad school. And then I took some time
 5 off and went back to school. And during my second grad
 6 school time, I was diagnosed again with pneumonia in
 7 the summer between the 2 years.
 8 That was the worst one. I was in the hospital
 9 for 6 days. I was off work on short-term disability
 10 for about 3 months, on oral antibiotics for 2 months.
 11 And that really underscored for me the importance of
 12 keeping my lungs healthy and also showed me how
 13 terrible pneumonia was and how I don't want to have
 14 that again. So that's always in the back of my mind,
 15 that fear.
 16 I'm also concerned about antibiotic resistance
 17 and side effects. I've been on and off antibiotics for
 18 my whole life. And as we heard from Amy about her
 19 stepmom, those are some systemic issues that can occur.
 20 What's going to happen to me as I grow up or as I get
 21 older? Will I have systemic effects? Am I at a higher
 22 risk for resistance and virulence? I've had

Page 240

1 pseudomonas infections in my sinuses, is that something
 2 I should worry about with my lungs?
 3 So the physical stuff is difficult to deal
 4 with, but I think by far the most difficult for me is
 5 the psychological issues and worry and anxiety. I
 6 don't want to get sick and I worry about not wanting to
 7 get sick. And I hear from other bronchiectasis
 8 patients. It's great especially in this forum and at
 9 the last couple of advisory panels. It's really
 10 awesome to hear their stories and hear how they're
 11 trying to change what's going on. It's also very
 12 sobering for me because I can see what the disease
 13 progression is like and that makes me worry a little
 14 bit more as well.
 15 I spoke with my pulmonologist last week to
 16 kind of get a better sense and make sure that I had all
 17 my dates right for my disease progression. So a big
 18 thanks to Dr. Judy Wong at the Palo Alto Medical
 19 Foundation. I asked her what kind of bronchiectasis
 20 patients she had and she said she has lot of
 21 bronchiectasis patients, and they're also concerned
 22 with the number of exacerbations and long-term

Page 241

1 antibiotic use, as we've heard a lot of that today.
 2 Many of her patients -- I asked her what some
 3 of the really big issues were. And she said many of
 4 her patients just let their flareups of bronchitis or
 5 some other lung infection go and they don't seek
 6 immediate treatment. And then she sees more
 7 bronchiectasis, as we saw with Dr. Tino's vicious
 8 cycle.
 9 So that just underscores for me that I really
 10 need to make sure that once I start feeling bad, I go
 11 see her and try to figure out how to take care of it.
 12 Dr. Wong also mentioned that CF patients are
 13 used to being patients -- like Chip mentioned to me
 14 that he was diagnosed with CF at age 3 and so he's been
 15 a patient for his whole life and I don't think all non-
 16 CF bronchiectasis patients are like that, especially
 17 with the late onset. So there has to be a lot of
 18 education for these patients so that people know the
 19 importance of immediate treatment and not letting stuff
 20 go.
 21 CF bronchiectasis just has the one path and
 22 non-CF bronchiectasis can come from various different

Page 242	Page 244
<p>1 diseases or other things that we've heard about today.</p> <p>2 So it's so much more difficult to treat, as we've been</p> <p>3 hearing all day.</p> <p>4 I was lucky enough to participate on the last</p> <p>5 two Advisory Committee panels for Bayer and for Aradigm</p> <p>6 and I actually advocated for longer clinical trials to</p> <p>7 address the antibiotic resistance.</p> <p>8 I had a conversation with Amy Leitman, who we</p> <p>9 heard from earlier today from NTM Info and Research,</p> <p>10 and Jamie Sullivan from the COPD Foundation, and they</p> <p>11 really changed my mind. And hearing everything today</p> <p>12 this morning and this afternoon, that really reinforced</p> <p>13 that my mind has been changed.</p> <p>14 I hadn't taken into account the people that</p> <p>15 had been given placebos -- and Dr. Nichols touched on</p> <p>16 this, Chip touched on this, so did Cara and Amy. Can</p> <p>17 they survive being off of their regular treatment for</p> <p>18 that long? Is that fair to them? Is it ethical?</p> <p>19 They'll still have the standard of care available for a</p> <p>20 flareup or whatever, but is that really a good idea?</p> <p>21 So that made me change my mind and made me</p> <p>22 think -- like Dr. Tino mentioned, we need to rethink</p>	<p>1 professionals here have "consultant" for this drug</p> <p>2 company, "on the advisory board" for this drug company.</p> <p>3 Chip and I don't have those disclosures. Why aren't</p> <p>4 patients involved in those kinds of things? Why aren't</p> <p>5 patients on advisory boards? Why aren't patients</p> <p>6 consultants to help design these drug trials?</p> <p>7 There's lots of discussion today about trial</p> <p>8 design and the drug development process and we haven't</p> <p>9 heard anything about patient input in either of those.</p> <p>10 We need more diverse patients to be involved in</p> <p>11 clinical trial design. Diverse meaning ages,</p> <p>12 socioeconomic status, races, locations, a balance</p> <p>13 between men and women. And we need that with the</p> <p>14 industry partners as well as the FDA.</p> <p>15 It would be great to have more validated</p> <p>16 patient-reported outcomes and quality of life surveys</p> <p>17 to be developed by the FDA. They can do that in</p> <p>18 conjunction with patient representatives and with</p> <p>19 community-based organizations.</p> <p>20 The patients are the experts. They know when</p> <p>21 they feel good on a drug and they know when they don't</p> <p>22 feel good when they're either on a drug or not on a</p>
Page 243	Page 245
<p>1 the endpoints for clinical trials so that they're much</p> <p>2 more relevant for patients. Can we use maybe some CF</p> <p>3 endpoints or translate them into non-CF bronchiectasis?</p> <p>4 Cara mentioned the survey of nearly 300</p> <p>5 bronchiectasis patients and that lung function and the</p> <p>6 number of exacerbations each year ranked as the top 2</p> <p>7 concerns. And those are very similar to my concerns as</p> <p>8 well.</p> <p>9 So it's obvious to me the quality of life of</p> <p>10 patients must be taken into account when we're</p> <p>11 designing these trials. Do people feel better when</p> <p>12 they're taking the drug and do they feel worse when</p> <p>13 they're not taking the drug? Are the existing quality</p> <p>14 of life surveys adequate for capturing how people feel?</p> <p>15 Are they adequate enough to be used as an endpoint?</p> <p>16 Well, let's figure this out, I think like Mary</p> <p>17 mentioned as well.</p> <p>18 I like to also leave you with some calls to</p> <p>19 action. It's obvious that we need more non-CF</p> <p>20 bronchiectasis research and clinical trials.</p> <p>21 And I'm struck by the number of disclosures</p> <p>22 that were in the agenda. All of the medical</p>	<p>1 drug, and that has to be taken into account in these</p> <p>2 trials. The patient-reported outcomes should be</p> <p>3 included in every trial so that we can determine the</p> <p>4 effectiveness of the trial.</p> <p>5 It will be great to have more of the pulmonary</p> <p>6 division of the FDA involved. I know we have one</p> <p>7 person here. And I'd like for them to be involved in</p> <p>8 the clinical trial design as well and not just the</p> <p>9 antimicrobial group.</p> <p>10 We talked about pharmacovigilance earlier.</p> <p>11 That will be great to have that to take into account</p> <p>12 antibiotic resistance and virulence after the drug is</p> <p>13 approved and other side effects, not just for</p> <p>14 antibiotic resistance. But people could be on these</p> <p>15 drugs for decades. So we need to follow them and make</p> <p>16 sure that everything is safe.</p> <p>17 I want to thank Bayer and Aradigm for</p> <p>18 participating in these conversations and for trying to</p> <p>19 get these drugs approved. Please continue to develop</p> <p>20 these inhaled treatments so that we can get these drugs</p> <p>21 approved with patient input of course and get them into</p> <p>22 the hands of the people who need the most, and like</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 246</p> <p>1 Chip said, make sure there are choices for patients 2 like me. Thank you very much. 3 DR. O'DONNELL: Thank you. Thank you, Jasan, 4 very much. Got a lot to think about. So we're going 5 to take a break till 2:30. So we'll reconvene at 2:30. 6 Thank you. 7 BREAK 8 CASE STUDY ON DEVELOPING AN INHALATIONAL THERAPY 9 FOR NON-CYSTIC FIBROSIS BRONCHIECTASIS 10 DR. SMITH: We're going to start with a case 11 study that's going to be a two part case study for 12 developing inhalational therapies for non-CF 13 bronchiectasis. First part will be about patient 14 selection and trial duration and the second will be 15 endpoint considerations. First up will be Peter Kim 16 from FDA. 17 PART I: PATIENT SELECTION AND TRIAL DURATION 18 DR. KIM: Good afternoon. I'll be presenting 19 the first part of this case study on developing an 20 inhalational therapy for non-cystic fibrosis 21 bronchiectasis. 22 So company A wants to develop drug Y to reduce</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 248</p> <p>1 patients with the following, such as a history of 2 nontuberculous mycobacteria pulmonary infections and 3 also patients with allergic bronchopulmonary 4 aspergillosis. 5 They also know the patients -- these patients 6 can be on a number of concomitant adjunctive therapies, 7 and some may require maintenance systemaic 8 corticosteroids. Should they include these patients in 9 the studies or no? 10 So as far as selecting the patient population 11 most likely to show a treatment benefit, they want to 12 enroll patients with multiple exacerbations in the 13 prior year. However, they also know that patients 14 enrolled in previous trials tended to have fewer 15 exacerbations during the trials than in the prior year. 16 Should they only include patients who required 17 hospitalization during one or more of these prior 18 exacerbations? And what criteria should they use to 19 define a prior exacerbation? Should they only enroll 20 those patients who are on concomitant macrolide therapy 21 or should they stratify enrolment based on macrolide 22 therapy? Should they only include patients with multi-</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 247</p> <p>1 the incidents of exacerbations due to bacterial 2 pathogens in patients with non-CF bronchiectasis. They 3 are trying to identify a patient population that's most 4 likely to demonstrate a treatment benefit in their 5 trials. But they are aware of a number of issues: no 6 anti-bacterial drugs are currently approved to reduce 7 the incidents of exacerbations due to bacterial 8 pathogens in patients with non-CF bronchiectasis, 9 previous trials of inhaled anti-bacterial drugs have 10 failed to demonstrate benefit over a current standard 11 of care, and there are uncertainties regarding an 12 appropriate trial design. 13 They know that non-CF bronchiectasis patients 14 are a heterogeneous population with different 15 etiologies for their disease; severity of illness and 16 comorbid conditions in these patients vary; and the 17 incidents of exacerbations may vary even within an 18 individual patient over time by season and potentially 19 by region of the world. 20 And there are additional factors. A variety 21 of microorganisms may cause exacerbations, not just 22 bacteria. And they're wondering how to deal with</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 249</p> <p>1 lobar involvement? Are there other demographic or 2 disease-related factors? And then also what patient 3 characteristics or comorbidities should lead to trial 4 exclusion? 5 Additionally, they're thinking about the 6 duration of the phase 3 trials. They note that prior 7 phase 3 trials lasting a year may not have been long 8 enough to adequately assess whether the new study 9 therapy reduced the frequency of exacerbations to a 10 clinically meaningful extent and whether the treatment 11 effect will be durable beyond a year. But they also 12 know the practical considerations of conducting trials 13 longer than a year: cost, and also that it may not be 14 ethical for patients to stay on placebo for a period of 15 2 or more years. 16 Another option could be to consider a study 17 which includes an open-label extension period to 18 address ethical issues relating to the extended use of 19 placebo. However, they're also aware that such a trial 20 design would not be as informative as a randomized 21 trial with a 2 year evaluation period. Additionally, 22 potentially longer trials could assess for additional</p>

Page 250	Page 252
<p>1 safety issues with chronic use and the developmental of 2 bacterial resistance. 3 So the questions to the panel: one, how would 4 you advise company A to enrich their trials for 5 subjects most likely to demonstrate a treatment 6 benefit? And two, what is an appropriate duration for 7 the phase 3 trials? Thank you. 8 DR. SMITH: Thank you, Peter. Next will be 9 LaRee Tracy from FDA to discuss endpoint 10 considerations. 11 PART II: ENDPOINT CONSIDERATIONS 12 DR. TRACY: Okay. Hello. So the good news is 13 this is the last presentation. The bad news is it's 14 given by myself and I'm a statistician, so I will 15 perhaps lose a few of you in a few of my slides, but 16 please bear with me. 17 So thanks to the organizers for having this 18 interesting workshop and I also wanted to just thank 19 the patients for coming and providing their 20 perspective. That takes a lot of courage and it's 21 always helpful from my point of view to hear your story 22 in trying to understand how to design these trials. So</p>	<p>1 evaluated, will be given or taken chronically over 2 perhaps decades. So that then leads the need for 3 rigorous evaluation of this treatment over a sufficient 4 length of time, which is Dr. Kim just outlined. We'll 5 discuss that in a few moments. 6 There's been some discussion about the use of 7 the time to first exacerbation endpoint. This has been 8 -- this served as the primary endpoint in several 9 previous clinical trials for this indication. It's a 10 relatively parsimonious endpoint, I mean, relative to 11 other endpoints because it's an easy one to analyze. 12 Essentially, we're looking at the first event and only 13 the first event and how long it takes to get there. 14 However, as we all have discussed and 15 understand, it ignores all the subsequent events that 16 occur after that first event. And for a chronic 17 disease such as non-cystic fibrosis bronchiectasis, we 18 are interested in what's happening in the course of 19 that patient's life with that disease. 20 Therefore, this endpoint is often -- can be 21 often easily misinterpreted. For example, a delay 22 observed in the initial exacerbation in one arm versus</p>
Page 251	Page 253
<p>1 thank you. 2 So as has been discussed throughout today, the 3 considerations for trial designing endpoints specific 4 to non-cystic fibrosis bronchiectasis really have to be 5 superiority trials because there is no approved or 6 current standard of care for treating this patient 7 population. And as has also been discussed and nicely 8 outlined in Dr. Tino's presentation is that the key 9 goal in management of this disease is the reduction of 10 pulmonary exacerbations, because those are the major 11 driver for complications, increased healthcare cost, 12 decreased quality of life and significant morbidity. 13 So then that leads us to: What's the overall 14 trial objective for a future clinical trial for non- 15 cystic fibrosis bronchiectasis? There's just a few 16 thoughts here. We'll discuss in our panel discussion. 17 It would perhaps include reduction of exacerbations or 18 would it be reduction in hospitalizations, however 19 that's defined? Or could it be decreased time on 20 antibacterials or a combination thereof or something 21 else? 22 But clearly given that whatever product is</p>	<p>1 another in a treatment -- a clinical trial may be 2 followed by more or -- more exacerbations or more -- 3 severe exacerbations, but aren't captured in that 4 endpoint. 5 And then finally, despite the fact this 6 endpoint has been used and it's relatively easy to use, 7 the results from prior clinical trials have been rather 8 inconsistent and there's no evidence at the current 9 time that time to first exacerbation predicts long-term 10 clinical outcome for this patient population. 11 So now I want to just talk a bit about 12 considerations for other clinical endpoints in future 13 clinical trials for non-cystic fibrosis bronchiectasis. 14 And the first being one of total pulmonary 15 exacerbations during the trial; total comprising first 16 and recurrent events. This is often described as the 17 frequency endpoint. 18 Another endpoint for discussion or 19 consideration would be the clinical severity of 20 exacerbations, which of course would need to be 21 defined, but could be perhaps the duration of 22 exacerbations, average duration of exacerbations that</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 254</p> <p>1 is. It could be the average duration of 2 hospitalizations for exacerbations or days on IV 3 therapy or a combination of those endpoints. 4 So then you could imagine perhaps taking the 5 total pulmonary exacerbations endpoint along with the 6 clinical severity of exacerbations, however defined, 7 and creating a co-primary endpoint, which I'll discuss 8 a little bit more in a moment. 9 Now, with respect to the frequency of 10 exacerbations endpoint, there's some considerations I 11 want to highlight. So in some cases, pulmonary 12 exacerbations are less frequent, but more severe and 13 prolonged, and this endpoint doesn't capture that. Nor 14 does this endpoint capture the patients at risk time, 15 such that while a patient is experiencing an 16 exacerbation, he or she is not presently at risk for 17 experiencing another one. 18 And in addition, investigators may have 19 varying opinions as to when an exacerbation has ended 20 as well as its severity. However, I would submit that 21 that could be addressed to some degree in the protocol 22 design.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 256</p> <p>1 events, which is defined as the gap time, but that's 2 not really that relevant right now. It analyses that 3 in an independent way. These models can also include 4 time-varying covariates to account for correlations. 5 And the beauty of that is we could model how an 6 exacerbation is treated during the trial as a time- 7 varying covariate in our models. 8 It assumes, however, though that the events 9 are of the same type and the same nature and it assumes 10 a proportionality. So that can be a false assumption 11 potentially for this disease. 12 And then the focus and the purpose of the use 13 of this is when we're interested in the overall effect 14 on the intensity of the occurrence of a recurrent 15 event. 16 So a similar approach is that by Prentice, 17 Williams and Peterson, which is essentially a modified 18 Andersen-Gill, which analyses gap times using 19 conditional risk sets, but it doesn't assume any 20 baseline hazard assumptions. And it's used when we're 21 interested in if the occurrence of the first event 22 increases the likelihood of a recurrent event; that is</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 255</p> <p>1 So when analyzing the frequency of 2 exacerbations endpoint, which we've done in the past as 3 a count, the strength of this approach is that it 4 captures all exacerbations. And when modeled, you can 5 incorporate other characteristics and factors and it 6 generates an estimate of the mean. 7 However, as I said, the weakness of this 8 endpoint is it doesn't capture the patients at risk 9 time. It also fails to account for correlation between 10 or among events for the same subject. 11 So now I want to just discuss another way we 12 can think about analyzing or capturing the course of 13 the patient's experience during a clinical trial, which 14 would essentially be done under the auspices of a 15 recurrent time-to-event approach. 16 This is essentially a modified Cox 17 proportional-hazards model. It generates an estimate of 18 the risk of recurrent events. And this isn't a new 19 approach. It's been -- these approaches have existed 20 for quite some time. And two prevailing approaches 21 exist that could be considered. The first is called 22 the Andersen-Gill model, which analyses time between</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 257</p> <p>1 risk of a future PE if it's impacted by the prior PE. 2 So both of those approaches could be considered in the 3 design or the analysis of an endpoint in a future 4 clinical trial. 5 And then really briefly I want to discuss the 6 consideration for a co-primary endpoint which would 7 incorporate both total pulmonary exacerbations as well 8 as severity of exacerbations, however that's defined. 9 Of course, the beauty of this is it would capture two 10 important clinical endpoints. Of course, the challenge 11 or the thought would need to go into the necessary 12 sample size to power on both of those endpoints. 13 However, if it's true -- and I think that the 14 epidemiologic data are still needed -- but if it is 15 true that the prevalence of this disease is increasing 16 and it's likely driven by the increasing age in our 17 population, then potentially there are adequate number 18 of patients to study. 19 And then finally, I want just to discuss 20 pulmonary function and the quality of life measures 21 because those have been discussed a lot and it is 22 important to mention them in the context of non-cystic</p>

Page 258	Page 260
<p>1 fibrosis bronchiectasis because they haven't been 2 ignored endpoints. However, they have not been highly 3 sensitive endpoints.</p> <p>4 Throughout the prior development for other 5 products that endpoints have been explored for quality 6 of life, either the quality of life B or the SGRQ, and 7 neither of those PROs was sensitive enough, didn't show 8 a statistically significant effect.</p> <p>9 And specific to the ORBIT trials, as one of 10 the patient speakers earlier mentioned, that endpoint 11 was evaluated at week 48. However, that endpoint or 12 that data were also looked at over time in those trials 13 and did not show an effect.</p> <p>14 And with respect to pulmonary function, the 15 same story unfortunately exists, that is there's no -- 16 has not been a difference observed on pulmonary 17 function, a change in pulmonary function from baseline 18 among the ORBIT trials and the RESPIRE trials.</p> <p>19 So then I just leave you now with our 20 questions. The first being -- the first two were 21 already highlighted by Dr. Kim. So then the questions 22 that I have with respect to the endpoints are for us to</p>	<p>1 and ask why did we -- why did we not see consistent 2 treatment effects. I mean, one of the striking 3 findings there was in the RESPIRE 2 study, 68 percent 4 of patients didn't have any events during the trial. 5 So regardless of any other aspect of your trial design, 6 if the study is underpowered, we won't able to 7 demonstrate an effect.</p> <p>8 So the first thing should be how do we enrich 9 for patient -- if we're going to have an exacerbation 10 endpoint, which I think we've all agreed that a 11 preconceived exacerbation endpoint is either the 12 primary or a co-primary, how do we increase the number 13 of events?</p> <p>14 And Greg showed a slide with one of the recent 15 studies that suggest that patients that have two 16 exacerbations are quite an inconsistent group. So some 17 of them will have future events. Some of them have no 18 events in the following year. Once you raise the bar 19 to three or four, you see a much more consistent 20 phenotype of patients that will always have events. 21 That's been demonstrated in CF, it's been demonstrated 22 in COPD, and it's been demonstrated now in several</p>
Page 259	Page 261
<p>1 discuss the importance of the non-time to first 2 exacerbation endpoints. So I think it's pretty well 3 thought that time to first exacerbation isn't enough.</p> <p>4 And the next question is or point for 5 discussion is: Is a co-primary endpoint of total 6 exacerbations and severity of exacerbations clinically 7 meaningful? And the last is: What other endpoints 8 should we consider? Thank you.</p> <p>9 MODERATED PANEL DISCUSSION (WITH AUDIENCE Q&A)</p> <p>10 DR. O'DONNELL: Great. Thank you very much. 11 So we'll go through these questions, just as Patrick 12 did, sort of one by one. I do want to say how I think 13 it's really great that we have the CF and non-CF 14 community here together, because I think we in the non- 15 CF world have, you know, frequently lamented the fact 16 that our studies that have been modeled after CF trials 17 haven't worked very well. So we need some advice here.</p> <p>18 So let's start. How can we enrich the trials 19 to demonstrate a treatment effect? I think, James, do 20 you have a comment there?</p> <p>21 DR. CHALMERS: I mean, I think the first thing 22 is to look at the trials that have just been completed</p>	<p>1 studies in bronchiectasis.</p> <p>2 So I think a starting point would be to say we 3 need more patients with more exacerbations. And then 4 there are additional factors like limiting just to 5 pseudomonas seems to increase the likelihood of events 6 because those patients are more at risk of 7 exacerbation. So as a starting point, we need to think 8 about how do we get more events in order to have trials 9 that give positive results.</p> <p>10 DR. O'DONNELL: Yes. Susan.</p> <p>11 DR. ELLENBERG: So with regard to the comment 12 before that, "taking in people who had multiple 13 exacerbations in their previous history always had 14 fewer when you actually did the trial," that's always 15 to be expected. I mean, that's the standard regression 16 to the mean problem.</p> <p>17 But as was just said, still people who had 18 more exacerbation -- even if they have less in the 19 first year after than they had in the year before, 20 they're still probably going to have more than people 21 who had fewer exacerbations in their history. So that 22 shouldn't worry people that, you know, that they had</p>

Page 262

1 fewer in the trial than they did before.

2 DR. O'DONNELL: Jeff.

3 DR. ALDER: For the first question, I would

4 advise the company first to figure out what the medical

5 benefit is. And we've fixated on exacerbations during

6 some of our rehearsals. A big critique that came is:

7 "You're not measuring what patients complain about."

8 You're on a 365-day a year disease; a therapy

9 that's cyclic, on off. And yet we're trying to boil

10 this down to an event that happens maybe once a year

11 and the time or the frequency of that. And that seems

12 like it's a very dull instrument and we're losing a lot

13 of data.

14 And as one example, in one of our PROs, we

15 measured at the end of on and off cycles with the SGRQ.

16 And we found, lo and behold, the differential is

17 greatest at the end of on cycle. And by the time we

18 get to the end of an off cycle, there's virtually no

19 difference. So sure at 48 weeks there's no difference

20 in the PRO scores, but if you totaled up all the

21 differences they're enormous during the trial, but not

22 at the beginning and end.

Page 263

1 So I feel that exacerbations may not be the

2 way to go. It's too infrequent. And I don't care if

3 you start with two or three or what. You're going to

4 get fewer than you think. And it's really not

5 capturing the nature. It's trying to make a chronic

6 disease fit into an acute model, where you look at a

7 cure or a lack of cure after 5 days therapy. This is

8 much different.

9 DR. O'DONNELL: Other comments about that?

10 Yes.

11 DR. FROEHLICH: I have a feeling that for

12 clinical trials when you count the number of

13 exacerbations in the previous year versus the number of

14 exacerbations that you proactively observe in a

15 clinical trial, you are comparing apples and oranges.

16 I think -- I personally believe for future trials we

17 need to do a better job to really nail down how many

18 exacerbations a patient had before he or she enters a

19 study.

20 I think it's easy to count one or two

21 exacerbations that as per the trial definitions were

22 not an exacerbation. And if you spin this even further

Page 264

1 -- and this of course makes the study much more onerous

2 -- you would have to observe patients for a run-in time

3 before you enter them in a trial. But I think it's

4 critical for -- when you go for exacerbations as one of

5 the primary endpoints, that you need to make sure that

6 the number of exacerbations is similarly assessed

7 before the study versus during the study.

8 And we see often in phase 3 trials and other

9 indications that the phase 3 event rate is lower than

10 phase 2 event rates. I can see that. But in this

11 particular situation, I think the counting of previous

12 exacerbations may play a critical role.

13 DR. FOLLMANN: Well, I guess I'd agree with

14 that, but I think exacerbations is a legitimate

15 endpoint and we want to enrich for a patient population

16 that will have a lot of exacerbations. And so we want

17 to have some period of run-in or, you know, a history

18 of them so we can select patients that have more

19 endpoints during the course of the study.

20 And just to make another plug, earlier I

21 brought up the idea of a crossover trial. I think that

22 would also be a fair thing to consider here. You could

Page 265

1 have a 2-year study, with a year of placebo followed by

2 a year of drug or vice versa.

3 And here this heterogeneity we've been hearing

4 about during the course of the discussions, including

5 this regression, the mean phenomenon, which is a

6 reflection of heterogeneity, the crossover design sort

7 of benefits from heterogeneity, the more the

8 heterogeneity, the more efficient the design is.

9 So that's what I would recommend, you know, a

10 sponsor to do, enrich the study. And you have data on

11 this, so you could, you know, see what potential gains

12 there are with a crossover trial of 2 years duration.

13 DR. SMITH: I will say that in response to Dr.

14 Froehlich's comment, we've noticed with this indication

15 and with other frequently recurring indications that

16 there's often not very good documentation of what the

17 previous history was of the exacerbation. And I'm not

18 sure how you can go back a year and somehow provide

19 adequate documentation that somebody met the same kind

20 of clinical criteria that you're going to be using to

21 define an event after patients have been randomized.

22 DR. O'DONNELL: Yeah, I'll just say -- I mean,

Page 266

1 I was on the Adjudication Committee for exacerbations
 2 for one of these trials and it was extremely tough even
 3 within the trial to adjudicate. But you're absolutely
 4 right. I mean, how we define an exacerbation pre-
 5 enrollment was different than how it's defined once
 6 you're in the trial.

7 And now we've come up with the definition from
 8 the -- Greg mentioned from the -- published in the ERJ.
 9 But that's not really going to help us. So any other
 10 comments would be appreciated.

11 DR. ZEITLIN: I have a question about
 12 heterogeneity. In seeing that CT scan for the 77-year-
 13 old where an entire lung is cystic and hearing from
 14 patient representatives they might have a focal area
 15 that's a problem, how do you know your inhaled
 16 antibiotic is penetrating the area that would make the
 17 most difference to time to exacerbation? So I'm
 18 wondering if you can control for that sort of
 19 variability in where the disease is attacking the
 20 lungs.

21 DR. O'DONNELL: Any comments on that? Alan?
 22 DR. BARKER: (off mic) how far down -- in

Page 267

1 diffused bronchiectasis, we're not even sure how far
 2 down the drug goes. We like to think that it gets
 3 down. But you're probably right that in -- somebody
 4 with a unilateral or one lung, most of it is going to
 5 go to the good lung. I mean, it's about --

6 DR. ALDER: Yeah, I would -- we have some
 7 scintigraphy studies that show great distribution, but
 8 those are normally done in healthy volunteers, not
 9 people with impaired lung function. So now it gets
 10 very complicated with the consolidations and does drug
 11 penetrate or not. That's a big variable.

12 DR. TINO: Well, can I just comment about the
 13 distribution of the antibiotic? I mean, what we have
 14 as a pretty good surrogate is micro data. I mean, you
 15 can see when the patients are on drug, colony forming
 16 is dropped; when they're off, it goes up.

17 And so if you're reducing total bug burden,
 18 some of the stuff that James has shown, I think that's
 19 a surrogate for distribution of the drug in killing
 20 bugs. And whether the active infection is in one area
 21 or not, I don't think we're ever going to be able to
 22 measure that. But I think the surrogate is the micro.

Page 268

1 DR. ALLENDE: Yes, I wanted to comment that I
 2 agree with the point brought by Dr. Froehlich. There
 3 was a lot of heterogeneity in the way that the number
 4 of exacerbations were considered for the inclusion
 5 criteria and then during the trial. And there was, as
 6 Dr. Smith pointed out, a lack of documentation. And I
 7 have to add that there was lack of documentation also
 8 on the anatomical characteristics, like we didn't have
 9 much detail about upper lobes or distribution of
 10 bronchiectasis to make some kind of more complete
 11 assessment of what happened with the absorption, the
 12 bioavailability of the drug. So there's a lot of data
 13 that needs to be collected to make a better assessment.

14 DR. O'DONNELL: Dr. Noone.
 15 DR. NOONE: Just going to say, we're talking
 16 about heterogeneity here a lot. And just going back to
 17 the radiology point, I don't know if there are data on
 18 this, but I certainly had many patients who have quite
 19 mild changes on the CT imaging -- I bet we all do --
 20 and yet have disproportionate symptoms to the
 21 radiologic changes and vice versa. I have some people
 22 with quite marked changes and sort of do okay.

Page 269

1 So, you know, the radiology is all over the
 2 shop. I mean, it gets away a bit from the physical
 3 penetration thing, but trying to think about
 4 heterogeneity and differentiating patients, I'm not
 5 sure -- and it probably will be logistically very
 6 difficult anyway. But the radiology really is very all
 7 over the place.

8 DR. O'DONNELL: James?
 9 DR. CHALMERS: I would just back that up. I
 10 would really not get into a discussion about the
 11 radiology of bronchiectasis as multiple studies have
 12 looked at this whether radiological appearance predicts
 13 clinical phenotype or predicts exacerbation frequency
 14 or predicts response to drugs in different contexts and
 15 they show no real correlation between radiological
 16 extent of disease and anything clinically meaningful.

17 You can have patients with very mild
 18 bronchiectasis radiologically who are incredibly sick
 19 and you can have patients that have completely
 20 destroyed lungs, like the ones that you saw with Dr.
 21 Tino, particularly in the context of things like post
 22 TB change, and the patients are almost asymptomatic.

Page 270	<p>1 And so it's very difficult to take anything</p> <p>2 radiological and think you're going to make anything</p> <p>3 clinically meaningful out of it.</p> <p>4 DR. BARKER: On your question about enriching,</p> <p>5 it's not as robust as previous exacerbation, but FEV1</p> <p>6 or the level of FEV1 has some relationship to</p> <p>7 exacerbation; that is somebody who has relatively</p> <p>8 normal FEV1 is going to have fewer exacerbations than</p> <p>9 somebody that has 30 or 40 percent FEV1.</p> <p>10 The studies that we've been talking about, the</p> <p>11 aztreonam and two cipros, the azteronam didn't have an</p> <p>12 upper limit of FEV1 and the cipros had 80 or 90</p> <p>13 percent. I would suggest that we for enriching</p> <p>14 consider lowering the upper limit of the FEV1. You</p> <p>15 can't make it too low, 40 or 50 percent, you won't get</p> <p>16 the patients. But I would think your ceiling should be</p> <p>17 something lower than normal pulmonary function, which</p> <p>18 is 80 or 90 percent. And I would at least consider 50</p> <p>19 to 60 percent or something.</p> <p>20 DR. O'DONNEL: So maybe James and Greg could</p> <p>21 comment on that because you have this paper just coming</p> <p>22 out about this issue.</p>	Page 272	<p>1 DR. FLUME: You know, part of the problem is</p> <p>2 that we describe this group as non-CF bronchiectasis</p> <p>3 and we have to stop doing that, because bronchiectasis</p> <p>4 patients of which CF patients are one endotype and then</p> <p>5 there are others, and really, you're getting at what is</p> <p>6 the phenotype because there are patients who do behave</p> <p>7 much like CF patients. There are patient who actually</p> <p>8 benefit from pulmozyme.</p> <p>9 I would venture to guess -- so we'll make</p> <p>10 everyone raise their hands -- that every clinician in</p> <p>11 here who takes care of bronchiectasis patients has</p> <p>12 patient on inhaled antibiotics and believes that it's</p> <p>13 working well for them. So we use them. We try them.</p> <p>14 And as you know, we've published our data. I've long</p> <p>15 complained about the phenotype we looked at in the AIR-</p> <p>16 BX studies. Those patients looked like they had COPD,</p> <p>17 because they had a high utilization of long-acting</p> <p>18 bronchodilators, inhaled steroids and they had low use</p> <p>19 of hypertonics and they had chronic macrolides. As</p> <p>20 Greg showed you, those were the opposite direction of</p> <p>21 recommended therapies.</p> <p>22 There was some improvement in the Bayer</p>
Page 271	<p>1 DR. CHALMERS: I mean, the Bayer studies did</p> <p>2 some sub-analyses of above 50 and less than 50 and</p> <p>3 there wasn't really any convincing difference across</p> <p>4 the four different analyses to say that one lung</p> <p>5 function level is better than another lung function</p> <p>6 level.</p> <p>7 So again, I think Alan's point is right, you</p> <p>8 want to enrich for people who have had more events. So</p> <p>9 by asking for people with a history of three or four</p> <p>10 exacerbations in the previous year, you'll get more of</p> <p>11 the patients with lower lung function.</p> <p>12 But remember that with inhaled antibiotics, we</p> <p>13 always cut out people with less than 30 percent because</p> <p>14 we don't want to put them at risk of bronchospasm. So</p> <p>15 if you set that bar at 50 percent and then the lower</p> <p>16 bar at 30, you're really not going to be able to do a</p> <p>17 feasible trial. So again, I would go back to</p> <p>18 exacerbations and not lung function.</p> <p>19 DR. TINO: Yeah, I agree.</p> <p>20 DR. O'DONNEL: So we agree that three or more</p> <p>21 exacerbations defined in some fashion would help to</p> <p>22 enrich further trials? Patrick.</p>	Page 273	<p>1 studies and the Aradigm, but the other part is they</p> <p>2 went into countries that enrolled patient who don't</p> <p>3 have the same access to care. And so you start to</p> <p>4 wonder what was that doing to the dilution of your</p> <p>5 population.</p> <p>6 So the answer isn't doing a (inaudible) work</p> <p>7 in these patients. I believe they do. It's about</p> <p>8 finding out the right population and whom they're going</p> <p>9 to benefit, who can demonstrate that benefit. And</p> <p>10 you've got to find a way to enrich them.</p> <p>11 The risk that we had is, those studies had to</p> <p>12 be so large that finding those patients is what made</p> <p>13 those companies go out into areas or broaden their</p> <p>14 inclusion criteria to make them get -- you know, finish</p> <p>15 in a timely manner.</p> <p>16 DR. O'DONNEL: One other -- sorry, one other</p> <p>17 caveat is trying to enroll patients with three or more</p> <p>18 exacerbations who are not on off-label inhaled</p> <p>19 antibiotics at this point. That's the challenge to try</p> <p>20 to stop somebody ethically that is on -- Susan.</p> <p>21 DR. ELLENBERG: Yeah. So I was intrigued with</p> <p>22 a comment somebody made at the beginning of this</p>

Page 274

1 discussion that maybe somebody with -- having one
 2 exacerbation a year, maybe that's not really the most
 3 important thing for patients because with they live
 4 with this disease 365 days a year.
 5 Now, somebody who has got -- who is having
 6 three or more exacerbations every year, maybe that is
 7 quite a meaningful thing. But I -- I'm interested to
 8 hear what, you know, maybe some of the patients here
 9 have to say about what endpoint would be of most
 10 interest.
 11 MR. ZIMMERMAN: One exacerbation is terrible;
 12 that's the bottom line. I don't want any
 13 exacerbations.
 14 DR. ELLENBERG: So if you were on average
 15 having one exacerbation a year and a treatment would
 16 reduce that to maybe only one every three years --
 17 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sign me up.
 18 DR. ELLENBERG: -- that -- okay.
 19 DR. SMITH: Yeah. There you go.
 20 MR. ZIMMERMAN: It's quality of life; that's
 21 what it comes down to.
 22 DR. SMITH: Are there any specific quality of

Page 275

1 life issues or other things besides, say, an actual
 2 exacerbation that you might find beneficial?
 3 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I think Mary can answer this
 4 better than me.
 5 DR. SMITH: Well, we could hear from both of
 6 you.
 7 MS. KITLOWSKI: All right. Well, could -- I'm
 8 sorry, could you repeat your question?
 9 DR. SMITH: So the question is, besides
 10 reducing the frequency of exacerbations what other
 11 types of outcomes would be important to you.
 12 MS. KITLOWSKI: Well, to me would be even
 13 reducing the time of the exacerbation. So like you
 14 said, one exacerbation is bad enough, but if -- you
 15 know, when I go on IV antibiotics, I can be on them,
 16 you know, for 4 weeks. And, you know, patient
 17 confession here. I tend to like try to push it off as
 18 long as I can. So I've been feeling pretty bad for a
 19 while leading up to that.
 20 But if there were a way of cutting that down
 21 to even, you know, just 2 weeks where we're not
 22 incapacitated, where, you know, we're still able to

Page 276

1 work, I mean, that would be a huge improvement.
 2 But I just -- you know, I wanted to second
 3 also just -- you know, even reducing one exacerbation
 4 would make a huge difference. You know, quality of
 5 life --
 6 DR. SMITH: So if there was some way of
 7 capturing the severity of an exacerbation and that
 8 could be improved, that would --
 9 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yeah, severity I think is
 10 really important. If I don't have to get to the IV
 11 antibiotic stage, great. If I just feel like at the
 12 top my chest and I can do something quick to get rid of
 13 it, even better. Time and severity are really
 14 important. And we're going to have exacerbations, but
 15 let's reduce the frequency and let's reduce the
 16 severity.
 17 DR. FOLLMANN: So a question related to that.
 18 Wouldn't you be indifferent between one exacerbation,
 19 say, of 4 weeks versus 2 exacerbations of 2 weeks --
 20 what would be worse or would they be same to you?
 21 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I'd probably say it's about
 22 the same just because it's the same time. And being

Page 277

1 sick is being sick whether it's for 2 weeks at a time
 2 or 4 weeks overall.
 3 DR. O'DONNELL: Mary.
 4 MS. KITLOWSKI: Sorry. If I could just chime
 5 into that. I would say it also depends on the nature
 6 of the treatment, because if I'm on IV antibiotics and
 7 I have to go -- I'm on IV for 2 weeks, then, you know,
 8 PICC line is gone and then I get another exacerbation
 9 for 2 weeks. I mean, that's a lot to go through
 10 getting the PICC line, you know, IV and twice. So, you
 11 know -- so my answer is sort of a caveat there. I
 12 mean, yeah, 2 weeks sounds great, but, you know,
 13 there's the extra consideration.
 14 DR. ELLENBERG: So then another possible type
 15 of endpoint would be the number of days over a year
 16 that one is -- in which one is experiencing an
 17 exacerbation.
 18 DR. CHEN: So I've a question for our patient
 19 representative, Jasan. It's that it seems to me that
 20 you're talking about the impact, the severity related
 21 to the patient. But I'm interested in all of the
 22 outcomes, say -- that you mentioned about quality of

Page 278

1 life. Is that quality of life just directly related
 2 during exacerbation or quality of life for the -- I
 3 mean, even in the stable state, if I can call it as
 4 stable. You know, like symptom severity, you have
 5 higher symptoms. That when you are not in
 6 exacerbations, that it's actually also impacting your
 7 quality of life? And what other things that you
 8 consider as quality of life, like symptoms, the impact
 9 in your working ability, your daily life, things like
 10 that?
 11 MR. ZIMMERMAN: That's a great question and I
 12 think it comes to the variability of the disease. For
 13 me, where I'm in my progression, exacerbations are my
 14 main concern. And I don't know that that's true for
 15 everybody. It could be that -- and where's Mary? I
 16 want to know what you had to say too.
 17 It could be that, you know, maybe somebody is
 18 not actively sick, but still doesn't feel like the lung
 19 function is there and so that's impacting daily life,
 20 working or whatever, or there are other cough symptoms
 21 that are just taking over. For me that's not as big of
 22 an issue, but who knows what's going to happen down the

Page 279

1 line.
 2 DR. CHEN: So follow-up would be, if there's a
 3 treatment that attacks those symptoms, would that be
 4 important to you -- if there's any treatment that may
 5 not reduce the number of exacerbations, but actually
 6 make you have less of those symptoms during your stable
 7 stage, normal days?
 8 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Sure. And also, kind of what
 9 Chip mentioned today, you know, he takes two and a half
 10 or three hours a day. If I don't have to do that, if
 11 it can be something that's easier to do that doesn't
 12 take as much of my day, because that's also quality of
 13 life right there.
 14 MS. KITLOWSKI: Yeah. So, you know, part of
 15 it is I think the severity for individual patients. I
 16 cough a lot, you know, and I can have bronchospasms.
 17 And even though I always coughed, it has gotten worse,
 18 as, you know, my lung function has declined. So I
 19 think part of that question just depends on the
 20 severity for the patient.
 21 For me now, you know, I feel like -- you know,
 22 you see me on oxygen. So I -- it's like a continuous

Page 280

1 quality of life. You know, lower quality of life is
 2 pretty much ever present for me at this point. When I
 3 -- you know, 20 years ago, you know, quality of life
 4 was great. I might just get, you know, sick a couple
 5 weeks out of the year. But other than that, it was
 6 great. So I think, you know, again it depends on the
 7 severity for the patients.
 8 DR. O'DONNELL: Jeff.
 9 DR. ALDER: Yeah. Regarding the PROs -- you
 10 might as well state (ph) the microphone -- the approach
 11 we're using now is, relatively speaking, lots of
 12 questions, but administered relatively and frequently
 13 with three call periods of 7 days or even longer. And
 14 again, we've heard patients say that's not capturing
 15 how I'm feeling, that we're missing a lot of patient
 16 input.
 17 And what's been suggested is something like a
 18 daily electronic diary of -- something simple, five
 19 questions maybe, because we're missing a lot of input
 20 by throwing 150 questions once a month at a patient.
 21 "How would you perceive that?" You know, something
 22 with a daily input to capture the waxing and waning.

Page 281

1 MS. KITLOWSKI: I think that has a lot of
 2 merit. When they were setting up the PCD, working on
 3 the PCD questionnaire, I talked with -- I'm assuming it
 4 was Dr. Quittner's team in Florida. They were asking
 5 me some of the questions. And when I shared with my
 6 husband later how I answered -- they caught me on a
 7 good day, so I was like, "Oh, yeah, things are pretty
 8 much good, you know." And he was like, "Well, how
 9 about, you know, a few weeks ago when you had to go
 10 downstairs? You kept having to leave the bedroom
 11 because you couldn't sleep because you were coughing
 12 too much." And I was like, "Oh! Yeah, I kind of
 13 forgot about that."
 14 You know, so -- yeah, I there is definitely
 15 merit to that because I have good points during the
 16 year. In the fall when my symptoms start flaring up, I
 17 -- you know, I measured it after he mentioned that, and
 18 September and October I spent about half of my time up
 19 late at night not able to sleep because of, you know,
 20 all the coughing and having trouble.
 21 So I think having it on, you know, a daily
 22 basis would be a better capture and particularly when

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 282</p> <p>1 the survey -- the QOLB right now only does a 7-day 2 recall. 3 DR. O'DONNELL: Tim. 4 DR. AKSAMIT: Yeah. So which is -- 5 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Yeah, I agree with that. 6 DR. AKSAMIT: Okay. 7 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I think the monthly is a 8 snapshot. And if it's daily, then you get a much better 9 sense of what it's like. And it could also be the time 10 of day too. That depends on how good you're feeling 11 that day or not. But I think it's a much better course 12 of how you feel. 13 DR. O'DONNELL: Another comment from the 14 audience? 15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (off mic). I just want 16 to make a couple of observations. One of them is the 17 goals Cayston study and in the ciprofloxacin DI study, 18 we observe that when the quality of life questionnaire 19 was measured around the time of an exacerbation, there 20 was a much bigger decrease in the quality of life of 21 those patients than during the sort of stable state. 22 So there is no doubt that at that time of an</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 284</p> <p>1 many exacerbations? So I'm missing something. 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, if they are -- 3 you typically exclude patients who have been on 4 antibiotics over the last 28 days -- 5 DR. FOLLMANN: I see. 6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- or some period of 7 trial -- some period of time, because then you really 8 have a population that is so variable due to the 9 previous treatment of the antibiotics. So it's 10 difficult to enroll these patients. 11 DR. FOLLMANN: So you exclude them because 12 they have had recent antibiotics and you think that 13 muddies the water. Though -- you know, you randomize 14 them to the two arms and then, you know, you still 15 could see a difference or not. I mean, it's still a 16 fair comparison. But -- 17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, it would be an 18 interesting -- I mean, the other thing of course, if 19 you wanted to have pseudomonas at the time of entry to 20 the trial, again, if they have been on antibiotics or 21 not -- the antibiotics for the last 28 days, it is 22 quite possible that will you not find any pseudomonas</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 283</p> <p>1 exacerbation, at least in my mind, there is a big drop 2 in quality of life. 3 The other point that I wanted to make, which 4 is very interesting -- I mean, it's absolutely true -- 5 if you want to have the number of exacerbations as your 6 endpoint, you have to take patients who've got all 7 exacerbations. That is obvious. The problem that you 8 find in practice -- and I've been involved for 11 years 9 enrolling patients into these clinic trials -- these 10 patients are very rarely eligible because they've got 11 so many exacerbations per year. 12 So the question then is how quickly can you 13 enroll a study, you know, with a reasonable number of 14 patient and how big a quantum of evidence can you 15 really produce given the small number of these 16 patients, because they're almost never eligible because 17 they continue to have exacerbations so they're on some 18 antibiotic therapy because of that. So there's a 19 practical problem with the size of these studies. 20 DR. FOLLMANN: Sort of a clarification 21 question. You say that these patients who have a lot 22 of exacerbations are not eligible because they have too</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 285</p> <p>1 in their sputum. So there are some real practical 2 difficulties. 3 DR. FOLLMANN: But if they had sort of a 4 history of pseudomonas and now they got antibiotics for 5 28 days and the pseudomonas has gone away, it might 6 well come back and they still might be a good candidate 7 for the trial. 8 DR. O'DONNELL: Okay. Tim Aksamit has been 9 waiting. 10 DR. AKSAMIT: Yeah. Okay, good. So I would 11 just follow that up, that signal-to-noise ratio that 12 we've been reconciling, that most patients have shared 13 with us and myself as a clinician that the goal is zero 14 exacerbations. 15 But from a statistical standpoint, I think it 16 would be incredibly tough if somebody is having one 17 every year or every other year, which is too much for 18 sure clinically in the purposes of a phase 3 study to, 19 say, try to demonstrate impact or event rate for that 20 infrequent, and again, to be in alignment. 21 So then you raise the issue of: Are there 22 other possibilities? And we understand that there is</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 286</p> <p>1 some data that when individuals have an exacerbation, 2 they have symptoms for up to 2 weeks before the time 3 period and then 5 weeks after the time period. And so 4 if you had days of exacerbation rather than event rate, 5 that that they may scratch at some of this. And so if 6 we start thinking about different endpoints or trying 7 to get more signal and less noise, that may be an 8 opportunity. 9 And then the other opportunity -- and I would 10 ask James, because I don't know that there has been 11 data to know what happens between exacerbations and has 12 there clearly been studies to look at quality of life 13 measures and some symptom scoring in between 14 exacerbations for those people, even though you in 15 between exacerbation say you feel well. But are your 16 scores if you're having more exacerbations in between 17 your exacerbations different than somebody else with 18 less frequent scores? 19 And that may be the opportunity to try to 20 enrich the signal rather than the noise to try to then 21 pick up on this rather than use just events. So I 22 think we continue to be a little bit off the mark of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 288</p> <p>1 just to look at the delta change in the quality of life 2 measures, whether it's QOL-B or St. George's, but to 3 use absolute numbers over that period of time to try to 4 capture exactly this for the more symptomatic patients. 5 Even though you say, "Well, I feel well; it's a good 6 day for me," but your good day is a really crummy day 7 for somebody else, relatively speaking. 8 DR. O'DONNEL: So I think we're saying it's 9 some combination of number of exacerbations and symptom 10 burden day to day that has to be factored in. Because 11 I think my -- what I hear from patients -- I may have 12 many patients who have one exacerbation a year and are 13 essentially asymptomatic the rest of the time and I'm 14 not sure they would be as inclined to do a chronic 15 therapy as somebody like Mary or Jasan. 16 So why don't we move to question four. Since 17 we're talking about the endpoints, thoughts on co- 18 primary endpoint. Oh, I'm sorry. Angela. 19 DR. DAVIS: Thanks. Hi. Angela Davis. I'm 20 with Grifols. So one question that may be -- might be 21 directed towards James or the statisticians -- I mean, 22 obviously -- Anne, I do think we're kind of saying the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 287</p> <p>1 using just the even rate as the only marker here. 2 DR. CHALMERS: So just to come in on that. I 3 mean, there has been one study that looked using 4 electronic diaries in bronchiectasis that did show that 5 20 percent of patients with bronchiectasis never 6 recovered to the same level in terms of symptoms after 7 an exacerbation. 8 So many patients experience a drop in lung 9 function. All patients experience a drop in quality of 10 life. Most return to close to baseline, but about 20 11 percent never recover. And that's again consistent 12 with the biology that you see in CF and in COPD, where 13 exacerbations cause gradual decrements in quality of 14 life and lung function over time. 15 So an electronic diary would be fantastic to 16 capture some of that data. The difficulty is there's 17 no validated diary at the moment in bronchiectasis. So 18 if we're answering question one, "how would you advise 19 company A today how to do a trial," it would be 20 difficult to say use this diary or use that diary 21 because there isn't a validated one in bronchiectasis. 22 DR. AKSAMIT: Well -- and the idea here is not</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 289</p> <p>1 same thing that it's a composite or even thinking of a 2 composite score. But I wonder if there has been any 3 thought put into looking at going back to why some of 4 these trials have failed and developing some propensity 5 score, some matching in order to identify specific 6 phenotypes of patients to then develop composite scores 7 as an endpoint for what's a successful study to look 8 like? 9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The thing is not 10 working. 11 DR. TRACY: So with respect to the ORBIT 12 trials, the Bayer -- or, excuse me, the Aradigm trails, 13 so -- you know, part of the challenge was, as was 14 mentioned, that there were limited pre-randomization 15 data that would have been really useful to understand 16 the underlying etiology of the disease for these 17 patients as well as the affected lobe. 18 So that was -- those data were just simply not 19 there along with the fact that -- because of the 20 inclusion, exclusion criteria and the prevalence 21 challenges, these trials are global, so we have 22 tremendous heterogeneity across the globe and what a</p>

Page 290

1 NCFB patient looks like in the United States is
 2 different than that in Japan. But again, we're not
 3 getting any other data other than region. Yes, so we
 4 don't have that phenotype, genotype level of data to
 5 really understand what's going on.
 6 I think your question about propensity score
 7 models is an interesting one, hadn't thought about
 8 that. I suppose you could do it, but you'd have to
 9 pool all the data from the various trials because you -
 10 - I don't know if you know a lot about propensity
 11 scores, you must -- since you asked the question. But
 12 you need a sufficiently large number of observations to
 13 model the counterfactual estimate for the propensity
 14 score.
 15 But I still think that's worth considering.
 16 You know, I think this is an effort that needs to
 17 happen with or without a current trial. We need to be
 18 mining the existing clinical trial data. We need to be
 19 collecting more robust epidemiologic natural history's
 20 data globally, not just in the United States
 21 considering the fact these trials are going to be done
 22 globally, you know, and learning as we go.

