			11149 7, 2021			
			Page 1			
1	Drug Develop	ment Considerations for the Trea	atment of			
2	Neonatal Enterovirus Infection and Congenital					
3	Cytomegalovirus Infection					
4	Virtual Public Workshop					
5						
6						
7						
8		Moderated by Sunita Shukla				
9		Tuesday, May 7, 2024				
10		9:00 a.m.				
11						
12						
13	Remote Proceeding					
14		Washington, D.C. 20005				
15						
16						
17						
18						
19	Reported by:	Alexandra Hobrecht				
20	JOB NO.:	6444256				
21						
22						

	Wiee	tiii	g	May 7, 2024
	Page 2			Page 4
1	APPEARANCES	1	CONTENTS	S
2	List of Attendees:	2		PAGE
3	Jeffrey Hincks, Ph.D., ViroDefense, Inc.	3	Dr. Yodit Belew	5
4	Kevin Messacar, M.D., Ph.D., University of Colorado	4	Dr. Prabha Viswanathan	12
5	David Byron, AntiVirus Therapeutics	5	Dr. An Massaro	31
6	Corey Farley, AV Support	6	Dr. Kunyi Wu	50
7	Marcus Washington, AV Support	7	Betsy Pilon	59
8	Yodit Belew, M.D., FDA	8	Dr. Yeruk Mulugeta	75
9	Prabha Viswanathan, M.D., FDA	9	Dr. John Concato	91
10	An Massaro, M.D., FDA	10	Dr. Natalie Pica	112, 166
11	Kunyi Wu, Pharm.D., FDA	11	Dr. Amy Rosenfeld	112
12	Betsy Pilon, Hope for HIE	12	Dr. Miranda Delahoy	122
13	Yeruk Mulugeta, Pharm.D., FDA	13	Dr. Mark Abzug	131
14	John Concato, M.D., MPH, FDA	14		
15	Natalie Pica, M.D., Ph.D., FDA	15		
16	Amy Rosenfeld, Ph.D., FDA	16		
17	Miranda Delahoy, Ph.D., CDC	17		
18	Mark Abzug, M.D., University of Colorado	18		
19	Aimee Hodowanec, FDA	19		
20	Matthew Vogt, M.D., Ph.D., UNC Chapel Hill School of	20		
21	Medicine	21		
22	Tatiana Lanzieri	22		
	Page 3			Page 5
1	APPEARANCES (Cont'd)	1	PROCEEDING	S
2	List of Attendees:	2	DR. BELEW: Good m	orning, everyone. It
3	Robert Debiasi		is my honor to welcome our spea	-
4	Wendy Carter	4	audience to this important works	hop on the topic of
5	David Kimberlin, M.D., University of Alabama at	5	drug development for the treatme	ent of neonatal
	Birmingham	6	enteroviral infection and congent	ital CMV infection.
	Mark Schleiss, M.D.	7	It is also my privilege to	o present the
8	Steve Oberste, Ph.D., CDC	8	opening remark and set the stage	for what I hope will
9		9	be a productive and valuable wor	rkshop.
10		10	Next slide, please.	
11		11	My name is Yodit Bele	w. I am the
12		12	Associate Director for Therapeut	ic Review in the
13		13	Division of Antivirals, Office of	Infectious Diseases,
14		14	CDER, FDA.	
15		15	Next slide, please.	
16		16	So about this time last y	year, the WHO,
17			among others, put out a disease-o	
18		18	due to regarding a severe enter	roviral infection in
19			infants and neonates, leading to 1	·
20		20	hospitalizations, including ICU a	dmissions.
21			Unfortunately, at least one infant	died due to this
22		22	outbreak.	
		_		

Meeting May 7, 2024 Page 6 1 Next slide, please. 1 adequate and well-controlled trials, which include 2 clear stated objectives or hypothesis of the trial 2 Congenital CMV infection is the leading 3 infectious cause of birth defects and 3 well before the trial is initiated, a comparator-4 neurodevelopmental disabilities, including deafness. 4 treatment group for quantifying or for qualitative 5 assessment of efficacy, clearly defined eligibility 5 The CDC estimates that 1 out of every 200 babies is 6 born with congenital CMV, with majority being 6 criteria, ensuring that the population has the disease 7 asymptomatic at birth. 7 of interest, steps to minimize bias, well-defined With adoption of universal screening 8 endpoints for assessing treatment effect, and sound 9 statistical-analysis plan. 9 similar to what Minnesota has introduced, one can 10 Next slide, please. 10 expect that many more neonates with congenital CMV 11 11 will be identified at birth. As many here might be familiar, there 12 12 is also an alternative pathway for establishing Next slide, please. 13 Both CMV infection and neonatal 13 substantial evidence of effectiveness in the pediatric 14 population. 14 enteroviral infection can be serious and potentially 15 life-threatening. More specifically, severe neonatal 15 That is to say that efficacy of a 16 product can be extrapolated from adults to pediatric 16 enteroviral infection and symptomatic congenital CMV 17 population if there already is an adequate and well-17 are associated with higher risk of morbidity and 18 mortality. 18 controlled clinical trial in adults, demonstrating 19 Based on the literature and epi data, 19 substantial evidence of effectiveness. 20 these conditions can be considered rare; and to 20 This extrapolation principle is applied 21 only when the agency has concluded that the course of 21 provide some regulatory context, Section 526(a)(2)(A) 22 the disease and the drug's effect are sufficiently 22 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act defines a Page 9 Page 7 1 rare disease or condition in part as a disease or 1 similar between adults and pediatric populations to 2 condition that affects less than 200,000 persons in 2 permit extrapolation from adult efficacy data to 3 the United States. 3 pediatric patients. 4 4 As we are all aware, there are no FDA Next slide. 5 5 approved antiviral products for the treatment of So to bring us back full circle, 6 enteroviral infection or congenital CMV infection in 6 because congenital CMV infection and neonatal 7 neonates or infants. So why is that? 7 enteroviral infection are unique or distinct 8 Next slide, please. 8 conditions limited to infants and neonatal 9 9 populations, adult data cannot be leveraged to If we step back and think about the 10 regulatory framework, there is a specific evidentiary 10 establish effectiveness. 11 requirement for establishing efficacy. Sponsors of 11 And conducting adequate and well-

12 drug products are required to establish safety and

13 efficacy in both adult and pediatric populations

14 before a product can be approved.

15 And how they demonstrate substantial 16 evidence of effectiveness is through adequate and

17 well-controlled clinical trials on the basis of which

18 it could fairly and responsibly be concluded that the

19 drug will have the effect it purports to have under

20 the condition of use.

21 Next slide.

22 Outlined here are the elements of 12 controlled clinical trials in these populations, while

13 necessary, is undoubtedly very challenging for many

14 reasons.

15 To name a few characteristics, we have 16 poorly understood or not well-characterized natural 17 history; potential challenges with designing well-

18 powered studies due to small population size; and

19 challenges in trial designs, including selection of

20 endpoints.

21 Next slide, please.

22 And that is essentially why we are here

Page 10 1 today, to discuss the challenges and identify the 1 disclosures are also available on the meeting website 2 needed additional scientific work to advance drug 2 under "Meeting Materials." 3 3 development for the treatment of neonatal enteroviral For the general audience, please note 4 infection and congenital CMV infection. 4 that your microphone and video are automatically 5 FDA Public Workshop is intended to 5 turned off. Please submit questions using the Q-and-A 6 facilitate exchange of ideas among stakeholders to 6 feature at the bottom center of your screen and Zoom 7 identify research gaps and help advance the field to 7 platform. 8 8 address unmet medical need. Next slide, please. 9 9 To clarify, FDA Public Workshops are And we are honored to have with us this 10 morning Dr. Prabha Viswanathan, Dr. An Massaro, Dr. 10 not advisory to the agency; and the agency will not 11 provide drug-development advice. It is not for 11 Kunyi Wu, Ms. Betsy Pilon, Dr. Lily Mulugeta, and Dr. 12 regulatory decision-making; and all opinions, 12 John Concato to kickstart the workshop. 13 recommendations, and proposals are unofficial and 13 Next slide. 14 14 nonbinding on FDA or other participants. And it is my pleasure to introduce 15 Next slide, please. 15 formally our first speaker, Dr. Prabha Viswanathan, 16 So I look forward to a discussion both 16 Deputy Director of Office of Pediatric Therapeutics. 17 today and tomorrow. We hope this workshop will move 17 Dr. Viswanathan's presentation will focus on ethical 18 considerations for pediatric clinical trials. Thank 18 us closer towards our shared goal of advancing drug 19 development to address these unmet needs. You should 19 you. 20 have full access to the agenda online, but I wanted to 20 DR. VISWANATHAN: Good morning, 21 briefly highlight the key segments. 21 everyone. It's a privilege to be here, and thank you 22 So the workshop will begin with several 22 for your attendance. We'll be beginning Session 1 Page 13 Page 11 1 presentations on the general principle of pediatric 1 with a brief overview of ethical considerations for 2 pediatric clinical trials. 2 and neonatal drug development. 3 3 Next slide, please. After we return from about a 20-minute 4 I have no disclosures. 4 break, the rest of the day will focus on neonatal 5 Next slide, please. 5 enteroviral infection with presentations during 6 Session 2 and panel discussion during Session 3. 6 So just an overview of what you can 7 Lunch break will be from 12:20 to 1:00 p.m., and we 7 expect this morning, this is going to be a high-level 8 30,000-foot view of pediatric ethics. 8 will adjourn today at around 3:30 p.m. 9 9 We'll begin with a discussion of the Next slide, please. 10 general ethical framework that we use to analyze our 10 Day 2 will be entirely dedicated to 11 congenital CMV infection with presentations during the 11 protocols, and then we'll see how that ethical 12 morning session and panel discussion during the 12 framework leads into the regulations that govern the 13 afternoon. Again, lunch break will be from 12:20 to 13 inclusion of children in research, and I'll be really 14 1:00 p.m.; and the workshop will conclude at 3:30 p.m. 14 stressing four key concepts. 15 15 The first is the prospect of direct Next slide, please. 16 benefit, followed by the assessment of risk, the 16 And before I introduce our morning 17 component analysis of risk, and finally the need for 17 speakers, let me run through a few housekeeping items. 18 parent and guardian permission; and then we'll end 18 So, one, this meeting is being recorded. Speaker

19 with a discussion about how these considerations

21 the subject of this workshop.

Next slide, please.

20 impact our development for the two conditions that are

22

slides, transcripts, and recordings will be availableon the meeting's website in the coming weeks. So

Speaker and panelist affiliations and

21 please check this page regularly for updates.

22

1 So let me take you back in time to

- 2 begin with the late 1970s, where the National
- 3 Commission was convened to discuss the structuring of
- 4 an ethical framework that really has two main concepts
- 5 it is considering: one, the fact that children are
- 6 vulnerable and require additional safeguards,
- 7 balancing that with the fact that pediatric research
- 8 is necessary to safeguard and improve the health and
- 9 wellbeing of children.
- 10 Next slide, please.
- 11 So this commission convened and filed a
- 12 report, and this is a very simplistic view about what
- 13 they found. So in essence and in a summary, there are
- 14 four key concepts: first, ensuring necessity; second,
- 15 limiting risks; third, preventing disadvantage; and
- 16 fourth, obtaining permission; and I will briefly go
- 17 into these individually.
- 18 So first with ensuring necessity,
- 19 because children cannot consent to participate in
- 20 clinical trials, we should only enroll subjects when
- 21 it is necessary to enroll these younger subjects to be
- 22 able to meet the scientific objective of the trial.

Page 15

Page 14

- 1 Secondly, when we think about risks, we
- 2 think about how the risks correlate with the benefits
- 3 that the child might experience in the trial; and this
- 4 is going to be unique for every circumstance.
- 5 Third, preventing disadvantage, when
- 6 children are enrolled in a trial, they should neither
- 7 be exposed to excessive risks due to the interventions
- 8 they -- they experience in the trial, nor should they
- 9 be placed at a disadvantage by being unable to access
- 10 care that they would otherwise receive outside of that
- 11 setting.
- 12 And finally, obtaining permission is a
- 13 critical aspect. Again, because children cannot
- 14 consent for themselves, they must have parents or
- 15 guardians that can act as a proxy to provide that
- 16 consent.
- 17 Next slide, please.
- So next I'm going to transition into a
- 19 discussion of how this ethical framework led to the
- 20 regulations that we currently use today.
- 21 Next slide, please.
- I won't bore you with every detail of

1 this slide, but you'll see on the left that the

- 2 National Commission report that I referenced as long
- 3 as the -- as well as a Belmont report that were both
- 4 put together in the late 1970s gave rise to
- 5 regulations that are both at the FDA level in 21 CFR
- 6 and the DHHS level in 45 CFR.
- 7 And these are parallel in their
- 8 structure, but I'm going to focus on the right-upper
- 9 area that's circled with the additional safeguards for
- 10 children in clinical investigations, which is 21 CFR
- 11 50 Subpart D, which I will be referring to as Subpart
- 12 D for the remainder of this presentation.
- Next slide, please.
- 14 So the Subpart D regulations are really
- 15 broken into five areas, two of which are really
- 16 relevant for this discussion of the development of
- 17 antiviral drugs for treating a clinical condition.
- 18 A therapeutic such as an
- 19 investigational antiviral drug would be considered an
- 20 intervention by and large that confers more than
- 21 minimal risk to research subjects and therefore must
- 22 be bound for the prospect of direct benefit for the

Page 17

- 1 subjects.
 - 2 That's 50.52, and then 50.55 is -- is
 - 3 the element about permission and assent. So we will
 - 4 only be focusing on those two today.
 - 5 Next slide, please.
 - 6 So let me just describe 50.52 for a
 - 7 moment. This is the balance of benefit and risk.
 - 8 This is what we do in clinical practice all the time
 - 9 and -- at the -- the bedside level as well as the
 - 10 population level.
 - So when we're evaluating a clinical
 - 12 protocol, we're looking for some key elements. So
 - 13 does this intervention involve greater than minimal
 - 14 risk? For the most -- by and large for candidate
 - 15 antivirals, that would be true.
 - 16 Does it provide that prospect of direct
 - 17 benefit to the individual subject? And we'll be
 - 18 talking about the definition of that shortly. And are
 - 19 the risks justified by the anticipated benefit to the
 - 20 subject?
 - 21 Secondarily and equally importantly, is
 - 22 that anticipated benefit, the risk balance, at least

Page 18

1 as favorable as any available alternatives, including

- 2 those that are available to the patient outside of
- 3 clinical research?
- 4 Next slide, please.
- 5 So I'm going to provide some
- 6 definitions. You'll have heard me use these -- these
- 7 exact phrases more than once, such as "prospect of
- 8 direct benefit"; and so first, I want to talk about --
- 9 what does it mean to be direct?
- 10 So the benefit that a child experiences
- 11 really needs to be felt by the individual subject, not
- 12 the -- the study population in general. Each subject
- 13 should have some benefit through their participation
- 14 in the trial; and secondarily, that benefit needs to
- 15 be arrived -- derived from the intervention under
- 16 study.
- 17 So the simple benefit of increased
- 18 access to healthcare and potentially enhanced
- 19 monitoring on themselves do not equate to that direct
- 20 benefit.
- 21 Second, I want to stress that the
- 22 assessment for the prospect of direct benefit is

Page 19

- 1 really based on the data that support the activity and
- 2 the ability of this intervention to modulate the
- 3 clinical outcome but also how that intervention is
- 4 used in the trial.
- 5 So proof-of-concept data that derive
- 6 from either clinical human data or nonclinical data, a
- 7 combination thereof, can support the -- the activity
- 8 of the drug and the ability for that drug to lead to a
- 9 change in clinical outcome, but the way that drug is
- 10 deployed in the trial also must be advantageous.
- 11 So the doses that are used and the
- 12 duration of the treatment should be sufficient to
- 13 achieve the outcome. There is always the temptation
- 14 to start low and slow, so to prevent toxicity; but
- 15 sub-therapeutic doses would not be considered ethica 15 and again, a risk-benefit analysis is -- is conducted
- 16 by and large.
- 17 Next slide, please.
- 18 So that was a discussion of benefit,
- 19 and now I want to turn to risk, and measuring risk is
- 20 -- is not easy, and -- and the language in our
- 21 regulations is not incredibly clear.
- 22 So first of all, we have the definition

1 of -- of minimal risk, which is the risk that normal

- 2 healthy children encounter in their daily lives and in
- 3 routine healthcare.
- 4 The other distinction that is made in
- 5 the regulations is a minor increase over minimal risk.
- 6 Again, there is some latitude here for interpretation;
- 7 but this is somewhat more than what the child would
- 8 experience in daily life.
- 9 Again, a healthy child would experience
- 10 in daily life but does not have a longstanding threat
- 11 to that child's health or wellbeing; and when a risk
- 12 falls into this category, there's an additional
- 13 requirement that the knowledge gained by exposing a
- 14 child to this risk must be generalizable to that
- 15 child's disorder or condition.
- 16 Next slide, please.
- 17 Now, to -- until now, I've really been
- 18 focused on the risk and benefit that derive from the
- 19 study intervention; but when we are looking at a
- 20 clinical-study protocol, we're looking at every
- 21 intervention that is part of that protocol.
- 22 So there's the -- the drug under study

- 1 but all the other interventions that come with it, and
- 2 we do the same benefit-risk assessment for each and
- 3 every one of those.
- 4 To -- to analyze those, we use the same
- 5 framework that we would for the -- for the main
- 6 intervention under study.
- 7 So if that intervention or procedure --
- 8 and for example, we could use a blood draw. If it
- 9 does not hold out a prospect of direct benefit, then
- 10 it should be restricted to more than -- more -- no
- 11 more than a minor increase over minimal risk.
- 12 On the contrary, if that intervention
- 13 does have some prospect of direct benefit for the
- 14 child, then we have a little bit more risk tolerance;
- 16 there.
- 17 Next slide, please.
- 18 I just want to highlight a few examples
- 19 of where this is challenging, and -- and some of these
- 20 things that we don't always think about as elements of
- 21 the protocol, not all of which are relevant to the
- 22 discussion here; but some of them might be.

Page 24

Page 25

Page 22 1 So for example, biopsies that might be 1 And second, it is also acceptable to 2 done in a clinical investigation either for diagnostic 2 use placebos when we have an established effective 3 purposes or for measuring outcomes, some of them are 3 intervention but the administration of that might 4 simple like a muscle biopsy that might be considered a 4 obscure the treatment and confound the 5 minor increase or -- or just minimal risk. Others 5 interpretability of the trial and if we could either 6 that are invasive -- solid-organ biopsies -- are in a 6 delay or not provide that drug for a certain amount of 7 different category. 7 time during the clinical-protocol duration and 8 The same with diagnostic imaging, you 8 introduce mitigation procedures that -- that prevent 9 that child from experiencing harm during the time that 9 have to consider both the risk of the radiation, how 10 many times a child might be undergoing diagnostic 10 they're exposed to placebo. 11 11 imaging. The risk of contrast agents that might be Next slide, please. 12 12 administered and -- and related to imaging in some We will pivot now from the discussion 13 ways is also nontherapeutic procedural sedation. 13 of benefit and risk in the 50.52 regulations to the 14 So we know there are inherent risks to 14 50.55 regulations for parent and guardian permission, 15 nontherapeutic procedural sedation. It may be 15 and the main concept to really drive home here is that 16 allowable in certain circumstances, but we really look 16 -- is, this is a hard time for parents and caregivers 17 at these closely and -- and determine whether the --17 when they are caring for a critically ill infant. 18 you know, each of these components is -- has both a 18 And so you might have to come back more 19 prospective benefit and a reasonable risk-benefit 19 than one time to really provide an opportunity for 20 ratio. 20 parents to ask questions, understand all the 21 21 dimensions that are affecting their child's Next slide, please. 22 22 participation; and they should receive follow-up as I want to just spend a few minutes

Page 23

1 the -- as the trial goes on, if things were to change, 2 if knowledge has been gained.

3 There are specific requirements for

4 what the documentation looks like, which is available

5 in the references on the slide; but I -- I won't go

6 into those details for this presentation.

7 Next slide, please.

8 So I'm going to turn now to how this

9 ethical framework impacts drug development for the two

10 conditions that we're discussing today, enterovirus

11 infection in neonates and congenital CMV infection.

12 Next slide, please.

13 And I'm going to go back to the ethical

14 framework that we laid out before, these four core

15 principles: ensuring necessity, limiting risk,

16 preventing disadvantage, and obtaining permission.

17 Next slide, please.

18 We'll begin with ensuring necessity,

19 and I think Dr. Belew has already addressed this quite

20 a bit in her opening remarks, but we know that

21 congenital CMV and enteroviral infections in neonates

22 and very young children are -- are unique to this

1 talking about placebo.

And this is the -- the discussion about

3 placebo from an -- from an ethical standpoint,

4 acknowledging that there are going to be many opinions

5 about placebo that are offered over the course of the

6 next two days both from pragmatic and acceptability to

7 caregivers and -- and providers; but this, again, is

8 really from the ethical standpoint.

So when we look at a placebo-controlled

10 trial, the first thing we look at is -- what is the

11 risk of the placebo itself? How is it administered?

12 What is its composition? How long is it going to be

13 given? And make an assessment about that in and of

14 itself.

15 Second, what are the implications for

16 that child receiving placebo instead of something else

17 in the controller of a trial. So by and large, if

18 there is an established and effective intervention,

19 then all participants in a trial should receive that.

20 However, placebos are an important tool

21 that we use first when there is no established

22 ineffective intervention.

Meeting Page 26 1 population. 1 there's no established effective intervention or if 2 2 the administration of an active control would make the It's a population that has an unmet 3 medical need, and efficacy cannot be extrapolated 3 study data uninterpretable and withholding that 4 because there is no corollary disease in other 4 treatment can be done safely for the participant. 5 A reminder that adjunctive treatments 5 populations, including in children. 6 should be provided if they are considered standard of And so the scientific and public-health 7 objectives cannot be met without enrolling the target 7 care. So for example, in a critically ill neonate, 8 population of neonates and young children; and so this 8 all supportive care measures would be standardized 9 element of the ethical framework is satisfied. 9 across treatment arms. 10 10 Next slide, please. Ongoing therapy, you have -- in the 11 Second, we'll turn to limiting risks; 11 case of both enteroviral sepsis as well as congenital 12 and this will be possibly a topic for the -- for the 12 CMV, such as physical or occupational therapy and 13 next two days. So clinical trials that evaluate most 13 early-intervention services, would be deployed, 14 candidate antivirals will need to meet the 14 regardless of treatment assignments. 15 requirements of 50.52, as I outlined. 15 Next slide, please. 16 Just in summary, clinical and 16 So last, obtaining permission -- and 17 nonclinical data can be used to support the prospect 17 the key message here is that informed consent is a 18 of direct benefits; and then we will be looking at the 18 process. It is not a document. The parents and 19 investigational drug, the risk that is conferred from 19 caregivers in the -- in the neonatal intensive-care 20 that as well as the other interventions and being --20 unit are signing consent all the time for blood

22

22 level of risk might be incurred. Page 27 1 A reminder that the study design is 2 important in this benefit-risk assessment; and 3 characteristics of the patient population, the risk-4 mitigation strategies that are deployed are -- are an 5 important part of the assessment. Next, the component analysis, so the

21 making a risk-benefit assessment there about what

7 risk-benefit assessment is not limited to that 8 investigational product. We'll be looking at the 9 benefit and risk of every intervention in the 10 protocol. 11 This might include lumbar punctures, 12 lab studies, diagnostic imaging, and -- and other 13 assessments that -- that the child undergoes either 14 for clinical care or for research purposes. 15 Next slide, please. 16 Third, preventing disadvantage, again, 17 this -- I'm not offering solutions or answers here but 18 just food for thought to frame the discussion that is 19 sure to -- sure to -- to take place over the next two 20 days. 21 So placebo-controlled trials are

22 acceptable if certain criteria are met: first, if

Page 29

1 enrollment in a clinical trial from all of the other 2 informed-consent procedures that they are -- all the 3 procedures that they're -- they're asked to consent 4 for. 5 Consider strategies that help parents 6 and caregivers really comprehend what they are signing 7 up for, training videos, parent feedback groups, et 8 cetera; and I'll just put a thought in mind that 9 although the focus of this -- of this discussion is 10 really on our very young, our neonates and young 11 infants. 12 If there was to be studies for these 13 populations as they age and -- and the -- the 14 possibility of antiviral therapy modulating their 15 disease at an older age, then assent may be required 16 in the participation of older children. 17 Next slide, please. 18 I'll just end with some resources. So 19 the FDA publishes guidance documents to -- to 20 summarize our views about a number of things, and 21 these four guidance documents all touch on ethical 22 aspects of -- of studies enrolling children.

21 transfusions, for small procedures.

So it's important to differentiate

Page 30 1 Next slide, please. 1 that are inherent in neonatal clinical trials with a 2 focus on considerations that may be relevant to the 2 I'm going to skip my summary because I 3 believe I have mentioned all of the points on the 3 development of antiviral products for treatment of 4 slide. 4 congenital infections but also provide some resources 5 that can be later referenced for both medical-product 5 Next slide, please. 6 development in neonates and some considerations for And I'll just end with some 7 acknowledgements of my colleagues in the Office of 7 rare diseases in pediatric populations. 8 8 Pediatric Therapeutics; to Dr. Melanie Bhatnagar, who Next slide, please. 9 9 has provided -- provided a lot of the content for this For background, in the U.S., pediatric 10 drug development is largely driven by pediatric-10 presentation; our director, Dr. Dionna Green; and all 11 of the Pediatric Ethics staff, both past and present, 11 specific drug legislations. 12 This includes the 2002 Best 12 who also have contributed to the content of this 13 Pharmaceutical Acts for Children or BPCA, which is a 13 presentation. Thank you so much. 14 14 voluntary-incentive program for pediatric clinical DR. BELEW: Thank you, Dr. Viswanathan. 15 Next I'd like to introduce Dr. An 15 studies, and the 2003 Pediatric Research Equity Act or 16 Massaro, Supervisory Medical Officer. 16 PREA, which gave the FDA the authority to require 17 pediatric studies for certain drug and biological 17 Next slide, please, Corey. 18 Supervisory Medical Officer for the 18 products. 19 Neonatal and Rare Pediatric Disease Team in the Office 19 Together these laws have led to a 20 of Pediatric Therapeutics at FDA, she will be speaking 20 significant increase in the number of pediatric 21 studies conducted and a subsequent increase in the 21 about clinical and regulatory considerations for 22 number of pediatric-labeling changes for drugs and 22 neonatal antiviral drug development. Page 31 Page 33 1 Thank you, Dr. Massaro. 1 biologics over the past several decades. 2 2 DR. MASSARO: Thank you. Next slide, please. 3 3 And thank you to the meeting organizers In September of 2022, the FDA announced 4 for inviting me to participate, and I hope to set the 4 the historic milestone of achieving over 1,000 5 stage in the next 10 to 15 minutes or so and provide 5 medicines that include evidence-based pediatric 6 some context from the neonatology perspective that may 6 information and product labeling. 7 be relevant to all of our discussions over the next 7 This milestone represented the 8 collaborative effort of the FDA and multiple other 8 two days. 9 9 stakeholders, who played a real important role in Next slide, please. These are my disclosures. My talk 10 informing the current approach to developing medicines 11 today will represent my views on these topics, but 11 for children. 12 they don't -- I don't plan to discuss any specific 12 It's notable that the majority of these 13 medical products. 13 labeling changes occurred in the therapeutic area of 14 I'll just acknowledge that ensuing 14 infection diseases, as you can see highlighted here on 15 discussions may involve off-label use of medications, 15 the right side of the slide. This is very much in 16 as this is common practice in the NICU, which is 16 part due to the work of the divisions involved in the

18

19

17 planning of this meeting.

Next slide, please.

22 it's also clear that progress in the neonatal

While it's clear that progress has been

20 made with regard to pediatric-labeling changes and

21 drug development in pediatric patients in general,

17 something we hope to change through efforts like this

22 level overview of considerations and challenges really

This is an outline of my presentation.

As noted, my goal is to provide a high-

Next slide, please.

18 workshop.

19

20

21

1 triggered after separation from placental support.

1 population has lagged.

2 In the NICU, we continue to practice in

3 a setting where, as I mentioned, the majority of

4 medications we prescribe to neonates are done so off

5 label, meaning that they haven't undergone sufficient

6 investigation to establish safety and effectiveness in

7 the neonatal population.

8 Despite what I had shown you in the

9 prior slides, which is, as I noted, now over 1,000

10 pediatric labeling changes, only about 5 percent of

11 those have been -- have included studies or

12 indications in neonates.

So we really have a scientific and

14 legislative mandate to address this gap both by

15 conducting clinical studies in neonates for

16 medications that are approved in adults and older

17 pediatric patients when that's appropriate but also by

18 developing new treatments for conditions that are

19 specific to the neonate.

Next slide, please.

There are many reasons for the limited

22 study of drug products in neonates.

Page 35

Page 34

1 These studies are inherently

2 challenging, not only because the -- of the relative

3 rarity of the disease conditions in the neonatal

4 patients, compared to adults, but also because of the

5 added complexity of clinical factors that can impact

6 evaluation of a drug administered to a neonate.

7 These include the rapid maturation of

8 organs and tissues that occurs late in gestation, a

9 period that occurs in the ex-utero environment in the

10 case of the pre-term infant; and there's continued

11 significant maturation after term birth and into early

12 infancy or childhood.

Developmental maturation at the

14 cellular and biochemical level also represents a

15 challenge, as many enzymes, receptors, transporters,

16 and other signaling molecules are expressed

17 differently with age.

18 Physiological changes associated with

19 the transition from the in-utero to ex-utero

20 environment after birth must also be considered, as

21 changes in circulation; oxygen tension; and function

22 of organ systems, such as the lungs and GI tract, are

Page 36

Finally, due to many of these factors

3 that characterize the immaturity of the neonate, they

4 are vulnerable to comorbidities and disease conditions

5 across organ systems, making assessment of the safety

6 and efficacy of a drug product particularly

7 challenging to discern.

8 Next slide, please.

9 With that general background, I'm going

10 to review a few regulatory considerations for neonatal

11 drug development. As discussed by Dr. Belew, there's

12 a regulatory standard for establishing substantial

13 evidence of effectiveness with adequate and well-

14 controlled studies.

15 However, this approach is often very

16 challenging and in some cases not feasible in some

17 neonatal conditions.

The other important regulatory concept

19 relevant to our conversations in the need to establish

20 substantial evidence of effectiveness with regard --

21 is considering that this is with regard to a

22 clinically meaningful endpoint. That is a measure of

Page 37

1 how a patient feels, functions, or survives.

2 This can be challenging in the neonate,

3 as I'll discuss in the next few slides; but first I

4 want to address the concept of pediatric

5 extrapolation, as it was also introduced by Dr. Belew

6 in her introductory comments.

7 You see here in this figure where

8 extrapolation is best leveraged is when there's a

9 clinical and pathophysiological overlap between the

10 neonatal and adult disease condition, denoted here by

11 the red area -- arrow.

While the areas where extrapolation has

13 been most successfully used to support substantial

14 evidence of effectiveness in neonates are in anti-

15 infectives and antivirals, as you saw in my prior

16 slide that high number of labeling changes in the

17 infectious-disease space is a testament to the

18 successful leveraging of pediatric extrapolation in

19 this therapeutic area, however, the use of

20 extrapolation is limited when conditions occur

21 exclusively in neonates or in conditions where the

22 natural history or pathophysiology of the condition as

Page 38 Page 40 1 it manifests in neonates is distinct from the adult-1 Next slide, please. disease correlate. 2 Those concepts translate into real And as Dr. Belew mentioned -- and I'll 3 challenges when defining clinical endpoints for 4 just re-emphasize here -- in general, I would consider 4 neonatal trials. We're often looking for that unicorn 5 the conditions we are focused on for this meeting, 5 -- what I'll call a unicorn endpoint that reflects an 6 congenital CMV and neonatal enterovirus that fall into 6 outcome that's common, assessed in a short time frame, 7 this category, infections with distinct manifestations 7 and precisely measured. 8 8 and clinical sequelae specific to neonates that limit Unfortunately for most neonatal 9 the use of extrapolation. 9 conditions, we're assessing rare events that occur 10 Next slide, please. 10 often late after exposure to a therapeutic agent; and 11 So as noted, I wanted to spend some 11 apart from outcomes such as mortality, morbidity, 12 time discussing why measuring clinical benefit is not 12 definitions in the neonate represent a challenge. 13 straightforward in the neonatal population. 13 As I noted earlier, the paradigm of 14 And many of these points are very 14 feels, functions, and survives becomes difficult in a 15 relevant to the discussions we'll have during this 15 neonate. A patient -- it's a patient who can't really 16 meeting when we think about how we will establish 16 describe of course how they feel, and functional 17 whether a drug, quote/unquote, "works" or not for 17 assessments in neonates often rely then on clinical or 18 these infections where the clinical sequelae may not 18 caregiver observations or other tools that may not be 19 manifest until much later, after treatment in the 19 well-validated or fit for purpose. 20 neonatal period. 20 Next slide, please. 21 As we'll hear from our patient and 21 So since I've spent a lot of time 22 family advocates during the meeting, not everyone 22 describing challenges without a lot of solutions, I do Page 41 Page 39 1 want to highlight a lot of ongoing work that's trying 1 values the same outcomes similarly. 2 to address some of these challenges in defining And the field of neonatology has 3 outcomes for neonatal studies. 3 numerous examples where therapies demonstrated to have 4 I've included some references here on 4 positive short-term benefits were later 5 several recent coordinated multistakeholder efforts to 5 counterbalanced by longer-term toxicities or loss of 6 effective -- effect or seeing that benefit in the long 6 build core outcome steps for neonatal clinical trials 7 term. 7 in general, and there's even more ongoing work in 8 8 specific disease area -- areas. While this may point to the need for 9 longer-term assessments for any investigational So one consideration for us in our 10 discussions is whether congenital CMV or enterovirus 10 therapeutic agent, we'll acknowledge that this 11 approach can lead to potential delays in getting 11 would benefit from such an effort, and that may start 12 with some of the discussions at our -- at this 12 effective drugs through the developmental pipeline to 13 patients. 13 meeting. 14 14 Next slide, please. And there's also inherent complications 15 Equally challenging to establishing 15 with these longitudinal type studies for attrition and 16 substantial evidence of effectiveness is collection of 16 intercurrent events that can impact the confidence we 17 adequate safety data for drugs studied in neonates. 17 have in the assessment of long-term drug effects. 18 18 The size of the safety database needed While this may point to the need for

19 may depend on several factors, including experience

22 subpopulations; the serious infrequency of adverse

with the drug itself or similar drugs in adults orolder children or even previously studied neonatal

19 surrogate endpoints for trials, timeliness and

22 and its relationship to the outcome of interest.

20 efficiency may be counterbalanced with uncertainty,

21 depending on the reliability of the surrogate endpoint

1 workflow for physicians and nurses in the ICU, these

So multistakeholder input is really

4 needed early in the design process to ensure that

5 these studies are feasible and acceptable to both

Page 42

1 reactions observed in other populations, such as

- 2 those; the rarity of the condition; the potential for
- 3 unique susceptibility of the neonate to particular
- 4 adverse events.
- 5 For example, when we're talking about
- 6 an investigational product targeting congenital CMV
- 7 with the aim to improve long-term sensorineural or
- 8 neurodevelopmental outcomes, that would clearly
- 9 warrant long-term evaluation from an efficacy
- 10 standpoint.
- But even when a drug is intended for a
- 12 short-term effect, this may still warrant assessment
- 13 for neuro -- long-term neurodevelopmental safety.
- 14 And the expectation may be to assess
- 15 potential safety issues longer than may be potentially
- 16 expected for -- in a drug development in adults, for
- 17 example, especially if that drug is known to cross the
- 18 blood-brain barrier and be associated with high
- 19 exposure to the developing brain, again, a unique
- 20 susceptibility to the neonatal population.
- 21 Next slide, please.
- These are some additional study

7 Finally, safety data should be

- 8 systematically collected. I already mentioned that
- 9 the size of the safety database may be based on
- 10 several different factors, but it's important to
- 11 ensure that attention is also paid to how adverse
- 12 events are collected.

2 are all big challenges.

6 clinicians and families.

3

- For example, an adverse event such as
- 14 hypertension is obviously defined with a different
- 15 physiological range in the neonate than an adult; and
- 16 other adverse events may be completely specific to the
- 17 neonate, such as the occurrence of prematurity-related
- 18 comorbidities.
- 19 So I'll refer you to a tool developed
- 20 by the International Neonatal Consortium to define and
- 21 grade severity for neonatal adverse events, and the
- 22 reference can be seen here on this slide.

Page 43

- 1 considerations. It's important to sure -- ensure that
- 2 studies are designed to include a spectrum of relevant
- 3 clinical variability in the neonatal population of
- 4 interest, and I'll discuss more about this on my next
- 5 slide.
- 6 Another point to emphasize is to
- 7 remember that the absolute blood volume of a neonate,
- 8 especially a pre-term neonate, is very small.
- 9 So limitations in neonatal blood
- 10 sampling need to be considered when we're designing
- 11 our clinical studies, especially when we're
- 12 considering that we'll need blood for sampling for
- 13 PK/PD endpoints but also laboratory and safety
- 14 monitoring in conjunction to routine clinical
- 15 monitoring.
- 16 It's important to remember the
- 17 environment also that these studies are occurring --
- 18 occurring.
- 19 As we'll hear from our patient and
- 20 family advocates, conducting, studies in the NICU,
- 21 obtaining consent from parents during a stressful
- 22 time, incorporating study procedures amongst the busy

- 1 Next slide, please.
- 2 As I alluded to on the prior slide,
- 3 there's a wide clinical heterogeneity that
- 4 characterizes the neonatal population. Using a common
- 5 language can allow for methods to stratify patients
- 6 based on characteristics that can greatly impact the
- 7 analysis of PK and dose-response data.
- 8 This can allow for assurance that the
- 9 product is evaluated across the range of gestational
- 10 age, postmenstrual age, or postnatal age, as
- 11 appropriate.
- While of course we recognize that some
- 13 of these variables may be highly correlated, such as
- 14 gestational age and birth weight, it's important to
- 15 recognize that they're all different conceptually, as
- 16 you can see on this slide; and the information they
- 17 provide to characterize the neonate are not
- 18 interchangeable.
- 19 Next slide, please.
- 20 I've included here additional resources
- 21 on many of the concepts I've introduced, including
- 22 tools developed by the International Neonatal

Page 46 Page 48 1 Consortium, resources from a meeting we convened in 1 awarding of priority vouchers. 2 collaboration with Duke-Margolis last year on neonatal 2 And I just want to emphasize that this 3 -- on measuring neonatal benefit -- benefit in 3 is an important distinction when we discuss 4 neonatal clinical trials, and several of -- neonatal-4 enterovirus or congenital CMV as, quote/unquote, "rare 5 specific FDA guidance documents. 5 diseases." We'll be hearing a lot of epidemiologic Next slide, please. 6 information over the course of the meeting. I'm going to end my talk on a brief And it's true, and while it -- I'll 8 discussion of rare-pediatric-disease-drug development, 8 note that it's true that prevention of congenital CMV 9 as these considerations may also be relevant to our 9 infection following primary CMV infection in pregnant 10 discussions for enterovirus and congenital CMV. 10 women and treatment of symptomatic enteroviral 11 11 infection in the neonate have been -- indications have Work to advance drug development in 12 rare diseases is supported by legislation, expedited-12 been granted orphan-drug designations in the past. 13 review pathways, and voucher incentives. I'm going to 13 Whether these programs, the Orphan Drug 14 Program or the RPD Program, may be leveraged for a 14 focus my comments -- my few comments on the orphan-15 drug-designation and rare-pediatric-disease-15 particular development program for an investigational 16 designation programs. 16 product to treat these infections really depends on 17 17 several factors or eligibility criteria. Next slide, please. 18 18 So prior to a sponsor receiving a rare And reviewing all of these nuances in 19 pediatric disease, prior to a review voucher, 19 criteria are beyond the scope of my talk today, but 20 determination must be made that the drug or biologic 20 I'll refer you to some resources that are available to 21 is actually for a rare pediatric disease. 21 guide this on my next slide. 22 22 So a request for a rare-pediatric-You can go to the next slide, please. Page 47 Page 49 1 disease designation includes the data to support that And here you'll find the relevant links 2 the proposed mechanism of action of the drug or -- of 2 to additional information on the programs I mentioned, 3 the drug or biologic in that drug is intended to treat 3 as well as this first link here is a recently 4 published review of the RPD Program. That has a lot 4 a rare pediatric disease. 5 And that's defined as a disease with 5 of information about this first ten years of -- of 6 serious or life-threatening manifestations that 6 this program being in existence. 7 primarily affect individuals from birth to 18 years 7 Next slide, please. 8 and that the total prevalence of the disease affects 8 So I'll wrap up and say in summary that 9 fewer than 200,000 people. 9 drug development in neonates faces unique challenges 10 due to rapid developmental changes and vulnerabilities The rare -- RPD-designation portion of 11 the Priority Review Voucher Program is administered by 11 that are really specific to neonates. 12 the Office of Orphan Products Development or OOPD in 12 The FDA and really multiple other 13 collaboration with our office and the Office of 13 sources have resources to promote and support drug 14 Pediatric Therapeutics within the Office of the 14 development for neonates and for rare pediatric 15 diseases. So with that, I will turn back to the 15 Commissioner at the FDA. 16 Next slide, please. 16 organizers. Thank you.

13 (Pages 46 - 49)

DR. BELEW: Thank you, Dr. Massaro.

Next I'd like to introduce Dr. Kunyi

19 Wu, Clinical Pharmacology Team Leader in the Division

20 of Infectious Disease Pharmacology at FDA. Dr. Wu

21 will be discussing clinical pharmacology

22 considerations for dose selection in pediatric

17

18

17

So I've noted here -- and as Dr. Belew

18 also mentioned -- the statutory definition of a rare

20 just discussed, there's also a definition for a rare

22 definition for the purposes of RPD designation and

21 pediatric disease; and it has its own statutory

19 disease, as defined by the Orphan Drug Act; and as we

Page 50 Page 52 1 patients. 1 and Safety Approach is not applicable. 2 Thank you, Dr. Wu. 2 So the sponsor may need to come to us 3 DR. WU: Thank you. 3 to discuss before they initiate their clinical 4 So today I'm going to share the 4 program. 5 clinical pharmacology considerations for dose 5 Next slide. 6 selection in pediatric patients. 6 Modeling and simulation plays an 7 Next slide. 7 important role in pediatric drug development. I 8 This is the outline for my talk. 8 borrowed this figure from a publication from FDA back 9 First, I will talk about three broad approaches to 9 to 2019. In this publication, it illustrates the 10 pediatric drug development; and then I'll talk about 10 MIDD, Model Informed Drug Development Program, in 11 modeling and simulation and the clinical pharm 11 Pediatric Program. 12 considerations for dose selection in pediatric 12 And they form three parts: first, 13 patients. 13 leverage knowledge; second, dose selection and 14 Then I will use one example to 14 optimization; third, informing clinical-trial design. 15 illustrate how to use animal data to select 15 So in Infectious Disease Pediatric Program, usually 16 initiatives in pediatric clinical trials and then 16 before that we already accumulate some data from 17 follow up with challenges and opportunities. 17 adults or other indications. 18 Next slide. 18 So a model can help to leverage 19 This slide lists three broad approaches 19 knowledge, and the model also can help to compare the 20 to pediatric drug development. First, when disease or 20 exposure-response relationship in pediatric patients 21 disease progression is unique to pediatric patients, 21 versus adults. Model can help to select initiatives 22 then PK, Safety, and Efficacy Approach is used. 22 in pediatric-development programs, and the model also Page 53 Page 51 1 The second scenario is when disease or 1 can incorporate pediatric ontogeny in infants and the 2 neonates. 2 disease progression is similar in pediatric patients 3 3 and adults but the exposure response, ER, relationship Sometimes model can help to select 4 in peds may be different from adults; and now the PK, 4 model, and the simulation can help to select sample 5 Safety, and PD/Efficacy Approach is used. 5 size and the PK sampling scheme in the program. 6 The third scenario is when adults and Next slide. 7 pediatrics share a sufficiently similar disease course Maribavir is an example to use 8 and response to intervention. Then PK and Safety 8 published PK model to select pediatric dose in 9 adolescents. Even without PK data, this dose has been 9 Approach is used. The third approach, which is the PK 10 approved. Of course, most studies are required in 10 and Safety Approach, is the most frequently used 11 approach in infectious-disease pediatric-development 11 adolescents to confirm the simulation results. 12 12 programs. Next slide. 13 Next slide. 13 So I want to use the rivaroxaban case 14 to illustrate the learning and the confirming cycle in 14 Valganciclovir is an example to use PK 15 the modeling-simulation practice. Rivaroxaban is an 15 and Safety Approach to select and approve those adult, 16 one month, and older, based on similar ganciclovir 16 anticoagulant, and it has been approved based on 17 exposure in pediatric patients versus adults. 17 similar drug exposure in pediatric patients versus 18 18 adults. As multiple speakers already mentioned 19 previously, for the two disease types we discussed in 19 And the -- the study design -- the 20 this workshop, which is congenital CMV infection and 20 clinical study design is age staggered from older 21 children to younger children. So in older-children 21 the neonatal enteroviral infection, those two disease 22 types are unique in pediatric patients; and this PK 22 cohort, it's older than 6 months. The study dose was

Page 54

1 predicted by using PBPK model, physiologically based

- 2 pharmacokinetics model.
- 3 And interestingly, the observed
- 4 exposure was way lower than the predicted exposure.
- 5 So based on this observation, the sponsor increased
- 6 dose regimen from QD to BID and then matched the
- 7 exposure in adults.
- 8 And also based on this observation,
- 9 sponsor selected higher than PBPK-model-predicted dose
- 10 in younger cohort, which is younger than 6 months.
- 11 However, the observed exposure still though was way
- 12 lower than the predicted exposure.
- Then the sponsor increased the dose
- 14 regimen again from BID to TID and then matched adult
- 15 exposure. At the end of the day, all the PK data were
- 16 incorporated into the population PK model; and the
- 17 clinical PK data and the population PK model analysis
- 18 results were used to select dose in pediatric
- 19 patients.
- 20 I hope this example illustrates the
- 21 practice in modeling simulation as prediction,
- 22 learning, and confirming the cycle.

Page 55

- 1 Next -- next slide.
- 2 This slide lists some clinical
- 3 pharmacology considerations for dose selection in
- 4 pediatric patients.
- 5 First, route of administration, for
- 6 very young children and very sick children, the
- 7 parenteral-administration route is preferred over oral
- 8 because for the oral route first we have to have age-
- 9 appropriate formulation, which takes time; and second,
- 10 age may have impact on absorption.
- So for different formulations, very
- 12 young children -- absorption in very young children
- 13 may be different from adults. However, most viability
- 14 -- viability studies are conducted in adults. So that
- 15 increased uncertainty for predict -- for -- for dose
- 16 prediction in very young children.
- 17 And also, disease may have impact on
- 18 absorption. For example, for enteroviral infection,
- 19 then it impacts GI tracts; and that may have an effect
- 20 on absorption.
- We also view pediatric population as a
- 22 very dynamic, very heterogeneous population, which

1 means their body size, their body surface area, their

- 2 weight changes on a daily basis, especially in
- 3 neonates and infants.
- 4 So when we think about dosing regimen,
- 5 we need to think about whether we want to use weight-
- 6 based dose, which is milligram-per-kilogram dose or we
- 7 want to use flat dose or we want to use weight-based
- 8 dose.
- 9 Sometimes we also need to think about
- 10 local drug concentrations. For example, for CNS
- 11 penetration, central-nervous-system penetration, so if
- 12 CNS is the target organ, then it is an efficacy
- 13 concern if it is -- it is not, then it becomes a
- 14 safety concern.
- 15 However, it's very hard to get a PK
- 16 sample in CSF, cerebrospinal fluid; and even when we
- 17 get a PK sample, it's very sparse and with high
- 18 variability.
- 19 Another example is for hearing loss.
- 20 For hearing loss, we need to consider the inner-ear
- 21 penetration -- drug-inner-ear penetration. However,
- 22 it's almost impossible for us to get a sample -- PK

Page 57

- 1 sample in clinical trials for inner-ear penetration.
- 2 So animal models may become helpful in this case.
- When we consider drug distribution and
- 4 elimination, we need to think about organ maturation,
- 5 enzyme maturation, receptor-transporter maturation. I
- 6 have to admit we still have a knowledge gap in this
- 7 area.
- 8 Next slide.
- 9 I want to use one example, which is
- 10 lucinactant's case, to illustrate how to use animal-
- 11 study results to select initial dose in pediatric
- 12 clinical trials. So lucinactant has been approved for
- 13 the prevention of respiratory distress syndrome, RDS.
- 14 in premature infants because those children -- they
- 15 cannot produce enough surfactant in their lungs.
- So lucinactant is a synthetic
- 17 surfactant. So because of the unique indication in
- 18 this population, we don't have any PK data from
- 19 adults, any clinical adults for -- from other
- 20 indications. So the initial dose in neonates was
- 21 directly selected based on premature monkeys and a
- 22 premature-rabbit model.

Meeting Page 58 Page 60 1 And a range of doses were evaluated in 1 might be walking in with. 2 animal models, and three doses moved -- moved on to 2 So, please, next slide. 3 So families come in with something 3 clinical trials; and eventually, one dose was 4 approved. 4 traumatic happening at birth often, whether it was 5 5 planned or unplanned, depending on what -- you know, Next slide. We already know for the PK -- PBPK in what their situation was. 7 animal models have been used in pediatric clinical And they have a lot of questions and a 8 programs. However, the daily challenge we encountered 8 lot of trauma regardless because acute care itself, 9 is with the decrease of age in younger cohorts we have 9 especially when you're expecting a baby and -- and 10 fewer data. 10 going through this experience, you know, is definitely 11 11 not in anyone's plan or hopes and dreams for -- for So additional data, especially in very 12 young children, will help us understand the physiology 12 their child and their -- their parenthood. 13 in -- in young children and help us to better predict 13 Plus, you have to think about the other 14 and use the modeling-simulation practice or use some 14 baggage that people have along the way regarding 15 social determinants of health, regarding any sort of 15 other approaches to estimate, predict, evaluate the 16 dose in pediatric populations. 16 other, you know, developmental trauma or systemic, you 17 Next slide. 17 know, impact and marginalization that may occur. 18 18 I want to use this opportunity to thank Next slide, please. 19 all the individuals listed on this slide and also 19 So this -- this is my story. Max was 20 thank my colleagues in the DIDP and the DAV in FDA for 20 born 12 years ago actually last week -- or 2 weeks ago 21 their help to develop those slides and also 21 now, and he was my first pregnancy. Everything was 22 stimulating discussions. Without them, this 22 normal and typical until it wasn't at 37 weeks. Page 59 Page 61 1 presentation would not happen. Thank you for your So the HIE community is a little bit

2 attention. 3 DR. BELEW: Thank you, Dr. Wu. Next I'd like to introduce Ms. Betsy 5 Pilon, Executive Director for Hope for Hypoxic 6 Ischemic Encephalopathy. Ms. Pilon's talk is entitled 7 "Life of a NICU Parent: Decision-Making in Clinical 8 Trial Enrollment." Thank you, Ms. Pilon, for being here 10 today and sharing your perspectives and experiences 11 with us. 12 MS. PILON: Thank you so much for 13 having me. 14 Next slide, please. 15 So I'm going to talk a little bit about 16 the NICU experience from both my perspective and being 17 a part of a community that very often starts in the 18 NICU. 19 And I just want to ask everyone what

20 you virtually walked into this room today and what

22 to think in the context of the NICU what families

21 kind of baggage. You know, it varies; and I want you

2 unique in that the majority of our families are full 3 term, but I know that there -- I'm very familiar with 4 the CMV community as well and hope that this is, you 5 know, applicable to the discussion points today as 6 well. 7 He was born in the community-hospital 8 setting, transferred to Downtown Detroit at Henry Ford 9 Hospital for therapeutic hypothermia. We had no idea 10 that this was even a possibility. 11 You know, the messaging and 12 representation still remains heavily skewed towards 13 preemies; and, you know, typically, families are 14 counseled that if you get past 36 weeks you should be, 15 quote/unquote, "in the clear." 16 And any full-term babies that I knew 17 were there for transient observation, maybe a 18 bilirubin level, something that -- that was very 19 transitional and not something neurologically focused. 20 For our -- for our journey, as you can see on the 21 bottom, you know, we did get transferred to the NICU.