Page 291

1 So thank you. I like that question. And, you
 2 know, no, we haven't done that, but I think it's
 3 something worth perhaps academics and others can do.
 4 If they want to give me some time off, I'll do it. But
 5 I don't know.
 6 DR. O'DONNELL: James, answer the question?
 7 DR. CHALMERS: Yeah. So I'm not going to
 8 comment on propensity scores particularly after a
 9 statistician has just gone into that. But what the
 10 question is dependent on is the company sharing their
 11 data with academics so that we can answer these
 12 questions. And I think the patient would agree that if
 13 1,000 of patients have given their time to do these
 14 studies, we need to learn as much as we can from them.
 15 We've been fortunate that some companies have
 16 shared their data from previous failed trials. So
 17 Gilead, for example, have provided us with access to
 18 the aztreonam trial data. And we'll present a poster
 19 at the World Bronchiectasis Conference next month,
 20 where we have identified a population that responds in
 21 both AIR-BX1 and AIR-BX2 with quality of life
 22 improvements above the MCID simply based on their

Page 292

1 baseline bacterial load. So the patients with the
 2 highest baseline bacterial load had massive
 3 improvements in quality of life, whereas those that had
 4 very low bacterial burden had no response at all.
 5 So that's a very simple biomarker that
 6 certainly in that trial seemed to predict response very
 7 robustly across both trials. And so that's something
 8 that could easily be tested in other studies to
 9 validate that concept.
 10 DR. O'DONNELL: Patrick.
 11 DR. FLUME: So I wasn't going to comment on
 12 the risks or benefits of a co-primary, but comment
 13 about severity and duration. This is something we've
 14 grappled with in the CF world as well and it's
 15 complicated by how treatment decisions are made and the
 16 variance in clinical practice.
 17 So although it might seem intuitive that a
 18 person that's hospitalized is having a more severe
 19 event than someone who just gets home IVs or gets oral
 20 antibiotics, but frequently those decisions are based
 21 upon which pathogen they're treating. If you're
 22 treating staph, you have oral opportunities; and if you

Page 293

1 have pseudomonas, you have fewer opportunities. And
 2 sometimes hospitalization decisions are based upon
 3 resources available to the family or your past history
 4 that there's just no way you're giving this person
 5 therapy at home. So it has zero to do with physiology.
 6 In terms of duration, the reason -- one of the
 7 reasons we're doing a duration of treatments study in
 8 CF is because the variation in practice is enormous.
 9 So the decision of whether someone gets 7 days, 10
 10 days, 14 days or 28 days has little to do with anything
 11 except the perception of what that particular patient
 12 needs and often times is a function of the calendar as
 13 opposed to some other marker.
 14 What we do know, and Tim has already mentioned
 15 this, is in the CF population where we've done the
 16 analysis looking at quality of life parameters after an
 17 event occurs, that for some of those parameters,
 18 particularly the physical functioning parameters, take
 19 6 weeks to resolve, whereas respiratory symptoms will
 20 resolve within 2 weeks.
 21 And so when you talk about, well, when is the
 22 exacerbation over, it's typically the start and stop of

Page 294

1 antibiotic days and yet the patient remains
 2 symptomatic. And that's excluding what Tim already
 3 talked about, was the duration of symptoms before a
 4 decision was made to treat.
 5 DR. O'DONNEL: Greg.
 6 DR. TINO: I want to echo what Patrick said,
 7 just add a couple of things. You know, I think the
 8 idea of a co-primary endpoint would be great if we had
 9 some guidance about definitions and things like
 10 severity. So we don't. And to echo what Patrick said,
 11 but also -- you know, many of the clinical trials --
 12 most of the clinical trials are international. To try
 13 to enrich is really the goal than to recruit patients
 14 from other countries.
 15 And so, for example, if you use
 16 hospitalization as a measure of severity from across
 17 countries, in our institution I can give home IV
 18 antibiotics. In the UK, the move to IV antibiotic
 19 requires hospitalization, whether that really speaks
 20 severity or just speaks to the fact that resources are
 21 limited in terms of home IV antibiotics. That's not
 22 only a national problem, but an international problem.

Page 295

1 So I'd love to be able to assess severity of
 2 exacerbation and reduce that, but I don't know of any
 3 other measures that could be good surrogates that can
 4 be studied.
 5 DR. CHEN: Actually, I may be able to answer
 6 this -- the question that related to your comment about
 7 there's no validated patient-reporting outcomes.
 8 There's an instrument called the EXACT-PRO. It was
 9 designed to catch underreporting as to the patient --
 10 for COPD patients and it actually has been qualified by
 11 FDA COA -- the Drug Development and Tools as a
 12 exploratory endpoint to use. And so maybe that tool,
 13 the EXACT -- and it also has this symptom subscale,
 14 maybe able to modify it for the pancreatitis patient
 15 populations.
 16 DR. AKSAMIT: And I might just follow-up I
 17 think on Dr. Tracy's comment about some of the
 18 heterogeneity issues. I think that we also need to
 19 understand internationally -- we don't know for sure
 20 that individuals on one continent are different than
 21 another continent, but what we don't know is what the
 22 definition is. And so I would just share that there's

Page 296

1 a intense amount of work going on at the moment trying
 2 to come up with, much like we did for a definition of
 3 exacerbation, a definition of bronchiectasis to be
 4 clear about this and then to try to incorporate at some
 5 level what are we really calling COPD and
 6 bronchiectasis, bronchiectasis alone, asthma and
 7 bronchiectasis, because they phenotypically may in fact
 8 behave very differently from a natural history of
 9 disease course if somebody has COPD and bronchiectasis.
 10 And so when we look at international groups
 11 from all over the world, what I call bronchiectasis in
 12 North America may be different than bronchiectasis in
 13 former Soviet Union or in Korea or Japan in this way to
 14 speak to your issue. But I don't know if we were to
 15 come up with a standardize definition that there's not
 16 similarities there.
 17 And in fact -- and James can comment on this -
 18 - and one of the roles of looking at international
 19 registries, the Europeans, the U.S. and now the
 20 Japanese, the Australians, we'll be able to hopefully
 21 with an objective way do that exact work that you're
 22 asking for in a comparison study, are we really

Page 297

1 comparing apples with apples or is it really all the
 2 different balls, if you will, to help us identify that.
 3 But the issue that we wrestle with is, is a person that
 4 James sees in Scotland the same person that I'll see in
 5 Minnesota and I don't know that that's the case.
 6 James?
 7 MR. CHALMERS: So I mean we now have some data
 8 because we have the European Registry which has over
 9 15,000 patients enrolled including in the former Soviet
 10 states. And the Eastern European patients look nothing
 11 like the patients that we see in Western Europe and
 12 they look nothing -- so our patients look a lot like
 13 your patients, Tim; they're 60, 70-year-old females.
 14 They have usually idiopathic and post-infective
 15 bronchiectasis. They have a variable number of
 16 exacerbations and moderate lung function impairment.
 17 The patients in Eastern Europe are often in their 30s
 18 and 40s. They often have severe post-TB
 19 bronchiectasis, because that's the major etiology.
 20 They have very different spectra pathogens, but some of
 21 them very rarely exacerbate, which was what we saw in
 22 some of the clinical trials. So they have a completely

Page 298

1 different phenotype of disease. And so taking data
 2 from them and expecting to extrapolate that to the U.S.
 3 population I think is a stretch.
 4 DR. AKSAMIT: Right. And even whether we're
 5 talking about post-tuberculosis or even smoking rate
 6 say between the two different groups and I think your
 7 data supports also even within Europe, Northern Europe
 8 to Southern Europe, I mean the phenotype and the
 9 microbiology has remarkable differences if I remember
 10 correctly.
 11 MR. FOLLMANN: Yeah, so just a comment on co-
 12 primary endpoints. I don't see those, all those often
 13 and it seems usually they are a way of hedging your
 14 bets like you think, well, I don't know if I'll show
 15 success on total exacerbations of severity, so let's
 16 put them both in there. There's a cost to that
 17 typically where you have to, you know, use some alpha
 18 for each and so you increase the sample-size. So to me
 19 that's sort of a statistical consequence of thinking of
 20 it this way.
 21 Another point I wanted to talk about, earlier
 22 we've seen -- you know, Susan mentioned the idea of

Page 299

1 total duration of exacerbations over the course of the
 2 year and then I learned, oh, the duration of
 3 exacerbation is just how long they get antibiotics,
 4 which is not very good really, but I wonder if there's
 5 some way we could try and hone in on like the severity
 6 of an exacerbation, maybe have an ordinal score
 7 something 1, 2, 3 or 4, so if you have two bad
 8 exacerbations that both get a score of 4, you get a
 9 score of 8 or something like that. Because I like the
 10 idea of the total burden somehow, but I see duration of
 11 exacerbations as measured by antibiotics is not the way
 12 to get out at -- maybe there's another way.
 13 DR. ALLENDE: Yes. I want -- talking about
 14 the differences the -- in the epidemiology, I read also
 15 regarding this phenotypes that there's an association
 16 between the microbiology and the anatomical location
 17 whether they are bilateral or upper lobe bronchiectasis
 18 or lower lobe. And I wonder if that has been looked at
 19 in the differences between the different populations
 20 and the co-infections mainly. Dr. Chalmers maybe --
 21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: James, you have a
 22 comment on that?

Page 300

1 DR. ALLENDE: James?
 2 MR. CHALMERS: So the question was the
 3 differences in infection rates between lower and upper
 4 lobe bronchiectasis. Yeah --
 5 DR. ALLENDE: Yeah, the association of the
 6 microbiology and the anatomical description whether
 7 they are bilateral, upper lobe, single lobe?
 8 MR. CHALMERS: Yeah. So they really --
 9 DR. ALLENDE: (inaudible).
 10 MR. CHALMERS: They really don't predict
 11 microbiology or clinical phenotype at all. I mean,
 12 there are some patterns that you see, some middle lobe
 13 disease is more likely to be associated with NTM.
 14 Upper lobe disease you start to suspect things like
 15 Aspergillus disease or adult cystic fibrosis, but these
 16 are really rare issues compared to the general
 17 bronchiectasis population.
 18 DR. ALLENDE: Could those co-infections play a
 19 role in -- with the -- and stratification be needed for
 20 --
 21 MR. CHALMERS: So certainly NTM infection
 22 could affect things, but most of our trials have

Page 301

1 deliberately excluded patients with NTM infections up
 2 until this point. The concern I think for a lot of us
 3 is how well that testing for these other issues is done
 4 --
 5 DR. ALLENDE: Exactly.
 6 MR. CHALMERS: -- prior to enrollment in
 7 trials. I mean, I -- so we routinely test people for
 8 ABPA. We routinely send sputum for NTM, but I'm not
 9 sure that that's uniformly done everywhere and I'm
 10 certain -- I'm certain it's not done in some of the
 11 European countries. And so I think that is an issue.
 12 But the radiology itself is not going -- is not going
 13 to tease that out. You need --
 14 DR. ALLENDE: No, but the association of --
 15 MR. CHALMERS: Yeah. You need --
 16 DR. ALLENDE: -- different etiologies --
 17 MR. CHALMERS: You need to --
 18 DR. ALLENDE: -- or co-infections.
 19 MR. CHALMERS: You need the sites to test for
 20 those conditions.
 21 DR. ALLENDE: Exactly. Thank you.
 22 DR. AKSAMIT: And there would be the same

Page 302

1 experience in the U.S. registry as well.
 2 DR. ALLENDE: Thank you. Yes.
 3 DR. NICHOLS: If I could, I just want to
 4 revisit something James said a minute ago. So I was
 5 intrigued by the fact that it sounds like you saw a
 6 robust effect-size in the clinical outcome
 7 retrospectively of course, since the causality is hard
 8 there, but that's notable I think, and I just -- I'm
 9 curious if there's been an attempt to enrich your study
 10 population not so much based on exacerbation frequency,
 11 but rather the target of therapy, which is evidence of
 12 high bacterial burden in the airway and might that be
 13 something worth considering?
 14 MR. CHALMERS: So I'm not aware that any study
 15 has done that, but if you just look roughly at the
 16 successful trials in bronchiectasis and the baseline
 17 bacterial loads, probably the most positive trial was
 18 the Gentamicin trial and the mean bacterial load at
 19 baseline was above 8 in that trial. The next possibly
 20 most positive trial was the colistin study, which
 21 narrowly missed its endpoint, the mean was around 8.
 22 And as you go down in mean bacterial load, you see

Page 303

1 lower success in those trials. So there is a --
 2 there's some -- there's some reason to believe that
 3 targeting patients that have really quite substantial
 4 bacterial loads would be meaningful.
 5 DR. NICHOLS: And is there a worldwide
 6 standard approach to quantify or semi-quantify? All
 7 right.
 8 MR. CHALMERS: No.
 9 DR. O'DONNELL: It's really only research --
 10 research tool. All right. Have we any other comments?
 11 Yes, Jeff.
 12 MR. ALDER: It's for -- question for -- I
 13 think it's implied if we're looking at a co-primary of
 14 total in severity, then there's doubt about whether
 15 total is itself clinically meaningful. That's why you
 16 might consider a co-primary. And if we're going to
 17 evaluate a daily chronic debilitating disease based on
 18 relatively infrequent acute events, then I would
 19 suggest not compounding the problem by making it a co-
 20 primary and trying to measure severity within total.
 21 And we tried to measure severity post hoc because in
 22 order to qualify patient had to have three -- at least

Page 304

1 three signs and symptoms plus the need for IV
 2 antibiotics. So within that questionnaire you could
 3 total up how many signs and symptoms?
 4 Even post hoc we found it very, very difficult
 5 to come up with any meaningful measure of severity,
 6 duration. Duration varied by study center and what
 7 drugs they happen to prescribe and their prescribing
 8 practice. Hospitalizations varied by center and by
 9 country. And so I think the second half of question
 10 for in severity is going to be very, very difficult to
 11 put into place. Plus, it's also doubling down on the
 12 same endpoint, basically exacerbations.
 13 DR. BARKER: If we're considering co-primary,
 14 I would at least consider having a biologic, and I use
 15 that in a broad term, in addition to a -- if
 16 exacerbation is one, there are emerging things and not
 17 FEV1, but elastase or other things that are emerging
 18 that give us some idea of both the pathophysiology as
 19 well combining it with the clinical.
 20 DR. O'DONNELL: Any other comments on that?
 21 Any comments from our statistics colleagues here? Yes.
 22 MR. ZIMMERMAN: What about just asking the

Page 305

1 patients how they feel?
 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.
 3 MR. ZIMMERMAN: I mean, it sounds really
 4 simple, but we're the ones that know. You guys can do
 5 all the lab tests you want and say, no, you're good,
 6 that's not always true.
 7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And the -- oh, sorry.
 8 MR. CHALMERS: So actually the EQ-5 (ph) does
 9 that. It has five questions and it has just alliances
 10 just mark where you are. So there is some history of
 11 doing that. I do want to say something about getting
 12 frequent measures because this was attempted in the EI
 13 study, which was asking patients who were randomized to
 14 the continued monitoring to measure spirometry and I
 15 think they were just asked to do their symptoms score
 16 two or three times a week and that was a seven question
 17 scale and the missingness of data was rather large.
 18 DR. O'DONNELL: From the audience side?
 19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. Yeah. I had a
 20 quick question. So you know like in the asthma
 21 community how they have like the asthma control test.
 22 Would that be something like for the patients? It's

Page 306	<p>1 only five questions and it says like how often has your 2 disease kind of affected your work-life, your sleep 3 quality and how do you feel overall it's being 4 controlled? Could that be something you do even like 5 weekly on like a app or something where you just track 6 like five questions that kind of give a overall picture 7 of your quality of life or is that like not feasible? 8 DR. O'DONNELL: I think that's where -- yeah, 9 I agree, right, a simple, I think our friends in London 10 have been working on a short sort of ACT type -- 11 MR. CHALMERS: Exactly right. So there's a -- 12 DR. O'DONNELL: Yeah, yeah. 13 MR. CHALMERS: -- there's a new tool called 14 the Bronchiectasis Health Questionnaire, which is 15 basically modeled on the asthma questionnaire -- 16 DR. O'DONNELL: On the asthma questionnaire. 17 MR. CHALMERS: -- and the COPD CAT, which is 18 very similar and it's five or six questions and it's 19 how bad is your cough? How breathless are you? Have 20 you had any exacerbations and it's exactly as you 21 described. 22 MR. ZIMMERMAN: Is that a statistical --</p>	Page 308	<p>1 of these, if you have -- if you're like intermittently 2 looking at them at various days, they're not really 3 capturing what you're really after which is the change 4 from the baseline at randomization. So I think with 5 these, if you're going to look at it every day, then 6 you're going to have to -- you can't have any gaps. 7 You have to, you know, be continuous -- it's continuous 8 time-period linked to the baseline. And another thing 9 I wanted to say is I think it's really important to 10 rate the exacerbation and severity. I think that said, 11 more work needs to be done in that area, that would be 12 very important because, you know, frequency of 13 exacerbations is a nice endpoint, but what if one 14 treatment has very mild exacerbations and there's very 15 severe. 16 So if you could somehow, you know, use the 17 same kind of analysis with its total exacerbation 18 because except for rate each single one and there you 19 could use like a patient -- a patient opinion, patient 20 reported outcome so you would have essentially similar 21 to a frequency of exacerbations, but they would all be 22 weighted according to how severe the patient thinks</p>
Page 307	<p>1 statistically validated thing? Can that be an 2 endpoint, an outcome? 3 MR. CHALMERS: Yeah, so it's been validated 4 within that population, so it's been tested in multiple 5 centers. It correlates very well with other quality of 6 life tools like the St. George's Respiratory 7 Questionnaire. What it hasn't been is applied in a 8 clinical trial to see if it changes, but it's a 9 promising approach because it's simple and patients 10 could do it more frequently. 11 MR. ALDER: I just want to plug a short daily 12 diary would absolutely capture what we're looking for 13 in severity. And that would be a built-in part by just 14 asking the patient from some simplistic daily 15 electronic diary. Patients that are spending two and a 16 half to three hours a day on medication and I don't 17 know why there's missing data, but something like this 18 would take less than 5 minutes. 19 DR. O'DONNELL: Chris? 20 MR. KADOORIE: Yeah. I think a complication 21 with some of these quality of life endpoints is the 22 timeframe that it's actually measuring. You know, some</p>	Page 309	<p>1 they are. 2 DR. O'DONNELL: Thanks. Sorry, do you have -- 3 DR. SMITH: Sorry, was there another comment? 4 MS. HAMBLETT: I was just going to say, so we 5 kind of skipped over three a little bit and I just keep 6 going back to the one comment that, you know, even one 7 exacerbation is important. So I think I was -- I'm 8 sort of struggling in that if there is a therapy that 9 reduces, you know, the proportion of patients, so 10 reduces the risk of just one event, it seems that that 11 may still be clinically important, and you know, 12 whether that possibility still exists, you know, as an 13 endpoint for a pivotal trial for, you know, a future 14 company coming in. Obviously, you would hope, you 15 know, that some of the phase II day that may form which 16 endpoint, but my -- maybe either of those endpoints are 17 meaningful. 18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So, Nicole, can I push 19 on that little bit? So if you have, as was I think 20 pointed out a low incidence of events, but high impact 21 of those events, from just a statistical standpoint, 22 let's forget about just specific exacerbations,</p>

Page 310

1 statistically how would you approach something that
 2 occurs very infrequently, but when it does occur it has
 3 a big impact to try to capture --
 4 MS. HAMBLETT: Well, I think where it was kind
 5 of going, I was trying to step a -- get a few steps
 6 ahead in terms of the enrichment question. And if
 7 there are trials being done to enrich the population
 8 such that you're really, you know, boosting your
 9 probability of having event in your population that
 10 would become less of a problem is that maybe you would
 11 expect 60 percent of your placebo group to have an
 12 event if you get the right enrichment, you know, maybe
 13 that's a possibility. And that you could potentially,
 14 if you have that right enriched population then, be
 15 able to do a shorter study with time to first, as
 16 opposed to a longer study with rate.
 17 And I'm just throwing that out there, you
 18 know, if it's still clinically meaningful. I think
 19 it's, you know, a question if you have -- if you
 20 actually need the multiple -- somehow, you're capturing
 21 severity with the frequency of exacerbations is that --
 22 I think that's what you're kind of getting it, that you

Page 311

1 need the frequency endpoint to capture the severity.
 2 DR. AKSAMIT: So let's, again just for
 3 argument sake, let's say you wanted to capture in the
 4 case of a cardiology study a MI every other year, every
 5 third year and then you were going to do an
 6 intervention trial, how would you set that trial up?
 7 If the expected events or MIs for once every other
 8 year, every third year and you wanted to have an impact
 9 on that, how would you set that trial up?
 10 MS. HAMBLETT: Yeah, I mean that -- I mean
 11 that's a whole different --
 12 DR. AKSAMIT: Well --
 13 MS. HAMBLETT: -- discussion, yeah.
 14 DR. AKSAMIT: Well, and that's different thing
 15 --
 16 MS. HAMBLETT: Yeah.
 17 DR. AKSAMIT: -- than the symptoms, so that --
 18 MS. HAMBLETT: Yeah.
 19 DR. AKSAMIT: -- I think if it's a matter of -
 20 -
 21 MS. HAMBLETT: Right.
 22 DR. AKSAMIT: -- intervention with an

Page 312

1 antibiotic trial and trying to minimize antibiotics
 2 with an inhaled antibiotic is one thing, but if I, you
 3 know, kind of turn that around a little bit and say,
 4 well, let's look at nonpharmacologic interventions. So
 5 let's say something comes out to enhance airway
 6 clearance or something else, we might be able to then
 7 liberalize that and rather than using events only,
 8 start looking at other quality issues or other types of
 9 measures that we're not using antibiotics as the
 10 denominator for. But then again, in these other
 11 instances of having very low frequency as Jasan said
 12 that one event is too much, but it just doesn't occur
 13 often, but when it occurs it has a huge impact on us,
 14 quality of life and as most patients will share.
 15 MS. HAMBLETT: Right.
 16 MR. ZIMMERMAN: And the other thing to hardly
 17 compared to an MI, each of these exacerbations could
 18 very well kill us. And as much as I don't want to
 19 think about that, it's absolutely true. So that's why
 20 I don't want them to happen.
 21 DR. O'DONNELL: What about number 3 since we
 22 alluded to that, the importance of the non time to

Page 313

1 first exacerbation or have we covered that
 2 sufficiently?
 3 DR. SMITH: That or any other endpoint
 4 questions, because that gets into question 5 as well.
 5 DR. O'DONNELL: Yeah.
 6 DR. SMITH: So I mean any other comments about
 7 endpoints in general?
 8 MR. HAWKINS: This is just out of curiosity,
 9 are there drugs that are on the market that were
 10 approved based solely on quality of life issues? Like
 11 we keep talking about quality of life questionnaires,
 12 but are they useful? Are they considered by the FDA to
 13 be valid and can they be made to be made valid?
 14 DR. O'DONNELL: So the question is has the FDA
 15 used quality of life endpoint to approve the drug?
 16 MR. HAWKINS: So not taking other factors into
 17 account, is it possible to make quality of life
 18 questionnaire that will be valid to the FDA?
 19 MR. CHEN: Yeah, let me to try to answer that
 20 question. The quality of life is a very broad concept
 21 and then everybody interpret quality of life
 22 differently. It's ranging from symptoms ability to

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 314</p> <p>1 financing difficulty to emotional to social function, 2 all that stuff. So in -- when you have a instrument 3 that you broadly naming as quality of life, we actually 4 look into what exactly that the questionnaire ask. So 5 for example, in QOL-B is called the quality of life. 6 It has social functions, emotional function, all that, 7 but we concentrate on the symptoms of scale because 8 that is actually more meaningful, more interpretable. 9 So I would say that the broader labeling 10 quality of life is probably more difficult, more 11 challenging, but we can actually labeling what exactly 12 that instrument that is ask of the patient and what is 13 actually interpretable and meaningful to the patients. 14 So it could be like say relief of the symptoms ability, 15 reduction of the days of exacerbations, things like 16 that. Maybe when it is actually very significant large 17 effect that we see say for example the daily activity, 18 physical functions, that's also possible, but what -- 19 if we put quality of life in the label, that is too 20 broad, we need to be able to communicate clear to the 21 patient what the drug is actually helping the patients, 22 so not just the broad quality of life.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 316</p> <p>1 we could agree to a strategy on how to define severity 2 of exacerbations, I could certainly see a role for 3 perhaps a composite endpoint of total exacerbations 4 frequency and severity because that might be a way to 5 increase the power or decrease sample-size to hit what 6 arguably would be clinically meaningful for both of 7 those parameters. But I also heard that -- I think I 8 heard that there was a concern that if you're only 9 looking at frequency or time to, there could be a 10 concern that you might decrease frequency, but miss 11 more severe exacerbations. And I'm wondering if 12 there's any precedent for that with pulmonary drugs, 13 inhaled antibiotics or other drugs where you actually 14 decreased frequency, but somehow you increase severity 15 down the road. I'm just trying to think about 16 biological plausibility of that. 17 DR. O'DONNELL: Yeah, I'm asking the CF 18 colleagues. I know we heard that statement, but I'm 19 not aware of any data to suggest that. Yes sir. 20 DR. DHAND: So one surrogate marker which 21 might be -- capture some of this information that we've 22 been trying to debate is the total amount of systemic</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 315</p> <p>1 MS. TRACY : I think -- 2 DR. O'DONNELL: Dr. Roach (ph) -- 3 MS. TRACY : I think the question was, if I 4 can try to rephrase it, is, are there any currently 5 FDA-approved products that were approved based on 6 primary endpoint that was PRO-based using a validated 7 measure? 8 MR. CHEN: Not in the non-CF bronchiectasis or 9 CF, right, but this -- they are alert in other disease 10 areas, other side would be the area that is actually 11 the patient reporting is actually the primary 12 endpoints. For example, in the female sexual 13 dysfunctions that's, you know, basically that's the 14 patient reporting their alert situation where -- and I 15 may think this, in the psoriasis situation, the 16 itchings, so that that you have to read that. So there 17 are -- there are drugs that is basically the patient 18 report is the primary endpoints. 19 DR. NICHOLS: Perhaps closely related would be 20 inhaled aztreonam and CF played a major role in 21 approval for that drug. 22 DR. ROACH: Hi, Jim Roach from Pulmatrix. If</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 317</p> <p>1 antibiotics that we'll use during the period of the 2 study because that might be able to quantify, you know, 3 when -- what was the severity in the sense that the 4 physicians thought that this patient requires 2 weeks 5 or 4 weeks of antibiotics and that would also correlate 6 with how frequently those occurred. 7 DR. O'DONNELL: Any comments on that using 8 either antibiotic days I guess or antibiotic free days? 9 I know that came up at the advisory committee -- 10 DR. DHAND: From the total amount used 11 actually. 12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. 13 DR. O'DONNELL: Yeah. 14 MR. CHALMERS: I would just -- I would just 15 make a comment again from order and registry data is 16 that the number of days of antibiotics patients receive 17 is often a measure of who their physician is rather 18 than the severity of their exacerbations. So 14 days 19 is standard according to guidelines, but many patients 20 in the U.K. receive 7, many patients receive 28. 21 That's not a measure of how bad their exacerbation was, 22 it's what their physicians' normal practices or which -</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 318</p> <p>1 - which physician they saw when they presented with 2 their exacerbation. So again I think for an endpoint 3 you would need something more objective that measures 4 symptoms rather than drugs. 5 DR. AKSAMIT: Unless there was a standardized 6 approach to the exacerbations; and as Dutch had pointed 7 out earlier, you know, in the Cleveland area they use a 8 lot of colistin and maybe other areas don't use it at 9 all and that in itself will have a big impact on number 10 of days of antibiotics. So it's not only the pathogen, 11 but then the training unless there was a standardized 12 response to exacerbations I think the noise is going to 13 be too prohibitive. 14 DR. DHAND: Could that be protocolized though, 15 you know, that -- no? 16 MS. HAMBLETT: I was just going to say, at 17 least for many of our studies, the number of days of 18 antibiotics has not been particularly sensitive. A few 19 studies for which we've had quite remarkable reductions 20 in exacerbation risk, but really no corresponding 21 movement on the antibiotic days that you would expect 22 to correlate with that. I think it's -- there -- it's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 320</p> <p>1 resolve that because if you see a return of symptoms to 2 baseline and then an increase rather than a sustained 3 high level of symptoms, you could make a better 4 determination than just setting what we have at the 5 moment, which is arbitrary thresholds of 14 days free 6 cause a new exacerbation or otherwise. 7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. 8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, again like has 9 been said, you have to be sure that your patients are 10 every day a high number completing that daily 11 questionnaire, which is a real problem. 12 DR. FROEHLICH: I have a quick comment on 13 that. We in our protocol in the orbit studies, we 14 defined that if a second cause of antibiotics was given 15 within less than 14 days in between this would have 16 counted as a single exacerbation. You can do this, but 17 another episode explains or demonstrates how difficult 18 this is in patients. I know at least of one case, 19 probably more in our studies where a patient at the 20 investigative side was diagnosed with a mild 21 exacerbation and no antibiotic was prescribed. The 22 patient left the hospital, a few hours later went to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 319</p> <p>1 very noisy. 2 MR. VANDEVANTER: I just wanted to comment on 3 protocolizing exacerbation treatment, that's an 4 excellent idea that will never be accomplished unless 5 we get more data. What we find when we try to 6 protocolize it is we either select for physicians that 7 believe that's the right way to treat and then that 8 reduces our numbers or we see a high number of protocol 9 violations. And so many people think it's great in 10 theory, but then when the patient is in front of them 11 they go back to their training and those trials are 12 problematic. 13 DR. O'DONNELL: Alan? 14 DR. BARKER: Just a comment on this frequency 15 of exacerbations, as we get higher number of 16 exacerbations, there are certainly patients that 2 17 weeks after their exacerbation they get worse or they 18 get another course of antibiotics is that continuation 19 of the same and how is that counted is the same one or 20 is that a new one. And that would have to be defined 21 if we're looking at a frequent exacerbation population. 22 MR. CHALMERS: Yeah. Again, the diaries could</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 321</p> <p>1 their personal physician and got his prescription of 2 ciprofloxacin filled for the same event. And this is a 3 difficulty that we are facing with many patients, some 4 have standing prescriptions for antibiotics or they 5 have their own perspective of what they need for 6 treatment. 7 MR. CHEN: So I think these all come down to 8 how we define exacerbations. And then I think we -- 9 there is need for a consensus how we define 10 exacerbation in these situations. The -- earlier we 11 see there's a presentation that the actually symptoms 12 of severity is included as the definitions that you 13 need to have 4 hour the following symptoms, cough, 14 mucus and all that. So if the symptoms severity is 15 including in the definition of exacerbation, then 16 actually that -- the days of exacerbation already 17 taking into account on the severity of exacerbations. 18 Earlier I mentioned about the use of PIO (ph), they 19 actually do -- they want to capture the pre- 20 exacerbations, you know, the up-tick of the symptoms. 21 And then they also major after the 22 exacerbation, they actually capture how the symptoms go</p>

Page 322

1 down. And actually, sometime you need to reestablish
 2 baselines because we also say 20 percent, they actually
 3 do not go down to baseline. So this has been --
 4 consider has been study in COPD. I'm not so sure about
 5 in the -- in this patient population, but there are
 6 things that we can do. We just need to like, you know,
 7 have a agreement how to do it.

8 DR. FLUME: So in the CF forum we looked at
 9 the intervals between events to try and figure out when
 10 are they really two different events and when are they
 11 the same event. And if you've done adjudication,
 12 you've seen really short intervals. And when we
 13 started setting this up intuitively, we thought, well,
 14 a really short interval, maybe that's just a logistical
 15 thing. And then maybe if it's all within a week that
 16 actually represents they stop therapy too soon and it's
 17 just a worsening of that previous event and just sort
 18 of assume that maybe if it's more than 2 weeks maybe it
 19 will be a new event. When we ask doctors, it was
 20 always a new event.

21 DR. DHAND: You know, looking at symptoms also
 22 depends on not only the presence of the symptom, but

Page 323

1 the perception of the symptom as well. I mean, you
 2 could have a shortness of breath or cough or you know,
 3 sputum, but then is of new onset or is the patient been
 4 having that for a long time, how much does it interfere
 5 with their lives. And so I think that if you look at
 6 those factors to determine severity, that's going to be
 7 an issue as well. But included in your definition of
 8 the exacerbation is the fact that the physician changes
 9 treatment. So I think that -- you know, so that's the
 10 objective evaluation of those symptoms that the
 11 physician feels that a change in treatment is needed.
 12 So some of that I think would be a surrogate marker.

13 DR. O'DONNELL: Any other ideas for endpoints?
 14 James?

15 MR. CHALMERS: Just to throw something out
 16 there, when we asked the European Bronchiectasis
 17 Patient Organization (ph) what they thought was the
 18 most important endpoint, frequency of exacerbations was
 19 right up there, but the top one that bothered the
 20 patients the most was cough. And we don't currently
 21 measure cough in any bronchiectasis trial directly. So
 22 quality of life bronchiectasis questionnaire

Page 324

1 respiratory symptom score has some domains for cough,
 2 but is heavily weighted by other symptoms like
 3 breathlessness, and other. And so I just think it's
 4 unusual that we haven't yet found a way to measure what
 5 is the dominant symptom of bronchiectasis. Again, we
 6 couldn't advise company to measure cough using scale X
 7 because there isn't one validated for bronchiectasis,
 8 but there are ways of measuring coughs. So there's
 9 cough monitors they used in cough trials that are
 10 objective measures of cough, and there are
 11 questionnaires that measure the impact of cough, and
 12 it's something that should be considered because it's
 13 the main symptom the patients complain of.

14 DR. TINO: Anne?
 15 DR. O'DONNELL: Yes?
 16 DR. TINO: I agree with that and anecdotally
 17 our patients say the same thing. But actually, the
 18 question for the FDA -- the Leicester Cough
 19 questionnaire has been used in small clinical trials,
 20 one of the early Mannitol trials et cetera. What's
 21 your opinion about that as a measure or any of the
 22 panelists actually?

Page 325

1 DR. COX: I don't know that folks are familiar
 2 enough to be able to --

3 DR. O'DONNELL: Thank you.

4 DR. COX: -- comment right now on the
 5 questionnaire, but others may have thoughts.

6 DR. O'DONNELL: I guess we don't have good
 7 data on that. Yes, Igor (ph)?

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, I just want to
 9 make a comment. So when we went to the Pre-IND meeting
 10 with FDA many, many years ago, we had exactly the same
 11 kind of conversation about what is the right endpoint,
 12 all these clinical trials. And I think that the one
 13 thing that hasn't changed is that excess of patients
 14 always come up as an important endpoint. And I also
 15 remember at the previous workshop I went to Dr. Folly
 16 (ph) after the workshop when this was discussed and I
 17 ask him about, "Is he really, really sick, that a
 18 single drug would meet all of the concerns that the
 19 patients have about their disease?" So I think that,
 20 you know, the sponsor together with the input from the
 21 patients needs to decide what is it that they're going
 22 to demonstrate in the trial? I mean, if we had set out

Page 326	Page 328
<p>1 to develop (inaudible) of ciprofloxacin DI to suppress 2 cough in the patients, we would have never been 3 developing any ciprofloxacin for that purpose. 4 So I don't disagree that we shouldn't be 5 monitoring cough. If we make these patients cough more 6 that's a bad thing, but I think that in the end, we 7 need to decide about what is the endpoint? And then if 8 we meet that endpoint, put that endpoint on the label 9 and then the patients need to decide whether there is 10 an endpoint that they really like and this is why they 11 would want to take that drug. I don't see that we can 12 make a universal remedy for all the symptoms. 13 DR. O'DONNELL: I mean is there a way to make 14 a composite endpoint between quality of life and 15 frequency of exacerbations? 16 MS. TRACY: Certainly, I mean you can combine 17 anything. However, I mean you need -- again that PRO 18 has not been validated in this population. So going 19 forward it would have to be tested in a phase II trial 20 or a some sort of non-pivotal trial in order for that 21 data to be collected to see whether or not that 22 endpoint is validated and then put it into the</p>	<p>1 exactly for these practical issues. 2 So that in the context of defining 3 exacerbations for clinical trials at least most of the 4 -- well, the overwhelming consensus was leave the 5 grading out, so it -- again it sounds great and I'm in 6 full agreement with that, but in practicality based on 7 the experience of Orbit (ph) and the other 8 investigators, there was consensus not to do that. And 9 I don't know if, James, again you want to comment? 10 DR. O'DONNELL: One last comment on this and 11 then we'll talk about duration. 12 MR. CHALMERS: Yeah, no, I was just going to 13 make the point -- I think Igor made a really important 14 point and yours goes to the same thing that we mustn't 15 make this too complicated and we mustn't create an 16 endpoint that is so difficult to hit that we never get 17 drugs through to patients 18 DR. O'DONNELL: That's where we are right now. 19 MR. CHALMERS: Total number of exacerbations 20 is a really simple thing to measure and the other 21 things that we're talking about like severity of 22 exacerbations, the things where we don't have validated</p>
Page 327	Page 329
<p>1 composite I suppose. But I think your question is more 2 statistical in nature, and, yes, much more complicated, 3 and certainly analysis and you know, objectives. 4 MS. ELLENBERG: So if you had some validated 5 way to grade severity, which we don't, apparently, but 6 if there were a scale that people were comfortable 7 with, one could imagine, you know, for each 8 exacerbation having a grade of severity say for each 9 day of the exacerbation, then one could do some kind of 10 area under the curve, you know, over the period of time 11 and add that up. But you know, that, you'd have to be 12 able to validate that, that's just -- 13 DR. AKSAMIT: I might push back a little bit 14 on the severity issue as Dr. O'Donnell said when they 15 adjudicated their severity for the purposes of the 16 clinical trial what appeared to otherwise be a 17 relatively simple concept became very difficult based 18 on available information. The second part is that when 19 the consensus statement came up with this international 20 group about what a definition of exacerbation was as is 21 pointed out in the discussion, the group purposefully 22 left off grade of exacerbation, mild, moderate, severe,</p>	<p>1 ways of measuring them are fantastic for secondary 2 endpoints to provide supporting data of what this means 3 for patients, but we really need to have an endpoint 4 that we can hit and we can measure properly. And total 5 number of exacerbations is the only one that we have 6 that the clinical community has confidence in. 7 DR. SMITH: Okay. You know, that's a good 8 point to take off on the question of the duration of 9 the trials. And I think one reason that we're asking 10 this is because based on what we've seen, if you're 11 looking at a frequency endpoint it just seems that a 1- 12 year trial may not be sufficient to detect differences 13 between treatment groups. So that's partly behind -- 14 now we understand if there were different endpoints, 15 then, you know, the duration of the trial might be 16 different. But we're interested to hear what people 17 would say about the appropriate duration of endpoint. 18 DR. AKSAMIT: Well, and I might just put the 19 caveat in, it depends on what the event rate is. So I 20 mean as -- I mean in the context of your point which is 21 very well taken in the experience with the respiter 22 (ph) program, the event rate was exceedingly low based</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 330</p> <p>1 on what the expected events were going to be. And I 2 can't speak to the CF trials, but if the event rate 3 would have been four or five per year, would we have 4 seen signal. And so I think we have to ask that 5 question in the context of what do you expect the 6 baseline event rate to be? 7 DR. SMITH: And it's true, we're going into 8 these trials, the expectation was that the event rates 9 were going to be somewhat higher than they turned out 10 to be. So it's pretty, you know -- 11 DR. TINO: So you know, the duration is going 12 to be a very important question because there's been an 13 impact on some of the guidance that FDA has given in 14 terms -- even at the upcoming colistin trial. So from 15 an academic standpoint, I think the longer the better 16 in terms of a disease where we've seen that the event 17 rate can be relatively low. But from a practical 18 standpoint in the placebo-controlled trial in a group 19 of patients who has the kind of morbidity that 20 suffered, it can be very, very impractical to do that. 21 The off-label use of these inhaled antibiotics is going 22 to continue. The doc in the office is going to use</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 332</p> <p>1 process we did use the NSM guild (ph) counting method 2 as a post-hoc analysis. You narrow down your 3 confidence interval and you get even better results. 4 When you look for the Orbit-3 (ph) study that has a 5 much lower -- not much, but has -- had a lower rate as 6 compared to Orbit-4 (ph). There you did not see a 7 significantly positive result for the frequency. And I 8 think in my mind it really comes down in the 9 identification of those patients that have a higher 10 disease severity in terms of a higher frequency of 11 excessive patients in your study. 12 MR. FOLLMANN: Well, where there are fewer 13 events in Orbit-4 maybe if Orbit-4 enrolled more people 14 that could have counterbalanced them not having many 15 endpoints. And you'd have similar total events in 3 16 and 4 and maybe showed 4 was significant. 17 MR. ALDER: There was no big difference in the 18 enrollment rate of 4 studies, but there was a 19 difference when you looked at the placebo, event rates 20 was -- in our interpretation Orbit-4 was unusually low. 21 MR. FOLLMANN: Right, so you had fewer events 22 in Orbit-4 which could have, you know, if you had a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 331</p> <p>1 tobramycin, is going to use colistin. So I think -- 2 and I think we should certainly hear from the patients 3 who alluded to it. I think ideally it would make 4 sense, but from a practical perspective, I think 2 5 years is too long and I don't think we're going to 6 complete clinical trials to our satisfaction. 7 MR. FOLLMANN: I was just going to make a 8 pretty obvious comment which is, you know, the duration 9 -- the feasibility of a trial is related to how many 10 people we recruit, and you know, it's basically based 11 on how many events you get. If you need a hundred 12 events, you could recruit a lot of people who have very 13 -- events very rarely or you can recruit very few 14 people who have a lot of events. And so it's all tied 15 up together, duration by itself in my mind it's not -- 16 is incomplete I guess. 17 DR. FROEHLICH: The experience with a tool 18 phase III Orbit trials in my mind is -- confirms if you 19 have a sufficiently high event rate in particular in 20 the placebo group, you will -- you do see a difference 21 in the frequency of exacerbations when you use it by 22 nominal method, and when we were to use the counting</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 333</p> <p>1 bigger study you would have had more events. So you 2 could have, you know, made Orbit-4 bigger. I know you 3 didn't plan on that. I guess they were identical 4 studies and for bad luck, you had fewer events in 5 Orbit-4. But to me it's not just a question of, you 6 know, you can counterbalance usually having few events 7 by enrolling more people and getting more events, power 8 is basically given by a number of events. 9 MR. ALDER: Sure, we did base our studies on 10 phase II results and in one study we were closer to the 11 phase II results, in the other one we were not. 12 DR. TINO: Again, I'll say, the respiter 1 and 13 2 were enrolled based on total events, not event rate. 14 And in the first respiter trial, the placebo event rate 15 per patient, where there was significant efficacy was 16 about 1.1, and every patient had to have a history of 2 17 or more. In the second respiter trial where it just 18 missed on statistical significance, the event rate in 19 placebo is 0.7. So you know about -- what is that, 20 about 28 percent lower. So there was better efficacy 21 when there was a higher event rate, but both trials 22 were still enrolled the total number of events. So</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 334</p> <p>1 there were more patients in the second trial than the 2 first because of the lower event rate overall. It 3 didn't help in other words. You still need a high 4 event rate per placebo patient. 5 DR. SMITH: I just want to comment on a 6 challenge with extending trial durations in that 7 there's an unintended consequence there that the longer 8 the trial is, the more likely you are to recruit 9 relatively healthier patients. And so you may think 10 that we have this event rate for a year trial, so if we 11 extend it to 2, we can extrapolate it out. But I think 12 what you would find is that you would lose more signal 13 than you would -- more signal per unit time than you 14 would gain by doubling the time. 15 And honestly a year is a long time for these 16 patients to be in these placebo-controlled trials. And 17 so at least this has been our experience in CF is that 18 the longer the study you propose, the more likely you 19 are to recruit patients that have a lower medical need. 20 DR. AKSAMIT: And I think one difficulty is 21 based on what we've seen so far would be hugely risky 22 for somebody to undertake a trial looking at frequency</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 336</p> <p>1 way of doing a shorter, you know, I think it was 48 2 weeks for one of the studies or a year. And if 3 everything sort of looks okay, so there's no, you know, 4 safety concerns per se, is there a way of doing a 5 tentative approval where patients would continue on the 6 drug, maybe not do the placebo, continue on the drug 7 and then be able to analyze? 8 DR. COX: So I mean the question comes up 9 every now and then about tentative approvals, and in 10 essence in order to approve a drug, I mean you do need 11 to have both the evidence of safety and efficacy. So 12 it's an interesting idea, it comes up from time to 13 time, but we really do need to have the data that would 14 support the approval to allow us to go forward. So you 15 know -- 16 MR. CHALMERS: Just a comment about enriching 17 for higher numbers of events, I mean, so in the COPD 18 literature, the major application of the exact PRO 19 diary that you mentioned earlier has been to actually 20 trigger physicians to diagnose events. So in COPD 21 trials now it's very common that patients will use the 22 diaries not as an endpoint, but it will alarm in the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 335</p> <p>1 and have that trial be one year because it may well 2 fail. Unless you've got a way to identify which we 3 haven't quite seen yet, the really frequent 4 exacerbaters. 5 DR. SMITH: Yeah, I'm not denying that that 6 risk is there, but what I'm saying is extending the 7 duration is not necessarily going to mitigate that 8 risk. 9 DR. AKSAMIT: And I think the experience with 10 the respider program that there was significant 11 geographic variations between the respider-1 or 12 respider-2. On the other hand, it was more difficult. 13 I think most of us that had enrolled patients in 14 rolling in a respider-2 and as a consequence of that, 15 it speaks to these issues that the more -- the larger 16 the population the longer it goes, the much more 17 difficult time we're going to have enrolling patients 18 anywhere here or internationally and so we have to be 19 mindful of that. 20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just want to ask the 21 question, is there a way of doing this, you know, 22 instead of doing a 2-year or longer study, is there a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 337</p> <p>1 physician's office to say your patient is having -- has 2 had 2 days of worsening symptoms and you contact the 3 patient and the patient says, "Yes, I'm having an 4 exacerbation. Sorry I forgot to contact you." And at 5 the moment in trials, we rely on then seeing that 6 patient 3 months later and then reporting to us that 7 they did have an exacerbation that they forgot to tell 8 us about. 9 But if we have the objective measure, the 10 triggers, the reporting of exacerbations, it's proven 11 in COPD that in some cases it doubles the event rate 12 just by detecting unreported events. So it's like 13 another thing that's important to think about. 14 MR. CHEN: I'm thinking of another scenario is 15 that instead of the total as the patient or the 16 frequencies, say if the treatment objective or the 17 treatment benefit is actually decrease the days of the 18 exacerbations, reducing the durations. In this case we 19 can actually when patients come into the hospital or 20 the emergency care to the clinic reporting that they 21 are having exacerbations, then we're enrolling into a 22 study and then to -- then we randomize them into</p>