22 So that was a layer of complexity.

Page 62

I was luckily transferred down a few 2 hours after Max was. Max got into the cooling process

- 3 -- you can see the little graphic at the bottom there
- 4 -- on full EEG umbilical line. He was on the
- 5 oscillator, very, very sick, getting transferred down;
- 6 and we had to be separated because he was, you know,
- 7 delivered by emergency C-section.
- And then he went through his cooling
- 9 for hypothermia, which is a 72-hour process, cooldown,
- 10 warmup, and then on Day 5 received an MRI; and at that
- 11 time, you know, the MRI, like many hospitals, was on
- 12 the other side of the moon, it felt like; and they so
- 13 had to pack him up, reintubated him for stability at
- 14 that time.

1

- 15 I hope and believe and have heard that
- 16 a lot of practices have changed over the past 12
- 17 years, always the case.
- 18 And -- but it was a very stressful time
- 19 for us; and everyone kept, you know, talking about how
- 20 MRI day was going to be the sentinel day of
- 21 information for us to figure out if this was kind of a
- 22 transient encephalopathy or if this was more

Page 63

- 1 associated with HIE.
- But HIE at that time was not named to
- 3 us. It was just talking about general brain injury,
- 4 and so we did have MRI day. It showed moderate damage
- 5 to the occipital, parietal, and frontal lobes; and we
- 6 were kind of thrust into what everyone in our
- 7 community called the dreaded HIE wait and see.
- 8 Wait and see how he's going to develop.
- 9 Wait and see if he'll eat. Wait and see if suck,
- 10 swallow, gag, you know, coordinates and comes together
- 11 or if he'll need a feeding tube.
- 12 We had no mention 12 years ago of HIE
- 13 until there was one day where we had non-family-
- 14 centered rounds and overheard the term encephalopathy.
- 15 So I had worked for the health system
- 16 in marketing and communications, had written a lot of
- 17 patient-education materials, and had been exposed to a
- 18 lot of different medical terms; and that was not one
- 19 that I had been -- that I had been familiar with.
- 20 So I reached out to my sister-in-law,
- 21 who's a pediatric physical therapist. I had asked her
- 22 what encephalopathy meant. I asked the -- the

1 physician what it meant. I flagged him down a little

- 2 bit; and he said, "Well, it just means it has to do
- 3 something with the brain; but don't go home and Google
- 4 it."
- 5 So for me, that was a dissatisfier not
- 6 knowing what, you know, a diagnosis was for my child,
- 7 what this could mean, what life might look like across
- 8 a very wide variety -- spectrum of outcomes with HIE.
- 9 It is very heterogeneous in all ways, I believe.
- 10 And I feel strongly about now
- 11 connecting with over 10,000 families worldwide with
- 12 Hope for HIE and hearing so many different stories.
- 13 So, you know, me as a family member, we -- we left the
- 14 NICU without any connection to any support. I had
- 15 asked for support. I had asked for other families to
- 16 be connected to.
- 17 So obviously, that was a very isolating
- 18 and frustrating time; and just the NICU in general is
- 19 really -- it's a slog, regardless of if you're there
- 20 for 1 day or 100 days. It's -- it's a very complex
- 21 acute-care environment.
- 22 In our situation, you know, Max was,

Page 65

- 1 like, the only really sick full-term baby. So that
- 2 was very isolating; and then when trying to talk to
- 3 people about the fact that he was full term in the
- 4 NICU, you know, there was just a lot of downplay or,
- 5 you know, of course well -- well-meaning but very much
- 6 -- you know: "He'll be fine. He's full term."
- 7 Or even in NICU support groups that we
- 8 initially connected with, you know, we were told,
- 9 like, many -- by fellow parents that had been -- there
- 10 was nothing to worry about 'cause our baby was only in
- 11 the NICU for three weeks.
- 12 So, you know, there's just a lot of
- 13 interesting things; and when we talk about today --
- 14 next slide, please.
- 15 The topic at hand, which is neonatal
- 16 clinical trials -- you know, and in this context of
- 17 HIE and other -- other very difficult, harrowing
- 18 potential experiences, there's lots of variables that
- 19 work against research and -- researchers and families.
- 20 Now, Max was born in 2012; and that was
- 21 at a period of time with cooling in particular that
- 22 that was becoming standard of care; but it was not

Page 66
1 fully expanded standard of care.

- 2 And so we were very fortunate that
- 3 Henry Ford was a part of the NRN cooling trials and
- 4 that everyone was very aware that this was a treatment
- 5 available and that they had the treatment available,
- 6 you know, not only at Henry Ford.
- 7 But obviously, I'm in metro Detroit.
- 8 There's lots of -- you know, lots of good sites that
- 9 are -- that we had a lot of great research and -- and
- 10 access to good care, but the disparity of care is
- 11 certainly variable out there.
- 12 And so, you know, with HIE, in
- 13 particular with cooling, you need to initiate it
- 14 within six hours and get the baby started cooling down
- 15 for biggest chance at efficacy; and I think back to
- 16 the families that I'm connected to through our
- 17 organizational support where there -- we have families
- 18 that participated in the original cooling trials.
- 19 And I think about what a science-
- 20 fiction, you know, discussion that sounds like to, you
- 21 know, do an experimental treatment to cool a baby down
- 22 for three days. You can't touch them, can't -- you

Page 67

- 1 know, have to keep stimuli low. At least, that was
- 2 what the -- the experience of -- of us and those that
- 3 went through those trials.
- 4 So it's, you know, very high stakes
- 5 and, again, time sensitive. Resource variability I
- 6 mentioned a little bit. You know, with HIE and a lot
- 7 of neonatal clinical trials, there's the mother-baby
- 8 health and separation aspects.
- 9 So I mentioned I'm very lucky that I
- 10 was transferred, you know, with Max; but many people
- 11 are not; and mother's health is often very impacted as
- 12 well, depending on the causation.
- There's an overwhelming well-
- 14 intentioned and necessary consent that's insisted by
- 15 the -- you know, the IRBs out there; and you have to
- 16 really build quick health-literacy lessons to build
- 17 consent to have informed consent. You know, with --
- 18 with HIE or many others, something didn't go right.
- So a lot of times there's that, you
- 20 know, fight or flight or freeze in -- in the midst of
- 21 trauma. That can create a mistrust, and there's just
- 22 a lot of medical misinformation out there that's

1 causing a lot of mistrust. It is trauma.

- 2 And then we also come across on the
- And then we also come across on the
- 3 clinical side -- there is -- is and can be bias,
- 4 gatekeeping, and misperception of families and
- 5 systemic inequity, so a lot of things -- a lot of big
- 6 factors from the family perspective of -- and the
- 7 clinical perspective of -- of trying to enroll
- 8 families into clinical trials in the context of the
- 9 NICU.
- 10 But we must accept finite
- 11 disappointment but never lose infinite hope for that.
- 12 So next slide, please.
- We're going to talk a little bit about
- 14 the exciting work of the -- that is going on with
- 15 researchers and families. So on HIE in particular,
- 16 'cause that's what I know and can talk about, you
- 17 know, there's 30-plus years of research with HIE.
- 18 We've explored cooling with head cooling versus whole
- 19 body.
- 20 People have done additional, you know,
- 21 studies with longer, quicker, colder gestational
- 22 modifiers to really explore all facets of cooling.

Page 69

- 1 There's a PCORI study going on right now called COOL
- 2 PRIME looking at mild HIE in cooling, which was not
- 3 originally included in the -- the original underlying
- 4 cohorts.
- 5 And then the HEAL study is another
- 6 landmark study that now has very powerful secondary
- 7 analyses going on. There's also -- the Gates
- 8 Foundation has a preclinical pipeline with various
- 9 small and large animal models and human organoid.
- 10 And they're really trying to look at
- 11 equity for LMIC because HIE in particular impacts LMIC
- 12 far more than high-income countries, but -- and -- and
- 13 cooling is just not something that's feasible for many
- 14 around the world or effective, given some updated
- 15 information.
- And on the horizon, there's novel and
- 17 repurposed medication possibilities; and this is where
- 18 I know the FDA and other regulatory agencies come in.
- 19 People are talking about stem cells, peptides,
- 20 biologics, and even melatonin and looking at what
- 21 could -- caffeine, there's all sorts of things that
- 22 are being explored.

Page 70

1 And things -- you know, what I -- what

- 2 I was really struck by, by a previous speaker was
- 3 looking at, you know, the -- the existing medications
- 4 that are approved and what could be repurposed and
- 5 getting also people outside of a specific area.
- 6 For HIE, it's very obviously
- 7 neonatology and neurology focused; but, you know, we
- 8 have a lot of innovation going on that -- I've heard a
- 9 story of, you know, innovation going on from
- 10 infectious-disease immunology as well, you know, in
- 11 looking at multiple factors. So multidisciplinary
- 12 collaboration is really essential for this.
- 13 And so the next slide, please.
- 14 Gap areas to consider from my
- 15 perspective, silos, bias, and impact to the enrollment
- 16 -- you know, centering the community that you're
- 17 studying and avoiding tokenization for funding, that
- 18 does happen across HIE and other -- and other disease
- 19 areas.
- 20 Having early multidisciplinary
- 21 stakeholder involvement, thinking outside neonatology
- 22 -- neonatology, as I mentioned early in the trial-

Page 71

- 1 design process -- and site training for communication
- 2 is essential to enrollment success, making sure that
- 3 people really are building training resources in
- 4 collaboration with families that have gone through
- 5 clinical trials to, you know, really, you know,
- 6 implement best practices in consistency and also have
- 7 mechanisms of trying to just, you know, find ways to
- 8 answer common questions to optimize enrollment
- 9 measures, develop measures that matter.
- 10 I know this was alluded to by An
- 11 earlier. Composite, there's a lot of work being done
- 12 right now in multiple areas, which is really exciting
- 13 versus lumping death and disability, which is kind of
- 14 the comment of, you know, mortality and morbidity.
- 15 And NDI in particular is such an
- 16 interesting definition that I think we're seeing a lot
- 17 of work that's being done, and Jean Vie [ph] up in
- 18 Canada and others are looking at what we can do to
- 19 move to that composite and then looking to help
- 20 patient and family stakeholders understand those
- 21 biomarkers too.
- We want to be educated. A lot of the

- 1 bias that does exist is that families can't understand
- 2 or they're not educated. So help us be educated and
- 3 understand so we can also translate that back to
- 4 communities.
- 5 And then looking at longitudinal
- 6 engagement and support and looking at proactive
- 7 communication planning, that should be formalized
- 8 throughout the entire study, so looking at how your
- 9 intention -- the intentionality, the key messages,
- 10 working with a communication consultant.
- 11 I -- I can't emphasize -- emphasize
- 12 that enough to use best practices for patient and
- 13 family engagement with those considerations for
- 14 building health literacy and include longitudinal
- 15 support resources for enrolled families.
- 16 Families -- you know, two years is a
- 17 long time. There's a lot that goes on. You're in the
- 18 acute period in a neonatal trial in the NICU; but then
- 19 afterwards you have to figure out life with what
- 20 you've gone through and process and, you know, deal
- 21 with whatever impacts might be long-lasting from the
- 22 NICU.
- 1 Families need those supports so we can
- 2 decrease attrition rates and make sure that they're
- 3 really engaged in these studies. So, you know, we've
- 4 tried to do that with several of the studies that our
- 5 families have been a part of; and, you know, the HEAL
- 6 study is a great example.
- 7 There's a ton of secondary analyses. I
- 8 am communicating those back to our community as they
- 9 come out and continuing to have families be engaged in
- 10 that process to build this community culture of
- 11 research.
- 12 Next slide, please.
- And just to give my own example of
- 14 Max's journey to share where a lot of these clinical
- 15 trials stop, you know, so Max's developmental-impact
- 16 journey, vision concerns early on, 3 months, you know,
- 17 we were pushed -- we pushed to wean him off
- 18 phenobarbital, which is now -- there's evidence behind
- 19 that practice change over the past decade, which is
- 20 fantastic.
- You know, at 9 months old, he got --
- 22 received an official cerebral palsy diagnosis. At 2

Page 74

1 years, he got corrective vision surgery. You know, he 1

2 was in PT and OT and has been for his entire life. He 2

3 has a slew of specialists down there -- you can see --

4 from 6 months onward.

5 Then you can see the black line, and

6 this is where most clinical trial ends because of data

7 and funding and needing to accelerate things through

8 but of course, kids hopefully go on to live lives; and

9 with Max, he began walking at age 3. At 5 years, he

10 had some delays and suspected ADHD. At 8, he had

11 confirmed inattentive ADHD.

12 At age 8 and a half, we had epilepsy

13 join our lives, onset at the sleep-wake cycle; 10

14 years, an anxiety diagnosis; and at 11 years, just

15 this past year, an official CVI diagnosis and had a

16 pretty intensive surgery that he's been doing an

17 amazing recovery with.

For medications, like I mentioned, he

19 was on phenobarb when he was born, which is very

20 standard of care to control seizures, although he had

21 no noted subclinical or clinical seizures; and -- but

22 when epilepsy rejoined, he was on Trileptal -- or he

Page 76 And, Betsy, really thank you for that

2 family perspective, such an important component of

3 what I'll be discussing.

4 Again, I'm Lily Mulugeta. I'd like to

5 thank Yodit Belew and the rest of the organizers for

6 inviting me to participate in this workshop today.

7 Again, my talk will focus on leveraging

8 pediatric-trial networks to facilitate pediatric drug

9 developments. In addition, I will briefly touch on

10 some global collaborations in advancing pediatric drug

11 developments.

12 Next slide, please.

13 I have no financial conflicts to

14 disclose.

Next slide, please.

16 So perhaps I'm preaching to the choir a

17 bit here, but I do want to take a minute to remind us

18 of the important principles of pediatric therapeutics'

19 development. So much of what we will be discussing

20 today and tomorrow will be based on these principles

21 So firstly, I hope we recognize that

22 it's imperative that pediatric patients similar to

Page 75

1 is continually on Trileptal.

2 He has a rescue med. He's on Adderall.

3 He was on baclofen until last year's surgery. So

4 we've been able to take that one off. So just looking

5 at the medication cocktail, what impact does that

6 have? It's really important to families to understand

7 the pharmacokinetics behind that as well.

8 And that is -- I have the next slide;

9 and I am happy to take questions or connect at any

10 point; but again, I want to thank you for the

11 opportunity to speak today.

DR. BELEW: Thank you, Ms. Pilon.

13 Next I'd like to introduce Dr. Lily

14 Mulugeta, Associate Director for Policy and Research

15 for the Division of Pediatric and Maternal Health at

16 FDA. Dr. Mulugeta's talk is entitled "Facilitating

17 Neonatal and Pediatric Drug Development: Leveraging

18 Pediatric Trial Networks and Global Collaboration."

19 Thank you, Dr. Mulugeta.

20 DR. MULUGETA: Thank you for that

21 introduction.

22 Good morning, everyone.

1 adults have access to products that have undergone

2 rigorous evaluation. One way to do this is to ensure

3 that pediatric studies are incorporated early into

4 product-development programs when appropriate.

5 There's also growing recognition that

6 incorporation of regulatory standards into pediatric

7 clinical research really strengthens the quality of

8 the research.

9 Next slide, please.

10 So moving on to the challenges in

11 pediatric drug development -- and I think you've heard

12 some of these challenges earlier; but really to

13 emphasize, one of the most persistent issues is the

14 lag between adult approval and pediatric labeling.

This delay, which often averages around

16 seven years, means that children may not have timely

17 access to treatments that have deemed to be safe and

18 effective in adults. Patient-accrual difficulties

19 also pose a significant challenge in pediatric drug

20 development and account for nearly 40 percent of study

21 discontinuations.

Factors contributing to these

Meeting Page 78 1 difficulties may include the small size of the 1 academia, industry, and regulators are also crucial 2 under -- in driving collaborative efforts. 2 pediatric patient population for certain conditions, 3 3 the willingness of clinicians to use therapeutics off These partnerships can also enable the 4 label, and inefficiencies in conducting pediatric 4 development of innovative trial designs that overcome 5 clinical trials. 5 the many limitations of neonatal and pediatric These challenges, which are 6 development, including the small sample sizes and the 7 particularly pronounced in neonates and infants, can 7 acceptability of the pediatric trial design. 8 8 result in insufficient evidence to support pediatric Additionally, which is really the focus 9 product labeling, which really leaves healthcare 9 of my talk today, pediatric-research networks can play 10 providers with limited guidance on the use of new 10 a pivotal role in facilitating the setup and execution 11 of pediatric clinical trials; and I'll talk a bit more 11 therapeutics in children. 12 Next slide, please. 12 about this in the next several slides. 13 13 So the evolution in pediatric drug Next slide, please. 14 development over the last really couple of decades 14 So the roles of pediatric-research 15 represents a paradigm shift; right? It's no longer 15 networks are really multifaceted. Networks in general 16 about protecting children from research but really 16 -- not limited to pediatric networks, but networks in 17 rather protecting them through research. 17 general have been identified as a promising approach 18 And this shift in mindset really 18 to overcome inefficiencies in clinical research, which 19 recognizes that evaluating both new and existing drugs 19 is particularly important for the pediatric 20 in pediatric patients requires collaborations across 20 population. 21 various stakeholders, and I think Betsy really 21 These networks facilitate collaboration 22 illustrated that very nicely as well. 22 among stakeholders who may not have traditionally Page 79 Page 81 1 So it has to include patients, 1 worked together -- right -- such as researchers from 2 families, patient organizations, academic researchers, 2 different institutions, industry sponsors, regulators. 3 3 community practitioners, regulators, and industry And so by pooling resources -- and that 4 partners. 4 may include data or expertise or both -- these 5 The FDA, for instance, has really 5 networks can accelerate research and development in 6 demonstrated its commitment to improving the 6 pediatric patients. 7 efficiency of pediatric clinical trials through 7 They can also encourage innovation,

8 collaborative initiatives; and I'll touch upon some of 8 which is highly desirable in the -- in pediatric drug 9 these in my talks; but really this workshop is another 9 development by supporting the implementation of novel 10 example of many collaborations that are aimed at 10 trial designs, use of registries, modeling studies, 11 advancing pediatric drug development. 11 and platform trials. 12 Next slide, please. 12 And lastly, pediatric-research networks 13 So opportunities really for 13 enable the conduct of multicentered trials; and I'm 14 collaboration in pediatric drug development are 14 sure I don't have to say too much about this to this 15 abundant. One key opportunity lies in precompetitive 15 group. I just really need to emphasize that this is 16 collaborations where various stakeholders can share 16 an essential component for recruiting larger and more 17 preclinical data, tools, and resources without 17 diverse pediatric-trial populations. 18 compromising their competitive interests. 18 Next slide, please. 19 These collaborations not only foster 19 So there is a variety of pediatric-20 innovation but also streamline the drug-development 20 research networks with different organizations --21 process and ultimately benefit patients, which is 21 organizational structures and levels of activities. 22 really our goal. Consortia and partnerships between 22 Some of these networks are based around

....

- 1 clinical specialties really focusing on optimizing
- 2 patient outcomes while other networks operate across
- 3 geographical locations and really focusing on
- 4 addressing barriers and inefficiencies in the conduct
- 5 of clinical research.
- 6 And really ideally, these networks are
- 7 highly integrated -- right -- combining the strengths
- 8 of clinical specialty-focused approaches really with
- 9 the broader reach of geographically diverse networks
- 10 and I'll provide some examples in the next few slides.
- 11 Next slide, please.
- So pediatric-research networks have the
- 13 potential to significantly impact discussion-making
- 14 throughout the drug-development life cycle, and I
- 15 think this is really an important emphasis.
- In the early phases, these networks can
- 17 provide valuable insight -- insights into disease
- 18 prevalence, treatment patterns, patient heterogeneity,
- 19 and even potential biomarkers that may be specific to
- 20 the pediatric population of interest.
- In later phase stages, pediatric-
- 22 research networks can influence key aspects of trial

1 pediatric-research networks abound -- right --

- 2 showcasing diverse models and approaches to pediatric
- 3 drug development. There's no way that in my 15-minute
- 4 talk I'll be able to provide an exhaustive list of
- 5 these networks, but I do -- would like to highlight a
- 6 few examples.

Page 82

- 7 One example is the Pediatric Trials
- 8 Network or the PTN, which was established in 2010 with
- 9 funding from the NIH. This was specifically to
- 10 fulfill a mandate under BPCA. The PTN collaborates
- 11 with academic institutions, industry sponsors, and
- 12 regulators to provide infrastructure and support for
- 13 both designing and conducting pediatric trials.
- 14 And what's interesting, this network's
- 15 contribution also includes submission of the collected
- 16 data to the FDA to update product labeling
- 17 specifically for off-patent drugs; and you'll hear
- 18 more about this network from my colleague Rachel
- 19 Greenberg tomorrow.
- 20 Similarly, other collaborative
- 21 initiatives, such as the Collaborative Antiviral Study
- 22 Group, bring together multiple centers to conduct

Page 83

- 1 design; and this can include inclusion-exclusion
- 2 criteria, treatment duration, collection of
- 3 supplementary safety data and considerations around
- 4 data extrapolation from either older children or
- 5 adults.
- 6 And in addition, by collaborating with
- 7 these networks, sponsors can also potential optimize
- 8 trial conduct by identifying potential trial
- 9 candidates, engaging qualified sites, and -- and
- 10 investigators as well.
- 11 Lastly, pediatric-research networks
- 12 play -- can play a vital role even in the post-
- 13 approval stage.
- 14 And this can be a mechanism to
- 15 contribute to the expansion of the product labeling to
- 16 other pediatric populations, generating supplementary
- 17 safety data, and potential even addressing long-term
- 18 safety considerations that may not be really fully
- 19 understood at the time of its initial approval in
- 20 adults or approval in pediatric patients.
- 21 Next slide, please.
- 22 So examples of successful active

1 clinical trials, evaluating new antiviral therapies.

- 2 So these really multicenter
- 3 collaborations, which often can be funded by
- 4 government agencies or public private partnerships,
- 5 play a crucial role in accelerating the development
- 6 and evaluation of both new and old treatments for
- 7 pediatric patients.
- 8 Next slide, please.
- 9 I know this is really a busy slide, and
- 10 I really don't expect you to read what's -- all the
- 11 information that's in this slide, but it's really to
- 12 emphasize that the landscape of pediatric drug
- 13 development is enriched by a multitude of
- 14 collaborative initiatives and research networks.
- Each of these contribute uniquely to
- 16 the advancement of pediatric therapeutic innovation.
- 17 As you can see, some of these networks
- 18 around -- are modeled around clinical specialties,
- 19 such as IMPAACT, for example, while others include
- 20 multiple specialties and focus on addressing
- 21 inefficiencies in the conduct of pediatric clinical
- 22 research; and that includes C4C, iACT, and others that

Meeting Page 86 Page 88 1 are listed on here. 1 collaboration and cooperation in therapeutics 2 development. 2 In addition, the range of activities of 3 3 these networks may also vary; and it could include The ICH fosters alignment among both 4 anywhere from protocol development for evaluation of 4 regulatory authorities and industry experts, and the 5 novel therapies to providing collaborative clinical-5 recent milestone in this collaborative journey is the 6 trial infrastructure, assistance with regulatory 6 recent publication of the ICH E11A Guideline, which 7 submission, and development of consensus and treatment 7 provides a harmonized global framework for 8 guidelines. 8 extrapolation of data, both PK efficacy and safety and 9 It's also important to note that these pediatric drug development. 10 10 networks are increasingly broadening to a global and And this guideline is really grounded 11 patient-centered approach, which, you know, given 11 in scientific rigor but also provides regulatory 12 Betsy's presentation, it's clear that this approach 12 harmonization and really exemplifies the synergistic 13 will yield to better and efficient pediatric research 13 potential inherent in global collaborations when aimed 14 and development programs. 14 at enhancing therapeutics development for children. 15 Next slide. 15 Next slide, please. 16 And just to briefly touch upon networks 16 There are clearly many international 17 that are unique to neonates, there are neonatal 17 regulatory collaborations. I've just listed a few. 18 networks. An example is the International Neonatal 18 Some are solely focused in pediatrics, while others 19 Consortium or the INC, which plays a vital role in 19 are broader but address pediatric regulatory-related 20 addressing the unique challenges associated with 20 issues. 21 21 neonatal drug development. Initiatives such as the Monthly

Page 87

Page 89

1 by my colleagues earlier this morning. So really by

Many of these challenges were mentioned

- 2 leveraging multidisciplinary expertise and
- 3 collaborative frameworks, neonatal networks like INC
- 4 aim to develop consensus-driven approaches that can
- 5 enable feasible and practical trials in neonates.
- This concerted effort has been
- 7 particularly -- particularly impactful, for example,
- 8 in neonatal seizures. This is a space where
- 9 regulatory waivers for required pediatric studies in
- 10 neonates were previously granted due to perceived
- 11 impracticality.

22

- And as a result of the -- all the work
- 13 that was done by the INC and the consensus
- 14 recommendations that were developed, it has really
- 15 allowed the FDA to require neonatal studies for anti-
- 16 epileptics on a case-by-case basis.
- 17 Next slide, please.
- 18 So moving on to global collaborations,
- 19 one that I would like to mention is the International
- 20 Council for Harmonization or the ICH, which stands as
- 21 an example of concerted efforts to harmonize
- 22 regular -- regulatory standards and promote global

- 1 2007, for example, facilitate ongoing dialogue and
- 2 information exchange among regulatory agencies. This

22 Pediatric Cluster Conference, which was established in

- 3 one particularly includes FDA, EMA, PMDA, Health
- 4 Canada, and TGA.
- 5 So these collaborative forums really
- 6 serve as catalysts for sharing scientific insights,
- 7 discussing policy considerations, and addressing
- 8 pediatric-specific regulatory challenges, ultimately
- 9 with the goal of ensuring that pediatric drug-
- 10 development programs are efficient and practical.
- 11 Next slide, please.
- 12 So really in summary, given all the
- 13 presentations today and hopefully from some of the
- 14 information I've shared with you, I hope it's evident
- 15 that the landscape of pediatric drug development is
- 16 characterized by significant achievements stemming
- 17 from collaborative efforts and multidisciplinary
- 18 approaches.
- 19 Collaborative networks that continue to
- 20 expand globally are instrumental in driving progress,
- 21 fostering innovation, and addressing challenges
- 22 inherent in pediatric and neonatal therapeutics

Page 90 1 development. 1 to, to evaluate the potential use of real-world 2 And as we look towards the future, 2 evidence to support a new indication for a drug 3 really continued emphasis of -- on inclusion of 3 already approved or to satisfy post-approval study 4 voices, such as Betsy's, of patient outcomes, data 4 requirements. 5 transparency, regulatory harmonization, and policy 5 We also have issued a draft framework 6 development will be paramount in sustaining the 6 within two years and guidance for industry starting 7 momentum of therapeutic innovation for pediatric 7 within five years and -- and continuing through just a 8 patients. 8 couple of months ago. 9 9 Next slide, please. An important note at the bottom of this 10 Again, I would like to thank the 10 slide, our standard for substantial evidence to 11 organizers for giving me an opportunity to speak 11 approve drugs and biologic products is unchanged. We 12 today, as well as my colleagues from the FDA at PTN 12 owe that to patients, whether they be adults or 13 who contributed to these slides; and I look forward to 13 neonates. We have to be sure that the drugs are safe 14 the rest of the presentations and discussions. Thank 14 and effective. 15 15 you so much. Next, please. 16 DR. BELEW: Thank you, Dr. Mulugeta. 16 This is a screenshot of our 2018 real-17 Next I'd like to introduce our last 17 world-evidence framework. I wanted to with this slide 18 speaker of the session, Dr. John Concato. Dr. Concatol 8 mention that what I'll be discussing applies to the 19 is the associate director for Real-World Evidence 19 Center for Drugs, the Center for Biologics, and the 20 Analytics in the Office of Medical Policy at FDA. Dr.20 Oncology Center of Excellence. 21 Concato will be speaking about real-world data and 21 We coordinate with our Center for 22 real-world evidence in drug development. 22 Devices and Radiological Health, but they have their Page 91 Page 93 1 Thank you, Dr. Concato. 1 separate regulations, and they've covered a real-2 2 world-evidence program with a lot of cross-DR. CONCATO: Thank you. 3 3 communication and cross-specialization. Hello, everyone. 4 4 Back to drugs and biologics, our And next slide, please. 5 program can be thought of informally in the taxonomy 5 The views and opinions expressed are my 6 own and should not be attributed as official FDA 6 of: one, internal agency processes, such as providing 7 policy. I do not have any conflicts of interest 7 consultation to review divisions; number two, external 8 stakeholder engagement listed in sections or even 8 related to this presentation; and when I mention 9 commercial product, it's not an actual or implied 9 today's workshop and tomorrow -- and tomorrow's 10 workshop; number three, demonstration of research 10 endorsement. 11 Next, please. 11 projects -- I'll give an example later -- and last but 12 I'll be providing a high-level 12 not least, number four, guidance development. 13 overview, starting with a background on real-world 13 Next, please. 14 Just to mention, because there is a bit 14 evidence and then moving onto selected aspects of 15 of ambiguity, if not confusion in the -- in the field, 15 FDA's Real-World Evidence Program, including guidance 16 development and demonstration of research projects, 16 in the ecosystem, real-world data are data related to 17 and then moving on to real-world data and real-world-17 patient-health status or delivery of healthcare 18 routinely collected from a variety of sources. 18 evidence activities related to neonatal healthcare. 19 And then real-world evidence is 19 Next. 20 20 clinical evidence regarding the benefits and risks of Let's start with the 21st Century Cures 21 a medical product, defined simply as being derived 21 Act of 2016 and mandates met. I need to convey that

22 from analysis of real-world data, regardless of the

22 we have established the program, as Congress asked us

Meeting Page 94 Page 96 1 study-design type. Next, please. 1 2 2 Next, please. Just in case it helps going forward in 3 So why all the attention focused on --3 general, not just limited to neonatal healthcare, one 4 let's say "hype" -- on real-world evidence? This is 4 misconception is that RWD and RWE are new concepts. 5 somewhat simplified, but interest in real-world 5 In reality, sources of data and types of study design, 6 evidence can be attributed at least in part to 6 as I mentioned, haven't fundamentally changed. 7 improved access to -- and the ability to be rapidly They might evolve, but it's really the 8 analyzed -- information in the era of so-called big 8 electronic access to more detailed clinical data 9 data. 9 evolution as well as the data becoming more 10 In addition, research over the past 10 reliable -- relevant and reliable, is what's making a 11 actually several decades has shown that observational 11 difference. 12 studies -- while they have a more challenging time 12 The second misconception is that 13 addressing sources of bias, they can under certain 13 there's a simple dichotomy of, quote, "randomized 14 circumstances generate valid results. 14 trials versus observational studies," close quote, 15 Certainly, the 21st Century Cures Act 15 again, a misconception. In reality, clinical trials 16 asking the -- the U.S. FDA to evaluate the potential 16 are defined by assignment of treatment according to an 17 use of real-world evidence for medical-product 17 investigational protocol. 18 approvals is relevant. 18 So if you think about it, single-arm 19 And then simply and perhaps and 19 trials face challenges similar to those of 20 sociologically, the popularity of "real-world" as a 20 observational studies in determining whether 21 term and other factors, unfortunately something like 21 differences in clinical outcomes -- in that case 22 the COVID-19 pandemic, which focused attention on 22 compared to an external control group -- represent Page 95 Page 97 1 different methods of evidence generation -- but I do 1 actual treatment effects. 2 2 want to point that with -- without invoking the terms Next slide. 3 3 "real-world data" or "real-world evidence," we can These same issues are shown in this 4 actually talk about types of data sources and study 4 figure. I will not go through each word on the page. 5 5 designs. But at the upper portion of the box in And those terms aren't new but are 6 the middle of this slide, as methodologists, we talk 7 totally sufficient to convey the intended message. 7 about randomized interventional studies, nonrandomized 8 8 but still interventional studies, and then Next slide, please. Moving forward to more recently from a 9 nonrandomized and noninterventional studies, a little 10 bit jargon-y; but the next one down is more shoptalk 10 couple of years ago, a colleague, Jacqueline Corrigan-

11 Curay, and I published on where are we now with regard 11 in our line of work. 12 to real-world evidence; and the main content of the 12 We've had traditional randomized 13 article -- the main issue being addressed -- excuse me 13 trials, which might use real-world data to help plan, 14 -- was that the terms "RWD" and "RWE" were being used 14 such as to assess enrollment criteria and assess trial 15 feasibility or select sites. We have trials in 15 inconsistently and interchangeably. 16 So the content of our article addressed 16 practice settings, such as point-of-care trials where 17 two common misconceptions, provided a conceptual 17 the outcome might be pulled from health-record data. 18 18 overview of study design, described our guidance and We have externally controlled trials, 19 demonstration projects, highlighted a couple of 19 and then we have observational studies, which is what 20 approvals, and offered a path forward. My next two 20 many people think of when they hear the term "real-21 slides will cover the first two of these five content 21 world evidence." 22 areas. 22 But at the bottom of that simple box,

Meeting Page 98 Page 100 1 note that the generation of real-world evidence can 1 multiple phases of the life cycle of" -- Microsoft 2 start with randomized trials. It certainly includes 2 changed "EHR" to "HER." I apologize for not spotting 3 externally controlled trials; and of course, it 3 that typo. 4 includes observational studies. 4 And the figure on the right basically 5 This is a bit technical, but I think 5 shows the complexity. 6 it's relevant, whether we're talking about neonatal 6 Not to go through this dataset, but 7 medicine or geriatric medicine or anywhere in between. 7 unlike clinical trials, where the data come in ready 8 Next slide, please. 8 to be analyzed, we don't -- we don't blame the 9 Here is where the guidance that FDA has 9 clinicians at the bedside for taking care of the 10 published is -- is summarized. I know there's a lot 10 neonatal patient and not necessarily knowing that the 11 of rows in this slide, but we chose a modular 11 electronic health record will be pulled later to do 12 approach, a suite of guidance so that it's one-stop 12 our research analysis. 13 shopping when you have a question as a sponsor or any 13 Next slide, please. 14 -- or an investigator. 14 So what does FDA do -- CDER and CBER 15 I'll summarize this slide by saying the 15 and OCE in particular -- when evaluating real-world 16 first two rows are real-world-data sources, Electronic 16 evidence? This is a very high-level overview; but 17 Health Records and Claims, as well as Registry or Data 17 when going to look down, we consider whether the real-18 Standards. In the third row, regulations were world data are fit for use, a major issue. 19 developed, assuming clinical trials would be the basis 19 And by "fit for use," we mean whether 20 of evidence submissions. So we had to account for the 20 they're reliable, accurate, complete, and traceable 21 real-world-data differences. 21 and whether they're clinically relevant. 22 22 "Regulatory Considerations" speaks for We also determine whether the study Page 99 Page 101 1 itself. Our regulations didn't anticipate nonclinical 1 design generated adequate scientific evidence to 2 trials; and then the next three, Externally Controlled 2 answer -- help answer the regulatory question; and 3 Trials, Noninterventional Studies, and Trials in 3 then last but not least, the study conduct has to meet 4 Practice Settings, are design-consideration guidances. 4 FDA regulatory requirements to ensure the -- the 5 Last but not least, we have a 5 safety and efficacy of the product. 6 Submitting Real-World Evidence guidance, which allows 6 Next slide, please. 7 sponsors to help us to help them if they accurately 7 So here is an example actually approved 8 identify what they're doing with regard to real-world 8 for both adult and -- and pediatric patients based on 9 data and real-world evidence. 9 so-called real-world evidence. 10 PROGRAF, tacrolimus, had been approved The link at the bottom provides all the

11 information you might want in general to see these 12 guidances as well as to see summaries of them. 13 Next slide, please. 14 Just to give a little bit of detail on 15 our guidances, this is a screenshot of the Assessing 16 Health Records and Medical Claims or HR Claims 17 guidance that was issued in draft several years back. 18 Next slide, please.

A little bit more in detail, excerpts

20 from "Real-World Data" on the left: "The process for

21 examining the quality of data is not a one-time

22 assessment. Rather, it's an ongoing process in

19

11 for the prophylaxis of organ rejection in patients 12 receiving liver and later kidney and heart transplants 13 based on traditional randomized control trial 14 evidence; and the drug was used widely in clinical 15 care, including for lung transplantation. 16 But RCTs were not done or at least not 17 submitted to the agency for approval. Later on a 18 sponsor submitted a supplemental New Drug Application 19 for FDA with an observational real-world-evidence 20 study. 21 The study data and design were

22 evaluated according to FDA standards. We heard in the

Page 102

1 introductory talk about our 314.126 regulation section

- 2 that determines what is an adequate and well-
- 3 controlled investigation.
- 4 And in -- in this case, approval for
- 5 preventing rejection/death in lung transplant, again
- 6 for both adults and pediatric patients, was granted in
- 7 2021.
- 8 Next slide, please.
- 9 I don't want to leave you all with the
- 10 idea that working with real-world data is an easy
- 11 task. These are representative challenges with the
- 12 real-world data or real-world evidence that cover a
- 13 wide slot of submissions, and most submissions fall
- 14 short at least at this time.
- 15 It's not always a sponsor's fault. I
- 16 would say in the first category of real-world-data
- 17 sources sometimes the data are just not reliable and
- 18 relevant enough; or again, a clinical trial might have
- 19 datapoints at certain intervals of weeks or months,
- 20 whereas in clinical care it's more driven by other
- 21 factors.
- We heard earlier about endpoints. The

1 world-data and real-world-evidence work on neonates.

- 2 This is a screenshot from a website that is still on
- 3 the FDA page, "Advancing Standards and Methodologies
- 4 to Generate Real-World Evidence from Real-World Data
- 5 through a Neonatal Pilot Project."
- 6 The U01 Award at the top is a
- 7 cooperative research agreement through Health and
- 8 Human Services. This was a competitive procedure or
- 9 process whereby the International Neonatal Consortium,
- 10 part of the Critical Path Institute, was awarded a
- 11 project.
- 12 Basically, it -- the point is to -- to
- 13 develop a real-world-data analytics platform, and that
- 14 has been very successful to date.
- 15 Next slide, please.
- I won't go into the details. I'll
- 17 leave that for my C-Path colleagues, but this
- 18 commentary from 2023 in the Journal of Pediatrics on
- 19 "Real-World Evidence for Neonatal Drug Development:
- 20 Challenges and Opportunities" mentioned that the
- 21 challenges surrounding the use of real-world data are
- 22 substantial but not insurmountable.

Page 103

1

- 1 suitable capture of endpoints isn't always feasible in
- 2 real-world-data sources, and sometimes there's a need
- 3 for linkage with other data sources. Excuse my voice
- 4 today, I'm asking.
- 5 Certainly, the design and
- 6 interpretation of nonrandomized studies presents
- 7 problems, such as confounding. An underappreciated
- 8 problem is problems with index date or zero time -- I
- 9 don't have time to get into that -- or the use of an
- 10 inappropriate comparator.
- And then last but not least, in the
- 12 category of conduct, unlike clinical trials, where
- 13 everything is done prospectively, in -- in this case,
- 14 we want to be sure that the analysis was prespecified
- 15 If it's not, there could be some cherry-picking going
- 16 on that makes the drug look better than it actually
- 17 is.
- And then last but not least, we do
- 19 require access to patient-level data and the ability
- 20 to inspect real-world-data sources.
- Next slide, please.
- 22 Part of our footprint includes real-

And real-world-evidence-driven drug

- 2 development represents an evolution in scientific
- 3 methodology as well as a renewed commitment to
- 4 advancing neonatal health on a global scale.
- 5 Next slide, please.
- 6 I'll wrap up by saying that the FDA
- 7 remains committed to robust policy development aligned
- 8 with the 21st Century Cures Act while we maintain our
- 9 evidentiary standards in honoring our obligation to
- 10 protect and promote public health.
- Focusing on the distinction between
- 12 interventional studies and noninterventional studies
- 13 can help us all understand and describe the relevant
- 14 methodologic issues that might be holding us back; and
- 15 certainly, getting more experience, including the
- 16 conduct of rigorous noninterventional studies, will
- 17 help to advance drug development.
- 18 Next slide, please.
- 19 So hopefully, I've conveyed these
- 20 summary points. One is that, in addition to the
- 21 randomized trial paradigm, not in lieu of it, not to
- 22 replace it, the availability of big data and passage

Page 106

2 to the emergency of real-world evidence.

3 Our Real-World Evidence Program for

4 drugs and biologics is advancing, as we outlined in

1 of the 21st Century Cures Act reflect and contributed

- 5 our 2018 framework, including guidance documents and
- 6 demonstration projects, as I've given a couple of
- 7 examples of.
- And please, again, appreciate that CDER
- 9 approves drugs and biological products based on
- 10 existing evidentiary standards, including when
- 11 evaluating real-world evidence.
- 12 But as the earlier slides have
- 13 indicated and presentations, we -- we all hope for a
- 14 better future and the appropriate use of real-world
- 15 data and real-world evidence can advance neonatal drug
- 16 development in ways that we're not entirely sure --
- 17 sure of yet but that we can look forward to seeing in
- 18 the future.
- 19 Next slide, please.
- 20 Thank you very much.
- 21 DR. BELEW: Thank you, Dr. Concato.
- 22 That concludes the presentations for

Page 107

- 1 Session 1 of our agenda. We're running a bit behind,
- 2 but we now have a few minutes to take clarifying
- 3 questions related to the presentations we have heard
- 4 this morning.
- 5 Panelists, please raise your hand in
- 6 Zoom if you wish to ask a question.
- 7 And, members of the public, you may
- 8 enter your questions in the Q-and-A box.
- 9 Dr. Kimberlin, do you have a question?
- 10 DR. KIMBERLIN: I -- I do, and I'm not
- 11 sure if it will fit with this particular section or
- 12 not. I was struck by a couple of things with --
- 13 across the presentations, which were all really good.
- 14 One is the comment about the challenge
- 15 of placebo and -- and the acceptance of -- of a
- 16 placebo-controlled trial on the one hand and then the
- 17 -- the need for some sort of comparator -- a good
- 18 comparator on the other hand, Point Number 1.
- 19 Point Number 2, even with the modeling
- 20 that we can do from older children and adults with a
- 21 given antiviral, if it's not being used in babies, we

Page 108

- 1 know how the drug is going to be metabolized,
- 2 excreted. We don't know what the concentrations are.
- 3 Would it be possible to develop a study
- 4 that has a range -- simultaneously enrolls a range of
- 5 -- of doses, some of which are modeled to be
- 6 therapeutic, not yet proven, some of which are
- 7 deliberately less than that, subtherapeutic or maybe
- 8 even homeopathic, in a way that then would be able to
- 9 -- we'd be able to say: "Look. Everybody gets
- 10 drugged, but we do have a range of -- we anticipate a
- 11 range of benefit that could be looked at with an
- 12 adequate sample size"?
- 13 So that -- that -- that's the question.
- 14 Is that something that FDA could be open to?
- 15 DR. BELEW: Dr. Kimberlin, thank you so
- 16 much for the question. I think your first question
- 17 about placebo -- I think we'll talk more about this
- 18 during the panel session. As to your second question,
- 19 we could also perhaps talk about this during the panel
- as well, unless Dr. Wu has any comments to make.
- 21 DR. WU: Yeah. This is Kunyi. I
- 22 can -- I can give a try and get started, and I think

Page 109

- 1 we can discuss more in the panel discussion.
- 2 But for modeling simulation, just from
- 3 a technical perspective, if this drug is repurposed
- 4 and then we know the PK of the drug, just based on our
- 5 understanding -- it -- it's case by case of course.
- 6 But based on our understanding on the
- 7 ontogeny, on the enzyme maturation, on the receptor-
- 8 transporter maturation, we may or may not be able to
- 9 predict those in the neonatal and infant population;
- 10 and then, again, it's case by case. So this is a

11 technical challenge and difficulties.

- 12 And then for your second question, I
- 13 think you asked, you know, simultaneously enrolled --
- 14 so that's, you know, beyond my knowledge; and then we
- 15 have to discuss. I'd just defer to other disciplines
- 16 to answer this question.
- 17 DR. VISWANATHAN: Hi, Dr. Kimberlin.
- 18 This is Prabha Viswanathan again. I -- just to
- 19 briefly touch on the ethical aspect of your -- of your
- 20 question, if I heard it correctly, about whether it
- 21 would be acceptable to enroll subtherapeutic doses and
- 22 don't know what the ontogeny is going to be. We don't2 -- we never say "never" in ethics. It's all really

Meeting Page 110 Page 112 1 about context. 1 enterovirus epidemiology and background. 2 But prolonged doses of a -- of a -- or 2 (Off the record.) 3 multiple doses of -- of a -- of a drug that's known to 3 DR. PICA: Welcome back. We will now 4 not offer that prospect of direct benefit to the 4 begin Session 2, which will focus on enterovirus 5 participant is something that would need to be 5 epidemiology and background. We are delighted to have 6 justified. So I think that's something that we can 6 Dr. Amy Rosenfeld, Dr. Miranda Delahoy, and Dr. Mark 7 dig into, into the panel a little bit more. 7 Abzug here this morning. DR. BELEW: And, Dr. Abzug, I think you Next slide, please. 9 9 had a clarifying question as well? It is now my pleasure to introduce our 10 DR. ABZUG: Thank you. 10 first speaker, Dr. Amy Rosenfeld, Principal 11 And I want -- first of all, want to 11 Investigator in the Division of Viral Products in the 12 thank everybody for the excellent presentations that 12 Office of Vaccines, Research, and Review at FDA. Dr. 13 we've heard thus far. I also want to pick up on -- on 13 Rosenfeld's talk is entitled "Picornaviruses and 14 David's question a little bit about the issue of a 14 Neonatal Sepsis." 15 placebo. 15 Thank you, Dr. Rosenfeld. 16 It seems to me there's a tension 16 DR. ROSENFELD: Thank you very much for 17 between the standard of direct benefit to all 17 inviting me to speak to you this morning about 18 participating subjects and having a placebo group, picornaviruses and neonatal sepsis. 19 which is the gold standard for a randomized control 19 Next slide. 20 trial because in most circumstances placebo recipients 20 So picornaviridae is a family of 21 are not expected to have a direct benefit from the 21 viruses. These are single-stranded positive-sent RNA 22 intervention. 22 viruses that are nonenveloped; and the viral family is

Page 111

1 composed of 40 genera; and today we're going to talk

2 more about how that tension is -- is addressed or 2 about 2 of the genera, which is the enterovirus genus

3 should be addressed in -- in study design. Thank you. 3 and the parechovirus genus.

DR. BELEW: Thank you, Dr. Abzug. I

5 think that those are really important comments, and

6 we're -- we're hoping to cover that more in the panel.

DR. VISWANATHAN: Yeah. I -- I can

8 just provide a very brief response, and I -- I do

9 think it merits more discussion during the panel. We

So I -- I'd like to hear a little bit

10 acknowledge that the placebo control doesn't receive

11 benefit. The -- the trial needs to be designed in

12 such a way that risks are minimized for all patients,

13 regardless of their subject assignment.

14 Ultimately, it is a complex issue. So

15 I -- I do think it probably deserves a little bit more

16 discussion from all the different contributors a

17 little bit later in the afternoon, but thank you for

18 the question.

4

19 DR. BELEW: Great. Thank you all for

20 those questions and to our speakers for providing

21 answers. We're now going to take a break; and we'll

22 reconvene at 11:20 for Session 2, when we will discuss

4 And the enterovirus genus is composed

5 of 11 -- of 14 species, plus Rhinoviruses A through C,

6 whereas the parechovirus genus is composed solely of

7 one species, parechovirus, which is then subdivided

8 into A and B.

And we're going to talk about the A --

10 viruses in A's, which is Parechovirus 1, 3A, and 6,

11 which are associated with neonatal-sepsis infection,

12 as well as members of Species B of the enterovirus

13 genus, which are Echoviruses 11, 30, and Coxsackie A.

14 Additionally, there are additional

15 coxsackieviruses that also associate with the

16 development of neonatal sepsis.

17 Next slide, please.

18 So the picornaviruses all have a

19 similar structure. They're composed of, as I said, a

20 nonenveloped particle, which is composed of three

21 viral capsid proteins. Viral Capsid Proteins 1

22 through 3 are on the exterior surface of the particle,

Page 114

1 and Viral Capsid Protein VP0 is on the inner surface 2 of the particle.

3 The difference between parechoviruses

- 4 and enteroviruses is a maturation cleavage, VP0 into
- 5 VP2 and 4 for enteros, which occurs after the particle
- 6 is egressed from the infected cell. So it is a
- 7 cleavage that is thought to be catalyzed by the ion
- 8 genome in the particle. That occurs after the virus
- 9 is released.
- 10 So capsid proteins are
- 11 cotranslationally proteolytically processed and self-
- 12 assembled, and they self-assemble into pentamers,
- 13 which are on the right, which are five protomers of
- 14 each viral protein. This gives rise to an icosahedron
- 15 particle, which has the signature threefold, fivefold,
- 16 and twofold axes of symmetry.
- 17 And here, if you look at the particle
- 18 on the side, the pentamer, you can see VP4 in green
- 19 lines the interior surface. Not all particles form a
- 20 canyon, which is a crevice that surrounds the fivefold
- 21 axis of symmetry.
- 22 For many enteroviruses, including

Page 115

- 1 poliovirus and rhinoviruses of the major group, this
- 2 is a receptor-binding site. However, once again, this
- 3 canyon is not present on the surface of parechoviruses
- 4 and many other echo -- and many other enteroviruses.
- 5 Next slide.
- 6 All of these viral genomes are -- have
- 7 the same organization. They're all linked to viral
- 8 genome -- viral-protein-linked genome, which is VPG at
- 9 the five-prime end. This is removed or -- upon
- 10 release of the viral genome into the cytoplasm.
- 11 So you have a free five-prime end
- 12 without the seven-methylguanosine cap to regulate
- 13 translation initiation, but the viral RNA is
- 14 immediately engaged by the ribosome and is the mRNA of
- 15 the genome.
- 16 And once again, it is a single open
- 17 meeting frame; and this polypeptide is
- 18 cotranslationally proteolytically processed by viral-
- 19 encoded proteases into either the mature or immature
- 20 proteins through the schematic map that I've described
- 21 beneath.
- 22 Next slide.

These viruses all replicate within the

- 2 cytoplasm of the infected cell. So they attach to a
- 3 cell-surface protein, which is known as the receptor.
- 4 Many of these receptors have not been identified.
- 5 Once the particular attaches to the
- 6 cell protein, the surface protein, it is internalized
- 7 in an endosome; and depending upon the enterovirus or
- 8 even parechovirus, un-coding and release of the viral
- 9 genome is a pH-dependent process. So it's regulated
- 10 by the acidification of this endosome.
- 11 The RNA is released. It's immediately
- 12 engaged by ribosomes. It's translated into the
- 13 polypeptide. The final approach -- the final enzyme
- 14 of this polypeptide is the RNA-dependent RNA
- 15 polymerase and -- which regulates and is required for
- 16 replication, which -- of the viral genome, which goes
- 17 through a negative-strand intermediate.
- 18 Once the viral genome is replicated, it
- 19 is immediately encapsidated by the viral procapsid
- 20 precursors. They are -- the virus particle is
- 21 assembled. It is released; and for enteroviruses, as
- 22 I said, there's the maturation cleavage of VP0 into

Page 117

- 1 VP2 and VP4 after egress.
- 2 Next slide, please.
- 3 So the pathogenesis of picornavirus is
- 4 very interesting. These viruses are species-specific.
- 5 They are generally spread from one individual or
- 6 animal to another in an oral-fecal or respiratory
- 7 mechanism.
- Severe disease does not occur at the
- 9 primary site of infection. It occurs at the secondary
- 10 sites of an infection, which can include the central
- 11 nervous system, the liver, the skin, as well as the
- 12 heart and thought to pancreas.
- 13 The presence of neutralizing antibodies
- 14 in the sera of infected patients is the best biomarker
- 15 for protection for the good development of severe
- 16 disease, and this is done from studies of patients
- 17 that were infected with poliovirus as well as many
- 18 different serotypes of human rhinovirus.
- 19 Next slide, please.
- 20 So in the lab, we measure infectious
- 21 virus generally by two methodologies. Our lab uses a
- 22 plaque assay, which is serial tenfold dilutions and we

Page 118 Page 120 1 -- of the viral stock or -- or sample, and then we ask 1 Next slide. 2 whether or not we can see a focus of dead cells by 2 However, there is a caveat to this; and 3 staining the monolayer with a dye -- with a dye that 3 that is the presence of a cross-reactive enterovirus-4 looks for cell viability. 4 antibody response, which my lab has been You can use -- also use 5 characterizing for many years now. 6 endpoint/terminal dilutions, which are done in these 6 So what we did was, we immunized mice 7 96-well plates; and again, you score for cytopathic 7 with individual enteroviruses, including islets of EV-8 effects, as described in the table below. 8 D68 and coxsackieviruses as well as rhinovirus and 9 Next slide, please. 9 polio; and then we collected the polyclonal sera and 10 However, the presence of RNA in the --10 used plaque assays to determine whether or not the 11 so clinically, we don't do this anymore. We generally 11 sera was able to protect cells and culture from the 12 use an RT-PCR looking for a fragment of the viral 12 infection -- from infectious virus. 13 13 genome. This suggests that we're measuring the And you can see here that when you use 14 presence of viral RNA and not infectious virus. 14 polyclonal sera from mice immunized with an 15 And here you can see from studies done 15 Enterovirus D islet -- you can see you're able to 16 by -- on Zika virus that the detection of viral RNA 16 protect cells and culture not only from the immunizing 17 occurs -- can persist much longer than the generation 17 virus but as well as from heterologous enteroviruses, 18 of the infectious virus. 18 including polio as well as different islets of EV-D68 19 19 and Rhinovirus 1A. So there is a discordance between the 20 presence and detection of RNA as from infectious 20 Next slide, please. 21 virus, and we're really only concerned about whether 21 This suggests that when we talk about 22 sera -- results from serosurveys, seroconversions, 22 or not you are producing and shedding infectious Page 119 Page 121 1 virus. 1 sera -- seropositivity studies, we must keep in 2 Next slide, please. 2 fact -- keep in mind that there is a presence of a 3 3 cross-reactive immune response, which may suggest that One of the important aspects of 4 clinical research or the clinic for enteroviruses was 4 these studies' conclusions are misleading. 5 -- is discerning or assessing whether or not you have 5 And we must try to figure out 6 an active infection, if you have immunity, or if you 6 mechanisms or assays which are more virus-specific, 7 were priorly exposed to the virus; and for this, we 7 which has been difficult because there's tremendous 8 use an ELISA binding assay. genomic conservation among these viruses. 9 And these are described here in the --Next slide, please. 10 10 in the schematics, as you have a solid support. You And with that, I will end and be happy 11 have an antibody. You either look for viral antigen 11 to take questions. Thank you for inviting me. 12 or an antibody against the virus, and then you come in 12 DR. PICA: Thank you, Dr. Rosenfeld. 13 with an indicator. 13 We'll actually wait for questions at the end of all 14 So these are generally done by lateral 14 the speakers, but thank you so much. 15 15 flow and commercially available for many viruses, such Next I'd like to introduce Dr. Miranda 16 as we saw for SARS-CoV-2. 16 Delahoy, Senior Epidemiologist in the Acute Flaccid And if we want to look at 17 Myelitis and Domestic Polio Team within the Division 18 of Viral Diseases at Centers for Disease Control and 18 neutralization and say that you have seroconverted and

Thank you for being with us here today,

DR. DELAHOY: Thank you.

19 Prevention.

21 Dr. Delahoy.

20

22

19 you have a protective immune response, we use a

20 microneutralization assay, which is derived from the

21 endpoint/terminal dilution assay that I just described

22 in the previous slide.

Page 122 1 Good morning, and thanks for the 1 across the country. 2 invitation to present today about epidemiologic data 2 Because NES has the most granular 3 and neonatal enterovirus infections, which is 3 information on enterovirus types and ages of the 4 collected through national surveillance. 4 patients with infections, most of this presentation 5 Next slide, please. 5 will focus on data from NES, although I will 6 Before presenting national surveillance 6 intersperse some information from NREVSS and NVSN. 7 data on neonatal enterovirus infections, I'll spend a 7 Next slide, please. 8 few minutes discussing the surveillance systems that 8 I'll now present an analysis of two 9 collect these data. Knowing about these systems can 9 decades' worth of data from NES. We analyzed data on 10 help understand data availability as well as 10 10,224 non-polio enterovirus infections reported to 11 limitations of surveillance data. 11 NES during 2004 to 2022 to assess types and fatal 12 There are three main national-12 outcomes of neonatal enterovirus infections. Note 13 surveillance systems that collect data on enterovirus 13 that the data presented today are considered 14 infections: the National Enterovirus Surveillance 14 preliminary. 15 System or NES, the National Respiratory and Enteric 15 Next slide, please. 16 Virus Surveillance System or NREVSS, and the New 16 Among all of the infections, 7 percent 17 Vaccine Surveillance Network, NVSN. 17 occurred among neonates defined in this presentation 18 Next slide, please. 18 as being under 1 month old. 19 This slide gives an overview about 19 Next slide. 20 these three systems. NES is a passive laboratory-20 Many enterovirus types were identified 21 based surveillance system. Passive surveillance 21 among the neonatal infections reported to NES. This 22 systems rely on voluntary reporting and are likely to 22 graph shows the number of neonatal infections reported Page 125 Page 123 1 miss cases but can cover large areas and be useful for 1 to NES during the past two decades by virus type. 2 Coxsackievirus B5, Coxsackievirus B3, 2 observing infection trends. 3 3 Echovirus 11, and Coxsackievirus B4 were the virus NES has been collecting reports on 4 types most frequently detected among neonates during 4 enterovirus infections, along with virus-type 5 this time period. 5 information, since the 1960s. It covers all age 6 6 groups, and patient age is reported down to the month. Next slide, please. 7 7 The number of reporting laboratories varies from year We'll now take a look at some temporal 8 trends in the nine most common virus types or those 8 to year. In 2022, the CDC lab and labs from four 9 states reported EV-typing data to NES. 9 that each represented more than 5 percent of the total 10 number of neonatal infections. 10 Scope is limited partly due to the 11 number of laboratories performing EV typing. The 11 Next slide, please. 12 12 other two surveillance systems that collect This graph shows data from NES on the 13 information on enterovirus infections provide 13 number of reported neonatal infections by year for the 14 most commonly detected enterovirus types among 14 aggregate non-typed data for rhinovirus and 15 neonates, with each EV type represented by a different 15 enterovirus positivity. 16 color. 16 These include the National Respiratory 17 17 and Enteric Virus Surveillance System or NREVSS, which To give an example of how to read this, 18 in 2004, all the way on the left, the orange segment 18 is also a passive system collecting data from more 19 than 90 labs nationally, and the New Vaccine 19 is the largest and goes from 1 to 16 on the Y axis, 20 Surveillance Network or NVSN, which also collects 20 representing 15 total infections for Echovirus 9

21 because Echovirus 9 is the one that corresponds to

22 that orange color in the key.

21 aggregated rhinovirus and enterovirus data among

22 children presenting to 7 pediatric-health facilities

Page 126 1 It's hard to see; but beneath that, 1 2004 to 2022, the numbers of reported infections were 2 there is one Coxsackievirus B5 infection in the dark-2 highest during July through October. 3 blue color; and above, there are four CVB4 infections 3 Next slide, please. 4 4 in gray and so on. Turning for a moment to other data Overall, there was not a single virus 5 sources, similar seasonal patterns of rhinovirus and 6 type that was most commonly detected and reported each 6 enterovirus circulation among respiratory specimens 7 year. Rather, the top virus types among neonates 7 were also observed in NREVSS, with percent positivity 8 changed over time. Several virus types had peaks in 8 peaking in September or October of the past five 9 certain years and then periods of low detection 9 years. 10 10 between peaks. Next slide, please. 11 11 Similarly, in NVSN, rhinovirus and For example, Coxsackievirus B5, shown 12 in the blue at the very bottom of the stacked graph, 12 enterovirus detection peaked in September or October 13 had apparent peaks of detection in 2005, 2010, 2014, 13 each -- each year among children with respiratory 14 and 2017 to 2018, whereas CVB3, in the brown color 14 infections. 15 toward the top of the graph, had a large peak in 2014 15 Next slide, please. 16 but low detection in other years. 16 We'll now turn back to the NES data. 17 17 Enterovirus infections were detected from a number of Please take caution in interpreting 18 these apparent patterns because of the small numbers 18 specimen types, such as CSF, NP swabs, and stool or 19 of infections represented overall, but I do hope --19 rectal swabs. 20 hope that this helps to visualize changes in 20 Compared with older patients, 21 predominant virus types over time. 21 enterovirus infections were more commonly detected 22 This can also be used to visualize

Page 127 1 overall trends in infection. You can see here that 2 the most neonatal enterovirus infections were reported 3 during 2014. 4 Next slide, please. 5 Overall, some virus types were more 6 frequently detected among neonates, compared with 7 older children and adults. These included 8 Coxsackievirus Types B1, B2, B3, B4, and B5 and 9 Echovirus 11. However, EV-D68 and Echovirus 30 were 10 less common among neonates and more frequently 11 detected among persons aged 1 month or older. 12 Next slide, please. 13 We also considered temporal patterns of 14 neonatal enterovirus infections. This graph shows the 15 reported number of neonatal infections reported to NES 16 by month from 2013 to 2022. Enterovirus infections 17 tend to peak in late summer and early fall. Few 18 enterovirus infections were reported during the early 19 COVID-19 pandemic or 2020 and 2021.

Next slide, please.

Looking at months during which

22 infections were reported summed across the years from

20

21

22 among CSF for neonatal patients, whereas among persons Page 129 1 aged 1 month or older infections were more commonly 2 detected by throat or NP swabs. 3 Next slide, please. 4 In NES data, only 10 percent of 5 neonates had a known outcome, that is, whether they 6 died. 7 Next slide, please. Among the 35 neonatal patients who had 9 known outcome in NES, 15 -- or 43 percent -- died. It 10 is likely that enterovirus testing and reporting in 11 general as well as reporting of outcome data are 12 biased toward patients with more severe infections. 13 Next slide, please. 14 There are a number of limitations in 15 the analyses presented today. A small number of labs 16 perform and report EV typing, and these labs are not 17 nationally representative. Enterovirus typing and 18 reporting is voluntary and not systematic. 19 It is likely that testing and reporting 20 are biased toward including more severe infections and 21 potential infections among younger patients. In NES, 22 outcome data are often unavailable; and in general,

Page 130 Page 132 1 national enterovirus-surveillance systems include 1 developing therapies for. 2 little -- limited clinical information. Excuse me. 2 Next slide, please. 3 3 Next slide, please. I have no relevant financial 4 To summarize our conclusions, 4 relationships with commercial interests. 5 enterovirus types detected among neonates differ from 5 Next slide. 6 those detected among persons aged 1 month or older. So my goal is to do two things. One is 7 Enterovirus infections display a seasonal pattern, 7 to give you a flavor of the clinical challenges that 8 typically peaking in late summer; and enterovirus 8 neonatal enterovirus infections present and why we 9 infections can cause severe disease among neonates 9 need therapies for them and then to let you know where 10 that can result in death. 10 we are currently as far as treatment options for these 11 National data on enterovirus infections 11 infections. 12 can be used to observe seasonal trends and detect 12 Next slide, please. 13 signals in year-to-year changes and enterovirus 13 So to give a little bit of broadness to 14 infections. They can also be used to analyze 14 the -- to the -- in context to the discussion, 15 circulating virus types by age. 15 neonatal enterovirus infections are one type of 16 It is our hope that enterovirus 16 manifestation of a broad canopy of -- of presentations 17 surveillance can be strengthened in the United States. 17 that enteroviruses can -- can produce. 18 Strengthening the capacity for enterovirus typing and 18 Firstly, most infections are likely 19 surveillance could be beneficial for understanding the 19 asymptomatic. Of those that are symptomatic, most of 20 burden of disease and clinical manifestations of 20 those cause nonspecific febrile illnesses in children 21 enterovirus infections and for informing potential 21 or adults. Many cause rashes. For example, Echo 9, 22 treatment options and prevention measures. 22 as shown here, is a common cause of rash-associated Page 133 Page 131 1 Next slide, please. 1 illness. 2 Coxsackie A Viruses are associated with 2 Thank you all for your attention today 3 and to my CDC team and those who invited us to speak 3 herpangina, which is shown in the picture just 4 today. I'm happy to take questions during the 4 immediately to the left with vesicles -- small 5 vesicles in the posterior oropharynx. This is often a 5 clarification session. 6 DR. PICA: Thank you so much, Dr. 6 highly febrile illness. Hand-foot-mouth disease is similar but 7 Delahoy. 8 Next I'd like to introduce Dr. Mark 8 with slight differences. Here you can see on the 9 Abzug. Dr. Abzug is a professor of pediatrics at the 9 right-hand side the ulcerations more commonly in the 10 anterior oropharynx but also involving the peripheral 10 University of Colorado School of Medicine in the 11 Section of Infectious Diseases and Epidemiology and is 11 extremities. This is often associated with Coxsackie 12 Vice Chair for Academic Affairs for the Department of 12 A16, also with Coxsackie A6, and in the context of 13 Pediatrics. 13 pandemics of Enterovirus A71. 14 14 His title is -- his talk is entitled Hemorrhagic conjunctivitis can cause --15 be caused by a number of serotypes. That also may be 15 "Neonatal Enterovirus Infections: Challenges and 16 Opportunities." 16 neurotropic, and that picture is depicted on the lower 17 Thank you, Dr. Abzug. 17 left, and in the last decade has emerged respiratory 18 18 illness associated with Enterovirus D68. DR. ABZUG: Thank you. 19 And thanks to the organizers for the 19 Next slide, please. 20 opportunity to speak with you today. My role is to 20 Coxsackie B Viruses in particular are 21 important causes of myocarditis and pericarditis and 21 now present over the next 20 minutes or so a clinical 22 account for up to about a third of cases of viral 22 overview of the infections that we're talking about

1 myocarditis with a proven etiology. Enteroviruses

- 2 cause a range of neurologic syndromes, including
- 3 meningitis, encephalitis, acute disseminated
- 4 encephalomyelitis, and Reye's syndrome.
- They can cause paralytic disease with
- 6 polioviruses or acute flaccid myelitis with
- 7 Enterovirus D68. Enterovirus A71 is a type of
- 8 enterovirus that's common in cause of pandemics of
- 9 brain-stem encephalitis, particularly in Asia.
- 10 Enteroviruses can cause a number of
- 11 severe infections in immunocompromised hosts,
- 12 including chronic CNS infection as well as
- 13 disseminated infections. We're going to talk more
- 14 about perinatal and neonatal viral sepsis.
- 15 And then I'll also mention that there
- 16 are some data linking enteroviruses in a persistent or
- 17 chronic form with a number of chronic conditions, as
- 18 shown here. Those data are really not that
- 19 definitive.
- 20 Next slide, please.
- 21 So for neonatal enteroviruses, as we
- 22 focus in on them, this slide is really just meant to

Page 135

Page 134

- 1 give you an overview of the epidemiology to say that
- 2 newborn enterovirus infections are common.
- 3 Many of them, if not most of them, are
- 4 asymptomatic; but of the smaller group that are
- 5 symptomatic, you can see that they're associated with
- 6 a range of presentations in the newborn: viral sepsis,
- 7 viral meningitis, myocarditis, or any combination
- 8 thereof.
- But overall, if you look across these
- 10 different articles in the literature -- literature,
- 11 you'll see that these viruses are a common cause of
- 12 disease in the newborn period.
- 13 Next slide, please.
- 14 The epidemiology of neonatal
- 15 enterovirus infections mirrors that of enterovirus
- 16 infections in general that we've just heard about. So
- 17 we tend to see these infections in the summer and fall
- 18 in temperate regions; and there's variability year to
- 19 year and place to place, depending on what types of
- 20 enteroviruses are circulating locally.
- And that was really borne out a year
- 22 ago when we saw these reports from the United Kingdom

1 of severe myocarditis in newborns associated with

- 2 Coxsackie B3 and B4 infections and, as been mentioned
- 3 earlier, reports from France and elsewhere in Europe
- 4 of Echovirus 11 infections causing severe neonatal
- 5 hepatitis and coagulopathy.
- 6 Next slide, please.
- Transmission to the newborn of
- 8 enteroviruses may occur in a minority of cases
- 9 prenatally, and that's evidenced by retrieval of virus
- 10 from products of conception or by evidence of clinical
- 11 illness and/or viremia in the baby as early as within
- 12 a couple of hours after birth to a couple of days
- 13 after birth.
- 14 But the majority of babies when they
- 15 acquire an enterovirus acquire it intra- or post-
- 16 partum most often from the mothers, occasionally from
- 17 other family contacts; and we know from epidemiologic
- 18 studies up to a few percentage of mothers during
- 19 enterovirus season will shed virus either from
- 20 respiratory or GI secretions at the time of delivery.
- If a mother has illness in the week
- 22 prior to delivery associated with enterovirus, then

- 1 there's a much higher rate of the baby becoming
- 2 infected; and babies have been shown to be infected
- 3 following both vaginal or caesarean delivery.
- 4 And there's speculation that breastmilk
- 5 may also transmit virus, at least based on reports of
- 6 positive culture or positive PCR of breastmilk
- 7 specimens.
- 8 There are also reports of sporadic and
- 9 epidemic spread of enterovirus infections among staff
- 10 and babies in nursery settings.
- 11 Next slide, please.
- 12 The vast majority of newborns who have
- 13 an enterovirus infection fortunately are asymptomatic
- 14 infections. Then there's a subset of babies who have
- 15 -- will have a benign illness often characterized by
- 16 fever for a few days and some other symptoms for
- 17 around a week. Sometimes there's a biphasic course.
- Meningitis that's uncomplicated may 18
- 19 occur in some of these babies, generally associated
- 20 with a good outcome. Fortunately, the disease that
- 21 we're most concerned about today in this session,
- 22 severe disease, is the least common of these outcomes

Meeting Page 138 Page 140 1 but the most worrisome. 1 set of symptoms. 2 Next slide, please. 2 Next slide, please. Next slide, 3 So when we see a baby who may be 3 please. 4 infected by an enterovirus, there are a number of 4 This slide shows the variety of 5 features that are evident from the history. Most 5 manifestations that I characterize under the heading 6 often these babies, even those who have a severe 6 of "Severe Disease." The more common are on the left-7 infection, are born to mothers with a normal 7 hand side: meningoencephalitis, myocarditis, 8 pregnancy. The babies are most often full term and pneumonitis, hepatitis, coagulopathy, and sepsis. 9 have had uncomplicated initial courses. Some uncommon complications of neonatal 10 Prematurity does worsen the outcome 10 enterovirus disease are listed on the right-hand side; 11 overall for neonatal enterovirus infections, but it's 11 and of note, any of these manifestations may occur in 12 a minority of babies who become sick who were 12 -- in -- together as a constellation. So a baby may 13 premature to start with. 13 have meningoencephalitis and hepatitis. It may have 14 If there has been a viral illness in 14 myocarditis and hepatitis and coagulopathy, et cetera. 15 the mother around the time or preceding delivery, 15 Next slide, please. 16 which occurs in about 60 to 70 percent, that may be 16 Now, this slide is a busy one; and 17 associated with a variety of symptoms, including 17 it -- and it aims to summarize the most common 18 fever, respiratory or GI symptoms. 18 scenarios we see with severe enteroviruses. 19 Severe abdominal pain in the perinatal 19 Meningoencephalitis, myocarditis, pneumonitis, and 20 period of the mother also is prominent as a result of 20 hepatitis and coagulopathy all just highlight some of 21 this infection, and that may mimic chorioamnionitis r21 the points on this slide. 22 22 abruption and may actually cause an obstetrician to Meningoencephalitis may be caused by Page 141 Page 139 1 think that delivery might be needed sooner rather than 1 echoviruses or Coxsackie B Viruses. It's hallmark is 2 later. 2 in change in consciousness. Seizures may occur. 3 There's often a history of viral 3 Motor abnormalities may occur. On imaging, 4 particularly MRI, white-matter injury particularly in 4 symptoms in other family members; and in the baby, the 5 viral-illness onset may occur anywhere from the first 5 the periventricular area is not uncommon. 6 day of life out to a month of life; but severe disease And these babies have a variable 7 most often is associated with onset of illness within 7 prognosis. The majority of them live through their 8 the first two weeks of life and especially within the 8 infection, but their neurologic prognosis depends on 9 first week of life. 9 how severe their acute-encephalitis picture was. 10 Next slide, please. Myocarditis most often is caused by the This is a listing of symptoms and signs 11 Coxsackie B Viruses, and this is often -- often 12 that neonates with an enterovirus infection may 12 associated with a high mortality rate in the order of

13 present with, and you can see it's rather broad and 14 rather long. 15 Often these babies present as 16 generically ill newborns with fever or hypothermia, 17 irritability, lethargy. They may have anorexia. They 18 may be hypoperfused. They may be jaundiced, and they 19 may have a variety of rashes, with macular or 20 maculopapular rashes being the most common. GI involvement is often present, and 22 respiratory symptomology is also a frequent presenting

13 30 to 50 percent, and survivors may either have 14 residual cardiac dysfunction or sometimes may go on to 15 have no evident long-term sequalae. 16 Pneumonitis is a less common presenter 17 of severe enterovirus disease. When it occurs, it's 18 most often associated with echoviruses, occasionally 19 with Coxsackie B Viruses. It may be a primary 20 manifestation, or it may be associated with any of 21 these other manifestations. It tends to be rapid and 22 severe and associated with a very high mortality rate. 36 (Pages 138 - 141)

Meeting Page 142 Page 144 1 Hepatitis and coagulopathy for years 1 representative examples. 2 2 now have been recognized as primarily associated with Next slide, please. 3 3 echoviruses, with Echo 11 being the prototype; but in What we do have from the literature are 4 more recent reports, Coxsackie B Viruses have also 4 a number of risk factors or markers that help us 5 been shown to cause severe hepatitis. 5 identify which babies are the ones most likely to have And in its most severe form, this 6 severe disease. 7 syndrome will present as acute hepatic necrosis with Onset of illness within the first seven 8 acute liver failure with an associated coagulopathy 8 days of life -- and especially within the first few 9 noted by thrombocytopenia and prolonged clotting times 9 days of life -- is a key marker, as is absence of 10 and often -- sometimes grave clinical bleeding, 10 neutralizing antibody in the baby to the serotype of 11 including intracranial bleeding. 11 enterovirus that he or she is dealing with. 12 12 There's a broad range of mortality And that likely is also tied to the 13 reported from anywhere from 24 percent to into the 80-13 next risk factor of maternal illness with offset just 14 percent range. Of survivors, some will have 14 before or at delivery, meaning mother has had enough 15 persistent hepatic dysfunction; but because of the 15 time to transmit a lot of virus to baby but not enough 16 regenerative capacity of the liver, many survivors 16 time to develop antibody that will be passably 17 will eventually develop normal liver function once 17 transmitted to the baby. 18 18 again. As I mentioned earlier, prematurity is 19 Next slide, please. 19 not the prototype on presentation; but when babies who 20 It is hard to give you the answer of 20 are premature develop severe neonatal disease, they 21 what is the mortality rate with neonatal enterovirus 21 tend to do worse, as do males; and babies who have 22 disease because we don't have good population-based 22 multisystem disease, such as hepatitis plus

Page 143

- 1 prospective data. Mostly, what we have are case 2 series in the literature that use a variety of
- 3 different conclusion criteria.
- 4 And Dave Byron from AntiVirus
- 5 Therapeutics put together this graph on the left,
- 6 which plots out some of the different reported
- 7 mortality rates in different series in the literature;
- 8 and you can see that they're really all over the
- 9 place, reflecting different inclusion criteria used in
- 10 the different series.
- 11 But many of the series show quite high
- 12 mortality rates; and in this plot, somewhere around 4012 timing of onset. This is a review over 10 years from
- 13 to 50 percent was sort of the average if you take all
- 14 these reports together.
- 15 A few years ago we did a query of the
- 16 PHIS database of 45 children's hospitals; and using
- 17 diagnostic codes for neonatal enterovirus hepatitis,
- 18 coagulopathy, or myocarditis, we came up with a 24-
- 19 percent mortality rate in this database.
- 20 And then a recent literature review
- 21 that spanned 20 years identified a mortality rate of
- 22 30 percent. So that at least gives you some

- 1 myocarditis, tend to do worse.
- 2 Severe hepatitis that's caused necrosis
- 3 and acute liver failure, also a poorer prognosis; and
- 4 a few lab markers, a positive serum viral culture has
- 5 been shown to correlate with mortality; and certain
- 6 serotypes, including Echovirus 11 and some of the
- 7 Coxsackie B Viruses, are also associated with worse
- 8 disease.
- 9 Next slide, please.
- 10 This is a nice graph because I just
- 11 think it -- it really exemplifies the importance of
- 13 China from now almost more than 20 years ago.
- 14 But this looked at neonatal enterovirus
- 15 disease characterized in three different
- 16 presentations: in the dark bars, nonspecific febrile
- 17 illness; in the white bars, uncomplicated viral
- 18 meningitis; and in the bar graph -- or not the bar
- 19 graph but the -- the line, the solid line, hepatic-
- 20 necrosis cases.
- 21 And you can see that the benign
- 22 presentations, febrile illness and meningitis, really

1 were pretty much scattered over the first month of

- 2 life, as shown on the X axis.
- 3 But if you look at hepatic necrosis,
- 4 that line has a really strong peak within the first
- 5 seven days of life, making the point that it's the
- 6 babies who present earliest who are generally the ones
- 7 more likely to develop severe disease.
- 8 Next slide.
- 9 And in my last few minutes with you, I
- 10 just want to tell you about the current state of
- 11 therapy and things that are on the horizon for
- 12 neonatal enterovirus infections. Standard treatment
- 13 right now includes when a baby presents and is being
- 14 worked up with the symptomology and the disease
- 15 manifestations I've shown you.
- 16 They typically are given empiric
- 17 antibacterial treatment until bacterial infection is
- 18 ruled out. Likewise, specimens are sent for herpes
- 19 simplex virus, which can often very much mimic the
- 20 presentation of neonatal enterovirus disease; and
- 21 usually, an empiric treatment of aciclovir is given
- 22 until herpes has been ruled out.

Page 147

Page 146

- And then after those two specific
- 2 interventions, we're really left with supportive care,
- 3 supporting the respiratory symptoms, the
- 4 cardiovascular symptoms, admitting -- administering
- 5 blood -- blood products when needed, supporting kidney
- 6 function.
- 7 Some babies go on to need ECMO and even
- 8 left-ventricular-assist devices in the acute setting,
- 9 and then occasionally transplant of liver or heart is
- 10 needed if there's been failure of either of those
- 11 organs.
- 12 Next slide.
- We often talk about immunoglobulin
- 14 therapy in the context of neonatal enterovirus
- 15 disease, and there are a number of reasons for that.
- 16 As has -- has been mentioned, enteroviruses -- a key
- 17 immune defense against enteroviruses in general is the
- 18 antibody response.
- We know for the newborn that a lack of
- 20 neutralizing antibody increases risk of severe disease
- 21 for that infecting serotype, and we know that in IVIG
- 22 there is neutralizing antibody to many different

Tugo 14

- 1 enteroviruses, although in variable amounts based on
- 2 serotype and the specific IVIG lot being addressed.
- 3 So for that reason, this therapy,
- 4 immunoglobulin, has been used in the newborn setting.
- 5 Mostly, we have anecdotal or retrospective reports of
- 6 using either IVIG or maternal convalescent plasma that
- 7 is hopefully enriched with antibody to the serotype
- 8 that's infected the mother and her baby.
- 9 And IVIG or plasma has been used both
- 10 in the treatment setting as well as for prophylaxis.
- 11 There has been one small randomized study -- really a
- 12 pilot study that we and others did many years ago now
- 13 that looked at newborns in the first two weeks of life
- 14 with neonatal enterovirus disease.
- 15 They were randomized to receive this
- 16 dose of IVIG or no treatment, and this was a study
- 17 that was not intended to look at clinical benefit but
 - 18 really to look to see whether there was virologic
- 19 suggestion that this might be a valid therapy.
- 20 And what we were able to show was that
- 21 in babies who received an IVIG product that had a
- 22 neutralizing titer of 1 to 800 or greater to that

- 1 baby's own infecting serotype there was faster
- 2 cessation of viremia and viruria, so at least giving
- 3 biological plausibility to this therapy.
- 4 And then more recently, we have a
- 5 retrospective study of babies with hepatitis and
- 6 coagulopathy due to enterovirus infection; and they
- 7 showed that IVIG administration within three days of
- 8 illness onset, as compared to receipt of IVIG more
- 9 than three days beyond illness onset, was associated
- 10 with a lower mortality.
- 11 Next slide, please.
- 12 As far as more specific antiviral
- 13 therapy, I'll mention the capsid-binder approach.
- 14 These are drugs that inhibit attachment and un-coding.
- 15 There are three that are in clinical development.
- Pleconaril, that has been evaluated for
- 17 neonatal enterovirus disease in particular both by
- 18 reports of individual cases and a randomized control
- 19 trial that I'll tell you more about.
- 20 Pocapavir is a poliovirus antiviral
- 21 that's being developed as part of the poliovirus
- 22 eradication effort. It has variable activity against

Meeting Page 150 1 non-polioviruses but has been used on -- in an 1 than the -- than the placebo recipients, and I show 2 expanded-access basis for some neonatal cases of 2 you there on the right-hand side the death rates, and 3 enterovirus disease. 3 that was significant, with a P-value of 0.02. And vapendavir is another capsid binder The bottom panel looks specifically at 5 that's in clinical development, primarily thus far 5 the 70 -- the 70 percent who were infected with 6 being looked at for rhinovirus infections in adults 6 enteroviruses; and you can see comparable death rates; 7 with obstructive pulmonary disease. 7 but here with the smaller numbers, the difference in 8 Next slide, please. survival is no longer statistically significant. 9 9 So this is the title of the study that Next slide here. 10 10 a Collaborative Antiviral Study Group did a number of Thank you. So this concludes with what 11 years ago, a randomized double-blind placebo-11 our current treatment status is for severe neonatal 12 controlled trial of pleconaril for newborns with 12 enterovirus disease, and that really is supportive 13 enterovirus sepsis. 13 care as the mainstay of therapy. Many, if not most, 14 14 babies these days do receive either IVIG or maternal-Next slide. 15 This baby -- this study looked at 15 convalescent plasma. 16 babies who were less than 2 weeks of age who presented 16 As far as antiviral therapy, pleconaril 17 with presumed enterovirus infection with at least one 17 is not FDA-approved. It is not available in the 18 of hepatitis, coagulopathy, or myocarditis. They were 18 United States. Individual cases may sometimes be able 19 randomized 2 to 1 to receive pleconaril or placebo for 19 to receive pocapavir via an expanded-access mechanism. 20 7 days. There were a number of different endpoints, 20 And then I'll just let you know that 21 both virological and clinical and other. 21 the Congenital and Perinatal Infections Consortium, 22 22 which is the next version of the Collaborative We enrolled 61 babies; and you can see Page 151 Page 153 1 the 2-to-1 ratio of pleconaril to placebo recipients; 1 Antiviral Study Group, is currently conducting a 2 and of the babies enrolled, 70 percent were ultimately 2 natural-history study to further describe in a 3 shown to be enterovirus infected. 3 prospective manner neonatal enterovirus and 4 Next slide, please. 4 parechovirus viral sepsis in newborns to help better 5 Amongst the enterovirus-infection 5 define mortality rates in a prospective manner and 6 group, this graph shows the rate or the time plotted 6 hopefully identify predictors of morbidity and 7 to culture negativity for all cultured sites combined. 7 mortality that will help this -- with the design of 8 The dark line is the placebo group. The lighter line 8 clinical trials of antivirals as they become available 9 is the pleconaril group. 9 for study. 10 So then you can see that there was a

10 I will stop there, and I'm happy to 11 address any questions at this time. Thank you. 12 DR. PICA: Thank you, Dr. Abzug. 13

That concludes the presentations for 14 Session 2 of our agenda. We now have a few minutes to 15 take clarifying questions related to the presentations 16 we've just heard; and as a reminder, these questions 17 should be related to the presentation contents 18 specifically. Other topics will be covered during the 19 panel session. 20 the study, the intend-to-treat group; and you can show 20 Panelists, please raise your hand in 21 Zoom if you wish to ask a question.

> And, members of the public, you may 39 (Pages 150 - 153)

22

11 trend of the pleconaril group becoming culture

12 negative overall faster than those who received

16 in the study, the subjects in the study. Again, the

17 light line is the pleconaril group. The darker line

21 that -- or you can see that the overall survival

22 probability was higher in the pleconaril recipients

And this shows survival of the patients

The top panel is all treated babies in

Next slide.

18 is the placebo group.

13 placebo.

14

15

19

1 predict who will go on to have organ disease that

Page 156

Page 154 1 enter your questions in the Q-and-A box. 2 DR. VISWANATHAN: So it looks like we 3 already have a question from Dr. Messacar directed 4 specifically to Dr. Abzug. 5 Dr. Abzug, the question is: "I am 6 curious on your thoughts about requiring signs of 7 severe enteroviral disease in neonates to enroll them 8 in a treatment trial. With the risk factors identified, would 10 it be more beneficial to try to enroll and treat 11 neonates identified with enterovirus earlier in the 12 course of disease, who are at high risk for 13 progression?" 14 So, Dr. Abzug, I'll turn it over to you 15 if you have some preliminary comments you want to make 16 on -- on this; but again, we're really trying to limit 17 this to, you know, just clarification if there's 18 something not clear in a presentation; and then some 19 of these more deeper discussion points we'll delve 20 into in the panel this afternoon. But, Dr. Abzug, if you have any initial 22 comments, feel free. Page 155

2 might portend a more severe outcome. 3 And I think if you look at the -- the 4 list of risk factors, if you subtract out the clinical 5 ones, the ones where there's already hepatitis or 6 already myocarditis or already multisystem disease, 7 the two most predictive risk factors are early onset 8 of illness and lack of neutralizing antibody in the 9 baby to the serotype infecting that child. 10 I'm not sure that early onset of 11 infection is predictive enough. 12 If we had a way to rapidly know whether 13 the baby has neutralizing antibody to his or her 14 particular enterovirus and we coupled that with early 15 onset of illness, then I think we may be able to 16 enrich that population enough to know that we're 17 studying the right group of children that will give us 18 the right answer that we want from the study. 19 DR. PICA: Thank you so much. 20 Are there other clarifying questions 21 that people would like to ask? 22 I don't think we can hear you.

1 DR. ABZUG: Yeah. Thank you. 2 And thanks, Kevin. It's a really, 3 really good question on how best to design a study of 4 neonatal enterovirus disease. 5 The challenge is that a large number of 6 -- well, not a large number but of the -- the number 7 of babies -- larger number of babies who present with 8 enterovirus infections, a modest percentage of them 9 will go on to have severe disease. 10 The others will have generally a benign 11 outcome, usually with a short hospital stay and 13 value of antiviral therapy in that group is likely to 14 be limited. 15 So that's why studies have focused on 16 the more severe babies, and we focused on babies whol 6 highly enriched for neutralizing antibody for that 17 present already -- have presented already with 18 evidence of end-organ disease that predicts a worse 19 outcome. 20 Kevin's question is: Can we take the

21 universe of babies who present with enterovirus

22 disease in the newborn period, use risk factors to

Page 157 1 DR. SCHLEISS: Oh, Mark --2 DR. PICA: There we go. 3 DR. SCHLEISS: Can you hear me? 4 DR. PICA: Yes. We can now. 5 DR. SCHLEISS: Oh, very good. Yeah. 6 That was a great presentation from the whole panel. 7 I had a question for Mark about 8 maternal -- maternal strains. I mean, should we be 9 trying to type maternal islets as well in the setting 10 of the neonatal disease. 11 I -- I'm remembering this interesting 12 usually without identified long-term sequelae. So the 12 case report from some years ago now in which they -13 and you cited it briefly in one of your slides or the 14 concept anyway of using maternal plasma, which if it's 15 a perinatally acquired infection, you know, should be 17 baby's islet. 18 So maybe this is a question better 19 suited for the later-afternoon session; but anyway, I 20 -- I just wondered. You know, we -- we -- we're in

21 this era now of this great explosion of knowledge

22 about neutralizing antibodies and infectious diseases

Page 158

2 thoughts on that -- on that topic.

3 DR. ABZUG: Yeah. The -- the appeal of

4 convalescent plasma is -- is really strong because

1 in babies, and I -- I just wondered if you had any

- 5 that -- that's certainly a better way of knowing that
- 6 you're giving a baby a high titer of antibody to the
- 7 relevant virus than by picking a lot of IVIG off a
- 8 pharmacy shelf.
- 9 The challenges are a couple. One is
- 10 that of timing. We want a mother to have recovered
- 11 enough clinically that we're confident that she's not
- 12 viremic and that we're not giving extra virus as we
- 13 give mothers plasma.
- 14 And we want enough time to have elapsed
- 15 to be confident that there is antibody that's been
- 16 produced in that and is present in that plasma to give
- 17 to the baby. So it certainly would be helpful if we
- 18 had rapid assays to tell us: "Is there still virus in
- 19 that plasma? Is there a high amount of antibody in
- 20 that plasma?"

4

10

11

13

16

22

12 related to this?

15 previously.

21 identifying the virus.

- 21 And then we just need the logistics to
- 22 be able to rapidly plasma freeze and -- and have the

2 where -- where a baby is housed, that could be a

6 more rapid assays to look at presence of virus, to

8 it, I think that would put us in -- in better stead

DR. PICA: Thank you.

7 look at type of virus, and the amount of antibody to

Dr. Vogt, do you have a question

14 actually may have already hinted at the answer to it

17 there are more -- or I guess I should say there are

18 not, like, commercial or readily available ways to do

All that stuff basically happens in

19 the, you know, measuring of neutralizing antibody 20 titer against a specific virus and/or, you know,

DR. VOGT: I sure do. I think Mark

There are -- but -- but, Dr. Abzug,

So it's a -- it's an attractive option;

5 but there are pragmatic obstacles; and if we had some

3 challenge, depending on the setting.

9 for using that therapy more broadly.

 $$\operatorname{Page}\ 160$$ 1 very slow periods of time when sending things off to

- 2 reference labs, were a clinician to have a baby in
- 3 front of them that they suspected had enteroviral
- 4 sepsis or even had confirmed had enteroviral sepsis.
- 5 I guess just to clarify -- are there
- 6 ways to do that, that you know of? "Quickly," I
- 7 should say.
- 8 DR. ABZUG: Matt, your question is:
- 9 Are there ways to quickly identify the amount of
- 10 antibody in a product being given to a baby?
- 11 DR. VOGT: Correct. Yeah, for -- for
- 12 one of these babies with enteroviral sepsis.
- DR. ABZUG: Yeah. I do not know of a
- 14 rapid way that's readily available. I'm open to
- 15 others who --
- DR. VOGT: Yeah.
- 17 DR. ABZUG: -- may -- may know -- know
- 18 more about that.
- 19 DR. VOGT: I suspected not, and I'm
- 20 sure we can talk about it more in the afternoon, but I
- 21 figured I'd put that out in the clarification time
- 22 here.

Page 159

1 product to give to baby; and that can be, depending on 1 DR. ABZUG: Well, perhaps there are

- 2 people like you who can make panels of relevant
- 3 antibodies.
- 4 DR. VOGT: Agreed. Totally agree.
- 5 DR. PICA: Dr. Kimberlin, did you have
- 6 a question as well?
- 7 DR. KIMBERLIN: Well, yes.
- 8 I'm going to ask Mark if he can to give
- 9 us some way of thinking about for antivirals, not for
- 10 -- not for -- for antibody therapies but for
- 11 antivirals.
- How -- how specific do we have to be to
- 13 say that we need to look for babies infected with
- 14 Coxsackie B5 and, "Does this antiviral work against
- 15 that; or does it work against, you know, one of the
- 16 enteroviruses or, you know, the echoviruses?"
- Do we have to get virus specific, or
- 18 can we look at things more across the -- the totality
- 19 of -- of virus subtypes that -- that infect these
- 1) of -- of virus subtypes that -- that infect th
- 20 babies?
- 21 DR. ABZUG: Good question, and I'd say
- 22 it depends a little bit on both the -- the virus and

41 (Pages 158 - 161)

Page 162 1 the drug. 1 not really work against more current circulating 2 So there are some enteroviruses like 2 islets like islets like nine -- eighteen four nine 3 poliovirus that seem to have their own particular 3 forty-seven, which was isolated from a case in 2014, 4 susceptibility to -- to an agent with pocapavir being 4 because it doesn't really have a canyon and stuff. 5 a good example of that being a good polio drug but not 5 So you have to have as much knowledge 6 being as good or at least being more variable against 6 as possible, unless you're going to target a 7 other enterovirus serotypes. 7 nonstructural protein like the protease or a 2C, which Now, there are other medications, 8 is a -- which is another protease or a helicase of the 9 pleconaril, which has relatively broad anti-9 virus, and even that has caveats. 10 enterovirus activity but isn't enriched against the 10 DR. PICA: Thank you very much, Dr. 11 polioviruses; and within the spectrum of nonpolio 11 Rosenfeld and Dr. Abzug. 12 enteroviruses, pleconaril may have more or less 12 I think we have time briefly for one 13 activity against some versus the others. 13 last question, and we have a Q-and-A from an attendee. 14 But overall, at least for the ones that 14 So the question is: Do you believe that IVIG and 15 infect newborns primarily, there's reasonably good 15 pleconaril is synergistic? Is there any data 16 activity. 16 suggesting synergistic effect? 17 Then you have some specialized 17 So Dr. Abzug, are you -- are you aware 18 enteroviruses like Enterovirus A71, Enterovirus D68, 18 of any data regarding potential synergy between IVIG 19 both of which are not major players in the newborn 19 and -- and pleconaril? 20 period but cause their own severe disease in -- in 20 DR. ABZUG: Good question. I am not

21 childhood, that seem less susceptible to pocapavir and 21 aware of invitro data that specifically looked at that 22 question, not to say that it doesn't exist, and -- and

Page 163

But there are other agents that are in

2 development, particularly protease inhibitors, which

3 tend to have a -- can be against those as well as

4 really having a broad range of invitro activity.

5 So it's hard to generalize, David. I

6 think it depends a little bit on the group of

7 enterovirus you're talking about and the type of

8 agent, some being more selective and some of the

9 agents being broader in their spectrum.

10 DR. ROSENFELD: Could I just add into

11 that?

22 pleconaril.

1

12 DR. ABZUG: Please.

13 DR. ROSENFELD: So in fact, actually it

14 goes a little bit even more specific than what Mark

15 said. So for instance, if you look at EV-D68, some

16 particles have canyons and have pocket factors; and

17 other particles do not.

18 So you really want to have as much

19 information about the actual virus that is infecting

20 the baby that is possible because, for instance, the

21 capsid inhibitor from Rossman's data works against

22 Furman, which is the prototype EV-D68 islet, but does22 statistically significant but at least interesting in

Page 165

1 maybe some of our pharmaceutical partners who are with

2 us today know the answer to that.

3 As far as clinical data, I'll mention

4 that the randomized study that I showed you some

5 graphs from earlier, we included in that a graph that

6 looks at -- looked at pleconaril plus IVIG, pleconaril

7 without IVIG, placebo with IVIG, and placebo without

8 IVIG and plotted the survival in the four groups.

9 Keep in mind that although the

10 pleconaril and placebo was a randomized intervention,

11 IVIG were not -- was not randomized.

12 That was up to the individual provider

13 to make that decision; but with all those caveats, we

14 did show that the survival was highest in the

15 pleconaril-IVIG recipients and then sequentially

16 lower, with the lowest group being the placebo, no-

17 IVIG group, so suggesting at least the potential that

18 there might be some clinical synergy, not -- not true

19 antiviral synergy per se but clinical synergy between

20 IVIG and an antiviral.

21 The results in that plot were not

Meeting Page 166 Page 168 1 terms of hypothesis generation. We will start by asking our panelists 2 DR. PICA: Thank you, everyone, for 2 to discuss the key challenges in antiviral drug 3 these questions and to our speakers for providing 3 development for the treatment of enterovirus infection 4 answers. We will now take a lunch break, and we'll 4 in infants and neonates. 5 resume at 1 p.m. for our panel discussion on Please comment on what additional 6 enterovirus trial-design challenges. Thank you all so 6 nonclinical or basic-science work may be needed to 7 much. 7 help drive therapeutic development of treatment of 8 8 enterovirus infection in infants and neonates. (Off the record.) 9 9 DR. PICA: Hello, everyone. Welcome Dr. Oberste, do you want to turn on 10 back. We will now start our panel discussion on 10 your camera and make a comment? 11 DR. OBERSTE: Yes. Thanks. 11 enterovirus trial-design challenges. As discussed 12 this morning, there are many challenges related to the 12 I think one of the big challenges at 13 development of pediatric therapeutics, including 13 least from kind of where I sit on CDC and from the 14 ethical, scientific, clinical, regulatory, and 14 laboratory perspective is that there are so many 15 different enteroviruses. There's over 100 different 15 logistical considerations. 16 There are also additional challenges 16 types. They use 7 different receptors. 17 specific to the development of treatments for severe And so, as you heard earlier from --18 enterovirus infection. We're looking forward to 18 from Amy, you know, some -- they're even within a 19 discussing these themes and important topics this 19 type. There are some that have different kind of 20 afternoon. 20 surface properties that may affect the efficacy of --21 21 of things like capsid-binding drugs; and certainly, Next slide, please. Next slide. 22 We welcome -- welcome back our speakers 22 you know, other targets could be affected similarly. Page 169 Page 167 1 from this morning and thank them for participating in And, you know, one of the issues is 2 that, while there are, you know, certain enteroviruses 2 our panel this afternoon. 3 3 that seem to be more highly associated with severe I would also like to welcome some 4 additional panelists: Dr. David Byron, Head of 4 disease in neonates, in fact probably most of them can 5 cause severe disease at some level. 5 Research and Development at AntiVirus Therapeutics; 6 6 Dr. Jeffrey Hincks, cofounder and President of You saw the -- the graph that Miranda 7 ViroDefense; Dr. David Kimberlin, professor and Vice 7 showed with even a fairly small number of cases, and 8 Chair of Clinical and Translational Research as well 8 there's a long tail of lots of other enterovirus 9 as Codirector of the Division of Pediatric Infectious 9 types. So that's -- that's, I think, one of the 10 biggest challenge -- challenges, and -- and the other 10 Diseases at the University of Alabama at Birmingham; 11 Dr. Steve Oberste, Acting Director of the Division of 11 one is something that Matt brought up this morning

12 Viral Diseases at Centers for Diseases Control and 12 about rapid ways to -- to type the viruses. 13 Prevention; Dr. Matthew Vogt, Assistant Professor of 13 It's -- it's very difficult. It 14 requires sequencing. At least, that's the current 14 Pediatrics in Microbiology and Immunology at UNC at 15 state-of-the-art test. 15 Chapel Hill School of Medicine; and Dr. Kevin 16 And -- and even though that's much, 16 Messacar, Associate Professor of Pediatrics at 17 much faster than the old ways of antigenic typing, 17 University of Colorado. 18 18 going back, you know, decades, it still takes a lot of As a reminder, panelists, please raise 19 your hand in Zoom if you wish to make a comment. 19 time; and it's not -- it's not really possible to turn 20 Members of the public may enter 20 that around in a clinically relevant time frame. So to me, those are -- those are two of 21 questions in the Q-and-A box. 22 22 the biggest challenges that we have in -- in getting Next slide, please.