Page 338

1 different arms and then to see if the target treatment
 2 actually reduced the number of days after the
 3 exacerbation, in that case you don't need the -- a very
 4 longer trial, but then your indication will be
 5 different, will be rather than total among, or total
 6 number of exacerbation, but is actually the number of
 7 days of experience as the patients.
 8 DR. BARKER: The comment about the practical
 9 utility of 2 years is come up, the longest study we've
 10 ever done is a year. But there's both patient and
 11 investigator fatigue, you're talking a minimum of 10 to
 12 12 visits per year as part of the study. You're
 13 talking about ideally coming in for their exacerbations
 14 to be evaluated and that's -- it's fatigue.
 15 MR. ALDER: Or data fatigue. Yeah, I'll say
 16 with longer trials there will be diminishing return in
 17 that even with a 1-year study. When it's placebo-
 18 controlled, there's market numbers, the dropouts. And
 19 the dropouts tend to happen during or after an
 20 exacerbation. Now statistically there's ways to
 21 compensate, but that's less than ideal to have patients
 22 dropping out, especially if the patients know there's a

Page 339

1 50-50 chance of being in the placebo arm and naturally
 2 they perceive that they're not receiving benefit from
 3 being in the trial, therefore drop out. So going to a
 4 2-year trial, I would expect we will see even more
 5 dropout rate and less and less data coming in.
 6 MR. CHALMERS: It's important that we
 7 recognize that guidelines now in Europe, in Australia,
 8 New Zealand, in Spain, in all of these countries
 9 recommend inhaled antibiotics for people with
 10 pseudomonas and frequent exacerbations. So the
 11 conversation you're having with the patient now when
 12 you enroll them into one of these trials is, "I could
 13 give you an off-label antibiotic now because that's
 14 what the guidelines say. But I want you to do this
 15 trial because it's good for your fellow patients to
 16 demonstrate the effectiveness of these drugs." And the
 17 patients are extraordinary because many of them will
 18 say, "Yes, I will take the risk of having a placebo in
 19 order for the greater good rather than taking the off-
 20 label therapy that's available now." But that
 21 conversation gets even more difficult when it comes to
 22 a 2-year trial, and I don't believe any of my patients

Page 340

1 are going to agree to do a 2-year study where they
 2 can't take off-label therapies. It's just -- it's
 3 ethically very difficult with what the guidelines
 4 currently say and the patients are already making a
 5 huge sacrifice to do 12-month studies.
 6 DR. O'DONNELL: All right, with that any last
 7 comments from the panel or the audience? Great, thank
 8 you very much.
 9 CLOSING REMARKS
 10 DR. COX: So I just want to thank everybody
 11 for the discussion today. I found it very informative.
 12 It was very helpful to hear, you know, what we've
 13 learned from past trials, both the things that have
 14 worked and the things that still need more work in
 15 essence, you know, some of the gaps that still need to
 16 be solved, some of the questions that still need to be
 17 answered, to try and get to trials that will be
 18 informative and ideally more feasible so that, you
 19 know, effective therapies can be found to be able to
 20 treat patients. I also want to thank too the patients
 21 who contributed their, you know, comments and thoughts
 22 about endpoints and helped us to understand more about

Page 341

1 the disease condition. I greatly appreciate it, and
 2 also the speakers at the public comment period.
 3 So I think it's been a good day and I think
 4 this, you know, the discussions today will help us in
 5 discussions with companies that are interested in
 6 developing therapies in this area, and should help us
 7 to move forward. We greatly appreciate everyone's
 8 willingness to come and join us here today and we
 9 realize that you're all very busy and this takes a big
 10 chunk of time out of your schedules to travel in and
 11 travel out, come join us. But we really do benefit
 12 from it tremendously, so we're very grateful for your
 13 willingness to come and do this. It's very valuable to
 14 us and I'll pass the microphone to Sumathi.
 15 DR. NAMBIAR: Yeah, I just want to add my
 16 thanks as well on behalf of the division. Really
 17 appreciate all of you coming and sharing your thoughts
 18 and ideas, and I think you've given us some food for
 19 thought, and hopefully this would be helpful as we
 20 forward. And many thanks Chip, Jasan and Mary (ph) for
 21 participating. We really appreciate it, thank you.
 22 DR. COX: Great. So safe travels home

Page 342

1 everybody, but one more announcement from Anne.
 2 DR. O'DONNEL: One last comment, the World
 3 Bronchiectasis Conference is here in a couple weeks
 4 here in D.C., so if anybody wants any further
 5 information --
 6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Information, yeah.
 7 DR. O'DONNEL: -- let us know. Thank you.
 8 DR. COX: Great. Thank you all.
 9 (Applause.)
 10 (Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 4:22
 11 p.m.)
 12 * * * * *
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22

Page 344

1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER
 2 I, MURALIDHAREN K.V., do hereby certify that
 3 this transcript was prepared from audio to the best of
 4 my ability.
 5
 6 I am neither counsel for, related to, nor
 7 employed by any of the parties to this action, nor
 8 financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of
 9 this action.
 10
 11
 12 July 10, 2018
 13 DATE MURALIDHAREN K.V.
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22

Page 343

1 CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC
 2 I, MICHAEL FARKAS, the officer before whom the
 3 foregoing proceeding was taken, do hereby certify that
 4 the proceedings were recorded by me and thereafter
 5 reduced to typewriting under my direction; that said
 6 proceedings are a true and accurate record to the best
 7 of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am neither
 8 counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the
 9 parties to the action in which this was taken; and,
 10 further, that I am not a relative or employee of any
 11 counsel or attorney employed by the parties hereto, nor
 12 financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of
 13 this action.
 14
 15
 16
 17 MICHAEL FARKAS
 18 Notary Public in and for the
 19 State of Maryland
 20
 21
 22

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22

&	293:10 317:18	335:22 337:2	27 1:16
& 3:2 17:15	320:5,15	338:9 339:4,22	28 10:8 54:11
0	144 226:8	340:1	69:20 70:1,19
0.7. 333:19	15 17:2 33:1 74:14	2,500 221:14	112:19 113:7
1	81:17 86:1 88:14	2-3 130:21	114:16 141:9,13
1 10:9 31:3 51:7	96:5 129:17	2.5 125:17	191:15 219:15
56:1 115:20,20	15,000 297:9	20 17:2 18:12	227:21 228:17,18
145:20 197:19	150 280:20	39:17,20 59:16	284:4,21 285:5
204:11 227:14,14	168 227:6	86:1 90:16 114:7	293:10 317:20
227:19,22 228:10	17 32:3 96:5	120:20 122:15	333:20
299:7 329:11	18 10:7 122:1	157:1 159:10	284 196:7
333:12 335:11	180 11:16,18	167:15 185:17	2:30 246:5,5
338:17	187 11:19	218:19 280:3	3
1,000 185:17	194 11:20	287:5,10 322:2	3 56:1 100:8
291:13	1984 237:9	2000 32:4	102:10 112:22
1,826 214:1	199 11:22 12:8	2001 67:17	115:20 118:19
1.1 333:16	1990's 121:8	2008 214:3	125:5,11,19
10 42:4 59:17 69:2	1996 60:5	2009 61:4	128:10,18 129:18
74:14 90:17 121:9	1997 52:11	2010 52:17 63:20	131:1 183:8
121:9 125:13	1999 24:3	2011 237:15	202:16 203:3
129:17 139:5	1:00 179:22	2012 184:8 220:18	216:1 227:20
214:12 221:14	2	2013 52:15 237:21	228:15,15 229:9
293:9 338:11	2 11:21 31:3	2014 184:9 214:3	230:2 239:10
344:12	102:10,10,10	2016 31:5 60:6	241:14 249:6,7
100,000 185:18	110:20 115:20	63:8 68:6 72:21	250:7 264:8,9
103 227:7	118:19 121:20	2017 31:12,21	285:18 299:7
10903 1:12	125:5,11,19	32:4 209:22	312:21 332:4,15
10993 40:2	126:12 128:9,10	2018 1:16 205:21	337:6
10:03 88:17	128:18 131:1	344:12	3.2 34:9
10:18 88:17	146:13 183:4	205 12:11	30 120:20 122:15
11 10:4 68:20	184:2,3,5,9 197:2	20993 1:14	129:20 139:5
219:3 283:8	197:9 199:14	21 27:16 34:9	190:1 205:19
12 63:9,13 73:14	227:14,15,20	219:15 226:11	207:13 224:7
92:13 192:4	228:14 230:2	22 197:6	270:9 271:13,16
197:14,19 211:4	239:7,10 243:6	236 12:13	300 55:11 134:18
226:20 228:2,21	249:15,21 260:3	24 99:15	243:4
338:12 340:5	264:10 265:1,12	246 12:14,18	30000 60:3
125 123:8	275:21 276:19,19	25 59:5 63:10	30s 297:17
138 11:15	277:1,7,9,12	122:1 197:9	31 1:13
14 82:21 110:18	286:2 293:20	218:20	32 122:1 181:14
121:9 181:12	299:7 317:4	250 12:20 185:17	33 219:2
192:3,3 193:7	319:16 322:18	259 12:22	340 13:4
219:12 227:21	331:4 333:13,16	26 138:19 153:8	35 60:21 237:17
	334:11 335:12,14		

<p>351 31:3,16,20 365 262:8 274:4 37 221:17 39 228:11 3:01:44 164:21 3:05:43 168:16</p>	<p>51 79:18 510 33:17 34:3,5,6 35:8 36:1,11 42:12,20 44:17 53 24:6 54 181:17 56 70:6 197:12 58 10:19</p>	<p>9</p>	<p>abstract 229:4 ac 19:1 academic 330:15 academics 291:3 291:11 accelerate 186:16 accelerated 235:8 accept 120:3 160:2 acceptable 29:15 113:1 234:1 acceptance 96:5 access 30:7 108:4 146:10 273:3 291:17 accessible 110:21 accessories 40:22 accompanied 68:14 accomplished 216:2 225:4 319:4 account 190:8 193:14 218:14 242:14 243:10 245:1,11 255:9 256:4 313:17 321:17 accounted 219:2 accounting 136:9 accounts 207:13 accurate 186:6 343:6 accused 175:20 achieve 24:20 106:7 134:19,20 achieved 185:14 achromobacter 163:7 acquired 55:7 138:22 acquisition 55:6 act 27:20 139:21 306:10</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>90 42:4 64:20 74:10 270:12,18 90s 60:8 95 167:15</p>	
<p>4 31:20 110:20 112:20,21 118:18 201:2 203:3 226:20 228:15 229:5 275:16 276:19 277:2 299:7,8 317:5 321:13 332:6,13 332:13,16,16,18 332:20,22 333:2,5 40 82:10 211:21 214:9,11 221:15 270:9,15 40s 297:18 42 70:4 45 60:11 47 10:10,16 48 202:16 210:4 227:22 228:17 229:2 258:11 262:19 336:1</p>	<p>6 106:7 107:22 109:20 129:4 134:18 182:1 201:8 226:11 239:9 293:19 60 270:19 297:13 310:11 68 260:3</p>	<p>a</p>	
<p>5</p>	<p>7</p>	<p>ability 63:17 64:8 69:11 105:9 159:17 278:9 313:22 314:14 343:7 344:4 able 22:6 42:15,18 54:2 66:21 94:14 97:3 114:5 117:12 140:2 146:10 148:8 183:21 227:4 238:12 260:6 267:21 271:16 275:22 281:19 295:1,5,14 296:20 310:15 312:6 314:20 317:2 325:2 327:12 336:7 340:19 abnormal 212:16 213:9 abpa 301:8 abroad 61:9 abscesses 237:12 absence 214:17 absent 174:5 absolute 125:12 125:17 129:18 288:3 absolutely 46:12 46:14 145:21 266:3 283:4 307:12 312:19 absorbed 38:13,15 absorption 223:17 268:11</p>	
<p>5 38:11 118:18 123:10 125:15,18 199:22 238:8 263:7 286:3 305:8 307:18 313:4 5-7 11:8,13 50 66:15 73:15 82:11 129:19,20 227:9 270:15,18 271:2,2,15 50-50 339:1 500 64:11 505 31:3,3,10</p>	<p>7 110:18 191:16 214:13 280:13 282:1 293:9 317:20 70 62:20 97:12 138:19 159:10 297:13 72 227:9 75 60:8 63:10 72:22 157:2 77 211:3 266:12 79 10:21</p>		
	<p>8</p>		
	<p>8 237:10 299:9 302:19,21 80 63:12 227:5 270:12,18 800 64:9 80s 212:9 820.30 27:16 85 62:9 64:20 88 10:22 11:5 89 11:10</p>		

<p>acting 99:13,14 108:17 272:17</p> <p>action 25:7 36:16 243:19 343:9,13 344:7,9</p> <p>activation 212:14</p> <p>active 70:1,4,6,10 71:10,11 77:2,9 94:19 99:4 104:11 106:8,9,10 113:4 115:13 133:19 134:2 137:12 146:19 172:2,10 172:14,15 175:11 267:20</p> <p>actively 278:18</p> <p>activity 103:13 118:12 314:17</p> <p>actor 223:6</p> <p>actors 223:5</p> <p>acts 109:12</p> <p>actual 30:3 125:12 125:19 173:21 189:15 275:1</p> <p>acute 63:12 176:5 206:14 217:18 225:21 226:12 263:6 303:18</p> <p>ad 156:21 168:20</p> <p>adapt 52:7 55:4 55:17 57:5</p> <p>adcom 163:15</p> <p>add 17:3 50:11 62:1 76:12 81:3 83:14 95:6,19,20 96:7 98:8,15 99:22 100:10 107:18 108:20,21 108:21,22 109:1,8 109:9,10 116:12 117:12 118:7 122:15,18 125:10 128:8 132:16 153:12 268:7</p>	<p>294:7 327:11 341:15</p> <p>added 81:8</p> <p>adding 81:1 95:10 140:3</p> <p>addition 25:9 27:22 30:4 65:3 101:20,20 176:11 196:20 254:18 304:15</p> <p>additional 29:20 65:12,19 67:7 83:7 92:8 96:12 116:16 123:16 204:4 208:22 247:20 249:22 261:4</p> <p>additionally 249:5 249:21</p> <p>address 26:11 69:15 84:21 87:4 87:5 94:4 143:5 154:9 176:21 180:12 199:8,17 235:21 242:7 249:18</p> <p>addressed 77:19 80:4 153:1 201:8 254:21</p> <p>addresses 38:22 185:6,9</p> <p>addressing 182:18</p> <p>adds 65:4</p> <p>adequate 112:1 135:22 143:15 243:14,15 257:17 265:19</p> <p>adequately 136:8 195:19 249:8</p> <p>adherence 99:18 218:4 226:14</p> <p>adhering 227:4</p> <p>adjudicate 266:3</p>	<p>adjudicated 327:15</p> <p>adjudication 266:1 322:11</p> <p>adjunct 3:10,22 18:10 233:14</p> <p>adjunctive 204:15 248:6</p> <p>adjust 198:1</p> <p>adjusted 185:12</p> <p>adjustment 193:17 219:9</p> <p>administered 192:8 280:12</p> <p>administration 1:2 27:13 117:17 118:4 200:8</p> <p>admission 160:21</p> <p>adolescent 62:18 121:18 139:4</p> <p>adolescents 90:9</p> <p>adopted 174:20</p> <p>adoption 235:6</p> <p>adult 21:2 46:6 48:6,8,20 49:1 58:12 62:18 72:22 90:10 121:18 122:2 139:4 300:15</p> <p>adults 37:14 45:2 46:2 48:1 73:1 92:12,15 143:2</p> <p>advanced 127:4 207:5 208:14 211:6</p> <p>advantage 105:10 108:17 128:12</p> <p>advantageous 97:2</p> <p>adverse 23:9,11 201:4 202:6,8 203:13 206:20 208:13 225:22 226:3 231:19</p>	<p>advice 164:7 259:17</p> <p>advise 184:4 250:4 262:4 287:18 324:6</p> <p>advisory 20:6,14 21:12 25:9 163:18 194:19 196:7 202:12 203:10 204:1 205:5 227:17,18 229:4 240:9 242:5 244:2 244:5 317:9</p> <p>advocacy 180:14 180:15</p> <p>advocate 180:21</p> <p>advocated 186:17 242:6</p> <p>advocates 187:13</p> <p>aerobic 234:10</p> <p>aerosol 38:9,14 214:12</p> <p>aerosolized 21:5</p> <p>aeruginosa 11:8 59:18 65:6 89:4 89:19 90:2,8 211:17 219:2 222:11 225:12</p> <p>affairs 229:12 231:21 233:11 234:20</p> <p>affect 300:22</p> <p>affiliation 16:19</p> <p>afford 147:19</p> <p>afternoon 131:15 163:9 179:22 180:4,11 205:2 224:2 242:12 246:18</p> <p>afternoon's 153:2</p> <p>age 39:3 63:9 73:11 80:14 91:10 92:3,5,13,16 121:21 122:1</p>
--	---	---	--

<p>142:22 181:12 211:4 223:19 241:14 257:16 agencies 155:14 229:17 agency 53:16 115:6 120:6 131:17 136:20 199:5 agency's 187:10 agenda 16:12 180:7 243:22 agent 61:17 64:11 107:5 117:11 119:20 215:21 agents 21:21 65:12,22 67:1,7 119:10 146:1 215:18,19 216:14 ages 73:15 244:11 aggressive 79:1 aggressively 70:3 agnostic 67:8 ago 20:5 47:9 59:13,17 61:3 64:16 65:20 66:7 82:12 90:17 157:1 180:19 182:1 184:14 201:8 217:8 226:8 280:3 281:9 302:4 325:10 agonist 35:17 agonists 99:14 agree 94:1 96:14 97:1 99:5,20 118:20 129:3 137:11 164:16 173:8 175:12 215:3 264:13 268:2 271:19,20 282:5 291:12 306:9 316:1 324:16 340:1</p>	<p>agreed 260:10 agreement 322:7 328:6 agricultural 165:5 ah 172:22 aha 161:5 ahead 29:17 88:13 102:6 131:22 175:17 310:6 aim 208:18 air 272:15 291:21 291:21 airway 80:11 162:9 190:13,14 206:3 211:12 212:15,20 213:8 214:8,22,22 215:7 216:18 217:13,22 223:16,21 226:1,3 302:12 312:5 airways 230:14 232:14 akin 207:7 aksamit 4:8 18:16 18:16 47:5,21 96:2 109:15 130:20 131:5 132:15 175:20 228:9 282:4,6 285:8,10 287:22 295:16 298:4 301:22 311:2,12 311:14,17,19,22 318:5 327:13 329:18 334:20 335:9 alan 2:20 17:14 266:21 319:13 alan's 271:7 alarm 336:22 albuterol 35:18 alder 6:9 20:3,3 44:4 45:9,12 46:8 46:13 115:10</p>	<p>262:3 267:6 280:9 303:12 307:11 332:17 333:9 338:15 alert 315:9,14 aligned 24:6 alignment 285:20 allende 6:18 11:10 20:11,11 89:2,5 89:10,20 163:17 268:1 299:13 300:1,5,9,18 301:5,14,16,18,21 302:2 allergic 233:8 234:4 237:21 248:3 allergy 7:5,11 20:16,19 127:2 alliances 305:9 allow 29:8 70:3 91:13 130:11 336:14 allowable 38:18 allows 28:16 29:6 alluded 61:3 149:20 232:22 312:22 331:3 alpha 298:17 alternate 83:5 84:9 alternating 106:11 alternatives 126:22 alto 8:11 240:18 altogether 116:7 amazing 167:14 amendments 183:4,7 america 296:12 aminoglycosides 61:5 98:12</p>	<p>amount 88:7 92:2 96:21 104:3 115:2 135:22 149:1 198:8 296:1 316:22 317:10 amy 11:18 180:8 180:13 239:18 242:8,16 analogy 188:19 237:2 analyses 31:12 166:20 202:4 255:22 256:2,18 271:2,4 analysis 8:19 18:11 22:15 24:3 24:8 30:19 43:20 60:19 108:15 126:7 131:9 132:17 134:13 135:3 137:16 176:5,18 177:1,9 177:18 182:20 190:21 202:9 218:9 257:3 293:16 308:17 327:3 332:2 analyze 135:4,5 136:5 193:5 252:11 336:7 analyzing 255:1 255:12 anatomical 268:8 299:16 300:6 anda 31:10,14 andersen 38:7 255:22 256:18 anecdotally 147:10 324:16 angela 8:22 288:18,19 animal 200:10,10 ann 126:15</p>
---	--	---	--

<p>anne 12:5 153:4 205:15 217:7 288:22 324:14 342:1 announcement 342:1 annual 73:12 216:10 answer 29:18 50:10 102:15 110:16 153:9 273:6 275:3 277:11 291:6,11 295:5 313:19 answered 145:4 281:6 340:17 answering 287:18 anti 6:10,20 18:15 19:13,16 20:4,12 20:22 32:17 35:19 51:13,20 89:11 148:18 162:8 213:4 230:9,13 232:4 233:15 247:6,9 antibacterial 1:7 36:9,15 90:12 172:18 182:3 200:5 antibacterials 200:14 201:6 251:20 antibiotic 60:4 62:2 63:15 64:22 65:2,9 70:17 71:15 73:14,21 78:9 97:7 98:20 99:16 100:10,19 103:15 126:20 130:1 149:6 159:8 159:9 162:8 165:14,18,19 167:10 168:13 169:18 171:21</p>	<p>172:1,2,9,13,15 179:10 181:19 195:22 197:4 198:5 216:10 218:22 219:8,10 219:18 239:16 241:1 242:7 245:12,14 266:16 267:13 276:11 283:18 294:1,18 312:1,2 317:8,8 318:21 320:21 339:13 antibiotics 10:17 14:7 21:6 58:17 61:3 62:4,15 63:7 65:4 68:20 70:20 73:8 76:11 84:9 85:6 96:16 100:15 110:16 113:4,13 126:17 128:3 133:12,14,17 150:14 155:9,10 156:6,19 157:14 158:9 159:16 165:5 166:14 167:7 168:14 173:2 181:15 183:11,11 194:16 197:18,22 198:9 198:19 211:11,20 213:4 214:11 220:3,18 222:10 223:9,12,15 224:3 224:9,15,18 225:1 229:13 233:1 239:10,17 271:12 272:12 273:19 275:15 277:6 284:4,9,12,20,21 285:4 292:20 294:18,21 299:3 299:11 304:2 312:1,9 316:13</p>	<p>317:1,5,16 318:10 318:18 319:18 320:14 321:4 330:21 339:9 anticholinergic 35:18 anticipate 25:20 124:17 antimicrobial 6:21 10:14 14:4 21:21 51:16 52:4 52:10 54:10,12,15 54:19 56:4,15 76:5 78:6 155:6 194:18 198:11 204:7,18 213:2 214:9 218:7 235:5 245:9 antimycobacterial 17:20 antipseudomonal 90:6 anxiety 240:5 anxious 238:21 anybody 94:22 157:9 342:4 anyone's 86:21 anyway 269:6 app 306:5 apparently 327:5 appear 96:8 152:5 208:17 appearance 72:1 269:12 appeared 327:16 appears 84:14 appetite 67:5 applaud 199:1 applause 342:9 apples 263:15 297:1,1 applicable 31:17 application 31:10 31:16,20 195:2</p>	<p>216:13 225:1 336:18 applications 31:3 32:19 35:14 applied 213:10,12 214:6,8,16,19 217:3 233:10 307:7 applies 26:14 apply 28:13,17 63:8 182:9 applying 50:12 151:19 190:20 appreciate 152:8 175:15,19 341:1,7 341:17,21 appreciated 62:11 65:13 237:1 266:10 approach 26:10 26:14 94:2 96:12 146:4 151:6,9 154:10 155:1 209:20 212:10,21 213:18 219:22 255:3,15,19 256:16 280:10 303:6 307:9 310:1 318:6 approached 72:22 212:6 approaches 26:5 64:18 66:3 205:20 255:19,20 257:2 appropriate 25:7 39:1 107:2 179:11 179:18 195:14 196:21,22 200:9 202:4 213:17 234:3 247:12 250:6 329:17 approval 20:7 33:20 45:8 55:21 67:2 69:2 229:17</p>
---	--	--	---

<p>315:21 336:5,14 approvals 336:9 approve 81:6 183:17 195:1 313:15 336:10 approved 35:10 35:13 45:16,17 49:19 52:10,11,13 52:15 59:14 65:21 68:8 69:1 90:15 90:16 92:14,15 94:17 119:10 125:15 144:11 149:10 159:7,21 200:2 210:13 245:13,19,21 247:6 251:5 313:10 315:5,5 aradigm 2:11 17:7 18:8 21:13 191:8 191:18 192:17 242:5 245:17 273:1 289:12 arbitrary 320:5 area 14:13,18 57:18 58:6 64:15 66:6,10 68:11,22 69:18 95:5 119:22 209:1 266:14,16 267:20 308:11 315:10 318:7 327:10 341:6 areas 24:7 95:7 103:21,22 104:19 117:18 237:19 273:13 315:10 318:8 arena 136:2 209:14 arguably 316:6 argue 65:7,15 68:9 110:15 167:9 174:12</p>	<p>argues 174:4 175:5 argument 121:12 122:5 311:3 arising 177:4 arm 252:22 339:1 armamentarium 217:6 arms 150:19 203:3 284:14 338:1 art 205:3 aside 85:7 100:13 149:14 asked 16:5 58:21 59:6 60:17 101:9 149:9 154:1 163:20 167:10 172:17 191:15,20 191:22 240:19 241:2 290:11 305:15 323:16 asking 42:11 50:9 65:14 70:9 73:13 147:8 149:14 169:3 205:17 271:9 281:4 296:22 304:22 305:13 307:14 316:17 329:9 aspect 44:6 105:6 146:12 260:5 aspergillosis 233:8 234:4 237:22 248:4 aspergillus 162:22 300:15 assess 51:1 91:16 93:5 185:1 188:2 209:7 249:8,22 295:1 assessed 77:11 222:6 264:6 assesses 208:15</p>	<p>assessing 208:8 assessment 8:14 21:15 48:12 144:6 187:6,8 208:22 268:11,13 assessments 24:22 77:16 assigned 104:15 assist 194:12 associate 4:9,21 5:17 8:17 22:13 associated 53:13 55:8 73:7 98:12 139:2,8 169:7 186:9 206:17 208:13 220:12 234:9 300:13 association 145:12 168:14 171:3 299:15 300:5 301:14 assume 45:16 101:10 128:13 256:19 322:18 assumed 113:16 assumes 256:8,9 assuming 145:9 281:3 assumption 76:3 167:6,18 256:10 assumptions 256:20 asthma 207:6 216:21 237:8,9 296:6 305:20,21 306:15,16 asymptomatic 269:22 288:13 ats 151:20 attacking 74:5 266:19 attacks 237:9 279:3</p>	<p>attainable 129:2 attained 122:4 172:7 attempt 102:5 122:5 302:9 attempted 150:13 305:12 attempting 204:15 attempts 67:21 attend 80:5 attended 203:1 attention 67:13,15 67:20 69:13 70:2 145:16 164:11 223:7 236:3 attenuated 134:10 135:14 attorney 343:11 attractive 114:6,9 115:21 118:16 146:11 223:14,20 audience 12:21 93:20 137:19 236:15 259:9 282:14 305:18 340:7 audio 344:3 aureus 53:14 112:11 138:17,21 219:3 auspices 255:14 australia 154:7 224:16 339:7 australians 296:20 authority 27:15 auto 27:2,11 avail 44:22 availability 68:13 available 16:14 17:1 34:19 36:2 40:10 43:2,6,7 44:1,14,19,21 59:15 60:6 61:18</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>61:19 68:19 69:8 72:19 81:12 82:15 84:6,9 86:8 87:12 114:10 119:21 142:14 152:16 172:8 179:10,15 210:14 216:4 242:19 293:3 327:18 339:20</p> <p>ave 1:12</p> <p>average 79:19 81:19 253:22 254:1 274:14</p> <p>averaging 183:8</p> <p>avoid 64:7 147:8 232:3</p> <p>avoidable 183:5</p> <p>avoiding 146:3 196:18</p> <p>aware 14:14 62:4 79:19 167:21 247:5 249:19 302:14 316:19</p> <p>awareness 80:2</p> <p>awesome 240:10</p> <p>axis 60:4,16,19 68:7,8 192:17</p> <p>azithromycin 134:11 231:4</p> <p>azteronam 270:11</p> <p>aztreonam 52:17 59:15 60:10 61:6 61:13,22 64:5 90:13 96:7 98:17 116:5 122:3 159:20,20 223:10 270:11 291:18 315:20</p>	<p>93:11 114:14 119:2 121:7 123:1 158:21 170:9 192:12 207:8 212:8 220:17 239:5,14 265:18 268:16 269:9 271:17 285:6 289:3 309:6 319:11 327:13</p> <p>background 18:5 147:5 152:10</p> <p>backgrounds 24:5</p> <p>backup 157:11</p> <p>bacteremia 173:15 178:1</p> <p>bacteremias 169:22 170:2</p> <p>bacteria 237:12 247:22</p> <p>bacterial 212:18 220:11,13,13 226:14 231:13 247:1,6,7,9 250:2 292:1,2,4 302:12 302:17,18,22 303:4</p> <p>bacteriology 218:12</p> <p>bactrim 149:1</p> <p>bad 57:4 112:18 164:14,16 167:2,8 168:2 223:5 241:10 250:13 275:14,18 299:7 306:19 317:21 326:6 333:4</p> <p>baddest 223:6</p> <p>balance 179:8 244:12</p> <p>balanced 78:17</p> <p>ball 189:4,14,15 237:3</p>	<p>balls 237:1 297:2</p> <p>baltimore 2:8</p> <p>bar 125:8 207:10 223:2 260:18 271:15,16</p> <p>barker 2:20 17:14 17:14 47:6 106:21 121:7 266:22 270:4 304:13 319:14 338:8</p> <p>barriers 143:16</p> <p>base 333:9</p> <p>baseball 189:2,2,4 237:3</p> <p>based 28:8 30:19 54:4 55:20 56:15 60:14 66:14 68:2 73:18 74:6 81:3 85:11 91:10 111:12 113:5 127:21 134:22 162:1 189:13 195:17 210:15 216:12 218:1,11 219:12,14 220:9 221:13 226:14 229:15 233:2 244:19 248:21 291:22 292:20 293:2 302:10 303:17 313:10 315:5,6 327:17 328:6 329:10,22 331:10 333:13 334:21</p> <p>baseline 60:20 74:6,12,14 90:20 91:1,2,11 108:22 109:9 130:10,10 139:10 158:22 256:20 258:17 287:10 292:1,2 302:16,19 308:4,8 320:2 322:3 330:6</p>	<p>baselines 322:2</p> <p>basic 56:19 57:1 143:6 172:9</p> <p>basically 38:8 52:15 55:9 56:18 107:15 141:9 151:19 155:7 158:20 304:12 306:15 315:13,17 331:10 333:8</p> <p>basis 55:21 174:16 221:17 226:10 233:6 281:22</p> <p>bat 189:2,4 230:20</p> <p>bayer 20:5 21:12 242:5 245:17 271:1 272:22 289:12</p> <p>bear 97:14 250:16</p> <p>beauty 256:5 257:9</p> <p>becoming 80:4</p> <p>bedeviling 209:13</p> <p>bedroom 281:10</p> <p>began 114:22 238:19</p> <p>beginning 50:15 77:15 185:4 262:22 273:22</p> <p>begs 77:8</p> <p>behalf 194:3 341:16</p> <p>behave 272:6 296:8</p> <p>behavior 132:11</p> <p>behold 262:16</p> <p>beings 175:14</p> <p>believe 60:13 76:16,21 112:14 116:1 188:8 263:16 273:7 303:2 319:7 339:22</p>
<p>b</p>			
<p>b 31:3,3 43:5 191:19 258:6 288:2 314:5</p> <p>back 16:12 23:7 29:19 36:14 61:4</p>			

<p>believed 38:12 believes 272:12 bench 38:5,5 40:8 beneficial 275:2 benefit 59:22 60:13 84:8 93:3 97:22 108:6,10 111:22 115:18 116:16 119:7,20 124:8,18,21 125:5 125:11 139:21 140:5 141:2 147:9 147:11,20 148:2 150:1 163:1 170:9 170:14,16,17 171:19 175:1 180:22 186:12 187:6,8,15 247:4 247:10 248:11 250:6 262:5 272:8 273:9,9 337:17 339:2 341:11 benefited 97:5 181:22 benefiting 174:7 175:6 benefits 93:1 113:15 198:10 265:7 292:12 best 57:2 84:13 85:15,16,18 93:1 101:13 107:9 143:1 148:18 152:15 155:9 175:18 176:22 177:8,9 199:6 202:1 204:2 207:17 343:6 344:3 bet 268:19 beta 35:17 99:14 bethesda 7:13 bethkis 52:14</p>	<p>bets 298:14 better 23:20,21 78:19 81:3 84:17 86:7,7,8 88:3 91:13 109:6 115:17 125:2 140:1 156:6 161:19 162:6 179:17 181:22 182:19 186:2 187:11 192:20 193:13 195:20 196:5,15 199:10 235:2,5,11 240:16 243:11 263:17 268:13 271:5 275:4 276:13 281:22 282:8,11 320:3 330:15 332:3 333:20 beyond 16:4 116:3 174:15 232:8 249:11 bfts 162:2 bias 137:3 big 75:3 99:19 100:1 116:1 149:16 165:5 237:18 238:16 240:17 241:3 262:6 267:11 278:21 283:1,14 310:3 318:9 332:17 341:9 bigger 75:19 282:20 333:1,2 biggest 100:5 131:19 143:16 bike 238:14 bilateral 299:17 300:7 bio 37:5 bioavailability 268:12</p>	<p>biochemistry 81:21 biocompatibility 39:7,22 40:11 41:1 46:3,7 biofilm 139:2 biologic 26:21,22 34:12 304:14 biological 40:2 316:16 biologics 24:10 36:19 43:4 biology 287:12 biomarker 57:14 57:19 292:5 biomarkers 142:8 biometrics 3:18 4:14 biosimilar 31:15 biostatistics 3:10 3:19 4:15 6:14,14 7:10 18:1,7 20:9 20:19 bit 48:4 52:22 53:16 58:1,5,7,22 66:13 67:11,20 68:15 82:22 86:6 87:19 120:22 131:11 132:20 134:10,19 139:1 139:18 140:8,12 140:14 152:9 153:3 165:8 166:3 173:20 174:2 175:17 213:6,13 237:16 240:14 253:11 254:8 269:2 286:22 309:5,19 312:3 327:13 bla 31:16,20 blame 145:14 blas 31:4</p>	<p>bless 230:20 blind 95:2 100:16 101:14,18 102:5 107:3 blinded 71:11 77:14 99:6 103:18 103:22 104:8,14 104:19,20 113:10 227:20 blinding 71:9,19 71:22 72:11 94:21 95:1,3 98:21 99:1 99:5 100:13 101:9 102:15 104:5 105:4,12,17 106:21 107:5,14 bloodstream 169:17 blue 221:11 board 61:7 217:3 222:7 244:2 boards 244:5 bob 20:15 boil 262:9 boost 97:13 boosting 310:8 bothered 323:19 bottom 67:3 73:12 274:12 box 178:14 boxes 178:5 branch 7:10 8:5 21:8 32:15 break 10:22 12:14 16:7 88:13,19 179:21 239:2,3 246:5,7 breakpoint 169:9 breakpoints 158:10,11 169:10 172:3 breaks 70:17 breath 323:2</p>
--	---	---	--

<p>breathing 103:14 196:17</p> <p>breathless 306:19</p> <p>breathlessness 210:6 324:3</p> <p>breaths 103:12</p> <p>brief 33:5 89:5,7 206:2 210:20</p> <p>briefly 52:3 63:22 138:8 152:1 225:5 257:5</p> <p>bring 50:9 107:17 109:2 130:19</p> <p>bringing 71:13 205:16</p> <p>brings 26:3 83:16 183:1</p> <p>british 2:18</p> <p>broad 304:15 313:20 314:20,22</p> <p>broaden 273:13</p> <p>broader 163:19 178:6 314:9</p> <p>broadly 314:3</p> <p>broken 101:18</p> <p>bronchial 206:4</p> <p>bronchiectasis 1:8 8:10 11:21 12:6,9 12:16 14:9 15:2,8 17:13,16 18:18,19 19:5,7,11 21:11 89:14 109:6,16,22 153:18,22 166:19 178:3 180:18 181:11,20 182:4 182:10 183:9,16 184:13 185:21 186:18 187:4,21 188:4,6,11,12,15 188:22 189:1,9,18 190:5 191:3,7,11 193:20 194:6,10 194:11,17,20 197:1,16 198:16</p>	<p>199:9,14,18,19 200:3,11,15 201:10,13,21 203:20 205:3,12 205:13,21 206:2 206:20 207:2,11 207:19 209:15 210:1,3,10,12 211:4,7 212:7,10 212:16 213:2,15 213:19 214:2 215:5,14 217:3,9 217:12 218:12 219:1,20 220:1 222:2,3,6 223:13 224:5 227:13 230:12 231:10 232:17,20 233:12 233:22 234:13,20 234:22 235:16,17 236:10 237:17,18 238:1 240:7,19,21 241:7,16,21,22 243:3,5,20 246:9 246:13,21 247:2,8 247:13 251:4,15 252:17 253:13 258:1 261:1 267:1 268:10 269:11,18 272:2,3,11 287:4 287:5,17,21 291:19 296:3,6,6 296:7,9,11,12 297:15,19 299:17 300:4,17 302:16 306:14 315:8 323:16,21,22 324:5,7 342:3</p> <p>bronchiolitis 230:16</p> <p>bronchitis 241:4</p> <p>bronchodilator 216:20</p>	<p>bronchodilators 35:17,18 214:15 216:15,19 272:18</p> <p>bronchoprovoca... 215:21</p> <p>bronchopulmon... 233:8 234:4 237:22 248:3</p> <p>bronchospasm 226:2 234:10 271:14</p> <p>bronchospasms 279:16</p> <p>brought 101:2 112:4 152:9 264:21 268:2</p> <p>brr 189:22</p> <p>bug 144:22 145:5 145:6,15 149:21 150:6 156:11,14 163:14 164:14,18 164:19 167:8,12 167:13 267:17</p> <p>bugaboo 163:9</p> <p>bugging 80:16</p> <p>bugs 145:1 146:1 147:4,5 149:19 154:15 157:12 169:22 171:10 218:15 267:20</p> <p>building 1:13 76:14 182:16</p> <p>built 113:20 307:13</p> <p>bump 110:18</p> <p>bumps 74:12</p> <p>burden 72:3 80:1 80:3,8,18 81:1,4,5 82:6,7 95:22 99:9 99:17,22 100:5,7 101:13 122:13,17 136:19 140:3 184:20 199:4 267:17 288:10</p>	<p>292:4 299:10 302:12</p> <p>burdened 122:15</p> <p>burdens 81:8 117:13 184:22</p> <p>burdensome 80:17,20 83:9 86:12,16 100:4</p> <p>burkholderia 53:15</p> <p>busy 51:13 341:9</p> <p>buzz 99:6</p> <p>bx 272:16</p> <p>bx1 291:21</p> <p>bx2 291:21</p>
c			
<p>c 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 43:5 178:11</p> <p>ca 2:12 8:11</p> <p>caf 36:4</p> <p>calendar 293:12</p> <p>calibrate 187:8</p> <p>call 66:18 75:6 114:20 215:15 226:1 278:3 280:13 296:11</p> <p>called 59:15 116:21 187:21 255:21 295:8 306:13 314:5</p> <p>calling 296:5</p> <p>calls 243:18</p> <p>camp 153:18</p> <p>campus 1:11</p> <p>canada 154:7 162:21</p> <p>cancer 104:2</p> <p>candidate 76:3,9 285:6</p> <p>candidates 148:14 148:21</p>			

<p>cap 94:11 116:21 capital 1:21 capture 109:19 113:9 141:22 149:10,11,17 153:11 254:13,14 255:8 257:9 280:22 281:22 287:16 288:4 307:12 310:3 311:1,3 316:21 321:19,22 captured 50:17 253:3 captures 255:4 capturing 136:8 243:14 255:12 263:5 276:7 280:14 308:3 310:20 cara 11:20 194:1,2 242:16 243:4 cardiac 231:17,18 232:1 cardiology 311:4 cardiovascular 136:1 care 2:22 4:10 12:9 17:20 19:3 21:3 54:5 55:5,10 58:13 59:7 64:19 74:22 77:18,22 79:1 80:11,19 81:9,11 82:20,20 83:21 84:2 86:17 90:11 91:8,17,17 92:6 95:11 107:22 108:2,5 109:13 115:6 116:16 130:10 140:15,22 141:2 144:11 166:16 167:4,11 174:21 175:10 205:3,12,13 208:3</p>	<p>223:10 241:11 242:19 247:11 251:6 263:2 272:11 273:3 337:20 caregiver 180:22 caregivers 28:22 cares 57:15 carolina 3:6 5:6 10:13 17:19 19:9 carried 30:18 carriers 147:7 carry 49:22 cascade 38:6,7 48:22 case 4:3 10:10 11:5,22 12:15 18:10 33:5 34:17 36:18 38:21 41:11 42:7 51:8 61:6 78:10 85:1 88:21 89:1,21 100:3 105:16 134:8 142:4 146:18 148:11 158:2 185:21 199:15 205:7 210:19,20 210:21 217:4 246:8,10,11,19 297:5 311:4 320:18 337:18 338:3 cases 26:7 45:13 53:17,22 54:1 64:21 83:10 226:3 254:11 337:11 cat 64:10 117:1,7 119:11 126:2 306:17 catch 295:9 categorized 187:1 caught 281:6 causality 302:7</p>	<p>causative 151:16 cause 23:3 173:22 181:7 247:21 287:13 320:6,14 caused 213:15 causes 188:15,16 causing 164:15 165:15,18 173:21 caution 109:15 caveat 75:4 273:17 277:11 329:19 cayston 52:17 56:9 59:16 81:12 81:15 82:22 92:15 282:17 cber 36:19 43:8 cdcr 2:5 3:20 4:7 4:17 5:11,15 7:2,7 7:17 8:15,21 19:14 21:16 22:4 22:5 36:16 44:8 44:15,16 46:16 cdcr's 22:15 24:7 cdr 12:20 cdrh 22:1,5 34:3 36:17 37:2 43:8 44:13,14 46:19,20 ceftazidime 149:11 ceiling 270:16 center 3:14 4:21 5:21 8:7 18:3 19:10,20 21:9 24:12 32:16 34:18 35:1 36:12,15 42:11 43:2,4,4,17 58:14 194:13 304:6,8 centers 34:15 167:22 214:7 307:5 central 68:16</p>	<p>certain 53:2 75:8 88:16 96:22 137:1 145:13 159:4 191:4 213:12 301:10,10 certainly 22:7 47:1 104:10 109:4 111:19 112:2 126:21 135:21 136:2 144:19 148:11 230:14 268:18 292:6 300:21 316:2 319:16 326:16 327:3 331:2 certainty 66:8 certificate 343:1 344:1 certification 40:7 certify 343:3 344:2 cetera 40:19 65:12 223:4 234:6 324:20 cf 3:13 5:21 8:10 11:5,7,21 14:8 15:1,2,7,7 16:21 17:20,20 18:2,11 18:22,22 19:10,19 20:1 21:11 46:10 52:4,10,20 53:11 53:12 58:13,14 59:7,9,11,14 60:2 62:5 64:15 65:3 65:19 66:4,17,20 68:17 69:17 74:5 76:1,6,12 78:7,7 78:15 79:1,19,22 80:2,3,8,11,14,17 81:9,11,16 82:9 82:19 83:18,21 85:21 86:9,11,14 86:17 88:4,9,21 89:3,13,18 94:16</p>
---	--	---	---

<p>98:13 102:12,12 109:4,6 116:2 121:7 123:18,20 125:3,21 132:15 133:8 134:11 138:18 140:3 141:8 143:18 152:9 153:15 154:6,6,7,7 155:7 156:19 157:9,13 158:17 162:16 166:18 167:19,22 168:7 171:5,13 175:3,9,21 182:4 183:9 188:6,10,12 188:15,19,22 189:3,7,8 191:3 194:11,17,20 197:1,16 198:16 199:9,14,18 200:2 200:10,14 201:9 201:12 203:20 205:3 217:3,8 219:20 223:10,13 227:12 230:15 231:10 241:12,14 241:16,21,22 243:2,3,19 246:12 247:2,8,13 259:13 259:13,15,16 260:21 272:2,4,7 287:12 292:14 293:8,15 315:8,9 315:20 316:17 322:8 330:2 334:17 cfbe 158:17 cff 151:18 cfqr 90:22 cf 27:16 34:9 cfrsd 90:22 92:11 cftr 74:4 128:9 cfu 111:17</p>	<p>cfus 220:13 chair 2:18 6:4 17:12 18:18 19:21 chairman 7:19 chairs 10:11 12:4 challenge 53:16 72:8 74:19 78:2 112:8 118:10 127:9 147:9,16 150:17 164:9 173:13 257:10 273:19 289:13 334:6 challenges 10:5,10 11:22 14:17 15:1 22:10 51:8 53:21 54:3,21 56:12 69:14 71:5 75:22 185:19 186:9 199:15 211:1 212:2 235:9,22 289:21 challenging 77:20 118:14 130:12 166:5 208:6 219:5 314:11 chalmers 2:13 17:10,10 220:17 221:11 234:18 259:21 269:9 271:1 287:2 291:7 297:7 299:20 300:2,8,10,21 301:6,15,17,19 302:14 303:8 305:8 306:11,13 306:17 307:3 317:14 319:22 323:15 328:12,19 336:16 339:6 chance 14:20 25:13 79:4 88:18 197:8 339:1</p>	<p>change 40:18 46:1 55:20 57:21 110:22 113:13 121:17 125:11,14 125:16,17 131:1 132:20,22 133:8 142:11,15 156:6 162:3 210:10 240:11 242:21 258:17 269:22 288:1 308:3 323:11 changed 242:11 242:13 325:13 changes 52:5,8 53:6 57:4,7 90:19 90:21 91:1 142:18 204:7 211:15 238:14 268:19,21 268:22 307:8 323:8 changing 92:7 chapel 3:7 17:19 characteristic 235:19 characteristics 76:9 207:20 221:8 249:3 255:5 268:8 characterization 235:3 characterize 211:16 235:12 characterized 206:3 226:1 characterizes 62:14 172:22 charleston 5:7 19:9 chart 127:7 cheap 146:4 cheapest 85:12 chemical 98:14 chemically 27:2</p>	<p>chemistry 100:12 chemotherapy 104:2 chen 8:12 21:14 21:14 277:18 279:2 295:5 313:19 315:8 321:7 337:14 chest 215:16 276:12 chick 105:3 chief 2:10 4:19 7:9 17:7 child 180:22 211:5 childhood 55:7 children 39:3 92:12,15 children's 3:14 5:19,22 18:4 chime 277:4 chip 2:6 10:21 16:20 79:10,10,13 88:12 94:6 113:6 114:21 178:19 179:1 241:13 242:16 244:3 246:1 279:9 341:20 choice 61:21 73:16 84:10 136:18 218:22 219:8,10 choices 78:20 83:4 83:7,9 84:4,11,13 85:8 166:9 246:1 cholesterol 192:7 192:8,9,11,14 choose 30:9 42:19 83:8 85:10,18 114:17 122:21 choosing 62:14 82:1 85:11 141:4 156:13 220:8 chose 83:20</p>
--	---	---	--