1 some of the basic information that's needed to -- to

- 2 drive either drug development or in fact, you know,
- 3 clinical treatments. Thank you.
- 4 DR. VISWANATHAN: Yes. And --
- 5 DR. PICA: Dr. -- Dr. Abzug, did you
- 6 want to comment?
- 7 DR. ABZUG: Yeah. I'll just add to the
- 8 list that -- that Steve has started us with. I want
- 9 to put the obvious out there, which is, we're dealing
- 10 with a relatively rare condition that's devastating
- 11 but fortunately rare in numbers.
- 12 And so the incentivization for
- 13 developing antiviral drugs particularly targeting this
- 14 population is -- is not presently there and -- and is
- 15 a major challenge; and with the rarity of the
- 16 condition, it also means doing the studies of
- 17 candidate drugs is challenging.
- And, as was discussed this morning,
- 19 this is a prime condition where it -- where network
- 20 studies are really the only way to evaluate new
- 21 agents.
- 22 But those network studies have to be

1 prepared to enroll at any time, primarily during the

- 2 summer and fall but not always. We're seeing some
- 3 circulation even in, you know, January and February,
- 4 when we wouldn't used to have seen that before.
- 5 Climate change is impacting so many
- 6 ways that infectious diseases circulate or -- or
- 7 pathogens circulate. So you've got to -- you've got
- 8 to have sites ready. That means they've got to have
- 9 warm funding. It's expensive.
- 10 And -- and I would suggest more
- 11 expensive than many times we really legitimately
- 12 compensate them for in -- in terms of being ready to
- 13 enroll and maybe not getting anybody not for lack of
- 14 effort but just because -- because the -- the patients
- 15 were not coming in, which can be a good thing from the
- 16 standpoint of the -- of the babies but -- but not so
- 17 good from the standpoint of trying to get to the end
- 18 of the study.
- 19 So the rarity of the -- of the disease
- 20 -- the severe-disease manifestations itself, I think,
- 21 is -- is one of the very biggest challenges. Another
- 22 would be -- and this is true for so many diseases

Page 171

Page 170

- 1 set up over a large number of sites because of the
- 2 rarity condition -- of conditions that represent a
- 3 rare -- a broad range of geography since what's
- 4 happening in one community on a given enterovirus
- 5 season may not be what's happening in another
- 6 community.
- 7 And those studies need to be done over
- 8 time; and by "over time," I mean usually several to --
- 9 to more than several years because of the year-to-year
- 10 variability and unpredictability of which
- 11 enteroviruses are circulating at any given time.
- 12 DR. PICA: Yeah. I think that's an
- 13 excellent point. Dr. Kimberlin, do you have something
- 14 else to add?
- 15 DR. KIMBERLIN: Yeah. I would -- I
- 16 would add to what Mark just said and -- and say that
- 17 in addition to wanting to do this over several seasons
- 18 because of variability of -- of circulating strains or
- 19 types of -- of enteroviruses, it's just by necessity
- 20 to get enough subjects. They are so few and far
- 21 between.
- 22 And -- and so you have to have sites

1 where it's -- it's -- you know, the baby has been

- 2 healthy and then all of a sudden is -- is not.
- 3 It's pretty overwhelming to -- to
- 4 families; and when they hear things about experimental
- 5 treatments, many of them just shut down and say:
- 6 "Nope. I'm not doing that for my baby." And that --
- 7 that -- that's not unique to neonatal enteroviral
- 8 sepsis, but it is a challenge.
- 9 DR. PICA: Dr. Vogt?
- DR. VOGT: I think this point that I'm
- 11 going to make also builds off all of the previous
- 12 points that were made, which is that for this rare
- 13 disease that is also caused by, as was pointed out,
- 14 over 100 different viruses that all seem to have the
- 15 ability to at least cause some of these forms of
- 16 disease and with all these different disease
- 17 manifestations like myocarditis or hepatitis or things
- 18 like that it also becomes hard to just decide, like,
- 19 what level of preclinical work is needed to advance
- 20 something into actual clinical trials.
- 21 So do you need to show evidence
- 22 against, you know, one just Echovirus 11 -- let's say

Meeting Page 174 1 -- or one -- or Coxsackie B3; or do you need to see, 1 to understand the importance of enteroviruses?" And 2 that seems to be very difficult. 2 you know, evidence against five clinical syndromes or DR. PICA: Excellent points. 3 3 ten clinical syndromes in preclinical models, with the 4 4 caveat that all the preclinical models are also models Dr. Abzug, did you want to respond? 5 DR. ABZUG: Yeah. I just wanted to 5 and not humans? 6 build on a couple of the previous points. So a complication that I think comes 7 7 even before we get the chance to think about all the You know, I think that the question of 8 other complications that come with the human studies 8 incentivization is key; and this really gets to the 9 second bullet that we're supposed to address in this 9 that follow. 10 session, which is the collaboration. 10 DR. PICA: Dr. Rosenfeld, do you have a 11 And this really needs to be an 11 comment? 12 effort -- there really needs to be an effort -- a 12 DR. ROSENFELD: I do. As the basic 13 scientist, the basic entero-virologist representative 13 collaborative effort amongst industry and academia, as 14 to the panel, I think we -- these are all, I agree, 14 -- as mentioned in that bullet, as well as funding 15 very serious points and concerns. We need to take a 15 agencies to make this a priority. 16 step back and say, "Do we actually have models for 16 I mean, this is a -- this is a group of 17 viruses which -- although they cause adult morbidity 17 these diseases?" And we really don't have immune-18 competent animal models for enteroviruses. 18 and sometimes mortality, they truly are more 19 And even -- I mean, I was trained by 19 pediatric-threatening; and the younger the child, the 20 somebody who generated the first model of a human 20 more threatening they are. 21 21 pathogen. He generated the mouse model for poliovirus And so we're really talking then to a 22 young pediatric population, which is not the kind of 22 infection and paralytic disease, but he will also Page 175 Page 177 1 acknowledge the fact that it's not true to real 1 market that -- that industry thrives on, and it's not 2 disease. 2 necessarily the kind -- type of disease that funding 3 Like, you cannot orally infect those 3 agencies are targeting. 4 mice and have the -- the polio replicate and go 4 But there really needs to be a

- 5 collaborative effort to try to raise the -- the
- 6 visibility of these agents and the need for -- for the
- 7 funding to develop the drugs -- develop drugs with
- 8 different roots of administration applicable to the
- 9 children we're talking about, developing the -- the
- 10 models that Amy is referring to, and then developing
- 11 the -- the means -- the networks to do these studies.
- 12 It -- it's really a major, major
- 13 undertaking.
- 14 I just want to add a couple other
- 15 challenges that are -- are at least tangentially
- 16 related to some that we've mentioned.
- 17 Kevin Messacar's question earlier
- 18 mentioned predictors. We have some predictors of who
- 19 is going to do badly, but they're not so honed down
- 20 that we can really apply them yet, I think, to the
- 21 clinical setting or the clinical-trial setting.
- 22 And if we had real-time laboratory

- 5 through the entire neuroinvasion process. We cheat.
- 6 We immunize the animals IP, IM.
- 7 So there is -- we take advantage of the
- 8 known viremic phase, and that's all based on a lot of
- 9 autopsies and data generated in the 1930s through the
- 10 '50s by seminal clinicians like Dorothy Horstmann and
- 11 David Bodain for polio.
- 12 We really don't have any of that
- 13 information for any other entero, and so we need to
- 14 start off just asking very simple questions and how to
- 15 develop a model that we can actually test and say,
- 16 "This is somewhat related to the human disease" with
- 17 the understanding that the animals are not humans.
- 18 And that has not been well-funded
- 19 because these are not considered diseases where people
- 20 die; and so that leads to the incentivization that
- 21 Mark was talking about; and that really starts off
- 22 with, "Can you get the NIH and other granting agencies

Page 178

- 1 diagnostics that give us serotype, antibody level,
- 2 that sort of thing, that might help us do that better.
- 3 And then one other thing just to
- 4 mention is that within a given newborn with severe
- 5 enterovirus disease, the disease course can be very
- 6 variable; and variability makes defining endpoints
- 7 harder.
- 8 And it makes having the -- the
- 9 appropriate end in your study more challenging, and it 9 basically a city, you know, a wastewater-treatment
- 10 also makes it harder to predict -- to predict which of
- 11 the babies you're seeing in front of you are the best
- candidates for a therapeutic trial. I'll stop there.
- 13 DR. PICA: Thank you.
- 14 Well, I think Dr. Schleiss had his hand
- 15 up.
- 16 DR. SCHLEISS: Oh, hi, thank you.
- 17 Yeah. This is a great discussion. I just wanted to
- 18 ask the panel what their thoughts might be about
- 19 wastewater surveillance and polio. You know,
- 20 obviously, that's an enterovirus 'cause it's caused a
- 21 lot of mortality.
- 22 And we had that infamous case in New

- DR. OBERSTE: Yeah. Thanks. I can 1
- 2 take that one on since we've been directly involved in
- 3 the wastewater testing for polio that followed the --
- 4 the New York case, and one of the issues for -- in
- 5 doing wastewater testing for enteroviruses is that
- 6 they're -- is that they're ubiquitous. There's
- 7 probably 30 to 50 million cases or infections a year.
- 8 So if you pick sewage from any --
- 10 system, it's going to be positive for enterovirus; and
- 11 so it's not terribly helpful in that way.
- 12 You would have to do typing and
- 13 sequencing, which is possible; but of course, you
- 14 know, it's not just a few people depositing viruses
- 15 into that sewage system. It's probably many
- 16 thousands, if not, you know, 100,000 or more; and so
- 17 sorting out all the different enteroviruses that are
- 18 there is going to be a huge challenge.
- 19 And then, again, the vast majority of
- 20 infections are asymptomatic or very mild; and so which
- 21 ones actually matter? And so while it's certainly an
- 22 interesting thought, I think it would be hard to get

Page 179

- 1 York State a couple years ago now, I guess; and I -- I
- 2 think the CDC had actually expanded some of the
- 3 wastewater surveillance in response to that event.
- 4 And is there some way to tie in, you
- 5 know, the kinds of messaging and awareness that Mark
- 6 was just talking about to vaccine-preventable diseases
- 7 and sort of package that polio story? Heaven help us
- 8 if we need therapeutics for -- for wild-type polio. I
- 9 -- I don't think we're going to get back to that
- 10 point.
- 11 But the antivaccine movement, you know,
- 12 has kind of forced our hand on this issue. So I --
- 13 just a sort of general question to the panel, thoughts
- 14 about wastewater surveillance, as it might relate to
- 15 enterovirus surveillance and tying the whole topic
- 16 into polio because that will certainly capture some
- 17 public attention.
- 18 DR. PICA: Yeah. Thank you, Dr.
- 19 Schleiss. I know Dr. Rosenfeld and Betsy had their
- 20 hands up, but I -- before we hear from them, I welcome
- 21 the panel -- anyone from the panel to -- to answer Dr.
- 22 Schleiss' question.

Page 181

- 1 any actionable data out of it.
- You know, we had talked to a number of
- 3 states about doing some wastewater testing for polio
- 4 specifically and especially in states that -- that had
- 5 -- states or cities that had known low-vaccine
- 6 coverage for polio, where we thought there were at-
- 7 risk populations.
- 8 And again, there's a lot involved in
- 9 setting that up. Even though, you know, there were
- 10 samples being collected for SARS-CoV-2 testing, it was
- 11 very different than what we do for polio globally
- 12 'cause of course globally, you know, they don't have
- 13 sewage systems in the places that we're worried about
- 14 polio transmission.
- 15 You know, the sewage system is a ditch
- 16 on the side of the road; and so it's environmental
- 17 sampling, not, quote, "wastewater testing"; and so
- 18 it's very different.
- 19 And when you have very low rates of
- 20 infection like we had in -- even in New York, even
- 21 though it was -- the virus was detected for some
- 22 months, relatively low rates of infection in a large

Page 182 1 catchment -- so some big-city catchments' wastewater 1 Dr. Kimberlin? DR. KIMBERLIN: To -- to focus on the 2 can be, you know, over a million people. 3 So you're really looking for a needle 3 bullet under Number 1, two additional things -- well, 4 in a haystack -- in a very nasty haystack in fact 4 I guess -- I guess three things come to mind. 5 because it's sewage, and so it -- it has a lot of One, biomarker, if we could have a 6 practical challenges to doing wastewater surveillance 6 biomarker that, I guess, could predict who is going to 7 not that we wouldn't do it in certain cases; but I 7 develop severe disease, that would really be ideal 8 think it's hard to find the -- the correct use case 8 'cause then we could get what Kevin Messacar was 9 where that would be useful. 9 suggesting earlier built into a protocol where you 10 DR. ROSENFELD: Can I just follow up 10 could -- you could treat earlier for a baby that's at 11 with what Steve said? There's a reason why BioFire 11 higher risk. 12 12 diagnoses people EV -- entero-positive, rhino-I think that could be very important 13 positive. It's because the genomes are also 13 and then also a biomarker for outcome 'cause that 14 extraordinarily similar. 14 could become an endpoint to a study. We'll talk about 15 And it's been very difficult to find 15 that later in the afternoon, I would think. 16 virus-specific primers so that you would only amplify 16 Secondly, Mark Abzug mentioned 17 out, say, EV-71 versus everything else if that's what 17 partnerships; and he brought in funding agencies. 18 you think is circulating. 18 I -- I am delighted that FDA is -- is taking these two 19 So just logistically, you can say: 19 days to -- to take a deep dive into these two diseases 20 "Yeah. You're EV-positive, rhinovirus-positive." But20 that so many of us care so much about. 21 it takes a lot more than a PCR to really discriminate 21 I think FDA, to the extent allowed 22 between the genomes because you're just using a very 22 as -- as the regulatory agency, being part of Page 185 Page 183 1 small fragment. 1 conversations early can be really, really helpful 2 The -- if you're multiplexing, the 2 to -- to the overall process. 3 3 primers all have to be at the appropriate annealing And then finally -- and this is broad. 4 temperature; and there's such genetic similarity 4 This is not just -- it -- it impacts rare diseases, 5 between the enteros. Plus, there's a huge amount of 5 but it impacts everything else too. The -- the OHRP 6 recombination among enteros, which leads to new 6 oversight of sights and IRBs, this whole idea of 7 enteros arising -- I don't know -- every year. 7 single IRB being a streamlined thing, it is not; and 8 So this is a huge undertaking, as Steve 8 you -- you can ask anybody. 9 said; but it's also more complicated than, "Let's just All it has done is added additional 10 throw out some primers." 10 layers of complexity of review, of everything that 11 DR. PICA: Okay. That does sound quite 11 goes into having a study approved at a given site or 12 across sites. So there could be -- it would help this 12 challenging. Thank you for that comment. 13 Dr. Hincks, did you want to make a 13 and so many other things. There could be some 14 comment? 14 regulatory adjustments that could make the conduct of 15 15 clinical research much easier. DR. HINCKS: Yeah. I -- I guess there 16 -- there are some models out there. Utah State has a 16 DR. PICA: Thank you for that 17 perspective. 17 couple different ones for D68, one for polio. They 18 were funded by NIH to set them up. So, I mean, there 18 Dr. Vogt, I saw your hand come up. DR. VOGT: Sure thing. Actually, this 19 are other models that are specific for EV infection. 19 20 So, I mean, there are some out there, not too many, 20 wasn't my initial intent; but I'm just going to second

21 Dr. Kimberlin on that point about central IRBs not

22 necessarily really making things easier. It does feel

21 but just to comment on that.

DR. PICA: Thank you.

22

Page 186 1 like it just adds another layer, which is a shame

- 2 'cause it would be nice if they were easier, as they
- 3 were intended to be.
- 4 The point that I was going to make was
- 5 based more on -- a couple different people have talked 5
- 6 about -- and me included -- diagnostics and how nice
- 7 it would be to have a rapid diagnostic both from the
- 8 standpoint of, you know, "What is the virus that this
- 9 child has more specifically than just enteroviruses in
- 10 general" and also, you know, what seropositivity they
- 11 may or may not have.
- 12 I think also the -- the thing is, I
- 13 don't know that we need that. I would like to have
- 14 that. So I don't think we should not try to have
- 15 that.
- 16 But I think of things like there -- you
- 17 know, there are certain clinical syndromes where we
- 18 will just empirically treat for them when we're
- 19 worried that a child is very sick, and we might need
- 20 to treat them.
- 21 So -- so in Dr. Abzug's talk, the
- 22 example of that was, we often give aciclovir for --

1 may not matter all that much if our drugs and our

- 2 treatments are relatively innocuous to give, that's
- 3 something to consider when we're doing our trials --
- 4 trial designs as well.
- DR. BELEW: I had a -- this is Yodit
- 6 Belew -- a follow-up question to that comment, Dr.
- 7 Vogt.
- 8 Would you be concerned -- and, others,
- 9 please feel free to chime in -- with respect to
- 10 empiric treatment and the potential for development of
- 11 resistance if we are using antivirals broadly for any
- 12 enteroviral-diagnosed -- diagnosed infection and
- 13 continuing treatment while we're waiting for subtypes
- 14 and susceptibility testing?
- 15 DR. VOGT: Sure. I -- I think that's
- 16 always something we need to think about; and, you
- 17 know, in some -- when you look at the use of small
- 18 molecules, for example, there's some small molecules
- 19 that have worked, you know, for decades and then some
- 20 small molecules that pretty quickly didn't work that
- 21 well anymore because the viruses mutated against them.
- 22 So I think it's hard to predict just

Page 187

- 1 you know, to treat for potential herpes simplex
- 2 infection in scenarios where herpes simplex is maybe
- 3 not the most likely thing the child has; but of
- 4 course, we'll do that; and aciclovir is not without
- 5 its toxicities.
- I think if we can also, you know, try
- 7 to make sure that our drugs are within a tolerable
- 8 level of toxicity one way to potential perform these
- 9 trials is to have a bit more of an inclusive net and
- 10 then allow that sort of post hoc analysis, which I
- 11 know some of the studies that Dr. Abzug cited had,
- 12 where you sort of break out.
- 13 "Okay. We -- you know, this was our
- 14 intention-to-treat group; but then we found out later,
- 15 you know" -- for example, if we're using a capsid
- 16 inhibitor, once we type the viruses -- "You know,
- 17 these were the kids who had viruses that actually have 17 have severe outcomes.
- 18 pocket factor that a capsid inhibitor could impair;
- 19 and these were the kids who didn't have those."
- 20 We -- just to -- to really try to not
- 21 limit the potential benefit to a lot of children
- 22 because we're waiting around on some diagnostics that 22 circulating in the world in all adults and children

Page 189

- 1 how that would work, but I -- I think that for
- 2 enteroviruses -- you know, I think of these as -- a
- 3 lot of these infections as things that set on pretty
- 4 quick. They're -- they're kind of a fast burn.
- 5 Like, they -- they come on pretty
- 6 quick; and then, you know, the virus -- the damage of
- 7 the virus may last weeks or months or years; but
- 8 really, the viral infection, you know, is actually
- 9 happening over the course of -- of days or at -- at
- 10 most weeks before the infection is cleared.
- 11 So you don't have quite the amount of
- 12 cocirculation of -- of virus and -- and small
- 13 molecules, and I think the other thing is to -- to
- 14 think about the epidemiology of these infections, is
- 15 that, as has been pointed out, this is actually a
- 16 pretty small group of children who -- certainly who
- 18 But even when you include all the kids
- 19 without severe outcomes, the amount of children who
- 20 would receive these empiric drugs is actually pretty
- 21 small compared to the number of enteroviruses

1 and all-comers. 2 So you'd really be applying that 3 pressure to a pretty small group of people. So I

4 think of this as at least theoretically to me -- so

5 I'll -- I'll really emphasize the "theoretically to

6 me" part of this -- a lower concern for this group of

7 viruses, although I'm sure other people might

8 disagree.

9 DR. PICA: Yeah. I -- Dr. Rosenfeld,

10 I'm not sure if you have your hand up or if that was

11 from earlier but --

12

13 So I have --

14 DR. PICA: Okay. Great.

15 DR. ROSENFELD: I have several problems 15

16 with -- or several concerns with certain aspects of

17 this discussion.

1 response.

18 So for instance, the idea of looking at

19 seropositivity for antibodies, there's a lot of cross-

20 reactivity against entero -- against enteroviruses,

21 and my lab has described the cross-neutralized -- is

22 beginning to describe the cross-neutralizing antibody

Page 191

2 So just to say you have a neutralizing

3 antibody response is not really sufficient to say you

4 have a neutralizing antibody response against that

5 specific virus, especially when you talk about cross-

6 reactivity because we don't really know whether --

7 what cross-reactivity means, if it can exacerbate the

8 viral infection and the disease or not because this is

9 just all done in tissue-culture cells.

The animal models that were referred to

11 are all basically immune compromised. They're

12 interferon alpha beta receptor knockout mice, which is12

13 problematic in the fact that these viruses are

14 interferon sensitive.

15 So if you look at work that was done by

16 the Japanese group for polio, they took out the

17 interferon response by removing TLR3; and the virus 17

18 was now all over in all extra-neural tissue,

19 suggesting that it is the interferon response that

20 constricts the virus to the primary site of infection.

And we're all talking about this as if

22 it's the virus that is the problem. Most likely if

2 disease and severe disease, the virus' genome is the

1 you take virus from children who develop non-severe

3 same.

Page 190

4 It has to do with host genetics, and we

5 have no understanding of what host genetics -- single

6 polymorphism, SNPs, or whatever -- correlate with the

7 development of severe disease 'cause severe disease is

8 really just a reflection of viral fitness in that

9 particular environment, and viral fitness is not

10 always defined by the virus.

11 And so I think that we -- if we want to

DR. ROSENFELD: No. I have my hand up.12 really address this question appropriately then, we

13 need to take into the fact that host genetics really

14 does contribute.

DR. PICA: Thank you, Amy, for that

16 perspective -- or, Dr. Rosenfeld, I should say.

Dr. Kimberlin and Dr. Vogt, I think you

18 have direct responses to this; and then we'll hear

19 from Dr. Abzug.

20 DR. KIMBERLIN: Yeah. I do. I -- I

21 don't -- I don't discount what Dr. Rosenfeld was

22 saying. I -- I would point out that the neonatal

Page 193

1 population is immunocompromised. I mean, the -- the

2 innate immune response is different in a neonate than

3 it is in a 2-month-old or a 7-month-old or a 2-year-

4 old or whatever it may be.

5 So -- so I -- I think that it may be

6 more complex than simply saying that: "The virus is

7 not the issue. It's the host's response to the

8 virus." These -- these people are -- these babies are

9 not able to -- to mount the kind of response -- that's

10 the reason HSV is -- is devastating in a neonate, and

11 if a -- if a 7-week-old gets it, they do fine.

It's -- it's not the genes that are

13 different. It's not the virus that is different.

14 It's the innate immune response that has matured over

15 those first weeks of life.

16 DR. PICA: Dr. Vogt?

And then, Dr. Abzug?

18 DR. VOGT: Sure. I just want to point

19 out in response to Dr. Rosenfeld's comments about the

20 cross-neutralization of antibodies, you know, I think

21 there's an important distinction to make; and that's

22 between -- the difference between binding and

Meeting Page 194 1 neutralization, and I think we've kind of been 1 the enrolled subjects to reach what we think is a 2 switching back and forth between those two. 2 target level that's appropriate. So that's the 3 I think with the -- you know, the 3 antiviral piece. 4 therapeutic studies, for example, that Dr. Abzug was 4 5 talking about, where, for example, they took lots of 6 IVIG and then said: "Okay. Does this lot of IVIG 7 have a 1-to-800 titer against a particular virus," 8 those are neutralization titers. I'm almost certain, 9 although I'm happy to be corrected if I'm wrong. 10 And -- and a lot of these when we're 10 protective or organ repairing. 11 talking about cross-reactivity or when we're talking 11 12 about -- let's say -- polyclonal sources of antibody 13 usually we are talking about a neutralization readout. 14 14 And so I'll totally agree to the fact 15 that I couldn't tell you if that antibody was 16 generated in response to a polio vaccine or to an 17 enterovirus infection of any specific type. 18 But in this case, I don't think that's 19 really relevant because if the neutralizing -- if the 20 antibodies neutralize the virus, whether they were 20 Thanks.

22 immunization to another thing, the fact is they

Page 195

1 neutralized the virus; and so it doesn't really matter

2 what caused the antibody to be generated.

21 elicited by an infection to something or an

3 It's there; and it's doing its

4 neutralization, you know, activity. So I think that's

5 just a sort of clarification I'd like to point out.

6 DR. PICA: Thanks.

7 And, Dr. Abzug?

8 DR. ABZUG: Thank you.

I just want to broaden a little bit in

10 -- in response to the first bullet our thinking.

11 We've been focused on antivirals, as -- as we're --

12 we're supposed to, and I'm all for that. I just want

13 to make a comment that we also need to think about

14 alternative routes of administration.

15 The fact is that most of the

16 enterovirus antivirals that are in development are

17 being developed by oral routes; and as was mentioned 17

18 this morning, that's probably not the best route for a

19 very sick newborn.

20 And our study -- I didn't have time to

21 show you the pharmacokinetics data, but it bore that

22 out that it took a while for a significant number of

But I also think we need to be thinking

5 broadly. We need to be thinking about

6 immunotherapies, be that antibody based or other; and

7 then another whole possibility to think about,

8 which -- which I don't even know if it's in

9 development, are agents that can be either organ

So for example, the heart and the

12 liver, as I showed this morning, are two of the major

13 target organs for enterovirus disease.

Maybe we don't have the right antiviral

15 to give to a baby; but if we had a medication that

16 could protect that target organ or to help that target

17 -- target organ repair better than natural history

18 would predict, that may be a very important category

19 of therapeutics for us to think about as well.

21 DR. PICA: Okay. Thank you all. I'm

22 going to just take one moment now to read one of the

Page 197

1 comments that we got in the Q-and-A box from a general

2 attendee.

3 This is from Dr. Park, who is a program

4 officer overseeing the picornavirus at NIH -- at NIH,

5 and Dr. Park notes that: "To address the problem of

6 needing to treat enterovirus infections we are

7 interested to find broad-spectrum antivirals.

8 For that reason, we provide antiviral-

9 screening services against enterovirus using mouse

10 models. Polio, coxsackie, EV-D68, and EV-71 and

11 echovirus model is being developed.

12 Additionally, picornavirus is one of

13 the members of the prototype pathogens for pandemic

14 preparedness; and NIH has programs for developing

15 antivirals against prototype pathogens via the AViDD

16 program."

So thank you, Dr. Park, for sharing

18 that information with us. Unfortunately, the way that

19 our Zoom platform is set up for these meetings,

20 attendees who -- who are not panelists or speakers do

21 not have capabilities of actually commenting verbally

22 during these.

Page 198

- 1 So I -- I apologize, but I thought that
- 2 that was an important point to share with the larger
- 3 group.
- 4 So if anyone has follow-up questions,
- 5 they can -- you know, if -- if you're an attendee, you
- 6 can ask those questions via the chat; or a panelist
- 7 can either raise their hand and ask questions if -- if
- 8 they have additional follow-on questions or comments
- 9 regarding Dr. Park's information there in the Q and A.
- I think before we go back -- I see that
- 11 Dr. Kimberlin has his hand raised again; but before we
- 12 go to Dr. Kimberlin, I wanted to give -- I know that
- 13 Ms. Pilon from -- from earlier today had her hand
- 14 raised.
- 15 I just wanted to give you the
- 16 opportunity if you still had comments on your
- 17 perspectives about these topics for this session.
- 18 We'd love to hear from you.
- 19 MS. PILON: Yeah. Just a really quick
- 20 comment 'cause I was looking at, you know, additional
- 21 nonclinical discussion.
- 22 And, you know, earlier there was a

Page 199

- 1 moment where I thought something relevant to bring up
- 2 would be, you know, obviously the difficulty in
- 3 identification of a very heterogeneous cohort but that
- 4 there are many communities like ours and others whose
- 5 kids and, you know, infants and neonates also are at
- 6 higher risk for a severe disease course from
- 7 enteroviruses and others.
- 8 And we have that; and we have seen
- 9 that, you know, time and time again with more severely
- 10 impacted children.
- 11 And so just looking at -- you know,
- 12 when you're looking at the difficulty of -- of that
- 13 cohort identification and working with a patient-
- 14 family basis for this in particular 'cause there's not
- 15 as much of -- in my -- my quick research of -- of
- 16 patient community behind it, it certainly would be --
- 17 there are communities who are more affected by these
- 18 in general that you could engage in this process as
- 19 well.
- DR. PICA: Thank you very much. We
- 21 appreciate hearing your perspectives on this.
- 22 I think that Dr. Kimberlin was next. I

Page 200

- 1 see that he's had his hand up for a while, and then we
- 2 will turn to Dr. Vogt to respond to one of the other
- 3 questions in our Q-and-A box.
- 4 But, Dr. Kimberlin, I'll -- I'll go to
- 5 you next.
- 6 DR. KIMBERLIN: This -- and this is
- 7 just circling back to an earlier question about
- 8 antiviral resistance and -- and antiviral pressure.
- 9 Yeah.
- 10 Of course, it depends on the molecule
- 11 in terms of what -- the likelihood of -- if a drug is,
- 12 you know, quick to develop antiviral resistance,
- 13 obviously that's going to be a less attractive drug
- 14 than if it's more difficult to develop resistance to
- 15 it.
- 16 I think Matt's point -- Dr. Vogt's
- 17 point is a good one that it would be used at least --
- 18 is envisioned with this neonatal enteroviral sepsis.
- 19 It would be used in a really small number of -- of
- 20 people, even preemptively used in a really small
- 21 number of people.
- 22 And so I -- I think my guess is it

- 1 would be unlikely to -- to lead to much in -- in the
- 2 way of antiviral resistance. I will say though that
- 3 if we think about -- let's fast-forward 15 years and
- 4 say, "We've got two or three drugs on the market."
- 5 They will be used preemptively just as
- 6 aciclovir is now when a neonate comes in and there's
- 7 at least a flash of concern for neonatal HSV.
- 8 Aciclovir is started along with the antibiotics, and
- 9 then it's stopped when the diagnostics rule that out,
- 10 or it's continued.
- 11 Same kind of approach clinically is how
- 12 I envision a successful molecule drug being used to
- 13 treat neonatal enteroviral sepsis. So there will be a
- 14 broader application utilization than just the smaller
- 15 population that ultimately rules in for that severe
- 16 manifestation of enteroviral disease.
- 17 DR. PICA: Thank you, Dr. Kimberlin.
- Dr. Vogt, did you want to respond? So
- 19 let me just quickly read the -- the question that --
- 20 that is -- is included in the Q and A here, "So are
- 21 there any antibodies, even if not neutralizing, that
- 22 are specific to a particular enterovirus without much

Meeting Page 202 1 cross-reactivity?" 1 out, that might be a combination of different types of 2 And Dr. Vogt had volunteered to address 2 drugs. 3 3 this question for us. So there might be small molecules and 4 DR. VOGT: Sure. And I think one thing 4 monoclonal antibodies and then maybe something that is 5 organ specific to help repair the organ or maybe 5 I'll point out in answering this question is there's 6 an important distinction, again, between polyclonal-6 something that is anti-inflammatory, you know, if it's 7 antibody sources -- so that's like the IVIG that Dr. 7 a disease process where the immune response is viewed 8 Abzug mentioned in some of the clinical trials he 8 as actually potentially causing damage rather than 9 referenced -- versus monoclonal antibodies, in which 9 helping. 10 10 case if there was a monoclonal-antibody product, you So hopefully we get to that point where 11 we have all those tools. 11 know, every single antibody within that product would 12 12 have the sort of same sequence, the same specificity. DR. PICA: That would -- that would be 13 And -- and so for monoclonal 13 great if we could -- if we could get to that point. 14 14 antibodies, the answer to that is a relatively easy Dr. Rosenfeld, did you have a comment? 15 DR. ROSENFELD: I do. 15 answer, which is to say that there are some monoclonal 16 antibodies that are indeed specific to certain 16 So I think that there's a little 17 enteroviruses; and then there are other monoclonal 17 confusion about resistance and how it arises. So 18 antibodies that cross-react between different 18 there's two mechanisms by which it can arise. It can 19 enteroviruses. 19 arise by point mutations that the polymerase 20 So, you know, before using -- oh, yeah. 20 introduces, but it can also arise by recombination

Page 203

22

Page 205

1 cross-react between different enteroviruses; and, you

22 definitely, you know, monoclonal antibodies that would

2 know, right now you can, you know, buy those as

21 So as a potential diagnostic -- so yes. So there are

- 3 laboratory reagents, for example, from, like, big
- 4 companies like Thermo Fisher.
- 5 And, you know, we're working on
- 6 identifying some that come from humans; and they're --
- 7 so -- so I think the answer is "yes."
- And actually, in such a diagnostic,
- 9 especially if you put a few, you know -- let's say
- 10 even two or three -- monoclonal antibodies you might
- 11 really be able to make sure you've got that cross-
- 12 reactivity you're looking for in a diagnostic.
- 13 And then also, I just wanted to support
- 14 what Dr. Kimberlin said, which is that -- I agree. I
- 15 mean, my hope would be long term if we can have
- 16 multiple options in our toolbox, if we get that lucky.
- You know, we would give this to any
- 18 child that we were worried about enteroviral sepsis
- 19 before we even eventually hopefully figured that out,
- 20 you know, one way or the other, exactly the way we
- 21 treat HSV.
- 22 And, you know, as Dr. Abzug pointed

1 about recombination partners. So we know something

And we really don't know very much

- 2 about recombination partners for polio; and we know
- 3 something about the polymerase and reversion rates;
- 4 and in fact, actually the reversion rate for certain
- 5 alterations in the genome is very quick.

21 with circulating enteros.

- 6 So work done -- if you look at the
- 7 reversion of the Stem Loop 5 alteration in the Sabin
- 8 variant of polio, that reversion occurs from the gut
- 9 selective pressure without 48 hours -- 24 hours of
- 10 giving the vaccine to the child, and that's work that
- 11 was done by David Evans and Phil Minor in the 1980s.
- 12 And then the majority of viruses that
- 13 we see circulating that cause -- let's say -- cVDPV2
- 14 outbreaks, they're all recombinants in which the
- 15 three-prime end of the virus has been changed and
- 16 recombined with an entero that is circulating.
- 17 So to say that we wouldn't get
- 18 resistance against some kind of small molecule may not
- 19 -- may be ideal, but it's probably not realistic, and
- 20 we probably also need to sample what is circulating in
- 21 the environment to understand if there are
- 22 recombination partners available.

Page 206 And that's one reason why you develop

2 combination therapies also, is to prevent that.

3 And that has been one of the concerns

- 4 about the development of the antiviral program for
- 5 polio, is whether or not you really need combination
- 6 therapy or you can just combine -- let's say -- 2C
- 7 protease inhibitor with a monoclonal antibody, which
- 8 has been proposed.

1

- 9 DR. PICA: So I think Dr. Abzug has a
- 10 response and then Dr. Vogt.
- 11
- 12 to what -- what Amy just said, you know, resistance is 12 arise be fit enough to actually become a dominant
- 14 We've learned that by history.
- 15 I think one feature that is in our
- 16 favor here is we're talking about a newborn, and
- 18 the environment, particularly in that first week or
- 19 two of life when -- when the ones we're -- we're most
- 20 worried about are getting sick.
- 21 So it is not impossible but unlikely
- 22 that that host will be having multiple enteroviruses

Page 208

- 1 of reference when we're thinking about the likelihood
- 2 of -- of that 'cause I agree that -- can viruses
- 3 develop resistance? Yeah. These are small --
- 4 these -- these are small RNA viruses.
- 5 And one of the main features that we
- 6 all learn about in, like, Viruses 101 in -- in even
- 7 high school or, if not, college is that those bad boys
- 8 -- they like to mutate, and that's kind of how they --
- 9 how they, you know, succeed.
- 10 And so we know they're going to mutate.
- DR. ABZUG: Yeah. A couple of comments 11 The question is: Is that mutation that's going to
- 13 always a concern any time you have an anti-infective 13 mutation and then also transmit not just from that one
 - 14 infant but to other people and then actually continue
 - 15 to circulate successfully?
 - And I think that that likelihood is a
- 17 newborns unfortunately haven't had much exposure tφ17 very different likelihood when you're talking about an
 - 18 infant with neonatal sepsis from an enterovirus versus
 - 19 populations where every single person has received,
 - 20 you know, a vaccine, for example.
 - 21 DR. PICA: Thank you, Dr. Vogt.
 - 22 We'll -- we'll let Dr. Oberste make a

Page 207

- 1 onboard that have the chance for recombination in that
- 2 narrow population.
- 3 Ultimately though, I -- I think the
- 4 goal will be to have multiple agents that can be used
- 5 in combination, particularly agents of different
- 6 mechanisms; and that will further reduce the chance of
- 7 resistance developing. Thanks.
- 8 DR. PICA: And, Dr. Vogt?
- DR. VOGT: And I think just to try
- 10 to -- to put further context on that, similar to what
- 11 Dr. Abzug was just doing, is -- you know, as he
- 12 pointed out -- right -- there's, you know, one baby
- 13 and one hospital and not a lot of exposure to the
- 14 enteroviruses.
- 15 And so while -- when we think about the
- 16 circulating vaccine-derived polioviruses that, you
- 17 know, have arisen from recombination, those have
- 18 arisen in populations where, like, every child has
- 19 received that vaccine. So you're talking, you know,
- 20 hundreds of thousands or even millions of people
- 21 interacting and sharing these things.
- 22 So just kind of another sort of point

- 1 comment, and then we'll read a question that we got in
- 2 the chat.
- 3 DR. OBERSTE: Yeah. I'd like to
- 4 address a couple things having to do with
- 5 recombination. First, with the circulating vaccine-
- 6 derived polioviruses, I'm not sure there's any
- 7 evidence that recombination actually plays a role in
- 8 their emergence per se and certainly not in their --
- 9 their pathogenesis or pathology.
- 10 As Amy pointed out, the -- the
- 11 attenuation site and the five-prime NTR of -- of
- 12 entero -- of the Sabin virus reverts extremely
- 13 quickly, and that in itself is sufficient to confer
- 14 neurovirulence on what used to be the vaccine.
- 15 My other point is that recombination in
- 16 the context of drugs and drug treatment really only
- 17 becomes relevant -- it -- it's really dependent on the
- 18 target. So for example, if you have a capsid-binding
- 19 drug, you know, the capsid is what defines an
- 20 enterovirus type.
- 21 And while there is going to be some
- 22 variability or could be some variability within type,

Page 210

2 you which type it is.

Now, if you have a drug that targets

4 another part of a genome that can recombine with --

1 that doesn't recombine out because that's what tells

- 5 with other circulating enteroviruses, that could cause
- 6 some issues. However, the key would be to find broad-
- 7 specificity drugs -- for example, to target the -- the
- 8 protease.
- 9 And there are some drugs that have been
- 10 developed over the years or at least taken to certain
- 11 stages of development over the years that have much
- 12 broader specificity, and so then you wouldn't worry as
- 13 much about recombination because it may -- may
- 14 recombine out one version, and the new one comes --
- 15 that comes in is just as susceptible.
- 16 So just kind of thinking of that,
- 17 recombination to me is maybe not a huge concern. I
- 18 think it's -- it's some of the point mutations that
- 19 can confer resistance to, you know, all kind of drugs.
- 20 And it's -- and it's very similar to
- 21 the HIV situation -- let's say. They of course --
- 22 they've had drugs for decades, and you don't give a

Page 211

- 1 single drug if you don't have to.
- 2 You know, we would expect resistance to
- 3 occur at some frequency; and that's the way we -- I
- 4 think we would want to have a combination, you know,
- 5 down -- down the road when we -- when we do have
- 6 treatments.
- 7 And finally, I'd just like to mention I
- 8 -- I would second all the calls for having the ability
- 9 to use some of these drugs empirically. I think it
- 10 will depend largely on the safety profile of the
- 11 drugs, especially since we have been discussing how
- 12 difficult it is to do the studies.
- But if you have a drug that's shown to
- 14 be extremely safe by, you know, every possible test
- 15 you can run, then I think that you could make an
- 16 argument that it's -- it's at least reasonable to try.
- 17 Obviously, there's lots of caveats that
- 18 go with that; but I -- I think that -- that would be
- 19 the first hurdle; and if you have a very safe drug,
- 20 that maybe lowers the bar just a little bit.
- DR. PICA: Thank you.
- Just in the absence of, you know,

Page 212 1 broadly effective therapeutics, we've heard a common

- 2 theme that it's important to really identify the
- 3 target.
- 4 And we do have someone who's typed into
- 5 the question -- into the Q-and-A box: "How accurate
- 6 could viral typing be in identifying which virus might
- 7 respond to a specific drug? Is that something that we
- 8 think is possible in the context of enterovirus
- 9 diversity?"
- DR. OBERSTE: I can tackle that one,
- 11 and maybe others want to comment as well. I think in
- 12 cases where it's well known how the -- the mechanism
- 13 of action of the drug -- so for example, the capsid-
- 14 binding drugs, it's pretty well known where they
- 15 interact.
- And there have been efforts to generate
- 17 -- either generate resistant viruses in the lab or to
- 18 characterize viruses from, for example, clinical
- 19 trials; and so it's pretty well-known which parts of
- 20 the capsid conferred that resistance; and so by --
- 21 again, it would be by sequencing, which is not rapid.
- But it would be at least accurate if

- 1 you can identify parts of the capsid that have -- have
- 2 characteristic amino acids that -- that are known to
- 3 confer resistance.
- 4 And presumably, you could do the same
- 5 thing with things like a protease inhibitor or others,
- 6 where the mechanism is known; and you could try -- you
- 7 could look at the active site of the enzyme.
- 8 DR. PICA: Thank you so much. This has
- 9 certainly been a very spirited discussion. In the
- 10 interest of time, I just want to introduce our second
- 11 topic for the panelists.
- 12 I'm hoping that we can now talk about
- 13 potential strategies that could be considered to
- 14 improve collaboration between industry, academia,
- 15 parents -- and parents and caregivers to facilitate
- 16 antiviral therapeutic development for the treatment of
- 17 enterovirus infection in infants and neonates.
- 18 I know Dr. Abzug touched upon this
- 19 briefly earlier in -- in the afternoon, talking about
- 20 the importance of network studies.
- 21 I don't -- Dr. Abzug, do you want to
- 22 talk more about that?

1 Or does anyone else have any other

- 2 ideas or comments?
- 3 DR. ABZUG: I'm going to take your
- 4 question and change it a little bit because before we
- 5 can get to network studies we need agents to -- to
- 6 study in those networks.
- 7 So I think it might be useful to hear a
- 8 little bit more about the industry-academia
- 9 partnership, and -- and I -- and I include funding
- 10 agencies as the third partner in that collaboration to
- 11 even to the point of having agents to bring to a
- 12 clinical trial's networks.
- 13 So I -- I -- I'd -- I'd like -- like to
- 14 hear from our industry partners as to what they see as
- 15 what's necessary to move the field along.
- DR. PICA: Yeah. I think that would --
- 17 it would be great.
- Dr. Hincks, do you have any comments or
- 19 just --
- DR. HINCKS: Sure. It is tough to get
- 21 funding. That's for sure. I mean, we're advancing
- 22 two drugs, two different molecular mechanisms of

1 is always an issue; and the duration of time it takes

- •
- 2 to do studies on these rare diseases makes not only
- 3 funding an issue.

Page 214

- 4 But -- but also for the sponsor, they
- 5 have to realize that the time -- the time that they
- 6 will be spending studying sufficient sample sizes is
- 7 going to be measured not in months or what we would
- 8 typically do in the industry in terms of months to
- 9 perhaps years but a limited number of years.
- But if the number of years becomes very
- 11 long because the number of subjects needed to get an
- 12 adequate sample size requires, as Mark -- as Dr. Abzug
- 13 had mentioned, requires a significant number of -- of
- 14 sites -- sites, and each site sometimes only enrolls
- 15 one to two subjects in a year or less.
- 16 It just -- it -- it adds to the
- 17 complication from an industrial perspective to want to
- 18 get behind that support because the end is so far away
- 19 from the current time. So it's -- it's another
- 20 complication of studying these in -- you know,
- 21 whatever you might characterize as ultra-rare
- 22 diseases.

Page 215

- 1 action; and we're working hard to try to get funding
- 2 to -- to do a study, a Phase 2 -- well, Phase 2, 3;
- 3 and it's -- it's been difficult. I guess that's all I
- 4 can say about that.
- 5 DR. PICA: Thank you.
- 6 And, Mr. Byron, do you have anything to
- 7 mention? We're -- we're not able to hear you, if
- 8 you're -- if you're providing a response.
- 9 Well, it -- it does sound like there
- 10 are substantial challenges for sure beyond -- beyond
- 11 even getting to a target in which to study. Are there
- 12 any other -- other comments related to this question?
- DR. ABZUG: I was just going to ask
- 14 whether any of our government partners on -- on the
- 15 phone or online have any thoughts on the issue.
- MR. BYRON: Can you hear me now?
- 17 Can -- can anybody hear me? This is Dave Byron.
- DR. PICA: Oh, yes. Yes. We can hear
- 19 you now. Thank you.
- 20 MR. BYRON: Okay. So sorry for that.
- 21 It -- I got a technical glitch, I guess. I mean, I'll
- 22 follow up on Mark's comment; and funding is always --

- DR. PICA: Yeah. Excellent points.
- 2 And just as a follow-up, Mr. Byron --
- 3 and, Dr. Hincks, you may want to chime in here as
- 4 well.
- 5 Do you think there are things that we
- 6 could do or things that the broader community could do
- 7 to encourage more industry partners who would be
- 8 interested in developing treatments for enterovirus?
- 9 MR. BYRON: Well, I mean, I'll -- I'll
- 10 just finish up. I mean, I think -- I think the
- 11 community -- the medical community and certain -- and
- 12 certainly Dr. -- Dr. Abzug and Dr. Kimberlin have done
- 13 quite a bit to -- to, I think, encourage interactions
- 14 with -- with the industry.
- But one of the pieces that is missing
- 16 is kind of the early-on FDA interactions to -- to be
- 17 sure that no studies are started for which there will
- 18 be questions asked later or that the studies started
- 19 are -- are kind of previewed so -- so that there isn't
- 20 -- there isn't time spent or money spent or effort
- 21 spent that will end up with -- with questions asked
- 22 that -- that then add more time to the process.

1 So I guess I'm not saying that maybe

- 2 it's not just the academic -- the academic
- 3 institutions, but it's also perhaps the agency in --
- 4 in fostering a clearer view of what will be expected
- 5 that can always not change but would at least give
- 6 some comfort.
- 7 DR. PICA: I think it's -- and point
- 8 taken. I just want to make the comment that the FDA
- 9 has a few mechanisms for interaction with the
- 10 industry, one of which is through the Pre-IND Program,
- 11 where some of these questions that you're alluding to
- 12 could -- could potential be answered.
- 13 MR. BYRON: Yeah. Thank you. I -- I
- 14 do know that -- that there are -- there are mechanisms
- 15 out there.
- 16 But again, from an industry
- 17 perspective, sometimes as we go through the process or
- 18 as new -- let's say -- new reviewers come onboard
- 19 during these long programs, new questions come up that
- 20 were -- that were perhaps -- you know, that were
- 21 not -- we were not aware of at the beginning because a
- 22 new -- a new reviewer has new input.

Page 219

Page 218

- 1 So it just -- that's not a -- I'm not
- 2 trying to be -- to express a frustration. I'm trying
- 3 to just say, you know, "What can we do?" Well, we're
- 4 not going to change that; and new reviewers are going
- 5 to be added all the time. It just -- those are the
- 6 things that -- that cause starts and stops to
- 7 programs.
- 8 MS. HODOWANEC: Thank you, Mr. Byron.
- 9 No. We -- we certainly appreciate your -- your
- 10 concerns, and -- and, you know, I think we -- we don't
- 11 have all of the answers at this point in terms of what
- 12 is the path to development for products for neonatal
- 13 enteroviral infections.
- 14 And that is why we are, you know,
- 15 putting the -- the time and energy into this workshop
- 16 here today, is to help us get a better understanding
- 17 of -- of what that path might look like; and
- 18 ultimately, we would love to be able to put out a
- 19 guidance document and to provide, you know, some of
- 20 these answers that you're seeking.
- MR. BYRON: Thank you.
- DR. PICA: Dr. Kimberlin, I'll let you

1 make one more comment before we take another break.

- 2 DR. KIMBERLIN: And this may be a
- 2 Br. Rindbergh Tind and may be
- 3 foretaste of the post-break conversation.
- 4 In -- in thinking about -- as an
- 6 would encourage to the -- encourage all of us to think
- 7 about what we could be doing to -- to improve our

5 outsider looking into what FDA does, it -- it -- I

- 8 situation with respect to antiviral drug development
- 9 in -- in these two diseases that we'll be talking
- 10 about today and tomorrow.
- 11 Looking at the data from an -- from an
- 12 academic standpoint, at least in clinical care, the
- 13 way I -- the way I approach it is, I kind of look for
- 14 the trends. I look for the threads. I look for the
- 15 truth across studies, and -- and sometimes that's with
- 16 a primary endpoint that hits.
- 17 Sometimes it's that another study did
- 18 not hit the primary endpoint, but there's some
- 19 secondary endpoints or some other very useful data in
- 20 -- in the manuscript that I'm -- that I'm reading to
- 21 make a clinical decision.
- 22 And for these rare diseases, that kind

Page 221

- 1 of -- where is truth? Where is -- across studies, you
- 2 know, retrospective studies, prospective studies,
- 3 randomized studies, where is the trend of -- of
- 4 evidence that a particular molecule might be helping
- 5 with the outcome?
- 6 And I think -- I think greater
- 7 flexibility for rare diseases where it is so
- 8 difficult, as -- as Mr. Byron was saying, to do these
- 9 studies, they just take a decade to do sometimes.
- 10 And -- and being willing to have a
- 11 little bit more flexibility, I think, for these rare
- 12 diseases is something that -- that I think could move
- 13 the needle somewhat.
- 14 DR. VISWANATHAN: Thank you, Dr.
- 15 Kimberlin; and I would say that personally the -- I
- 16 completely agree with you, and I would say that the
- 17 agency has taken numerous steps specifically for rare
- 18 diseases.
- And so, as mentioned during the morning
- 20 presentations, this evidentiary standard in terms of
- 21 substantial evidence of effectiveness is applicable
- 22 both to rare diseases as well as diseases that are

Meeting Page 222 1 more common. So that evidentiary standard does not 1 first? 2 2 change between the two types of diseases. DR. KIMBERLIN: Yes. Thank you. 3 But where the agency has made it clear 3 Dr. Abzug mentioned this during his 4 is that -- and -- and there have been a number of 4 talk, I believe. One of the studies that the 5 guidances that have been put forth to, again, as you 5 Congenital and Perinatal -- and Perinatal Infections 6 stated, consider some additional flexibility in 6 Consortium or CPIC, the -- the successor to the CASG, 7 getting clinical trials up and running for these rare 7 is undertaking now is a natural-history study of 8 diseases, which, as we have been talking about today, 8 neonatal enteroviral sepsis. 9 9 can be quite challenging. And we liberalized the enrollment 10 And just echoing Dr. Aimee Hodowanec's 10 criteria relative to what was used in the prior CASG 11 point earlier, you know, we all recognize the 11 pleconaril treatment -- Phase 2 treatment study. So 12 challenges of drug development in these two disease 12 we're -- we're -- we are catching -- catching a 13 areas; and that is one of the reasons that, you know, 13 broader net of -- of babies with -- with potential 14 this -- this workshop was organized. 14 enterovirus infection. They don't have to have it to 15 And we are hoping that all the 15 -- to enroll in the study. 16 discussions that are happening today will help us inch 16 But -- but of the subset that will test 17 a little bit forward, you know, both in terms of 17 positive for enterovirus, once we're doing those 18 potential in the future putting out guidances and/or 18 analyses in our research lab, of those, we -- we 19 collectively for the community to understand some of 19 should have a broader grouping, compared with that --20 the nuances of what it means to -- to have evidence of 20 that tighter more sick patient that we enrolled in the 21 effectiveness for consideration, what additional 21 pleconaril study. 22 nonclinical or scientific work that needs to be 22 Part of the reason of doing this study Page 223 Page 225 1 considered so that the overall evidence in terms of a 1 and being a little bit more forgiving with respect to 2 enrollment, these babies still have, you know, 2 disease, endpoints, trial designs, et cetera, could be 3 refined and moved forward. 3 elevated transaminases, myocarditis, things like that, 4 just not as -- quite as strict of criteria of how bad 4 Thank you. DR. PICA: Thank you. Thank you so 5 it had to be. 5 6 6 much to all the panelists for this excellent Part of the reason of doing that is to 7 discussion. I think it's given us some food for 7 try to inform endpoints to -- to help people who are 8 thought, and we'll have a lot more to talk about when 9 we come back from a short break and reconvene at 2:15. 9 a drug. What would that look like?

10 Thanks so much. 11 (Off the record.) 12 DR. PICA: Hello, everyone. Welcome 13 back from the break. We will now continue our panel 14 discussion, this time turning our focus specifically 15 to clinical-trial design considerations. 16 I'm hoping during the next hour and 15 17 minutes we can discuss ideal study populations for

18 enrollment into clinical trials, appropriate clinical-19 trial endpoints, and comparator-treatment groups. I

21 comments.

22

20 now open the floor to anyone who would like to make

Dr. Kimberlin, would you like to go

8 listening on this call as they think about developing 10 And -- and perhaps if they were working 11 within a network such as ours, you know, helping us 12 also design what those future treatment studies would 13 look like, Phase 2 or Phase 3 studies would look like. 14 So -- so only to make the point that 15 there are some data being generated, being gathered 16 now that hopefully will be informative for the future. 17 DR. PICA: Yes. Thank you. Thank you 18 for that. 19 We'll hear from Dr. Vogt and then Dr. 20 Abzug. 21 DR. VOGT: So a question, David, to you 22 about that. For a clinical study like yours where

Page 228

Page 226 1 you're more information gathering -- right -- this 2 isn't an interventional study. You're trying to 3 define the natural history. 4 Is there -- I know the answer as the 5 study is constructed now, but is there any room in 6 study design to sort of include patients who aren't at 7 one of the actual study sites? So, you know, and -- and we talked 9 about this with a particular patient once before. So 10 that's why I know the answer as the study is designed 11 today. 12 But for something like natural history, 13 it would seem like it's an easier ask to go outside 14 the network to say: "All right. Invest -- you know, 15 you have to identify an investigator at this other 16 hospital or this institution. 17

16 hospital or this institution.

17 So if you can fill out our form, we can
18 include your patient in the study," as opposed to an
19 intervention obviously, which is a far different type
20 of -- of out-of-network question and -- and seems

22 DR. KIMBERLIN: Hey, your -- your -- I

21 incredibly unlikely.

1 love the tenor of your question. The way the regs
2 are, unless I'm totally missing it, we can't do it. I
3 mean, we've got to have everybody at -4 DR. VOGT: Okay. It's just a hard
5 "no"?
6 DR. KIMBERLIN: The number of hoops
7 that you've got to jump through to get a -- to get a
8 site activated, it takes months and -- and all the
9 different documentation, and they've had their -10 their training and so on and so forth, and I
11 understand why we do that.
12 But as we talk about it -- and I sort
13 of finished prebreak, you know, advocating for

We had -- we had a little bit more -- 16
David Boulware up in Minnesota did some interesting 17

18 work during the pandemic, and -- and -- but it -- 19 it -- it's not one that -- that I'm aware of, of a way

14 flexibility. I would love to have that degree of

15 flexibility. I don't see it happening right now.

20 -- path forward with it. I'm -- I'm -- I'd love to

21 hear more from people that might be smarter with --

22 than I am with that.

DR. VOGT: And is that limitation due

 $2\,$ to the funders, Dr. Kimberlin; and who is that funding

3 source; or, like, where -- where does the limitation

4 come from just to try to identify places where maybe

5 we can try to liberal -- liberalize the -- the way we

6 do these trials a little bit?