<p>chosen 157:15,18 chris 4:12 18:20 307:19 chromobacterium 223:4 chronic 11:12 52:20 53:11 54:8 54:17 62:12 65:16 69:7 74:19 75:10 89:9 108:8 111:15 137:22 138:5,9 139:7 144:5 158:16 166:17 167:7 176:6 206:6 207:12 211:17 212:3,17,18 213:4 217:16 219:22,22 220:3,12 221:21 222:13,22 224:21 225:19 226:8 228:19 229:22 230:5,7 233:4 250:1 252:16 263:5 272:19 288:14 303:17 chronically 11:7 39:19 62:22 89:4 89:18 90:1,8 139:14 153:7 222:16 252:1 chunk 341:10 chunkier 103:11 ciliary 187:22 189:19 cipro 20:6 195:16 ciprofloxacin 17:9 18:8 202:13,14,17 203:2,6,18 227:21 228:17 282:17 321:2 326:1,3 cipros 270:11,12 circle 212:11 circuits 142:8</p>	<p>circumstance 157:17 circumstances 213:12 claim 168:16 clarification 57:11 57:12 128:8 283:20 clarify 92:13 clarifying 32:12 class 33:10,10,10 33:11,14,19 52:19 55:22 62:2,15 76:5,14 113:12,15 classes 35:16 159:18 168:13 classify 33:2 cleanest 60:18 cleaning 72:7 clear 36:12 65:3 68:11 75:10 76:5 95:18 98:1 101:21 126:19 141:1 161:13 170:16 183:20 203:8 208:12 216:12 220:11 229:13 296:4 314:20 clearance 33:12 80:12 162:9 190:13,14 211:12 212:17 213:8,9 214:8,22 215:1,2 215:7 216:18 217:14,22 312:6 cleared 34:6 35:7 35:22 36:2,6,6 49:22 clearly 59:18 66:2 66:10 69:18 75:21 77:10 94:5,6 97:19 101:1 106:3 115:3 119:4 128:17 208:15,22</p>	<p>211:22 225:22 230:22 251:22 286:12 cleveland 158:3 318:7 clindamycin 149:2 clinic 4:11 18:16 283:9 337:20 clinical 5:13 8:14 17:16 18:14 19:5 19:16 20:1,10,15 21:15 31:7 45:3 52:6 53:3 54:13 55:3,16 56:2,9 57:7 58:5,7 59:22 63:18,19 65:17,22 66:5,22 68:14 69:7 70:18,21 74:22 76:4 98:4 111:18,22 116:3 117:7 121:21 125:11 134:20,21 136:7 139:7,12,19 140:15,22 141:19 142:2,12 148:1,16 151:12 152:2 154:20 156:2 157:13 160:16 169:4 171:3 172:10 174:5,5 176:10 179:8 182:2,6,7,8,12,13 182:22 183:17 184:2,6,12,21 185:2,3,5 186:9 186:15 194:13 195:15 197:1 201:9,15 203:11 206:12 208:8 209:3 210:2,14,16 216:4,7 217:7 219:16 221:7,8 223:11 225:3,16</p>	<p>229:14,20 230:18 232:9 235:4,21 242:6 243:1,20 244:11 245:8 251:14 252:9 253:1,7,10,12,13 253:19 254:6 255:13 257:4,10 263:12,15 265:20 269:13 290:18 292:16 294:11,12 297:22 300:11 302:6 304:19 307:8 324:19 325:12 327:16 328:3 329:6 331:6 clinically 57:22 64:4 65:7 92:1,18 119:21 124:22 125:7 128:17 131:2 142:10,14 147:15 204:3 206:4 209:14 215:12 225:14 227:1 229:19 249:10 259:6 269:16 270:3 285:18 303:15 309:11 310:18 316:6 clinician 58:13 124:22 161:1 207:15 210:9 272:10 285:13 clinicians 117:2 124:4 126:22 144:8 154:7 155:13 160:19 161:8 163:12 169:5 171:2 183:12 235:7 clinics 208:1 clonal 156:17</p>
---	--	---	---

<p>close 67:15 70:2 179:2,21 287:10</p> <p>closely 32:18 34:15 75:11 136:21 194:7 196:9 315:19</p> <p>closer 333:10</p> <p>closing 13:4 340:9</p> <p>clsi 173:16</p> <p>clustering 186:3</p> <p>coa 295:11</p> <p>code 36:3 43:16</p> <p>codified 184:18</p> <p>cohort 132:16 221:15</p> <p>cole 212:9</p> <p>colistin 61:8,10,22 116:6 128:4 149:10 157:9,17 157:22 158:3,4 226:7,10 227:7,9 227:12 302:20 318:8 330:14 331:1</p> <p>collaborate 43:10 119:2</p> <p>collaborated 33:6</p> <p>collaborating 218:11</p> <p>collaborative 42:14 47:17 194:12</p> <p>collaboratively 32:8 34:15</p> <p>collaborators 221:12</p> <p>colleague 96:3</p> <p>colleagues 46:20 125:22 176:1 186:2 228:9 304:21 316:18</p> <p>collect 59:1 169:6</p> <p>collected 268:13 326:21</p>	<p>collecting 184:17 290:19</p> <p>college 238:19 239:3</p> <p>colonization 151:15 163:20 164:4 169:15 212:18</p> <p>colonized 151:11 164:3</p> <p>colonizer 165:13</p> <p>colony 111:20 138:22 160:12,15 220:20 225:13 226:20 267:15</p> <p>colorado 151:19</p> <p>combat 181:19</p> <p>combination 26:15,17,18 27:1 27:9,14 28:6 31:7 31:14 34:8,12,16 36:20 37:9 44:13 91:2 92:22 117:15 118:2,9 139:16,17 251:20 254:3 288:9</p> <p>combinations 53:5</p> <p>combine 26:19,21 326:16</p> <p>combined 27:2,3 74:14 109:3</p> <p>combining 304:19</p> <p>come 14:11 15:11 15:14 36:1 40:14 40:20 49:18 51:22 64:4 69:20 76:3 85:6,8 93:8,21 97:14,17 101:22 112:13 155:2 180:8 187:18 207:8 208:4 209:19 238:5 241:22 266:7 285:6 287:2 296:2</p>	<p>296:15 304:5 321:7 325:14 337:19 338:9 341:8,11,13</p> <p>comers 150:8,12</p> <p>comes 49:10 55:17 55:18 56:6 160:13 195:3 274:21 278:12 312:5 332:8 336:8,12 339:21</p> <p>comfortable 327:6</p> <p>coming 50:5 61:7 158:1 182:13 209:18 250:19 270:21 309:14 338:13 339:5 341:17</p> <p>commensal 231:13</p> <p>comment 96:13 106:21 107:11,13 107:18 114:11 115:5 119:2,3 120:2 121:7 122:11,12 123:3 129:11 131:16 132:15 134:4 135:18 136:11 157:20 166:6 175:16 259:20 261:11 265:14 267:12 268:1 270:21 273:22 282:13 291:8 292:11,12 295:6 295:17 296:17 298:11 299:22 309:3,6 317:15 319:2,14 320:12 325:4,9 328:9,10 331:8 334:5 336:16 338:8 341:2 342:2</p>	<p>commented 103:6</p> <p>comments 11:17 93:18,21,22 133:18 137:10,19 180:4,6,10 203:22 263:9 266:10,21 303:10 304:20,21 313:6 317:7 340:7 340:21</p> <p>commercial 41:5 83:3</p> <p>commercially 68:19</p> <p>commissions 125:18</p> <p>commit 26:2</p> <p>commitment 199:1</p> <p>committed 199:7</p> <p>committee 20:6,14 163:18 194:19 196:7 202:12 203:1,1,11 204:1 204:18 205:5 227:15,17 229:4 242:5 266:1 317:9</p> <p>committees 25:10</p> <p>committing 79:21</p> <p>common 61:21 77:21 122:3 155:8 156:5 157:4 178:15 194:7 207:2 215:13 219:8 224:17 336:21</p> <p>commonly 61:9,13 62:7,11 63:11 68:20 95:6 97:8 211:11 213:9,10 216:16 218:15 223:17 224:3,4</p> <p>communicate 44:10 83:18 314:20</p>
--	---	--	--

communicating 39:12,15	115:14 129:8 131:18 133:20	297:22	327:17
communication 42:22 45:10 155:12	134:2 141:2,4 145:22 146:20	completing 320:10	conceptual 212:7
communities 177:12	comparators 175:11	complex 156:16 166:21 172:6	concern 41:15,16 41:17 97:1 158:12
community 59:11 66:21 67:4 69:17 71:5 76:1 78:15 98:5 138:22 153:22 155:6 166:21 167:20 168:10 171:9,11 176:20 190:6 194:7,22 195:6,12 199:5 218:11 235:10 244:19 259:14 305:21 329:6	compare 78:16 91:16 101:5 207:2	complexity 72:3,8 96:17	163:15,15 168:20 171:16 176:21 193:16 204:19 231:14 238:17 278:14 301:2 316:8,10
comorbid 196:1 247:16	compared 56:1 81:16 101:5 117:19 122:3 135:8,12 169:11 190:3 191:14 222:19 300:16 312:17 332:6	complicate 78:11	concerned 59:20 179:16 238:11 239:16 240:21
comorbidities 187:2 231:18 249:3	comparing 94:19 94:20 98:22 127:11 189:17 191:16 233:18 263:15 297:1	complicated 66:7 134:5 135:16 178:21 267:10 292:15 327:2 328:15	concerningly 63:20
comorbidity 194:8	comparison 222:19 284:16 296:22	complicates 162:16	concerns 44:8 67:9 76:15 98:2 109:7 183:13 185:2,6 203:17 231:11,12 238:3 243:7,7 325:18 336:4
companies 85:14 193:19 273:13 291:15 341:5	compatibility 37:5 118:20	complication 71:13 307:20	conclude 29:14 32:7 95:11
company 1:21 85:13 244:2,2 246:22 250:4 262:4 287:19 291:10 309:14 324:6	compelling 125:9	complications 133:15 180:19 251:11	concluded 183:1 342:10
comparative 31:12,13 78:13 120:22 121:4,6	compensate 338:21	component 34:10 36:18	conclusion 29:16 43:12 102:1 189:20,21
comparator 54:4 54:4 71:10,11 77:2,10 99:4 102:22 105:10 106:8,9,10 110:5	complain 262:7 324:13	components 37:6 41:7,9 132:4 176:11	conclude 29:14 32:7 95:11
	complained 272:15	composite 289:1,2 289:6 316:3 326:14 327:1	concluded 183:1 342:10
	complaint 50:22 50:22 146:22	compounded 68:20 148:6 149:5	conclusion 29:16 43:12 102:1 189:20,21
	complaints 51:1	compounding 68:19 303:19	conclusions 33:8
	complete 66:22 127:1 268:10 331:6	compounds 40:13	conclusively 229:16
	completed 60:6 110:17 155:15 183:18 259:22	comprise 113:12	concomitant 248:6,20
	completely 106:2 120:16 136:13 172:7,16 269:19	comprised 24:4	concrete 164:7
		comprising 253:15	concurrent 207:12 231:16
		conceivable 117:15	condition 165:20 170:15 201:3 213:14,16 221:9 341:1
		conceive 110:10	conditional 219:13 256:19
		concentrate 314:7	
		concentration 223:16	
		concept 25:18 292:9 313:20	

<p>conditions 196:1 207:8 216:20 247:16 301:20 conduct 29:11 76:22 120:1 136:21 conducted 182:16 197:19 conducting 249:12 conference 16:4 117:19 291:19 342:3 confession 275:17 confidence 39:1 145:7 329:6 332:3 confident 62:22 216:13 confidently 153:10 confirms 331:18 conflate 168:18 173:13 conflicts 16:12,13 confound 202:9 conjunction 207:17 234:18 244:18 connect 142:2 cons 223:21 consensus 59:3,21 155:2 209:19 321:9 327:19 328:4,8 consequence 298:19 334:7 335:14 consider 35:16 39:12 65:19 71:10 74:1 82:2 88:4 91:15,20 92:3 119:22 130:4,5,7 141:11 199:3 249:16 259:8</p>	<p>264:22 270:14,18 278:8 303:16 304:14 322:4 considerable 57:18 consideration 37:1 39:4 56:5 71:22 95:13 96:1 111:11 115:11 183:3 198:17 199:12 253:19 257:6 277:13 considerations 10:6,18 12:19 22:11 26:4 30:22 31:7,22 33:4 40:20 53:8 56:19 58:16,18 90:18 93:15 116:11,12 119:3 140:6 143:6 185:11 205:8 246:15 249:12 250:10,11 251:3 253:12 254:10 considered 35:21 40:4 72:10 198:22 203:14 215:4 224:18 255:21 257:2 268:4 313:12 324:12 considering 77:12 82:2 98:14 143:13 195:11 204:4 290:15,21 302:13 304:13 consist 91:7 consistency 203:5 210:5 consistent 75:10 75:18 229:10 260:1,19 287:11 consistently 62:21 189:2,4</p>	<p>consolidated 194:10 consolidation 237:19 consolidations 267:10 consortium 183:16 constantly 237:9 constituent 26:20 27:8 29:4 constituents 36:20 constraints 97:17 construct 172:20 construction 39:8 48:5,12 consult 36:17 46:20 consultant 244:1 consultants 244:6 consulting 6:10 20:4 consume 197:17 consumer 23:5 consumers 83:14 contact 39:13,17 39:19 40:16,18 44:14 50:1,21 337:2,4 contagion 171:10 containing 27:13 context 59:9 171:13 176:10 177:11 257:22 269:21 328:2 329:20 330:5 contexts 269:14 continent 295:20 295:21 continually 30:19 continuation 319:18 continue 76:16,18 110:1 119:15</p>	<p>171:7,19,19 190:20 224:2,11 238:12 245:19 283:17 286:22 330:22 336:5,6 continued 11:2 12:2 13:2 68:11 97:8 121:22 188:5 193:16 305:14 continues 61:12 126:18 159:11 168:21 continuing 67:5 69:9 106:10 continuous 54:18 64:10 70:16 71:14 77:22 91:18 102:8 113:7 126:17 141:11 164:5 279:22 308:7,7 continuously 92:7 contrast 144:4 contribute 79:20 contributed 237:22 340:21 contributing 15:14 168:10 control 29:10,20 54:2 60:20 63:19 64:9 99:3 101:3 102:20 106:8,16 108:6,18 112:5 129:5 130:15 137:12 144:6 147:13 207:19 266:18 305:21 controlled 56:20 69:20 71:3,6 76:13,17 78:12 110:4,11 111:4 113:20 114:18 119:19 120:1,4 123:4 140:8 147:22 174:12,14</p>
---	--	---	---

<p>174:16 175:6 179:18 198:21 216:17 306:4 330:18 334:16 338:18 controls 33:11,14 33:15,20 convened 216:1 227:11 convening 186:7 194:15 conversation 119:8 121:15 153:2 242:8 325:11 339:11,21 conversations 245:18 conveyed 199:5 convincing 130:13 232:16 271:3 coordinating 3:14 5:21 18:3 19:20 58:14 copd 11:20 194:3 194:5,8 207:5 216:21 222:3 230:16 242:10 260:22 272:16 287:12 295:10 296:5,9 306:17 322:4 336:17,20 337:11 core 23:19 cornerstone 159:8 159:11 corporation 2:11 correct 185:1 correctly 193:10 298:10 correlate 142:11 177:21 317:5 318:22 correlates 307:5</p>	<p>correlation 255:9 269:15 correlations 256:4 corresponding 318:20 corticosteroid 213:7 232:13 234:3 corticosteroids 214:15,16 232:15 232:17,21 233:5 248:8 cosmetic 27:20 cost 21:19 82:3 84:20 208:3 249:13 251:11 298:16 costly 183:7 cough 206:5 207:20 210:5 217:16 226:2 278:20 279:16 306:19 321:13 323:2,20,21 324:1 324:6,9,9,10,11 324:18 326:2,5,5 coughed 279:17 coughing 238:5 281:11,20 coughs 324:8 council 21:12 counsel 343:8,11 344:6 count 111:21 132:12 255:3 263:12,20 counted 319:19 320:16 counterbalance 333:6 counterbalanced 332:14 counterfactual 290:13</p>	<p>counting 264:11 331:22 332:1 countless 186:19 countries 273:2 294:14,17 301:11 339:8 country 61:10 68:17 214:20 304:9 counts 132:7 160:12,16 couple 36:13 60:14 98:9 127:7 165:8 176:3 200:6 205:5 218:8 221:1 225:6 240:9 280:4 282:16 294:7 342:3 courage 250:20 courageous 180:18 course 29:4 35:11 37:8 38:21 42:22 43:14,20 44:17 53:12 55:18 58:1 58:2 101:13 124:14,22 136:6 141:17 142:13 150:18 169:5 201:15 206:12 210:22 219:13,15 231:11 234:8 245:21 252:18 253:20 255:12 257:9,10 264:1,19 265:4 282:11 284:18 296:9 299:1 302:7 319:18 covariate 256:7 covariates 256:4 cover 59:5 93:15 165:1</p>	<p>covered 313:1 cox 2:2 10:4 14:3 14:3 21:17 22:4 165:7 169:9 170:1 170:13 171:18 173:19 175:13 255:16 325:1,4 336:8 340:10 341:22 342:8 create 158:12 328:15 created 24:3 185:21 188:16 creating 177:7 254:7 criss 90:22 92:12 criteria 63:9 64:2 73:2,4 93:1 132:2 133:11,13,16 150:4 151:20 230:22 248:18 265:20 268:5 273:14 289:20 critical 2:22 4:10 19:3 21:3 29:8 37:11 79:5 94:16 195:6 218:9 264:4 264:12 criticism 107:7 175:3 critique 262:6 cromolyn 35:19 cross 10:5 22:10 27:5 45:1 crossover 107:19 109:16 111:6 113:22 264:21 265:6,12 crucially 235:5 cruel 181:16 crummy 288:6 ct 266:12 268:19 culprit 163:1</p>
--	---	--	---

<p>culture 62:10 68:2 68:4 75:1 147:14 154:15 156:3,9 157:20 159:4 167:2,18 cultured 237:12 cultures 55:12,13 62:21 75:3,7 culturing 173:21 cups 100:6 cure 194:5 263:7,7 curiosity 313:8 curious 86:3 103:6 302:9 current 10:9,18 11:21 12:9 51:7 53:3 58:16,17 59:7 64:14,17 71:12 77:21 91:17 92:6 126:1,3 127:11 155:21 199:4,15 205:14 210:11 217:13 219:11 229:12 231:21 233:11 247:10 251:6 253:8 290:17 currently 18:18 72:19 182:21 229:17 247:6 315:4 323:20 340:4 curve 187:15 327:10 cut 38:10 117:4 216:12 271:13 cutting 10:5 21:19 22:10 119:5 275:20 cyber 41:20 cycle 62:8 64:10 70:16 71:14,15 77:22 98:16 102:8 102:9 108:22</p>	<p>144:10 146:18 181:17 212:8,11 212:19 213:1 241:8 262:17,18 cycled 62:13 cycles 54:11 56:2 62:8 71:2 91:18 141:12,12 146:18 146:19 202:16 228:17 262:15 cyclic 146:21 147:1 150:17 262:9 cycling 54:19 62:16 64:6,11 70:19 102:12 cystic 1:8,8 2:7 3:12 10:9,14,17 11:4,13 12:6,16 14:7,8 16:21 51:7 51:10,11,15,16 52:2 55:6 58:17 85:4 88:20 89:9 89:15,22 90:7,16 92:14 109:5 137:22 138:5,10 199:19 205:22 207:5 211:7 216:6 217:2,5,11,11 219:20 246:9,20 251:4,15 252:17 253:13 257:22 266:13 300:15</p>	<p>daip 4:6 5:10,14 6:20 7:16 dairy 280:18 damage 184:3 dancing 101:8 danger 198:19 dark 166:3 data 28:8 34:5 37:8 39:6 40:9 41:19 42:18 45:7 49:13 50:7 60:2,5 60:15 63:8 64:21 68:1,6 72:9,20 73:11 74:20 75:4 75:18,22 76:4 77:21 91:11 92:6 97:20 102:2 108:16 121:4,6 123:14,20 124:2 129:1 130:21 132:20,22 133:5 134:12,14,22 139:7 142:2,3 143:11,12,13 145:12 151:2 152:15 154:20 155:22 156:2 176:11 179:8 184:18,20 185:16 190:20 193:5 206:9 214:17 215:6 216:17 220:7 222:12 224:9 227:16 229:3,8 232:16 233:2 257:14 258:12 262:13 265:10 267:14 268:12,17 272:14 286:1,11 287:16 289:15,18 290:3,4 290:9,18,20 291:16,18 297:7 298:1,7 305:17</p>	<p>307:17 316:19 317:15 319:5 325:7 326:21 329:2 336:13 338:15 339:5 database 36:1 44:18 50:22 143:15 194:11 databases 108:13 date 14:19 291:11 344:13 dates 240:17 dave 19:18 58:11 58:11 79:6 94:5 96:3 99:2,5 101:2 102:19 111:12 112:18 dave's 118:9 david 5:16 10:19 david's 110:13 davis 8:22 288:19 288:19 day 15:21 39:20 54:11 72:6 79:10 80:11 81:13,16,17 81:20 82:5,7,11 82:14,17,19 83:11 83:12 84:2 96:18 96:19 99:11,17 100:3,5 114:16 117:22 125:1,1 141:9,13 184:22 184:22 211:21 219:13 227:21 237:5 242:3 262:8 279:10,12 281:7 282:1,10,11 288:6 288:6,6,10,10 307:16 308:5 309:15 320:10 327:9 341:3 days 69:21 70:1,4 70:6,19 110:18 112:19 113:8</p>
	<p>d</p>		
	<p>d 14:1 d.c. 342:4 daily 80:17 91:18 196:2 226:10 227:21 228:16 230:4 278:9,19 280:18,22 281:21 282:8 303:17 307:11,14 314:17 320:10</p>		

114:7 160:22 161:1,10 176:14 191:15,16 204:7 219:15 226:11 227:6,7 228:17 237:2,3,3 239:9 254:2 263:7 274:4 277:15 279:7 280:13 284:4,21 285:5 286:4 293:9 293:10,10,10 294:1 308:2 314:15 317:8,8,16 317:18 318:10,17 318:21 320:5,15 321:16 337:2,17 338:2,7 deal 21:20 22:8 49:20 80:22 87:13 144:15 196:21 213:8 240:3 247:22 dealing 22:8 72:5 156:16 223:19 deals 21:19 dealt 237:14 dean 7:8 20:18 107:11 dean's 111:6 134:4 deaths 186:18 debate 57:18 139:6 316:22 debilitating 303:17 decade 60:10 61:22 67:18 decades 60:14 76:11 171:6,16 245:15 252:2 decide 34:4 84:15 325:21 326:7,9 decided 87:15	decision 58:5 74:2 133:9 146:21 148:16 157:13 195:1 199:3 293:9 294:4 decisions 137:2 292:15,20 293:2 declaration 16:13 decline 65:17,22 66:5 69:7 75:1,15 80:22 110:20 128:6 151:12 152:2 declined 279:18 declines 139:8 declining 74:16 152:5,7 212:1 decrease 74:15 92:20,21 96:9 201:1 282:20 316:5,10 337:17 decreased 251:12 251:19 316:14 decrement 216:10 229:10 231:9 decrements 225:12 287:13 deem 126:2 deemed 105:12 117:2 deeper 224:6 deepika 8:3 10:8 21:7 32:13,18,20 44:2,3 49:4 50:20 51:5 defer 161:7 define 28:19 37:16 38:1 64:2 78:1 98:3,4 108:21 115:16 141:21 142:20 149:22 151:10 201:22 209:20 221:8 235:4 248:19	265:21 266:4 316:1 321:8,9 defined 38:10 111:15 184:18 206:13 221:12 228:2,22 251:19 253:21 254:6 256:1 257:8 266:5 271:21 319:20 320:14 defines 39:15,21 43:19 defining 23:1 127:1 133:17 150:21 151:6 160:14 187:2 328:2 definite 133:12 definitely 127:8 223:15 281:14 definition 26:17 34:9 37:11 56:13 73:21 74:1 92:4 131:12,20 132:3,5 132:18,19 133:3 136:14 142:6 172:1,12 176:12 209:4,7,19 210:1 210:9 266:7 295:22 296:2,3,15 321:15 323:7 327:20 definitions 131:13 131:21 133:2 142:19 154:12 263:21 294:9 321:12 definitive 140:20 degree 53:2 77:7 254:21 delay 183:8 252:21 deleterious 217:9	deliberately 301:1 deliver 198:9 delivery 42:5,10 43:12 65:10 72:6 76:10 101:13 208:16 214:12 delphi 155:1 209:20 delta 121:9,11,17 288:1 demographic 249:1 demonstrate 28:3 29:12 66:20 67:5 93:2 141:5 147:8 147:20 247:4,10 250:5 259:19 260:7 273:9 285:19 325:22 339:16 demonstrated 63:17 105:9 140:18 163:2 171:6 196:16 229:9 260:21,21 260:22 demonstrates 145:12 320:17 demonstrating 31:22 167:9 denominator 312:10 density 226:15 229:11 denver 6:8 denying 335:5 department 2:15 3:9,10 4:20 6:5,14 7:20 dependent 43:13 94:3 291:10 depending 34:16 36:19 37:15 105:22 141:16
--	--	---	---

<p>depends 158:2 237:4 277:5 279:19 280:6 282:10 322:22 329:19 describe 209:3 213:12 224:20 272:2 described 68:18 186:10 197:22 222:8 223:22 226:3 231:17 253:16 306:21 describes 63:5 132:10 describing 213:21 description 37:4 300:6 deserve 69:13 76:20 design 14:21 18:11 22:17 24:18 25:2 26:5,11 27:22 28:12,15 31:8 50:18 53:8 54:1 55:17 56:19 59:11 70:3,5,22 71:9 72:13 79:5 84:21 90:10 94:14 99:15 108:16 109:12,16 115:16 116:11,17 117:8 127:19 182:2,9 183:17 184:13 186:15 201:9 244:6,8,11 245:8 247:12 249:20 250:22 254:22 257:3 260:5 265:6 265:8 designation 34:20 designed 23:15 28:15 100:9 112:14 169:10</p>	<p>172:4 185:4 215:2 295:9 designing 99:3 182:6 186:9 243:11 251:3 designs 11:4 78:11 88:20 94:12 114:1 114:5 desirable 63:6 84:12 desire 69:11 198:7 despite 59:20 60:14 71:5 76:15 78:12 97:22 119:14 192:13 233:13 253:5 destroyed 269:20 destruction 184:3 212:15 detail 56:12 57:6 224:17 268:9 detect 204:12 329:12 detecting 337:12 deter 193:18 deterioration 55:8 210:3 determination 28:7 320:4 determine 40:10 41:8,14,19 84:19 131:1 169:6 176:15 192:10 197:3 245:3 323:6 determined 191:12 determines 199:5 210:9 determining 160:4 186:8 191:8 192:4 devastating 207:3 207:4 develop 15:15 65:5,19 78:3,6</p>	<p>81:6 85:2,17 86:7 86:7 114:22 120:16 151:5,22 174:22 223:15 245:19 246:22 289:6 326:1 developed 42:9 46:9 51:15 55:9 59:16 60:7 67:6,8 69:2 82:10 88:1 89:15 97:11 117:16 118:3 244:17 developing 11:11 12:15 14:6,17 15:1 44:5 47:9 51:11 59:9 89:8 93:16 115:3 138:4 138:8 171:14 183:13 198:11 211:5 246:8,12,19 289:4 326:3 341:6 development 1:7 3:13 12:7 14:14 15:7,16 16:22 17:8 18:3 22:17 25:8 30:12 31:8 33:4,7 36:5 42:13 43:11,18 46:22 49:8 53:1,10 54:7 66:19 67:21 69:10 83:7 84:19 89:12 90:5 106:20 116:3 139:2 163:11 179:4,13 182:19 183:1 184:11 186:16 187:10 199:18,20 203:13 203:16 212:15 230:9 231:13 244:8 258:4 295:11 developmental 250:1</p>	<p>developments 221:4 device 8:6 10:5 15:6 22:4,10 26:22 27:8,15,17 29:4 31:14 32:16 33:3,4 34:5,11,12 34:22 35:15 36:5 36:8,10,18 37:1,2 37:3,4,4,6,7,9,14 37:16,18,19,21 38:3,9,14,18,19 39:8 40:4,14 41:4 41:12,15,18 42:6 42:16,20,21 43:9 43:14 44:7,8,12 44:12,17 45:1,15 45:16 46:4,5,17 46:21 47:16,18 48:3,5,11 49:20 50:3 65:10 devices 8:5,7 21:8 21:9,20 22:7 27:12,13 32:15,16 33:2,10,13,15,19 33:21 35:3 36:12 39:16 40:3,11,16 40:21 41:21 42:11 43:2,18,19,20,22 44:10,18,20 46:9 49:3,21 54:22 65:11 72:6 99:12 215:11,12 devote 81:9 dhand 7:18 21:2,2 99:8 128:2 316:20 317:10 318:14 322:21 di 17:9 282:17 326:1 diagnose 336:20 diagnosed 211:4 237:8,17,21 239:1 239:6 241:14</p>
--	---	---	--

<p>320:20 diagnosis 214:2 diagnostic 26:19 47:13 diagnostics 47:7 47:15,20 diaries 287:4 319:22 336:22 diary 287:15,17 287:20,20 307:12 307:15 336:19 dictated 160:17 219:16 died 180:18 184:8 difference 99:19 100:2,16 103:6,15 103:17,19,20 134:1,15 184:9 258:16 262:19,19 266:17 271:3 276:4 284:15 331:20 332:17,19 differences 60:21 174:10 188:21 190:8 201:4 204:12 230:22 262:21 298:9 299:14,19 300:3 329:12 different 15:13 31:1 34:15 36:21 39:18 45:22 47:22 48:6,8,13,14,20 49:1 53:3,5 54:22 55:1 56:16 68:20 76:7 84:7 88:3 112:11 113:12 130:5 134:13 140:9 141:14 156:20 165:9 166:1,10 169:11 170:2 172:7 173:10 175:4 189:10,18 190:5</p>	<p>190:10,11 200:17 210:21 212:22 221:3 231:5 238:2 241:22 247:14 263:8 266:5 269:14 271:4 286:6,17 290:2 295:20 296:12 297:2,20 298:1,6 299:19 301:16 311:11,14 322:10 329:14,16 338:1,5 differential 262:16 differentiating 269:4 differently 296:8 313:22 difficile 178:11 difficult 49:20 66:13 70:12 72:2 77:14 84:15 95:8 103:11 106:22 127:2,13 139:1 174:21 175:11 179:14 186:20 209:4,10 238:7 240:3,4 242:2 269:6 270:1 284:10 287:20 304:4,10 314:10 320:17 327:17 328:16 335:12,17 339:21 340:3 difficulties 285:2 difficulty 57:20 73:4 92:10 170:16 183:6 204:10 217:17 287:16 314:1 321:3 334:20 diffuse 230:15 diffused 267:1</p>	<p>digress 67:12 dilatation 206:4 dilution 273:4 diminish 73:9 diminishes 75:7 diminishing 72:17 76:15 338:16 diminutions 222:1 direct 18:2 directed 202:10 219:8 288:21 direction 272:20 343:5 directly 44:14 113:4 278:1 323:21 director 2:3 3:12 5:9,20 8:17 9:2 14:4 19:10,13,19 22:13 58:14 180:13 disability 239:9 disagree 326:4 disappointment 195:2 discipline 23:14 disciplines 15:13 disclaimer 22:19 disclosure 58:22 disclosures 58:21 206:1 243:21 244:3 discontinuation 226:5 discordance 154:21 156:1 discordant 203:8 discount 136:13 137:5 discourage 193:19 discover 44:7 45:17 discovered 45:15</p>	<p>discriminate 158:8 discuss 47:6 179:7 194:16 202:13 205:2 224:19 250:9 251:16 252:5 254:7 255:11 257:5,19 259:1 discussed 49:11 138:16 140:7,9 141:18 144:20 201:13 203:10 217:20 227:17 251:2,7 252:14 257:21 325:16 discussing 33:16 42:8 44:17 47:8 122:17 199:10 208:1 218:6 discussion 11:9,14 12:21 15:4,9,14 41:22 50:9 57:10 58:10 69:19 76:7 76:21 88:15 89:3 89:6 93:9 107:2,4 108:19 112:11 131:15 137:21 144:3 158:8 166:19 174:3 182:11 196:22 201:10,16,21 203:14 205:7 207:18 224:1 235:22 236:4,5 244:7 251:16 252:6 253:18 259:5,9 269:10 274:1 311:13 327:21 340:11 discussions 46:22 49:8,9 50:16 82:4 112:6 153:21 195:5,12 219:19</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>265:4 341:4,5 disease 4:10 55:9 58:3 95:7,13 99:10,18 108:8 127:4 143:3 151:8 151:17,20,22 154:9 164:8,15 170:3,15 176:12 176:17 180:17,19 181:8,10 185:19 187:1,21 189:19 190:5,10 194:7 195:4 197:21 199:4 201:19 202:8 207:6 208:6 214:7 221:2 222:5 230:15 232:2,14 235:7,13 236:19 237:6 238:2 240:12,17 247:15 249:2 251:9 252:17,19 256:11 257:15 262:8 263:6 266:19 269:16 274:4 278:12 289:16 296:9 298:1 300:13,14,15 303:17 306:2 315:9 325:19 330:16 332:10 341:1 diseases 7:12 20:20 185:11 190:15 194:14 207:1,4 242:1 dispersion 202:14 203:7 disposable 100:6 disproportionate 268:20 dissimilar 178:16 distinctive 104:1</p>	<p>distinguish 151:15 distribution 218:17 267:7,13 267:19 268:9 dive 103:2 224:6 diverse 54:12 244:10,11 diversities 178:9 diversity 139:19 176:20 177:11 178:4 divide 33:9 division 2:21 3:18 4:14 6:20 7:5 8:18 18:15 19:13,16 20:12,16,22 22:14 24:2 32:17 46:17 51:13,20 52:1,7 89:11 245:6 341:16 divisions 45:12 divulges 48:16 dmepa 30:14,14 dnase 217:1,4,8 doable 144:7,13 doc 162:4 330:22 docs 164:9 doctor 109:4 doctors 79:17 80:16 185:21 322:19 document 29:17 184:16 documentation 265:16,19 268:6,7 documents 184:15 doing 48:10 65:7 69:5 78:8 79:21 80:15 82:19,20 85:4 86:2,16 95:6 95:12 101:3 103:13 104:13 112:10 115:11,13 115:20 116:3,13</p>	<p>117:1,4 122:22 134:12 137:1 143:16 145:5 164:21 167:10 173:13 174:17,20 175:1 187:7 190:13 272:3 273:4,6 293:7 305:11 335:21,22 336:1,4 dollars 183:8 domain 44:22 domains 324:1 dominant 218:20 222:20 324:5 dominated 61:6 donald 3:21 doomed 117:8 167:18 dose 35:12 81:15 107:5 122:16 192:10 doses 82:5 83:20 197:18 227:5 dosing 71:17 72:5 72:7 91:15 200:11 double 71:12 99:6 99:6 100:20 227:20 doubled 170:10 doubles 337:11 doubling 71:14 122:20 304:11 334:14 doubt 131:10,22 164:9 166:9 282:22 303:14 downside 116:17 downstairs 281:10 doxycycline 149:2 dparp 128:8 131:7 dpi 20:6 227:21 dr 14:3 17:6,10,14 17:18,22 18:5,9</p>	<p>18:14,16,20 19:2 19:8,12,15,18,21 20:3,8,11,15,18 20:21 21:2,7,14 21:17 22:3,4,12 25:17 32:11,21 44:2,4,11 45:9,11 45:12,20 46:8,12 46:13,14,15 47:2 47:3,5,6,13,21 48:2 49:4,6,9,15 49:21 50:11 51:4 51:6,9,12,18 57:5 57:9,17 58:9,19 79:6 88:12,22 89:2,5,7,10,20 90:3,13,14,21 91:11 93:10,21 94:1 95:14 96:2 96:13 98:8,11,21 99:8 101:1 102:6 102:16 105:2 106:21 108:19 109:15 110:1,10 110:15 111:8,12 111:19 112:3,12 114:11,12,19 116:20 118:8,15 120:2 121:7,15 124:3,20 125:21 126:6 128:2,7,9 128:15,16 129:3 129:13 130:17,20 130:20 131:4,5,7 131:9,19 132:15 133:7 135:17 136:11 137:9,11 137:18 138:6,15 143:21 144:2,21 148:4,22 149:9 150:20 151:18 152:17 153:5,11 153:17 157:10,14 160:7 161:8,16</p>
---	---	--	--

162:14,19 163:16 163:17 164:8 165:7 166:15 169:9 170:1,13,22 171:18 173:19 175:13,20 178:22 179:3,20 180:3 187:17 191:11,20 193:22 199:13,16 199:16,21 205:2 205:10,10,15 212:9 220:17 221:11 225:5 228:9 234:18 236:6,13 240:18 241:7,12 242:15 242:22 246:3,10 246:18 250:8,12 251:8 252:4 258:21 259:10,21 261:10,11 262:2,3 263:9,11 264:13 265:13,13,22 266:11,21,22 267:6,12 268:1,2 268:6,14,14,15 269:8,9,20 270:4 270:20 271:1,19 271:20 272:1 273:16,21 274:14 274:18,19,22 275:5,9 276:6,17 277:3,14,18 279:2 280:8,9 281:4 282:3,4,6,13 283:20 284:5,11 285:3,8,10 287:2 287:22 288:8,19 289:11 291:6,7 292:10,11 294:5,6 295:5,16,17 298:4 299:13,20 300:1,5 300:9,18 301:5,14 301:16,18,21,22	302:2,3 303:5,9 304:13,20 305:18 306:8,12,16 307:19 309:2,3 311:2,12,14,17,19 311:22 312:21 313:3,5,6,14 315:2,2,19,22 316:17,20 317:7 317:10,13 318:5 318:14 319:13,14 320:12 322:8,21 323:13 324:14,15 324:16 325:1,3,4 325:6,15 326:13 327:13,14 328:10 328:18 329:7,18 330:7,11 331:17 333:12 334:5,20 335:5,9 336:8 338:8 340:6,10 341:15,22 342:2,7 342:8 draft 31:5,11,21 184:14 185:9 dragging 103:13 dramatic 74:13 103:12 driven 107:17 121:17 257:16 driver 251:11 drop 125:1 283:1 287:8,9 339:3 dropout 339:5 dropouts 338:18 338:19 dropped 192:14 267:16 dropping 338:22 drops 92:2 161:18 drug 1:2 15:7 17:2 23:9,11 24:9,12 24:17 26:6,21,21 26:22 27:6,12,13	27:19,20 30:12 31:2,14,18 32:15 33:3,5 34:10 35:4 35:5,8,13,14,16 35:21 36:8,14,16 36:18 37:5,13 38:3 40:19 42:5 42:10,16,21 43:12 43:13 44:6,12 49:8,18,19 53:1,5 54:6 62:7 64:1 66:19 67:21 68:15 70:1,5,6,8,10 71:12,16 74:10 76:3,8 78:20 82:1 82:4,5,6 84:5,14 84:16,17,17,19 86:1,10,11,18,22 87:7,7,13,16 88:1 88:8 90:6,11 91:8 93:16 94:19 95:17 97:6 98:17 100:14 101:5,11 102:3 105:6 107:21 108:1,4,22,22 109:12 111:21 112:2 114:7,21 116:5 122:8,10,14 123:9 128:4 139:22 140:5 146:10 156:11,12 156:14 157:12,18 159:22 164:15,18 170:6 172:18 179:4,15 182:12 182:17 183:1,13 184:11 186:16 187:9 191:13,15 191:17 192:8,11 192:15,19,21 195:17,19 202:7 204:21 216:18 225:14 226:5 227:2 229:11	243:12,13 244:1,2 244:6,8,21,22 245:1,12 246:22 265:2 267:2,10,15 267:19 268:12 295:11 313:15 314:21 315:21 325:18 326:11 336:6,6,10 drugs 6:22 15:1 15:16 16:22 21:16 24:7 35:19 36:9 43:4,21 52:19 54:9,10 55:22 59:22 62:13,17 64:6,7 67:3 68:8,8 72:18,18 74:4,7 74:17 75:5 78:6 81:12,17 82:2,7 83:4,14,21 85:15 85:17,18 86:11 89:14 90:15 92:14 99:9 102:10,11 104:1 109:3,8 119:15,17 120:11 120:20 129:16 130:4 132:11 148:6,19 169:7 171:5,6,14 182:3 190:14 193:1 200:5 208:16 214:9 219:20 245:15,19,20 247:6,9 269:14 304:7 313:9 315:17 316:12,13 318:4 328:17 339:16 dry 35:12 52:15 75:6 82:17 83:10 97:12 99:21 202:14 203:2 drypowder 63:11 65:11 81:11
--	---	---	---

<p>due 84:20 181:15 183:5 185:11 188:9 202:6 247:1 247:7 284:8 dull 262:12 dummy 71:12 99:6 dundee 2:17,19 17:11 durability 77:4,5 110:14 203:15 204:20 durable 96:10 146:6 249:11 duration 12:17 39:17,21 45:5 77:2 91:15 93:5 100:8 106:6,9 111:3 114:3 135:1 140:11 141:22 200:7,11 204:9,12 219:11 232:8 246:14,17 249:6 250:6 253:21,22 254:1 265:12 292:13 293:6,7 294:3 299:1,2,10 304:6,6 328:11 329:8,15,17 330:11 331:8,15 335:7 durations 334:6 337:18 dutch 18:9 101:6 126:7 151:11 154:17 157:19 318:6 dyad 161:12 dynamic 92:7 dysfunctions 315:13 dyskinesia 187:22 189:19</p>	<p>dyspnea 226:2</p> <p style="text-align: center;">e</p> <p>e 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1,1 5:1,1 6:1,1 7:1,1 8:1,1 9:1,1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1,1 34:9 101:5 e.g. 185:11 earlier 56:17 124:12,12 125:13 132:2 152:11 173:20 186:22 242:9 245:10 258:10 264:20 298:21 318:7 321:10,18 336:19 early 30:16 42:13 42:14,22 43:6,10 45:9 46:19,22 49:8,9,12 50:17 62:6 69:4 88:14 94:10 215:21 324:20 ease 82:3 easier 84:4 141:6 279:11 easiest 85:11 easily 129:22 140:18 182:9 252:21 292:8 eastern 297:10,17 easy 208:4 252:11 253:6 263:20 eating 238:22 echo 294:6,10 ed 10:4 14:3 editorial 234:17 education 155:12 194:6 241:18 edward 2:2 effect 60:17 66:9 69:11 72:15 73:9 76:5,15 77:4,19 81:4 86:20 99:17</p>	<p>111:7 122:6,20 124:14 133:21 134:9 135:14 173:12 186:4 197:4 204:21 229:14 249:11 256:13 258:8,13 259:19 260:7 302:6 314:17 effective 25:5 28:16 29:12 32:10 43:22 62:9 64:19 65:9 66:2 69:12 74:7,20 95:7 107:9 110:17 123:10 126:20 127:10 166:14 178:12 186:16 217:8 235:1 340:19 effectively 101:18 effectiveness 92:6 95:12 97:7 245:4 339:16 effects 56:22 104:2 113:12,15 113:18,18 198:4 200:20 203:12 223:21 226:1,3 231:19 239:17,21 245:13 260:2 efficacy 71:6 76:14,17 77:9 78:13 90:19 91:6 93:5,5 103:1 110:12 114:2 175:12 182:15 188:2 195:8 203:15 208:9 214:18 215:6 216:18 223:12 225:19 229:15 333:15,20 336:11</p>	<p>efficiency 65:11 150:9 efficient 108:3,7 108:15 132:8 173:16 265:8 effort 48:19 145:8 197:3 290:16 egg 105:3 ei 305:12 either 26:21 29:18 45:14 84:20 94:18 98:17 106:13 111:2 159:3 184:1 195:2 225:19 227:21 244:9,22 258:6 260:11 309:16 317:8 319:6 elaborate 48:3 elastase 304:17 electrical 37:6 41:7,9 electrocardiogra... 232:2 electronic 280:18 287:4,15 307:15 elegant 221:10 elements 23:16 160:19 elevations 220:16 eligibility 64:2 73:18 eligible 70:15 73:5 157:2 283:10,16 283:22 eliminating 74:18 159:16 elimination 28:3 ellenberg 6:12 20:8,8 95:2,22 103:21 105:15 110:9 111:5 117:9 261:11 273:21 274:14,18 277:14</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>327:4 embarc 235:16 embrace 230:20 emc 37:7 41:10 emergence 225:14 229:18 emergency 337:20 emergent 93:8 emerging 64:21 98:6 304:16,17 emotional 314:1,6 emphasize 71:4 78:5 emphasized 91:12 empiric 148:16,20 152:12 157:6 164:11 167:17 174:8 218:21 219:7 employed 213:6 343:8,11 344:7 employee 343:10 employees 22:19 24:6 encapsulated 72:2 encounter 15:1 encountered 14:17 encourage 47:1 encourages 188:3 endeavored 59:1 ended 107:7 254:19 endotype 272:4 endpoint 12:19 56:10 91:16 93:4 104:6,21 105:13 105:16 106:13,14 109:17 110:12 111:14,18 112:1 114:2,4 116:1 121:14,16 124:16 126:10 128:12 129:6 131:2,3,16</p>	<p>133:7,12,19 134:3 134:16,16,17,19 136:3 137:13,15 137:17 141:16 142:17,21 190:19 190:21,22 191:1,9 191:11 193:3,9 202:1,9,18 203:3 204:2,11 205:8 216:4 226:12,13 226:17 228:13 229:1,2 243:15 246:15 250:9,11 252:7,8,10,20 253:4,6,17,18 254:5,7,10,13,14 255:2,8 257:3,6 258:10,11 259:5 260:10,11 264:15 274:9 277:15 283:6 288:18 289:7 294:8 295:12 302:21 304:12 307:2 308:13 309:13,16 311:1 313:3,15 315:6 316:3 318:2 323:18 325:11,14 326:7,8,8,10,14 326:22 328:16 329:3,11,17 336:22 endpoints 14:21 53:6 55:18 56:3,7 56:15 57:2 58:7 90:19 91:3,21 104:6 105:4,12 106:3 110:6 113:12 124:11 125:10 128:18 129:7,12 133:1,5 141:19 142:4,20 143:1 144:20 150:16 174:5,6</p>	<p>185:1,5 190:19,21 192:22 193:18 195:15 200:9,17 200:18 202:19 203:6 208:7,8,10 209:8 220:22 228:5,8 229:15 231:5 235:20 243:1,3 251:3 252:11 253:12 254:3 257:10,12 258:2,3,5,22 259:2,7 264:5,19 286:6 288:17 298:12 307:21 309:16 313:7 315:12,18 323:13 329:2,14 332:15 340:22 endure 183:19 enforce 182:21 engagement 155:5 engineering 28:10 28:13,19 30:13,17 50:13 enhance 215:2 312:5 enormous 187:2 262:21 293:8 enrich 73:18 135:21 141:15 250:4 259:18 260:8 264:15 265:10 271:8,22 273:10 286:20 294:13 302:9 310:7 enriched 310:14 enriching 270:4 270:13 336:16 enrichment 310:6 310:12 enroll 94:14 116:22 126:1</p>	<p>147:13 148:8 184:1,6 248:12,19 273:17 283:13 284:10 339:12 enrolled 189:6 214:2 226:11 228:1 230:21 248:14 273:2 297:9 332:13 333:13,22 335:13 enrolling 105:7 113:4 147:14 193:18 283:9 333:7 335:17 337:21 enrollment 204:17 230:22 266:5 301:6 332:18 enrolment 248:21 ensure 25:2,4 28:14 30:1 32:9 43:22 56:21 135:21 143:15 195:7 enter 264:3 enters 263:18 entire 117:20 123:20 211:7 266:13 entirely 61:5 66:1 71:17 76:7 entities 34:14 entity 120:17 162:20 206:8 235:4 entry 63:9 73:2 284:19 environment 37:17,18 45:4 environments 28:20 29:2 epidemiologic 235:18 257:14 290:19</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>epidemiology 6:15 8:20 18:6 24:15 235:12 299:14</p> <p>episode 181:12 320:17</p> <p>eq 305:8</p> <p>equal 83:8,16 185:22</p> <p>equally 156:10</p> <p>equate 125:16</p> <p>equation 17:5 170:21</p> <p>equipment 47:8 80:12</p> <p>eradicate 65:2 158:19</p> <p>eradicated 75:8</p> <p>eradicating 62:6 62:10</p> <p>eradication 55:14 64:15,20 69:4 94:11 111:13 142:4,5 145:17</p> <p>erj 228:9 266:8</p> <p>error 8:18 22:14 23:1,1,2,19 24:2,8 24:13 26:2</p> <p>errors 23:8,11,21 24:2,17 26:8,13 27:21 28:4</p> <p>ers 219:12</p> <p>erythromycin 231:4</p> <p>especially 39:3 79:17 82:7,15 83:2 84:15 104:9 141:14 142:21 188:6 195:3 206:11 236:17 240:8 241:16 338:22</p> <p>essence 336:10 340:15</p>	<p>essential 53:11</p> <p>essentially 21:21 52:19 93:15 104:5 160:11 252:12 255:14,16 256:17 288:13 308:20</p> <p>establish 125:8 141:5 155:20 207:16 208:7 209:4 221:6 223:12</p> <p>established 74:18 92:4 214:1 216:5 225:22 230:6 232:8</p> <p>establishing 92:11 154:12 215:6 235:18</p> <p>estimate 66:14 255:6,17 290:13</p> <p>et 40:19 65:12 223:4 234:6 324:20</p> <p>ethical 87:17 116:11 119:3 120:1 123:5 182:18 242:18 249:14,18</p> <p>ethically 273:20 340:3</p> <p>ethics 101:2 140:10</p> <p>etiologies 189:10 201:14 206:8 221:3,6 247:15 301:16</p> <p>etiology 188:11 289:16 297:19</p> <p>europe 206:10 221:14 222:12 297:11,17 298:7,7 298:8 339:7</p> <p>european 17:12 154:6 209:17,22</p>	<p>217:21 235:15,15 297:8,10 301:11 323:16</p> <p>europeans 296:19</p> <p>evaluate 23:15 27:17 29:9 50:6 182:14,17 303:17</p> <p>evaluated 29:9 104:16 191:7 192:1 252:1 258:11 338:14</p> <p>evaluates 187:5</p> <p>evaluating 50:7 106:19 192:1 202:1</p> <p>evaluation 8:6 24:12 30:20 32:15 32:16 40:2 43:4 91:6 104:9,12,13 125:6 249:21 252:3 323:10</p> <p>evaluations 25:4 26:15</p> <p>event 23:2 50:19 56:10 109:17,18 131:13,14 133:17 134:13 135:4,7,13 136:2,8,10 174:9 178:17 212:12 252:12,13,16 255:15 256:15,21 256:22 262:10 264:9,10 265:21 285:19 286:4 292:19 293:17 309:10 310:9,12 312:12 321:2 322:11,17,19,20 329:19,22 330:2,6 330:8,16 331:19 332:19 333:13,14 333:18,21 334:2,4 334:10 337:11</p>	<p>events 23:9,11 132:12 134:7 135:5,6,8,10,15 135:22 136:9 141:22 201:5 202:6,9 228:6 252:15 253:16 255:10,18 256:1,8 260:4,13,17,18,20 261:5,8 271:8 286:21 303:18 309:20,21 311:7 312:7 322:9,10 330:1 331:11,12 331:13,14 332:13 332:15,21 333:1,4 333:6,7,8,13,22 336:17,20 337:12</p> <p>eventual 122:18</p> <p>eventually 123:21 183:13</p> <p>everybody 14:5 52:9 188:22 278:15 313:21 340:10 342:1</p> <p>everybody's 15:19</p> <p>everyone's 341:7</p> <p>evidence 56:8 75:10 102:13 133:8 140:20 145:4,5 151:3 152:2 163:6 164:14 171:11 192:13 210:16 216:12 218:1 219:14 233:2 253:8 283:14 302:11 336:11</p> <p>evident 161:9</p> <p>evolution 10:15 51:17 53:1</p> <p>evolving 94:9</p> <p>exacerbate 297:21</p>
--	---	---	--