7 DR. KIMBERLIN: Yeah. It's the

8 regulatory oversight of studies. So it's -- it's not

9 really so much the -- the funding source, although

10 they -- they're going to be -- they obviously will be

11 compliant with what -- with the regulatory environment

12 that we work under.

But it's -- it's everything else, and

14 it also involves subcontracting and -- and getting a

15 legal agreement so there is a mechanism by which data

16 can leave one place to go to a --

DR. VOGT: Yeah.

18 DR. KIMBERLIN: -- centralized

19 database.

21

Page 227

20 DR. VOGT: Sure.

DR. KIMBERLIN: And you add all those

22 things together, things that -- you know, if you and I

Page 229
1 were taking care of a patient, we'd call each other.

2 We'd work through it, and we'd have something taken

3 care of in 15 or 20 minutes.

4 It -- it would take -- it -- it'd take

5 substantially longer, months to -- to do the same sort

6 of thing within the confines of the research realm.

7 DR. VOGT: Sure. Thanks for that

8 answer.

9 DR. KIMBERLIN: And -- and again, if

10 other people have a different way of doing it, I will

11 be taking notes. I would love to hear it, but that's

12 been -- that's been my experience.

DR. PICA: Thank you for those

14 perspectives.

Dr. Abzug, do you have a comment?

DR. ABZUG: Thank you. Yes.

7 I'd like to make two comments, one in

18 response to Dr. Kimberlin's description of the

19 natural-history study just to add that, as he

20 mentioned, that study will hopefully identify

21 appropriate endpoints for the next treatment trial.

22 It will also help to, as he implied -- help to -- us

Meeting Page 230 Page 232 1 to know more about the appropriate inclusion. 1 some efficacy. 2 2 In the pleconaril-treatment study, we But at the same point then, the 3 picked the sickest of the sick deliberately to try to 3 challenge with the rare outcomes is of course -- how 4 get meaningful endpoints. 4 do you know -- how do you select the kids enough in 5 This natural-history study will tell us 5 advance that your end could be high enough to actually 6 whether we can be more liberal and have a sick but not 6 point out that there were some kids who never actually 7 the sickest of the sick study population, which will 7 got that sick at all but otherwise would have gotten 8 make the study -- the next study a little bit easier 8 that sick? 9 9 to do, or whether we really need to focus on the most I think most folks on this call with at 10 sick infants to -- to get to meaningful endpoints. 10 the FDA have probably had to think about that a 11 11 million times. So maybe I'm just sort of speaking And then I want to just make an 12 anecdote because we -- we talked this morning about 12 into an echo chamber here, but I think that for a lot 13 the challenges of enrolling families of -- of very 13 of these antiviral drugs definitely earlier is the 14 sick newborns into studies. 14 better. 15 15 And we -- we've seen this in animal My anecdotal experience is that for a 16 treatment study like the pleconaril-treatment study, 16 models; but, you know, animal models are one thing; 17 where there's either a 2-to-1 or 2-out-of-3 or 1-out-17 and -- and humans are another with -- with all the 18 of-2 chance at a baby who's going to receive what we different challenges that have been mentioned before. 19 think is an active drug, it was much easier to 19 DR. PICA: Dr. Abzug?

Page 231

1 study looking at pleconaril for infants with

21 on a couple of the bullets that -- that you -- you

22 have up there -- virtual connectivity interruption --

2 meningitis. So these were outside the newborn grade,

DR. ABZUG: Thanks. And I can comment

Page 233

3 and they were not as sick as the kind of sick newborns

4 we're talking about.

5 And the challenge there is that

6 fortunately those babies -- those children are just

7 not as ill, and they generally do quite well.

8 And we actually aborted the study

9 because it was clear that we were not going to have

10 enough meaningful endpoints to get to say whether the

11 treatment was beneficial or not because most of the

12 children in the study had short hospitalizations and

13 really did not suffer at least in the near term

14 significant morbidity and mortality.

15 So that's why we have chosen to start

16 really focusing on the sickest babies, those being the

17 newborns.

18 DR. PICA: Dr. Massaro?

19 DR. MASSARO: Thanks. I just wanted to

20 piggyback on some of the comments that have been made

21 from the neonatology perspective. You know, I -- I

22 think everybody is homing in on this point that the

20

1 convince them to start participation in a natural-

22 participate in that sort of study than it has been to

20 convince parents, even those who are really dealing

21 with a dreadful situation in front of them, to

- 2 history study, where the only potential benefit is
- 3 future knowledge that hopefully will -- will help
- 4 other babies but will not help their own because for
- 5 those, you know, families with a very sick child one
- 6 more blood draw is one more blood draw too much
- 7 sometimes.
- 8 Thanks.
- 9 DR. PICA: Absolutely, well put.
- 10 Dr. Vogt?
- DR. VOGT: I think I'll try to build
- 12 off what Dr. Abzug was just saying in the -- you know,
- 13 how do we pick what children to target; right? The
- 14 sickest of the sick versus, you know, intervening a
- 15 little bit early, I think when you think about it from
- 16 a virologic standpoint, the earlier we give these
- 17 drugs, the better.
- 18 I mean, you know, if we give the
- 19 drug -- if we give the virus more time to infect more
- 20 cells or to maybe get father in a life cycle within a
- 21 cell, it makes sense to me at least to think that that
- 22 -- that drug now has a harder hill to climb to show

Page 234

- 2 comments these studies -- studies are so incredibly
- 3 challenging.
- 4 And I -- I hope after I speak that
- 5 if -- if Betsy is still on she can speak to this as
- 7 But we do have a lot of experience in
- 8 the NICU and in the neonatal space and in trials that
- 9 -- that really do have some of the same issues that
- 10 have all been mentioned, you know, time sensitivity,
- 11 critical illness, the HIE population, which Betsy
- 12 talked about her experience there as a prime example
- 13 of that where, you know, we enrolled in -- in acute
- 14 trials with a therapeutic window of six hours in a
- 15 really, really sick population as well.
- 16 So I think the keys that we've learned
- 17 from those experiences, the leveraging of networks,
- 18 that's been mentioned. Involvement of parents really
- 19 early in the process -- and we've even learned from,
- 20 you know, our early successes in that hypothermia for 20 those trials in other spaces in neonatology that may
- 21 hypoxic ischemic encephalopathy space is -- we're --
- 22 we're still learning, and we're still improving.
 - Page 235
 - So we had mentioned the International
- 2 Neonatal Consortium; and Lily mentioned the, you know,
- 3 development of -- of seizure-trial guidelines through
- 4 that group; and even still, we've struggled with some
- 5 neonatal-seizure trials, which is another area where,
- 6 you know, this -- that faces some of these similar
- 7 challenges.
- 8 And we've worked on -- in meeting with
- 9 parent groups, and -- and there have been
- 10 publications, as Betsy mentioned, from the
- 11 erythropoietin and -- and HIE trial from family and
- 12 patient experiences to try to kind of identify some of
- 13 those best practices.
- 14 So that may be an area to kind of look
- 15 at some of those publications and resources that may
- 16 help in this space as well.
- So, you know, one of the things we
- 18 identified in the seizure-trial network is -- is, you
- 19 know, the use of -- of, you know, the investigators,
- 20 who are consenting and -- and not having the -- using,
- 21 you know, even the well-trained clinical research
- 22 assistant to come and talk to some of these families,

- 1 studies -- and I mentioned also during my introductory 1 who really have complex illnesses.
 - So there's, you know, the ethical
 - 3 issues of -- of therapeutic misconception and making
 - 4 sure that if it's a treating physician or a clinician
 - 5 that can answer questions for families.
 - 6 But -- but, you know, the -- the
 - 7 families just really -- I think we have pretty high
 - 8 consent rates in some of our trials where, you know,
 - 9 one of the investigators was really somebody who could
 - 10 answer questions for the family about the disease
 - 11 process and -- and answer questions about the study.
 - 12 So there's some benefit or -- or -- you
 - 13 know, to the consent process, as we've discussed, in
 - 14 the information that's conveyed to families through
 - 15 that process. So I think that -- and there's, you
 - 16 know, tools and -- and things that are being developed
 - 17 that help with that consent -- that consent process.
 - 18 So I'll -- I'll just put a plug in to
 - 19 kind of look at some of those resources and some of

 - 21 be helpful for the discussion here; and I see Betsy's
 - 22 hand up, which I'm glad about 'cause I'm sure she has
 - Page 237

- 1 things to add here as well.
 - 2 DR. PICA: Yes.
 - 3 Betsy, please?
 - 4 MS. PILON: Yeah. So I just wanted to,
 - 5 you know, dovetail off of that a little bit; and
 - 6 obviously, there's a lot of work that's been -- that's
 - 7 been going on, as An mentioned, and lots of resources
 - 8 out there.
 - 9 You know, some of the things that we
 - 10 found partnering on -- on these trials as they're
 - 11 underway now is the real-time problem-solving of
 - 12 looking at, you know, if there's consenting issues or
 - 13 even bias and things that -- that we're, you know,
 - 14 observing or, you know, questioned.
 - 15 As patient families involved, we've
 - 16 done a lot of PCORI work; and there's a lot of great
 - 17 PCORI work out there as well, especially the neonatal
 - 18 seizure research network; and there's a lot of
 - 19 resources that have come out of that as well.
 - 20 So just, you know, some things to
 - 21 consider because, you know, there are lots of cohorts
 - 22 like ours and -- and the -- the -- you know, the

Page 238

1 relevance here, just looking at what that is and --

2 and that consenting process, again, to An's point, you

3 know, what they tell you, it is very short.

4 But that doesn't necessarily mean that

5 -- you know, that this can't be done; but it certainly

6 -- you know, there's -- there's things that are

7 learning -- that we're learning and -- and can bring

8 those perspectives and other patient-family

10 these -- these challenges that -- that are brought up.

11 You know, and -- and I hear this again

12 from the patient-family perspective of -- I -- you

13 know, these are very sick babies we're talking about;

14 and there's a perception of not wanting to overburden

15 families.

16 But also, if you're not bringing things

17 to the bedside that their babies and kids can benefit

18 from and you're, you know, making that decision for

19 them of not even approaching families, that also, you

20 know, can be problematic, especially for a lot of, you

21 know, therapeutic interventions and potential, you

22 know, that needs the good enrollment data and

Page 239

1 longitudinal follow-up, you know, to get -- get an

2 actual sizable amount of data for these.

3 Thank you.

4 DR. PICA: Excellent point. Thank you

5 so much.

So I -- I think we could just maybe

7 tackle some of these questions a little bit more

8 directly. I'm -- I'm interested in this concept of

9 infection severity. You know, what -- what do we

10 gain, or what do we lose by focusing on severe

11 infection or disease versus mild symptomatic

12 infection, for example?

13 Dr. Kimberlin?

14 And then, Dr. Vogt?

15 DR. KIMBERLIN: Yeah.

16 In conversations over -- over the

17 years, Dr. Abzug, I think, has shifted my opinion on

18 this to some degree and -- and convinced me that it's

19 really -- it is the sickest ones that -- that are

20 probably most appropriate to study because some of

21 those that are less sick are never, as Dr. Vogt said

22 just a moment ago -- are never going to progress to

Page 240 1 being more severely sick, and these babies are still -

2 - are so few and far between that if we -- if we blend

3 populations too much we won't have the power to be

4 able to see those differences 'cause there just aren't

5 enough to enroll.

6 So I think it's good and -- and

7 maybe -- I hope anyway the natural-history study that

8 we're conducting now can be informative for the sub

9 involvement that I think, you know, kind of allows for 9 well, across the spectrum but including the subsets

10 that are -- that are most severely ill in terms of

11 what their outcomes are with their mortality, for

12 example, at 1 month or at 3 months.

13 But maybe as well, it might, since it's

14 a noninterventional study, allow us to identify those

15 predictors of which ones start out more mild and stay

16 mild versus those that start out more mild and get

17 more severe.

18 If we could find that, then I would

19 liberalize and go with an -- enroll across the

20 spectrum. If we don't know that, I think I would stay

21 focused on the sickest of the sick.

22 DR. PICA: Thank --

Page 241

DR. VOGT: So, Dr. Kimberlin, I think

2 you -- you teed up my question well and maybe even

3 partially answered it. Unfortunately, I don't have

4 the benefit of the years of discussion between --

5 between you guys to frame my thinking on this.

6 But, you know, I was thinking -- so

7 whoever -- I forget whose slide it was; but someone

8 had their unicorn slide about, you know, what's the

9 ideal clinical study; and -- and, you know, they

10 presented it as a unicorn 'cause obviously it's hard,

11 if not impossible, to get your ideal study.

12 But if I were to dream up an ideal

13 study, you know, I -- I was told when we were planning

14 for this, this isn't a meeting about prevention. This

15 is a meeting about treatment, but that also kind of

16 exists on a spectrum, and I think that's what this

17 bullet point about infection severity is pointing out.

18 You know, infection just means you have

19 virus in you; and then disease, as Dr. Abzug pointed

20 out in his talk, there's a -- there's a wide range of

21 disease.

22 So at what point, you know, does

Page 242
1 something become prevention of maybe not infection so

- 2 much 'cause the infection has already happened but
- 3 prevention of progression to severe illness versus
- 4 treatment of a mild illness; and -- and is it even --
- 5 is it important that we distinguish that?
- 6 It seems the FDA thinks it's important
- 7 because there's a bullet point right there about it.
- 8 So to get back to that unicorn study, I would love to
- 9 see no kids get any severe disease.
- 10 And so, you know, I think we lose a
- 11 little something by only focusing on the children with
- 12 the most severe disease because the cat is already out
- 13 of the bag. The horse is out of the barn, whatever
- 14 you want to use.
- 15 So my question -- maybe to frame it as
- 16 a real question to either Dr. Kimberlin or Dr. Abzug,
- 17 who've probably thought about this much more than me,
- 18 would your end needed to find that -- you know, that
- 19 actual statistical endpoint change if you could
- 20 prevent every instance of severe disease, every
- 21 instance?
- 22 So we had a drug that's very safe. In

1 response, and Dr. Kimberlin can give the second. I'm

Page 244

- 2 -- you know, first of all -- virtual connectivity
- 3 interruption -- actually, I'm sorry. Are you hearing
- 4 me? Can you hear better as I lean closer to my
- 5 laptop?
- 6 THE REPORTER: Yes.
- 7 DR. PICA: I think it might be
- 8 something with your connectivity, but it is better
- 9 when you lean a little bit closer.
- 10 DR. ABZUG: Okay. I will try to speak
- 11 up and lean into my laptop. I think in the real world
- 12 medications aren't available to be used in the way Dr.
- 13 Vogt is describing. Could one do a clinical trial in
- 14 that way? I think that depends on resources. It
- 15 would have to be quite a large study with quite a
- 16 large budget.
- 17 And that hasn't been the situation to
- 18 date, which is why we have focused on a sicker
- 19 population likely to give clinically meaningful
- 20 endpoints more -- more quickly.
- DR. PICA: So, you know, I think just
- 22 thinking a little bit more about what Dr. Vogt had

Page 243

- 1 my unicorn world, this drug is very safe. So we don't
- 2 feel bad about giving it to basically -- let's say --
- 3 any child who is either born to a mother who tests
- 4 positive for enterovirus or tests positive themselves
- 5 for enterovirus. So you're just screening kids and
- 6 screening moms as they come in and give birth.
- 7 So now you've identified your sort of
- 8 overall cohort as just enterovirus-positive, you know,
- 9 mother-infant dyad. We give all those babies drug,
- 10 and yeah. Probably only a very, very, very small part
- 11 of that population was going to progress to any sort
- 12 of illness.
- But if you see a flat line, you don't
- 14 really need a ton of severe disease -- right -- to get
- 15 statistical significance when one of your lines is
- 16 flat. Is that -- let's say again that dollars are not
- 17 an issue in our unicorn world. Could you do a study
- 18 like that, Dr. Kimberlin or Abzug; or is that, like,
- 19 completely impossible to -- to dream of?
- DR. PICA: Feel free, Dr. Abzug, to
- 21 respond.
- DR. ABZUG: I -- I can give the first

Page 245

- 2 and want to prevent severe disease; or you're --
- 3 you're enrolling individuals who already have severe

1 said, you are enrolling mild symptomatic population

- 4 disease.
- 5 You know, what do you think the
- 6 appropriate trial endpoints would be? Would it be
- 7 mortality? Would it be time to hospital discharge?
- 8 What are kind of the key things? And -- and maybe
- 9 this is informed by your clinical practice, but -- but
- 10 what would be the -- the endpoints that you think
- 11 would be the most important to focus on?
- 12 And -- and I -- I also want to give Dr.
- 13 Hincks the -- the opportunity to address some of these
- 14 comments as well.
- DR. VOGT: Yeah. Was that --
- DR. ABZUG: I'll just --
- DR. VOGT: Yeah. Go ahead.
- DR. ABZUG: Go ahead, Matt.
- 19 DR. VOGT: Yeah. I don't know if that
- 20 was directed at anyone specifically.
- 21 DR. PICA: Dr. Vogt, I was thinking in
- 22 the context of your unicorn study and -- and also what

1 Dr. Kimberlin had mentioned before. So if you -- if

- 2 you want to, respond; but then -- then we can turn it
- 3 over to Dr. Hincks.
- 4 DR. VOGT: And it sounds like Dr. Abzug
- 5 probably has an idea there. I mean, to me, it would
- 6 just be progression to, you know, severe disease with
- 7 a broad definition of that 'cause I think that gets
- 8 back to the one slide that Dr. Abzug had, which was,
- 9 like, myocarditis, hepatitis, coagulopathy.
- 10 These are all bad things, mortality
- 11 certainly; but -- but all of those are bad things; and
- 12 I think if we intervene early we actually have a
- 13 chance to prevent all of those things if we have drugs
- 14 that are broadly enough acting.
- 15 And I do think you'd probably want to
- 16 have some kind of, you know, post hoc analysis where 16 totality of the data, whatever the population, whether
- 17 you have -- again, if, it's, like, a capsid-inhibiting
- 18 drug, you know, you identify the -- the -- you know,
- 19 eventually you get to the point where you can identify 19 and see what the story that is -- is there that's
- 20 the specific virus the child; and you can see if there
- 21 was a match to be made or not.

6

7

13

8 perspective?

22 Or for me, you know, I -- I think about

2 only going to react to certain viruses. Did we

4 that maybe gets a little bit at your question, and

DR. ABZUG: I agree.

5 maybe Dr. Abzug has some more thoughts to add.

10 everybody that comes in, if they have enteroviral or

So I -- I think there has to be some

11 not, is difficult 'cause we would be treating babies

12 that may not need treatment at all.

DR. PICA: And -- and, Dr. Hincks, your

DR. HINCKS: I think doing a trial on

3 actually have one of those viruses or not? Hopefully

1 be best to take all severe and minor effects of the

- 2 disease and then look at the data they generate.
- 3 DR. PICA: Dr. Kimberlin?
- 4 DR. KIMBERLIN: I really like what Dr.
- 5 Hincks just said at the very end, "Look at the data
- 6 that you generate."
- 7 If we set mortality as the primary
- 8 endpoint and we have a number of different things,
- 9 hospital discharge, including virologic endpoints as
- 10 secondary or tertiary, and then we don't hit mortality
- 11 and so it's just tossed out because the primary
- 12 endpoint wasn't achieved, that would be a real shame.
- 13 I think we've got to -- this is a point
- 14 I was advocating for earlier as well.
- 15 I think you've got to look at the
- 17 it's just the sickest of the sick or whether it's, you
- 18 know, a more broad spectrum, and -- and really look
- 20 being told and -- and being -- being willing to -- to
- 21 think more about the art of it than the science of it,
- 22 at least as a component, as you would if you're

Page 247

Page 246

1 antibodies; and so, you know, we know the antibody is 1 reading a book.

- What is the storyline that we're 3 seeing, and is it strong enough to -- to get a product
- 4 to the finish line in terms of the licensure kind of a
- 5 result for the NDA?
- 6 DR. PICA: Dr. Rosenfeld?
- 7 And then, Dr. Hincks, again?
- 8 DR. ROSENFELD: Yeah. I'm a little
- 9 confused if -- if we absolutely know that severe
- 10 disease and replicating virus are concordant. Like,
- 11 that -- when you see severe disease, you can detect
- 12 replicating virus rather than the severe disease is
- 13 due to the body responding to the viral infection; and
- 14 the virus has already been cleared.
- 15 So if you're targeting the virus only
- 16 and there's no virus, then I'm not clear what we're --
- 17 what we're looking at. I understand about, like, IVIG
- 18 working because it can dampen the viruses that are
- 19 surrounding and stuff that may contribute to the
- 20 development of severe disease.
- 21 But if you're -- if the actual -- if
- 22 the actual virus that you think is causing the disease

15 myocarditis, hepatitis, encephalitis; but something is 16 going on that would warrant treatment in the baby.

17 And I -- I think taking all-comers --18 again, it might -- might impact the end; but I think

14 endpoint that's already detected, whether it's

- 19 going after the severe disease, you're asking a lot of
- 20 the antiviral because, again, once the organ is
- 21 damaged far enough it's not going to recover. 22 So I don't know. I -- I think it would

Page 250 1 is gone, then I don't know what we're -- we're

- 2 targeting. So I think we need to understand whether
- 3 or not virus is really replicating in present at that
- 4 time that severe -- we detect severe disease, and I
- 5 don't think we have that data.
- DR. PICA: Yeah. I think that's an 6
- 7 excellent point, Dr. Rosenfeld.
- 8 Dr. Hincks?
- 9 Then, Dr. Abzug?
- 10 Then, Dr. Kimberlin?
- 11 DR. HINCKS: Yeah. I mean, we have
- 12 quite a bit of data from our Capacity Use Program;
- 14 approach us and say, "We have this check -- this
- 15 neonate, and they're PCR-positive," which -- no --
- 16 that might not be culturable or -- or replicating
- 17 virus.
- 18 But they're PCR-positive for
- 19 enterovirus and typically rhino, entero; and they're
- 20 presenting with these diagnoses or these effects:
- 21 myocarditis, hepatitis, things like that; and you put
- 22 the two together, and you think they have -- have a

- 1 babies are viremic at the time that they're presenting
- 2 and showing organ disease. So I don't think there's
- 3 doubt that there's a component of active viral
- 4 infection.
- 5 But I -- I will add that pathology
- 6 studies of babies who've died suggest there's both a
- 7 component of cytolysis, cell breakdown due to direct
- 8 viral infection, as well as an inflammatory response
- 9 of the host, the baby, that may be contributing to the
- ultimate pathology.
- 11 DR. BELEW: Thank you, Dr. Abzug.
- 12 This is Yodit Belew. Before we go to
- 13 and, I mean, the -- the way they approach us, PIs will 13 Dr. Kimberlin, I just had a follow-up question to both
 - 14 Dr. Kimberlin and Dr. Abzug, considering your long
 - 15 history of -- of taking care of these babies with
 - 16 enteroviral infection and sepsis.
 - 17 So considering other viral diseases and
 - 18 the effectiveness of antivirals having been
 - 19 established to be generally the earlier you give it,
 - 20 the better they're effective, I wanted to go back to
 - 21 Dr. Kimberlin's earlier point about the natural
 - 22 history and identifying potential baseline

Page 251

- 1 condition of, you know, enteroviral infection with
- 2 severe disease. So then we treat with pocapavir.
- 3 So I don't think it's just one or the
- 4 other, and -- and I think in -- in a trial you'd be
- 5 doing the same thing; right? You -- you'd get a
- 6 patient that would come in. They're positive for PCR
- 7 entero, and you go ahead and have other conditions
- 8 that would predict its enteroviral infection with
- 9 severe disease.
- That severity depends on how far the
- 11 organ has been damaged; right? So you -- you don't go
- 12 in with one or the other. You kind of -- you need
- 13 both pieces of information.
- 14 DR. PICA: Okay. And even the
- 15 information is somewhat incomplete because you may be
- 16 PCR-positive for enterovirus or rhino, entero for that
- 17 matter; and you don't know, you know, in fact what is
- 18 -- what is the infecting agent.
- 19 Dr. Abzug?
- 20 And then, Dr. Kimberlin?
- DR. ABZUG: We do have data from the 21
- 22 pre-PCR era that shows that -- that these very sick

- 1 characteristics and/or biomarkers.
- 2 So from the preexisting literature, are
- 3 there reasonable characteristics that we could rely on
- 4 if we were to consider therapeutics where you're
- 5 treating to prevent severe disease, including death?
- 6 Thank you.
- 7 Yes. Dr. Kimberlin, please?
- 8 DR. KIMBERLIN: I was hoping that Mark
- 9 would jump in on that one. I don't know the answer to
- 10 that. To my -- to my knowledge, we don't have that
- 11 well defined a biomarker yet. Either -- either that,
- 12 or I'm -- or I'm flat on my feet in terms of thinking
- 13 about it.
- 14 I -- I would -- my hand up was -- was
- 15 up in response to the -- the conversation just before
- 16 that, which might actually be informative to this too
- 17 about whether it's replicating virus or -- or not.
- 18 And the -- and the -- the graphic that
- 19 popped in my head was what Dr. Abzug showed from our
- 20 pleconaril study, where there was more rapid clearance
- 21 of virus among the -- or at least a trend toward that,
- 22 a P-value, I think, of 0.08, with -- with respect to

Page 254

- 1 the group getting active drug versus the group getting
- 2 placebo, which, you know, either was erroneous.
- 3 Or it's because there's actively
- 4 replicating virus; and the antiviral drug is slowing
- 5 that down. Now, whether we have enough to -- to call 5 useful to pick out that child from the start who's
- 6 viral load the kind of biomarker that -- that your
- 7 question is getting at, I -- I don't know.
- Or is this a rare enough and unusual
- 9 enough disease, and we want enough flexibility to --
- 10 to simply accept virologic endpoints and say that --
- 11 that that's good enough for where we are right now?
- 12 And maybe post licensure, we could do
- 13 some of the additional work because then it is -- you
- 14 don't have to jump through all the different
- 15 complexities of having a site and being positioned
- 16 right in the hospital where that particular woman
- 17 delivers the baby or brings the baby back when the
- 18 baby gets sick.
- 19 Instead, you could do more real-world,
- 20 to use the -- the catchy phrase, follow-up and -- and
- 21 learn more about the use of the drug that in -- in
- 22 this hypothetical is -- has been licensed based upon

- 1 useful is a positive serum viral culture at the time 2 the child presents, but nobody does viral cultures,
- 3 and nor are they rapid.
- So I don't think that's particularly
- 6 going to have a higher likelihood of an adverse
- 7 outcome.
- 8 And I also just want to clarify in case
- 9 there's a misconception. It's not like these babies
- 10 who are the sickest -- it's not like they sit around
- 11 for three, four, five days with a mild infection and
- 12 then deteriorate five, six, seven days later.
- 13 These sickest babies present and within
- 14 either -- either on presentation or within 24 to 48
- 15 hours are -- are really telling you, "I'm one of the
- 16 sick ones." So it's not like anyone is sitting around
- 17 for days thinking, "Hmm, antiviral or not?" That --
- 18 that really isn't the clinical reality.
- 19 DR. BELEW: Thank you, Dr. Abzug.
- 20 Dr. Hincks?
- 21 DR. HINCKS: You're -- you're asking me
- 22 for a comment?

Page 255

- 1 virologic endpoints.
- 2 DR. BELEW: Thank you, Dr. Abzug. I
- 3 was -- I was thinking more along the lines of elevated
- 4 white count; anemia; maternal status; young age, I
- 5 think, in Dr. Abzug's presentation being less than 7
- 6 years of age, so using those, I guess, characteristics
- 7 that have been described for a number of years as a
- 8 way of identifying infants who are likely to have a
- 9 higher risk of progressing to severe disease to allow
- 10 identifying an enrollment of these neonates into a
- 11 potential clinical trial.
- 12 Dr. Abzug, please?
- 13 DR. ABZUG: Thank you. And I'm leaving
- 14 my video off just so hopefully you can hear me better. 14 different question.
- 15 For the demographic predictors like illness within the 15
- 16 first seven days of life, I think we need still to
- 17 learn how predictive that is. I mean, it -- it's
- 18 clearly a predictor; but what it's positive predictive
- 19 value is, I think, still needs to -- to be defined.
- 20 Things like white count and hematocrit
- 21 and that sort of thing haven't really been shown to be
- 22 terrific predictors, but one lab predictor that can be

Page 257

- DR. PICA: Your hand is up. So we just 1
- 2 want to --
- 3 DR. HINCKS: Oh, thank you. Okay.
- 4 That was a while ago, but just commenting on what --
- 5 what Mark just said, I -- I agree. Some of these
- 6 cases present very quickly; or they've been seen at
- 7 one hospital; and they're transferred to another; and
- 8 within a couple days after that, they become very ill.
- 9 So it -- it -- again, it depends on
- 10 each individual, I would have to say. So I agree with
- 11 what Mark said.
- 12 DR. PICA: Dr. Kimberlin, we'll give
- 13 you an opportunity to respond; and then we have a
- DR. KIMBERLIN: Well, it -- it's --
- 16 it's really kind of a question for Dr. Abzug to see if
- 17 my memory is accurate. Way back in the '90s when the
- 18 pleconaril study -- when we developed it and we had to
- 19 define what severe hepatitis was, what severe DIC was,
- 20 what severe myocarditis was, my recollection is that
- 21 we kind of made it up.
- 22 I mean, we kind of -- we kind of used a

1 threshold that we thought would define a severe -- a

- 2 severe baby; but it wasn't based upon a prior study
- 3 that showed that, you know, 3.5 fold over baseline is
- 4 -- is really bad versus 3.4 over baseline being not so
- 5 bad.
- 6 So there was -- as we look at what has
- 7 been in the literature, I think we have to have some
- 8 grace with respect to -- there -- there could be some
- 9 variability. It's not written in stone simply because
- 10 that's the way it was defined once that that's the way
- 11 severe disease has to be defined going forward.
- 12 Mark, do I -- do I have a faulty memory
- 13 on that?
- 14 DR. ABZUG: No, 'cause your memory is
- 15 better than mine. But -- but I'll -- I'll add that
- 16 there's -- there were some preexisting data. We and
- 17 others have written case -- had written case series
- 18 where we described our sick population, and these were
- 19 the kinds of lab findings or parameters that -- that
- 20 describe them.
- 21 But -- but there isn't in the
- 22 literature that finer gradation to say that 2X normal

Page 259

Page 258

1

- 1 LFT is different from 3X normal LFT. We just picked
- 2 the ones that had been described, but -- but not --
- 3 but there had not been a full analysis of different
- 4 gradations of those abnormalities, if that makes
- 5 sense.
- DR. VISWANATHAN: This is Prabha
- 7 Viswanathan. I have a question to our clinical
- 8 experts in the room, and this is tying together
- 9 comments from -- from many people. One question for
- 10 Amy Rosenfeld though is -- is: What can we ask of an
- 11 antiviral?
- So it is clear that the disease course
- 13 is heterogeneous. The rate of clinical deterioration
- 14 is heterogeneous, but is there a point that we reach
- 15 where we think that an antiviral really is not likely
- 16 to help a child?
- So if we have a child who has
- 18 myocarditis with heart failure, a child with liver --
- 19 like, full liver failure, are these groups of patients
- 20 that you feel like are -- are too severe to include in
- 21 your clinical trial and may impact your ability to
- 22 have a successful primary endpoint?

DR. ABZUG: This is Mark. I'll start.

- 2 Well, if -- if you believe the study from the -- the
- 3 pleconaril study that we talked about earlier this
- 4 morning, I believe we showed a mortality benefit. It
- 5 didn't meet all of the rigor that we would have liked
- and that the FDA would have liked.
- 7 But I think at least as proof of
- 8 concept it did show that treating those sickest babies
- 9 was beneficial, and I -- as far as I know,
- 10 pleconaril's activity is purely as an antiviral. So
- 11 that suggests to me that antiviral therapy at that
- 12 stage of illness can be effective.
- 13 DR. BELEW: Thank you for that --
- 14 DR. ABZUG: I welcome other opinions.
- 15 DR. BELEW: It sounds like you have the
- 16 final word on the -- on the question, Dr. Abzug.
- DR. PICA: Just as a follow-up, maybe
- 18 looping back to the comment that Dr. Kimberlin had
- 19 made earlier, what -- what questions do you think
- 20 could be answered from larger natural-history studies
- 21 with -- in regard to understanding appropriate
- 22 populations and trial endpoints?

Page 261

- Do you think that the disease is so
- 2 heterogeneous that the data will be hard to interpret,
- 3 or -- or are there goals for these natural-history
- 4 studies in the context of -- of designing clinical
- 5 trials?
- 6 DR. ABZUG: Dr. Kimberlin, do you want
- 7 to start with that one?
- 8 DR. KIMBERLIN: Yeah. I'd be happy to.
- 9 I -- I think we can always learn more, and I think
- 10 more information, more data are better than -- than
- 11 less. I -- I think that we -- that -- that many of
- 12 the good points raised about, you know, is -- is a
- 13 particular, you know, coxsackievirus worse in neonates
- 14 than another, you know, echovirus is?
- 15 To -- to some extent, I -- I appreciate
- 16 it, but if we -- if we stay in that rabbit hole, we
- 17 don't ever have the opportunity to move into a
- 18 clinical trial to see if an antiviral works.
- 19 And I remember with the pleconaril
- 20 trial design back in the '90s there -- there was one
- 21 very smart person who was advocating strongly that,
- 22 "100 different enteroviruses, we can't do this --

Meeting Page 262 1 can't do it." 1 comment? 2 2 And -- and maybe that's the right DR. HINCKS: Yeah. I guess it comes to 3 answer; but ultimately, I -- I kind of agree with Mark 3 the next point that we might be talking about, but 4 that we did show a benefit, albeit in a Phase 2 study 4 what about using the natural-history study as the 5 that was never in -- you know, intended to be a 5 comparator arm to an active trial? 6 licensure trial. 6 That was for Mark, David. 7 7 Nevertheless, the data -- I think the DR. PICA: If no one has anything to 8 story told would, to me anyway, suggest that -- that 8 add right at the moment, you know, I think that your 9 it works for that particular drug in -- in that 9 question will be a great segue into our final question 10 population. 10 for this panel discussion; but we did have a couple Q-11 So -- so I -- I think that we -- we 11 and-As from online that we wanted to get to regarding 12 don't have to -- what is the phrase? You know, you 12 the -- the topic that -- that we've already covered. 13 don't -- don't let the -- the good be the enemy, the 13 So maybe I'll go to those first, and 14 perfect -- or whatever it is. You know what? Let --14 then we can -- can move on altogether then and -- and 15 let's -- let's kind of get our -- roll up our sleeves 15 go into that last discussion topic. So we -- I 16 and -- and move forward with what we have. 16 promise we will come back to you, Dr. Hincks. 17 And if -- if additional information But going to the -- the Q-and-A briefly

18 comes out through natural-history studies and others 18 here, so we had several comments in here -- and 19 down the road, that's fine; and we can make 19 apologies. We will not be able to address all of --20 modifications as needed; but let's not just sit back 20 of the comments, but I wanted to -- I wanted to read

21 and wait for it if we have a drug that has the 21 out one comment, not really a question but, I think,

22 potential that really could move forward and move the 22 an -- an important comment to share with the group.

Page 263 Page 265

2 DR. ABZUG: And I'll add that -- that 3 I'm -- I'm really very hopeful, 'cause I'm an 4 optimist, that the current natural-history study will 5 tell us something about the value of quantitative PCR 6 in this disease. I come from a background of treating 7 children with HIV; and as we all know, that marker has

So whether it's as -- useful as a 10 predictor of babies who are destined to have worse

11 outcomes, which then helps us identify who should be

12 treated and who shouldn't be treated, or whether it's

13 value as an endpoint of -- of treatment because it has

14 predictive value of outcome, I don't know; and

15 maybe -- maybe it'll help with both.

8 proved incredibly useful.

1 field.

16 But if we can identify something like

17 that through natural-history studies that then make

18 mortality -- while obviously an important endpoint,

19 not the only endpoint that we need to strive for

20 and -- and hopefully an -- an easier-to-achieve

21 endpoint, then I think that will be a major gain.

22 DR. PICA: Dr. Hincks, did you have a

So we had an attendee who says: "I 1

2 think it is important to separate the idea of trials

3 to license a drug from trials to optimize treatment.

4 A company wants one thing from a trial for licensure,

5 which is a license within a reasonable time.

6 It is utterly unrealistic to expect an

7 industry-supported trial to look more -- to look at

8 more complex endpoints that will take more patients,

9 read higher costs, and take more time to license a

10 drug."

11 And I think these are all very fair

12 points; and, you know, the focus of today is really to

13 talk about that licensure issue; but -- but you're

14 right. There are two different objectives there.

15 And then another question that came in

16 that we've somewhat touched on here but just wanted to

17 -- to close the loop on, so we have a question: "Have

18 any studies looked into risk-based scoring models to

19 predict severe illness? Perhaps a composite of

20 different risk factors?"

21 I know we've been talking about how

22 this would be really advantageous if we had such

1 predictors to identify those at risk for more severe

- 2 illness, but does anybody have anything else to add on
- 3 that line of -- of thinking?
- 4 Anything from the real world or from
- 5 the natural-history studies that are -- that are
- 6 ongoing that could be used to further look into this?
- 7 And I will stop there.
- DR. ABZUG: You know, as I showed
- 9 earlier in my -- my talk, people have identified some
- 10 predictors; but I have not seen a composite-scoring
- 11 model to specifically look at the risk of severe
- 12 neonatal enterovirus disease.
- 13 That is a potential outcome from the --
- 14 from the ongoing natural-history study. We're
- 15 collecting a lot of clinical and laboratory data. So
- 16 we certainly can look to see if something like that is
- 17 able to be derived from the dataset.
- 18 DR. PICA: Thank you. Does anyone have
- 19 any other comments on the population discussion before
- 20 we move on?
- 21 DR. VOGT: I mean, I guess just so that
- 22 my silence isn't, you know, seen as opposition, I

Page 267

Page 266

- 1 mean, I think that makes a lot of sense. We have a
- 2 rare disease. It's really hard to get that comparator
- 3 population.
- And maybe Dr. Kimberlin is working on
- 5 that comparator population right now. I think it
- 6 seems pretty reasonable, just to support what Dr.
- 7 Hincks had said.
- 8 DR. PICA: Great. So I think in the
- 9 remaining minutes we could maybe try to discuss the
- 10 most appropriate comparator-treatment groups, and I --
- 11 I open the floor to either Dr. Hincks or Dr. Kimberlin
- 12 to start us off.
- 13 DR. KIMBERLIN: I'd be happy to, and --
- 14 and I -- I guess the -- the theme I would -- I would
- 15 advocate for, if possible, is to find a creative study
- 16 design that would not require a placebo.
- 17 Enrolling even a 2-to-1 randomization
- 18 or a 3-to-1 randomization on a placebo-controlled
- 19 trial when a family's 7- or 8-day-old baby is
- 20 critically ill is -- it -- it can be done, especially
- 21 if the drug is not available otherwise, through
- 22 compassionate use or something along those lines.

1 But it's a -- it's a lot easier to sit

- 2 down and say, "Your baby will get the drug either
 - 3 because everybody is getting treated at the same
 - 4 dose"; and -- and maybe there's natural history or
 - 5 comparators, as -- as Dr. Hincks was suggesting.
- 6 Maybe the natural-history study could provide -- or I
- 7 -- I come back to what I said before.
- If a drug has not been studied in
- 9 babies and we have modeling data and we -- you know,
- 10 we think we know what dose to use but it hasn't been
- 11 studied, that's the reason we're doing the trial.
- 12 Maybe something -- this is a new concept to me, and
- 13 I'm -- I'm developing it as I'm saying it out loud.
- 14 But multiple doses of the active drug,
- 15 some of which are the sweet spot, based upon -- that
- 16 we anticipate based upon the modeling data, but also a
- 17 little bit above and some below that too, some of
- 18 which may be based upon modeling data, are -- are
- 19 anticipated to be subtherapeutic.
- 20 If they're subtherapeutic, they're not
- 21 going to work. That's your placebo. That's your
- 22 comparator, or you look across the spectrum of the

Page 269

- 1 amount of drug exposure you're achieving and correlate
- 2 that with viral load, or you correlate that with
- 3 outcome of some kind or a series of outcomes.
- 4 Something creative like that would --
- 5 would help, I think, with getting a study that not
- 6 only reads well but actually implements well and has a
- 7 chance of enrolling.
- 8 DR. HINCKS: I -- I definitely agree
- 9 that designing a study without a true placebo control
- 10 would enroll a lot faster, and I just think -- I mean,
- 11 I hate using that "unethical" word; but it -- it seems
- 12 unethical, similar to oncology studies where all --
- 13 all, you know, patients get treated.
- 14 But again, it's -- it's -- what is that
- 15 comparator arm, is the key; and would FDA accept a
- 16 non-placebo comparator?
- 17 DR. PICA: Dr. Vogt?
- 18 DR. VOGT: I mean, I think we're
- 19 already doing this -- right -- this non-placebo
- 20 controlled trial with pocapavir; and we just call it
- 21 expanded access or, you know, compassionate use; and I
- 22 don't say that to be inflammatory or anything like

Page 270

1 that; but that's kind of how it's done; right?

- 2 So, you know, Dr. Kimberlin or I have a
- 3 baby in front of us that we're very concerned about
- 4 and enterovirus-positive and that sort of thing; and,
- 5 you know, we call them up and say, "Hey, man, let's --
- 6 let's give them this drug, please"; and so we do it.
- 7 There's no placebo in that, but there's
- 8 also no -- there's no real rigorous trial design to
- 9 that either; right? It's just the whim of particular
- 10 investigators who take it upon themselves to, you
- 11 know, call up the company and say, "Hey, Dr. Hincks,
- 12 can we have your drug?"
- 13 So I think we're already doing it. It
- 14 makes a lot of sense to me to try to do it a little
- 15 bit more prospectively with a little bit more design
- 16 behind it. I think when we think of it that way --
- 17 again, I'm kind of thinking this out loud just the way
- 18 that Dr. Kimberlin was -- was thinking out loud
- 19 earlier.
- 20 But it sure makes sense to me that I
- 21 would rather see a non-placebo-controlled trial that
- 22 has been prospectively designed and implemented rather

Page 271

- 1 than compassionate use, which is kind of the same
- 2 thing but just way more willy-nilly 'cause I do worry
- 3 that when we do that compassionate-use stuff that, as
- 4 has been raised before, just the -- the organ damage
- 5 is just so far gone by the time we give the drug.
- 6 I worry that we're going to miss --
- 7 that we're going to miss potential benefits that we
- 8 otherwise might see if we weren't just, you know --
- 9 'cause it takes -- it's -- it's not an instant thing.
- 10 We don't just call the drug company, and they send the
- 11 drug that day.
- 12 I mean, it's -- I will give them
- 13 credit. I've had colleagues who've done this, and it
- 14 seems pretty well streamlined compared to maybe some
- 15 other expanded-access stuff I've been exposed to. So
- 16 that's not a knock. It's just the way it is. It's --
- 17 it's a very hard thing to do, a lot of paperwork and
- 18 stuff.
- 19 And -- and I'd love to hear from
- 20 anyone, especially Dr. Hincks on the company side, his
- 21 perspective on that.
- 22 DR. VISWANATHAN: Hi, this is --

Page 272

- 1 apologies for that. This is Prabha Viswanathan again
- 2 from FDA. There's a lot to unpack here; but clearly,
- 3 there are hesitations about placebo control.
- 4 And I would like to hear more about
- 5 what -- whether the hesitation is -- is parental --
- 6 it's a concern of parental refusal for enrollment,
- 7 whether this is really on the provider side, feeling
- 8 that it's infeasible or unacceptable from a scientific
- 9 perspective.
- 10 And then I want to remind everyone that
- 11 we -- we have an obligation to the patients and the
- 12 families who enroll in these clinical trials to
- 13 conduct trials that are -- that are interpretable,
- 14 that in the end when we enroll children and expose
- 15 them to investigational product there needs to be a
- 16 real end there that we can -- we know what to do with
- 17 the data that we have.
- And without a comparator, it's very
- 19 hard to know whether these drugs really work. So we
- 20 certainly want to dialogue with you about -- about
- 21 different solutions for how we get interpretable data;
- 22 and I think part of that is, it's important to

- 1 understand what are the real factors limiting
- 2 enrollment.
- 3 Is it the concern that my child is not
- 4 going to get something that works? We -- we only do
- 5 trials when there is clinical equipoise about whether
- 6 the trial -- whether the drug really will impact the
- 7 endpoint that we're studying. Otherwise, we wouldn't
- 8 do the trial. We would already know the answer; and
- 9 in this case, we don't.
- So for anybody who cares to respond,
- 11 I'd like to go back to that a little bit and talk
- 12 about what are the factors that are -- that are
- 13 keeping us from doing placebo-controlled trials.
- 14 DR. KIMBERLIN: Well, I might -- I
- 15 might start with that. My impression or experience is
- 16 that the bigger barrier is -- is with the parents.
- 17 Think about it.
- 18 If, you know, your 10-day-old is -- is
- 19 critically ill and somebody comes to you and says: "I
- 20 can -- you can enroll on this study that's placebo
- 21 controlled. There's a three-to-one chance you're
- 22 going to get active drug. We're going to take all

1 this blood. We're going to do all these things, or I

- 2 could call Company X and get it compassionate use, and
- 3 -- and we'll get it tomorrow. What do you want to
- 4 do," a different drug probably, although sometimes
- 5 this is -- if there is a compassionate-use program,
- 6 that can -- with -- with the same drug, that can be --
- 7 that can be a disincentive as well.
- And they're going to generally -- not
- 9 generally, but a lot of times they will take the --
- 10 the path of: "I want the real thing. I want what has
- 11 a chance of working."
- 12 I do fully appreciate what you're
- 13 saying about the ethics of -- of the -- of -- of
- 14 enrolling and exposing -- enrolling babies, exposing
- 15 them to a -- to an investigational product when
- 16 there's -- when there's a chance that we won't know
- 17 how to interpret the data.
- 18 But again, I come back to this idea
- 19 that -- what if we do a range of exposure, and you see
- 20 a range of response so that the worst outcomes are
- 21 when there's very little or subtherapeutic exposure?
- 22 Best outcomes is when you get really good drug

Page 275

Page 274

- 1 exposure.
- 2 That in and of itself within one single
- 3 treatment study could provide its own comparator that
- 4 would be placebo-ish, if you will.
- 5 DR. VISWANATHAN: I'd like to just
- 6 briefly respond to that, and then I'll hand it over to
- 7 Dr. Vogt. I -- I just am not sure what the difference
- 8 is practically from having a micro subtherapeutic dose
- 9 versus a placebo. Is it just telling the -- the
- 10 family that you're getting something?
- 11 But if it's something that you don't
- 12 think is actually going to work, isn't that just a
- 13 placebo that also exposes a baby to potential
- 14 toxicity?
- 15 MR. KIRSCH: That -- that's certainly
- 16 an argument; but the point is, we don't know the dose
- 17 If we did -- if we knew the dose and we knew that it
- 18 worked, then yes. That would be -- that -- that would 18 actually kind of know that it's -- it's more or less a
- 19 be a problem, but we don't know that.
- 20 There is a -- at -- at least with --
- 21 with the kind of point in drug development that I'm -
- 22 that I'm envisioning as I make this argument.

Page 276

- And so, you know, it's possible that
- 2 100 milligrams of the drug and 20 milligrams of the
- 3 drug in a baby, because of the difference in the way
- 4 it's metabolized, the 20 milligrams is as good as 100
- 5 milligrams. We don't know that.
- 6 And if we only come in with 100 versus
- 7 placebo, we'll never know that; but if we give a range
- 8 of exposure, including some that's on the very low
- 9 side, I think it's -- it's an ethically sound thing to
- 10 do, as I'm just kind of developing the concept or --
- 11 you know, in -- in midstream here, and I -- I think it
- 12 definitely is easier for the family.
- 13 I mean, if the family says: "Yeah.
- 14 You're going to be getting the drug" -- or you say to
- 15 the family: "You're going to be getting the drug. We
- 16 don't know the dose you're going to be getting, but
- 17 you will be getting the drug," that is a much easier
- 18 thing to -- a much easier discussion to have.
- 19 DR. VISWANATHAN: I'll just add --
- 20 we -- we definitely endorse dose-ranging trials, and
- 21 it is possible that we -- we end up with doses that
- 22 have enough similar activity, or you can cap out at

- 1 your -- at your therapeutic dose.
- But you may not be able to appreciate
- 3 the difference between treatment arms, but we
- 4 certainly do endorse trials that investigate multiple
- 5 doses for potentially multiple durations so that we
- 6 arrive at that -- at that correct dose.
- 7 I know that there are a number of
- 8 people who are waiting to speak, and I believe Dr.
- 9 Vogt is next.
- 10 DR. VOGT: I think I'm -- I'm in
- 11 agreement. I -- I don't know the difference between
- 12 the homeopathic dose and just a straight-on placebo
- 13 dose other than to be able to say something to the
- 14 family that, you know, there's medicine in here.
- 15 And personally, I actually kind of find
- 16 that a bit troubling to try to, you know, convince
- 17 them there might be some -- some benefit when you
- 19 homeopathic dose.
- 20 But I -- I see where you're going,
- 21 David. Like, you know, again, this is -- this is --
- 22 it's an awkward forum because it's online, and we're

1 sort of taking turns on our camera.

2 I'd like to think in real life we'd

- 3 probably be, like, you know, chatting this out, you
- 4 know, one -- going -- going around the table pretty
- 5 quickly, working through these ideas because I -- I do
- 5 quickly, working unough these facas occause 1 -- 1 c
- 6 like the idea that -- I guess to clarify what I had
- 7 said earlier about, you know, wanting to have a not-
- 8 placebo-controlled trial, I think I meant that more
- 9 just in direction opposition to having the
- 10 availability of -- of something by compassionate use
- 11 at the same time.
- To me, it feels like there should be
- 13 one or the other.
- 14 And if I'm given the choice, I'd rather
- 15 have a prospectively -- prospectively designed no-
- 16 placebo trial than compassionate use 'cause at least I
- 17 have -- I think I have a better chance at interpreting
- 18 the data that comes out of the prospectively designed
- 19 trial than just us again just sort of based on the
- 20 whim.
- 21 It's -- it's -- it gets -- it's -- so
- 22 as a -- maybe as a comparator, when earlier we were

1 have a number of hands up; but before we jump in, I

Page 280

Page 281

- 2 just wanted to follow up on the comments that Dr. Vogt
- 3 and Dr. Viswanathan made. So with -- with respect to
- 4 the -- the looking at various doses, that is a very
- 5 typical drug development in many disease therapeutic
- 6 areas, including viral diseases.
- 7 But the difference, I would say, is,
- 8 you wouldn't intentionally study a dose that is a
- 9 microdose or lower than what you -- at least based on
- 10 invitro or cell contra-activity that you think is
- 11 lower than the minimal effective dose, at least based
- 12 on the nonclinical data.
- 13 And so the -- the dose finding is a
- 14 very reasonable Phase 2 looking at optimal-dose
- 15 selection; and I think that would be a reasonable
- 16 consideration, again, provided that ultimately we do
- 17 have a comparator arm in order to establish the
- 18 treatment benefit from the antiviral.
- 19 With -- with respect to the
- 20 compassionate use, the availability of compassionate-
- 21 use programs at the same time as when you're trying to
- 22 enroll patients into placebo-controlled clinical

Page 279

Page 278

- 1 talking about the epidemiology of enteroviruses this
- 2 morning, you know, there's those passive systems where
- 3 we get some data; and there's good data there. It's
- 4 not like that's useless data. There's absolutely good
- 5 data there.
- 6 And then there's the prospective
- 7 systems, and maybe that data gives us a little bit
- 8 higher quality or a little bit more precision for
- 9 certain other types of questions. I think when it
- 10 comes to rare diseases, I mean, this is that -- this
- 11 is why we're having a whole two-day symposium on it,
- 12 as this is tough.
- But I do think that trying to interpret
- 14 compassionate use is tougher than it would be if we
- 15 had, you know, a trial that was no placebo.
- That said, I'm going to talk about the
- 17 unicorn, which I said before I'd rather us hit a lot
- 18 of kids before they get super-duper sick and prevent
- 19 them from ever getting super-duper sick; but that's
- 20 maybe derailing this conversation too far. So maybe
- 21 forget I said that.
- DR. BELEW: This is Yodit Belew. We

1 trials, just to kind of put this out there for the

- 2 group to discuss and consider is, you know, going back
- 3 to the ideal population and potentially the severity
- 4 of the illness at the time of enrollment.
- 5 What would you think about if, for
- 6 example, compassionate use would be limited to those
- 7 who are severely ill and don't meet eligibility
- 8 criteria to enroll into the clinical trial and the
- 9 clinical trial perhaps would focus on populations that
- 10 may be less critically ill?
- 11 And I don't know who had their hands up
- 12 first; but just going from left to right, Dr. Abzug?
- DR. ABZUG: Thank you. I'm -- I'm not
- 14 sure which question I'm responding to now, but I'll
- 15 say a couple of things.
- One additional flaw with the low-
- 17 medium-high trial design where all the arms are active
- 18 is if the outcomes are the same amongst the three
- 19 groups. You don't know if everybody derived benefit
- 20 or no one derived benefit. So that's -- that's a
- 21 problem.
- Dr. Hincks mentioned, I think, whether

- 1 the natural-history study could be an appropriate
- 2 comparator, if you will, of historical control but at
- 3 least a contemporary-era historical control. I -- I
- 4 think that's a possibility, except that we would have
- 5 to subtract out those subjects who received a
- 6 compassionate-use agent.
- 7 And then now -- now remind me of the
- 8 most recent question that you posed. Oh, people who
- 9 don't meet inclusion criteria and get the
- 10 compassionate use but others can't. I think that's a
- 11 valid approach.
- 12 I'll -- I'll tell you that when the
- 13 pleconaril randomized study was going on we had it
- 14 opened at one tertiary-care center in our city; but it
- 15 wasn't opened at another tertiary-care center, which
- 16 is a different hospital system in our same city.
- 17 And before compassionate use would have
- 18 been available, that baby might have been transferred
- 19 to our hospital for the study; but when an alternate
- 20 mechanism of having 100-percent access to the study
- 21 drug was available, that removed the incentive for
- 22 transferring the baby to the -- the center with the
 - Page 283

- 1 active study.
- 2 So it -- it even gets murky when you
- 3 try to define who meets or doesn't meet inclusion
- 4 criteria because usually inclusion criteria for a
- 5 study means being at a center where that study is
- 6 available and open. Thanks.
- 7 DR. PICA: Thank you very much for
- 8 that. So I -- I -- we are running out of time; but
- 9 given all of this robust discussion regarding use of
- 10 natural-history data, we would like to give our real-
- 11 world-evidence expert, Dr. Concato, an opportunity to 11 table of comparability.
- 12 comment.
- 13 But before I turn it over to Dr.
- 14 Concato, I did want to just read one of the comments
- 15 in the Q-and-A from an attendee that I think is a nice
- 16 segue for this.
- 17 So the comment states: "Regarding the
- 18 conversation about using the natural-history study as
- 19 a comparison group, it seems like there would be an
- 20 inherent bias because parents might be more likely to
- 21 enroll in a new investigational drug trial if their
- 22 child was sick and the current management wasn't

- 1 working well, whereas many more patients' parents
- 2 might agree to participate in a natural-
- 3 history/observational study.
- 4 It seems like it would bias towards
- 5 underestimating the benefit of the treatment being
- 6 studied." And so I think this highlights some of the
- 7 many inherent challenges with natural-history data;
- 8 and with that, I will turn it over to Dr. Concato to
- 9 see what -- what comments he would like to make.
- 10 DR. CONCATO: Thank you, and I'll --
- 11 I'll leave my camera off as well due to connectivity
- 12 issues, and yes. That was indeed a nice segue. I was
- 13 already raising my hand to make a comment about the
- 14 possible use of a comparator arm for a single-arm
- 15 trial, whether it's the natural-history study that was
- 16 mentioned or other sources of data.
- 17 And unfortunately, I know no pleasure
- 18 in saying this. The challenges are pretty -- pretty
- 19 common. You know, oncology was mentioned; but the
- 20 endpoint for oncology tumors don't tend to shrink.
- 21 I'm an internist, not a pediatrician or
- 22 a neonatologist; but listening to the earlier
- Page 285
- 1 presentations the heterogeneity both within an organ
- 2 system and across organ systems, CNS, heart, liver,
- 3 lung, this is quite challenging to imagine how
- 4 comparability is going to be assured, which is the
- 5 crux of the matter for an externally controlled child.
- 6 I will refer to an externally
- 7 controlled child guidance that CDER, CBER, or OCE
- 8 published last year for our -- our current thinking in
- 9 this regard; and in particular, I don't have it open
- 10 on my other monitor; but what comes to mind is the
- 12 There's more than one way to -- to
- 13 organize one's thinking; but I believe we settled on
- 14 ten different domains; and just off the top of my
- 15 head, again, deferring to the clinical division about
- 16 whether this makes clinical sense or not.
- 17 But even if it doesn't matter which
- 18 enterovirus, at least even with a small child, you
- 19 tend to get balance; but we believe we know which -
- 20 which viruses were involved, would they be the same;
- 21 but more -- more fundamentally, prognosis, as I
- 22 mentioned, would be very -- very heterogeneric --

Page 286 1 heterogeneous.

Even something as straightforward as

3 the outcome, what is the endpoint; and is it measured

4 the same in the single-arm trial versus the natural-

5 history study? Supportive therapy could vary.

6 And I think the -- I didn't see the

7 question in the chat. I was getting -- preparing

8 myself to -- to make a more general comment, but I

9 think the commenter also had another concern.

10 So again, our bar is -- is singular.

11 Our evidentiary threshold is the same. We have

12 regulatory flexibility, but it would take an awful lot

13 of things to go well for an externally controlled

14 trial to work out.

15 That doesn't mean we shouldn't explore

16 the possibility; but again, a -- sometimes a small

17 randomized trial is better than a larger externally

18 controlled trial because it conserves for bias. Thank

19 you.

DR. PICA: Thanks so much for that.

21 Dr. Hincks, I -- I think you've had

22 your hand up for quite a bit.

1 there's an ethical quandary there because if we really

2 don't think it works and we're telling the patients --

3 or we -- we think we'll get better enrollment because,

4 you know, they -- they think it works, that's -- that

5 -- that would be viewed as deceiving the patients.

6 I mean, it's not only equipoise. It's

7 also the standard of care. The drug could actually do

8 more harm than good, which unfortunately sometimes is

9 the case. So I'll -- I'll defer to the clinical

10 trialists, but.

11 DR. KIMBERLIN: And if I could respond

12 to it, I -- I -- as I was developing the concept in

13 real time, I guess one caveat, which may not sway

14 people, this would not be a Phase 3 study I'm talking

15 about. This wouldn't be where the drug had been --

16 the dose had been determined in Phase 1.

17 You've done a Phase 2 for, you know,

18 feasibility and whether or not there's enough clinical

19 evidence to move forward; and then you go to Phase 3.

20 This would be more of a Phase 2A-ish level where

21 you're still working on what the dose is, and you're

22 trying to get with one trial enough information --

Page 287

DR. HINCKS: Sure. So again, there's

2 several questions that have been raised. The -- the

3 one regarding compassionate use, Mark mentioned the 3

4 issues that he had with pleconaril. We ended up

5 shutting that down because it was an issue.6 We were getting a lot of calls for

7 compassionate use because they didn't want to deal

8 with the clinical trial. So I don't think that could

9 continue if there's a clinical trial ongoing.

10 As far as the various doses, there's a

11 lot of variable already, as we mentioned: disease

12 state, virus, viral load. Adding multiple doses on

13 top of that, I think, would just dilute out any

14 effects that we're trying to look for. My opinion is,

15 you go in with your highest, safest dose to show

16 effect. I think that was it for now. Responses?

17 DR. CONCATO: As a nonclinical trialist

18 -- this is Dr. Concato again -- I'll just say that

19 I -- I agree that coming in with the dose that you

20 think works.

21 And also, a problem with the giving

22 homeopathic doses, I think others have mentioned

Page 289
DR. CONCATO: Then -- then it works.

2 DR. KIMBERLIN: -- to get a drug --

3 DR. CONCATO: Yeah.

4 DR. KIMBERLIN: -- across the finish

5 line.

1

6 DR. CONCATO: Yeah. Thank you. And by

7 the way, I hit the wrong button. My apologies. I was

8 trying to type in an answer to the propensity-score

9 question.

10 So in fairness to the person who asked,

11 propensity scores are indeed how externally controlled

12 trials and observational studies would be done; but

13 it's not a magic bullet.

So the -- the data either do or do not

15 support the comparability issue, and -- and we -- we

16 can't wave a magic wand and have propensity scores

17 provide comparability if it's not there to begin with.

18 Thank you. Sorry for not typing it in the chat -- in

19 the Q-and-A, I should say.

DR. PICA: Thank you. Thank you for

21 that answer.

Wow, this has just been such robust

Mee	eting May 7, 2024
Page 290	Page 292
1 discussion. Thank you to all of our speakers and	1 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER
2 panelists for your participation, and many thanks to	2 I, SHANE WILLIAM SPROWL, do hereby certify
3 our meeting organizers and AV team for providing	3 that this transcript was prepared from the digital
4 support today.	4 audio recording of the foregoing proceeding, that said
5 We look forward to welcoming you all	5 transcript is a true and accurate record of the
6 back tomorrow for Day 2 of the workshop tomorrow at 9	6 proceedings to the best of my knowledge, skills, and
7 a.m. Thanks so much.	7 ability; that I am neither counsel for, related to,
8 (Whereupon, the meeting concluded at	8 nor employed by any of the parties to the action in
9 3:30 p.m.)	9 which this was taken; and, further, that I am not a
10	10 relative or employee of any counsel or attorney
11	11 employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or
12	12 otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.
13	13
14	14 Shane Sprow
15	15 SHANE WILLIAM SPROWL
16	16
	17
17	
18	18
19	19
20	20
21	21
22	22
Page 291	
1 CERTIFICATE	
2 I, ALEXANDRA HOBRECHT, the officer before	
3 whom the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby	
4 certify that any witness(es) in the foregoing	
5 proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn;	
6 that the proceedings were recorded by me and	
7 thereafter reduced to typewriting by a qualified	
8 transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of	
9 said proceedings are a true and accurate record to the	
10 best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am	
11 neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any	
12 of the parties to the action in which this was taken;	
13 and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of 14 any counsel or attorney employed by the parties	
15 hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the	
16 outcome of this action.	
abyle Hot	
17 ALEXANDRA HOBRECHT	

Notary Public in and for the

State of Michigan

18

19

202122

[**0.02. - 48**] Page 1

0	122 4:12	200 6:5	28707 291:16
0.02. 152:3	12:20 11:7,13	200,000 7:2	2:15 223:9
0.08 253:22	131 4:13	47:9	2a 288:20
1	14 113:5	20005 1:14	2c 164:7 206:6
	15 31:5 84:3	2002 32:12	2 x 258:22
1 6:5 12:22	125:20 129:9	2003 32:15	3
64:20 107:1,18	201:3 223:16	2004 124:11	3 11:6 73:16
113:10,21	229:3	125:18 128:1	74:9 113:22
124:18 125:19	16 125:19	2005 126:13	215:2 225:13
127:11 129:1	166 4:10	2007 89:1	230:17 240:12
130:6 148:22	18 47:7	2010 84:8	267:18 288:14
150:19 151:1	19 94:22	126:13	288:19
166:5 184:3	127:19	2012 65:20	3.4 258:4
194:7 230:17	1930s 175:9	2013 127:16	3.5 258:3
230:17 240:12	1960s 123:5	2014 126:13,15	30 68:17
267:17,18	1970s 14:2 16:4	127:3 164:3	113:13 127:9
288:16	1980s 205:11	2016 91:21	141:13 143:22
1,000 33:4 34:9	1:00 11:7,14	2017 126:14	
10 31:5 74:13	1a 120:19	2018 92:16	180:7
129:4 145:12	2	106:5 126:14	30,000 13:8 31 4:5
273:18		2019 52:9	314.126 102:1
10,000 64:11	2 6:21 11:6,10 60:20 73:22	2020 127:19	35 129:8
10,224 124:10	107:19 111:22	2021 102:7	36 61:14
100 64:20		127:19	
168:15 173:14	112:4 113:2	2022 33:3	
261:22 276:2,4	119:16 150:16	123:8 124:11	3:30 11:8,14
276:6 282:20	150:19 151:1	127:16 128:1	290:9
100,000 180:16	153:14 181:10	2023 104:18	3a 113:10
101 208:6	193:3,3 215:2	2024 1:9	3x 259:1
11 74:14 113:5	215:2 224:11	21 16:5,10	4
113:13 125:3	225:13 230:17	21st 91:20	4 114:5
127:9 136:4	230:17,18	94:15 105:8	40 77:20 113:1
142:3 145:6	262:4 267:17	106:1	143:12
173:22	280:14 288:17	24 142:13	43 129:9
112 4:10,11	290:6	143:18 205:9	45 16:6 143:16
11:20 111:22	20 11:3 131:21	256:14	48 205:9
12 4:4 60:20	143:21 145:13	28106 292:14	256:14
62:16 63:12	229:3 276:2,4		

5	80 142:13	abnormalities	214:3 215:13
5 4:3 34:10	800 148:22	141:3 259:4	216:12 217:12
62:10 74:9	194:7	aborted 233:8	224:3 225:20
125:9 205:7	9	abound 84:1	229:15,16
50 4:6 16:11	9 73:21 125:20	above 126:3	231:12 232:19
141:13 143:13	125:21 132:21	268:17	232:20 239:17
180:7	290:6	abruption	241:19 242:16
50.52 17:2,6	90 123:19	138:22	243:18,20,22
24:13 26:15	90s 257:17	absence 144:9	244:10 245:16
50.55 17:2	261:20	211:22	245:18 246:4,8
24:14	91 4:9	absolute 43:7	247:5,6 250:9
50s 175:10	96 118:7	absolutely	251:19,21
526 6:21	9:00 1:10	231:9 249:9	252:11,14
59 4:7	a	279:4	253:19 255:2
6		absorption	255:12,13
6 53:22 54:10	a.m. 1:10 290:7 a16 133:12	55:10,12,18,20	256:19 257:16
74:4 113:10		abundant	258:14 260:1
60 138:16	a6 133:12 a71 133:13	79:15	260:14,16
61 150:22	134:7 162:18	abzug 2:18	261:6 263:2
6444256 1:20	abdominal	4:13 110:8,10	266:8 281:12
	138:19	111:4 112:7	281:13
7	ability 19:2,8	131:9,9,17,18	abzug's 186:21
7 1:9 123:22	94:7 103:19	153:12 154:4,5	255:5
124:16 150:20	173:15 211:8	154:14,21	academia 80:1
168:16 193:3	259:21 291:10	155:1 158:3	176:13 213:14
193:11 255:5	292:7	159:16 160:8	214:8 academic 79:2
267:19	able 14:22 75:4	160:13,17 161:1,21	84:11 131:12
70 138:16	84:4 108:8,9	163:12 164:11	218:2,2 220:12
151:2 152:5,5	109:8 120:11	164:17,20	accelerate 74:7
71 182:17	120:15 148:20	170:5,7 176:4	81:5
197:10	152:18 156:15	176:5 184:16	accelerating
72 62:9	158:22 193:9	187:11 192:19	85:5
75 4:8	203:11 215:7	193:17 194:4	accept 68:10
8	219:18 240:4	195:7,8 202:8	254:10 269:15
8 74:10,12	264:19 266:17	203:22 206:9	acceptability
267:19	277:2,13	206:11 207:11	23:6 80:7
		213:18,21	23.0 00.7

acceptable	111:10 175:1	acts 32:13	264:8 266:2
24:1 27:22	acknowledge	actual 91:9	276:19
44:5 109:21	30:7	97:1 163:19	added 35:5
acceptance	acknowledging	173:20 226:7	185:9 219:5
107:15	23:4	239:2 242:19	adderall 75:2
access 10:20	acquire 136:15	249:21,22	adding 287:12
15:9 18:18	136:15	actually 46:21	addition 76:9
66:10 77:1,17	acquired	60:20 94:11	83:6 86:2
94:7 96:8	157:15	95:4 101:7	94:10 105:20
103:19 150:2	act 6:22 15:15	103:16 121:13	171:17
152:19 269:21	32:15 47:19	138:22 159:14	additional 10:2
271:15 282:20	91:21 94:15	163:13 174:16	14:6 16:9
account 77:20	105:8 106:1	175:15 179:2	20:12 42:22
98:20 133:22	acting 167:11	180:21 185:19	45:20 49:2
accrual 77:18	246:14	187:17 189:8	58:11 68:20
accumulate	action 47:2	189:15,20	113:14 166:16
52:16	212:13 215:1	197:21 203:8	167:4 168:5
accurate	291:12,16	204:8 205:4	184:3 185:9
100:20 212:5	292:8,12	208:12,14	198:8,20 222:6
212:22 257:17	actionable	209:7 232:5,6	222:21 254:13
291:9 292:5	181:1	233:8 244:3	262:17 281:16
accurately 99:7	activated 227:8	246:12 247:3	additionally
achieve 19:13	active 28:2	253:16 269:6	80:8 113:14
263:20	83:22 119:6	275:12 277:15	197:12
achieved	213:7 230:19	277:18 288:7	address 10:8
248:12	252:3 254:1	acute 60:8	10:19 34:14
achievements	264:5 268:14	64:21 72:18	37:4 41:2
89:16	273:22 281:17	121:16 134:3,6	88:19 153:11
achieving 33:4	283:1	141:9 142:7,8	176:9 192:12
269:1	actively 254:3	145:3 147:8	197:5 202:2
aciclovir	activities 81:21	234:13	209:4 245:13
146:21 186:22	86:2 91:18	add 163:10	264:19
187:4 201:6,8	activity 19:1,7	170:7 171:14	addressed
acidification	149:22 162:10	171:16 177:14	25:19 95:13,16
116:10	162:13,16	217:22 228:21	111:2,3 148:2
acids 213:2	163:4 195:4	229:19 237:1	addressing
acknowledge	260:10 276:22	247:5 252:5	82:4 83:17
31:14 39:10	280:10	258:15 263:2	85:20 86:20

00.7.01.04.10	41 20 42 16	66 1 121 12	162 0 251 10
89:7,21 94:13	41:20 42:16	affairs 131:12	163:8 251:18
adds 186:1	51:3,4,6,17	affect 47:7	282:6
216:16	52:17,21 53:18	168:20	agents 22:11
adequate 7:16	54:7 55:13,14	affected 168:22	163:1,9 170:21
8:1,17 9:11	57:19,19 77:1	199:17	177:6 196:9
36:13 41:17	77:18 83:5,20	affecting 24:21	207:4,5 214:5
101:1 102:2	92:12 102:6	affects 7:2 47:8	214:11
108:12 216:12	107:20 127:7	affiliations	ages 124:3
adhd 74:10,11	132:21 150:6	11:22	aggregate
adjourn 11:8	189:22	afternoon	123:14
adjunctive	advance 10:2,7	11:13 111:17	aggregated
28:5	46:11 105:17	154:20 157:19	123:21
adjustments	106:15 173:19	160:20 166:20	ago 60:20,20
185:14	232:5	167:2 184:15	63:12 92:8
administered	advancement	213:19	95:10 135:22
22:12 23:11	85:16	age 29:13,15	143:15 145:13
35:6 47:11	advancing	35:17 45:10,10	148:12 150:11
administering	10:18 76:10	45:10,14 53:20	157:12 179:1
147:4	79:11 104:3	55:8,10 58:9	239:22 257:4
administration	105:4 106:4	74:9,12 123:5	agree 161:4
24:3 28:2 55:5	214:21	123:6 130:15	174:14 194:14
55:7 149:7	advantage	150:16 255:4,6	203:14 208:2
177:8 195:14	175:7	aged 127:11	221:16 247:6
admissions	advantageous	129:1 130:6	257:5,10 262:3
5:20	19:10 265:22	agencies 69:18	269:8 284:2
admit 57:6	adverse 41:22	85:4 89:2	287:19
admitting	42:4 44:11,13	175:22 176:15	agreed 161:4
147:4	44:16,21 256:6	177:3 184:17	agreement
adolescents	advice 10:11	214:10	104:7 228:15
53:9,11	advisory 10:10	agency 8:21	277:11
adoption 6:8	advocate	10:10,10 93:6	ahead 245:17
adult 7:13 9:2	267:15	101:17 184:22	245:18 251:7
9:9 37:10 38:1	advocates	218:3 221:17	aim 42:7 87:4
44:15 51:15	38:22 43:20	222:3	aimed 79:10
54:14 77:14	advocating	agenda 10:20	88:13
101:8 176:17	227:13 248:14	107:1 153:14	aimee 2:19
adults 8:16,18	261:21	agent 39:10	222:10
9:1 34:16 35:4		40:10 162:4	

	1	1	1
aims 140:17	amino 213:2	174:18 191:10	antibodies
alabama 3:5	amount 24:6	232:15,16	117:13 157:22
167:10	158:19 159:7	animals 175:6	161:3 190:19
albeit 262:4	160:9 183:5	175:17	193:20 194:20
alert 5:17	189:11,19	annealing	201:21 202:9
alexandra 1:19	239:2 269:1	183:3	202:14,16,18
291:2,17	amounts 148:1	announced	202:22 203:10
aligned 105:7	amplify 182:16	33:3	204:4 247:1
alignment 88:3	amy 2:16 4:11	anorexia	antibody
allow 45:5,8	112:6,10	139:17	119:11,12
187:10 240:14	168:18 177:10	answer 71:8	120:4 144:10
255:9	192:15 206:12	101:2,2 109:16	144:16 147:18
allowable	209:10 259:10	142:20 156:18	147:20,22
22:16	an's 238:2	159:14 165:2	148:7 156:8,13
allowed 87:15	analyses 69:7	179:21 202:14	157:16 158:6
184:21	73:7 129:15	202:15 203:7	158:15,19
allows 99:6	224:18	226:4,10 229:8	159:7,19
238:9	analysis 8:9	236:5,10,11	160:10 161:10
alluded 45:2	13:17 21:15	253:9 262:3	178:1 190:22
71:10	27:6 45:7	273:8 289:8,21	191:3,4 194:12
alluding	54:17 93:22	answered	194:15 195:2
218:11	100:12 103:14	218:12 241:3	196:6 202:7,10
alpha 191:12	124:8 187:10	260:20	202:11 206:7
alteration	246:16 259:3	answering	247:1
205:7	analytics 90:20	202:5	anticipate 99:1
alterations	104:13	answers 27:17	108:10 268:16
205:5	analyze 13:10	111:21 166:4	anticipated
alternate	21:4 130:14	219:11,20	17:19,22
282:19	analyzed 94:8	anterior	268:19
alternative	100:8 124:9	133:10	anticoagulant
8:12 195:14	anecdotal	anti 37:14	53:16
alternatives	148:5 230:15	87:15 162:9	antigen 119:11
18:1	anecdote	204:6 206:13	antigenic
altogether	230:12	antibacterial	169:17
264:14	anemia 255:4	146:17	antivaccine
amazing 74:17	animal 50:15	antibiotics	179:11
ambiguity	57:2,10 58:2,7	201:8	antiviral 7:5
93:15	69:9 117:6		16:17,19 29:14

	1	1	
30:22 32:3	apart 40:11	appropriate	arisen 207:17
84:21 85:1	apologies	34:17 45:11	207:18
107:21 149:12	264:19 272:1	55:9 77:4	arises 204:17
149:20 150:10	289:7	106:14 178:9	arising 183:7
152:16 153:1	apologize	183:3 196:2	arm 96:18
155:13 161:14	100:2 198:1	223:18 229:21	264:5 269:15
165:19,20	apparent	230:1 239:20	280:17 284:14
168:2 170:13	126:13,18	245:6 260:21	284:14 286:4
196:3,14 197:8	appeal 158:3	267:10 282:1	arms 28:9
200:8,8,12	applicable 52:1	appropriately	277:3 281:17
201:2 206:4	61:5 177:8	192:12	arrive 277:6
213:16 220:8	221:21	approval 77:14	arrived 18:15
232:13 247:20	application	83:13,19,20	arrow 37:11
254:4 256:17	101:18 201:14	92:3 101:17	art 169:15
259:11,15	applied 8:20	102:4	248:21
260:10,11	applies 92:18	approvals	article 95:13,16
261:18 280:18	apply 177:20	94:18 95:20	articles 135:10
antivirals 5:13	applying 190:2	approve 51:15	asia 134:9
17:15 26:14	appreciate	92:11	asked 29:3
37:15 153:8	106:8 199:21	approved 7:5	63:21,22 64:15
161:9,11	219:9 261:15	7:14 34:16	64:15 91:22
188:11 195:11	274:12 277:2	53:10,16 57:12	109:13 217:18
195:16 197:7	approach	58:4 70:4 92:3	217:21 289:10
197:15 252:18	33:10 36:15	101:7,10	asking 94:16
antivirus 2:5	39:11 50:22	152:17 185:11	103:4 168:1
143:4 167:5	51:5,9,9,10,11	approves 106:9	175:14 247:19
anxiety 74:14	51:15 52:1	area 16:9 33:13	256:21
anybody	80:17 86:11,12	37:11,19 41:8	aspect 15:13
172:13 185:8	98:12 116:13	56:1 57:7 70:5	109:19
215:17 266:2	149:13 201:11	141:5 235:5,14	aspects 29:22
273:10	220:13 250:13	areas 16:15	67:8 82:22
anymore	250:14 282:11	37:12 41:8	91:14 119:3
118:11 188:21	approaches	70:14,19 71:12	190:16
anyone's 60:11	50:9,19 58:15	95:22 123:1	assay 117:22
anyway 157:14	82:8 84:2 87:4	222:13 280:6	119:8,20,21
157:19 240:7	89:18	argument	assays 120:10
262:8	approaching	211:16 275:16	121:6 158:18
	238:19	275:22	159:6
		•	

	125.5 126.1 22	-4444 20-15	
assemble	135:5 136:1,22	attrition 39:15	awareness
114:12	137:19 138:17	73:2	179:5
assembled	139:7 141:12	audience 5:4	awful 286:12
114:12 116:21	141:18,20,22	12:3	awkward
assent 17:3	142:2,8 145:7	audio 291:8	277:22
29:15	149:9 169:3	292:4	axes 114:16
assess 42:14	assuming	authorities	axis 114:21
97:14,14	98:19	88:4	125:19 146:2
124:11	assurance 45:8	authority	b
assessed 40:6	assured 285:4	32:16	b 113:8,12
assessing 8:8	asymptomatic	automatically	133:20 141:1
40:9 99:15	6:7 132:19	12:4	141:11,19
119:5	135:4 137:13	autopsies 175:9	142:4 145:7
assessment 8:5	180:20	av 2:6,7 290:3	b1 127:8
13:16 18:22	attach 116:2	availability	b2 127:8
21:2 23:13	attaches 116:5	105:22 122:10	b3 125:2 127:8
26:21 27:2,5,7	attachment	278:10 280:20	136:2 174:1
36:5 39:17	149:14	available 11:19	b4 125:3 127:8
42:12 99:22	attendance	12:1 18:1,2	136:2
assessments	12:22	25:4 48:20	b5 125:2 126:2
27:13 39:9	attendee	66:5,5 119:15	126:11 127:8
40:17	164:13 197:2	152:17 153:8	161:14
assignment	198:5 265:1	159:18 160:14	babies 6:5
96:16 111:13	283:15	205:22 244:12	61:16 107:21
assignments	attendees 2:2	267:21 282:18	136:14 137:2
28:14	3:2 197:20	282:21 283:6	137:10,14,19
assist 147:8	attention 44:11	average 143:13	138:6,8,12
assistance 86:6	59:2 94:3,22	averages 77:15	139:15 141:6
assistant	131:2 179:17	avidd 197:15	144:5,19,21
167:13 235:22	attenuation	avoiding 70:17	146:6 147:7
associate 5:12	209:11	award 104:6	148:21 149:5
75:14 90:19	attorney	awarded	150:16,22
113:15 167:16	291:14 292:10	104:10	150.10,22
associated 6:17	attractive	awarding 48:1	151.2,19
35:18 42:18	159:4 200:13	aware 7:4 66:4	155:16,16,21
63:1 86:20	attributed 91:6	164:17,21	158:1 160:12
113:11 132:22	94:6	218:21 227:19	161:13,20
133:2,11,18			101.13,20

172:16 178:11	99:17 105:14	barriers 82:4	218:21
193:8 224:13	112:3 128:16	bars 145:16,17	belew 2:8 4:3
225:2 231:4	166:10,22	based 6:19	5:2,11 25:19
233:6,16	169:18 174:16	19:1 33:5 44:9	30:14 36:11
238:13,17	179:9 194:2	45:6 51:16	37:5 38:3
240:1 243:9	198:10 200:7	53:16 54:1,5,8	47:17 49:17
247:11 252:1,6	223:9,13 242:8	56:6,7 57:21	59:3 75:12
252:15 256:9	246:8 252:20	76:20 81:22	76:5 90:16
256:13 260:8	254:17 257:17	101:8,13 106:9	106:21 108:15
263:10 268:9	260:18 261:20	109:4,6 122:21	110:8 111:4,19
274:14	262:20 264:16	137:5 142:22	188:5,6 252:11
baby 60:9 65:1	268:7 273:11	148:1 175:8	252:12 255:2
65:10 66:14,21	274:18 281:2	186:5 196:6	256:19 260:13
67:7 136:11	290:6	254:22 258:2	260:15 279:22
137:1 138:3	background	265:18 268:15	279:22
139:4 140:12	32:9 36:9	268:16,18	believe 30:3
144:10,15,17	91:13 112:1,5	278:19 280:9	62:15 64:9
146:13 148:8	263:6	280:11	164:14 224:4
150:15 156:9	baclofen 75:3	baseline 252:22	260:2,4 277:8
156:13 158:6	bacterial	258:3,4	285:13,19
158:17 159:1,2	146:17	basic 168:6	belmont 16:3
160:2,10	bad 208:7	170:1 174:12	beneath 115:21
163:20 173:1,6	225:4 243:2	174:13	126:1
184:10 196:15	246:10,11	basically 100:4	beneficial
207:12 230:18	258:4,5	104:12 159:22	130:19 154:10
247:16 252:9	badly 177:19	180:9 191:11	233:11 260:9
254:17,17,18	bag 242:13	243:2	benefit 13:16
258:2 267:19	baggage 59:21	basis 7:17 56:2	16:22 17:7,17
268:2 270:3	60:14	87:16 98:19	17:19,22 18:8
275:13 276:3	balance 17:7	150:2 199:14	18:10,13,14,17
282:18,22	17:22 285:19	becoming	18:20,22 19:18
baby's 149:1	balancing 14:7	65:22 96:9	20:18 21:2,9
157:17	bar 145:18,18	137:1 151:11	21:13,15 22:19
back 7:9 9:5	211:20 286:10	bedside 17:9	22:19 24:13
14:1 24:18	barn 242:13	100:9 238:17	26:21 27:2,7,9
25:13 49:15	barrier 42:18	began 74:9	38:12 39:6
52:8 66:15	273:16	beginning	41:11 46:3,3
72:3 73:8 93:4		12:22 190:22	79:21 108:11

110:4,17,21	261:10 278:17	biologics 33:1	239:7 244:9,22
111:11 148:17	286:17 288:3	69:20 92:19	247:4 250:12
187:21 231:2	beyond 48:19	93:4 106:4	268:17 270:15
236:12 238:17	109:14 149:9	biomarker	270:15 273:11
241:4 260:4	215:10,10	117:14 184:5,6	277:16 279:7,8
262:4 277:17	bhatnagar 30:8	184:13 253:11	286:22
280:18 281:19	bias 8:7 68:3	254:6	black 74:5
281:20 284:5	70:15 72:1	biomarkers	blame 100:8
benefits 15:2	94:13 237:13	71:21 82:19	bleeding
26:18 39:4	283:20 284:4	253:1	142:10,11
93:20 271:7	286:18	biopsies 22:1,6	blend 240:2
benign 137:15	biased 129:12	biopsy 22:4	blind 150:11
145:21 155:10	129:20	biphasic	blood 21:8
best 32:12 37:8	bid 54:6,14	137:17	28:20 42:18
71:6 72:12	big 44:2 68:5	birmingham	43:7,9,12
117:14 155:3	94:8 105:22	3:6 167:10	147:5,5 231:6
178:11 195:18	168:12 182:1	birth 6:3,7,11	231:6 274:1
235:13 248:1	203:3	35:11,20 45:14	blue 126:3,12
274:22 291:10	bigger 273:16	47:7 60:4	bodain 175:11
292:6	biggest 66:15	136:12,13	body 56:1,1
beta 191:12	169:10,22	243:6	68:19 249:13
betsy 2:12 4:7	172:21	bit 21:14 25:20	book 249:1
12:11 59:4	bilirubin 61:18	59:15 61:1	bore 15:22
76:1 78:21	binder 149:13	64:2 67:6	195:21
179:19 234:5	150:4	68:13 76:17	born 6:6 60:20
234:11 235:10	binding 115:2	80:11 93:14	61:7 65:20
237:3	119:8 168:21	97:10 98:5	74:19 138:7
betsy's 86:12	193:22 209:18	99:14,19 107:1	243:3
90:4 236:21	212:14	110:7,14 111:1	borne 135:21
better 58:13	biochemical	111:15,17	borrowed 52:8
86:13 103:16	35:14	132:13 161:22	bottom 12:6
106:14 153:4	biofire 182:11	163:6,14 187:9	61:21 62:3
157:18 158:5	biologic 46:20	195:9 211:20	92:9 97:22
159:8 178:2	47:3 92:11	214:4,8 217:13	99:10 126:12
196:17 219:16	biological	221:11 222:17	152:4
231:17 232:14	32:17 106:9	225:1 227:16	boulware
244:4,8 252:20	149:3	228:6 230:8	227:17
255:14 258:15		231:15 237:5	

bound 16:22	185:3 197:7	button 289:7	canyons 163:16
box 97:5,22	210:6 246:7	buy 203:2	cap 115:12
107:8 154:1	248:18	byron 2:5	276:22
167:21 197:1	broaden 195:9	143:4 167:4	capabilities
200:3 212:5	broadening	215:6,16,17,20	197:21
boys 208:7	86:10	217:2,9 218:13	capacity
bpca 32:13	broader 82:9	219:8,21 221:8	130:18 142:16
84:10	88:19 163:9	c	250:12
brain 42:18,19	201:14 210:12	c 2:1 3:1 4:1	capsid 113:21
63:3 64:3	217:6 224:13	5:1 62:7	113:21 114:1
134:9	224:19	104:17 113:5	114:10 149:13
break 11:4,7	broadly 159:9	c4c 85:22	150:4 163:21
11:13 111:21	188:11 196:5	caesarean	168:21 187:15
166:4 187:12	212:1 246:14	137:3	187:18 209:18
220:1,3 223:9	broadness	caffeine 69:21	209:19 212:13
223:13	132:13	call 40:5 225:8	212:20 213:1
breakdown	broken 16:15	229:1 232:9	246:17
252:7	brought 169:11	254:5 269:20	capture 103:1
breastmilk	184:17 238:10	270:5,11	179:16
137:4,6	brown 126:14	271:10 274:2	cardiac 141:14
brief 13:1 46:7	budget 244:16	called 63:7	cardiovascular
111:8	build 41:6	69:1 94:8	147:4
briefly 10:21	67:16,16 73:10	101:9	care 15:10
14:16 76:9	176:6 231:11	calls 211:8	27:14 28:7,8
86:16 109:19	building 71:3	287:6	28:19 60:8
157:13 164:12	72:14	camera 168:10	64:21 65:22
213:19 264:17	builds 173:11	278:1 284:11	66:1,10,10
275:6	built 184:9	canada 71:18	74:20 97:16
bring 9:5 84:22	bullet 176:9,14	89:4	100:9 101:15
199:1 214:11	184:3 195:10	candidate	102:20 147:2
238:7	241:17 242:7	17:14 26:14	152:13 184:20
bringing	289:13	170:17	220:12 229:1,3
238:16	bullets 232:21	candidates	252:15 282:14
brings 254:17	burden 130:20	83:9 178:12	282:15 288:7
broad 50:9,19	burn 189:4	canopy 132:16	caregiver
132:16 139:13	busy 43:22	canyon 114:20	40:18
142:12 162:9	85:9 140:16	115:3 164:4	caregivers 23:7
163:4 171:3		110.0 101.1	24:16 28:19

29:6 213:15	category 20:12	caveats 164:9	cerebral 73:22
cares 273:10	22:7 38:7	165:13 211:17	cerebrospinal
caring 24:17	102:16 103:12	cber 100:14	56:16
carter 3:4	196:18	285:7	certain 22:16
case 28:11	causation	cdc 2:17 3:8	24:6 27:22
35:10 53:13	67:12	6:5 123:8	32:17 78:2
57:2,10 62:17	cause 6:3 65:10	131:3 168:13	94:13 102:19
87:16,16 96:2	68:16 130:9	179:2	126:9 145:5
96:21 102:4	132:20,21,22	cder 5:14	169:2 182:7
103:13 109:5,5	133:14 134:2,5	100:14 106:8	186:17 190:16
109:10,10	134:8,10	285:7	194:8 202:16
143:1 157:12	135:11 138:22	cell 114:6	205:4 210:10
164:3 178:22	142:5 162:20	116:2,3,6	217:11 247:2
180:4 182:8	169:5 173:15	118:4 231:21	279:9
194:18 202:10	176:17 178:20	252:7 280:10	certainly 66:11
256:8 258:17	181:12 184:8	cells 69:19	94:15 98:2
258:17 273:9	184:13 186:2	118:2 120:11	103:5 105:15
288:9	192:7 198:20	120:16 191:9	158:5,17
cases 36:16	199:14 205:13	231:20	168:21 179:16
123:1 133:22	208:2 210:5	cellular 35:14	180:21 189:16
136:8 145:20	219:6 236:22	center 12:6	199:16 209:8
149:18 150:2	240:4 241:10	92:19,19,20,21	213:9 217:12
152:18 169:7	242:2 246:7	282:14,15,22	219:9 238:5
180:7 182:7	247:11 258:14	283:5	246:11 266:16
212:12 257:6	263:3 271:2,9	centered 63:14	272:20 275:15
casg 224:6,10	278:16	86:11	277:4
cat 242:12	caused 133:15	centering	certificate
catalysts 89:6	140:22 141:10	70:16	291:1 292:1
catalyzed	145:2 173:13	centers 84:22	certify 291:4
114:7	178:20 195:2	121:18 167:12	292:2
catching	causes 133:21	central 56:11	cessation 149:2
224:12,12	causing 68:1	117:10 185:21	cetera 29:8
catchment	136:4 204:8	centralized	140:14 223:2
182:1	249:22	228:18	cfr 16:5,6,10
catchments	caution 126:17	century 91:20	chair 131:12
182:1	caveat 120:2	94:15 105:8	167:8
catchy 254:20	174:4 288:13	106:1	challenge
			35:15 40:12

58:8 77:19	269:7 273:21	chatting 278:3	128:13 132:20
107:14 109:11	274:11,16	cheat 175:5	156:17 177:9
155:5 159:3	278:17	check 11:21	187:21 189:16
169:10 170:15	change 19:9	250:14	189:19,22
173:8 180:18	25:1 31:17	cherry 103:15	192:1 199:10
232:3 233:5	73:19 141:2	child 15:3	231:13 233:6
challenges 9:17	172:5 214:4	18:10 20:7,9	233:12 242:11
9:19 10:1	218:5 219:4	20:14 21:14	263:7 272:14
31:22 40:3,22	222:2 242:19	22:10 23:16	children's
41:2 44:2 49:9	changed 62:16	24:9 27:13	143:16
50:17 77:10,12	96:6 100:2	60:12 64:6	chime 188:9
78:6 86:20,22	126:8 205:15	156:9 176:19	217:3
89:8,21 96:19	changes 32:22	186:9,19 187:3	china 145:13
102:11 104:20	33:13,20 34:10	203:18 205:10	choice 278:14
104:21 131:15	35:18,21 37:16	207:18 231:5	choir 76:16
132:7 158:9	49:10 56:2	243:3 246:20	chorioamnio
166:6,11,12,16	126:20 130:13	256:2,5 259:16	138:21
168:2,12	chapel 2:20	259:17,18	chose 98:11
169:10,22	167:15	273:3 283:22	chosen 233:15
172:21 177:15	characteristic	285:5,7,18	chronic 134:12
182:6 215:10	213:2	child's 20:11	134:17,17
222:12 230:13	characteristics	20:15 24:21	circle 9:5
232:18 235:7	9:15 27:3 45:6	childhood	circled 16:9
238:10 284:7	253:1,3 255:6	35:12 162:21	circling 200:7
284:18	characterize	children 13:13	circulate 172:6
challenging	36:3 45:17	14:5,9,19 15:6	172:7 208:15
9:13 21:19	140:5 212:18	15:13 16:10	circulating
35:2 36:7,16	216:21	20:2 25:22	130:15 135:20
37:2 41:15	characterized	26:5,8 29:16	164:1 171:11
94:12 170:17	9:16 89:16	29:22 32:13	171:18 182:18
178:9 183:12	137:15 145:15	33:11 41:21	189:22 204:21
222:9 234:3	characterizes	53:21,21,21	205:13,16,20
285:3	45:4	55:6,6,12,12	207:16 209:5
chamber	characterizing	55:16 57:14	210:5
232:12	120:5	58:12,13 77:16	circulation
chance 66:15	chat 198:6	78:11,16 83:4	35:21 128:6
174:7 207:1,6	209:2 286:7	88:14 107:20	172:3
230:18 246:13	289:18	123:22 127:7	

circumstance	climate 172:5	136:10 142:10	clotting 142:9
15:4	climb 231:22	148:17 149:15	cluster 88:22
circumstances	clinic 119:4	150:5,21 153:8	cmv 5:6 6:2,6
22:16 94:14	clinical 7:17	156:4 165:3,18	6:10,13,16 7:6
110:20	8:18 9:12	165:19 166:14	9:6 10:4 11:11
cited 157:13	12:18 13:2	167:8 170:3	25:11,21 28:12
187:11	14:20 16:10,17	173:20 174:2,3	38:6 41:10
cities 181:5	17:8,11 18:3	177:21,21	42:6 46:10
city 180:9	19:3,6,9 20:20	185:15 186:17	48:4,8,9 51:20
182:1 282:14	22:2 24:7	202:8 212:18	61:4
282:16	26:13,16 27:14	214:12 220:12	cns 56:10,12
claims 98:17	29:1 30:21	220:21 222:7	134:12 285:2
99:16,16	32:1,14 34:15	223:15,18,18	coagulopathy
clarification	35:5 37:9 38:8	225:22 235:21	136:5 140:8,14
131:5 154:17	38:12,18 40:3	241:9 244:13	140:20 142:1,8
160:21 195:5	40:17 41:6	245:9 255:11	143:18 149:6
clarify 10:9	43:3,11,14	256:18 259:7	150:18 246:9
160:5 256:8	45:3 46:4	259:13,21	cocirculation
278:6	49:19,21 50:5	261:4,18	189:12
clarifying	50:11,16 52:3	266:15 272:12	cocktail 75:5
107:2 110:9	52:14 53:20	273:5 280:22	codes 143:17
153:15 156:20	54:17 55:2	281:8,9 285:15	coding 116:8
clear 8:2 19:21	57:1,12,19	285:16 287:8,9	149:14
33:19,22 61:15	58:3,7 59:7	288:9,18	codirector
86:12 154:18	65:16 67:7	clinically 36:22	167:9
222:3 233:9	68:3,7,8 71:5	100:21 118:11	cofounder
249:16 259:12	73:14 74:6,21	158:11 169:20	167:6
clearance	77:7 78:5 79:7	201:11 244:19	cohort 53:22
253:20	80:11,18 82:1	clinician 160:2	54:10 199:3,13
cleared 189:10	82:5,8 85:1,18	236:4	243:8
249:14	85:21 86:5	clinicians 44:6	cohorts 58:9
clearer 218:4	93:20 96:8,15	78:3 100:9	69:4 237:21
clearly 8:5 42:8	96:21 98:19	175:10	colder 68:21
88:16 255:18	100:7 101:14	close 96:14	collaborates
272:2	102:18,20	265:17	84:10
cleavage 114:4	103:12 119:4	closely 22:17	collaborating
114:7 116:22	130:2,20	closer 10:18	83:6
	131:21 132:7	244:4,9	

collaboration	collects 123:20	285:10	283:14 284:9
46:2 47:13	college 208:7	comfort 218:6	commercial
70:12 71:4	color 125:16,22	coming 11:20	91:9 132:4
75:18 79:14	126:3,14	172:15 287:19	159:18
80:21 88:1	colorado 2:4	comment 71:14	commercially
176:10 213:14	2:18 131:10	107:14 167:19	119:15
214:10	167:17	168:5,10 170:6	commission
collaborations	combination	174:11 183:12	14:3,11 16:2
76:10 78:20	19:7 135:7	183:14,21	commissioner
79:10,16,19	204:1 206:2,5	188:6 195:13	47:15
85:3 87:18	207:5 211:4	198:20 204:14	commitment
88:13,17	combine 206:6	209:1 212:11	79:6 105:3
collaborative	combined	215:22 218:8	committed
33:8 79:8 80:2	151:7	220:1 229:15	105:7
84:20,21 85:14	combining	232:20 256:22	common 31:16
86:5 87:3 88:5	82:7	260:18 264:1	40:6 45:4 71:8
89:5,17,19	come 21:1	264:21,22	95:17 125:8
150:10 152:22	24:18 52:2	283:12,17	127:10 132:22
176:13 177:5	60:3 68:2	284:13 286:8	134:8 135:2,11
colleague 84:18	69:18 73:9	commentary	137:22 139:20
95:10	100:7 119:12	104:18	140:6,17
colleagues 30:7	174:8 184:4	commenter	141:16 212:1
58:20 87:1	185:18 189:5	286:9	222:1 284:19
90:12 104:17	203:6 218:18	commenting	commonly
271:13	218:19 223:9	197:21 257:4	125:14 126:6
collect 122:9,13	228:4 235:22	comments 37:6	128:21 129:1
123:12	237:19 243:6	46:14,14	133:9
collected 44:8	251:6 263:6	108:20 111:5	communicati
44:12 84:15	264:16 268:7	154:15,22	73:8
93:18 120:9	274:18 276:6	193:19 197:1	communicati
122:4 181:10	comers 190:1	198:8,16	71:1 72:7,10
collecting	247:17	206:11 214:2	93:3
123:3,18	comes 63:10	214:18 215:12	communicati
266:15	174:6 201:6	223:21 229:17	63:16
collection	210:14,15	233:20 234:2	communities
41:16 83:2	247:10 262:18	245:14 259:9	72:4 199:4,17
collectively	264:2 273:19	264:18,20	community
222:19	278:18 279:10	266:19 280:2	59:17 61:1,4,7

63:7 70:16	compassionate	component	concepts 13:14
73:8,10 79:3	267:22 269:21	13:17 27:6	14:4,14 40:2
171:4,6 199:16	271:1,3 274:2	76:2 81:16	45:21 96:4
217:6,11,11	274:5 278:10	248:22 252:3,7	conceptual
222:19	278:16 279:14	components	95:17
comorbidities	280:20,20	22:18	conceptually
36:4 44:18	281:6 282:6,10	composed	45:15
companies	282:17 287:3,7	113:1,4,6,19	concern 56:13
203:4	compensate	113:20	56:14 190:6
company 265:4	172:12	composite	201:7 206:13
270:11 271:10	competent	71:11,19	210:17 272:6
271:20 274:2	174:18	265:19 266:10	273:3 286:9
comparability	competitive	composition	concerned
285:4,11	79:18 104:8	23:12	118:21 137:21
289:15,17	complete	comprehend	188:8 270:3
comparable	100:20	29:6	concerns 73:16
152:6	completely	compromised	174:15 190:16
comparator	44:16 221:16	191:11	206:3 219:10
8:3 103:10	243:19	compromising	concerted 87:6
107:17,18	complex 64:20	79:18	87:21
223:19 264:5	111:14 193:6	concato 2:14	conclude 11:14
267:2,5,10	236:1 265:8	4:9 12:12	concluded 7:18
268:22 269:15	complexities	90:18,18,21	8:21 290:8
269:16 272:18	254:15	91:1,2 106:21	concludes
275:3 278:22	complexity	283:11,14	106:22 152:10
280:17 282:2	35:5 61:22	284:8,10	153:13
284:14	100:5 185:10	287:17,18	conclusion
comparators	compliant	289:1,3,6	143:3
268:5	228:11	concentrations	conclusions
compare 52:19	complicated	56:10 108:2	121:4 130:4
compared 35:4	183:9	concept 19:5	concordant
96:22 127:6	complication	24:15 36:18	249:10
128:20 149:8	174:6 216:17	37:4 157:14	condition 7:1,2
189:21 224:19	216:20	239:8 260:8	7:20 16:17
271:14	complications	268:12 276:10	20:15 37:10,22
comparison	39:14 140:9	288:12	42:2 170:10,16
283:19	174:8	conception	170:19 171:2
		136:10	251:1

11.1		25.7	20 6 27 20
conditions 6:20	confirming	consensus 86:7	28:6 35:20
9:8 13:20	53:14 54:22	87:4,13	43:10 124:13
25:10 34:18	conflicts 76:13	consent 14:19	127:13 175:19
35:3 36:4,17	91:7	15:14,16 28:17	213:13 223:1
37:20,21 38:5	confound 24:4	28:20 29:2,3	considering
40:9 78:2	confounding	43:21 67:14,17	14:5 36:21
134:17 171:2	103:7	67:17 236:8,13	43:12 252:14
251:7	confused 249:9	236:17,17	252:17
conduct 81:13	confusion	consenting	consistency
82:4 83:8	93:15 204:17	235:20 237:12	71:6
84:22 85:21	congenital 1:2	238:2	consortia 79:22
101:3 103:12	5:6 6:2,6,10,16	conservation	consortium
105:16 185:14	7:6 9:6 10:4	121:8	44:20 46:1
272:13	11:11 25:11,21	conserves	86:19 104:9
conducted	28:11 32:4	286:18	152:21 224:6
21:15 32:21	38:6 41:10	consider 22:9	235:2
55:14	42:6 46:10	29:5 38:4	constellation
conducting	48:4,8 51:20	56:20 57:3	140:12
9:11 34:15	152:21 224:5	70:14 100:17	constricts
43:20 78:4	congress 91:22	188:3 222:6	191:20
84:13 153:1	conjunction	237:21 253:4	constructed
240:8	43:14	281:2	226:5
confer 209:13	conjunctivitis	consideration	consultant
210:19 213:3	133:14	41:9 99:4	72:10
conference	connect 75:9	222:21 280:16	consultation
88:22	connected	considerations	93:7
conferred	64:16 65:8	1:1 12:18 13:1	cont'd 3:1
26:19 212:20	66:16	13:19 30:21	contacts
confers 16:20	connecting	31:22 32:2,6	136:17
confidence	64:11	36:10 43:1	contemporary
39:16	connection	46:9 49:22	282:3
confident	64:14	50:5,12 55:3	content 30:9,12
158:11,15	connectivity	72:13 83:3,18	95:12,16,21
confines 229:6	232:22 244:2,8	89:7 98:22	contents
confirm 53:11	284:11	166:15 223:15	153:17
confirmed	consciousness	considered	context 6:21
74:11 160:4	141:2	6:20 16:19	31:6 59:22
		19:15 22:4	65:16 68:8

[context - cover]