exacerbated 221:21	319:21 320:6,16 320:21 321:10,15	260:16 261:3,13 261:21 262:5	95:15 109:6 116:15 118:8,12
exacerbaters 335:4	321:16,22 323:8 327:8,9,20,22	263:1,13,14,18,21 264:4,6,12,14,16	126:8 157:8 163:21 164:4
exacerbation 56:12 73:13,21 74:16 77:7 91:3,5 92:3,4 97:9 106:13 113:18 114:2 115:3 128:5 131:20 132:3,6,8 132:9,18 133:4,19 136:14 137:13 139:10,16 141:20 142:1 152:3 158:18 159:12 191:1,2 195:18 196:2,14 198:13 202:2,19,20 204:2 204:10 209:8,20 210:2 216:3 221:16 225:21 226:12,13,14 227:6,8 228:5,6 228:11 229:1,6 231:2 248:19 252:7,22 253:9 254:16,19 256:6 259:2,3 260:9,11 261:7,18 263:22 265:17 266:4,17 269:13 270:5,7 274:2,11,15 275:2 275:13,14 276:3,7 276:18 277:8,17 278:2 282:19 283:1 286:1,4,15 287:7 288:12 293:22 295:2 296:3 299:3,6 302:10 304:16 308:10,17 309:7 313:1 317:21 318:2,20 319:3,17	exacerbations 11:6 56:11,14,14 63:2,13 73:11,19 89:17,22 90:6 91:4 92:21,22 105:14 110:8 126:7,10,11,19 127:5,22 128:21 129:9,20 130:19 131:11,16 132:13 134:10 150:2 157:5 159:9 173:4 173:18 181:15 190:2 196:8,11,13 197:17,20 198:2 201:18,19,22 202:1,3,11 203:20 204:3,5,16 206:13 207:22 209:2,12 211:18 212:3 213:3 214:10 217:19 218:7 220:5,6,14,15,21 221:18,19 224:7 224:11,11,12,19 224:21 228:1,12 228:20,21 229:7 230:2 231:3,10 232:1 233:13 234:9,19 238:12 240:22 243:6 247:1,7,17,21 248:12,15,18 249:9 251:10,17 253:2,3,15,20,22 253:22 254:2,5,6 254:10,12 255:2,4 257:7,8 259:6,6	266:1 268:4 270:8 271:10,18,21 273:18 274:6,13 275:10 276:14,19 278:6,13 279:5 283:5,7,11,17,22 284:1 285:14 286:11,14,16,17 287:13 288:9 297:16 298:15 299:1,8,11 304:12 306:20 308:13,14 308:21 309:22 310:21 312:17 314:15 316:2,3,11 317:18 318:6,12 319:15,16 321:8 321:17,20 323:18 326:15 328:3,19 328:22 329:5 331:21 337:10,18 337:21 338:13 339:10 exacerbator 221:13 exacerbators 222:4 exact 295:8,13 296:21 336:18 exactly 174:19 288:4 301:5,21 306:11,20 314:4 314:11 325:10 328:1 example 27:2,4,6 28:11 31:2 33:13 36:9 39:13 41:1 41:16 43:1 45:2 46:2,7 48:9 67:16 73:19 90:12 93:7	178:11 190:4 208:11 233:7 252:21 262:14 291:17 294:15 314:5,17 315:12 examples 22:21 27:9 35:16 195:16 exceedingly 329:22 excellent 319:4 excess 325:13 excessive 332:11 excessively 183:19 excitement 149:18 194:21 exciting 74:4 exclude 150:12 284:3,11 excluded 301:1 excluding 294:2 exclusion 249:4 289:20 excuse 98:8 289:12 executive 3:12 exempt 33:12 exercise 80:16 210:6 234:10 238:15,21 exhaustive 91:21 exhibits 210:3 exist 182:21 255:21 existed 255:19 existing 44:7,9 95:10 195:22 198:18 222:3 243:13 290:18 exists 258:15 309:12

<p>expand 96:3 165:8 176:3 235:13 expect 115:14 122:14 130:3,13 134:6 170:4 172:10 310:11 318:21 330:5 339:4 expectation 133:22 169:19 330:8 expected 261:15 311:7 330:1 expecting 116:16 298:2 expectorate 75:6 expectorating 217:17 experience 18:22 50:17 63:22 79:12 91:10 126:18 156:19 181:1 184:17,20 219:1 226:6,8 255:13 287:8,9 302:1 328:7 329:21 331:17 334:17 335:9 338:7 experienced 124:6 124:18 198:4 experiences 14:19 15:13 80:8 experiencing 63:2 65:17 66:5 188:7 254:15,17 277:16 expert 95:5 97:3 121:8 136:1 191:11 193:4 215:3 expertise 15:12 20:10 186:13 214:7 experts 181:2 209:19 244:20</p>	<p>explain 119:6 explains 320:17 explanation 203:8 exploratory 295:12 explore 200:11 explored 258:5 exploring 186:11 exposure 59:21 60:14 65:21 77:17 119:6 139:22 140:2 146:3 164:5 exposures 196:1 express 100:1 109:15 expressed 198:7 extend 169:1 171:9 334:11 extended 96:10 102:2 249:18 extending 334:6 335:6 extends 173:17 extension 110:13 228:18 249:17 extensions 146:11 extensive 33:22 extent 249:10 269:16 externally 39:12 39:15 extra 82:15 277:13 extractables 48:10 extraordinary 339:17 extrapolate 129:22 298:2 334:11 extremely 266:2 eyes 136:5</p>	<p>f f 24:13 face 39:2 41:1,2 75:22 211:2 221:4 faced 198:12 facetious 166:16 facilitate 15:16 facing 186:20 321:3 fact 43:17 67:21 75:5 78:5,9 97:21 119:14 133:5 147:5 153:22 216:15 221:2 224:10 232:22 233:21 253:5 259:15 289:19 290:21 294:20 296:7,17 302:5 323:8 factor 28:2 45:14 45:19 82:3 94:13 198:22 factored 288:10 factors 8:17 10:5 22:10,13,16 23:13 23:14,18 24:9 25:3 28:6,8,10,13 28:18 29:11,13 30:1,13,16,20 31:1,6,13 37:8 42:1 50:5,13 177:13 188:9 196:2 247:20 249:2 255:5 261:4 313:16 323:6 fail 71:19 335:2 failed 116:21 146:14 181:18 188:9 191:9 192:11 193:3 203:7 247:10 289:4 291:16</p>	<p>failing 116:19 190:22 fails 115:2 255:9 failure 117:8 169:20 188:5 failures 126:1,2 127:1,6 193:16 fair 51:14 58:22 61:10 104:3 115:2 119:15 144:16 149:1 173:19 175:13 242:18 264:22 284:16 fairly 61:19 63:5 73:20 77:20 88:16 152:7 189:8 214:16 218:19 fall 26:16 34:9 35:1 47:12 191:2 281:16 falling 57:13 falls 34:18 35:20 false 256:10 fame 168:16 familiar 26:18 27:10 71:20 101:15 325:1 families 155:13 family 293:3 fantastic 287:15 329:1 far 44:20 79:1,2 81:8 84:3 86:21 159:19 196:14 229:20 240:4 248:10 266:22 267:1 334:21 farfetched 157:22 farkas 1:20 343:2 343:17 fashion 102:4 213:4 214:12 216:13 271:21</p>
---	---	---	--

<p>fast 82:14 100:19 fatigue 210:7 338:11,14,15 faults 137:6 favor 57:13 170:18 favorable 61:13 fda 1:5,11 2:5 3:20 4:7,17 5:11,15 7:2 7:7,17 8:7,15,21 10:4,7,8,11,16 11:10,15 12:4,8 12:18,20 18:6,15 18:21 19:14,17 20:17 25:8 26:20 32:2,8 34:7,15,19 36:21 41:13 45:12 47:11 51:3 59:13 67:2 68:8 85:4 102:19 182:2 184:8,14,16 185:10 186:7 187:5 194:15 199:1,7,16 205:16 236:12 244:14,17 245:6 246:16 250:9 295:11 313:12,14,18 315:5 324:18 325:10 330:13 fda's 27:15 163:10 163:15 184:11 195:7 fear 156:22 164:10 195:2 239:15 fearful 157:5 feasibility 78:11 85:20 94:12 95:15 95:20 112:9 114:15 116:2 137:6 140:10 145:20 150:13 331:9</p>	<p>feasible 59:10 69:17 71:3,7 72:13 76:1 78:14 104:1,15 108:12 111:6 112:14 114:16 123:4,13 140:13 142:6,7 144:13 271:17 306:7 340:18 features 138:13 223:14 february 31:5 fecal 178:10 federal 43:16 184:18 feedback 43:9 44:12 50:16 144:8 163:19 183:6 feel 65:1 84:8 85:1 100:15 103:14 112:8 162:5,6 178:20 195:20 196:15 237:4 243:11,12,14 244:21,22 263:1 276:11 278:18 279:21 282:12 286:15 288:5 305:1 306:3 feeling 84:3 113:11 127:10 193:13 241:10 263:11 275:18 280:15 282:10 feels 323:11 feet 153:17 fellow 339:15 felt 101:21 103:6,9 103:10,11,19 119:11 female 315:12 females 297:13 fern 181:9 184:7 186:17</p>	<p>fev 90:20 105:21 106:13 129:17 130:6,13 fev1 55:20 57:13 57:21 58:4,8,10 62:20 63:10 72:22 73:6,10 74:12 76:16 77:6 91:11 92:1 105:14 110:2 110:9,12,18 111:7 113:13 114:4 121:7,9,11,12 122:11 123:1,3 124:10,16 125:12 125:14,16 127:22 128:10,19 129:6 129:10,13 130:3 130:22 142:8 162:1 201:4 202:21 208:12,13 208:16 222:1 228:4 270:5,6,8,9 270:12,14 304:17 fewer 248:14 261:14,21 262:1 263:4 270:8 293:1 332:12,21 333:4 fibrosis 1:8,8 2:7 3:12 10:9,15,17 11:4,13 12:6,16 14:7,8 16:21 51:7 51:10,11,15,16 52:2 55:7 58:17 85:5 88:20 89:10 89:15,22 90:7,16 92:14 109:5 138:1 138:5,10 199:19 205:22 207:5,5 216:6 217:2,5,11 217:12 219:20 246:9,20 251:4,15 252:17 253:13 258:1 300:15</p>	<p>field 79:18 116:18 174:15 175:3 181:2 215:3 fields 175:5 figure 23:6 38:7 75:20 162:10 174:6 193:14 241:11 243:16 262:4 322:9 figured 173:16 file 42:12,18 50:21 filed 30:15 36:10 44:15 filled 237:11 321:2 final 143:4 155:11 193:22 finalized 155:17 finally 41:3,22 85:19 181:18 208:2 209:10 213:14 223:8 253:5 257:19 financially 343:12 344:8 financing 314:1 find 49:19 78:14 85:17 86:3 104:21 130:2 133:4 134:1 147:20 153:13 155:8 162:15 273:10 275:2 283:8 284:22 319:5 334:12 finding 73:5 151:21 163:4 166:2 273:8,12 findings 203:4,5,8 203:15 260:3 finish 146:9 273:14 finished 41:4 firm 131:12 first 15:5 16:4 21:18,19 22:22</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>28:19 51:9 59:5 59:12 62:5 64:15 77:13 78:4 79:15 82:13,13 89:2 92:17 95:14 132:9 132:9,14 133:10 133:18 135:4,7 142:13 145:3 154:11 155:15 157:10,18 164:13 176:4 184:14 188:10,14 190:22 191:12 192:2,6 195:18 196:12,13 198:6 202:18 204:1 213:21,22 214:1,22 220:11 228:5,11 229:1,6 239:1,4 246:13,15 246:19 252:7,12 252:13,16 253:9 253:14,15 255:21 256:21 258:20,20 259:1,3,21 260:8 261:19 262:3,4 310:15 313:1 333:14 334:2 fit 30:13 263:6 fits 150:16 187:10 five 39:3 64:3,5 67:19 154:10 160:22 161:1,9 179:16 180:6 280:18 305:9 306:1,6,18 330:3 fixated 262:5 flare 196:19 flareup 242:20 flareups 241:4 flaring 281:16 flat 96:6 122:4 flex 129:11 flexibility 53:22 193:17</p>	<p>flight 238:8 florida 281:4 flow 38:17 48:22 101:5 flowchart 29:21 flume 5:3 10:12 19:8,8 57:9 58:9 79:6 88:12 93:21 94:1 95:14 98:21 101:1 102:16 105:2 110:1,10 111:12 114:19 118:8 121:15 124:20 126:6 128:15 129:3 130:17 131:9 133:7 144:21 148:22 149:9 152:17 153:11,17 157:10,14 161:8 161:16 162:19 163:16 164:8 166:15 178:22 179:20 272:1 292:11 322:8 flume's 128:9 fluoroquinolones 203:19 focal 266:14 focus 33:3 51:10 59:8 64:14,17 65:8,15,18 67:16 69:5 70:21 77:3 89:3,8 90:3 122:1 167:16 171:14 209:2 214:21 215:19 219:21 220:2 222:9 256:12 focused 53:11 59:11 71:6 76:14 76:18 78:12 184:11 187:9 231:1</p>	<p>focusing 165:3 205:7 folks 14:10,10,12 14:13,20 16:11,16 16:18 226:11 325:1 follmann 7:8 20:18,18 57:12 107:13 132:6 135:3,11 150:3 151:14 264:13 276:17 283:20 284:5,11 285:3 298:11 331:7 332:12,21 follow 14:13 15:8 22:5 29:21 34:3 35:7 55:12 60:17 67:18 70:8,22 75:19 112:22 114:3 120:5,7,10 123:20 141:13 171:15 186:5 196:11 221:16 222:18 245:15 279:2 285:11 295:16 followed 33:11 75:11 89:7 93:4 107:21 110:12 253:2 265:1 following 24:21 75:16 196:6 210:4 248:1 260:18 321:13 folly 325:15 food 1:2 27:20 341:18 fooling 103:16 forcing 183:19 foregoing 343:3 forget 309:22 forgot 281:13 337:4,7</p>	<p>forgotten 86:2 120:8 121:3 form 16:14 82:1 82:17 229:4 309:15 formal 11:17 26:16 44:9 177:1 180:4,10 formed 85:9 former 296:13 297:9 forming 220:20 225:13 226:20 267:15 forms 59:15 61:18 formulation 40:7 81:7 83:11 99:21 formulations 83:10,11,12 99:13 99:16 100:2 forth 105:5 118:13 fortunate 291:15 forum 240:8 322:8 forums 210:22 forward 15:3,9 106:20 118:21 130:12 151:13 177:4 186:8 187:16 195:12 199:6,9 235:22 236:4 326:19 336:14 341:7,20 fosfomycin 118:10 118:11 found 87:21 117:14 163:1 215:22 227:4 262:16 304:4 324:4 340:11,19 foundation 2:18 11:20 66:18 85:5 154:6 194:4,5,9 240:19 242:10</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>founded 220:9 founder 20:4 four 62:8 64:3 70:5 81:15 161:9 184:14 211:19 260:19 271:4,9 288:16 330:3 fourth 155:5 fraction 38:2,4 frame 185:20 framework 187:10 212:7,8 frankly 186:2 193:2,6 220:7 free 317:8 320:5 freely 22:20 frequencies 337:16 frequency 56:3,13 91:3 131:14 134:4 134:10 152:4 170:14 196:8,10 196:12 200:8 202:3,20 204:3,10 209:9 215:16 224:20 228:12 229:2,7 249:9 253:17 254:9 255:1 262:11 269:13 275:10 276:15 302:10 308:12,21 310:21 311:1 312:11 316:4,9,10,14 319:14 323:18 326:15 329:11 331:21 332:7,10 334:22 frequent 109:18 196:18 197:17 211:18 217:18 220:5 221:12,18 221:20 222:4 224:7,10,19 230:2</p>	<p>231:22 233:13 234:19 254:12 286:18 305:12 319:21 335:3 339:10 frequently 127:5 136:3 164:19 259:15 265:15 280:12 292:20 307:10 317:6 freshman 239:2 friends 306:9 frohlich 2:9 17:6 17:6 179:3 263:11 268:2 320:12 331:17 frohlich's 265:14 front 34:2 41:14 42:7 165:1 319:10 frontiers 187:12 frustrated 188:5 fuchs 133:11,13 full 67:2 69:10 80:13 82:8,8,17 86:22 88:10 93:13 103:12 152:19 161:2 328:6 fully 208:21 fun 86:5 function 47:8,10 72:19 80:22 92:19 103:7,18 139:9 142:18 152:3 160:10 161:18,21 162:4 196:9 207:21 208:11,18 238:11 243:5 257:20 258:14,17 258:17 267:9 270:17 271:5,5,11 271:18 278:19 279:18 287:9,14 293:12 297:16 314:1,6</p>	<p>functional 128:6 functioning 162:2 293:18 functions 62:19 204:8 314:6,18 fundamentally 77:18 funded 151:18 154:5 fungi 162:19 163:3 176:9 fungus 162:15 further 66:10 69:19 70:9 74:16 76:20 235:4 263:22 271:22 342:4 343:10 furthermore 30:6 136:4 future 10:18 11:4 58:16,18 83:6,13 84:11 88:20 134:14 163:22 164:7 220:14 221:19 224:12 251:14 253:12 257:1,3 260:17 263:16 309:13</p>	<p>35:22 42:17 44:18 80:6 109:12 138:21 167:6 208:16,18 215:7 218:2 219:4,7,14 232:2 233:2 300:16 313:7 generalizability 141:17 generalizable 30:3 generally 139:3 162:1 206:13 generate 38:1,3,14 generated 38:9 39:10 40:13 generates 255:6 255:17 generic 31:9 61:18 97:13 genotype 290:4 gentamicin 302:18 gentleman 211:3 geographic 335:11 george's 206:21 216:9 226:15,21 288:2 307:6 georgetown 12:5 geriatrics 37:14 getting 15:18 39:9 40:13 75:12 82:16 93:12 119:20 126:12 168:9 236:20 238:20 272:5 277:10 290:3 305:11 310:22 333:7 gi 231:19 gilead 291:17 gill 255:22 256:18 give 55:2 85:14 97:13 101:16 107:4 110:14 117:14 121:16</p>
		g	
		<p>g 14:1 g551d 74:22 gain 20:7 334:14 gained 67:20 gains 265:11 game 45:14 gap 256:1,18 gaps 308:6 340:15 gastrointestinal 163:22 gather 14:20 gathered 185:16 general 20:10 33:11,14,18,20 35:5,6,15,17,20</p>	

<p>137:14 205:11,20 230:11 261:9 291:4 294:17 304:18 306:6 339:13 given 14:19 30:4 56:6 63:7 71:18 84:15 105:9 109:8 147:3 171:7,7 182:15 198:17 242:15 250:14 251:22 252:1 283:15 291:13 320:14 330:13 333:8 341:18 gives 53:20 56:18 133:20 giving 100:17 159:15 293:4 glad 22:6 72:19 74:5 global 165:5 289:21 globally 290:20,22 globe 289:22 gloves 33:13 go 16:2,10,16 23:7 29:17,19 33:1 44:16 50:22 70:19 75:5 81:8 82:8 83:6 88:13 93:17 102:6 108:1 132:3 147:19 151:22 152:12 156:3 160:21 168:22 177:13 224:16 237:16 241:5,10 241:20 257:11 259:11 263:2 264:4 265:18 267:5 271:17 273:13 274:19 275:15 277:7,9 281:9 290:22</p>	<p>302:22 319:11 321:22 322:3 336:14 goal 15:20 27:22 75:14 84:10,12 87:1 158:19 220:6 251:9 285:13 294:13 goals 207:16,18 208:5,9 282:17 goes 32:4 99:14 176:2 267:2,16 328:14 335:16 going 14:5 39:11 54:3 57:6 58:11 58:15 61:4,11 67:22 69:22 70:11 70:16 71:9,17 72:3,4,8,9 73:4 75:19 76:3,4 77:14,19 78:2 80:15 81:2 82:9 82:17 83:8,10,14 84:13 85:8,10 87:3 88:13,14 94:18,19 95:17 99:6 100:18 102:1 102:3,7,15,21 104:18 105:5 109:20,20 110:1,7 114:20 115:18 118:5 120:3,19 122:12,18,21,22 123:2 126:6 130:8 130:11,14,17 131:3,6 134:1 136:15 138:8 142:7 143:13 146:13 153:5,14 155:18 160:5 163:8,13 164:12 166:4,15,18 169:19 170:2,6,15 172:5,10 173:11</p>	<p>175:9 177:17,19 177:21 178:18,22 179:1 180:3,5 189:10 199:17 205:2 220:10 224:16 230:7 232:10 234:16 236:9 238:12 239:20 240:11 246:4,10,11 260:9 261:20 263:3 265:20 266:9 267:4,21 268:15 268:16 270:2,8 271:16 273:8 276:14 278:22 289:3 290:5,21 291:7 292:11 296:1 301:12,12 303:16 304:10 308:5,6 309:4,6 310:5 311:5 318:12,16 323:6 325:21 326:18 328:12 330:1,7,9 330:11,21,22 331:1,5,7 335:7 335:17 339:3 340:1 gold 113:14 good 14:20 17:2 19:2,12,15 20:3 21:7 22:12 32:21 41:22 57:4 68:3 73:9 75:12 76:9 76:10 80:7,18 81:16 89:20 111:13 121:3 125:1 127:10 148:14,21 149:17 174:4,5,18 180:11 193:11 225:2 242:20 244:21,22 246:18 250:12</p>	<p>265:16 267:5,14 281:7,8,15 282:10 285:6,10 288:5,6 295:3 299:4 305:5 325:6 329:7 339:15,19 341:3 gotten 159:22 279:17 government 22:19 grad 239:4,5 grade 327:5,8,22 grading 328:5 gradual 287:13 graduate 7:21 gram 212:3 220:4 222:8 223:3,6 230:1 grandfather 61:8 graphs 223:3 grappled 292:14 grateful 22:1 67:18 194:15 341:12 gravitate 186:3 great 1:13 14:3 21:17 51:4 112:19 127:15 177:3 196:21 197:20 236:13 237:2 240:8 244:15 245:5,11 259:10 259:13 267:7 276:11 277:12 278:11 280:4,6 294:8 319:9 328:5 340:7 341:22 342:8 greater 63:9 73:22 125:2 145:7 152:3 161:22 167:11 228:1 339:19 greatest 59:8 64:14,17 65:8,14 65:18 262:17</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>greatly 100:11 341:1,7 green 61:15 greg 4:18 12:11 19:2 205:10 236:6 260:14 266:8 270:20 272:20 294:5 grifols 9:3 288:20 grinding 183:1 ground 155:8 grounded 43:15 43:17 group 47:20 62:14 63:5 67:2 71:20 75:17 85:5 92:5 94:8 124:7 155:2 175:21 178:3 185:22 214:6,16 215:1 217:22 218:19 221:7 223:19,19,20 226:18 227:7,7,9 227:10,16 245:9 260:16 272:2 310:11 327:20,21 330:18 331:20 groups 25:9 60:21 143:2 189:19 190:3,5,10 296:10 298:6 329:13 grow 239:20 growing 237:14 238:18 guaranteed 114:7 guess 52:18 58:7 102:18 104:2 105:11 108:20 109:2 110:15 136:20 149:19 150:3 170:11 264:13 272:9 317:8 325:6 331:16 333:3</p>	<p>guidance 25:8 30:22 31:5,11,17 31:21 32:3 34:2 40:1 41:13 43:7 48:15 156:4 184:15 185:9 294:9 330:13 guide 33:6 43:10 guideline 219:12 guidelines 64:19 210:14 217:22 224:14 317:19 339:7,14 340:3 guild 332:1 guys 79:20 160:13 167:2 305:4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">h</p> <p>hacking 238:5 haemophilus 218:13 221:22 haemoptysis 210:8 half 22:6 60:3 80:10 81:9,10,14 81:19 82:19,20 84:1 86:16 99:11 121:10 183:4,8 214:8 226:22 279:9 281:18 304:9 307:16 halt 183:2 hamblett 3:8 17:22,22 106:4 113:19 123:2 133:18 135:9,12 137:11 309:4 310:4 311:10,13 311:16,18,21 312:15 318:16 hampshire 1:12 hand 42:6 116:13 149:21 176:1 207:10 335:12</p>	<p>handful 117:20 hands 23:4 26:1 245:22 272:10 hang 130:14 happen 160:20 179:16 239:20 278:22 290:17 304:7 312:20 338:19 happened 14:15 159:17 161:14 268:11 happening 25:21 52:6 53:2 54:7 55:3,16 57:7 59:6 59:12 136:6 252:18 happens 161:6 164:5 176:22 262:10 286:11 hard 44:21 66:14 106:1,2 109:18 166:12 174:6 302:7 harder 58:7 118:5 134:19,20 harm 23:4,8,9,12 145:5 harmed 26:8 harshest 107:7 hawkins 2:6 10:21 16:11,17,19,20,20 20:2 49:17 79:10 79:15 99:20 103:9 122:12 149:5,13 313:8,16 hayward 2:12 hazard 116:18 256:20 hazards 27:18 28:1,4,8 29:5,7,15 255:17 head 20:18 116:5 116:14 125:19</p>	<p>130:14 health 3:2 6:7 8:7 17:15 19:22 32:17 69:9 74:6,12 78:10 87:11 96:1 130:10 306:14 healthcare 23:5 24:4 28:22 29:1,3 37:18 251:11 healthier 334:9 healthy 83:22 84:3 239:12 267:8 hear 79:11 102:19 124:3 138:7 144:4 162:5 171:12 236:7 238:5 240:7 240:10,10 250:21 274:8 275:5 288:11 329:16 331:2 340:12 heard 90:2,13,20 94:5 95:18,22 98:16 99:9 102:19 110:3 112:12 114:21 131:11 148:4 171:1 178:5 185:3 201:11 203:1 239:18 241:1 242:1,9 244:9 280:14 316:7,8,18 hearing 98:13 120:13 242:3,11 265:3 266:13 heartache 133:20 heavily 17:8 324:2 heavy 197:17 hedging 298:13 held 87:8,10 hello 51:18 250:12 help 15:19 34:3,21 38:13 43:9,10 65:1 79:5 85:17 86:7 149:7 156:3</p>
--	---	---	---

<p>174:22 175:14 178:11 186:15,19 187:9 209:1 244:6 266:9 271:21 297:2 334:3 341:4 341:6 helped 97:11 340:22 helpful 45:8 77:10 174:9 250:21 340:12 341:19 helping 181:4 314:21 helpline 49:22 helps 15:15 hemoptysis 181:13 233:17 hereto 343:11 heterogeneity 201:12 204:14 265:3,6,7,8 266:12 268:3,16 269:4 289:22 295:18 heterogeneous 186:11 188:10 206:8 221:2 247:14 hi 16:20 20:21 51:18 126:15 187:19 194:2 288:19 305:19 315:22 hide 100:21 high 28:11 60:1 63:9 65:11 72:3 91:9 116:18 162:2 215:15 220:12,13 220:13 222:5 223:15 231:8 235:3 272:17 302:12 309:20 319:8 320:3,10 331:19 334:3</p>	<p>higher 73:6 169:20 215:15 220:15 222:17,22 224:12 239:21 278:5 319:15 330:9 332:9,10 333:21 336:17 highest 33:19 139:3 196:8 292:2 highlight 254:11 highlighted 225:7 258:21 highlighting 197:20 highly 124:18 153:1 162:12 164:20 165:13 173:15 196:10 238:20 258:2 hill 3:7 17:19 187:20 historical 12:6 64:1 73:3 199:17 199:19 historically 26:5 54:7 55:22 162:21 history 53:17 73:19 97:6 102:16 126:11 147:4 150:1 208:14 235:12,19 238:17 248:1 261:13,21 264:17 265:17 271:9 285:4 293:3 296:8 305:10 333:16 history's 290:19 hit 63:4 126:10 129:6 189:2,4 316:5 328:16 329:4 hiv 117:19 hoc 303:21 304:4 332:2</p>	<p>hodgepodge 165:22 hold 185:7 holding 117:20 holds 201:6 222:21 home 28:22 29:2 37:18 45:4 63:4 80:21 292:19 293:5 294:17,21 341:22 homogenous 91:12 hone 209:6 299:5 honestly 334:15 honesty 175:19 hope 186:14 195:4 220:21 223:11 309:14 hopefully 17:3 69:18 83:6 138:6 161:22 162:12 236:21 296:20 341:19 hopkins 80:6 86:4 87:9 horizon 18:12 horrible 165:2 hospital 2:16 5:19 18:4 45:4 160:21 239:8 320:22 337:19 hospitalization 56:3 141:20 211:19 220:15 222:14,18 224:13 248:17 293:2 294:16,19 hospitalizations 190:3 204:6 220:22 251:18 254:2 304:8 hospitalized 80:21 292:18</p>	<p>hospitals 167:22 hour 81:14 82:20 321:13 hours 80:10 81:9 81:11,20 82:19,21 82:22 84:1 86:17 88:9 99:11,15 210:5 238:9 279:10 307:16 320:22 huge 82:7 107:1 276:1,4 312:13 340:5 hugely 334:21 human 8:17 10:5 22:10,13,16 23:13 23:14,16,17,18,22 24:9 25:3 28:2,6,7 28:10,13,18 29:11 29:13,22 30:13,16 30:19 31:1,6,13 37:8 42:1 45:14 45:18 50:5,12 67:4 175:14 humidifier 40:17 40:19 hundred 106:17 331:11 hundreds 106:14 hung 8:12 21:14 husband 281:6 hyperosmolar 215:19 hypertonic 84:6 216:5 218:5 hypertonic 272:19 hypothesis 91:8 92:10 212:12 hypothetical 64:1 90:4</p>
---	---	--	---

<p>i</p> <p>i.e. 212:15</p> <p>idea 25:19 28:14 30:1 55:2 104:18 116:13 119:22 141:1 146:2 242:20 264:21 287:22 294:8 298:22 299:10 304:18 319:4 336:12</p> <p>ideal 76:6 111:3 338:21</p> <p>ideally 169:14 331:3 338:13 340:18</p> <p>ideas 323:13 341:18</p> <p>identical 228:16 333:3</p> <p>identification 332:9</p> <p>identified 26:6 156:15 213:15 218:21 221:12 222:20 291:20</p> <p>identify 25:6 26:11 29:5,14 154:19 199:10 236:1 247:3 289:5 297:2 335:2</p> <p>identifying 149:20</p> <p>ideology 162:16</p> <p>idiopathic 207:4 297:14</p> <p>ignore 161:7</p> <p>ignored 258:2</p> <p>ignores 252:15</p> <p>ignoring 165:4</p> <p>igor 325:7 328:13</p> <p>ii 12:19 33:10,14 111:18 146:18 250:11 309:15 326:19 333:10,11</p>	<p>iii 17:8 33:11,19 331:18</p> <p>illness 187:3 247:15</p> <p>illustrate 214:5</p> <p>illustrates 25:15 25:18 206:19 210:22 211:1</p> <p>illustrative 22:21</p> <p>imagine 254:4 327:7</p> <p>imaging 268:19</p> <p>immediate 241:6 241:19</p> <p>immediately 101:17,19 175:15</p> <p>immense 199:8</p> <p>immunodeficien... 234:6</p> <p>immunoglobulin 234:5</p> <p>immunomodulat... 213:5 230:10,13</p> <p>impact 37:20 53:19 82:18 96:8 96:11 132:20 163:20,22 176:20 178:19 182:7 184:12 185:20 186:4 206:20 207:6 215:22 220:19 222:13 225:11 277:20 278:8 285:19 309:20 310:3 311:8 312:13 318:9 324:11 330:13</p> <p>impacted 196:10 211:15 257:1</p> <p>impacting 278:6 278:19</p> <p>impaction 38:6 48:22</p>	<p>impactor 38:8</p> <p>impacts 129:16</p> <p>impaired 267:9</p> <p>impairment 206:17 207:14 212:4 217:18 297:16</p> <p>impediment 148:7</p> <p>implanted 33:21 33:21</p> <p>implement 29:10</p> <p>implementing 29:20</p> <p>implications 150:9</p> <p>implied 230:11 303:13</p> <p>imply 159:13</p> <p>importance 175:5 176:4 182:6 195:9 195:10 218:21 234:15 239:11 241:19 259:1 312:22</p> <p>important 56:2 58:22 59:19 61:14 70:7 71:7,19 76:8 76:18,19,22 77:11 79:11 84:18 85:6 91:12 93:15 97:18 98:15 103:3 106:4 108:20 119:22 121:2,6 128:20 129:14 132:5 136:8 139:10 140:19 151:13 158:7 159:6 163:19 166:18 170:21 174:13 175:2,15 176:18 178:21 179:6,6 186:8 188:4 196:16 198:6,17 198:22 207:15 208:12,15 210:8</p>	<p>211:1 213:17 215:22 234:6 257:10,22 274:3 275:11 276:10,14 279:4 308:9,12 309:7,11 323:18 325:14 328:13 330:12 337:13 339:6</p> <p>importantly 73:5 193:19 206:12,16 207:8 210:8 222:4 236:1</p> <p>impossible 147:13 184:6</p> <p>impractical 330:20</p> <p>impressed 82:14</p> <p>improperly 190:20 191:12</p> <p>improve 103:4 207:21 208:17</p> <p>improved 27:21 52:18 192:5 195:17 201:3 276:8</p> <p>improvement 73:7 92:20 127:9,18 128:10,19,21 130:22 142:12 145:6 152:13 188:8 216:8,9 225:16 226:21 272:22 276:1</p> <p>improvements 74:6,12 128:19 291:22 292:3</p> <p>improves 95:11 128:5</p> <p>improving 78:10 96:1 103:5</p> <p>inability 141:5</p> <p>inadequacy 154:14</p>
--	---	---	--

<p>inappropriate 23:3</p> <p>inaudible 81:19 85:8 96:12 273:6 300:9 326:1</p> <p>incapacitated 275:22</p> <p>inception 96:5</p> <p>incidence 73:17 73:22 75:1 309:20</p> <p>incidents 73:12,12 247:1,7,17</p> <p>inciting 212:12</p> <p>inclined 288:14</p> <p>include 90:9 184:21 202:2 207:19 248:8,16 248:22 251:17 256:3</p> <p>included 41:3 150:11 189:11 202:19 203:11,16 204:1 211:10 245:3 321:12 323:7</p> <p>includes 51:14 60:3 62:18 181:9 188:11 234:14 249:17</p> <p>including 21:5 52:1,13 65:11 206:5 215:15 216:21 219:6 221:21 228:3 230:4 231:19 265:4 297:9 321:15</p> <p>inclusion 150:4 268:4 273:14 289:20</p> <p>incomplete 331:16</p> <p>inconsistencies 200:20</p>	<p>inconsistent 75:18 253:8 260:16</p> <p>incorporate 255:5 257:7 296:4</p> <p>incorporated 113:21 185:3</p> <p>increase 24:16 71:18 72:8 121:22 129:19 228:10 229:6 260:12 261:5 298:18 316:5,14 320:2</p> <p>increased 67:14 70:9 220:14 222:7 227:6 232:19 251:11</p> <p>increases 139:9 256:22</p> <p>increasing 61:14 61:16,21 72:20 138:16 171:17 199:2 206:10 257:15,16</p> <p>increasingly 182:8</p> <p>incredibly 269:18 285:16</p> <p>ind 30:15,16 44:15 45:1 325:9</p> <p>independent 124:1 221:20 256:3</p> <p>independently 30:5</p> <p>index 222:6</p> <p>indicate 42:17 76:4 149:7</p> <p>indicated 39:17,20 42:16 52:1 60:9 60:12 74:11 194:19 197:10 216:21 224:13</p> <p>indicates 135:1</p> <p>indication 35:21 138:14 141:15</p>	<p>143:8 148:19 252:9 265:14 338:4</p> <p>indications 35:5,5 35:6,22 37:3,10 52:2 264:9 265:15</p> <p>indicative 237:5 238:2</p> <p>indicator 171:4</p> <p>indicators 196:17</p> <p>indifferent 276:18</p> <p>indirect 152:15</p> <p>individual 247:18 279:15</p> <p>individuals 68:7 286:1 295:20</p> <p>inds 44:20</p> <p>industry 25:8 32:8 34:4 40:1 41:13 155:13 184:15 187:13 244:14</p> <p>infants 37:15</p> <p>infected 11:7 20:22 62:22 63:1 66:11 89:4,18 90:1,8 150:5,7,8 151:7,12 222:16</p> <p>infection 11:5,13 54:17 65:6 74:19 88:21 89:9 115:13 137:22 138:5,10 138:17 139:8 144:16,17,18 166:12,17 170:3 172:22 173:15 211:18 212:3,13 212:18,19 219:22 220:4,12 221:22 222:14 226:9 228:20 230:1 231:16 232:5,20 233:15 237:13 241:5 267:20 300:3,21</p>	<p>infections 52:21 53:11 54:8 93:8 111:15 144:5,12 158:16 164:1,2 168:9 181:5,7,19 204:22 206:14 207:12 222:9 223:1,3 224:22 232:7 240:1 248:2 299:20 300:18 301:1,18</p> <p>infectious 7:11 20:20 58:3 154:8 164:8</p> <p>infective 6:10,20 18:15 19:13,17 20:4,12 32:18 51:13,20 89:11 297:14</p> <p>infer 152:14</p> <p>inferiority 77:8,16 91:7 92:9 95:8 106:12 127:12 141:6</p> <p>infield 189:3,5</p> <p>inflammation 206:3 212:14,19 220:16,20</p> <p>inflammatory 35:19 162:9 213:5 230:10,13 232:14</p> <p>influence 137:7 195:21</p> <p>influenced 136:17</p> <p>influencing 137:3</p> <p>influenza 218:14</p> <p>info 11:18 180:14 196:4 242:9</p> <p>inform 156:10 177:4</p> <p>information 44:21 49:10 121:1 143:18,19 155:14 155:19 167:3,4</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>185:15 200:12 316:21 327:18 342:5,6 informative 59:10 69:17 76:1 249:20 340:11,18 informed 85:9 informing 167:4 infrequent 263:2 285:20 303:18 infrequently 310:2 infusion 27:12 inhalation 22:16 26:15 27:7,11 28:7,21 35:3,15 36:8 37:2 38:1 40:5 42:3 43:12 45:22 48:19 90:12 109:5 202:14,15 203:2,7 inhalational 11:11 12:15 44:5 138:4 138:9 246:8,12,20 inhale 21:21 32:19 48:20 51:11 103:11 118:3 129:22 inhaled 1:7 10:14 10:17 14:7 20:13 21:5 33:5 34:11 35:4 36:14 38:4 51:16,22 52:4,10 52:17 54:9,12,19 55:11 58:17 59:14 60:4,22 61:3 62:2 62:4,15 63:6,15 64:4,5 65:2,4 70:17,20 71:14,20 73:8 76:10,11 78:6,8 84:9 85:6 89:13 90:6,10 92:8 96:4,16,21 96:21 97:5 98:11</p>	<p>100:15 109:8 110:16 113:3,13 118:17 120:11 126:9,17 128:4 139:20 140:3,5 144:12 148:5,12 149:1 150:14 157:3 158:9 159:8 159:10,22 171:7 171:13 173:2 178:8 179:10 183:11 194:16 195:16 198:8 200:4,14 202:7,17 203:18 208:16 213:3,7 214:14,15 215:20,20 219:17 219:17 220:2,19 222:10 223:9,12 223:15 224:3,9,15 224:18 225:1,8,13 226:6,10 227:12 229:13 232:12,15 232:17,21 245:20 247:9 266:15 271:12 272:12,18 273:18 312:2 315:20 316:13 330:21 339:9 inhaler 52:16 81:11 101:10 inhalers 35:11,12 35:12 39:10 inhales 48:19 inhaling 82:11 initial 53:10 55:5 75:14 252:22 initially 65:5 71:16 injector 27:2 injectors 27:11,11 injury 212:20 innovate 187:16</p>	<p>innovation 113:2 input 46:18 49:7 79:5 187:7 244:9 245:21 280:16,19 280:22 325:20 inroads 235:18 insert 145:1 inside 40:14 insight 169:4 instance 25:22 98:2 148:13 196:13 200:22 instances 46:21 174:14 198:1 312:11 instigator 175:20 institute 3:15 5:22 7:11 20:19 institution 294:17 institutions 148:5 148:10,15 instructive 213:20 instrument 262:12 295:8 314:2,12 insurance 85:13 integrate 199:10 intended 27:7 28:19,21 37:12 42:10 45:5,21 46:4,6 50:14 133:13,15 136:3 intending 42:17 intends 37:12 intense 296:1 intensity 256:14 intention 226:18 interact 23:20 39:8 43:6 interaction 164:17 164:18 interactions 23:15 interchangeability 31:22</p>	<p>interchangeable 31:19 interest 19:5 21:5 63:18 64:8 67:21 137:21 274:10 interested 70:12 70:15 94:9 144:3 148:10 252:18 256:13,21 274:7 277:21 329:16 341:5 343:12 344:8 interesting 25:14 86:3 116:13 130:2 230:8 250:18 283:4 284:18 290:7 336:12 interestingly 145:22 211:9 interests 16:13,13 135:17 interface 27:18 28:20 29:3 42:5 interfere 323:4 intermittent 202:16 intermittently 63:1 308:1 internally 168:12 international 209:18 227:11 294:12,22 296:10 296:18 327:19 internationally 295:19 335:18 internist 154:8 interplay 38:3 43:13 interplaying 40:18 interpret 313:21 interpretable 314:8,13</p>
---	--	---	--