Page 17

110:1 132:14	controlled 7:17	66:14,18 68:18	292:10
133:12 147:14	8:1,18 9:12	68:18,22 69:2	counseled
207:10 209:16	23:9 27:21	69:13	61:14
212:8 245:22	36:14 97:18	cooperation	count 255:4,20
261:4	98:3 99:2	88:1	counterbalan
continually	102:3 107:16	cooperative	39:5,20
75:1	150:12 267:18	104:7	countries 69:12
continue 34:2	269:20 270:21	coordinate	country 124:1
89:19 208:14	273:13,21	92:21	couple 78:14
223:13 287:9	278:8 280:22	coordinated	92:8 95:10,19
continued	285:5,7 286:13	41:5	106:6 107:12
35:10 90:3	286:18 289:11	coordinates	136:12,12
201:10	controller	63:10	158:9 176:6
continuing	23:17	core 25:14 41:6	177:14 179:1
73:9 92:7	convalescent	corey 2:6 30:17	183:17 186:5
188:13	148:6 152:15	corollary 26:4	206:11 209:4
contra 280:10	158:4	correct 160:11	232:21 257:8
contrary 21:12	convened 14:3	182:8 277:6	264:10 281:15
contrast 22:11	14:11 46:1	corrected	coupled 156:14
contribute	conversation	194:9	course 8:21
83:15 85:15	220:3 253:15	corrective 74:1	23:5 40:16
192:14 249:19	279:20 283:18	correctly	45:12 48:6
contributed	conversations	109:20	51:7 53:10
30:12 90:13	36:19 185:1	correlate 15:2	65:5 74:8 98:3
106:1	239:16	38:2 145:5	109:5 137:17
contributing	convey 91:21	192:6 269:1,2	154:12 178:5
77:22 252:9	95:7	correlated	180:13 181:12
contribution	conveyed	45:13	187:4 189:9
84:15	105:19 236:14	corresponds	199:6 200:10
contributors	convince	125:21	210:21 232:3
111:16	230:20 231:1	corrigan 95:10	259:12
control 28:2	277:16	cosmetic 6:22	courses 138:9
74:20 96:22	convinced	costs 265:9	cov 119:16
101:13 110:19	239:18	cotranslation	181:10
111:10 121:18	cool 66:21 69:1	114:11 115:18	cover 95:21
149:18 167:12	cooldown 62:9	council 87:20	102:12 111:6
269:9 272:3	cooling 62:2,8	counsel 291:11	123:1
282:2,3	65:21 66:3,13	291:14 292:7	

[coverage - data]

coverage 181:6	121:3 190:19	cycle 53:14
covered 93:1	190:21,22	54:22 74:13
153:18 264:12	191:5,7 193:20	82:14 100:1
covers 123:5	194:11 202:1	231:20
covid 94:22	202:18 203:1	cytolysis 252
127:19	203:11	cytomegalov
coxsackie	crucial 80:1	1:3
113:13 133:2	85:5	cytopathic
133:11,12,20	crux 285:5	118:7
136:2 141:1,11	csf 56:16	cytoplasm
141:19 142:4	128:18,22	115:10 116:2
145:7 161:14	culturable	d
174:1 197:10	250:16	d 5:1 16:11,1
coxsackievirus	culture 73:10	16:14 120:15
125:2,2,3	120:11,16	d.c. 1:14
126:2,11 127:8	137:6 145:4	d68 120:8,18
261:13	151:7,11 191:9	127:9 133:18
coxsackievir	256:1	134:7 162:18
113:15 120:8	cultured 151:7	163:15,22
cpic 224:6	cultures 256:2	183:17 197:1
create 67:21	curay 95:11	daily 20:2,8,
creative 267:15	cures 91:20	56:2 58:8
269:4	94:15 105:8	damage 63:4
credit 271:13	106:1	189:6 204:8
crevice 114:20	curious 154:6	271:4
criteria 8:6	current 33:10	damaged
27:22 48:17,19	146:10 152:11	247:21 251:1
83:2 97:14	164:1 169:14	dampen 249:
143:3,9 224:10	216:19 263:4	dark 126:2
225:4 281:8	283:22 285:8	145:16 151:8
282:9 283:4,4	currently	darker 151:1
critical 15:13	15:20 132:10	data 6:19 9:2
104:10 234:11	153:1	19:1,5,6,6
critically 24:17	cvb3 126:14	26:17 28:3
28:7 267:20	cvb4 126:3	41:17 44:7
273:19 281:10	cvdpv2 205:13	45:7 47:1
cross 42:17	cvi 74:15	50:15 52:16
93:2,3 120:3		50.15 52.10
•		•

82:14 100:1 231:20 ytolysis 252:7 ytomegalov 1:3 90:4,21 91:17 93:16,16,22 94:9 95:3,4 96:5,8,9 97:13 97:17 98:16,17 98:21 99:9,20 99:21 100:7,18 101:21 102:10 102:12,16,17 103:2,3,19,20 104:1,4,13,21 105:22 106:15 122:2,7,9,10 122:11,13 123:9,14,18,21 124:5,9,9,13 125:12 128:4 128:16 129:4 129:11,22 130:11 134:16 134:18 143:1 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 165:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 220:11,19 225:15 228:15 238:22 239:2 248:2,5,16 250:5 12	ycle 53:14	53:9 54:15,17
231:20 ytolysis 252:7 ytomegalov 1:3 ytopathic 118:7 ytoplasm 115:10 116:2 d 5:1 16:11,12 16:14 120:15 ac. 1:14 68 120:8,18 127:9 133:18 134:7 162:18 163:15,22 183:17 197:10 aily 20:2,8,10 56:2 58:8 amage 63:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:7 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16 81:4 83:3,4,17 84:16 88:8 90:4,21 91:17 93:16,16,22 94:9 95:3,4 96:5,8,9 97:13 97:17 98:16,17 103:2,3,19,20 102:12,16,17 103:2,3,19,20 104:1,4,13,21 105:22 106:15 122:2,7,9,10 122:11,13 123:9,14,18,21 124:5,9,9,13 125:12 128:4 129:11,22 130:11 134:16 134:18 143:1 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 165:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 220:11,19 225:15 228:15 238:22 239:2 248:2,5,16 250:5,12 251:21 258:16 261:2,10 262:7	54:22 74:13	57:18 58:10,11
ytolysis 252:7 ytomegalov 84:16 88:8 11:3 90:4,21 91:17 ytopathic 91:16,16,22 118:7 96:5,8,9 97:13 ytoplasm 97:17 98:16,17 15:10 116:2 98:21 99:9,20 d 99:21 100:7,18 101:21 102:10 102:12,16,17 103:2,3,19,20 104:1,4,13,21 105:22 106:15 122:2,7,9,10 122:11,13 123:9,14,18,21 124:5,9,9,13 125:12 128:4 128:16 129:4 129:11,22 130:11 134:16 134:18 143:1 149:1,22 130:11 134:16 149:1,24 129:11,22 140:2,10 122:11,13 123:9,14,18,21 124:5,9,9,13 125:12 128:4 129:11,22 130:11 134:16 134:18 143:1 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 165:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 165:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 165:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 165:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 18:1 195:21 2	82:14 100:1	74:6 79:17
ytomegalov 1:3 ytopathic 118:7 ytoplasm 115:10 116:2 d 5:1 16:11,12 16:14 120:15 .c. 1:14 68 120:8,18 127:9 133:18 134:7 162:18 163:15,22 183:17 197:10 aily 20:2,8,10 56:2 58:8 amage 63:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16	231:20	81:4 83:3,4,17
93:16,16,22 94:9 95:3,4 96:5,8,9 97:13 97:17 98:16,17 98:21 99:9,20 99:21 100:7,18 101:21 102:10 102:12,16,17 103:2,3,19,20 104:1,4,13,21 105:22 106:15 122:2,7,9,10 122:11,13 123:9,14,18,21 124:5,9,9,13 125:12 128:4 129:11,22 130:11 134:16 134:18 143:1 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 165:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 220:11,19 225:15 228:15 238:22 239:2 248:2,5,16 250:5,12 251:21 258:16	ytolysis 252:7	84:16 88:8
ytopathic 118:7 ytoplasm 115:10 116:2 d 5:1 16:11,12 16:14 120:15 ac. 1:14 68 120:8,18 127:9 133:18 134:7 162:18 163:15,22 183:17 197:10 aily 20:2,8,10 56:2 58:8 amage 63:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16	ytomegalov	90:4,21 91:17
ytoplasm 96:5,8,9 97:13 115:10 116:2 98:21 99:9,20 d 99:21 100:7,18 5:1 16:11,12 10:21 102:10 68 120:8,18 127:9 133:18 127:9 133:18 134:7 162:18 105:22 106:15 134:7 162:18 105:22 106:15 122:2,7,9,10 122:11,13 123:9,14,18,21 124:5,9,9,13 125:12 128:4 129:11,22 130:11 134:16 134:18 143:1 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 165:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 181:1 195:21 182:15 228:15 183:22 239:2 182:1,7,9,10 122:11,13 123:9,14,18,21 183:17 197:10 124:5,9,9,13 125:12 128:4 189:6 204:8 129:11,22 130:11 134:16 184:18 143:1 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 185:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 181:1 195:21 182:15 228:15 184:17 44:7 184:17 44:7 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27 184:27	1:3	93:16,16,22
ytoplasm 97:17 98:16,17 d 98:21 99:9,20 5:1 16:11,12 99:21 100:7,18 101:21 102:10 102:12,16,17 103:2,3,19,20 104:1,4,13,21 105:22 106:15 122:2,7,9,10 122:11,13 123:9,14,18,21 123:9,14,18,21 124:5,9,9,13 125:12 128:4 128:16 129:4 129:11,22 130:11 134:16 134:18 143:1 163:21 164:15 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 163:21 164:15 163:21 164:15 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 163:21 164:15 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 165:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 181:1 195:21 20:11,19 225:15 228:15 238:22 239:2 248:2,5,16 250:5,12 251:21 258:16 250:15 52:16 261:2,10 262:7	ytopathic	94:9 95:3,4
115:10 116:2 d 5:1 16:11,12 16:14 120:15 ac. 1:14 68 120:8,18 127:9 133:18 134:7 162:18 163:15,22 183:17 197:10 aily 20:2,8,10 56:2 58:8 amage 63:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16	118:7	96:5,8,9 97:13
5:1 16:11,12 16:14 120:15 cc. 1:14 68 120:8,18 127:9 133:18 134:7 162:18 163:15,22 183:17 197:10 aily 20:2,8,10 56:2 58:8 amage 63:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16	ytoplasm	97:17 98:16,17
5:1 16:11,12 16:14 120:15 ac. 1:14 68 120:8,18 127:9 133:18 134:7 162:18 163:15,22 183:17 197:10 aily 20:2,8,10 56:2 58:8 amage 63:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16	115:10 116:2	98:21 99:9,20
102:12,16,17 103:2,3,19,20 104:1,4,13,21 105:22 106:15 122:2,7,9,10 122:11,13 123:9,14,18,21 124:5,9,9,13 125:12 128:4 128:16 129:4 129:11,22 130:11 134:16 134:18 143:1 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 165:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 220:11,19 225:15 228:15 238:22 239:2 248:2,5,16 250:5,12 251:21 258:16	d	99:21 100:7,18
16:14 120:15 .c. 1:14 68 120:8,18 127:9 133:18 134:7 162:18 163:15,22 183:17 197:10 aily 20:2,8,10 56:2 58:8 amage 63:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16	5.1 16.11 12	101:21 102:10
103:2,3,19,20 104:1,4,13,21 105:22 106:15 122:2,7,9,10 122:11,13 123:9,14,18,21 124:5,9,9,13 125:12 128:4 129:11,22 130:11 134:16 134:18 143:1 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 165:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 220:11,19 225:15 228:15 238:22 239:2 248:2,5,16 250:5,12 251:21 258:16	·	102:12,16,17
104:1,4,13,21 105:22 106:15 134:7 162:18 163:15,22 183:17 197:10 2119 20:2,8,10 26:2 58:8 271:4		103:2,3,19,20
127:9 133:18 134:7 162:18 163:15,22 183:17 197:10 aily 20:2,8,10 56:2 58:8 amage 63:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16		104:1,4,13,21
134:7 162:18 163:15,22 183:17 197:10 aily 20:2,8,10 56:2 58:8 amage 63:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16	,	105:22 106:15
163:15,22 183:17 197:10 aily 20:2,8,10 56:2 58:8 amage 63:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16		122:2,7,9,10
183:17 197:10 aily 20:2,8,10 56:2 58:8 amage 63:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16		122:11,13
124:5,9,9,13 125:12 128:4 128:16 129:4 129:11,22 130:11 134:16 134:18 143:1 163:21 164:15 164:18,21 165:3 175:9 181:1 195:21 220:11,19 225:15 228:15 238:22 239:2 248:2,5,16 251:21 258:16 251:21 258:16	,	
56:2 58:8 amage 63:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16		124:5,9,9,13
128:16 129:4 189:6 204:8 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:4 271:11 271:134:16 271:134:18 271:		
189:6 204:8 271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16		128:16 129:4
271:4 amaged 247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16	O	129:11,22
amaged 134:18 143:1 247:21 251:11 163:21 164:15 ampen 249:18 164:18,21 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 220:11,19 ata 6:19 9:2,9 238:22 239:2 19:1,5,6,6 248:2,5,16 26:17 28:3 250:5,12 41:17 44:7 251:21 258:16 261:2,10 262:7		130:11 134:16
247:21 251:11 ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16	_	
ampen 249:18 ark 126:2 145:16 151:8 181:1 195:21 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 250:5,12 251:21 258:16 261:2,10 262:7		163:21 164:15
165:3 175:9 145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16		,
145:16 151:8 arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16 181:1 195:21 220:11,19 225:15 228:15 238:22 239:2 248:2,5,16 250:5,12 251:21 258:16 261:2,10 262:7	-	
arker 151:17 ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 250:5,12 25:15 228:15 238:22 239:2 248:2,5,16 250:5,12 251:21 258:16 261:2,10 262:7		
ata 6:19 9:2,9 19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 250:5,12 25:15 228:15 238:22 239:2 248:2,5,16 250:5,12 251:21 258:16 261:2,10 262:7		,
19:1,5,6,6 26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16 238:22 239:2 248:2,5,16 250:5,12 251:21 258:16 261:2,10 262:7		
26:17 28:3 41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16 248:2,5,16 250:5,12 251:21 258:16 261:2,10 262:7	,	
41:17 44:7 45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16 250:5,12 251:21 258:16 261:2,10 262:7	, , ,	
45:7 47:1 50:15 52:16 251:21 258:16 261:2,10 262:7	41:17 44:7	
50:15 52:16 261:2,10 262:7		
266:15 268:9		
		266:15 268:9

Page 19

[data - depends]

268:16,18	150:20 152:14	defer 109:15	delays 39:11
272:17,21	184:19 189:9	288:9	74:10
274:17 278:18	255:16 256:11	deferring	deliberately
279:3,3,4,5,7	256:12,17	285:15	108:7 230:3
280:12 283:10	257:8	define 44:20	delighted 112:5
284:7,16	dead 118:2	153:5 226:3	184:18
289:14	deafness 6:4	257:19 258:1	delivered 62:7
database 41:18	deal 72:20	283:3	delivers 254:17
44:9 143:16,19	287:7	defined 8:5,7	delivery 93:17
228:19	dealing 144:11	44:14 47:5,19	136:20,22
datapoints	170:9 230:20	93:21 96:16	137:3 138:15
102:19	death 71:13	124:17 192:10	139:1 144:14
dataset 100:6	102:5 130:10	253:11 255:19	delve 154:19
266:17	152:2,6 253:5	258:10,11	demographic
date 103:8	debiasi 3:3	defines 6:22	255:15
104:14 244:18	decade 73:19	209:19	demonstrate
dav 58:20	133:17 221:9	defining 40:3	7:15
dave 143:4	decades 33:1	41:2 178:6	demonstrated
215:17	78:14 94:11	definitely	39:3 79:6
david 2:5 3:5	124:9 125:1	60:10 202:22	demonstrating
163:5 167:4,7	169:18 188:19	232:13 269:8	8:18
175:11 205:11	210:22	276:12,20	demonstration
225:21 227:17	deceiving	definition	91:16 93:10
264:6 277:21	288:5	17:18 19:22	95:19 106:6
david's 110:14	decide 173:18	47:18,20,22	denoted 37:10
day 11:4,10	decision 10:12	71:16 246:7	department
54:15 62:10,20	59:7 165:13	definitions	131:12
62:20 63:4,13	220:21 238:18	18:6 40:12	depend 41:19
64:20 139:6	decrease 58:9	definitive	211:10
267:19 271:11	73:2	134:19	dependent
273:18 279:11	dedicated	degree 227:14	116:9,14
290:6	11:10	239:18	209:17
days 23:6	deemed 77:17	delahoy 2:17	depending
26:13 27:20	deep 184:19	4:12 112:6	39:21 60:5
31:8 64:20	deeper 154:19	121:16,21,22	67:12 116:7
66:22 136:12	defects 6:3	131:7	135:19 159:1,3
137:16 144:8,9	defense 147:17	delay 24:6	depends 48:16
146:5 149:7,9		77:15	141:8 161:22

163:6 200:10	95:18 96:5	127:6,11	developed
244:14 251:10	99:4 101:1,21	128:17,21	44:19 45:22
257:9	103:5 111:3	129:2 130:5,6	87:14 98:19
depicted	153:7 155:3	181:21 247:14	149:21 195:17
133:16	166:6,11	detection	197:11 210:10
deployed 19:10	223:15 225:12	118:16,20	236:16 257:18
27:4 28:13	226:6 261:20	126:9,13,16	developing
depositing	267:16 270:8	128:12	33:10 34:18
180:14	270:15 281:17	deteriorate	42:19 132:1
deputy 12:16	designation	256:12	170:13 177:9
derailing	46:15,16 47:1	deterioration	177:10 197:14
279:20	47:10,22	259:13	207:7 217:8
derive 19:5	designations	determinants	225:8 268:13
20:18	48:12	60:15	276:10 288:12
derived 18:15	designed 43:2	determination	development
93:21 119:20	111:11 226:10	46:20	1:1 5:5 10:3,11
207:16 209:6	270:22 278:15	determine	10:19 11:2
266:17 281:19	278:18	22:17 100:22	13:20 16:16
281:20	designing 9:17	120:10	25:9 30:22
describe 17:6	43:10 84:13	determined	32:3,6,10
40:16 105:13	261:4 269:9	288:16	33:21 36:11
153:2 190:22	designs 9:19	determines	42:16 46:8,11
258:20	80:4 81:10	102:2	47:12 48:15
described	95:5 188:4	determining	49:9,14 50:10
95:18 115:20	223:2	96:20	50:20 51:11
118:8 119:9,21	desirable 81:8	detroit 61:8	52:7,10,22
190:21 255:7	despite 34:8	66:7	75:17 76:19
258:18 259:2	destined	devastating	77:4,11,20
describing	263:10	170:10 193:10	78:14 79:11,14
40:22 244:13	detail 15:22	develop 58:21	79:20 80:4,6
description	99:14,19	63:8 71:9 87:4	81:5,9 82:14
229:18	detailed 96:8	104:13 108:3	84:3 85:5,13
deserves	details 25:6	142:17 144:16	86:4,7,14,21
111:15	104:16	144:20 146:7	88:2,9,14
design 27:1	detect 130:12	175:15 177:7,7	89:10,15 90:1
44:4 52:14	249:11 250:4	184:7 192:1	90:6,22 91:16
53:19,20 71:1	detected 125:4	200:12,14	93:12 104:19
80:7 83:1 94:1	125:14 126:6	206:1 208:3	105:2,7,17

106:16 113:16	dic 257:19	248:8 254:14	directed 154:3
117:15 149:15	dichotomy	257:14 259:1,3	245:20
150:5 163:2	96:13	261:22 265:14	direction 278:9
166:13,17	didp 58:20	265:20 272:21	directly 57:21
167:5 168:3,7	die 175:20	274:4 282:16	180:2 239:8
170:2 188:10	died 5:21 129:6	285:14	director 5:12
192:7 195:16	129:9 252:6	differentiate	12:16 30:10
196:9 206:4	differ 130:5	28:22	59:5 75:14
210:11 213:16	difference	differently	90:19 167:11
219:12 220:8	96:11 114:3	35:17	disabilities 6:4
222:12 235:3	152:7 193:22	difficult 40:14	disability 71:13
249:20 275:21	275:7 276:3	65:17 121:7	disadvantage
280:5	277:3,11 280:7	169:13 176:2	14:15 15:5,9
developmental	differences	182:15 200:14	25:16 27:16
35:13 39:12	96:21 98:21	211:12 215:3	disagree 190:8
49:10 60:16	133:8 240:4	221:8 247:11	disappointme
73:15	different 22:7	difficulties	68:11
developments	44:10,14 45:15	77:18 78:1	discern 36:7
76:9,11	51:4 55:11,13	109:11	discerning
devices 92:22	63:18 64:12	difficulty 199:2	119:5
147:8	81:2,20 95:1	199:12	discharge
dhhs 16:6	111:16 117:18	dig 110:7	245:7 248:9
diagnosed	120:18 125:15	digital 291:8	disciplines
188:12,12	135:10 143:3,6	292:3	109:15
diagnoses	143:7,9,10	dilute 287:13	disclose 76:14
182:12 250:20	145:15 147:22	dilution 119:21	disclosures
diagnosis 64:6	150:20 168:15	dilutions	12:1 13:4
73:22 74:14,15	168:15,16,19	117:22 118:6	31:10
diagnostic 22:2	173:14,16	dimensions	discontinuati
22:8,10 27:12	177:8 180:17	24:21	77:21
143:17 186:7	181:11,18	dionna 30:10	discordance
202:21 203:8	183:17 186:5	direct 13:15	118:19
203:12	193:2,13,13	16:22 17:16	discount
diagnostics	202:18 203:1	18:8,9,19,22	192:21
178:1 186:6	204:1 207:5	21:9,13 26:18	discriminate
187:22 201:9	208:17 214:22	110:4,17,21	182:21
dialogue 89:1	226:19 227:9	192:18 252:7	discuss 10:1
272:20	229:10 232:18		14:3 31:12

Meeting

May 7, 2024

37:3 43:4 48:3	disease 5:17	204:7 222:12	dissatisfier
52:3 109:1,15	7:1,1 8:6,22	223:2 236:10	64:5
111:22 168:2	26:4 29:15	239:11 241:19	disseminated
223:17 267:9	30:19 35:3	241:21 242:9	134:3,13
281:2	36:4 37:10,17	242:12,20	distinct 9:7
discussed	38:2 41:8 46:8	243:14 245:2,4	38:1,7
36:11 47:20	46:15,19,21	246:6 247:19	distinction
51:19 166:11	47:1,4,5,8,19	248:2 249:10	20:4 48:3
170:18 236:13	47:21 49:20	249:11,12,20	105:11 193:21
discussing	50:20,21 51:1	249:22 250:4	202:6
25:10 38:12	51:2,7,11,19	251:2,9 252:2	distinguish
49:21 76:3,19	51:21 52:15	253:5 254:9	242:5
89:7 92:18	55:17 70:10,18	255:9 258:11	distress 57:13
122:8 166:19	82:17 117:8,16	259:12 261:1	distribution
211:11	121:18 130:9	263:6 266:12	57:3
discussion	130:20 133:7	267:2 280:5	ditch 181:15
10:16 11:6,12	134:5 135:12	287:11	dive 184:19
13:9,19 15:19	137:20,22	diseases 5:13	diverse 81:17
16:16 19:18	139:6 140:6,10	32:7 33:14	82:9 84:2
21:22 23:2	141:17 142:22	46:12 48:5	diversity 212:9
24:12 27:18	144:6,20,22	49:15 121:18	division 5:13
29:9 46:8 61:5	145:8,15 146:7	131:11 157:22	49:19 75:15
66:20 82:13	146:14,20	167:10,12,12	112:11 121:17
109:1 111:9,16	147:15,20	172:6,22	167:9,11
132:14 154:19	148:14 149:17	174:17 175:19	285:15
166:5,10	150:3,7 152:12	179:6 184:19	divisions 33:16
178:17 190:17	154:7,12 155:4	185:4 216:2,22	93:7
198:21 213:9	155:9,18,22	220:9,22 221:7	document
223:7,14	156:1,6 157:10	221:12,18,22	28:18 219:19
236:21 241:4	162:20 169:4,5	221:22 222:2,8	documentation
264:10,15	172:19,20	252:17 279:10	25:4 227:9
266:19 276:18	173:13,16,16	280:6	documents
283:9 290:1	174:22 175:2	disincentive	29:19,21 46:5
discussions	175:16 177:2	274:7	106:5
31:7,15 38:15	178:5,5 184:7	disorder 20:15	doing 74:16
41:10,12 46:10	191:8 192:2,2	disparity 66:10	99:8 170:16
58:22 90:14	192:7,7 196:13	display 130:7	173:6 180:5
222:16	199:6 201:16		181:3 182:6

[doing - dr] Page 23

188:3 195:3	dosing 56:4	158:3 159:10	200:2,4,6,16
207:11 220:7	double 150:11	159:11,13,16	201:17,17,18
224:17,22	doubt 252:3	160:8,11,13,16	202:2,4,7
225:6 229:10	doubt 232.3 dovetail 237:5	160:17,19	202.2,4,7
247:9 251:5		, ,	,
	downplay 65:4 downtown	161:1,4,5,5,7 161:21 163:10	204:12,14,15
268:11 269:19	61:8		206:9,9,10,11
270:13 273:13		163:12,13	207:8,8,9,11
dollars 243:16	dr 4:3,4,5,6,8,9	164:10,10,11	208:21,21,22
domains	4:10,11,12,13	164:17,20	209:3 211:21
285:14	5:2 12:10,10	166:2,9 167:4	212:10 213:8
domestic	12:10,11,11,15	167:6,7,11,13	213:18,21
121:17	12:17,20 25:19	167:15 168:9	214:3,16,18,20
dominant	30:8,10,14,14	168:11 170:4,5	215:5,13,18
208:12	30:15 31:1,2	170:5,5,7	216:12 217:1,3
dorothy 175:10	36:11 37:5	171:12,13,15	217:12,12,12
dose 45:7 49:22	38:3 47:17	173:9,9,10	218:7 219:22
50:5,12 52:13	49:17,17,18,20	174:10,10,12	219:22 220:2
53:8,9,22 54:6	50:2,3 59:3,3	176:3,4,5	221:14,14
54:9,13,18	75:12,13,16,19	178:13,14,16	222:10 223:5
55:3,15 56:6,6	75:20 90:16,16	179:18,18,19	223:12,22
56:7,8 57:11	90:18,18,20	179:21 180:1	224:2,3 225:17
57:20 58:3,16	91:1,2 106:21	182:10 183:11	225:19,19,21
148:16 268:4	106:21 107:9	183:13,15,22	226:22 227:4,6
268:10 275:8	107:10 108:15	184:1,2 185:16	228:1,2,7,17
275:16,17	108:15,20,21	185:18,19,21	228:18,20,21
276:16,20	109:17,17	186:21 187:11	229:7,9,13,15
277:1,6,12,13	110:8,8,10	188:5,6,15	229:16,18
277:19 280:8	111:4,4,7,19	190:9,9,12,14	231:9,10,11,12
280:11,13,14	112:3,6,6,6,10	190:15 192:15	232:19,19,20
287:15,19	112:12,15,16	192:16,17,17	233:18,18,19
288:16,21	121:12,12,15	192:19,20,21	237:2 239:4,13
doses 19:11,15	121:21,22	193:16,16,17	239:14,15,17
58:1,2 108:5	131:6,6,8,9,17	193:18,19	239:21 240:22
109:21 110:2,3	131:18 153:12	194:4 195:6,7	241:1,1,19
268:14 276:21	153:12 154:2,3	195:8 196:21	242:16,16
277:5 280:4	154:4,5,14,21	197:3,5,17	243:18,20,20
287:10,12,22	155:1 156:19	198:9,11,12	243:22 244:1,7
	157:1,2,3,4,5	199:20,22	244:10,12,21

[dr - dyad] Page 24

244:22 245:12	284:8,10	49:13 50:10,20	288:15 289:2
245:15,16,17	286:20,21	52:7,10 53:17	drug's 8:22
245:18,19,21	287:1,17,18	56:10,21 57:3	drugged
245:21 246:1,3	288:11 289:1,2	75:17 76:8,10	108:10
246:4,4,8	289:3,4,6,20	77:11,19 78:13	drugs 16:17
247:5,6,7,7,9	draft 92:5	79:11,14,20	32:22 39:12
248:3,3,4,4	99:17	81:8 82:14	41:17,20 78:19
249:6,6,7,8	draw 21:8	84:3 85:12	84:17 92:11,13
250:6,7,8,9,10	231:6,6	86:21 88:9	92:19 93:4
250:11 251:14	dreaded 63:7	89:9,15 90:22	106:4,9 149:14
251:19,20,21	dreadful	92:2 101:14,18	168:21 170:13
252:11,11,13	230:21	103:16 104:19	170:17 177:7,7
252:14,14,21	dream 241:12	105:1,17	187:7 188:1
253:7,8,19	243:19	106:15 108:1	189:20 201:4
255:2,2,5,12	dreams 60:11	109:3,4 110:3	204:2 209:16
255:13 256:19	drive 24:15	162:1,5 168:2	210:7,9,19,22
256:19,20,21	168:7 170:2	170:2 200:11	211:9,11
257:1,3,12,12	driven 32:10	200:13 201:12	212:14 214:22
257:15,16	87:4 102:20	209:16,19	231:17 232:13
258:14 259:6	105:1	210:3 211:1,13	246:13 272:19
260:1,13,14,15	driving 80:2	211:19 212:7	due 5:18,21
260:16,17,18	89:20	212:13 220:8	9:18 15:7
261:6,6,8	drug 1:1 5:5	222:12 225:9	33:16 36:2
263:2,22,22	6:22 7:12,19	230:19 231:19	49:10 87:10
264:2,7,16	10:2,11,18	231:22 242:22	123:10 149:6
266:8,18,21	11:2 16:19	243:1,9 246:18	228:1 249:13
267:4,6,8,11	19:8,8,9 20:22	254:1,4,21	252:7 284:11
267:11,13	24:6 25:9	262:9,21 265:3	duke 46:2
268:5 269:8,17	26:19 30:22	265:10 267:21	duly 291:5
269:17,18	32:10,11,17	268:2,8,14	duper 279:18
270:2,11,18	33:21 34:22	269:1 270:6,12	279:19
271:20,22	35:6 36:6,11	271:5,10,11	duration 19:12
273:14 275:5,7	38:17 39:17	273:6,22 274:4	24:7 83:2
276:19 277:8	41:20 42:11,16	274:6,22	216:1
277:10 279:22	42:17 46:8,11	275:21 276:2,3	durations
280:2,3 281:12	46:15,20 47:2	276:14,15,17	277:5
281:13,22	47:3,3,19	280:5 282:21	dyad 243:9
283:7,11,13	48:12,13 49:9	283:21 288:7	

dye 118:3,3	easier 185:15	212:1 252:20	27:13 83:4
dynamic 55:22	185:22 186:2	260:12 280:11	115:19 119:11
dysfunction	226:13 230:8	effectiveness	136:19 141:13
141:14 142:15	230:19 263:20	7:16 8:13,19	147:10 148:6
e	268:1 276:12	9:10 34:6	152:14 170:2
e 2:1,1 3:1,1	276:17,18	36:13,20 37:14	196:9 198:7
4:1 5:1,1	easy 19:20	41:16 221:21	212:17 230:17
e11a 88:6	102:10 202:14	222:21 252:18	242:16 243:3
	eat 63:9	effects 39:17	253:11,11
ear 56:20,21 57:1	echo 115:4	97:1 118:8	254:2 256:14
earlier 40:13	132:21 142:3	248:1 250:20	256:14 267:11
	232:12	287:14	268:2 270:9
71:11 77:12	echoing 222:10	efficacy 7:11	289:14
87:1 102:22	echovirus	7:13 8:5,15 9:2	elapsed 158:14
106:12 136:3 144:18 154:11	125:3,20,21	26:3 36:6 42:9	electronic 96:8
165:5 168:17	127:9,9 136:4	50:22 51:5	98:16 100:11
177:17 184:9	145:6 173:22	56:12 66:15	element 17:3
	197:11 261:14	88:8 101:5	26:9
184:10 190:11	echoviruses	168:20 232:1	elements 7:22
198:13,22 200:7 213:19	113:13 141:1	efficiency	17:12 21:20
222:11 231:16	141:18 142:3	39:20 79:7	elevated 225:3
232:13 248:14	161:16	efficient 86:13	255:3
252:19,21	ecmo 147:7	89:10	elicited 194:21
'	ecosystem	effort 33:8	eligibility 8:5
260:3,19 266:9 270:19 278:7	93:16	41:11 87:6	48:17 281:7
278:22 284:22	educated 71:22	149:22 172:14	elimination
earliest 146:6	72:2,2	176:12,12,13	57:4
early 28:13	education	177:5 217:20	elisa 119:8
35:11 44:4	63:17	efforts 31:17	ema 89:3
70:20,22 73:16	eeg 62:4	41:5 80:2	emerged
77:3 82:16	effect 7:19 8:8	87:21 89:17	133:17
127:17,18	8:22 39:6	212:16	emergence
136:11 156:7	42:12 55:19	egress 117:1	209:8
156:10,14	164:16 287:16	egressed 114:6	emergency
185:1 217:16	effective 23:18	ehr 100:2	62:7 106:2
231:15 234:19	24:2 28:1 39:6	eighteen 164:2	emphasis 82:15
234:20 246:12	39:12 69:14	either 19:6	90:3
257.20 240.12	77:18 92:14	22:2 24:5	

emphasize 38:4	endorse 276:20	engaging 83:9	ensuing 31:14
43:6 48:2	277:4	enhanced	ensure 43:1
72:11,11 77:13	endorsement	18:18	44:4,11 77:2
81:15 85:12	91:10	enhancing	101:4
190:5	endosome	88:14	ensuring 8:6
empiric 146:16	116:7,10	enrich 156:16	14:14,18 25:15
146:21 188:10	endpoint 36:22	enriched 85:13	25:18 89:9
189:20	39:21 40:5	148:7 157:16	enter 107:8
empirically	118:6 119:21	162:10	154:1 167:20
186:18 211:9	184:14 220:16	enroll 14:20,21	enteric 122:15
employed	220:18 242:19	68:7 109:21	123:17
291:11,14	247:14 248:8	154:7,10 172:1	entero 174:13
292:8,11	248:12 259:22	172:13 224:15	175:13 182:12
employee	263:13,18,19	240:5,19	190:20 205:16
291:13 292:10	263:21 273:7	269:10 272:12	209:12 250:19
enable 80:3	284:20 286:3	272:14 273:20	251:7,16
81:13 87:5	endpoints 8:8	280:22 281:8	enteros 114:5
encapsidated	9:20 39:19	283:21	183:5,6,7
116:19	40:3 43:13	enrolled 15:6	204:21
encephalitis	102:22 103:1	72:15 109:13	enteroviral 5:6
134:3,9 141:9	150:20 178:6	150:22 151:2	5:18 6:14,16
247:15	220:19 223:2	196:1 224:20	7:6 9:7 10:3
encephalomy	223:19 225:7	234:13	11:5 25:21
134:4	229:21 230:4	enrolling 26:7	28:11 48:10
encephalopat	230:10 233:10	29:22 230:13	51:21 55:18
59:6 62:22	244:20 245:6	245:1,3 267:17	154:7 160:3,4
63:14,22	245:10 248:9	269:7 274:14	160:12 173:7
234:21	254:10 255:1	274:14	188:12 200:18
encoded	260:22 265:8	enrollment	201:13,16
115:19	ends 74:6	29:1 59:8	203:18 219:13
encounter 20:2	enemy 262:13	70:15 71:2,8	224:8 247:10
encountered	energy 219:15	97:14 223:18	251:1,8 252:16
58:8	engage 199:18	224:9 225:2	enterovirus 1:2
encourage 81:7	engaged 73:3,9	238:22 255:10	25:10 38:6
217:7,13 220:6	115:14 116:12	272:6 273:2	41:10 46:10
220:6	engagement	281:4 288:3	48:4 112:1,4
ended 287:4	72:6,13 93:8	enrolls 108:4	113:2,4,12
		216:14	116:7 120:3,15

122:3,7,13,14	213:17 217:8	228:11	eradication
123:4,13,15,21	224:14,17	environmental	149:22
124:3,10,12,20	243:4,5,8	181:16	erroneous
125:14 127:2	250:19 251:16	envision	254:2
127:14,16,18	266:12 270:4	201:12	erythropoietin
128:6,12,17,21	285:18	envisioned	235:11
129:10,17	enteroviruses	200:18	es 291:4
130:1,5,7,8,11	114:4,22 115:4	envisioning	especially
130:13,16,18	116:21 119:4	275:22	42:17 43:8,11
130:21 131:15	120:7,17	enzyme 57:5	56:2 58:11
132:8,15	132:17 134:1	109:7 116:13	60:9 139:8
133:13,18	134:10,16,21	213:7	144:8 181:4
134:7,7,8	135:20 136:8	enzymes 35:15	191:5 203:9
135:2,15,15	140:18 147:16	epi 6:19	211:11 237:17
136:15,19,22	147:17 148:1	epidemic 137:9	238:20 267:20
137:9,13 138:4	152:6 161:16	epidemiologic	271:20
138:11 139:12	162:2,12,18	48:5 122:2	essence 14:13
140:10 141:17	168:15 169:2	136:17	essential 70:12
142:21 143:17	171:11,19	epidemiologist	71:2 81:16
144:11 145:14	174:18 176:1	121:16	essentially 9:22
146:12,20	180:5,17 186:9	epidemiology	establish 7:12
147:14 148:14	189:2,21	112:1,5 131:11	9:10 34:6
149:6,17 150:3	190:20 199:7	135:1,14	36:19 38:16
150:13,17	202:17,19	189:14 279:1	280:17
151:3,5 152:12	203:1 206:22	epilepsy 74:12	established
153:3 154:11	207:14 210:5	74:22	23:18,21 24:2
155:4,8,21	261:22 279:1	epileptics	28:1 84:8
156:14 162:7	entire 72:8	87:16	88:22 91:22
162:10,18,18	74:2 175:5	equally 17:21	252:19
163:7 166:6,11	entirely 11:10	41:15	establishing
166:18 168:3,8	106:16	equate 18:19	7:11 8:12
169:8 171:4	entitled 59:6	equipoise	36:12 41:15
178:5,20	75:16 112:13	273:5 288:6	estimate 58:15
179:15 180:10	131:14	equity 32:15	estimates 6:5
194:17 195:16	environment	69:11	et 29:7 140:14
196:13 197:6,9	35:9,20 43:17	er 51:3	223:2
201:22 208:18	64:21 192:9	era 94:8 157:21	ethical 12:17
209:20 212:8	205:21 206:18	251:22 282:3	13:1,10,11

14:4 15:19	44:12,16,21	evolution 78:13	excellent
19:15 23:3,8	eventually 58:3	96:9 105:2	110:12 171:13
25:9,13 26:9	142:17 203:19	evolve 96:7	176:3 217:1
29:21 109:19	246:19	ex 35:9,19	223:6 239:4
166:14 236:2	everybody	exacerbate	250:7
288:1	108:9 110:12	191:7	except 282:4
ethically 276:9	227:3 233:22	exact 18:7	excerpts 99:19
ethics 13:8	247:10 268:3	exactly 203:20	excessive 15:7
30:11 109:22	281:19	examining	exchange 10:6
274:13	evidence 7:16	99:21	89:2
etiology 134:1	8:13,19 33:5	example 21:8	exciting 68:14
europe 136:3	36:13,20 37:14	22:1 28:7 42:5	71:12
ev 120:7,18	41:16 73:18	42:17 44:13	exclusion 83:1
123:9,11	78:8 90:19,22	50:14 51:14	exclusively
125:15 127:9	91:14,15,18	53:7 54:20	37:21
129:16 163:15	92:2,10,17	55:18 56:10,19	excreted 108:2
163:22 182:12	93:2,19,20	57:9 73:6,13	excuse 95:13
182:17,20	94:4,6,17 95:1	79:10 84:7	103:3 130:2
183:19 197:10	95:3,12 97:21	85:19 86:18	execution
197:10	98:1,20 99:6,9	87:7,21 89:1	80:10
evaluate 26:13	100:16 101:1,9	93:11 101:7	executive 59:5
58:15 92:1	101:14,19	125:17 126:11	exemplifies
94:16 170:20	102:12 104:1,4	132:21 162:5	88:12 145:11
evaluated 45:9	104:19 105:1	186:22 187:15	exhaustive
58:1 101:22	106:2,3,11,15	188:18 194:4,5	84:4
149:16	136:10 155:18	196:11 203:3	exist 72:1
evaluating	173:21 174:2	208:20 209:18	164:22
17:11 78:19	209:7 221:4,21	210:7 212:13	existence 49:6
85:1 100:15	222:20 223:1	212:18 234:12	existing 70:3
106:11	283:11 288:19	239:12 240:12	78:19 106:10
evaluation 35:6	evidenced	281:6	exists 241:16
42:9 77:2 85:6	136:9	examples 21:18	expand 89:20
86:4	evident 89:14	39:3 82:10	expanded 66:1
evans 205:11	138:5 141:15	83:22 84:6	150:2 152:19
event 44:13	evidentiary	106:7 144:1	179:2 269:21
179:3	7:10 105:9	excellence	271:15
events 39:16	106:10 221:20	92:20	expansion
40:9 42:4	222:1 286:11		83:15

expect 6:10	expose 272:14	extremely	failure 142:8
13:7 85:10	exposed 15:7	209:12 211:14	145:3 147:10
211:2 265:6	24:10 63:17	extremities	259:18,19
expectation	119:7 271:15	133:11	fair 265:11
42:14	exposes 275:13	f	fairly 7:18
expected 42:16	exposing 20:13	face 96:19	169:7
110:21 218:4	274:14,14	faces 49:9	fairness 289:10
expecting 60:9	exposure 40:10	235:6	fall 38:6 102:13
expedited	42:19 51:3,17	facets 68:22	127:17 135:17
46:12	52:20 53:17	facilitate 10:6	172:2
expensive	54:4,4,7,11,12	76:8 80:21	falls 20:12
172:9,11	54:15 206:17	89:1 213:15	familiar 8:11
experience	207:13 269:1	facilitating	61:3 63:19
15:3,8 20:8,9	274:19,21	75:16 80:10	families 44:6
41:19 59:16	275:1 276:8	facilities	59:22 60:3
60:10 67:2	express 219:2	123:22	61:2,13 64:11
105:15 229:12	expressed	fact 14:5,7 65:3	64:15 65:19
230:15 234:7	35:16 91:5	121:2 163:13	66:16,17 68:4
234:12 273:15	extent 184:21	169:4 170:2	68:8,15 71:4
experiences	261:15	175:1 182:4	72:1,15,16
18:10 59:10	exterior 113:22	191:13 192:13	73:1,5,9 75:6
65:18 234:17	external 93:7	194:14,22	79:2 173:4
235:12	96:22	195:15 205:4	230:13 231:5
experiencing	externally	251:17	235:22 236:5,7
24:9	97:18 98:3	factor 144:13	236:14 237:15
experimental	99:2 285:5,6	187:18	238:15,19
66:21 173:4	286:13,17	factors 35:5	272:12
expert 283:11	289:11	36:2 41:19	family 38:22
expertise 81:4	extra 158:12	44:10 48:17	43:20 63:13
87:2	191:18	68:6 70:11	64:13 68:6 71:20 72:13
experts 88:4 259:8	extraordinarily 182:14	77:22 94:21	
explore 68:22	extrapolated	102:21 144:4	76:2 112:20,22 136:17 139:4
286:15	8:16 26:3	154:9 155:22	199:14 235:11
explored 68:18	extrapolation	156:4,7 163:16	236:10 238:8
69:22	8:20 9:2 37:5,8	265:20 273:1	238:12 275:10
explosion	37:12,18,20	273:12	276:12,13,15
157:21	38:9 83:4 88:8		277:14
131.21	30.9 03.4 00.0		4//.14

Meeting

family's 267:19	104:3 105:6	fever 137:16	finish 217:10
fantastic 73:20	108:14 112:12	138:18 139:16	249:4 289:4
far 69:12	152:17 184:18	fewer 47:9	finished 227:13
110:13 132:10	184:21 217:16	58:10	finite 68:10
149:12 150:5	218:8 220:5	fiction 66:20	first 12:15
152:16 165:3	232:10 242:6	field 10:7 39:2	13:15 14:14,18
171:20 216:18	260:6 269:15	93:15 214:15	18:8 19:22
226:19 240:2	272:2	263:1	23:10,21 27:22
247:21 251:10	fda's 91:15	fight 67:20	37:3 49:3,5
260:9 271:5	feasibility	figure 37:7	50:9,20 52:12
279:20 287:10	97:15 288:18	52:8 62:21	55:5,8 60:21
farley 2:6	feasible 36:16	72:19 97:4	95:21 98:16
fast 189:4	44:5 69:13	100:4 121:5	102:16 108:16
201:3	87:5 103:1	figured 160:21	110:11 112:10
faster 149:1	feature 12:6	203:19	139:5,8,9
151:12 169:17	206:15	filed 14:11	144:7,8 146:1
269:10	features 138:5	fill 226:17	146:4 148:13
fatal 124:11	208:5	final 116:13,13	174:20 193:15
father 231:20	febrile 132:20	260:16 264:9	195:10 206:18
fault 102:15	133:6 145:16	finally 13:17	209:5 211:19
faulty 258:12	145:22	15:12 36:2	224:1 243:22
favor 206:16	february 172:3	44:7 185:3	244:2 255:16
favorable 18:1	fecal 117:6	211:7	264:13 281:12
fda 2:8,9,10,11	federal 6:22	financial 76:13	firstly 76:21
2:13,14,15,16	feedback 29:7	132:3	132:18
2:19 5:14 7:4	feeding 63:11	financially	fisher 203:4
10:5,9,14 16:5	feel 40:16	291:15 292:11	fit 40:19
29:19 30:20	64:10 154:22	find 49:1 71:7	100:18,19
32:16 33:3,8	185:22 188:9	182:8,15 197:7	107:11 208:12
46:5 47:15	243:2,20	210:6 240:18	fitness 192:8,9
49:12,20 52:8	259:20	242:18 267:15	five 16:15 92:7
58:20 69:18	feeling 272:7	277:15	95:21 114:13
75:16 79:5	feels 37:1 40:14	finding 280:13	115:9,11 128:8
84:16 87:15	278:12	findings 258:19	174:2 209:11
89:3 90:12,20	feet 253:12	fine 65:6	256:11,12
91:6 94:16	fellow 65:9	193:11 262:19	fivefold 114:15
98:9 100:14	felt 18:11 62:12	finer 258:22	114:20
101:4,19,22			

[flaccid - fully] Page 31

flaccid 121:16	242:11	formulations	169:20 241:5
134:6	fold 258:3	55:11	242:15
flagged 64:1	folks 232:9	forth 194:2	framework
flash 201:7	follow 24:22	222:5 227:10	7:10 13:10,12
flat 56:7	50:17 174:9	fortunate 66:2	14:4 15:19
243:13,16	182:10 188:6	fortunately	21:5 25:9,14
253:12	198:4,8 215:22	137:13,20	26:9 88:7 92:5
flavor 132:7	217:2 239:1	170:11 233:6	92:17 106:5
flaw 281:16	252:13 254:20	forty 164:3	frameworks
flexibility	260:17 280:2	forum 277:22	87:3
221:7,11 222:6	followed 13:16	forums 89:5	france 136:3
227:14,15	180:3	forward 10:16	free 115:11
254:9 286:12	following 48:9	90:13 95:9,20	154:22 188:9
flight 67:20	137:3	96:2 106:17	243:20
floor 223:20	food 6:22 27:18	166:18 201:3	freeze 67:20
267:11	223:7	222:17 223:3	158:22
flow 119:15	foot 13:8 133:7	227:20 258:11	frequency
fluid 56:16	footprint	262:16,22	211:3
focus 11:4	103:22	288:19 290:5	frequent
12:17 16:8	forced 179:12	foster 79:19	139:22
29:9 32:2	ford 61:8 66:3	fostering 89:21	frequently
46:14 76:7	66:6	218:4	51:10 125:4
80:8 85:20	foregoing	fosters 88:3	127:6,10
112:4 118:2	291:3,4 292:4	found 14:13	front 160:3
124:5 134:22	foretaste 220:3	187:14 237:10	178:11 230:21
184:2 223:14	forget 241:7	foundation	270:3
230:9 245:11	279:21	69:8	frontal 63:5
265:12 281:9	forgiving 225:1	four 13:14	frustrating
focused 20:18	form 52:12	14:14 25:14	64:18
38:5 61:19	114:19 134:17	29:21 93:12	frustration
70:7 82:8	142:6 226:17	123:8 126:3	219:2
88:18 94:3,22	formalized	164:2 165:8	fulfill 84:10
155:15,16	72:7	256:11	full 9:5 10:20
195:11 240:21	formally 12:15	fourth 14:16	61:2,16 62:4
244:18	forms 173:15	fragment	65:1,3,6 138:8
focusing 17:4	formulation	118:12 183:1	259:3,19
82:1,3 105:11	55:9	frame 27:18	fully 66:1
233:16 239:10		40:6 115:17	83:18 274:12