<p>interpretation 57:20 91:14 332:20</p> <p>interrogate 108:13</p> <p>interrupt 212:22</p> <p>intersect 23:12</p> <p>intersection 23:10</p> <p>interval 91:4 322:14 332:3</p> <p>intervals 322:9,12</p> <p>intervention 69:21 160:18 161:22 311:6,22</p> <p>interventions 312:4</p> <p>intolerance 127:2 210:6</p> <p>intolerant 126:2</p> <p>intravenous 204:6 211:20</p> <p>intrigued 273:21 302:5</p> <p>intrinsically 173:10</p> <p>introduce 16:10</p> <p>introduced 29:16 34:1 41:4 58:12 144:22</p> <p>introducing 16:1</p> <p>introduction 10:3 14:2 32:22 96:7 153:19 206:2</p> <p>introductory 10:3 14:2</p> <p>intuitive 292:17</p> <p>intuitively 322:13</p> <p>investigation 68:12</p> <p>investigational 36:7</p> <p>investigative 320:20</p>	<p>investigator 19:6 338:11</p> <p>investigators 143:16 183:7 254:18 328:8</p> <p>invite 58:11,20 79:9 93:19 157:19</p> <p>inviting 236:13</p> <p>involve 36:14 39:5</p> <p>involved 17:8,16 17:20 18:18 24:21 30:14,15,15 33:16 35:1 36:19,21 40:22 41:1,11 49:13 50:10 79:16 81:22 82:3,4 86:10,14 87:10 89:12,14 100:12 106:22 121:19 122:14 146:15 147:22 152:14 197:8 244:4,10 245:6,7 283:8</p> <p>involvement 50:13 249:1</p> <p>involves 103:14</p> <p>involving 197:11 211:7</p> <p>ipratropium 35:19</p> <p>irrelevant 160:16</p> <p>irrespective 161:14</p> <p>isolate 168:4 172:20</p> <p>isolated 177:15 218:15 219:10</p> <p>isolates 168:7 219:3</p> <p>israel 221:14</p> <p>issue 45:15 83:17 94:17,22 95:15,19 104:4,5 120:18 125:6 136:12</p>	<p>141:4 155:8 156:7 156:16 157:7 165:2 166:13 167:3 169:9,13 171:18 182:18 190:18 197:5 202:5 270:22 278:22 285:21 296:14 297:3 301:11 323:7 327:14</p> <p>issued 184:14</p> <p>issues 11:11 15:6 21:20 22:7 26:6 26:11,12 50:19 59:11 87:11,17 91:20 94:20 96:20 99:1 101:2 118:19 120:12 123:5 138:3,11,11 140:10 142:18 153:3 154:10 156:21 165:4 178:21 182:2 196:20 201:9 203:10 237:7 239:19 240:5 241:3 247:5 249:18 250:1 275:1 295:18 300:16 301:3 312:8 313:10 328:1 335:15</p> <p>itchings 315:16</p> <p>iv 3:18 4:14 30:18 64:22 73:14,21 133:12,17 157:3 159:8,12,21 197:18 254:2 275:15 276:10 277:6,7,10 294:17 294:18,21 304:1</p> <p>iva 129:18</p>	<p>ivacaftor 74:21 129:15,17</p> <p>ivd 47:19</p> <p>ivds 47:14</p> <p>ivs 80:21 292:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">j</p> <hr/> <p>j 31:10</p> <p>james 2:13 17:10 259:19 267:18 269:8 270:20 286:10 288:21 291:6 296:17 297:4,6 299:21 300:1 302:4 323:14 328:9</p> <p>jamie 242:10</p> <p>january 31:12</p> <p>japan 290:2 296:13</p> <p>japanese 296:20</p> <p>jasan 8:9 12:13 21:10 205:4 236:8 246:3 277:19 288:15 312:11 341:20</p> <p>jeff 6:9 20:3 44:3 46:15 262:2 280:8 303:11</p> <p>jet 101:6</p> <p>jewish 6:7 19:22</p> <p>jim 315:22</p> <p>job 86:21 180:20 205:19 263:17</p> <p>johns 80:6 86:4</p> <p>join 15:11 22:7 341:8,11</p> <p>joining 14:12</p> <p>joins 22:1</p> <p>journal 209:17,22 221:11</p> <p>journals 231:9</p> <p>journey 186:20</p> <p>judy 240:18</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>juergen 2:9 17:6 july 344:12 jump 32:22 127:16 jumping 35:3 june 1:16</p>	<p>151:8 174:15 176:2 178:6 201:5 211:14 237:13 238:9 240:16,19 265:19 268:10 279:8 281:12 288:22 306:2,6 308:17 309:5 310:4,22 312:3 325:11 327:9 330:19</p>	<p>118:1,3,4 120:3,5 120:7,9,10,11,13 120:17,18,20 121:1,4 122:7,19 123:7,8,12,13,18 124:1,9,12 125:8 128:4,11 129:9,15 129:21 130:8 134:1,12,15,22 136:12,15,18 137:1,2,4,5,7,16 138:12,13,17,20 138:21 139:5,6,11 139:14 140:16,21 141:8,10 142:11 142:13 143:6,12 143:19 144:3,8,12 147:7,10,17 148:6 148:8,16 149:6,11 150:18 153:6,10 153:17 154:13,15 155:21 158:10,15 159:1,22 161:19 162:17 163:8,12 164:10,11 166:4 166:14,20 167:1 173:1 174:16,19 175:11,18 188:20 190:12,16 191:21 193:11 201:1,12 204:9,20 215:20 220:18 241:18 244:20,21 245:6 247:13 248:5,13 249:12 259:15 261:22 264:17 265:9,11 266:15 268:17 269:1 272:1,14 273:14 274:8 275:15,16 275:16,21,22 276:2,3,4 277:7 277:10,11,12 278:4,14,16,17</p>	<p>279:9,14,16,18,21 279:21 280:1,3,3 280:4,6,21 281:8 281:9,14,17,19,21 283:13 284:13,14 286:10,11 289:13 290:10,10,16,22 291:2,5 293:14 294:7,11 295:2,19 295:21 296:14 297:5 298:14,17 298:22 305:4,20 307:17,22 308:7 308:12,16 309:6,9 309:11,12,13,15 310:8,12,18,19 312:3 315:13 316:18 317:2,9 318:7,15 320:18 321:20 322:6,21 323:2,9 325:1,20 327:3,7,10,11 328:9 329:7,15 330:10,11 331:8 331:10 332:22 333:2,2,6,19 335:21 336:1,3,15 338:22 340:12,15 340:19,21 341:4 342:7</p>
<p>k</p>	<p>kinds 143:11 168:7 244:4</p>		
<p>k 31:16,20 33:17 34:3,5,6 35:8 36:1 36:11 42:12,20 44:17 k.v. 344:2,13 kadoorie 4:12 18:20,20 137:11 307:20 keep 15:20 94:4 94:15 106:18 121:5 154:2 217:10 309:5 313:11 keeping 72:7 239:12 keeps 182:13 kept 116:10 281:10 key 15:20 28:4 59:11 61:17 64:1 72:16 90:18 94:20 210:4 251:8 kid 238:18 kidneys 181:18 kill 99:7 312:18 killing 267:19 kim 4:4 12:18 18:14,14 246:15 246:18 252:4 258:21 kind 34:5 39:15 40:16,17 41:19 44:18 48:4,12 76:22 86:1,19 101:8 113:8 119:5 124:7 126:12 127:12 130:1,6</p>	<p>kit 27:3 kitlowski 11:19 187:18,19,19 275:7,12 277:4 279:14 281:1 kits 27:12 knew 103:15 105:22 117:11 know 14:11,13 15:10,12,20 16:12 16:18 18:22 39:22 52:19 53:10,16 54:3,14 55:2,4,19 55:22 58:2 78:8 80:1 83:19 84:13 84:17 85:3,10,14 85:21 87:9,15,17 88:7 95:9,20 99:8 99:13,21 100:7,11 100:18 101:17 102:7,8,9,16,21 103:9,18 104:7,15 104:16,17,22 105:18,19,20,21 106:1,20 107:20 108:11 109:11 111:10,17 112:4,7 113:22 114:4,7,8 114:8 115:1,4,12 115:19,19 116:18 117:16,19,21</p>	<p>knowing 104:11 104:14 136:17 152:19 knowledge 105:1 155:21 343:7 known 53:18 54:5 139:22 197:16 227:15 232:4 knows 52:9 161:1 238:1,9 278:22 knoxville 8:2 21:4 korea 296:13</p>	

l	147:21 153:12 174:11 200:19 211:20 216:7 217:6 230:17,18 273:12 290:12 305:17 314:16	led 129:19 154:17 left 73:16 75:14 78:8 83:16 129:4 166:9 167:12 207:10 211:7 222:15 237:10 320:22 327:22	225:16 237:7 238:13 239:18 241:15 243:9,14 244:16 251:12 252:19 257:20 258:6,6 274:20 275:1 276:5 278:1 278:1,2,7,8,9,19 279:13 280:1,1,3 282:18,20 283:2 286:12 287:10,14 288:1 291:21 292:3 293:16 306:2,7 307:6,21 312:14 313:10,11 313:15,17,20,21 314:3,5,10,19,22 323:22 326:14
lab 172:4 305:5 label 68:15 69:9 77:2 78:20 102:4 102:5,22 110:5,13 113:17 114:8 120:5,7 121:2 123:16 129:7 131:18 136:12 137:5 146:11,18 183:11 195:22 228:18 249:17 273:18 314:19 326:8 330:21 339:13,20 340:2	largely 69:3 152:12 larger 124:14 135:9 335:15 lasting 249:7 lastly 66:4 129:13 late 45:14 60:8 121:8 181:9 212:9 241:17 281:19 law 184:18 laws 120:9 leachables 48:10 lead 7:4 8:4 20:5 23:3 24:7 32:14 34:18 36:17 64:20 69:19 74:11 187:9 220:14 249:3 leader 5:13 18:14 19:16 20:16 21:15 leading 58:15 67:1 181:2 275:19 leads 53:7 60:1 212:13,16 223:17 251:13 252:2 lean 126:13 learn 186:14 291:14 learned 14:16 94:10,11 189:20 217:2 236:19,22 299:2 340:13 learning 181:1 187:14 290:22 leave 93:9 186:21 219:4 243:18 258:19 281:10 328:4	legitimate 146:3 264:14 leicester 324:18 leitman 11:18 180:8,11,13 181:9 187:17 242:8 length 182:11 196:22 197:12,14 199:22 252:4 lessons 80:5 217:2 letting 85:10 241:19 level 39:1 41:14 41:16,17 51:2 63:9 152:16 218:1 219:14 270:6 271:5,6 287:6 290:4 296:5 320:3 leveled 60:11 levels 172:6 192:8 192:9,11,14 leverage 40:9 45:6 143:18 levofloxacin 126:9 liberalize 133:3 312:7 lies 112:19 life 82:16,18 86:21 110:22 181:10,11 191:7,8,10,13 192:5,18,20,21 193:2,9 196:2,11 201:21 204:8 206:17,21 207:1,7 207:14,21 208:20 211:22 212:4 217:18 222:5	275:1 276:5 278:1 278:1,2,7,8,9,19 279:13 280:1,1,3 282:18,20 283:2 286:12 287:10,14 288:1 291:21 292:3 293:16 306:2,7 307:6,21 312:14 313:10,11 313:15,17,20,21 314:3,5,10,19,22 323:22 326:14 lifestyle 238:13 lifetime 181:18 likelihood 169:20 256:22 261:5 lim 7:3 20:15,15 128:7,7,16 130:20 131:4,7 limit 73:18 88:14 140:2 141:17 203:18 204:19,21 270:12,14 limitations 77:12 limited 68:13 69:1 185:10 289:14 294:21 limiting 261:4 limits 140:11 line 177:6 274:12 277:8,10 279:1 linger 108:9 link 130:1 linked 308:8 links 25:13 liposomal 228:16 liquid 96:21

<p>list 16:12 68:20 91:21 149:15 184:19 208:4,5 230:12 listed 58:21 68:4 lists 133:16 literature 154:18 225:4 336:18 little 16:5 48:4 52:22 53:16,22 58:1,5,6 63:3 66:13 86:6 87:18 96:8 120:22 131:10 132:20 134:19 139:1 140:8,12,14 152:1 152:9,20 153:3 165:8 166:3 168:19 173:20 174:2 175:17 213:6,13 215:6 237:16 240:13 254:8 286:22 293:10 309:5,19 312:3 327:13 live 238:13 274:3 lived 157:1 lives 79:10,21 122:18 323:5 living 196:18 llc 6:10 lo 262:16 load 220:11,13,13 292:1,2 302:18,22 loads 302:17 303:4 lobar 249:1 lobe 211:8 289:17 299:17,18 300:4,7 300:7,12,14 lobectomy 237:11 lobes 268:9 local 169:11</p>	<p>localized 233:12 locally 139:21 location 299:16 locations 244:12 loch 187:20 logic 147:1 logistical 322:14 logistically 269:5 logistics 84:20 85:19 118:22 london 306:9 long 39:20 55:8 56:20 57:2 59:21 60:19 65:21 72:13 77:17 91:22 93:4 96:11 97:6,22 99:14 117:9 119:6 120:15 123:17,22 128:16 129:2 131:21 132:11 134:20 142:2,12 143:13,14 146:15 147:8,13 176:20 179:12 182:13,14 182:18 186:20 198:15,21 203:17 216:17 231:20 238:17 240:22 242:18 249:7 252:13 253:9 272:14,17 275:18 299:3 323:4 331:5 334:15 longer 70:1 75:3,6 75:11 77:2,9 78:13 99:13 101:3 106:9 110:4,13 113:17 114:3 120:4 123:19 127:21 135:1 141:7 144:14 169:1,2 171:5 182:16 183:19 198:3 219:15</p>	<p>231:12 242:6 249:13,22 280:13 310:16 330:15 334:7,18 335:16 335:22 338:4,16 longest 338:9 longitudinal 176:5 176:18 longstanding 19:4 21:4 206:22 look 15:3,9 25:14 32:5 37:3 46:3 49:2 53:9 54:6 55:19 57:4 99:12 102:22 121:18,21 123:22 125:3,3 127:7 128:17 129:6,10 136:2,20 137:15 141:11,12 142:3,7,8 144:14 159:6 160:9 161:5 162:5 170:9 189:6 189:14 192:16,17 199:9 207:10 209:8 212:22 213:22 220:7 222:15 223:2 224:5,6 227:3 235:22 236:4 259:22 263:6 286:12 288:1 289:7 296:10 297:10,12,12 302:15 308:5 312:4 314:4 323:5 332:4 looked 117:5 134:11 152:22 168:20 200:18 222:13 225:20 231:5 258:12 269:12 272:15,16 287:3 299:18 322:8 332:19</p>	<p>looking 47:18,20 48:21 54:9,17 60:15 74:20 77:5 111:17 123:9 126:3,11 127:21 129:7,9 132:7,18 136:15 137:12 143:7 144:9 160:19 162:12 172:3 189:18 193:7 221:5 252:12 289:3 293:16 296:18 303:13 307:12 308:2 312:8 316:9 319:21 322:21 329:11 334:22 looks 24:1 124:4 137:3 206:21 211:6 290:1 336:3 loose 152:7 lose 161:20 166:13 250:15 334:12 losing 262:12 loss 98:13 120:13 152:3 lost 122:6 159:17 lot 14:12 15:15 16:22 51:21,22 58:10 62:1 67:13 79:4,7,20 81:22 83:18,20 86:13 88:9 97:8 100:7 112:16 117:18 118:17 120:9,12 123:14 127:3 128:22 129:10 134:2 138:11 140:7,16 141:18 142:18 143:17 144:19 175:9 177:19 200:7,20 201:10 218:6,10 219:18,21 222:9</p>
---	--	--	--

<p>223:7 240:20 241:1,17 246:4 250:20 257:21 262:12 264:16 268:3,12,16 277:9 279:16 280:15,19 281:1 283:21 290:10 297:12 301:2 318:8 331:12,14 lots 207:22 230:3 232:7 238:4 244:7 280:11 loud 95:18 love 295:1 loving 180:18 low 28:17 73:17 107:5 111:3 170:14 210:15,15 218:1 219:14 234:1 270:15 272:18 292:4 309:20 312:11 329:22 330:17 332:20 lower 41:17 62:19 67:11 198:8 208:12 237:10 264:9 270:17 271:11,15 280:1 299:18 300:3 303:1 332:5,5 333:20 334:2,19 lowering 270:14 lowest 101:13 196:14 luck 333:4 lucky 120:10 242:4 luma 129:18 lumacaftor 128:14 129:15 lunch 11:16 16:3,3 16:6 88:18 179:2</p>	<p>179:21 180:2 lung 2:18 42:6 62:19 72:19 80:22 92:19 103:7 127:4 152:3 161:18,20 162:4 172:5 173:9 181:10 194:7 196:9 207:1,4,21 208:11,18 211:7 220:16,20 234:12 237:7,11,16 238:11 241:5 243:5 266:13 267:4,5,9 271:4,5 271:11,18 278:18 279:18 287:8,14 297:16 lungs 38:12,15 39:9,11,13,14 103:10 184:4 237:20 239:12 240:2 266:20 269:20</p>	<p>233:4 248:7 major 204:19 211:15 235:17 251:10 297:19 315:20 321:21 336:18 majority 44:4 59:2 63:15 75:5 96:14 116:4 188:8 making 52:7 78:19 133:4 137:2 166:4 179:15 184:5 199:3 235:17 238:13 303:19 340:4 malaise 210:7 manage 52:20 90:7 156:4 managed 104:3 211:10 management 11:6 24:14 89:3,17,22 90:15 210:14 215:5 251:9 mandate 233:5 maneuver 48:19 manner 28:15 273:15 mannitol 107:1,3 107:5 215:20,20 324:20 manufacturer 27:17 47:9 50:2,3 50:21 manufacturers 55:1 margaretville 6:11 margin 48:13 92:11,11 95:9 121:19 141:6 196:12 margins 78:1</p>	<p>maria 6:18 11:10 20:11 89:16 93:10 107:20 mark 286:22 305:10 marked 268:22 marker 149:21 287:1 293:13 316:20 323:12 markers 177:7 220:16,19 market 25:6,22 40:5 41:5 50:20 313:9 338:18 marketing 26:7,12 124:2 177:1,9 179:11,19 182:20 mary 11:19 187:18,19 243:16 275:3 277:3 278:15 288:15 341:20 mary's 237:1 maryland 5:11 7:2 187:20 343:19 mask 39:2 41:1,2 massive 233:16 292:2 matched 99:1 matching 289:5 material 39:7 40:7 48:3,5,11 matter 80:22 153:16 154:3 165:15 167:19 175:22 311:19 matters 40:12 170:20 maximize 218:3 maximum 38:17 mayo 4:10 18:16 mcid 291:22 md 1:14 2:2,5,8,9 2:20 3:4,20 4:4,7</p>
	<p>m</p>		
	<p>m 232:4 233:15 macrolide 230:7 231:15 233:3 248:20,21 macrolides 152:18 168:15 213:6 230:6,9 231:12,22 232:3 272:19 magic 131:8 magnitude 124:13 124:15,21 125:4 main 36:15 59:5 121:11 278:14 324:13 mainstay 213:1 mainstays 215:4 maintain 96:15 97:12 207:21 maintenance 103:5 225:19</p>		

<p>4:8,18 5:3,8,12,15 5:16 6:3,18 7:3,7 7:13,14,17,18 8:8 8:15,21,22 10:4 10:16,19 11:10,15 12:8,11,18 mdr 68:9 mean 83:10 101:22 102:11 104:19 108:21 117:17 121:21 122:10 123:2 124:4 125:22 127:17 135:20 136:12 149:15 153:5,8 157:12 159:8,13 160:9 163:8,14 165:2,16 169:10,12,13,16 169:18 171:22 172:9,11 174:13 175:4,8 178:13 252:10 255:6 259:21 260:2 261:15,16 265:5 265:22 266:4 267:5,13,14 269:2 271:1 276:1 277:9 277:12 278:3 283:4 284:15,18 287:3 288:21 297:7 298:8 300:11 301:7 302:18,21,22 305:3 311:10,10 313:6 323:1 325:22 326:13,16 326:17 329:20,20 336:8,10,17 meaning 115:22 244:11 meaningful 87:15 92:1,18 128:18 182:7 204:4</p>	<p>225:15 229:19 249:10 259:7 269:16 270:3 274:7 303:4,15 304:5 309:17 310:18 314:8,13 316:6 meaningfully 132:10 means 54:20 109:9 162:21 172:1 187:15 329:2 meant 52:19 103:7 measurable 184:19 measure 57:15 60:18 76:19 110:21 169:3 173:14 193:12 201:20,21 267:22 294:16 303:20,21 304:5 305:14 315:7 317:17,21 323:21 324:4,6,11 324:21 328:20 329:4 337:9 measured 195:17 262:15 281:17 282:19 299:11 measurement 110:3 207:1 measurements 150:16 measures 29:10 29:20 72:16 77:9 179:12 202:21 204:5,8 214:22 215:4 234:2,15 257:20 286:13 288:2 295:3 305:12 312:9 318:3 324:10</p>	<p>measuring 262:7 307:22 324:8 329:1 mechanical 215:10 mechanism 34:19 36:16 median 72:22 170:10 227:5 228:11 229:6 medical 2:10,16 4:5,20 5:6,20 6:19 7:4,15 9:2 10:12 17:7 19:9,19 20:11,22 32:10 33:2,10 40:3 43:9 51:12,19 58:14 82:20 89:10 90:4 103:21 199:8 201:3 233:13,14 233:18 240:18 243:22 262:4 334:19 medication 8:18 22:14 23:1,1,2,3,4 23:8,11,19,21 24:1,2,8,13 25:3 26:2,8,13 27:21 28:4 42:4 143:14 157:4 193:13 197:9,11 307:16 medications 139:17 medicine 2:15,21 2:22 3:5 4:3,9,10 4:20,21,22 5:5 6:16 7:20,22 20:10 86:4 116:2 158:5 medium 111:11 meet 83:5 110:3 117:6 137:17 146:5 325:18 326:8</p>	<p>meeting 15:15 17:4 19:1 20:14 69:3 79:12,16 83:6,18 84:11 325:9 342:10 meetings 43:5 80:4 196:7 202:12 203:1,11 205:6 227:18,18 members 93:18,20 men 106:5,19 244:13 mention 42:1 100:13 119:1 216:15 257:22 mentioned 29:2 34:8 36:13 41:6 51:19 59:13 76:13 77:13 112:7 120:13 141:8 150:4 152:11 177:14 186:22 206:7 210:13 216:16 233:9 238:16 241:12,13 242:22 243:4,17 258:10 266:8 277:22 279:9 281:17 289:14 293:14 298:22 321:18 336:19 mentioning 47:17 130:16 165:9 mentions 30:22 merely 166:18 merit 281:2,15 message 45:9 met 194:21 195:2 203:3 226:17 265:19 metered 35:11 method 208:22 331:22 332:1</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>methodological 184:15</p> <p>methodologies 154:15</p> <p>methodology 184:17</p> <p>methods 43:1 151:14</p> <p>mi 311:4 312:17</p> <p>mic 22:3 98:4 172:22 266:22 282:15</p> <p>michael 1:20 343:2,17</p> <p>micro 111:16 161:5,15 173:14 177:15 267:14,22</p> <p>microbial 171:13</p> <p>microbiologic 111:8,9,20 142:3 142:17 154:19 155:3 225:11 229:14</p> <p>microbiological 155:22 156:2</p> <p>microbiologists 154:9</p> <p>microbiology 91:11 298:9 299:16 300:6,11</p> <p>microbiome 166:20 177:12,17</p> <p>microcosm 168:11</p> <p>micron 38:11</p> <p>microorganisms 247:21</p> <p>microphone 93:21 280:10 341:14</p> <p>mics 171:17</p> <p>middle 23:10 211:8 300:12</p> <p>mild 268:19 269:17 308:14 320:20 327:22</p>	<p>milligrams 55:11</p> <p>milliliters 211:21</p> <p>million 183:8</p> <p>mind 15:21 94:15 128:20 217:10 239:14 242:11,13 242:21 283:1 331:15,18 332:8</p> <p>mindful 119:5 335:19</p> <p>minimization 28:3</p> <p>minimize 28:1 115:20 312:1</p> <p>minimized 116:9</p> <p>minimizing 24:17</p> <p>minimum 38:17 197:2 204:16 338:11</p> <p>mining 290:18</p> <p>minnesota 18:17 297:5</p> <p>minority 233:10</p> <p>minute 81:13 100:8 302:4</p> <p>minutes 11:8,13 33:1 39:18,20 59:5 81:15,17 82:11 88:14 122:16 180:6 199:22 205:19 221:1 236:1 307:18</p> <p>mirroring 53:2</p> <p>mis 311:7</p> <p>mishra 7:14 10:16 11:15 20:21,21 51:12,18,19 57:17 89:7 120:2 136:11 138:6 160:7</p> <p>mishra's 90:14</p> <p>misinterpreted 252:21</p> <p>misleading 193:3</p>	<p>misrepresent 190:21</p> <p>misrepresents 193:6</p> <p>missed 302:21 333:18</p> <p>missing 280:15,19 284:1 307:17</p> <p>missingness 305:17</p> <p>mission 24:16,20 194:4 195:7</p> <p>mistake 101:12</p> <p>mitigate 37:13 335:7</p> <p>mitigating 116:15</p> <p>mitigation 29:10</p> <p>mixed 200:6</p> <p>mixture 166:10</p> <p>mls 118:19</p> <p>mn 4:11</p> <p>modalities 208:9 215:7,9</p> <p>modality 216:6 218:3</p> <p>model 136:5 150:22 255:17,22 256:5 263:6 290:13</p> <p>modeled 255:4 259:16 306:15</p> <p>models 76:6 200:10 256:3,7 290:7</p> <p>moderate 297:16 327:22</p> <p>moderated 11:8 11:14 12:21 259:9</p> <p>modest 77:20 110:20</p> <p>modestly 62:19</p> <p>modified 255:16 256:17</p>	<p>modify 295:14</p> <p>modulator 74:4 74:17 125:4 128:9 129:16</p> <p>modulators 129:22</p> <p>module 36:10</p> <p>molecular 120:17</p> <p>molecule 85:7</p> <p>moment 59:13 61:3 64:13,16 65:20 66:7 67:12 115:7 254:8 287:17 296:1 320:5 337:5</p> <p>moments 252:5</p> <p>money 87:22 88:6 88:8</p> <p>monitor 55:13 85:2 93:6 163:20 164:6</p> <p>monitoring 177:2 182:20 305:14 326:5</p> <p>monitors 324:9</p> <p>monoclonal 178:2</p> <p>month 47:9 54:20 54:20 55:11 82:21 100:15,20 102:7,8 102:8 109:1 120:21 129:5 176:16 183:8 280:20 291:19 340:5</p> <p>monthly 282:7</p> <p>months 20:5 63:13 73:14 81:14,14 82:22 87:10 91:18 106:7 107:22 109:20 112:22 134:18 146:16 176:16,17 192:10 197:15 226:11 228:2,21 239:10</p>
---	--	---	--

<p>239:10 337:6 morbidity 127:3 206:18 208:14 234:1 235:1 251:12 330:19 morning 19:2,12 19:15 20:3 21:7 22:12 32:21 89:20 242:12 mortality 60:18 60:22 97:20 98:1 139:9 142:3 143:2 206:18 208:2,14 209:10 222:7,14 222:21,22 234:1 234:22 move 15:6 21:18 51:9 58:6 79:9 124:16 137:19,20 177:3 195:12 199:6 288:16 294:18 341:7 moved 116:2 movement 73:7 318:21 moving 67:3 88:22 187:16 mph 2:2 5:8 7:14 10:4 mrsa 11:12 53:14 66:15 67:16 89:9 137:22 138:5,9,18 138:20,22 139:7 144:17 150:6 219:7 mssa 138:18,19 mucociliary 215:2 mucokinetic 107:1 mucolytics 216:22 mucosal 39:14 mucus 212:16 213:9 321:14 muddies 284:13</p>	<p>multi 36:15 194:13 248:22 multidrug 167:21 multifocal 222:2 multinational 227:12 multiple 56:22 61:18 72:5,6 91:18 96:16 97:16 131:12 132:7 135:5 206:8 248:12 261:12 269:11 307:4 310:20 muralidharen 344:2,13 mustn't 328:14,15 mutation 74:11,22 mycobacteria 53:15 248:2 mycobacterial 180:16,17 231:16 232:7,19 myriad 230:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">n</p> <hr/> <p>n 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1,1 11:1,1 12:1 12:1 13:1,1 14:1 nail 263:17 nambiar 5:8 10:11 19:12,13 32:11 44:2 46:15 47:3 49:4,15 51:4,9 88:22 93:10 111:19 114:11 124:3 131:19 135:17 137:9,18 143:21 144:2 148:4 341:15 name 16:19 17:10 22:12 51:18 59:16 180:13 187:19 194:2</p>	<p>names 24:22 naming 24:18 314:3 narrow 332:2 narrowing 219:9 narrowly 302:21 nasally 14:7 national 6:7 7:11 19:22 20:19 294:22 natural 53:17 108:8 147:3 208:13 235:12,19 290:19 296:8 naturally 30:6 339:1 nature 92:7 187:3 188:10 256:9 263:5 277:5 327:2 naïve 95:4 nc 3:7 ncfb 46:11 290:1 nda 35:10 36:11 42:19 44:15 ndas 31:4 35:9 nearly 59:16 72:21 129:19 181:18 183:4 243:4 neb 80:12 100:6 nebs 81:18 nebulization 100:8 nebulizations 80:11 nebulize 100:5 118:18 nebulized 52:12 81:17 83:11 97:15 139:14,18 nebulizer 33:18 39:17,19 41:16 42:9 65:11 72:1</p>	<p>nebulizers 35:6,6 35:8 36:4 39:10 41:6 101:6 nebulizing 71:21 82:6 necessarily 72:17 112:1 113:14 128:1 157:21 158:4 159:20 177:21 178:16 186:5 217:11 335:7 necessary 25:7 86:13 88:4 233:16 257:11 need 27:7,20 28:1 28:8 29:19 30:10 36:3 39:16 40:8 44:16 48:5 51:1,3 59:8 64:14,17 65:8,15,18 66:6 68:14,22 69:5,14 70:2 75:22 76:2 77:12 78:5,18 80:21 81:18 85:2 85:16 87:6 88:11 90:4 94:6 99:16 102:2 106:19 111:15 113:20 119:4,9,13 123:6 123:10,13,16 124:5 134:17 135:1 141:10,13 142:1,13 143:19 147:15,18 149:7,8 151:4,8 155:7 160:2 162:7,8 169:1 170:9 176:10,14,14,16 176:16 181:21 185:16 194:17 198:1,18 199:4,8 204:6 208:22 209:8 235:2,20</p>
--	---	---	--

241:10 242:22 243:19 244:10,13 245:15,22 252:2 253:20 257:11 259:17 261:3,7 263:17 264:5 290:12,17,18 291:14 295:18 301:13,15,17,19 304:1 310:20 311:1 314:20 318:3 321:5,9,13 322:1,6 326:7,9 326:17 329:3 331:11 334:3,19 336:10,13 338:3 340:14,15,16 needed 28:2 29:9 141:22 186:18 257:14 300:19 323:11 needing 162:10 needs 34:6 39:21 41:12,20,20 69:3 72:10 77:18 83:5 185:15 195:11 235:7 268:13 290:16 293:12 308:11 325:21 negative 107:6,8 212:3 220:4 222:8 223:3,6 230:1 neglect 83:21 neither 182:17 185:6 258:7 343:7 344:6 neonates 37:15 nervous 133:21 238:4,6 network 3:13 17:13 18:3 neutrophilic 212:14	never 81:5 83:21 133:15 154:3 174:10 283:16 287:5,11 319:4 326:2 328:16 nevertheless 104:4 new 1:12 6:22 21:16 24:6 29:15 31:2,18 35:14 42:9 44:5 47:10 48:5 59:9 64:1,2 66:3 67:6 71:12 78:6 81:6,6 82:1,2 83:14 85:17 88:1 92:8 95:10 102:3 110:10 114:10 119:20 120:17 124:5 125:8 171:14 174:21 179:10 187:5,12 195:8,20 224:16 236:2 249:8 255:18 306:13 319:20 320:6 322:19,20 323:3 339:8 newer 98:14 99:12 news 225:2 250:12 250:13 newsweek 164:22 nguyen 8:16 10:7 21:22 22:3,12,13 25:17 50:11 ni 92:11 nice 59:4 220:17 308:13 nicely 251:7 nichols 5:16 10:19 19:18,18 57:6 58:11,19 90:3,14 90:21 91:11 96:13 110:15 112:3,12 114:12 116:20	118:15 129:13 138:15 150:20 151:18 170:22 242:15 302:3 303:5 315:19 nicole 3:8 17:22 309:18 night 281:19 ninewells 2:16 noise 285:11 286:7 286:20 318:12 noisy 319:1 nominal 38:17 331:22 non 1:8 8:10 11:21 12:6,16 14:8 15:2 15:7 17:20 18:22 21:11 23:9 61:1 76:4 77:8,16 89:13 91:7 92:9 95:8 102:12 106:12 109:6 127:12 141:5 149:10 158:17 163:21 164:5 175:21 180:14 182:4 183:9 188:6 188:10,12,15,21 189:3,8 191:3 194:4,11,17,20 197:1,16 198:16 199:9,14,18,19 200:2,10,14 201:9 201:12 203:20 205:3 217:3,8,11 219:20 223:13 227:12 231:10 233:3 241:15,22 243:3,19 246:9,12 246:20 247:2,8,13 251:4,14 252:17 253:13 257:22 259:1,13,14 272:2 312:22 315:8	326:20 nonpharmacolo... 312:4 nonresponse 160:9 nontuberculous 53:14 180:16 231:16 232:7,19 248:2 norm 80:13 86:6 normal 103:13 158:21 232:2 270:8,17 279:7 317:22 normally 267:8 north 3:6 17:19 296:12 northern 298:7 notable 67:7 69:2 69:22 74:11 77:11 78:2 129:21 130:1 206:17 302:8 notary 343:1,18 note 65:12 71:19 177:5 204:18 249:6 noted 143:17 198:1 notes 29:22 notice 199:21 200:13,15 noticed 265:14 noting 66:10 67:14 notion 115:6 notions 157:21 notorious 158:4 novel 90:5 nsm 332:1 ntm 11:18 18:18 18:19 19:11 67:19 150:22 151:5,7,20 152:6 164:4 176:9 176:12,17 180:14
---	---	---	--

<p>181:10 194:10,11 196:4 242:9 300:13,21 301:1,8 nuisances 226:4 number 14:14 17:2,17 49:22 51:14 61:10 65:10 67:1,3,7 68:4 92:21 114:13 125:18,19 126:12 128:22 131:8 141:22 144:16 145:20 164:1 168:21 204:16 208:12 213:11,20 215:9,14,19 217:7 224:14,20 225:3 225:18 228:5 230:21 240:22 243:6,21 247:5 248:6 257:17 260:12 263:12,13 264:6 268:3 277:15 279:5 283:5,13,15 288:9 290:12 297:15 312:21 317:16 318:9,17 319:8,15 320:10 328:19 329:5 333:8,22 338:2,6,6 numbers 63:20 66:14 108:6 115:22 119:15,16 288:3 319:8 336:17 338:18 ny 6:11</p>	<p>217:7 236:6 270:20 271:20 273:16 277:3 280:8 282:3,13 285:8 288:8 291:6 292:10 294:5 324:15 342:2,7 o'donnell 12:5 199:16 205:10 246:3 259:10 261:10 262:2 263:9 265:22 266:21 268:14 269:8 303:9 304:20 305:18 306:8,12,16 307:19 309:2 312:21 313:5,14 315:2 316:17 317:7,13 319:13 323:13 325:3,6 326:13 327:14 328:10,18 340:6 oak 1:11 oap 2:4 4:6 5:10 5:14 6:21 7:16 objective 103:4 104:21 105:13,16 105:18,20 106:3 107:16 110:2 158:5 251:14 296:21 318:3 323:10 324:10 337:9,16 objectives 92:19 185:12 201:17 327:3 obliterative 230:16 observation 104:10 148:20 152:12 174:8 observations 148:16 157:6</p>	<p>164:12 167:17 282:16 290:12 observe 135:22 179:9 263:14 264:2 282:18 observed 200:21 203:12 229:20 252:22 258:16 obtain 76:2 obtained 102:4 obvious 68:11 77:5 104:3 127:6 148:2 182:8 225:14 243:9,19 283:7 331:8 obviously 52:11 53:7,10 54:11,20 57:17 59:19 78:15 113:19 118:16 123:13 125:9 136:16 139:20 140:10,11,17 142:21 143:4 207:17 209:10 213:16 219:18 223:8,14,21 231:18 234:2 288:22 309:14 occasion 218:5 occasionally 159:1 233:15 occur 25:20 29:7 170:4 239:19 252:16 310:2 312:12 occurred 317:6 occurrence 256:14,21 occurring 26:13 occurs 293:17 310:2 312:13 october 155:18 184:9 281:18</p>	<p>offer 89:6 offered 148:5 235:1 offers 123:3,19,22 office 3:19 4:15,16 6:21,21 8:5,20 14:4 18:7 21:16 24:6,13,14 32:15 32:16 47:14 89:11 330:22 337:1 officer 2:10 4:5 6:19 7:4,15 17:7 20:12,22 51:12,19 343:2 offs 38:11 oft 207:1 oftentimes 109:17 oh 22:4 161:5 281:7,12 288:18 299:2 305:7 okay 45:17,18 51:4 65:7 69:5 77:16 87:18 98:10 135:11 136:19 144:2 157:5 180:3 236:6 250:12 268:22 274:18 282:6 285:8,10 329:7 336:3 old 72:21 79:18 121:12 139:5 211:3 237:10,18 266:13 297:13 older 46:11 92:13 92:16 206:11 223:19 239:21 once 38:19 99:16 117:21 130:21 183:17 228:16 241:10 260:18 262:10 266:5 280:20 311:7 ond 2:5 4:7 5:11 5:15 6:22 7:7,17</p>
<p>o</p>			
<p>o 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 o'clock 179:22 o'donnel 102:6 125:21 153:5,14 157:8,11 163:8</p>			

<p>8:15 onerous 264:1 ones 85:12,14 128:20 130:18 167:1 225:6 269:20 305:4 ongoing 59:22 60:13 65:17 74:9 74:19 78:18 97:22 119:9 145:17 153:20 182:11 227:13 online 14:12 85:7 85:8 236:16 onset 241:17 323:3 open 15:3,9 77:2 94:21 102:4,5,22 110:5,13 113:17 114:8 120:4,7 121:2 123:16 129:7 131:18 136:12 137:5 146:11,18 228:18 249:17 opening 109:11 operates 194:9 operative 176:15 opinion 59:1,1,3 59:21 69:18 97:4 112:13 209:9 308:19 324:21 opinions 97:17 186:12 254:19 opportunities 53:20,21 235:10 292:22 293:1 opportunity 30:5 46:16,18 66:2 123:3,22 146:10 177:3 180:12 212:17 235:11 286:8,9,19</p>	<p>opposed 145:8 151:7 201:18 293:13 310:16 opposite 109:14 272:20 optimal 93:3 219:11 optimism 194:21 optimize 23:17,22 28:10 optimized 25:4 28:14 230:3 option 99:12 102:14 112:18 198:8 233:9,11 249:16 options 59:14 64:20 65:9,10 68:13 69:1,12 71:18 97:16 98:20 112:17 124:7 164:2 208:1 210:15 212:21 214:6,18 215:15 230:3 oral 65:3 74:1 139:17,18 146:1,4 197:18 214:13 239:10 292:19,22 orally 33:5 35:4 36:14 oranges 263:15 orbit 227:14 228:15 229:5,9 258:9,18 289:11 320:13 328:7 331:18 332:4,6,13 332:13,20,22 333:2,5 order 16:3,7 23:16 94:5 147:19 180:7 187:7 261:8 289:5 303:22 317:15 326:20 336:10</p>	<p>339:19 ordered 88:17 ordinal 299:6 oregon 3:2 17:15 17:15 organic 40:13 organism 156:18 158:19 160:13 165:11,16 166:11 170:5 171:22 172:16 173:11 174:1 177:15 178:17 organisms 158:13 159:4,16 166:1,8 166:10,21 168:11 169:15 173:9 176:21 177:11 178:4,9,9 220:4 225:15 231:14 organization 180:15 194:4 323:17 organizations 244:19 organizers 250:17 original 28:12 78:17 originally 56:16 108:1 oropharyngeal 55:13 orphan 235:6 oscillators 215:16 osmolality 118:17 ototoxicity 231:20 ots 3:19 4:16 outbreaks 167:21 168:10 outcome 8:14 21:15 32:9 56:8 60:18 72:16 76:18 110:21 111:9,10 190:16 195:14,19</p>	<p>195:22 196:9,21 198:6 201:20 202:20 253:10 302:6 307:2 308:20 343:12 344:8 outcomes 90:22 91:22 98:1 111:3 124:1 127:22 132:22 145:13 148:10 154:20,22 156:2 171:3 196:5 244:16 245:2 275:11 277:22 295:7 outline 32:22 outlined 93:14 211:14 251:8 252:4 outlines 184:17 outside 35:20 overall 23:17 68:1 112:3 190:7 196:9 198:5,8 206:20 251:13 256:13 277:2 306:3,6 334:2 overcome 14:22 78:2 overlap 61:14 63:14,21 138:11 142:19 144:16 overlaps 104:5 144:19 oversimplification 177:19 overstate 176:4 overview 11:11 59:6 138:3 205:20 236:14 overwhelming 100:11 328:4 oxygen 234:11 279:22</p>
---	--	---	--

<p>p</p> <p>p 2:1,1 3:1,1 4:1,1 5:1,1 6:1,1 7:1,1 8:1,1 9:1,1 14:1 135:4,6,7,9,13 227:8</p> <p>p.m. 342:11</p> <p>pa 5:2 6:17</p> <p>packaged 27:3,4</p> <p>packaging 24:19 25:2</p> <p>page 10:2 11:3 12:3 13:3 227:19</p> <p>paid 87:16,21</p> <p>painful 86:12,15</p> <p>paired 123:13,17</p> <p>palliative 158:20</p> <p>palo 8:11 240:18</p> <p>pam 19:21</p> <p>pamela 6:3</p> <p>panbronchiolitis 230:15</p> <p>pancreatitis 295:14</p> <p>panel 10:3 11:9,14 12:21 14:2 15:8 50:8 89:6 92:17 93:19 125:7 144:4 144:18 236:4 250:3 251:16 259:9 340:7</p> <p>panelist 183:15</p> <p>panelists 12:22 16:1,10 112:9 324:22</p> <p>panels 15:4 156:22 168:20 240:9 242:5</p> <p>paper 16:14 221:10 234:18 270:21</p> <p>paradigm 141:8 141:10,14 182:9</p>	<p>parameter 121:14</p> <p>parameters 128:20 226:16 228:4 293:16,17 293:18 316:7</p> <p>parent 181:14 204:21</p> <p>parenteral 158:10</p> <p>parents 236:17</p> <p>pari 101:6</p> <p>parked 163:5</p> <p>parsimonious 252:10</p> <p>part 12:17,19 17:1 17:4 60:14 80:6 85:22 86:11 87:7 87:9,12,16,21 88:2,4,5 97:18 100:8 112:2 118:6 120:8 122:21 129:15 163:10,15 165:3 175:8 187:2 188:7,9 210:9 213:17 217:5 234:7 237:11 246:11,13,17,19 250:11 272:1 273:1 279:14,19 289:13 307:13 327:18 338:12</p> <p>partial 237:10</p> <p>participant 17:4</p> <p>participants 30:4 30:9 72:4 121:22 181:3 189:15</p> <p>participate 25:7,9 119:19 143:11 183:21 197:8,11 197:13 205:18 242:4</p> <p>participated 20:1 21:12 63:19 205:5</p> <p>participating 184:21 198:20</p>	<p>236:14 245:18 341:21</p> <p>participation 93:19</p> <p>particular 25:22 28:6 57:2,3 67:16 67:20 143:2,8 152:13 166:11,11 166:12 170:5 181:16 191:7 208:7 234:15 264:11 293:11 331:19</p> <p>particularly 52:5 105:6 160:1 187:3 207:20 219:7 220:4 223:20 230:1 232:5 269:21 281:22 291:8 293:18 318:18</p> <p>particulate 40:12</p> <p>parties 343:9,11 344:7</p> <p>partition 38:9</p> <p>partly 107:7,8 329:13</p> <p>partner 66:21</p> <p>partnered 77:1 196:4</p> <p>partners 244:14</p> <p>parts 36:21 78:22 212:22</p> <p>pasquale 11:20 194:1,2,2</p> <p>pass 341:14</p> <p>patches 27:12</p> <p>path 130:12 241:21</p> <p>pathogen 59:19 66:13 67:8,13 152:13,14 173:21 176:16 218:20 219:10 222:20</p>	<p>229:19 292:21 318:10</p> <p>pathogenesis 212:10</p> <p>pathogenicity 66:8 151:3</p> <p>pathogens 53:4,9 53:13,18 54:16 59:18 66:4 67:10 69:12 93:8 145:13 150:22 151:10,16 152:5 164:20 165:12 176:7 219:6,9 222:19 228:3 247:2,8 297:20</p> <p>pathologically 206:3</p> <p>pathophysiology 304:18</p> <p>paths 238:2</p> <p>pathway 31:10,16 35:8 36:1,11</p> <p>pathways 31:1,2</p> <p>patient 2:7 8:10 10:20,20 12:9,12 12:12,17 16:21,21 17:4 21:11 23:4,5 26:1,1 32:9 34:1 37:13,17 39:21 42:4 43:14 45:2 46:1 48:18,20 49:2,7,11 50:1,4 54:14,21 55:12 56:7,21 57:15 63:16 79:1,14,14 79:22 80:2 83:8 84:12,16 86:22 87:20 88:1 90:22 93:17 94:7 95:16 98:19 100:22 101:16,21 103:5 104:9 107:16 108:4 115:22</p>
--	---	---	---

118:13 123:19	319:10 320:19,22	140:4,16 143:10	232:20 233:10,12
124:18 132:11	322:5 323:3,17	146:8,12 147:7,11	233:16,19,21
136:6 143:8	333:15,16 334:4	147:12,14,17,18	234:21 235:3,11
144:10 149:20	337:1,3,3,6,15	147:21 148:6,12	240:8,20,21 241:2
150:21 152:13,16	338:10 339:11	148:17,20 150:1,5	241:4,12,13,16,18
156:6,14 160:5,9	patient's 38:12,15	150:7 151:22	243:2,5,10 244:4
160:10 161:2,11	39:9,11,13 42:6	152:18,18 153:7	244:5,5,10,20
161:12 162:3	50:12,13 80:9	155:12 157:2,15	246:1 247:2,8,13
166:12 167:7	161:6 196:2	158:20 159:3,10	247:16 248:1,3,5
169:7 173:22	252:19 255:13	161:18,20 162:13	248:5,8,12,13,16
177:17,22 178:19	patients 11:7	163:2 164:3 166:7	248:20,22 249:14
179:17 180:15,18	15:19 26:9 28:21	167:5,19 168:7	250:19 254:14
180:21,22 181:11	38:20 46:10,11	169:22 170:7	255:8 257:18
182:5 183:10,15	49:13,18 52:20	174:7,19,22 175:2	260:4,15,20 261:3
184:1,11,17,19	53:12 54:18 55:6	175:7,19 181:2,4	261:6 262:7 264:2
185:2,6,8,14	58:13 60:3,9,12	181:6,21 182:10	264:18 265:21
186:6 187:7,9	61:2,10,17 62:2	183:19 184:13	267:15 268:18
191:13 194:18,22	66:3,11,15 68:3	185:15,17,18	269:4,17,19,22
195:6,12,18 197:6	68:18,21 69:4	186:1,3,18,22	270:16 271:11
198:7 199:2,11	70:12,14 73:5,13	187:4,11,13	272:4,4,6,7,11,16
201:11,13,14,20	73:15 74:10 75:2	188:20 189:6,10	273:7,12,17 274:3
202:20 204:14	75:4 78:18 80:3	189:22 190:11,12	274:8 279:15
205:6,8,13 210:21	83:13,18,20 84:21	190:13 191:3,17	280:7,14 282:21
218:3 232:22	85:10,16,17 86:14	192:3,7,19 193:1	283:6,9,10,16,21
235:14 236:7,8,9	87:6,8,12,14,16	193:6,8,12,18	284:3,10 285:12
236:11,11 241:15	88:4,11 89:3,9,15	194:11 195:20	287:5,8,9 288:4
244:9,16,18 245:2	89:18 90:1,7,10	196:5,7,15 197:7	288:11,12 289:6
245:21 246:13,17	90:16 91:10 93:4	197:10,13,17,19	289:17 291:13
247:3,18 248:10	94:7,14 96:15	197:22 198:7,18	292:1 294:13
249:2 251:6	97:9 98:13 99:7	198:20 201:15	295:10 297:9,10
253:10 254:15	101:4,15 105:8	203:21 205:12,21	297:11,12,13,17
258:10 260:9	106:15,17 109:5,7	207:11,13,16,18	301:1 303:3 305:1
263:18 264:15	112:20 113:3,6	211:2,16 213:10	305:13,22 307:9
266:14 272:7,12	114:6,9,13 115:3	213:11,18 214:1,9	307:15 309:9
273:2 275:16	115:12,18 116:4	214:17 215:5	312:14 314:13,21
277:18,21 279:20	116:22 119:11,11	217:14,15 218:15	317:16,19,20
280:15,20 283:14	119:16,16 120:14	218:19,22 220:1,3	319:16 320:9,18
290:1 291:12	120:19 121:18,19	221:14,15 222:20	321:3 323:20
293:11 294:1	122:21 123:7,8,15	222:22 223:10,19	324:13,17 325:13
295:7,9,14 303:22	123:17 124:6,7	224:6,8,10,18	325:19,21 326:2,5
307:14 308:19,19	126:4,16,22 127:4	225:13 226:4,8	326:9 328:17
308:19,22 314:12	130:4 134:2,18	227:3,4,22 229:11	329:3 330:19
314:21 315:11,14	135:2 137:22	230:21 231:10,15	331:2 332:9,11
315:17 317:4	138:18 139:13,15	231:22 232:4,17	334:1,9,16,19

<p>335:13,17 336:5 336:21 337:19 338:7,21,22 339:15,17,22 340:4,20,20 patrick 5:3 10:12 19:8 58:19 102:6 130:3 150:20 165:10 179:3 259:11 271:22 292:10 294:6,10 pattern 75:13 171:15 201:5 patterns 54:13 78:10 300:12 pay 70:2 87:14,18 164:11 223:7 payers 61:20 paying 67:15 payment 86:19,20 87:2 pcd 187:22 189:22 281:2,3 pcr 177:17 pdufa 27:22 pe 257:1,1 peadar 3:4 17:18 ped 49:2 pediatric 5:18 46:4,4 48:7,18 58:12 90:9 162:16 pediatricians 154:8 pediatrics 3:9 4:2 5:5,17 6:5,6 18:1 18:10 19:22 37:14 46:2 48:1,7 peeled 136:5 peer 97:16 116:12 pen 27:11 penetrate 267:11 penetrating 266:16</p>	<p>penetration 269:3 penn 4:20 19:6 pennsylvania 5:2 6:16 19:4 20:9 205:11 232:6 people 16:6 44:5 85:21 86:9,10 88:9 99:10 103:9 104:16 107:19 108:1,11,17 115:19 116:7 117:16,20 118:3 121:5 122:13 128:3 146:15 149:15 153:15 156:2 158:5 162:1 162:21,22 163:4 167:1 222:16 238:4,4,10 241:18 242:14 243:11,14 245:14,22 261:12 261:17,20,22 267:9 268:21 271:8,9,13 286:14 301:7 319:9 327:6 329:16 331:10,12 331:14 332:13 333:7 339:9 pep 215:11,13 218:4 perceive 119:17 280:21 339:2 perceived 68:14 81:4 103:17 119:8 perceives 211:22 percent 42:4,4 55:20 57:21 58:4 60:9,12,22 62:9 62:20,20 63:10,12 64:20 66:15 73:1 73:15 74:10,14 90:19,20 91:22 97:12 121:9,20 123:10 125:5,11</p>	<p>125:14,15,17,20 128:10,10,18 129:17,18,19,20 130:22 131:1,1,5 138:19,19 142:8 153:8 157:2 159:10 167:15 197:7,10,12 201:4 202:21 207:13 214:10,11,12,13 218:19,20 219:2,3 221:15,17 224:7 227:5,9,10 228:11 260:3 270:9,13,15 270:18,19 271:13 271:15 287:5,11 310:11 322:2 333:20 percentage 68:7 189:9 perception 103:20 293:11 323:1 perelman 4:21 perfect 94:13 111:10 206:1 perform 24:21 25:1,3,5 performance 23:17 37:4,16,22 45:6,15 48:18,21 performed 29:9 188:20 230:18 234:1,12 period 57:10 64:7 69:21 70:3,7,9,17 70:22 75:12 96:10 96:11 109:14 112:22 114:16,17 115:1 116:9 120:15 124:9 221:16 222:15,18 229:2 238:19 249:14,17,21 264:17 284:6,7</p>	<p>286:3,3 288:3 308:8 317:1 327:10 341:2 periods 198:21 280:13 permanent 206:4 permanently 33:21 persistence 93:5 persistent 65:6 75:21 person 14:11 22:4 22:5 104:14 157:21 164:19 178:11 210:2 212:13 236:19 245:7 292:18 293:4 297:3,4 personal 181:1 321:1 personally 182:1 263:16 perspective 10:20 12:7,12 17:3 22:16 37:22 40:11 42:3 48:3 50:12 79:14 80:9 106:18 120:6 134:21 179:4 199:17,20 205:6 236:8,9,11 236:20,22 250:20 321:5 331:4 perspectives 199:2,11 236:21 pertaining 24:8 peter 4:4 12:18 18:14 212:9 246:15 250:8 peterson 256:17 pfdd 184:12,15 187:6 pfds 47:17 pfts 143:1</p>
---	---	--	--

<p>ph 78:8 83:16 94:11 132:21 136:5 143:22 150:22 213:8 223:4 280:10 305:8 315:2 321:18 323:17 325:7,16 328:7 329:22 332:1,4,6 341:20</p> <p>pharma 18:13</p> <p>pharmacists 154:9</p> <p>pharmacologic 215:10,18 216:14</p> <p>pharmacovigila... 245:10</p> <p>pharmacy 68:16</p> <p>phase 17:8 30:16 30:18 66:22 69:21 70:8 74:4,8,9 111:17 183:4 202:16 216:1 227:20 228:15 249:6,7 250:7 264:8,9,10 285:18 309:15 326:19 331:18 333:10,11</p> <p>phases 84:20 94:10</p> <p>phd 2:13 3:8,16,21 4:12 6:9,12 7:8 8:3,12,16 10:8 12:20</p> <p>phenomenon 265:5</p> <p>phenotype 221:7 221:13,21 260:20 269:13 272:6,15 290:4 298:1,8 300:11</p> <p>phenotypes 221:6 289:6 299:15</p> <p>phenotypic 177:16</p>	<p>phenotypically 177:22 296:7</p> <p>philadelphia 5:2 6:17</p> <p>philosophical 171:16</p> <p>phonetic 101:7 105:14 117:1 164:21 168:15</p> <p>phrase 83:16</p> <p>physical 240:3 269:2 293:18 314:18</p> <p>physically 27:1</p> <p>physician 17:11 18:17 19:3 21:3 74:1 104:12,13 133:9 136:15 161:12 214:1 317:17 318:1 321:1 323:8,11</p> <p>physician's 337:1</p> <p>physicians 58:2,3 58:3 83:19 85:18 104:17 183:22 185:22 218:11 235:10 317:4 319:6 336:20</p> <p>physicians' 317:22</p> <p>physiology 293:5</p> <p>picc 277:8,10</p> <p>pick 54:4 286:21</p> <p>picture 165:6 306:6</p> <p>piece 155:11,15</p> <p>pieces 155:16</p> <p>pillars 210:17</p> <p>pills 117:20</p> <p>pio 321:18</p> <p>pipeline 66:19 69:10 118:9 126:9</p> <p>pivotal 195:15 309:13 326:20</p>	<p>place 49:17 97:17 151:1 195:6 269:7 304:11</p> <p>placebo 54:2 56:1 56:20 69:20,22 70:11 71:2,6 76:13,17 78:12 94:20 95:17 98:22 99:2 100:17 101:3 101:17,18 102:20 106:8,16 107:3,8 110:4,11 111:3 112:5 113:5,20 114:17 115:8,11 115:12,15,19 116:12,15 117:3 119:4,19 120:1,4 123:4 124:10 129:5 130:15 140:8,11,21 144:6 145:21 147:13,22 184:2,5 197:9,11 197:14 198:20 202:17 226:10 227:7,10 249:14 249:19 265:1 310:11 330:18 331:20 332:19 333:14,19 334:4 334:16 336:6 338:17 339:1,18</p> <p>placebos 115:21 242:15</p> <p>placed 181:6 186:22</p> <p>places 195:4</p> <p>plan 90:5 134:14 183:16 333:3</p> <p>plane 238:8,9</p> <p>planktonic 156:18</p> <p>planning 194:13</p> <p>plausibility 230:11 316:16</p>	<p>play 25:12 40:15 40:20 187:2 264:12 300:18</p> <p>played 315:20</p> <p>playing 25:16 166:11</p> <p>please 22:22 23:7 23:13,18 24:1,11 24:16,20 25:11 47:2 49:6 93:21 180:8 187:18 245:19 250:16</p> <p>pleased 22:15</p> <p>plug 264:20 307:11</p> <p>plume 38:14</p> <p>plummets 150:13</p> <p>plus 68:13 81:18 116:14 125:14 190:1 304:1,11</p> <p>pneumonia 156:17 178:1 203:20 211:5 237:15 238:16,17 238:20 239:2,6,13</p> <p>podhaler 52:14,14 82:10</p> <p>podium 180:9 187:18</p> <p>point 15:22 21:18 44:8 52:5 55:10 59:20 61:17 62:3 62:3 63:4 65:12 66:19 68:17 71:8 72:15 73:6 74:3 83:3 91:14 97:4 106:4 112:4 113:21 115:15 119:13 124:11 128:8,9 129:14 130:3 135:15 139:10 141:9 151:2 163:10 168:22 169:12,16</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>171:20,21 173:8 173:20 175:13 178:8,13 179:4 217:4 250:21 259:4 261:2,7 268:2,17 271:7 273:19 280:2 283:3 298:21 301:2 328:13,14 329:8,20 pointed 62:8 68:5 111:13 112:18 116:8 132:2 182:4 268:6 309:20 318:6 327:21 pointing 73:20 points 176:4 178:15 180:20 218:8 281:15 policy 180:13 polyclonal 172:21 polymicrobial 172:21 pool 150:12 229:8 290:9 pooled 137:15 poor 72:9 238:21 poorly 161:20 popping 136:22 popular 68:16 populate 173:9 populating 173:10 population 37:13 45:2 46:1 48:8,14 56:21 60:2 62:19 63:6,16 64:3 70:18 71:4,16 72:14,20 74:19,21 75:9 79:2 82:9 90:9 91:9,13 93:2 93:17 113:10 114:14 119:9 122:2 123:21 124:5 126:16,18</p>	<p>126:21 127:3,17 128:2 135:21 139:4 141:15 143:8 144:10 147:21 149:20 150:21 151:21 159:15 165:4 167:19 169:8 170:10 172:21 178:2 185:14,20 186:6,11 194:18 197:21 198:18 199:9 201:13 204:14 233:22 247:3,14 248:10 251:7 253:10 257:17 264:15 273:5,8 284:8 291:20 293:15 298:3 300:17 302:10 307:4 310:7,9,14 319:21 322:5 326:18 335:16 populations 77:1 124:19 130:9 201:11 206:11 229:22 233:7 295:15 299:19 portfolio 51:14 portion 66:18 121:2 portland 3:3 17:14 posed 198:20 position 184:1 positive 62:21 75:1,3 132:19 147:14 261:9 302:17,20 332:7 possibilities 285:22 possibility 309:12 310:13</p>	<p>possible 30:6 84:19 95:13 100:11 101:13 116:10 117:11 118:2 186:11 208:19 232:19 277:14 284:22 313:17 314:18 possibly 62:7 91:2 92:22 111:6 135:2 302:19 post 25:5 26:7 124:2 132:21 139:10 177:1,9 179:11,19 182:20 230:15 269:21 297:14,18 298:5 303:21 304:4 332:2 poster 189:17 291:18 potent 72:18 potential 29:6 53:18 90:19 93:6 111:3 119:20 124:10 141:19 164:6 179:9 198:16 207:18 231:15 265:11 potentially 76:19 108:12 119:1 120:20 143:14 144:7,13 145:1 217:9 247:18 249:22 256:11 257:17 310:13 powder 52:16 81:13 82:13,17 83:10 97:12 99:21 202:14 203:2 power 35:12 131:9 134:6 137:14 257:12 316:5 333:7</p>	<p>practical 96:22 183:3 184:22 185:11 218:2 249:12 283:19 285:1 328:1 330:17 331:4 338:8 practicality 328:6 practically 185:13 practice 52:6 53:3 54:13 55:4,16 57:7 78:10 232:6 283:8 292:16 293:8 304:8 practices 317:22 pre 30:16 43:3 182:15 228:3 266:4 289:14 321:19 325:9 precedence 230:14 precedent 102:17 125:3 146:17,20 159:6 316:12 preceding 109:20 228:2,21 precipitously 161:18 preclinical 30:17 preconceived 260:11 predetermined 131:6 predict 38:18 64:3 74:10 77:20 173:4 173:5 292:6 300:10 predicted 55:20 57:21 58:4 62:20 63:10,12 73:1 90:20 92:1 170:10 201:4 202:21 predicting 73:17</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>predictive 142:9 159:2 224:12</p> <p>predictors 221:19 221:20</p> <p>predicts 173:5 253:9 269:12,13 269:14</p> <p>preface 236:18</p> <p>prefer 78:21</p> <p>preference 114:12</p> <p>preferences 195:11</p> <p>preferred 105:13 132:14</p> <p>prefilled 27:4,10</p> <p>preliminary 196:6</p> <p>premarket 33:12 33:20</p> <p>prentice 256:16</p> <p>prepared 344:3</p> <p>presbyterian 4:20</p> <p>prescribe 304:7</p> <p>prescribed 188:12 320:21</p> <p>prescribing 304:7</p> <p>prescription 60:1 321:1</p> <p>prescriptions 321:4</p> <p>presence 194:20 196:1 322:22</p> <p>present 33:5 49:12 58:20 59:2 72:3 127:6 130:15 145:15 209:5 236:9 280:2 291:18</p> <p>presentation 79:5 89:5,7,21 160:17 177:16 205:4 210:20,20 250:13 251:8 321:11</p> <p>presentations 201:15,19</p>	<p>presented 19:1 89:2 132:21 180:7 210:21 227:16 229:3 318:1</p> <p>presenter 20:5</p> <p>presenting 94:8 246:18</p> <p>presently 254:16</p> <p>preservation 92:20</p> <p>preserve 103:4</p> <p>pressurized 35:11</p> <p>presumably 110:5 127:19</p> <p>pretty 42:14 52:11 54:9 55:4 60:1 78:20 81:16 88:16 94:2 107:14 116:18 127:2 139:12 153:12 161:9,13 174:4 223:17 229:10 237:18 259:2 267:14 275:18 280:2 281:7 330:10 331:8</p> <p>prevailing 255:20</p> <p>prevalence 67:10 67:14,17 68:1 138:17,19 206:10 257:15 289:20</p> <p>prevalent 148:9</p> <p>prevent 23:21 25:21 26:12 90:6 194:5</p> <p>preventable 23:2 23:9,12</p> <p>preventing 198:12 202:10</p> <p>prevention 8:18 11:6 22:14 23:19 24:3,8,13 89:17 89:21 201:18</p>	<p>prevents 216:12</p> <p>previous 45:3,7 90:2,21 93:11 119:3 200:4 204:17 247:9 248:14 252:9 261:13 263:13 264:11 265:17 270:5 271:10 284:9 291:16 322:17 325:15</p> <p>previously 36:5 207:3 211:12</p> <p>primarily 89:13 121:17 219:21</p> <p>primary 45:20 56:6,10 62:5 91:16 93:3 128:11 131:2 132:22 133:1 134:16 142:16 187:22 189:19 190:22 193:9 195:14 200:17 202:9,17 203:3 204:2 216:3 226:12,17 228:4,7 228:13,22 252:8 254:7 257:6 259:5 260:12,12 264:5 288:18 292:12 294:8 298:12 303:13,16,20 304:13 315:6,11 315:18</p> <p>principal 19:6</p> <p>principle 107:22 172:9</p> <p>principles 28:17 219:4</p> <p>prior 26:12 186:18 221:18 248:13,15,17,19 249:6 253:7 257:1 258:4 301:6</p>	<p>priorities 195:11</p> <p>prioritize 196:6</p> <p>priority 130:22 131:6 196:9,14</p> <p>privilege 181:4</p> <p>pro 262:20 295:8 315:6 326:17 336:18</p> <p>proactive 26:4,10 26:14</p> <p>proactively 26:11 263:14</p> <p>probability 310:9</p> <p>probably 44:4 53:1 56:11 58:10 68:1 72:12 79:7 81:22 86:6 94:8 97:11 100:5 106:15 111:14 125:19 134:17 148:1 170:19 172:4 177:8,18 238:21 261:20 267:3 269:5 276:21 302:17 314:10 320:19</p> <p>problem 74:5 83:22 92:10 98:6 112:19 131:19 132:1 138:15 146:7 147:6 165:15,19,21 166:7 168:2,22 172:20 173:22 175:8 181:8 191:6 202:7 261:16 266:15 272:1 283:7,19 294:22 294:22 303:19 310:10 320:11</p> <p>problematic 71:9 109:22 232:5 319:12</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>problems 131:17 168:17 177:7</p> <p>proceed 34:21</p> <p>proceeding 343:3</p> <p>proceedings 343:4 343:6</p> <p>process 28:9,13,19 29:18 30:12,13,17 40:6 43:3 44:9,13 46:19 50:13,15,18 88:2,5,5 152:15 199:11 235:6 244:8 332:1</p> <p>processing 40:7</p> <p>produce 283:15</p> <p>produced 22:19</p> <p>produces 211:20</p> <p>producing 82:4</p> <p>product 12:7 18:8 22:20 24:18 25:2 25:4,19,21,22 26:12 27:6,8,21 28:11,11,14,17,22 29:1,4,7 30:5,7,7 30:9,11 31:7,9,14 32:1 33:7 34:16 34:18,22 35:2,4 36:3,14,18,20,22 37:9,11 38:1 45:22 50:14,20 61:8 63:15 71:21 72:2 110:11 117:15 120:16 149:10 185:6,7 187:5 199:17,20 251:22</p> <p>production 206:6 212:5 217:16</p> <p>products 6:20,21 7:6 11:12 14:4 18:15 19:13,17 20:12,17 21:1 22:9,17 24:17 26:6,15,16,17,18</p>	<p>26:19 27:1,6,9,11 27:14 28:6,7,21 32:10,18 33:3,5 33:16 34:8,11,17 42:3 49:21 51:13 51:14,20,22 52:10 52:13 71:20 89:8 89:11 94:17 97:10 97:14,15 118:17 118:20 126:8 138:4,9 177:11 187:11 258:5 315:5</p> <p>professional 88:5</p> <p>professionals 24:5 244:1</p> <p>professor 2:14,21 3:5,9,10,22 4:9,21 5:4,17 6:6,13 7:19 17:22 18:10 20:8</p> <p>profile 198:16</p> <p>profit 180:14 194:4</p> <p>profound 206:5 207:14 220:16,19 225:11,12</p> <p>profoundly 215:22</p> <p>prognostic 154:19</p> <p>program 34:3 47:10 132:18 184:12 187:7 329:22 335:10</p> <p>programs 14:15 19:11 155:18 202:15,18</p> <p>progress 104:4 183:1 186:17,19 209:5</p> <p>progression 202:8 240:13,17 278:13</p> <p>prohibitive 318:13</p>	<p>project 125:21 151:18 153:20 154:5</p> <p>prolongation 91:4</p> <p>prolonged 254:13</p> <p>promising 307:9</p> <p>promote 178:6</p> <p>prong 154:17</p> <p>pronged 154:10</p> <p>propagates 212:19</p> <p>propensity 289:4 290:6,10,13 291:8</p> <p>proper 56:21 191:1</p> <p>properly 112:14 185:1 188:2 329:4</p> <p>properties 140:1 230:10,13</p> <p>proportion 309:9</p> <p>proportional 255:17</p> <p>proportionality 256:10</p> <p>propose 334:18</p> <p>proposed 90:4 91:6 107:21 110:3 212:8</p> <p>proposing 90:5</p> <p>proprietary 24:22</p> <p>pros 76:19 105:14 129:9 142:13,13 142:22 223:20 258:7 262:14 280:9</p> <p>prospective 182:22</p> <p>protease 212:14</p> <p>protocol 90:18 131:21 183:4,7 228:22 254:21 319:8 320:13</p> <p>protocolize 319:6</p>	<p>protocolized 318:14</p> <p>protocolizing 319:3</p> <p>proven 229:16 235:1 337:10</p> <p>provide 26:16 40:6 68:3 119:7 124:1 169:4 175:1 200:12 265:18 329:2</p> <p>provided 22:20 30:8 32:5 39:16 41:8,20,21 291:17</p> <p>provider 19:19 23:5</p> <p>providers 29:1 68:21 130:4 187:14</p> <p>provides 31:21 32:2 194:5</p> <p>providing 45:6 250:19</p> <p>pseudomonas 11:8 52:21 53:11 54:8,10,17 55:6 59:18 62:6,10,21 65:6,16 66:12,13 66:16 68:9,9 69:4 69:7 74:18 75:10 75:15 89:4,19 90:1,8 112:10 140:9 144:5,17 145:3 146:2,22 147:4,6,17 150:6 150:8,15 152:19 167:22 176:9 181:5,16 194:21 201:1 207:12 211:17 218:14 219:2,6 220:5 221:22 222:11,13 222:17 223:1,5 224:22 225:12</p>
---	---	---	--

<p>226:9,20 228:3,19 229:11 230:1 240:1 261:5 284:19,22 285:4,5 293:1 339:10 psoriasis 315:15 psychological 240:5 public 1:5 11:17 44:1,22 154:3 155:18 180:4,10 193:22 341:2 343:1,18 publication 154:4 154:12 155:16 161:17 209:17 213:21 232:18 publicly 44:21 publish 159:1 published 209:22 217:21 221:11 222:12 224:14 225:4 226:7 228:8 230:19 231:8 233:20 266:8 272:14 pull 77:6 154:7 pulled 214:4 pulling 118:22 pulmatrix 315:22 pulmonary 2:21 4:10 7:5 8:5 19:3 20:16 21:3 32:14 47:8,10 55:8 58:3 63:2 103:18 126:18 139:8 142:18 151:7,20 158:16,18 159:9 159:12 160:10 173:3,17 176:12 180:15 181:5,7,8 201:22 204:8 207:4 209:12,20 210:1 234:11</p>	<p>245:5 248:2 251:10 253:14 254:5,11 257:7,20 258:14,16,17 270:17 316:12 pulmonologist 154:8 240:15 pulmonology 5:18 pulmozyme 84:5 125:15 133:10 272:8 pun 136:3 punctuated 206:12 purpose 256:12 326:3 purposefully 327:21 purposes 22:21 54:16 62:5 120:8 285:18 327:15 pursuing 141:14 purulence 210:6 purulent 211:21 purview 47:12 push 61:20 275:17 309:18 327:13 put 16:7 36:3 98:18 115:8 117:2 154:4 164:22 167:6 170:21 184:7 216:22 237:4 271:14 289:3 298:16 304:11 314:19 326:8,22 329:18 puts 183:22 putting 115:12 193:20</p>	<p>qolb 282:1 qualified 295:10 qualify 303:22 qualitative 193:12 quality 72:9 75:7 110:22 191:6,8,10 191:12 192:5,18 192:20,21 193:2,9 196:11 201:20 204:8 206:17,20 207:1,7,14,21 208:20 210:15 211:22 212:4 216:11 217:18 222:5 225:16 231:8 235:3 243:9 243:13 244:16 251:12 257:20 258:5,6 274:20,22 276:4 277:22 278:1,2,7,8 279:12 280:1,1,3 282:18,20 283:2 286:12 287:9,13 288:1 291:21 292:3 293:16 306:3,7 307:5,21 312:8,14 313:10 313:11,15,17,20 313:21 314:3,5,10 314:19,22 323:22 326:14 quantify 303:6,6 317:2 quantitatively 193:5 quantum 283:14 quarter 183:5 question 44:3 47:3 49:5,16 53:9 57:1 64:15 69:19 77:8 85:20 94:16 95:3 95:4,16 98:21 99:4 101:9,11</p>	<p>108:8 110:16 112:3 113:9 114:15 124:20 126:6,12 145:4,19 150:3,21 152:21 152:22 154:1 156:9 160:8 164:13 170:13,18 172:17 259:4 262:3 266:11 270:4 275:8,9 276:17 277:18 278:11 279:19 283:12,21 287:18 288:16,20 290:6 290:11 291:1,6,10 295:6 300:2 303:12 304:9 305:16,20 310:6 310:19 313:4,14 313:20 315:3 324:18 327:1 329:8 330:5,12 333:5 335:21 336:8 questionnaire 206:22 216:10 226:15,22 281:3 282:18 304:2 306:14,15,16 307:7 313:18 314:4 320:11 323:22 324:19 325:5 questionnaires 91:1 313:11 324:11 questions 29:17 29:19 32:12 44:3 46:18,21 57:10 79:7 92:17 93:11 93:12,14,18,18,20 94:3,4 97:21 137:19 143:6,22</p>
	q		
	<p>q&a 12:21 259:9 qol 191:19 288:2 314:5</p>		

<p>145:2 195:13 230:4 250:3 258:20,21 259:11 280:12,19,20 281:5 291:12 305:9 306:1,6,18 313:4 340:16 quick 135:18 136:11 143:4 160:8 192:16 276:12 305:20 320:12 quickly 96:20 97:4 111:7 122:13 138:14 283:12 quinolone 211:17 quite 17:7 54:22 56:16 62:6 64:18 67:11,20 68:15 82:22 133:22 134:14 135:1 139:18 140:14 166:3 211:11 255:20 260:16 268:18,22 274:7 284:22 303:3 318:19 335:3 quitting 86:21 quittner 191:11 191:20 quittner's 281:4 quynh 8:16 10:7 21:22,22 22:6,9 22:12 32:11,12,13 34:8 50:10 51:4</p>	<p>radiologic 8:7 32:17 268:21 radiological 269:12,15 270:2 radiologically 269:18 radiology 152:9 268:17 269:1,6,11 301:12 raise 260:18 272:10 285:21 raised 98:2 125:6 156:21 raises 178:20 rajiv 7:18 21:2 random 186:4 randomization 115:7 289:14 308:4 randomize 284:13 337:22 randomized 63:19 64:9 70:10 113:10 115:1 117:3 148:14 216:17 226:9 249:20 265:21 305:13 range 125:5,20 188:14 ranging 313:22 ranked 196:7,12 196:14 198:6 243:6 rapid 60:7,11 115:22 rare 157:16 185:11,19 187:21 300:16 rarely 283:10 297:21 331:13 rate 48:22 67:22 109:17 134:18 152:3 222:22 224:13 227:9</p>	<p>264:9 285:19 286:4 287:1 298:5 308:10,18 310:16 329:19,22 330:2,6 330:17 331:19 332:5,18 333:13 333:14,18,21 334:2,4,10 337:11 339:5 rates 38:17 60:1 67:10 75:15 92:3 96:4,8 97:12 128:5 139:3 216:3 264:10 300:3 330:8 332:19 ratio 285:11 rationale 177:6 ray 160:4 reach 38:12,15 reached 26:8 67:4 reactions 203:13 reactive 26:4 read 172:21 299:14 315:16 ready 25:5 132:21 real 69:5 82:18 84:4 99:6 103:17 103:19 122:13 182:7 183:9 269:15 285:1 320:11 realistic 30:2 117:10 realities 164:12 reality 101:14 157:2 160:6 234:21 realize 86:5 341:9 really 15:3,15,18 15:18 23:18 42:13 59:13 63:4 64:19 64:21 65:21 69:1 71:11 72:22 74:4 76:14 78:1 79:4</p>	<p>81:18 83:7 85:16 86:3 95:3 99:22 102:12 108:20 109:18 111:9,14 111:22 112:19 120:7,17,18,21 124:5 127:12 129:1 131:7,20 136:20 139:10 140:4 141:1,13 142:14 147:11,18 152:15 153:16 158:11 159:2 161:7 165:18,19 174:12,13,16,19 175:2,5,6,15,18 177:15 178:18 206:13 208:7 209:7,18 210:15 211:13 212:9 214:4 216:12,17 217:1 221:4,6,7,8 221:12 230:8,11 232:16 233:10 237:1,5,8 239:11 240:9 241:3,9 242:11,12,20 251:4 256:2 257:5 259:13 263:4,17 266:9 269:6,10 271:3,16 272:5 274:2 276:10,13 283:15 284:7 288:6 289:15 290:5 294:13,19 296:5,22 297:1 299:4 300:8,10,16 303:3,9 305:3 308:2,3,9 310:8 318:20 322:10,12 322:14 325:17,17 326:10 328:13,20 329:3 332:8 335:3 336:13 341:11,16</p>
<p>r</p>			
<p>r 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 14:1 168:4,19 173:5 178:17 races 244:12 radiographically 222:2</p>			

<p>341:21 reason 45:20 81:5 115:13 116:22 170:19 293:6 303:2 329:9 reasonable 114:13 124:17 130:13 283:13 reasonably 74:9 104:21 reasons 97:1 195:5 225:18 293:7 rebound 75:16 recalcitrant 158:14 recall 191:15 282:2 receive 51:2 183:10 317:16,20 317:20 received 163:19 203:22 217:22 229:17 233:1 receiving 66:1,12 126:17 197:9 339:2 recognize 81:21 152:17 154:20 339:7 recognized 77:12 recognizing 123:5 195:7 recommend 218:3 265:9 339:9 recommendation 218:1 219:13 recommendations 204:13 217:14 219:12 232:3 recommended 204:4 232:12 272:21</p>	<p>recommending 184:1 recommends 185:10 reconciling 285:12 reconvene 179:22 246:5 record 76:11 175:22 343:6 recorded 149:6 197:19 343:4 recover 287:11 recovered 287:6 recruit 70:12 71:16 88:3 123:7 123:16 126:14 294:13 331:10,12 331:13 334:8,19 recruiting 87:2 146:7 recruitment 183:6 recurrence 55:14 recurrent 132:12 132:13 134:7,12 135:6,8,10,14 136:2 212:2 224:22 253:16 255:15,18 256:14 256:22 recurring 265:15 reduce 27:21 100:7 126:20 168:14 204:13 207:22 208:2,2 246:22 247:6 274:16 276:15,15 279:5 295:2 reduced 158:21 159:14 197:4 223:16,18 249:9 338:2 343:5 reduces 309:9,10 319:8</p>	<p>reducing 164:1 198:5 220:6,20,21 267:17 275:10,13 276:3 337:18 reduction 60:22 111:17,20 129:20 142:6 160:12 161:10 216:3 226:19 228:12 229:7 251:9,17,18 314:15 reductions 318:19 reestablish 322:1 reference 30:21 32:1,5 44:15 45:1 references 225:9 referring 122:16 122:17 168:4 217:1 refers 215:1 reflect 195:19 reflection 265:6 reflective 71:1 177:16 refractory 168:8 233:16 refrain 179:15 regard 59:3 144:20 215:18 216:14 228:7,13 261:11 regarding 34:2 71:8 128:9 130:2 156:22 163:19 195:13 196:20 200:7 204:9 210:14 247:11 280:9 299:15 regardless 183:13 185:14 197:12 260:5 regards 26:4 78:16 100:13</p>	<p>regime 83:15 regimen 71:17 91:13 96:15 100:10,20 117:1,7 126:3 128:3 227:22 regimens 53:5 54:6 72:5,7 118:2 200:11,16 211:10 214:13 230:5 region 247:19 290:3 registries 143:19 235:14 296:19 registry 18:19 19:7 60:2,16 63:8 66:18 68:6 123:19 123:19 143:18 145:12 149:3,6,16 153:6,12,13 189:18 194:10 213:19,22 215:14 219:1 224:5,6,8 235:16,17 297:8 302:1 317:15 regression 261:15 265:5 regular 70:20 108:3 197:22 242:17 regulated 26:20 34:10 regulation 27:16 27:19 regulations 43:15 43:16 regulators 187:13 regulatory 10:15 27:15 31:1,2,9,15 33:7,9 51:17 52:7 79:12 199:11 229:17 235:21 rehabilitation 234:11</p>
--	---	--	---

<p>rehearsals 262:6 reinforced 242:12 reiterate 102:17 related 15:6 24:18 27:18 28:1,4,8 29:5,14,15 31:6 31:13 46:17,21 83:17 96:2 107:18 138:14 194:7 205:21 217:12 249:2 276:17 277:20 278:1 295:6 315:19 331:9 343:8 344:6 relates 95:2 150:4 relating 249:18 relationship 109:19 230:5 270:6 relative 55:20 125:13,14,16 147:4 223:1 252:10 343:10 relatively 167:13 209:11 230:17 252:10 253:6 270:7 280:11,12 288:7 303:18 327:17 330:17 334:9 release 32:2 released 31:5,11 31:21 relevance 203:11 relevant 35:9 36:9 57:22 76:6 131:15 142:11,14 153:2 158:11 200:10 243:2 256:2 reliable 145:22 reliably 84:2 relief 314:14 reluctance 115:5</p>	<p>rely 337:5 remain 105:8 199:7 remaining 61:22 160:11 remains 294:1 remarkable 298:9 318:19 remarkably 76:10 remarks 10:3 13:4 14:2 340:9 remedy 26:7 326:12 remember 82:12 121:20 271:12 298:9 325:15 remind 217:1 renders 186:5 repeat 181:17 275:8 repeatedly 186:10 rephrase 315:4 replacement 234:5 replicated 228:13 229:9 replication 203:4 reply 156:8 repopulate 178:9 report 51:3 177:15 190:1 213:22 315:18 reported 1:20 56:7 90:22 104:10 201:20 202:20 231:9 244:16 245:2 308:20 reporting 1:21 295:7 315:11,14 337:6,10,20 reports 172:4 represent 114:13 representative 2:7 8:10 21:11 50:14</p>	<p>79:2 277:19 representatives 244:18 266:14 representing 18:12 represents 322:16 reproduced 22:20 reproducibility 121:13 reproducible 113:16 request 34:20 38:16,21 43:8 requested 154:1 requesting 143:11 require 33:17,20 33:22 70:7 110:6 122:8 204:16 206:14 211:19 234:12 248:7 required 30:10 34:4 37:16,20 73:14 114:1 210:10 248:16 requirement 27:17 137:17 177:1 182:22 requires 82:5,6 114:3 294:19 317:4 requiring 73:21 rescue 65:1 113:20 rescueable 115:17 research 2:19 3:14 5:22 7:10 11:18 17:16 19:5,7 24:12 63:18 180:14 183:16 185:12 188:3 193:20 194:6,12 196:4 209:14 213:19 224:5 242:9 243:20</p>	<p>303:9,10 researchers 187:14 235:7,11 reserve 4:3 18:10 resis 157:12 resistance 93:7 98:3 153:4,15 154:3,14 156:7 157:1,22 158:8 163:11,18 164:14 164:17 165:1 166:7,13,16 167:16,18 168:2,3 168:15,19 170:5 170:20 171:3,4 175:22 177:20 179:5,9,12 182:12 182:17,19 183:14 197:4 198:11 203:13,16 204:19 224:1 231:13,15 239:16,22 242:7 245:12,14 250:2 resistant 156:11 156:12,15 157:13 163:14 164:20 165:11,13,17 166:1,8 167:8,13 167:21 168:5,11 169:15,18 171:10 171:22 172:16 173:9,11 211:17 225:15 229:19 resolution 206:15 resolve 293:19,20 320:1 resources 193:20 293:3 294:20 respect 27:14 46:6 50:16 254:9 258:14,22 289:11 respectively 59:17 respider 335:11 335:12,14</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>respirable 38:1,4 respiratory 2:15 2:18 8:5 17:11 18:17 21:8 32:14 33:2 133:15 163:21 164:6 190:2 206:5,14,22 209:17,22 216:9 217:21 226:15,22 231:14 235:15 293:19 307:6 324:1 respire 132:17 227:14,19 228:10 228:14 258:18 260:3 respiter 329:21 333:12,14,17 335:10 respond 157:15 159:4 160:5 161:16 165:17 166:6 responded 156:14 198:3 responding 152:4 161:2,4,6 170:19 172:1 responds 156:18 291:20 response 73:8 98:5 122:4,4 134:3 146:6 151:3 155:22 159:3 160:19 161:13,14 162:17 172:11,13 173:5,6 219:16 265:13 269:14 292:4,6 318:12 responsive 74:21 110:6 162:13 rest 155:18 205:1 218:16 224:9 237:20 288:13</p>	<p>restrict 64:8 150:6 restricted 216:19 restrictions 118:18 result 23:8,9 156:9 161:5 182:5 187:21 227:10 332:7 results 30:3 91:14 145:6 154:21 156:3 160:22 161:15 200:6 226:4 228:7 235:14 253:7 261:9 332:3 333:10,11 rethink 235:20 242:22 retreat 191:4 retrofit 45:18 retrospective 97:20 132:17 retrospectively 60:15 302:7 return 139:9 287:10 320:1 338:16 review 18:8 24:7 30:11 32:19 33:4 33:22 34:16 35:2 36:15,17,21 37:1 38:5 39:4 42:2 43:14,18,19 44:9 46:17 47:15,18 48:2 154:18 199:11 reviewed 47:11 51:21,21 reviewer 3:17 4:13 8:13 18:8,21 20:13 reviewing 40:15 40:20</p>	<p>reviews 25:1 194:19 revisit 64:12 302:4 revolves 96:17 rh 217:1,4,8 rheology 216:1,9 rheumatology 7:6 20:16 rid 276:12 ride 238:14 right 22:2 23:6 32:22 38:7 57:17 57:18 64:12 79:6 79:9 83:3 87:5 88:12 101:22,22 102:13 116:7 119:9 120:10 126:4 135:11 145:11 151:19 163:11 164:10 165:13 167:12 177:2 178:22 179:8,20 211:8 237:15,15,19 239:2 240:17 256:2 266:4 267:3 271:7 273:8 275:7 279:13 282:1 298:4 303:7,10 306:9,11 310:12 310:14 311:21 312:15 315:9 319:7 323:19 325:4,11 328:18 332:21 340:6 rigidity 190:18 rigor 78:16 rigorous 252:3 rises 51:2 risk 24:13 28:11 28:17 29:10,20 30:18 33:19 43:20 48:12 72:9 74:16 76:12 77:6 83:22</p>	<p>91:9 143:9 148:3 162:14 167:12 169:7 170:9,11,13 170:17 171:9,10 171:14 179:9 184:5 187:6,8 196:2 198:10 220:14,14 222:17 231:17 232:19 234:17 239:22 254:14,16 255:8 255:18 256:19 257:1 261:6 271:14 273:11 309:10 318:20 335:6,8 339:18 risks 29:14 93:7 98:15 164:6 203:12 292:12 risky 334:21 roach 315:2,22,22 road 179:17 316:15 roadmap 186:15 rob 128:7 robert 7:3 robust 88:16 123:10,18 214:16 224:1 270:5 290:19 302:6 robustly 292:7 rochester 4:11 18:17 rods 223:6 role 22:16 50:5 76:20 84:6 93:7 148:19 166:10 232:15 264:12 300:19 315:20 316:2 roles 83:19 296:18 roll 123:15 rolled 114:8</p>
--	---	---	---

<p>rolling 335:14 room 1:13 16:4 113:2 127:8 236:16 root 74:5 181:7 rotating 211:10 214:13 233:1 roughly 125:17 138:18 180:5 302:15 round 102:1,1 145:20 route 144:12 routine 70:18 80:17 232:16 233:6 routinely 301:7,8 rs 168:7,18,21 173:4 rule 106:2 run 70:2,21 113:16 118:17 130:17 148:3 151:19 168:17 264:2,17 running 121:13</p>	<p>70:8 76:11 77:3,4 93:6 97:7 102:2 103:1 110:14 120:8,12,18 121:1 123:14,17,17 140:1 143:15 153:3 179:12 182:14,15 195:7 198:15 202:5 203:15 208:15 226:16 250:1 336:4,11 sake 232:10 311:3 saline 84:6 216:5 218:5 sample 38:22 134:15,22 185:9 185:10 257:12 298:18 316:5 samples 68:3 75:12 sampling 185:20 186:4 200:13 satisfaction 331:6 satisfies 110:2 save 57:10 saw 56:8 71:1 75:13 128:19 129:18 130:8 224:4 241:7 269:20 297:21 302:5 318:1 saying 131:17 135:7 138:14 144:21 166:16 172:11,12 190:9 193:2 236:18 288:8,22 335:6 says 85:13 178:19 306:1 337:3 sc 5:7 scale 216:7 217:6 305:17 314:7 324:6 327:6</p>	<p>scan 211:6 266:12 scedosporium 163:4 scenario 39:6 105:3 337:14 scenarios 38:18 50:6 schedule 91:16 schedules 341:10 school 2:16 4:3,22 6:16 7:21 20:9 82:8 239:4,5,6 science 3:2 17:15 81:21 86:4 sciences 4:16 scientific 23:14 230:11 scientifically 85:9 scientist 85:3 scientists 24:4 79:17 scintigraphy 267:7 scope 187:3 score 289:2,5 290:6,14 299:6,8 299:9 305:15 324:1 scores 91:1 92:12 262:20 286:16,18 289:6 290:11 291:8 scoring 286:13 scotland 297:4 scratch 286:5 screen 115:2 se 132:1 336:4 season 247:18 seattle 3:14,15 5:19,22 6:2 18:3 58:15 second 22:5 62:11 71:8 118:6 134:3 154:17 190:18</p>	<p>196:8 220:10 223:2 239:5 246:14 276:2 304:9 320:14 327:18 333:17 334:1 secondary 96:1 195:15 202:19 226:13 229:1 329:1 secondly 77:19 section 89:1 153:19 sections 61:16 sectors 176:22 security 41:20 see 16:9 23:10 25:17 35:4,9 60:5 60:6,20 61:4,15 61:16 63:1,13 66:15 67:18 68:6 73:9 74:5 75:13 94:22 95:10 97:22 99:15 103:10 108:14 111:7 112:12 113:17 119:8 122:6 124:8 126:16 127:8,17 128:5 129:17 137:9,17,18 138:7 139:3 146:6 147:1 151:4 152:13 161:22 166:7 168:21 169:22 171:11,19 174:10 179:11 184:2 188:19 189:7 192:2,18 202:22 207:6,7 211:6 214:14 215:11 217:20 218:13,16 218:18 222:16 225:9 227:8 228:4 228:9,22 229:5</p>
<p>s</p>			
<p>s 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 6:1 7:1 8:1 9:1 10:1 11:1 12:1 13:1 14:1 173:5 178:17 sacrifice 340:5 sadly 198:13 safe 24:16 25:2,5 28:16 29:12 32:9 37:21 43:22 46:5 48:11 65:9 68:18 69:12 106:12 163:13 245:16 341:22 safety 25:6 37:6 39:7 40:10,15 41:9 47:22 48:14</p>			

<p>230:12,20 231:4 232:6 240:12 241:11 260:1,19 264:8,10 265:11 267:15 279:22 284:5,15 287:12 297:4,11 298:12 299:10 300:12 302:22 307:8 314:17 316:2 319:8 320:1 321:11 326:11,21 331:20 332:6 338:1 339:4 seeing 52:22 53:3 53:4,6,12 54:12 56:5 61:11,21 67:20 124:15 137:1 138:20 169:13 170:1 172:12 266:12 337:5 seek 44:6,12 199:8 241:5 seeking 36:11 126:22 seen 42:3 57:22 67:14 73:9 74:7,8 94:18 98:5 110:18 111:19 113:5 122:9 134:9 144:5 148:7 159:19 168:19 171:15 174:14 175:4 223:17 229:7 232:9 235:14 298:22 322:12 329:10 330:4,16 334:21 335:3 sees 241:6 297:4 select 91:9,12 165:4 185:22 264:18 319:6</p>	<p>selected 197:13 selecting 98:3 248:10 selection 12:17 56:21 63:16 93:1 118:13 156:22 159:14 205:8 246:14,17 self 234:17 semantic 168:3 semi 303:6 send 36:17 301:8 sense 53:21 78:7 110:14 134:21 240:16 282:9 317:3 331:4 sensitive 258:3,7 318:18 sensitivity 121:14 sent 46:16 separate 27:5 34:14 36:11 47:14 56:22 227:18 september 155:17 184:8 281:18 sequel 213:8 serial 55:12 series 15:4 serious 181:5 198:17 serve 24:22 108:5 served 177:1,9 179:18 182:19 252:8 server 207:5 serves 57:2 service 56:10 services 16:7 serving 234:17 session 10:9,11 11:21 12:4 51:7 51:10 89:1 137:20 143:22 179:21 180:1 199:14</p>	<p>set 26:3 38:8 41:7 41:12 188:18,22 190:7,19 191:20 193:17 271:15 311:6,9 325:22 sets 48:14 212:17 256:19 setting 29:1,3 107:15,20 127:12 128:1 139:12,19 140:8,15 141:1 172:18 173:6 176:6,6 179:19 281:2 320:4 322:13 settings 174:10 182:8 seven 20:4 228:3 305:16 sevenfold 222:17 severe 143:3 195:3 198:4 203:19 204:22 222:1,2 253:3 254:12 292:18 297:18 308:15,22 316:11 327:22 severity 91:3 92:21 199:4 204:5 222:5,6 224:20 228:21 247:15 253:19 254:6,20 257:8 259:6 276:7 276:9,13,16 277:20 278:4 279:15,20 280:7 292:13 294:10,16 294:20 295:1 298:15 299:5 303:14,20,21 304:5,10 307:13 308:10 310:21 311:1 316:1,4,14 317:3,18 321:12</p>	<p>321:14,17 323:6 327:5,8,14,15 328:21 332:10 sexual 315:12 sfo 238:8 sgrq 258:6 262:15 share 42:15 44:18 49:13 80:7 94:22 132:16 155:14 178:13 179:4 295:22 312:14 shared 15:20 281:5 285:12 291:16 sharing 291:10 341:17 shift 57:22 64:13 69:16 152:21 221:5 shifted 130:10,10 130:11 shifting 61:2 shifts 61:12 shop 269:2 short 99:2 102:20 110:4,7,11,21 112:4,5 116:10 117:5 119:4 120:1 120:3 127:1 129:5 142:12 143:12 146:7 209:11 234:8 239:9 306:10 307:11 322:12,14 shortcomings 78:16 shorter 71:6 76:13 76:17 78:12 106:8 106:16 110:5 141:12,12 144:9 146:8 310:15 336:1 shortish 111:11</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>shortness 323:2 shot 237:4 show 22:18 25:11 30:22 61:11 97:19 108:17 114:2 140:20 163:13 191:18 209:16 220:10 248:11 258:7,13 267:7 269:15 287:4 298:14 showed 117:7 239:12 260:14 272:20 332:16 showing 65:22 66:19 73:11 118:6 152:2 160:12 189:17 200:5 shown 61:7,13 70:14 77:4 122:3 147:6 193:11 225:11 233:21 267:18 shows 23:7 30:12 72:21 125:10 188:14,18 192:18 shrimant 7:14 10:16 11:15 20:21 51:15,18 135:18 138:1 143:21 sick 80:21 183:10 238:4,5,6,10 240:6,7 269:18 277:1,1 278:18 280:4 325:17 side 102:12 104:2 198:4 223:21 237:15,19 239:17 245:13 305:18 315:10 320:20 sieves 38:8 sign 274:17 signal 25:6 73:10 76:15 110:22</p>	<p>113:8,9 117:5 130:6,13 132:21 285:11 286:7,20 330:4 334:12,13 signals 77:4 93:6 161:17 177:4 226:19 signatory 25:1 signed 189:15 significance 117:6 333:18 significant 74:6,13 74:15 124:22 125:7 129:16 130:7 131:3 135:13 181:21 194:17 197:5 206:18 216:2 226:19 227:1 228:10 229:5 231:9 234:10,22 251:12 258:8 314:16 332:16 333:15 335:10 significantly 61:6 65:4 184:12 189:22 332:7 signs 116:8 304:1 304:3 silence 152:21 silly 87:18,19 160:8 silos 181:6 187:1 silver 1:14 2:5 3:20 4:7 5:11,15 7:2,7,17 8:8,15,21 silverstein 6:4 similar 45:5 55:22 75:13 77:1 84:7 107:14 147:16 151:8 188:21 189:8 202:15 243:7 256:16 306:18 308:20</p>	<p>332:15 similarities 296:16 similarly 264:6 simple 33:13 48:22 280:18 292:5 305:4 306:9 307:9 327:17 328:20 simplify 67:9 212:9 simplistic 307:14 simply 174:9 289:18 291:22 simulated 29:11 29:22 simultaneously 54:15 sincerely 171:12 single 64:11 124:8 177:14 178:17,17 178:17 300:7 308:18 320:16 325:18 singular 54:9 sinuses 240:1 sir 316:19 sit 24:11 sites 137:1 163:21 164:6 168:9 183:6 221:14 301:19 situation 106:11 160:6 169:4 175:19 176:17 200:1 264:11 315:14,15 situations 321:10 six 91:18 92:16 146:16 160:22 161:1 176:17 228:17 306:18 size 38:11,22 106:15 123:6 133:22 134:9,15 134:22 135:14</p>	<p>185:9,10,14 216:11 257:12 283:19 298:18 302:6 316:5 sizeable 218:19 sizes 72:16 77:19 skills 343:7 skip 83:20 232:10 234:16 skipped 309:5 sleep 238:21 281:11,19 306:2 slide 22:18,22 30:12,21 35:7 41:8 93:12 96:3 118:9 122:3 166:17,22 188:14 188:18 189:13 190:9 206:19,21 207:10 218:18 224:13 225:9 230:19 232:10 260:14 slides 32:2 36:13 191:17 192:17 200:6 250:15 slightly 46:5 48:6 slugs 164:20 small 52:11 61:15 63:20 75:17 85:7 86:20 87:3 121:19 133:22 138:22 196:12 200:19 216:8 283:15 324:19 smaller 70:18 75:9 97:14 108:6 115:22 124:15 135:7,13 150:13 213:11 smell 71:22 smith 5:12 12:4,8 19:15,15 180:3 187:17 193:22</p>
---	--	--	---

199:13,16,21 225:5 246:10 250:8 265:13 268:6 274:19,22 275:5,9 276:6 309:3 313:3,6 329:7 330:7 334:5 335:5 smoking 298:5 snapshot 66:17 68:15 282:8 sneak 169:16 sobering 234:21 240:12 social 314:1,6 society 154:6 191:4 217:21 235:15 socioeconomic 244:12 sodium 35:20 softball 189:14 software 37:7,7 41:11,15,17,21 47:10,16,19 solely 313:10 solution 40:19 82:11 solutions 186:12 solved 340:16 somebody 47:12 100:17 105:20 117:20 265:19 267:3 270:7,9 273:20,22 274:1,5 278:17 285:16 286:17 288:7,15 296:9 334:22 somewhat 130:12 330:9 soon 322:16 sorry 32:16 51:21 123:1 160:7 189:20 273:16	275:8 277:4 288:18 305:7 309:2,3 337:4 sort 52:5,6 54:5 57:3,13,20 94:5 98:22 106:5 107:18 108:5,6,7 108:9,10,14 120:4 120:8,19,21 121:12 127:1 132:10,12 133:20 136:20,22 137:1 138:13,15 139:3 141:2 142:6 146:16,20 148:18 149:19 157:1,22 160:12 162:20 163:5 165:7 166:12,14 202:6 259:12 265:6 266:18 268:22 277:11 282:21 283:20 285:3 298:19 306:10 309:8 322:17 326:20 336:3 sounding 234:17 sounds 127:17 149:16 277:12 302:5 305:3 328:5 south 5:6 10:12 19:9 southeastern 232:6 southern 298:8 soviet 296:13 297:9 space 31:4,9,15,17 31:19 65:13 66:9 67:6,22 spacers 39:1 spain 224:15 339:8	speak 69:6 79:4 136:1 180:20 296:14 330:2 speaker 10:20 12:12 32:13 79:9 79:14 98:7,10 107:11 144:1 194:1 236:8,11 282:15 284:2,6,17 289:9 299:21 305:2,7,19 309:18 317:12 320:7,8 325:8 335:20 342:6 speakers 180:5 258:10 341:2 speaking 188:1 194:3 280:11 288:7 speaks 101:1 294:19,20 335:15 special 33:14 67:10,13 69:12 150:22 151:1,10 151:16 specialize 186:1 species 53:15 specific 27:6,8 30:22 33:3 35:5,8 35:13,21 36:8 42:10,16,21 142:21 152:1 176:7 201:20 214:21 219:10 221:5 233:7 234:2 251:3 258:9 274:22 289:5 309:22 specifically 35:13 42:19 47:7,19 109:10 112:10 144:2 187:8 215:8 216:22 222:10 228:19 231:17	specified 228:3 specifies 27:7,16 27:20 28:1 131:22 spectra 297:20 spend 80:10 81:10 82:10 84:1 99:10 207:22 218:6,10 232:11 spending 307:15 spent 82:19 86:13 95:19 181:11 208:20 221:1 281:18 spin 263:22 spirometry 305:14 split 103:10 spoke 184:7 240:15 sponsor 33:6 34:17,21 38:6,22 42:8,8 45:13 48:10 49:10 90:5 112:20 115:5 265:10 325:20 sponsors 40:6 43:10,22 44:22 45:16 66:21 67:5 72:4 101:12 112:6 119:1 124:1 147:8 147:10 148:3 sports 237:1 spot 237:18 spreading 171:10 spring 1:14 2:5 3:20 4:7 5:11,15 7:2,7,17 8:8,15,21 239:2,3 sputum 55:12 75:12 201:2,2 206:6 207:20 210:5,5 211:21 212:4 216:1,8 217:16,17 218:9
--	--	--	--

<p>229:10 285:1 301:8 323:3 squishy 152:9 ss 168:18 173:4 st 206:21 216:9 226:15,21 288:2 307:6 stability 110:19 stabilize 208:18 stabilized 67:19 148:17 stable 160:11 278:3,4 279:6 282:21 stably 60:8 staff 8:14 21:15 184:16 stage 49:14 276:11 279:7 stages 38:10 stakeholders 184:16 stand 142:16 229:21 standard 40:2 54:5 55:5,10 77:18,22 90:11 91:8,17,17 92:6 95:11 107:21 108:2,5 109:13 113:14 115:6 116:16 140:14,17 140:22 141:2 144:11 146:5 173:14 174:20 175:10 223:9 242:19 247:10 251:6 261:15 303:6 317:19 standardize 204:15 296:15 standardized 318:5,11</p>	<p>standards 41:8 43:17,19 standing 321:4 standpoint 33:9 48:18 54:21 109:22 134:5 285:15 309:21 330:15,18 staph 53:13 112:11 118:12 138:17,21 144:22 145:15,22 147:7 147:12,21 148:18 150:2 153:7,8 176:9 219:3,6 292:22 start 14:5 15:5 16:1,11,17 21:22 22:22 28:12 51:12 59:4 75:5 76:2 79:22 87:6 88:2 88:10 113:17 131:17 133:9 144:3,21 146:9,14 149:14 176:19 180:3 205:16 210:19 223:22 241:10 246:10 259:18 263:3 273:3 281:16 286:6 293:22 300:14 312:8 started 82:13 86:2 174:4 191:13 192:13 194:9 195:18 322:13 starting 32:4 50:15 110:19 181:12 261:2,7 starts 212:12 state 10:18 12:10 16:18 58:16,18 59:7 97:19 148:1 155:21 187:1</p>	<p>205:3,14 210:11 217:13 229:12 231:21 233:11 234:20 278:3 280:10 282:21 343:19 statement 102:21 316:18 327:19 statements 155:2 states 19:7 114:15 189:21 206:9 213:20 215:17 235:17 290:1,20 297:10 statistical 3:17 4:13 18:7,21 97:3 117:6 134:5 285:15 298:19 306:22 309:21 327:2 333:18 statistically 97:2 132:8 258:8 307:1 310:1 338:20 statistician 250:14 291:9 statisticians 288:21 statistics 18:6 304:21 status 130:11 244:12 stay 249:14 stayed 155:7 staying 62:17 steep 187:14 stems 27:15,19 steno 163:6 stenotrophomonas 145:9 223:4 step 29:6,19 118:21 151:13 170:9 186:8 310:5 stepdaughter 180:17</p>	<p>stepmom 181:9 184:7 239:19 steps 29:21 145:10 310:5 sterilize 100:4 sterilized 81:18 sterilizing 80:12 steroids 234:9 272:18 stewardship 155:6 stick 73:3 sticking 58:8 stomach 101:3 stop 108:10 183:12 272:3 273:20 293:22 322:16 stops 108:10 stories 240:10 story 156:5 250:21 258:15 straightforward 71:18 strategy 122:20 178:12 316:1 stratification 300:19 stratify 150:18,18 248:21 straw 106:5,19 street 109:4 strength 255:3 strengthen 235:13 stress 195:10 stressed 238:20 stretch 298:3 stretching 70:22 strict 73:20 striking 260:2 stringent 132:19 133:2 stringently 228:2 strive 43:21</p>
---	---	---	--

<p>strives 50:3 strong 76:4 strongest 221:19 strongly 85:1 174:4 199:3 232:4 struck 243:21 structured 182:20 structures 98:14 struggle 69:9 162:7 struggled 171:1 struggling 309:8 stuck 102:7 studied 200:17 201:7 216:7 217:4 217:5 295:4 studies 10:10 11:5 28:2 31:6,13 45:19 51:8 63:11 70:15 71:3,10 74:8,9 75:19 76:18,22 77:3,10 77:17 78:3,12,14 78:17,22 84:21 88:21 89:1 95:6 99:3 103:22 110:16 111:13 113:19 114:22 115:11 119:4 122:22 124:2,13 125:4,13 128:13 144:14,14 146:8,9 148:3 151:5 182:15 184:21 185:20 188:2,6,9 190:7 193:19 200:4,4,19,19,22 215:21 231:3,8 248:9 259:16 260:15 261:1 267:7 269:11 270:10 271:1 272:16 273:1,11 283:19 286:12</p>	<p>291:14 292:8 318:17,19 320:13 320:19 332:18 333:4,9 336:2 340:5 study 11:22 12:15 29:12,13 31:7 33:6 36:7 42:7 49:12 59:11 60:15 63:6 64:1,2,4 66:10 71:8,11 72:13 73:17 75:9 75:14 86:22 90:10 90:11 91:8,9 93:2 98:19 100:14 104:8,19 106:6 109:21 110:4,5,6 111:4 113:17,20 114:8,9 116:20 117:4,12 118:7 119:19,20 120:1 121:19 122:2,9 123:16 126:14 129:15 131:3,18 133:6,10,20 135:1 141:21 146:8,13 146:16 185:7 186:6 190:17 191:8 199:15 205:7 209:11 220:17 221:13 225:20 226:7 231:1 246:8,11,11 246:19 249:8,16 257:18 260:3,6 263:19 264:1,7,7 264:19 265:1,10 282:17,17 283:13 285:18 287:3 289:7 293:7 296:22 302:9,14 302:20 304:6 305:13 310:15,16 311:4 317:2 322:4</p>	<p>332:4,11 333:1,10 334:18 335:22 337:22 338:9,12 338:17 340:1 stuff 234:14 240:3 241:19 267:18 314:2 style 189:4 sub 126:18 271:2 subacute 176:6 subject 162:20 182:12 255:10 subjective 104:7 105:18 132:4 subjectivity 106:2 subjects 141:16 188:20 250:5 submission 43:3 44:13 46:16 submissions 18:22 21:13 43:9 submit 42:18,20 254:20 submits 38:6 submitted 31:14 34:6 39:6 41:13 154:11 subscale 295:13 subsequent 15:8 252:15 subset 227:3 substantial 53:8 303:3 subtract 153:13 succeeded 189:13 success 162:11 298:15 303:1 successful 42:5 43:1,13 62:6 64:18 289:7 302:16 successfully 38:3 38:14 50:3 233:14 234:13</p>	<p>suffer 127:5 234:22 suffered 330:20 suffering 181:12 suffice 131:2 231:7 sufficient 38:22 114:4 123:15 149:22 204:12 252:3 329:12 sufficiently 30:2 290:12 313:2 331:19 suggest 64:22 72:17 104:16 151:3 177:18 182:16 216:18 260:15 270:13 303:19 316:19 suggested 60:13 64:16 65:20 66:7 216:8 225:17 280:17 suggesting 65:22 76:9 197:2 214:17 232:18 suggestion 111:21 suggestions 110:13 suggests 139:7 172:13 suitable 34:5 suited 143:1 sullivan 242:10 sumathi 5:8 10:11 19:12 51:19 89:21 341:14 summarize 68:22 78:4 summarized 210:11 218:13 summarizes 230:19 234:20</p>
---	---	---	--

<p>summary 225:10 summer 239:7 sunita 93:10 143:22 super 101:10 superior 127:14 superiority 91:7 92:9 95:12 106:16 115:15 116:17 127:15,19,21 140:18 141:5 251:5 supplemental 234:11 supply 233:6 support 37:20 41:21 48:11 133:6 194:6,12 232:16 233:3 235:13 336:14 supported 41:2 56:2 142:17 supporting 130:21 329:2 supportive 129:1 200:12 234:2,15 supports 298:7 suppose 290:8 327:1 suppress 145:10 326:1 suppression 145:17 147:9,12 suppressive 62:12 167:7 213:4 214:12 219:22 225:20 233:3 sure 25:19 52:9 59:3 70:3 80:19 99:1 115:10,21 136:21 140:4 148:15 156:8 178:1,2 185:13 189:9 190:6 224:1</p>	<p>240:16 241:10 245:16 246:1 262:19 264:5 265:18 267:1 269:5 279:8 285:18 288:14 295:19 301:9 320:9 322:4 333:9 surface 39:14 surgery 213:11 233:9,21 surgical 33:13 233:19,20 surrogate 267:14 267:19,22 316:20 323:12 surrogates 295:3 surrounding 196:22 surrounds 167:20 surveillance 8:20 24:14 25:6 survey 191:13,15 191:21,21 192:18 193:7 196:6,11 197:6,18 198:7 243:4 282:1 surveys 191:16 192:3,3,4 193:8 196:16 243:14 244:16 survival 55:9 60:19 170:11 survive 242:17 surviving 180:21 susan 6:12 20:8 107:14 261:10 273:20 298:22 susan's 107:18 susceptibility 154:16,21 156:22 159:2,14 160:3,20 susceptible 156:12 159:3 191:5</p>	<p>212:13 susie 109:11 suspect 86:9 152:5 300:14 suspected 232:4 sustained 320:2 swag 85:15 sweet 107:3 switch 46:2 108:1 109:13 symptom 133:16 161:10 278:4 286:13 288:9 295:13 322:22 323:1 324:1,5,13 symptomatic 217:15 288:4 294:2 symptoms 74:15 92:20 114:22 115:4 116:9 127:18 158:21 176:10 190:2 206:5 207:19 210:4,7 225:16 226:1 231:19 268:20 278:5,8,20 279:3,6 281:16 286:2 287:6 293:19 294:3 304:1,3 305:15 311:17 313:22 314:7,14 318:4 320:1,3 321:11,13 321:14,20,22 322:21 323:10 324:2 326:12 337:2 synchronize 150:14 syndrome 206:16 syringe 27:5 syringes 27:10</p>	<p>system 23:16,20 systemaic 248:7 systematic 94:2 154:18 211:11 systemic 97:7 139:17,22 140:2 146:3 158:10,14 158:15 159:18 169:10,17 170:6 172:5 173:3 181:19 183:10 198:5,9,19 203:19 206:15 210:7 213:2,7 214:15 218:7 220:18 223:16,18 233:1,3 233:5 234:3,8 239:19,21 316:22 systemically 171:8 172:8</p>
t			
<p>t 10:1,1 11:1,1 12:1,1 13:1,1 table 16:16 106:5 tablet 72:2 tail 116:5,14 take 17:1 25:6,14 32:5 49:19 63:8 63:16,22 69:16 80:5,5 84:4,8,8 85:11,13 87:6,8 87:12,21 88:13 94:1 98:18 99:10 113:7 117:21 120:19 121:15 122:8,21 134:2 145:1,11,14 150:8 170:12 172:20 176:10 177:5 180:6 227:5 241:11 245:11 246:5 270:1 279:12 283:6 293:18 307:18</p>			

<p>326:11 329:8 339:18 340:2 taken 66:17 68:5 68:16 85:22 99:16 105:21 129:14 151:9 167:11 188:7 190:8 242:14 243:10 245:1 252:1 329:21 343:3,9 takes 36:16 81:13 81:15 82:1 145:8 250:20 252:13 272:11 279:9 341:9 talk 14:21,21,22 15:6 21:18,19 22:6,15 33:1 35:9 36:10 48:17 52:3 56:11,13 57:6 58:15 81:7 83:17 90:2,14 98:16 122:11 131:11 138:8 140:5 153:3 162:17 163:9 168:3,18 199:22 210:17 213:3,6 229:18 236:7 253:11 293:21 298:21 328:11 talked 42:2 48:15 72:12 105:4 111:9 142:10 153:16 223:8 234:14 245:10 281:3 294:3 talking 15:5 71:12 79:22 80:18 95:5 99:8 101:4 106:12 106:14 109:10 112:22 128:13 138:12 142:5,22 154:2,13 160:8 163:17 173:2,3</p>	<p>179:5 208:20 221:1 268:15 270:10 277:20 288:17 298:5 299:13 313:11 328:21 338:11,13 talks 34:20 40:1 41:14,18 42:14 43:8 48:15 80:5 90:21 tandem 137:2 target 59:17 93:1 141:16 152:20 229:21 231:22 233:22 302:11 338:1 targeted 53:4,13 139:20 198:9 217:15 targeting 54:10,15 118:11 150:15 220:8 228:19 303:3 targets 220:2,8 236:2 taste 71:22 101:22 107:4 tb 269:22 297:18 tdn 3:13 5:21 19:20 58:14 teaching 218:10 team 5:13 8:4 18:14 19:16 20:15 21:14 32:14,19 281:4 teamed 37:5 tease 301:13 tech 215:15 technically 115:8 techniques 215:1 technology 42:9 tell 147:10 153:19 159:19 162:13 209:9 337:7</p>	<p>telling 120:19 162:4 232:11 temporal 109:19 ten 179:16 226:22 tend 46:11 68:10 148:17 160:18 186:3 275:17 338:19 tended 248:14 tendency 75:16 tends 156:6 160:18 161:14 tennessee 7:21 21:4 tennis 189:14,15 237:3 tentative 336:5,9 term 28:5 55:8 59:21 60:19 65:21 77:17 91:22 97:22 110:7,21 111:11 112:6 119:6 123:17,22 127:21 132:11 134:20 142:2,12 143:12 143:13 144:9,14 147:8 176:20 179:12 182:18 198:15 203:17 209:11 216:17 231:20 239:9 240:22 253:9 304:15 termed 201:3 terms 28:9 32:3 102:22 106:19 108:19 124:10 132:6 134:15 143:9 146:21 156:4 178:7 201:14,14 202:1 204:20 208:11 209:12 218:2 219:11 229:21</p>	<p>233:4 287:6 293:6 294:21 310:6 330:14,16 332:10 terrible 239:13 274:11 terrific 118:21 test 30:4 38:5,5,13 66:3 101:11 154:21 160:21 173:7 179:12 182:5 192:7,9 203:3 301:7,19 305:21 tested 292:8 307:4 326:19 testing 30:1,2,8,18 30:20 37:20,22 38:16 39:4,5,15 40:8 41:3,12 46:5 48:4,9,10,21 49:1 66:22 67:4 155:4 159:2 160:3 301:3 tests 29:8 103:18 105:21 188:19 305:5 thank 14:10 21:17 22:9 26:5 32:12 32:21 44:1 49:17 51:4,5,6 57:8,9 58:9 79:3,6,15,16 79:21 88:11,12 89:20 93:9 96:14 98:7 138:2 143:21 178:21 179:3,20 180:11 186:7 187:16,17 193:21 193:22 199:12,13 199:21 205:8,16 206:1 236:3,12,13 236:14,15 245:17 246:2,3,3,6 250:7 250:8,18 251:1 259:8,10 291:1 301:21 302:2</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>325:3 340:7,10,20 341:21 342:7,8 thanks 14:3 32:11 44:2 58:19,19 93:10 143:20 205:15 236:6 240:18 250:17 288:19 309:2 341:16,20 theme 224:17,22 theoretically 117:11 118:2 theory 319:10 therapeutic 24:7,9 26:18 213:17 214:6 230:3 therapeutics 3:13 18:2 47:6 therapies 14:6,18 15:18 20:13 21:5 32:19 44:5 51:11 54:15 57:1 59:9 65:19 67:6 69:8 89:13 92:8 96:19 123:21 124:5 144:11 147:19 148:5 158:15 159:18 174:21 181:22 201:17 204:15 206:15 210:13 235:2,5 246:12 248:6 272:21 340:2,19 341:6 therapy 10:14 12:15 51:16 52:4 54:18,19 60:4 62:1,12 64:10,22 65:2,5 70:8,16 71:14 73:14,22 77:22 78:9 81:6,6 90:12 103:8 105:9 106:11 108:9 109:6,9 113:1,7,7</p>	<p>114:10 115:7 117:4 122:18 126:20 127:11,11 130:1 139:17,20 140:3,16 141:11 146:4 147:1 148:18 150:17 158:13,14 159:5 169:11 171:13 172:5,8 179:11 200:12 202:7 204:6,7 207:16,19 208:17 210:12 212:21 213:2,5,7 216:20 218:7 219:17,18 225:19 225:20 230:8 232:8,13 233:4,13 233:14,19,19 234:3,4,5 246:8 246:20 248:20,22 249:9 254:3 262:8 263:7 283:18 288:15 293:5 302:11 309:8 322:16 339:20 thereof 251:20 there's 148:12 thing 15:20 16:2 80:7 85:16 107:17 137:6 141:10 149:17 159:20 163:6 164:16 165:2 167:14 176:2 259:21 260:8 264:22 269:3 274:3,7 284:18 289:1,9 307:1 308:8 311:14 312:2,16 322:15 324:17 325:13 326:6 328:14,20 337:13</p>	<p>things 55:3,15 95:11 98:9 104:20 105:19,19 129:10 136:16,22 137:2 165:9 169:16 175:1 177:19 184:20 220:9 236:21 242:1 244:4 269:21 275:1 278:7,9 281:7 294:7,9 300:14,22 304:16 304:17 314:15 322:6 328:21,22 340:13,14 think 14:16 15:17 15:19,22 16:4,11 44:5 45:5,9 49:4 49:15 57:5,9,18 57:19,22 58:6,9 65:13 66:5 69:10 72:10 73:10,19 76:2,5,8,19 77:18 78:7 79:7,8 80:14 81:1 83:2,14 85:20,21 86:5 88:13 93:12 94:5 94:12 95:18,19 96:22 97:2,5,13 97:18,18 98:5,13 99:2,5,11,18,20 100:4,9,16,21 101:1,10,11,12 102:14 103:3 104:4,12,22 105:15,21 106:4,5 106:12,17 109:21 110:22 111:16 112:4,11,17 113:1 113:11,22 114:12 114:19 116:10,12 117:6 118:5,15 119:4,22 120:5,12 121:1,8,10 122:19</p>	<p>123:1,12,18 124:4 124:11 126:12 128:11 130:2,12 130:15 131:19 132:1,10,12 133:3 133:19,21 135:8 135:17 136:12,13 136:16,18,19 137:4,4,7,14,15 137:20 138:1,10 138:15 139:11 140:4,6,7,19 141:4,7,10 142:16 143:5,6,10 144:4 144:6,7,15 145:20 146:13,19 147:9 147:20 148:4 150:20 151:2,12 152:20 153:9,11 153:15 158:7 159:6 160:2 162:22 165:9 168:6 170:8,20 172:15,17 173:16 173:19 174:2,2,8 176:15,21 177:10 177:10,20 178:6 178:10,14,15 179:7,17 189:12 193:3,5,6 209:4 210:22 215:3 216:12,19 218:18 220:7,9 223:18 225:5 232:13 234:19 238:1 240:4 241:15 242:22 243:16 246:4 255:12 257:13 259:2,12 259:14,19,21 260:10 261:2,7 263:4,16,20 264:3 264:11,14,21 267:2,18,21,22</p>
--	--	---	--

<p>269:3 270:2,16 271:7 275:3 276:9 278:12 279:15,19 280:6 281:1,21 282:7,11 284:12 285:15 286:22 288:8,11,22 290:6 290:15,16 291:2 291:12 294:7 295:17,18 298:3,6 298:14 301:2,11 302:8 303:13 304:9 305:15 306:8,9 307:20 308:4,9,10 309:7 309:19 310:4,18 310:22 311:19 312:19 315:1,3,15 316:7,15 318:2,12 318:22 319:9 321:7,8 323:5,9 323:12 324:3 325:12,19 326:6 327:1 328:13 329:9 330:4,15 331:1,2,3,4,5 332:8 334:9,11,20 335:9,13 336:1 337:13 341:3,3,18 thinking 47:7 86:14 87:6 88:3 88:10 102:9 176:19 249:5 286:6 289:1 298:19 337:14 thinks 308:22 third 98:16 146:18 151:21 155:1 198:6 218:15 311:5,8 thirdly 72:15 77:21 thomas 5:12 12:8 19:15</p>	<p>thought 14:19 79:22 80:7 85:19 86:17,18 88:6 93:13 95:14 100:12 107:19 108:11 111:6 112:9 115:10 162:21 170:21 186:21 207:3 227:1 237:2 257:11 259:3 289:3 290:7 317:4 322:13 323:17 341:19 thoughtful 108:15 thoughts 58:20 85:22 95:1 143:4 144:4,18 251:16 288:17 325:5 340:21 341:17 thousand 106:14 three 34:13 59:5 64:5 66:22 71:2 72:6 74:9 75:17 80:10 81:9,10,15 81:15,19 82:5,6 82:19 83:12 84:1 86:17 96:19 99:11 100:3 146:19 149:12 176:16 180:5 210:3 211:18 221:17 230:17,19 231:3,7 231:8 260:19 263:3 271:9,20 273:17 274:6,16 279:10 280:13 303:22 304:1 305:16 307:16 309:5 threefold 222:21 threshold 47:22 130:6 143:9</p>	<p>thresholds 320:5 throw 102:13 323:15 throwing 280:20 310:17 tick 321:20 ticket 162:9 tie 174:3 tied 331:14 tier 125:4 till 246:5 tim 18:16 130:18 153:22 159:1 179:18 282:3 285:8 293:14 294:2 297:13 time 16:7 32:6 39:18 45:5 51:6 52:12,22 54:8 56:4,14 60:5 61:11 68:6 70:9 75:2,12,16 77:6 80:13 82:8,8,15 85:2,6 86:13,22 87:14 88:2,10,15 89:6 91:4 95:18 96:11,17,22 98:12 98:19 100:8 109:8 109:14 117:14 118:4 120:15 121:21 130:17 131:11,13,22 132:9,14 134:4,13 134:16 135:4,7,13 135:18 136:2,9 137:21 138:7 141:20 143:14 145:8,11 159:7 160:21 164:22 176:8 190:22 193:8,21 195:18 196:13 197:4 198:21 199:12 202:2,18 203:16</p>	<p>204:1 208:1,19,20 209:8 214:10,11 218:6,10,16,20 226:13,14 227:6 228:5,11 229:1,6 232:11,11 239:1,4 239:6 247:18 251:19 252:4,7 253:9,9 254:14 255:9,15,20,22 256:1,4,6 258:12 259:1,3 262:11,17 264:2 266:17 275:13 276:13,22 277:1 281:18 282:9,19,22 284:7 284:19 286:2,3 287:14 288:3,13 291:4,13 308:8 310:15 312:22 316:9 323:4 327:10 334:13,14 334:15 335:17 336:12,13 341:10 timeframe 307:22 timeline 32:3 timely 273:15 times 45:21 63:21 72:6,7 75:18,18 81:16 83:12,12 96:19 100:3 181:15 191:4 193:7 238:18 256:18 293:12 305:16 timing 92:2 96:17 timothy 4:8 tino 4:18 12:11 19:2,2 108:19 205:2,10,10,15 236:13 242:22 267:12 269:21 271:19 294:6 324:14,16 330:11</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>333:12 tino's 241:7 251:8 tissue 174:1 titled 31:6,12 tn 8:2 tob 64:4 tobi 52:11,14 55:19,21 71:1 78:17 81:11,13 82:10,11,13 92:15 95:16,17 101:6 105:7,8 109:1 116:5,6,14,14 121:8 122:3 146:17 159:7 167:15 tobramycin 52:13 52:16 55:11 59:14 60:7 61:1,5,12,18 90:13 96:4,9 97:5 101:16 118:10 120:14 122:5 157:3,3 159:7,11 159:11 200:22 201:5 223:10 225:9 331:1 tobras 98:17 today 15:4 26:10 32:22 33:16 35:10 36:10 46:8 58:20 59:2 66:20 69:19 76:21 79:4 87:4 98:6 102:18 143:5 180:12 181:3 186:14 188:1 194:3 195:6 210:18 219:19 236:15,19 241:1 242:1,9,11 244:7 251:2 279:9 287:19 340:11 341:4,8 today's 14:6 48:17 83:17,17 84:11</p>	<p>194:16 told 182:1 tolerability 109:3 109:7 202:7 tolerable 105:5 tolerate 105:9 109:5 157:16 tolerated 102:20 227:2 tom 12:4 tool 87:2 295:12 303:10 306:13 331:17 tools 56:8 295:11 307:6 top 134:2 243:6 276:12 323:19 topic 59:12 80:1,3 209:13 topical 158:9,13 topics 59:5 toss 126:6 total 24:6 130:9 185:17,18 192:3 204:7 253:14,15 254:5 257:7 259:5 267:17 298:15 299:1,10 303:14 303:15,20 304:3 308:17 316:3,22 317:10 328:19 329:4 332:15 333:13,22 337:15 338:5,5 totaled 262:20 totally 137:4 touch 225:6 touched 225:5 242:15,16 tough 118:5 129:8 266:2 285:16 tougher 170:6 toxicity 223:18</p>	<p>track 68:10 72:7 76:10 149:3 306:5 tract 163:22 173:15 206:14 231:14,19 tracy 3:16 12:20 18:5,5 103:2 127:14,16 135:20 250:9,12 289:11 315:1,3 326:16 tracy's 295:17 traditional 70:5 78:21 106:6 160:3 traditionally 229:15 trail 54:4 trails 55:19 233:20 289:12 trained 158:2,6 183:12 trainees 218:10 training 318:11 319:11 transcriber 344:1 transcript 344:3 transdermal 27:12 transition 138:20 translate 243:3 translated 111:22 translates 178:18 translational 4:16 transplant 178:10 230:16 234:12 transport 37:19 trapped 238:7,9 travel 341:10,11 travelling 238:7 travels 341:22 treat 37:12 55:5 66:3 74:2 133:9 136:15 139:1 144:12 164:15 169:18 170:7</p>	<p>171:19 182:4 188:16 201:17 213:3 214:10 226:18 242:2 294:4 319:7 340:20 treated 139:11,15 139:19 150:2 151:8 153:7 198:2 224:8 232:20 256:6 treating 80:2,8 97:9 145:6 152:6 158:18 163:2 165:20 170:16,18 183:12 186:1 251:6 292:21,22 treatment 11:12 14:6,8 17:21 54:13 64:19 66:9 66:12 74:20 80:3 80:19 81:1,2,3 89:8 91:10 93:3 93:16 95:10 104:11,14 105:1 106:1 124:6,13,17 124:18 126:1 133:14 136:17 138:4,9 140:21 150:19 151:4 152:4 155:22 157:4 158:9,14,20 159:9,12,21 161:3 164:2 166:9 168:8 173:3,17 182:3 183:10 194:14 195:20 197:3 198:11 200:2,8,16 200:20 203:12,19 204:12,20 205:20 208:5,9 210:10,17 212:6 213:1,16 214:18 217:6 225:21 234:13</p>
--	---	--	--

236:2 241:6,19	148:13,21 150:10	86:1,10,11,11	297:22 300:22
242:17 247:4	163:13 182:9,15	87:7,7,13,17	301:7 302:16
248:11 249:10	182:16 183:17,18	92:19 94:11 99:3	303:1 310:7
250:5 252:3 253:1	184:2,6,13 185:2	101:3 107:19	319:11 324:9,19
259:19 260:2	185:5 189:2,12,16	108:3,4 121:11,21	324:20 325:12
274:15 277:6	191:18,22 192:7	128:16 130:9	328:3 329:9 330:2
279:3,4 284:9	192:13,22 193:3	133:8 134:11	330:8 331:6,18
292:15 308:14	197:8,11,12,14,14	136:19 137:12,16	333:21 334:16
319:3 321:6 323:9	198:21 203:6,7	140:6 141:8 143:9	336:21 337:5
323:11 329:13	204:11 208:8	143:17 144:7	338:16 339:12
337:16,17 338:1	216:1,8,11,17	145:17 147:13	340:13,17
treatments 1:7	217:7 226:13,17	148:8 164:7 169:1	tricky 58:1,5
86:8,8 95:8	227:11,12,14	174:12,14,16	tried 20:6 58:6
101:15 188:2,3,13	230:21 244:7,11	175:6 182:3,6,12	97:19 303:21
190:12 194:19	245:3,4,8 246:14	182:13,22 183:20	trigger 336:20
195:8,21 198:3	246:17 247:12	185:3 186:9,15	triggers 337:10
208:5 245:20	249:3,19,21 251:3	188:7,16,18,22	triple 128:3
293:7	251:14,14 253:1	189:7,7 190:19	tripled 67:17
tremendous	253:15 255:13	193:10,12 194:13	trivial 83:13
289:22	256:6 257:4 260:4	195:15 197:1,2	trouble 281:20
tremendously	260:5 261:14	200:14 201:9,17	troublesome
341:12	262:1,21 263:15	202:10,16 203:5,9	104:8
trend 121:12	263:21 264:3,21	204:9 209:3,11	true 124:12
trial 11:4 12:17	265:12 266:3,6	210:2,16 216:7	127:20 128:11
14:21 18:11 45:3	268:5 271:17	225:3,8 227:15,20	148:9,11,15 170:8
53:8 54:1 55:17	284:7,20 285:7	227:20 228:16	187:4 201:6
56:19 57:2,3	287:19 290:17,18	229:20 230:18,19	222:21 257:13,15
63:19 66:22 86:18	291:18 292:6	230:20 231:6,7	278:14 283:4
88:8,20 91:15	302:17,18,19,20	232:9 233:18	305:6 312:19
94:11,12 95:9,12	307:8 309:13	235:4,21 242:6	330:7 343:6
102:20 106:9,9,12	311:6,6,9 312:1	243:1,11,20 244:6	truly 75:8 165:16
106:15,16 107:1,2	323:21 325:22	245:2 247:5,9	174:22 195:20
107:6,6,8,19,20	326:19,20 327:16	248:14,15 249:6,7	trust 154:6
110:11 111:6	329:12,15 330:14	249:12,22 250:4,7	truth 72:11
112:5,10 115:15	330:18 331:9	250:22 251:5	try 15:15 16:2
116:10,11,21	333:14,17 334:1,6	252:9 253:7,13	25:15 45:18 46:10
117:3,7 120:4,9	334:8,10,22 335:1	258:9,12,18,18	64:2 73:18 80:15
120:22 121:3,5	338:4 339:3,4,15	259:16,18,22	94:4 104:20 107:9
122:14 123:4,6	339:22	261:8 263:12,16	115:19 150:15
125:22 129:2,5	trials 17:2 20:1,10	264:8 266:2	155:14 162:10
134:14,17 136:7	53:7 54:2 56:6,9	271:22 283:9	174:3 204:13
136:21 137:8	56:17,20 58:15	289:4,12,21 290:9	241:11 272:13
140:12,18 141:7	64:9 69:20 70:13	290:21 291:16	273:19 275:17
145:18 147:22	71:6 73:3,8 76:13	292:7 294:11,12	285:19 286:19,20

<p>288:3 294:12 296:4 299:5 310:3 313:19 315:4 319:5 322:9 340:17 trying 60:20 78:3 82:16 94:10 96:18 101:12 106:20 112:17 119:14 126:13,13 149:22 151:5 155:2,20 160:14 162:7 168:6 202:5 221:6 240:11 245:18 247:3 250:22 262:9 263:5 269:3 273:17 286:6 296:1 303:20 310:5 312:1 316:15,22 ts 132:21 tuberculos 180:16 tuberculosis 298:5 turn 138:1 157:12 195:4 198:13 230:7 312:3 turned 330:9 turning 219:17 turns 215:12 221:18 twice 81:13 83:11 96:18,19 227:21 277:10 two 47:9 48:14 59:13 62:5,8 64:6 64:7,19 65:9 68:8 70:4 72:5,21 74:8 76:11 80:10 81:9 81:10,12,13,14,19 82:19 83:4,5 84:1 84:8,10 86:16 89:1 90:15 92:14 96:18 98:20 99:10 100:2 106:5,19</p>	<p>109:3,8 111:2 117:17 118:3,20 119:10,17 133:18 146:18 155:16 171:6,16 180:20 184:13 192:22 202:12 203:9 218:14 227:17,18 228:1,20 231:3 242:5 246:11 250:6 255:20 257:9 258:20 260:15 263:3,20 270:11 279:9 284:14 298:6 299:7 305:16 307:15 322:10 type 31:10,16,20 39:13,18 40:20 43:5,5,5 122:20 190:13 256:9 277:14 306:10 types 31:3 55:15 190:10 275:11 312:8 typewriting 343:5 typical 39:6 63:6 69:21 typically 35:7,10 70:19 111:16,17 157:14 218:2,4 229:22 284:3 293:22 298:17</p>	<p>ultimately 32:7 102:4 185:2,5 187:9 196:15 235:2 236:22 un 104:20 188:7 unable 25:12 68:3 96:15 unanswered 230:4 unblended 107:15 unblinded 77:16 78:13 uncertainties 69:14 200:7 247:11 unclear 183:20 uncomfortable 86:12 uncommon 191:3 underestimate 68:1 underlined 211:14 underlying 181:8 213:14,16 216:21 232:1 289:16 underpowered 260:6 underreporting 295:9 underscore 182:5 underscored 239:11 underscores 69:11 218:21 224:10 241:9 understand 23:20 29:6,8 36:2,4 38:2 38:13 47:21 80:13 80:20 86:15 103:3 112:17 117:13 129:3 150:15 164:9 169:12 171:18 179:14 195:13 196:5 198:10,15 250:22</p>	<p>252:15 285:22 289:15 290:5 295:19 329:14 340:22 understandably 195:1 understanding 23:15 34:22 50:2 139:12 140:13 understood 53:19 undertake 334:22 unethical 117:2 183:22 unexpected 25:19 unfeasible 96:20 unfortunate 200:1 unfortunately 25:12 145:8 148:21 208:21 210:12 216:2,6 225:18 229:14 258:15 unidentified 98:7 98:10 107:11 144:1 282:15 284:2,6,17 289:9 299:21 305:2,7,19 309:18 317:12 320:7,8 325:8 335:20 342:6 unified 71:16 91:13 151:6 uniformly 301:9 unilateral 267:4 unintended 334:7 union 296:13 unique 44:6,6 69:13 138:13 unit 334:13 united 19:7 114:15 206:9 213:20 215:17 235:16 290:1,20</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">u</p>		
	<p>u.k. 17:12 224:15 317:20 u.s. 1:2 18:19 114:14 149:11 157:17 215:13 224:4 296:19 298:2 302:1 uk 2:19 154:6 294:18</p>		

<p>units 220:20 225:13 226:20 227:1 universal 326:12 university 2:16 3:2,6,11 4:3,22 5:6 6:16 7:21 10:12 12:5 17:11 17:15,19 18:1,11 19:4,9,18 20:9 21:3 205:11 unmet 59:8 64:14 64:17 65:15,18 66:6 68:22 78:18 90:3 111:15 119:13 147:18 181:21 194:17 198:18 199:4,8 unproven 190:19 unrelated 188:16 unreported 337:12 unsure 34:17 untenable 183:22 unusual 150:5 324:4 unusually 332:20 upcoming 330:14 update 205:11 updated 30:19 upper 73:2 268:9 270:12,14 299:17 300:3,7,14 ups 196:19 upset 162:15 uptake 60:7,11 urge 199:3 urgency 198:12 urinary 173:15 usage 96:6 216:11 usages 25:20 use 16:21 23:3 24:17,17 25:3,5 25:18 27:7,18</p>	<p>28:1,3,8,16,20 29:2,5,11,12,14 29:15,22 30:3,5,9 31:13 32:10 33:18 35:15,17,21,22 37:3,10,12,17,18 37:18,21 38:4,18 39:6,18 40:1 42:17 43:14 44:7 44:18 45:4,21 46:4,6,11 48:11 49:20 50:6,12,16 56:4,9,15 61:6,10 61:16,20,21 62:1 62:15 63:14 68:15 69:10 70:18,21 78:20 90:5 91:18 96:9 97:8,12,22 100:7 111:20 128:3,4 134:14 142:22 148:9 149:5,21 151:1 152:17 155:3,9,9 156:13,19 158:3,4 158:15 159:18 165:5 181:19 183:11 189:21 190:14 195:14,22 197:22 198:5,19 199:2 200:9 203:17 215:10,12 215:13,16 216:4 216:19 219:19,19 219:21 222:10 223:11 230:14 231:12 232:3,16 233:3,5 234:8 241:1 243:2 248:18 249:18 250:1 252:6 253:6 256:12 272:13,18 286:21 287:20,20 288:3 294:15 295:12 298:17</p>	<p>304:14 308:16,19 317:1 318:7,8 321:18 330:21,22 331:1,21,22 332:1 336:21 useful 78:14 149:13 159:21 160:1,4 169:5 182:17 289:15 313:12 user 27:18 28:20 29:3,7 users 23:20 25:18 28:20,21 30:6 50:14 60:22 61:1 62:14 uses 45:1 231:3 usual 99:1 152:5 usually 55:7 212:12 297:14 298:13 333:6 utility 203:18 204:21 338:9 utilization 94:18 96:4,8,10 149:2 272:17 utilized 187:6 219:15 utmost 195:8</p>	<p>valuable 15:10 341:13 valuation 112:2 value 135:5,6,7,9 135:13 143:7 154:19 185:7 227:8 valve 215:13 valves 218:4 vancomycin 139:14 148:12 149:1 vandevanter 3:21 18:9,9 101:8 112:16 126:15 127:15,20 147:3 148:11 149:18 150:11 152:11 153:9 158:1 160:15 168:1 169:21 170:8 172:19 175:8 319:2 vantage 180:20 variability 38:22 174:11 197:21 214:5 237:5 266:19 278:12 variable 139:13 236:20 267:11 284:8 297:15 variably 214:19 variance 138:22 292:16 variation 293:8 variations 335:11 varied 236:20 238:3 304:6,8 varies 92:1 variety 54:16,16 161:16 175:4 200:16 247:20 various 15:12 38:10,10 83:19</p>
v			
		<p>valid 313:13,13,18 validate 27:18 133:13 292:9 327:12 validated 91:22 92:12 142:13 208:21 244:15 287:17,21 295:7 307:1,3 315:6 324:7 326:18,22 327:4 328:22 validation 29:12 29:13 30:1 37:8 41:19 111:1</p>	

<p>241:22 290:9 308:2 vary 92:3,5 247:16,17 varying 24:5 131:21 254:19 256:4,7 ventilator 41:18 venture 272:9 versa 108:2 159:5 265:2 268:21 version 36:6 52:16 61:20 versus 39:19 46:5 61:1 71:12 72:5 90:11 91:8 92:9 95:17 106:8,15 109:12 113:5 116:14 134:4,13 134:18 151:16 192:20 202:8 209:9 226:10 227:7 230:4 252:22 263:13 264:7 276:19 vertex 87:22 vertical 192:17 vet 114:5 viable 72:12 vial 27:4 vibratory 215:11 vice 108:2 159:5 265:2 268:21 vicious 181:16 241:7 video 25:11,12,14 25:15,16,18 view 59:7 64:13 69:6 71:5 72:11 72:11 75:21 83:3 94:2,16 110:21 117:9 121:16 163:10 171:4 179:5 250:21</p>	<p>viewed 57:14,19 59:10 violations 319:9 virtually 184:5 262:18 virulence 164:18 168:14 239:22 245:12 virulent 165:16 174:1 viruses 237:12 viscous 212:8,11 212:11,19 visits 338:12 vitro 47:13,14,20 160:3 vogue 57:16 voice 79:11 volatile 40:13 volume 97:14 210:5 volumes 211:20 voluminous 212:4 volunteers 267:8 vulnerability 48:7</p>	<p>127:17 130:18 136:5 140:4 143:12 146:15 153:19 156:3 162:17 168:1 169:14 175:14 178:13 196:15 218:8 236:7,18 239:13 240:6 245:17 248:11 253:11 254:11 255:11 257:5,19 259:12 264:15,16 271:8,14 274:12 278:16 282:15 283:5 291:4 294:6 299:13 302:3 305:5,11 307:11 312:18,20 321:19 325:8 326:11 328:9 334:5 335:20 339:14 340:10,20 341:15 wanted 107:17 112:8 128:8 163:17 170:22 179:3 216:15 219:4 250:18 268:1 276:2 283:3 284:19 298:21 308:9 311:3,8 319:2 wanting 240:6 wants 95:20 112:20 246:22 342:4 wash 112:20 washington 3:11 18:2 19:19 washout 116:9 waste 193:8 watch 114:20 watching 236:15</p>	<p>water 284:13 waxing 280:22 way 16:17 46:3,9 48:16,18 77:14 83:2,13 85:9,17 86:6 87:14,15 93:13 100:1,9 116:2 119:2,5 137:7 158:5 159:3 182:6 184:7 206:2 225:10 255:11 256:3 263:2 268:3 273:10 275:20 276:6 293:4 296:13,21 298:13 298:20 299:5,11 299:12 316:4 319:7 324:4 326:13 327:5 335:2,21 336:1,4 ways 14:22 15:15 25:19 85:2 88:3,3 119:6 134:12 213:21 324:8 329:1 338:20 we've 14:16,16 15:4 42:2 46:20 46:21 78:8 89:5 97:8 101:22 102:11 110:17,18 111:19 112:16 113:5 114:1 120:11 138:12 140:7 141:18 142:10 144:5,19 148:4 159:19 167:14 168:20 170:11 171:5,15 173:19 175:4 202:12 209:5,6 214:18 217:10 219:18 223:8,22 225:3 232:9 235:14 236:19</p>
	<p>w</p>		
	<p>wa 3:15 6:2 waiting 285:9 waldo 166:22 walk 28:9,18 wall 215:16 waning 96:9 280:22 want 14:10 16:6 42:1 49:12 52:3 59:4 62:3 63:4 68:17 71:4 72:10 72:15 73:6,16,17 74:3 76:12 78:5 79:3 80:19 84:13 84:16 86:7,8 96:2 96:13 98:7 107:15 109:2 112:21 114:14 119:2</p>		

<p>241:1 242:1,2 255:2 260:10 262:5 265:3,14 266:7 270:10 272:14 280:14 285:12 291:15 292:13 293:15 298:22 316:21 318:19 329:10 330:16 334:21 338:9 340:12 weak 218:1 weakness 255:7 web 16:15 website 34:19 wednesday 1:16 week 112:21 202:16 229:2 240:15 258:11 305:16 322:15 weekly 306:5 weeks 62:9 70:4,5 102:10,10 110:20 112:20 184:13 201:2 226:20 227:22 228:17 262:19 275:16,21 276:19,19 277:1,2 277:7,9,12 280:5 281:9 286:2,3 293:19,20 317:4,5 319:17 322:18 336:2 342:3 weigh 123:5 weighted 308:22 324:2 weird 86:6 136:22 welcome 32:20 51:15 93:18 144:18 welcoming 14:5 wellbeing 23:17 23:22</p>	<p>wen 8:12 21:14 went 63:11 192:22 238:19 239:5 273:2 320:22 325:9,15 western 4:3 18:10 297:11 wheezing 237:9 white 1:11 who've 283:6 wide 96:5 188:14 widespread 78:21 wife 236:17 williams 256:17 willing 87:12 143:10 170:12 197:7,13 willingness 15:11 119:18 175:16 341:8,13 window 16:5 withdrawal 115:9 116:8 122:9 women 244:13 wonder 87:1 273:4 289:2 299:4 299:18 wondering 108:11 121:13 247:22 266:18 316:11 wong 240:18 241:12 word 109:4 151:1 179:1 words 103:16 334:3 work 16:17 25:9 34:15 43:18,21 79:20 80:6,13 82:8,15 84:11,14 86:4 88:10 108:16 112:16 119:15,21 165:14 171:5,7,21 209:6,14 217:11</p>	<p>222:9 238:5,14 239:9 273:6 276:1 296:1,21 306:2 308:11 340:14 worked 51:20 145:3 161:11 259:17 340:14 working 15:21 32:8 78:6 79:12 79:17 82:17 84:16 88:9 111:1 119:12 119:18 122:11 199:7 272:13 278:9,20 281:2 289:10 306:10 works 32:18 84:14 100:18 111:21 118:6 145:2 173:14 217:10 workshop 1:5 14:6 181:3 182:2 184:8 186:7 194:16 201:8 205:17 250:18 325:15,16 workshops 15:10 world 78:22 102:11 155:7 182:7 183:9 247:19 259:15 291:19 292:14 296:11 342:2 worldwide 303:5 worried 163:5 worry 114:19 118:22 120:6 122:19 240:2,5,6 240:13 261:22 worse 85:12,13 115:14,16 122:9 222:5 243:12 276:20 279:17 319:17</p>	<p>worsening 322:17 337:2 worst 145:13 239:8 worth 66:10 67:14 73:20 111:10 130:16 290:15 291:3 302:13 worthy 111:11 wrestle 176:8 297:3 write 34:20 wrong 176:2 wrote 234:18</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">x</p> <hr/> <p>x 60:4,16 68:6 90:6,11 91:8 107:21 108:1 128:4 160:4 324:6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">y</p> <hr/> <p>y 60:19 68:7 107:21 246:22 yeah 25:15 45:9 45:20 46:13,14 96:13 99:20 102:16 105:15 107:12,13 110:15 111:5,19 115:10 118:15 127:16 128:15 129:13 136:11 153:5 162:19 165:7 169:21 170:13,17 173:11 265:22 267:6 271:19 273:21 274:19 276:9 277:12 279:14 280:9 281:7,12,14 282:4 282:5 285:10 291:7 298:11 300:4,5,8 301:15 305:2,19 306:8,12</p>
---	---	---	---

<p>306:12 307:3,20 311:10,13,16,18 313:5,19 316:17 317:13 319:22 320:7 325:8 328:12 335:5 338:15 341:15 342:6 year 63:3 83:1 91:19 100:14 146:13 168:20 191:4 197:20 202:13 204:11,17 206:10,11 211:3 211:19 227:22 230:2 231:2 239:3 239:4 243:6 248:13,15 249:7 249:11,13,21 260:18 261:19,19 262:8,10 263:13 265:1,1,2,18 266:12 271:10 274:2,4,6,15 277:15 280:5 281:16 283:11 285:17,17 288:12 297:13 299:2 311:4,5,8,8 329:12 330:3 334:10,15 335:1 335:22 336:2 338:10,12,17 339:4,22 340:1 yearlong 109:21 yearly 221:17 years 14:15 17:17 17:21 18:12 20:1 32:3 39:3 59:17 60:16 67:1,19 69:2 72:21 75:17 79:18 82:12 90:17 92:13,16 96:6 97:10 100:21</p>	<p>105:7 108:9 120:20 121:9 122:1 124:15 127:8 139:5 157:1 159:10 167:15 179:16 180:19 181:14,17 182:1 184:3,3,5,10 190:1 197:2,9 201:8 211:9,12,13 214:3 217:7 221:4 222:15 225:3 226:7 237:10,18 239:7 249:15 265:12 274:16 280:3 283:8 325:10 331:5 338:9 yellow 61:7,14 yesterday 238:8 yield 185:5 yielded 200:6 yields 187:11 young 139:4,4 211:5 237:8 younger 46:10 190:1</p>	
	z	
	<p>zealand 224:16 339:8 zeitlin 6:3 19:21 19:21 98:8,11 162:14 266:11 zero 125:2 221:16 285:13 293:5 zimmerman 8:9 12:13 21:10,10 49:7 205:4 236:8 236:12 274:11,17 274:20 275:3 276:9,21 278:11 279:8 282:5,7 304:22 305:3 306:22 312:16</p>	