[function - gives]

function 35:21	gaps 10:7	generating	269:5 275:10
142:17 147:6	gatekeeping	83:16	276:14,15,16
functional	68:4	generation	276:17 279:19
40:16	gates 69:7	95:1 98:1	286:7 287:6
functions 37:1	gathered	118:17 166:1	gi 35:22 55:19
40:14	225:15	generically	136:20 138:18
fundamentally	gathering	139:16	139:21
96:6 285:21	226:1	genes 193:12	give 73:13
funded 85:3	genera 113:1,2	genetic 183:4	93:11 99:14
175:18 183:18	general 11:1	genetics 192:4	108:22 125:17
funders 228:2	12:3 13:10	192:5,13	132:7,13 135:1
funding 70:17	18:12 33:21	genome 114:8	142:20 156:17
74:7 84:9	36:9 38:4 41:7	115:8,8,10,15	158:13,16
172:9 176:14	63:3 64:18	116:9,16,18	159:1 161:8
177:2,7 184:17	80:15,17 96:3	118:13 192:2	178:1 186:22
214:9,21 215:1	99:11 129:11	205:5 210:4	188:2 196:15
215:22 216:3	129:22 135:16	genomes 115:6	198:12,15
228:2,9	147:17 179:13	182:13,22	203:17 210:22
furman 163:22	186:10 197:1	genomic 121:8	218:5 231:16
further 153:2	199:18 286:8	genus 113:2,3,4	231:18,19
207:6,10 266:6	generalizable	113:6,13	243:6,9,22
291:13 292:9	20:14	geographical	244:1,19
future 90:2	generalize	82:3	245:12 252:19
106:14,18	163:5	geographically	257:12 270:6
222:18 225:12	generally 117:5	82:9	271:5,12 276:7
225:16 231:3	117:21 118:11	geography	283:10
g	119:14 137:19	171:3	given 23:13
g 5:1	146:6 155:10	geriatric 98:7	69:14 86:11
gag 63:10	233:7 252:19	gestation 35:8	89:12 106:6
gain 239:10	274:8,9	gestational	107:21 146:16
263:21	generate 94:14	45:9,14 68:21	146:21 160:10
gained 20:13	104:4 212:16	getting 39:11	171:4,11 178:4
25:2	212:17 248:2,6	62:5 70:5	185:11 223:7
ganciclovir	generated	105:15 169:22	278:14 283:9
51:16	101:1 174:20	172:13 206:20	gives 114:14
gap 34:14 57:6	174:21 175:9	215:11 222:7	122:19 143:22
70:14	194:16 195:2	228:14 254:1,1	279:7
	225:15	254:7 268:3	

giving 90:11	163:14 185:11	gold 110:19	151:6 165:5
149:2 158:6,12	going 13:7 15:4	good 5:2 12:20	169:6
205:10 243:2	15:18 16:8	66:8,10 75:22	graphic 62:3
287:21	18:5 23:4,12	107:13,17	253:18
glad 236:22	25:8,13 30:2	117:15 122:1	graphs 165:5
glitch 215:21	36:9 46:7,13	137:20 142:22	grave 142:10
global 75:18	50:4 59:15	155:3 157:5	gray 126:4
76:10 86:10	60:10 62:20	161:21 162:5,5	great 66:9 73:6
87:18,22 88:7	63:8 68:13,14	162:6,15	111:19 157:6
88:13 105:4	69:1,7 70:8,9	164:20 172:15	157:21 178:17
globally 89:20	96:2 100:17	172:17 200:17	190:14 204:13
181:11,12	103:15 107:22	238:22 240:6	214:17 237:16
go 14:16 25:5	108:1 111:21	254:11 261:12	264:9 267:8
25:13 48:22	113:1,9 134:13	262:13 274:22	greater 17:13
64:3 67:18	161:8 164:6	276:4 279:3,4	148:22 221:6
74:8 97:4	169:18 173:11	288:8	greatly 45:6
100:6 104:16	177:19 179:9	google 64:3	green 30:10
141:14 147:7	180:10,18	gotten 232:7	114:18
155:9 156:1	184:6 185:20	govern 13:12	greenberg
157:2 175:4	186:4 196:22	government	84:19
198:10,12	200:13 208:10	85:4 215:14	grounded
200:4 211:18	208:11 209:21	grace 258:8	88:10
218:17 223:22	214:3 215:13	gradation	group 8:4
226:13 228:16	216:7 219:4,4	258:22	81:15 84:22
240:19 245:17	228:10 230:18	gradations	96:22 110:18
245:18 251:7	233:9 237:7	259:4	115:1 135:4
251:11 252:12	239:22 243:11	grade 44:21	150:10 151:6,8
252:20 264:13	247:2,16,19,21	233:2	151:9,11,17,18
264:15 273:11	256:6 258:11	granted 48:12	151:20 153:1
286:13 287:15	264:17 268:21	87:10 102:6	155:13 156:17
288:19	271:6,7 273:4	granting	163:6 165:16
goal 10:18	273:22,22	175:22	165:17 176:16
31:21 79:22	274:1,8 275:12	granular 124:2	187:14 189:16
89:9 132:6	276:14,15,16	graph 124:22	190:3,6 191:16
207:4	277:20 278:4,4	125:12 126:12	198:3 235:4
goals 261:3	279:16 281:2	126:15 127:14	254:1,1 264:22
goes 25:1 72:17	281:12 282:13	143:5 145:10	281:2 283:19
116:16 125:19	285:4	145:18,19	

grouping	h	215:1 227:4	healthcare
224:19	half 74:12	241:10 261:2	18:18 20:3
groups 29:7	hallmark 141:1	267:2 271:17	78:9 91:18
65:7 123:6	hand 65:15	272:19	93:17 96:3
165:8 223:19	107:5,16,18	harder 178:7	healthy 20:2,9
235:9 259:19	133:7,9 140:7	178:10 231:22	173:2
267:10 281:19	140:10 152:2	harm 24:9	hear 38:21
growing 77:5	153:20 167:19	288:8	43:19 84:17
guardian 13:18	178:14 179:12	harmonization	97:20 111:1
24:14	185:18 190:10	87:20 88:12	156:22 157:3
guardians	190:12 198:7	90:5	173:4 179:20
15:15	198:11,13	harmonize	192:18 198:18
guess 159:17	200:1 236:22	87:21	214:7,14 215:7
160:5 179:1	253:14 257:1	harmonized	215:16,17,18
183:15 184:4,4	275:6 284:13	88:7	225:19 227:21
184:6 200:22	286:22	harrowing	229:11 238:11
215:3,21 218:1	hands 179:20	65:17	244:4 255:14
255:6 264:2	280:1 281:11	hate 269:11	271:19 272:4
266:21 267:14	happen 59:1	haystack 182:4	heard 18:6
278:6 288:13	70:18	182:4	62:15 70:8
guidance 29:19	happened	he'll 63:9,11	77:11 101:22
29:21 46:5	242:2	65:6	102:22 107:3
78:10 91:15	happening	head 68:18	109:20 110:13
92:6 93:12	60:4 171:4,5	167:4 253:19	135:16 153:16
95:18 98:9,12	189:9 222:16	285:15	168:17 212:1
99:6,17 106:5	227:15	heading 140:5	hearing 48:5
219:19 285:7	happens	heal 69:5 73:5	56:19,20 64:12
guidances 99:4	159:22	health 14:8	199:21 244:3
99:12,15 222:5	happy 75:9	20:11 26:6	heart 101:12
222:18	121:10 131:4	60:15 63:15	117:12 147:9
guide 48:21	153:10 194:9	67:8,11,16	196:11 259:18
guideline 88:6	261:8 267:13	72:14 75:15	285:2
88:10	hard 24:16	89:3 92:22	heaven 179:7
guidelines 86:8	56:15 126:1	93:17 97:17	heavily 61:12
235:3	142:20 163:5	98:17 99:16	helicase 164:8
gut 205:8	173:18 180:22	100:11 104:7	hello 91:3
guys 241:5	182:8 188:22	105:4,10	166:9 223:12
		123:22	

help 10:7 29:5	156:5 173:17	56:17 67:4	264:2,16 267:7
52:18,19,21	246:9 247:15	69:12 91:12	267:11 268:5
53:3,4 58:12	250:21 257:19	100:16 141:12	269:8 270:11
58:13,21 71:19	hereto 291:15	141:22 143:11	271:20 281:22
72:2 97:13	292:11	154:12 158:6	286:21 287:1
99:7,7 101:2	herpangina	158:19 208:7	hinted 159:14
105:13,17	133:3	232:5 236:7	historic 33:4
122:10 144:4	herpes 146:18	281:17	historical
153:4,7 168:7	146:22 187:1,2	higher 6:17	282:2,3
178:2 179:7	hesitation	54:9 137:1	history 9:17
185:12 196:16	272:5	151:22 184:11	37:22 138:5
204:5 219:16	hesitations	199:6 255:9	139:3 153:2
222:16 225:7	272:3	256:6 265:9	196:17 206:14
229:22,22	heterogeneity	279:8	224:7 226:3,12
231:3,4 235:16	45:3 82:18	highest 128:2	229:19 230:5
236:17 259:16	285:1	165:14 287:15	231:2 240:7
263:15 269:5	heterogeneous	highlight 10:21	252:15,22
helpful 57:2	55:22 64:9	21:18 41:1	260:20 261:3
158:17 180:11	199:3 259:13	84:5 140:20	262:18 263:4
185:1 236:21	259:14 261:2	highlighted	263:17 264:4
helping 204:9	286:1	33:14 95:19	266:5,14 268:4
221:4 225:11	heterogeneric	highlights	268:6 282:1
helps 96:2	285:22	284:6	283:10,18
126:20 263:11	heterologous	highly 45:13	284:3,7,15
hematocrit	120:17	81:8 82:7	286:5
255:20	hey 226:22	133:6 157:16	hit 220:18
hemorrhagic	270:5,11	169:3	248:10 279:17
133:14	hi 109:17	hill 2:20 167:15	289:7
henry 61:8	178:16 271:22	231:22	hits 220:16
66:3,6	hie 2:12 61:1	hincks 2:3	hiv 210:21
hepatic 142:7	63:1,2,7,12	167:6 183:13	263:7
142:15 145:19	64:8,12 65:17	183:15 214:18	hmm 256:17
146:3	66:12 67:6,18	214:20 217:3	hobrecht 1:19
hepatitis 136:5	68:15,17 69:2	245:13 246:3	291:2,17
140:8,13,14,20	69:11 70:6,18	247:7,9 248:5	hoc 187:10
142:1,5 143:17	234:11 235:11	249:7 250:8,11	246:16
144:22 145:2	high 13:7 31:21	256:20,21	hodowanec
149:5 150:18	37:16 42:18	257:3 263:22	2:19 219:8

hodowanec's	horizon 69:16	humans 174:5	ideally 82:6
222:10	146:11	175:17 203:6	ideas 10:6
hold 21:9	horse 242:13	232:17	214:2 278:5
holding 105:14	horstmann	hundreds	identification
hole 261:16	175:10	207:20	199:3,13
home 24:15	hospital 61:7,9	hurdle 211:19	identified 6:11
64:3	155:11 207:13	hype 94:4	80:17 116:4
homeopathic	226:16 245:7	hypertension	124:20 143:21
108:8 277:12	248:9 254:16	44:14	154:9,11
277:19 287:22	257:7 282:16	hypoperfused	155:12 235:18
homing 233:22	282:19	139:18	243:7 266:9
honed 177:19	hospitalizatio	hypothermia	identify 10:1,7
honor 5:3	5:20 233:12	61:9 62:9	99:8 144:5
honored 12:9	hospitals 62:11	139:16 234:20	153:6 160:9
honoring 105:9	143:16	hypothesis 8:2	212:2 213:1
hoops 227:6	host 192:4,5,13	166:1	226:15 228:4
hope 2:12 5:8	206:22 252:9	hypothetical	229:20 235:12
10:17 31:4,17	host's 193:7	254:22	240:14 246:18
54:20 59:5	hosts 134:11	hypoxic 59:5	246:19 263:11
61:4 62:15	hour 62:9	234:21	263:16 266:1
64:12 68:11	223:16	i	identifying
76:21 89:14	hours 62:2	iact 85:22	83:8 159:21
106:13 126:19	66:14 136:12	ich 87:20 88:3	203:6 212:6
126:20 130:16	205:9,9 234:14	88:6	252:22 255:8
203:15 234:4	256:15	icosahedron	255:10
240:7	housed 159:2	114:14	illness 133:1,6
hopeful 263:3	housekeeping	icu 5:20 44:1	133:18 136:11
hopefully 74:8	11:17	idea 61:9	136:21 137:15
89:13 105:19	hr 99:16	102:10 185:6	138:14 139:5,7
148:7 153:6	hsv 193:10	190:18 246:5	144:7,13
203:19 204:10	201:7 203:21	265:2 274:18	145:17,22
225:16 229:20	huge 180:18	278:6	149:8,9 156:8
231:3 247:3	183:5,8 210:17	ideal 184:7	156:15 234:11
255:14 263:20	human 19:6	205:19 223:17	242:3,4 243:12
hopes 60:11	69:9 104:8	241:9,11,12	255:15 260:12
hoping 111:6	117:18 174:8	281:3	265:19 266:2
213:12 222:15	174:20 175:16		281:4
223:16 253:8			

illnesses 132:20	immunology	important 5:4	incentives
236:1	70:10 167:14	23:20 27:2,5	46:13
illustrate 50:15	immunothera	28:22 33:9	incentivization
53:14 57:10	196:6	36:18 43:1,16	170:12 175:20
illustrated	impaact 85:19	44:10 45:14	176:8
78:22	impact 13:20	48:3 52:7 75:6	inch 222:16
illustrates 52:9	35:5 39:16	76:2,18 80:19	include 8:1
54:20	45:6 55:10,17	82:15 86:9	27:11 33:5
imagine 285:3	60:17 70:15	92:9 111:5	35:7 43:2
imaging 22:8	73:15 75:5	119:3 133:21	72:14 78:1
22:11,12 27:12	82:13 247:18	166:19 184:12	79:1 81:4 83:1
141:3	259:21 273:6	193:21 196:18	85:19 86:3
immature	impacted 67:11	198:2 202:6	117:10 123:16
115:19	199:10	212:2 242:5,6	130:1 189:18
immaturity	impactful 87:7	245:11 263:18	214:9 226:6,18
36:3	impacting	264:22 265:2	259:20
immediately	172:5	272:22	included 34:11
115:14 116:11	impacts 25:9	importantly	41:4 45:20
116:19 133:4	55:19 69:11	17:21	69:3 127:7
immune 119:19	72:21 185:4,5	impossible	165:5 186:6
121:3 147:17	impair 187:18	56:22 206:21	201:20
174:17 191:11	imperative	241:11 243:19	includes 32:12
193:2,14 204:7	76:22	impracticality	47:1 84:15
immunity	implement	87:11	85:22 89:3
119:6	71:6	impression	98:2,4 103:22
immunization	implementati	273:15	146:13
194:22	81:9	improve 14:8	including 5:20
immunize	implemented	42:7 213:14	6:4 9:19 18:1
175:6	270:22	220:7	26:5 41:19
immunized	implements	improved 94:7	45:21 80:6
120:6,14	269:6	improving 79:6	91:15 101:15
immunizing	implications	234:22	105:15 106:5
120:16	23:15	inappropriate	106:10 114:22
immunocom	implied 91:9	103:10	120:7,18
134:11 193:1	229:22	inattentive	129:20 134:2
immunoglob	importance	74:11	134:12 138:17
147:13 148:4	145:11 176:1	incentive 32:14	142:11 145:6
	213:20	282:21	166:13 240:9

248:9 253:5	indication	infant 5:21	134:12 137:13
276:8 280:6	57:17 92:2	24:17 35:10	138:7,21
inclusion 13:13	indications	109:9 208:14	139:12 141:8
83:1 90:3	34:12 48:11	208:18 243:9	146:17 149:6
143:9 230:1	52:17 57:20	infants 5:19	150:17 151:5
282:9 283:3,4	indicator	7:7 9:8 29:11	156:11 157:15
inclusive 187:9	119:13	53:1 56:3	166:18 168:3,8
income 69:12	individual	57:14 78:7	174:22 181:20
incomplete	17:17 18:11	168:4,8 199:5	181:22 183:19
251:15	117:5 120:7	213:17 230:10	187:2 188:12
inconsistently	149:18 152:18	233:1 255:8	189:8,10 191:8
95:15	165:12 257:10	infeasible	191:20 194:17
incorporate	individually	272:8	194:21 213:17
53:1	14:17	infect 161:19	224:14 239:9
incorporated	individuals	162:15 175:3	239:11,12
54:16 77:3	47:7 58:19	231:19	241:17,18
incorporating	245:3	infected 114:6	242:1,2 249:13
43:22	industrial	116:2 117:14	251:1,8 252:4
incorporation	216:17	117:17 137:2,2	252:8,16
77:6	industry 79:3	138:4 148:8	256:11
increase 20:5	80:1 81:2	151:3 152:5	infections
21:11 22:5	84:11 88:4	161:13	25:21 32:4
32:20,21	92:6 176:13	infecting	38:7,18 48:16
increased	177:1 213:14	147:21 149:1	122:3,7,14
18:17 54:5,13	214:8,14 216:8	156:9 163:19	123:4,13 124:4
55:15	217:7,14	251:18	124:10,12,16
increases	218:10,16	infection 1:2,3	124:21,22
147:20	265:7	5:6,6,18 6:2,13	125:10,13,20
increasingly	ineffective	6:14,16 7:6,6	126:3,19 127:2
86:10	23:22	9:6,7 10:4,4	127:14,15,16
incredibly	inefficiencies	11:5,11 25:11	127:18,22
19:21 226:21	78:4 80:18	25:11 33:14	128:1,14,17,21
234:2 263:8	82:4 85:21	48:9,9,11	129:1,12,20,21
incurred 26:22	inequity 68:5	51:20,21 55:18	130:7,9,11,14
ind 218:10	infamous	113:11 117:9	130:21 131:15
index 103:8	178:22	117:10 119:6	131:22 132:8
indicated	infancy 35:12	120:12 123:2	132:11,15,18
106:13		126:2 127:1	134:11,13

135:2,15,16,17	175:13 197:18	initiated 8:3	instrumental
136:2,4 137:9	198:9 226:1	initiation	89:20
137:14 138:11	236:14 251:13	115:13	insufficient
146:12 150:6	251:15 261:10	initiatives	78:8
152:21 155:8	262:17 288:22	50:16 52:21	insurmounta
180:7,20 189:3	informative	79:8 84:21	104:22
189:14 197:6	225:16 240:8	85:14 88:21	integrated 82:7
219:13 224:5	253:16	injury 63:3	intend 151:20
infectious 5:13	informed 28:17	141:4	intended 10:5
6:3 37:17	29:2 52:10	innate 193:2,14	42:11 47:3
49:20 51:11	67:17 245:9	inner 56:20,21	95:7 148:17
52:15 70:10	informing	57:1 114:1	186:3 262:5
117:20 118:14	33:10 52:14	innocuous	intensive 28:19
118:18,20,22	130:21	188:2	74:16
120:12 131:11	infrastructure	innovation	intent 185:20
157:22 167:9	84:12 86:6	70:8,9 79:20	intention 72:9
172:6	infrequency	81:7 85:16	187:14
infective	41:22	89:21 90:7	intentionality
206:13	inherent 22:14	innovative 80:4	72:9
infectives	32:1 39:14	input 44:3	intentionally
37:15	88:13 89:22	218:22	280:8
infinite 68:11	283:20 284:7	insight 82:17	intentioned
inflammatory	inherently 35:1	insights 82:17	67:14
204:6 252:8	inhibit 149:14	89:6	interact 212:15
269:22	inhibiting	insisted 67:14	interacting
influence 82:22	246:17	inspect 103:20	207:21
inform 225:7	inhibitor	instance 79:5	interaction
informally	163:21 187:16	163:15,20	218:9
93:5	187:18 206:7	190:18 242:20	interactions
information	213:5	242:21	217:13,16
33:6 45:16	inhibitors	instant 271:9	interchangea
48:6 49:2,5	163:2	institute	45:18
62:21 69:15	initial 57:11,20	104:10	interchangea
85:11 89:2,14	83:19 138:9	institution	95:15
94:8 99:11	154:21 185:20	226:16	intercurrent
123:5,13 124:3	initially 65:8	institutions	39:16
124:6 130:2	initiate 52:3	81:2 84:11	interest 8:7
163:19 170:1	66:13	218:3	39:22 43:4

[interest - issue] Page 40

82:20 91:7	interpretation	112:9 121:15	invitro 163:4
94:5 213:10	20:6 103:6	131:8 213:10	164:21 280:10
interested	interpreting	introduced 6:9	invoking 95:2
197:7 217:8	126:17 278:17	37:5 45:21	involve 17:13
239:8 291:15	interruption	introduces	31:15
292:12	232:22 244:3	204:20	involved 33:16
interesting	intersperse	introduction	180:2 181:8
65:13 71:16	124:6	75:21	237:15 285:20
84:14 117:4	intervals	introductory	involvement
157:11 165:22	102:19	37:6 102:1	70:21 139:21
180:22 227:17	intervene	234:1	234:18 238:9
interestingly	246:12	invasive 22:6	involves 228:14
54:3	intervening	invest 226:14	involving
interests 79:18	231:14	investigate	133:10
132:4	intervention	277:4	ion 114:7
interferon	16:20 17:13	investigation	ip 175:6
191:12,14,17	18:15 19:2,3	22:2 34:6	irb 185:7
191:19	20:19,21 21:6	102:3	irbs 67:15
interior 114:19	21:7,12 23:18	investigational	185:6,21
intermediate	23:22 24:3	16:19 26:19	irritability
116:17	27:9 28:1,13	27:8 39:9 42:6	139:17
internal 93:6	51:8 110:22	48:15 96:17	ischemic 59:6
internalized	165:10 226:19	272:15 274:15	234:21
116:6	interventional	283:21	ish 275:4
international	97:7,8 105:12	investigations	288:20
44:20 45:22	226:2	16:10	islet 120:15
86:18 87:19	interventions	investigator	157:17 163:22
88:16 104:9	15:7 21:1	98:14 112:11	islets 120:7,18
235:1	26:20 147:2	226:15	157:9 164:2,2
internist	238:21	investigators	isolated 164:3
284:21	intra 136:15	83:10 235:19	isolating 64:17
interpret 261:2	intracranial	236:9 270:10	65:2
274:17 279:13	142:11	invitation	issue 95:13
interpretability	introduce	122:2	100:18 110:14
24:5	11:16 12:14	invited 131:3	111:14 179:12
interpretable	24:8 30:15	inviting 31:4	193:7 215:15
272:13,21	49:18 59:4	76:6 112:17	216:1,3 243:17
	75:13 90:17	121:11	265:13 287:5

[issue - know] Page 41

289:15	join 74:13	279:18	194:1 201:11
issued 92:5	journal 104:18	kilogram 56:6	205:18 207:22
99:17	journey 61:20	kimberlin 3:5	208:8 210:16
issues 42:15	73:14,16 88:5	107:9,10	210:19 217:16
77:13 88:20	july 128:2	108:15 109:17	217:19 220:13
97:3 105:14	jump 227:7	161:5,7 167:7	220:22 233:3
169:1 180:4	253:9 254:14	171:13,15	235:12,14
210:6 234:9	280:1	184:1,2 185:21	236:19 238:9
236:3 237:12	justified 17:19	192:17,20	241:15 245:8
284:12 287:4	110:6	198:11,12	246:16 249:4
it'd 229:4	k	199:22 200:4,6	251:12 254:6
it'll 263:15	keep 67:1	201:17 203:14	257:16,21,22
items 11:17	121:1,2 165:9	217:12 219:22	257:22 262:3
ivig 147:21	keeping 273:13	220:2 221:15	262:15 269:3
148:2,6,9,16	kept 62:19	223:22 224:2	270:1,17 271:1
148:21 149:7,8	kevin 2:4 155:2	226:22 227:6	275:21 276:10
152:14 158:7	167:15 177:17	228:2,7,18,21	277:15,18
164:14,18	184:8	229:9 239:13	281:1
165:6,7,7,8,11	kevin's 155:20	239:15 241:1	kinds 179:5
165:15,17,20	key 10:21	242:16 243:18	258:19
194:6,6 202:7	13:14 14:14	244:1 246:1	kingdom
249:17	17:12 28:17	248:3,4 250:10	135:22
\mathbf{j}	72:9 79:15	251:20 252:13	kirsch 275:15
jacqueline	82:22 125:22	252:14 253:7,8	knew 61:16
95:10	144:9 147:16	257:12,15	275:17,17
january 172:3	168:2 176:8	260:18 261:6,8	knock 271:16
japanese	210:6 245:8	267:4,11,13	knockout
191:16	269:15	270:2,18	191:12
jargon 97:10	keys 234:16	273:14 288:11	know 22:14,18
jaundiced	kickstart 12:12	289:2,4	25:20 58:6
139:18	kidney 101:12	kimberlin's	59:21 60:5,10
jean 71:17	147:5	229:18 252:21	60:16,17 61:3
jeffrey 2:3	kids 74:8	kind 59:21	61:5,11,13,21
167:6	187:17,19	62:21 63:6	62:6,11,19
job 1:20	189:18 199:5	71:13 168:13	63:10 64:6,13
john 2:14 4:9	232:4,6 238:17	168:19 176:22	64:22 65:4,5,6
12:12 90:18	242:9 243:5	177:2 179:12	65:8,12,16
		189:4 193:9	66:6,8,12,20

[know - lack] Page 42

66:21 67:1,4,6	198:20,22	242:10,18	164:5 231:3
67:10,15,17,20	199:2,5,9,11	243:8 244:2,21	253:10 291:10
68:16,17,20	200:12 202:11	245:5,19 246:6	292:6
69:18 70:1,3,7	202:20,22	246:16,18,18	known 42:17
70:9,10,16	203:2,2,5,9,17	246:22 247:1,1	110:3 116:3
71:5,5,7,10,14	203:20,22	247:22 248:18	129:5,9 175:8
72:16,20 73:3	204:6,22 205:1	249:9 250:1	181:5 212:12
73:5,15,16,21	205:2 206:12	251:1,17,17	212:14,19
74:1 85:9	207:11,12,17	253:9 254:2,7	213:2,6
86:11 98:10	207:19 208:9	258:3 260:9	kunyi 2:11 4:6
107:22 108:1,2	208:10,20	261:12,13,14	12:11 49:18
109:4,13,14	209:19 210:19	262:5,12,14	108:21
132:9 136:17	211:2,4,14,22	263:7,14 264:8	l
147:19,21	213:18 216:20	265:12,21	lab 27:12
152:20 154:17	218:14,20	266:8,22 268:9	117:20,21
156:12,16	219:3,10,14,19	268:10 269:13	120:4 123:8
157:15,20	221:2 222:11	269:21 270:2,5	145:4 190:21
159:19,20	222:13,17	270:11 271:8	212:17 224:18
160:6,13,17,17	225:2,11 226:4	272:16,19	255:22 258:19
161:15,16	226:8,10,14	273:8,18	label 31:15
165:2 168:18	227:13 228:22	274:16 275:16	34:5 78:4
168:22 169:1,2	230:1 231:5,12	275:19 276:1,5	labeling 32:22
169:18 170:2	231:14,18	276:7,11,16	33:6,13,20
172:3 173:1,22	232:4,16	277:7,11,14,16	34:10 37:16
174:2 176:7	233:21 234:10	277:18,21	77:14 78:9
178:19 179:5	234:13,20	278:3,4,7	83:15 84:16
179:11,19	235:2,6,17,19	279:2,15 281:2	laboratories
180:9,14,16	235:19,21	281:11,19	123:7,11
181:2,9,12,15	236:2,6,8,13	284:17,19	laboratory
182:2 183:7	236:16 237:5,9	285:19 288:4	43:13 122:20
186:8,10,13,17	237:12,13,14	288:17	168:14 177:22
187:1,6,11,13	237:20,21,22	knowing 64:6	203:3 266:15
187:15,16	238:3,5,6,9,11	100:10 122:9	labs 123:8,19
188:17,19	238:13,18,20	158:5	129:15,16
189:2,6,8	238:21,22	knowledge	160:2
191:6 193:20	239:1,9 240:20	20:13 25:2	lack 147:19
194:3 195:4	241:6,8,9,13	52:13,19 57:6	156:8 172:13
196:8 198:5,12	241:18,22	109:14 157:21	

[lag - limited] Page 43

lag 77:14	lead 19:8 39:11	lethargy	72:19 74:2
lagged 34:1	201:1	139:17	82:14 100:1
laid 25:14	leader 49:19	level 13:7 16:5	139:6,6,8,9
landmark 69:6	leading 5:19	16:6 17:9,10	144:8,9 146:2
landscape	6:2	26:22 31:22	146:5 148:13
85:12 89:15	leads 13:12	35:14 61:18	193:15 206:19
language 19:20	175:20 183:6	91:12 100:16	231:20 255:16
45:5	lean 244:4,9,11	103:19 169:5	278:2
lanzieri 2:22	learn 208:6	173:19 178:1	light 151:17
laptop 244:5	254:21 255:17	187:8 196:2	lighter 151:8
244:11	261:9	288:20	liked 260:5,6
large 16:20	learned 206:14	levels 81:21	likelihood
17:14 19:16	234:16,19	leverage 52:13	200:11 208:1
23:17 69:9	learning 53:14	52:18	208:16,17
123:1 126:15	54:22 234:22	leveraged 9:9	256:6
155:5,6 171:1	238:7,7	37:8 48:14	likely 122:22
181:22 244:15	leave 102:9	leveraging	129:10,19
244:16	104:17 228:16	37:18 75:17	132:18 144:5
largely 32:10	284:11	76:7 87:2	144:12 146:7
211:10	leaves 78:9	234:17	155:13 187:3
larger 81:16	leaving 255:13	lft 259:1,1	191:22 244:19
155:7 198:2	led 15:19 32:19	liberal 228:5	255:8 259:15
260:20 286:17	left 16:1 64:13	230:6	283:20
largest 125:19	99:20 125:18	liberalize 228:5	likewise 146:18
lasting 72:21	133:4,17 140:6	240:19	lily 12:11 75:13
lastly 81:12	143:5 147:2,8	liberalized	76:4 235:2
83:11	281:12	224:9	limit 38:8
late 14:2 16:4	legal 228:15	license 265:3,5	154:16 187:21
35:8 40:10	legislation	265:9	limitation
127:17 130:8	46:12	licensed 254:22	228:1,3
lateral 119:14	legislations	licensure 249:4	limitations
latitude 20:6	32:11	254:12 262:6	43:9 80:5
law 63:20	legislative	265:4,13	122:11 129:14
laws 32:19	34:14	lies 79:15	limited 9:8
layer 61:22	legitimately	lieu 105:21	27:7 34:21
186:1	172:11	life 6:15 20:8	37:20 78:10
layers 185:10	lessons 67:16	20:10 47:6	80:16 96:3
		59:7 64:7	123:10 130:2

[limited - lot] Page 44

155:14 216:9	68:13 97:9	logistically	248:2,5,15,18
281:6	99:14,19 110:7	182:19	258:6 265:7,7
limiting 14:15	110:14 111:1	logistics 158:21	266:6,11,16
25:15 26:11	111:15,17	long 16:2 23:12	268:22 287:14
273:1	130:2 132:13	39:6,17 42:7,9	290:5
line 62:4 74:5	161:22 163:6	42:13 72:17,21	looked 108:11
97:11 145:19	163:14 195:9	83:17 139:14	145:14 148:13
145:19 146:4	204:16 211:20	141:15 155:12	150:6,15
151:8,8,17,17	214:4,8 221:11	169:8 203:15	164:21 165:6
243:13 249:4	222:17 225:1	216:11 218:19	265:18
266:3 289:5	227:16 228:6	252:14	looking 17:12
lines 114:19	230:8 231:15	longer 39:5,9	20:19,20 26:18
243:15 255:3	237:5 239:7	42:15 68:21	27:8 40:4 69:2
267:22	242:11 244:9	78:15 118:17	69:20 70:3,11
link 49:3 99:10	244:22 247:4	152:8 229:5	71:18,19 72:5
linkage 103:3	249:8 268:17	longitudinal	72:6,8 75:4
linked 115:7,8	270:14,15	39:15 72:5,14	118:12 127:21
linking 134:16	273:11 274:21	239:1	166:18 182:3
links 49:1	279:7,8	longstanding	190:18 198:20
list 2:2 3:2 84:4	live 74:8 141:7	20:10	199:11,12
156:4 170:8	liver 101:12	look 10:16	203:12 220:5
listed 58:19	117:11 142:8	22:16 23:9,10	220:11 233:1
86:1 88:17	142:16,17	64:7 69:10	237:12 238:1
93:8 140:10	145:3 147:9	90:2,13 100:17	249:17 280:4
listening 225:8	196:12 259:18	103:16 106:17	280:14
284:22	259:19 285:2	108:9 114:17	looks 25:4
listing 139:11	lives 20:2 74:8	119:11,17	118:4 152:4
lists 50:19 55:2	74:13	125:7 135:9	154:2 165:6
literacy 67:16	lmic 69:11,11	146:3 148:17	loop 205:7
72:14	load 254:6	148:18 156:3	265:17
literature 6:19	269:2 287:12	159:6,7 161:13	looping 260:18
135:10,10	lobes 63:5	161:18 163:15	lose 68:11
143:2,7,20	local 56:10	188:17 191:15	239:10 242:10
144:3 253:2	locally 135:20	205:6 213:7	loss 39:5 56:19
258:7,22	locations 82:3	219:17 220:13	56:20
little 21:14	logistical	220:14,14	lot 30:9 40:21
59:15 61:1	166:15	225:9,13,13	40:22 41:1
62:3 64:1 67:6		235:14 236:19	48:5 49:4 60:7

[lot - margolis] Page 45

60:8 62:16	181:19,22	magic 289:13	259:4 267:1
63:16,18 65:4	276:8 281:16	289:16	270:14,20
65:12 66:9	lower 54:4,12	main 14:4 21:5	285:16
67:6,19,22	133:16 149:10	24:15 95:12,13	making 10:12
68:1,5,5 70:8	165:16 190:6	122:12 208:5	26:21 36:5
71:11,16,22	280:9,11	mainstay	59:7 71:2
72:17 73:14	lowers 211:20	152:13	82:13 96:10
93:2 98:10	lowest 165:16	maintain 105:8	146:5 185:22
144:15 148:2	lucinactant	major 100:18	236:3 238:18
158:7 169:18	57:12,16	115:1 162:19	males 144:21
175:8 178:21	lucinactant's	170:15 177:12	man 270:5
181:8 182:5,21	57:10	177:12 196:12	management
187:21 189:3	luckily 62:1	263:21	283:22
190:19 194:6	lucky 67:9	majority 6:6	mandate 34:14
194:10 207:13	203:16	33:12 34:3	84:10
223:8 232:12	lumbar 27:11	61:2 136:14	mandates
234:7 237:6,16	lumping 71:13	137:12 141:7	91:21
237:16,18	lunch 11:7,13	180:19 205:12	manifest 38:19
238:20 247:19	166:4	make 23:13	manifestation
266:15 267:1	lung 101:15	28:2 73:2	132:16 141:20
268:1 269:10	102:5 285:3	108:20 154:15	201:16
270:14 271:17	lungs 35:22	161:2 165:13	manifestations
272:2 274:9	57:15	167:19 168:10	38:7 47:6
279:17 286:12	m	173:11 176:15	130:20 140:5
287:6,11	m.d. 2:4,8,9,10	183:13 185:14	140:11 141:21
lots 65:18 66:8	2:14,15,18,20	186:4 187:7	146:15 172:20
66:8 169:8	3:5,7	193:21 195:13	173:17
194:5 211:17	macular	203:11 208:22	manifests 38:1
237:7,21	139:19	211:15 218:8	manner 153:3
loud 268:13	maculopapular	220:1,21	153:5
270:17,18	139:20	223:20 225:14	manuscript
love 198:18	made 20:4	229:17 230:8	220:20
219:18 227:1	33:20 46:20	230:11 262:19	map 115:20
227:14,20	173:12 222:3	263:17 275:22	marcus 2:7
229:11 242:8	233:20 246:21	284:9,13 286:8	marginalizati
271:19	257:21 260:19	makes 103:16	60:17
low 19:14 67:1	280:3	178:6,8,10	margolis 46:2
126:9,16 181:5		216:2 231:21	

maribavir 53:7	matt's 200:16	meaning 34:5	63:18 67:22
mark 2:18 3:7	matter 71:9	65:5 144:14	90:20 93:21
4:13 112:6	141:4 180:21	meaningful	94:17 99:16
131:8 157:1,7	188:1 195:1	36:22 230:4,10	217:11
159:13 161:8	251:17 285:5	233:10 244:19	medication
163:14 171:16	285:17	means 56:1	69:17 75:5
175:21 179:5	matthew 2:20	64:2 77:16	196:15
184:16 216:12	167:13	170:16 172:8	medications
253:8 257:5,11	maturation	177:11 191:7	31:15 34:4,16
258:12 260:1	35:7,11,13	222:20 241:18	70:3 74:18
262:3 264:6	57:4,5,5 109:7	283:5	162:8 244:12
287:3	109:8 114:4	meant 63:22	medicine 2:21
mark's 215:22	116:22	64:1 134:22	98:7,7 131:10
marker 144:9	mature 115:19	278:8	167:15 277:14
263:7	matured	measure 36:22	medicines 33:5
markers 144:4	193:14	117:20	33:10
145:4	max 60:19 62:2	measured 40:7	medium 281:17
market 177:1	62:2 64:22	216:7 286:3	meet 14:22
201:4	65:20 67:10	measures 28:8	26:14 101:3
marketing	74:9	71:9,9 130:22	260:5 281:7
63:16	max's 73:14,15	measuring	282:9 283:3
massaro 2:10	mean 18:9 64:7	19:19 22:3	meeting 11:18
4:5 12:10	100:19 157:8	38:12 46:3	12:1,2 31:3
30:16 31:1,2	171:8 174:19	118:13 159:19	33:17 38:5,16
49:17 233:18	176:16 183:18	mechanism	38:22 41:13
233:19	183:20 193:1	47:2 83:14	46:1 48:6
match 246:21	203:15 214:21	117:7 152:19	115:17 235:8
matched 54:6	215:21 217:9	212:12 213:6	241:14,15
54:14	217:10 227:3	228:15 282:20	290:3,8
materials 12:2	231:18 238:4	mechanisms	meeting's
63:17	246:5 250:11	71:7 121:6	11:20
maternal 75:15	250:13 255:17	204:18 207:6	meetings
144:13 148:6	257:22 266:21	214:22 218:9	197:19
152:14 157:8,8	267:1 269:10	218:14	meets 283:3
157:9,14 255:4	269:18 271:12	med 75:2	melanie 30:8
matt 160:8	276:13 279:10	medical 10:8	melatonin
169:11 245:18	286:15 288:6	26:3 30:16,18	69:20
		31:13 32:5	

member 64:13	284:19 285:22	microdose	minimize 8:7
members 107:7	287:3,11,22	280:9	minimized
113:12 139:4	merits 111:9	microneutrali	111:12
153:22 167:20	messacar 2:4	119:20	minnesota 6:9
197:13	154:3 167:16	microphone	227:17
memory	184:8	12:4	minor 20:5
257:17 258:12	messacar's	microsoft	21:11 22:5
258:14	177:17	100:1	205:11 248:1
meningitis	message 28:17	midd 52:10	minority 136:8
134:3 135:7	95:7	middle 97:6	138:12
137:18 145:18	messages 72:9	midst 67:20	minute 11:3
145:22 233:2	messaging	midstream	76:17 84:3
meningoence	61:11 179:5	276:11	minutes 22:22
140:7,13,19,22	met 26:7 27:22	mild 69:2	31:5 107:2
mention 63:12	91:21	180:20 239:11	122:8 131:21
87:19 91:8	metabolized	240:15,16,16	146:9 153:14
92:18 93:14	108:1 276:4	242:4 245:1	223:17 229:3
134:15 149:13	methodologic	256:11	267:9
165:3 178:4	105:14	milestone 33:4	miranda 2:17
211:7 215:7	methodologies	33:7 88:5	4:12 112:6
mentioned	104:3 117:21	milligram 56:6	121:15 169:6
30:3 34:3 38:3	methodologists	milligrams	mirrors 135:15
44:8 47:18	97:6	276:2,2,4,5	misconception
49:2 51:18	methodology	million 180:7	96:4,12,15
67:6,9 70:22	105:3	182:2 232:11	236:3 256:9
74:18 86:22	methods 45:5	millions 207:20	misconceptio
96:6 104:20	95:1	mimic 138:21	95:17
136:2 144:18	methylguano	146:19	misinformati
147:16 176:14	115:12	mind 29:8	67:22
177:16,18	metro 66:7	121:2 165:9	misleading
184:16 195:17	mice 120:6,14	184:4 285:10	121:4
202:8 216:13	175:4 191:12	mindset 78:18	misperception
221:19 224:3	michigan	mine 258:15	68:4
229:20 232:18	291:19	minimal 16:21	missing 217:15
234:1,10,18	micro 275:8	17:13 20:1,5	227:2
235:1,2,10	microbiology	21:11 22:5	mistrust 67:21
237:7 246:1	167:14	280:11	68:1
281:22 284:16			

mitigation 24:8	molecule	216:7,8 227:8	138:7 158:13
27:4	200:10 201:12	229:5 240:12	motor 141:3
model 52:10,18	205:18 221:4	moon 62:12	mount 193:9
52:19,21,22	molecules	morbidity 6:17	mouse 174:21
53:3,4,8 54:1,2	35:16 188:18	40:11 71:14	197:9
54:9,16,17	188:18,20	153:6 176:17	mouth 133:7
57:22 174:20	189:13 204:3	233:14	move 10:17
174:21 175:15	moment 17:7	morning 5:2	71:19 214:15
197:11 266:11	128:4 196:22	11:12,16 12:10	221:12 261:17
modeled 85:18	199:1 239:22	12:20 13:7	262:16,22,22
108:5	264:8	75:22 87:1	264:14 266:20
modeling 50:11	momentum	107:4 112:7,17	288:19
52:6 53:15	90:7	122:1 166:12	moved 58:2,2
54:21 58:14	moms 243:6	167:1 169:11	223:3
81:10 107:19	money 217:20	170:18 195:18	movement
109:2 268:9,16	monitor 285:10	196:12 221:19	179:11
268:18	monitoring	230:12 260:4	moving 77:10
models 57:2	18:19 43:14,15	279:2	87:18 91:14,17
58:2,7 69:9	monkeys 57:21	mortality 6:18	95:9
84:2 174:3,4,4	monoclonal	40:11 71:14	mph 2:14
174:16,18	202:9,10,13,15	141:12,22	mri 62:10,11
177:10 183:16	202:17,22	142:12,21	62:20 63:4
183:19 191:10	203:10 204:4	143:7,12,19,21	141:4
197:10 232:16	206:7	145:5 149:10	mrna 115:14
232:16 265:18	monolayer	153:5,7 176:18	multicenter
moderate 63:4	118:3	178:21 233:14	85:2
moderated 1:8	month 51:16	240:11 245:7	multicentered
modest 155:8	123:6 124:18	246:10 248:7	81:13
modifications	127:11,16	248:10 260:4	multidiscipli
262:20	129:1 130:6	263:18	70:11,20 87:2
modifiers	139:6 146:1	mother 67:7	89:17
68:22	193:3,3 240:12	136:21 138:15	multifaceted
modular 98:11	monthly 88:21	138:20 144:14	80:15
modulate 19:2	months 53:22	148:8 158:10	multiple 33:8
modulating	54:10 73:16,21	243:3,9	49:12 51:18
29:14	74:4 92:8	mother's 67:11	70:11 71:12
molecular	102:19 127:21	mothers	84:22 85:20
214:22	181:22 189:7	136:16,18	100:1 110:3

203:16 206:22	257:20 259:18	185:22 238:4	needing 74:7
207:4 268:14	n	necessary 9:13	197:6
277:4,5 287:12	n 2:1 3:1 4:1,1	14:8,21 67:14	needle 182:3
multiplexing	5:1	214:15	221:13
183:2	name 5:11 9:15	necessity 14:14	needs 10:19
multistakeho	named 63:2	14:18 25:15,18	18:11,14
41:5 44:3	narrow 207:2	171:19	111:11 176:11
multisystem	nasty 182:4	necrosis 142:7	176:12 177:4
144:22 156:6	natalie 2:15	145:2,20 146:3	222:22 238:22
multitude	4:10	need 10:8	255:19 272:15
85:13	national 14:2	13:17 26:3,14	negative
mulugeta 2:13	16:2 122:4,6	36:19 39:8,18	116:17 151:12
4:8 12:11	122:12,14,15	43:10,12 52:2	negativity
75:14,19,20	123:16 130:1	56:5,9,20 57:4	151:7
76:4 90:16	130:11	63:11 66:13	neither 15:6
mulugeta's	nationally	73:1 81:15	291:11 292:7
75:16	123:19 129:17	91:21 103:2	neonatal 1:2
murky 283:2	natural 9:16	107:17 110:5	5:5 6:13,15 9:6
muscle 22:4	37:22 153:2	132:9 147:7	9:8 10:3 11:2,4
mutate 208:8	196:17 224:7	158:21 161:13	28:19 30:19,22
208:10	226:3,12	171:7 173:21	32:1 33:22
mutated	229:19 230:5	174:1,15	34:7 35:3
188:21	231:1 240:7	175:13 177:6	36:10,17 37:10
mutation	252:21 260:20	179:8 186:13	38:6,13,20
208:11,13	261:3 262:18	186:19 188:16	40:4,8 41:3,6
mutations	263:4,17 264:4	192:13 195:13	41:21 42:20
204:19 210:18	266:5,14 268:4	196:4,5 205:20	43:3,9 44:20
myelitis 121:17	268:6 282:1	206:5 214:5	44:21 45:4,22
134:6	283:10,18	230:9 243:14	46:2,3,4,4
myocarditis	284:2,7,15	247:12 250:2	51:21 65:15
133:21 134:1	286:4	251:12 255:16	67:7 72:18
135:7 136:1	nda 249:5	263:19	75:17 80:5
140:7,14,19	ndi 71:15	needed 10:2	86:17,18,21
141:10 143:18	near 233:13	41:18 44:4	87:3,8,15
145:1 150:18	nearly 77:20	139:1 147:5,10	89:22 91:18
156:6 173:17	necessarily	168:6 170:1	96:3 98:6
225:3 246:9	100:10 177:2	173:19 216:11	100:10 104:5,9
247:15 250:21	200.10 1/1.2	242:18 262:20	104:19 105:4

106:15 109:9	34:4,12,15,22	235:18 237:18	neutralizing
112:14,18	37:14,21 38:1	network's	117:13 144:10
113:11,16	38:8 40:17	84:14	147:20,22
122:3,7 124:12	41:17 49:9,11	networks 75:18	148:22 156:8
124:21,22	49:14 53:2	76:8 80:9,15	156:13 157:16
125:10,13	56:3 57:20	80:15,16,16,21	157:22 159:19
127:2,14,15	78:7 86:17	81:5,12,20,22	190:22 191:2,4
128:22 129:8	87:5,10 92:13	82:2,6,9,12,16	194:19 201:21
131:15 132:8	104:1 124:17	82:22 83:7,11	never 68:11
132:15 134:14	125:4,15 126:7	84:1,5 85:14	109:22,22
134:21 135:14	127:6,10 129:5	85:17 86:3,10	232:6 239:21
136:4 138:11	130:5,9 139:12	86:16,18 87:3	239:22 262:5
140:9 142:21	154:7,11 168:4	89:19 177:11	276:7
143:17 144:20	168:8 169:4	214:6,12	nevertheless
145:14 146:12	199:5 213:17	234:17	262:7
146:20 147:14	255:10 261:13	neural 191:18	new 34:18
148:14 149:17	neonatologist	neuro 42:13	78:10,19 85:1
150:2 152:11	284:22	neurodevelo	85:6 92:2 95:6
153:3 155:4	neonatology	6:4 42:8,13	96:4 101:18
157:10 173:7	31:6 39:2 70:7	neuroinvasion	122:16 123:19
192:22 200:18	70:21,22	175:5	170:20 178:22
201:7,13	233:21 236:20	neurologic	180:4 181:20
208:18 219:12	nervous 56:11	134:2 141:8	183:6 210:14
224:8 234:8	117:11	neurologically	218:18,18,19
235:2,5 237:17	nes 122:15,20	61:19	218:22,22,22
266:12	123:3,9 124:2	neurology 70:7	219:4 268:12
neonate 28:7	124:5,9,11,21	neurotropic	283:21
34:19 35:6	125:1,12	133:16	newborn 135:2
36:3 37:2	127:15 128:16	neurovirulence	135:6,12 136:7
40:12,15 42:3	129:4,9,21	209:14	147:19 148:4
43:7,8 44:15	net 187:9	neutralization	155:22 162:19
44:17 45:17	224:13	119:18 193:20	178:4 195:19
48:11 193:2,10	network 84:8	194:1,8,13	206:16 233:2
201:6 250:15	84:18 122:17	195:4	newborns
neonates 5:19	123:20 170:19	neutralize	136:1 137:12
6:10 7:7 25:11	170:22 213:20	194:20	139:16 148:13
25:21 26:8	214:5 225:11	neutralized	150:12 153:4
29:10 32:6	226:14,20	190:21 195:1	162:15 206:17

230:14 233:3	nonpolio	number 29:20	208:22 209:3
233:17	162:11	32:20,22 37:16	212:10
news 5:17	nonrandomiz	93:7,10,12	objective 14:22
nice 145:10	97:7,9 103:6	107:18,19	objectives 8:2
186:2,6 283:15	nonspecific	123:7,11	26:7 265:14
284:12	132:20 145:16	124:22 125:10	obligation
nicely 78:22	nonstructural	125:13 127:15	105:9 272:11
nicu 31:16 34:2	164:7	128:17 129:14	obscure 24:4
43:20 59:7,16	nontherapeutic	129:15 133:15	observation
59:18,22 61:21	22:13,15	134:10,17	54:5,8 61:17
64:14,18 65:4	nope 173:6	138:4 144:4	observational
65:7,11 68:9	normal 20:1	147:15 150:10	94:11 96:14,20
72:18,22 234:8	60:22 138:7	150:20 155:5,6	97:19 98:4
nih 84:9 175:22	142:17 258:22	155:6,7 169:7	101:19 284:3
183:18 197:4,4	259:1	171:1 181:2	289:12
197:14	notable 33:12	184:3 189:21	observations
nilly 271:2	notary 291:18	195:22 200:19	40:18
nine 125:8	note 12:3 48:8	200:21 216:9	observe 130:12
164:2,2	86:9 92:9 98:1	216:10,11,13	observed 42:1
non 63:13	124:12 140:11	222:4 227:6	54:3,11 128:7
123:14 124:10	noted 31:21	248:8 255:7	observing
150:1 192:1	34:9 38:11	277:7 280:1	123:2 237:14
269:16,19	40:13 47:17	numbers	obstacles 159:5
270:21	74:21 142:9	126:18 128:1	obstetrician
nonbinding	notes 197:5	152:7 170:11	138:22
10:14	229:11	numerous 39:3	obstructive
nonclinical	novel 69:16	221:17	150:7
19:6 26:17	81:9 86:5	nursery 137:10	obtaining
99:1 168:6	np 128:18	nurses 44:1	14:16 15:12
198:21 222:22	129:2	nvsn 122:17	25:16 28:16
280:12 287:17	nrevss 122:16	123:20 124:6	43:21
nonenveloped	123:17 124:6	128:11	obvious 170:9
112:22 113:20	128:7	0	obviously
noninterventi	nrn 66:3	o 4:1 5:1	44:14 64:17
97:9 99:3	ntr 209:11	oberste 3:8	66:7 70:6
105:12,16	nuances 48:18	167:11 168:9	178:20 199:2
240:14	222:20	168:11 180:1	200:13 211:17
		100.11 100.1	226:19 228:10

237:6 241:10	291:2	one's 285:13	104:20 131:16
263:18	official 73:22	ones 144:5	opportunity
occasionally	74:15 91:6	146:6 156:5,5	24:19 58:18
136:16 141:18	offset 144:13	162:14 180:21	75:11 79:15
147:9	oh 157:1,5	183:17 206:19	90:11 131:20
occipital 63:5	178:16 202:20	239:19 240:15	198:16 245:13
occupational	215:18 257:3	256:16 259:2	257:13 261:17
28:12	282:8	ongoing 28:10	283:11
occur 37:20	ohrp 185:5	41:1,7 89:1	opposed
40:9 60:17	okay 183:11	99:22 266:6,14	226:18
117:8 136:8	187:13 190:14	287:9	opposition
137:19 139:5	194:6 196:21	online 10:20	266:22 278:9
140:11 141:2,3	215:20 227:4	215:15 264:11	optimal 280:14
211:3	244:10 251:14	277:22	optimist 263:4
occurred 33:13	257:3	onset 74:13	optimization
124:17	old 73:21 85:6	139:5,7 144:7	52:14
occurrence	124:18 169:17	145:12 149:8,9	optimize 71:8
44:17	193:3,3,4,11	156:7,10,15	83:7 265:3
occurring	267:19 273:18	ontogeny 53:1	optimizing
43:17,18	older 29:15,16	107:22 109:7	82:1
occurs 35:8,9	34:16 41:21	onward 74:4	option 159:4
114:5,8 117:9	51:16 53:20,21	oopd 47:12	options 130:22
118:17 138:16	53:22 83:4	open 108:14	132:10 203:16
141:17 205:8	107:20 127:7	115:16 160:14	oral 55:7,8
oce 100:15	127:11 128:20	223:20 267:11	117:6 195:17
285:7	129:1 130:6	283:6 285:9	orally 175:3
october 128:2,8	onboard 207:1	opened 282:14	orange 125:18
128:12	218:18	282:15	125:22
offer 110:4	once 18:7	opening 5:8	order 141:12
offered 23:5	115:2,16 116:5	25:20	280:17
95:20	116:18 142:17	operate 82:2	organ 22:6
offering 27:17	187:16 224:17	opinion 239:17	35:22 36:5
office 5:13	226:9 247:20	287:14	56:12 57:4
12:16 30:7,19	258:10	opinions 10:12	101:11 155:18
47:12,13,13,14	oncology 92:20	23:4 91:5	156:1 196:9,10
90:20 112:12	269:12 284:19	260:14	196:16,17
officer 30:16	284:20	opportunities	204:5,5 247:20
30:18 197:4		50:17 79:13	251:11 252:2

271:4 285:1,2	155:11,19	overseeing	pandemics
organization	156:2 184:13	197:4	133:13 134:8
115:7	221:5 256:7	oversight 185:6	panel 11:6,12
organizational	263:14 266:13	228:8	108:18,19
66:17 81:21	269:3 286:3	overview 13:1	109:1 110:7
organizations	291:16 292:12	13:6 31:22	111:6,9 151:19
79:2 81:20	outcomes 22:3	91:13 95:18	152:4 153:19
organize	39:1 40:11	100:16 122:19	154:20 157:6
285:13	41:3 42:8 64:8	131:22 135:1	166:5,10 167:2
organized	82:2 90:4	overwhelming	174:14 178:18
222:14	96:21 124:12	67:13 173:3	179:13,21,21
organizers	137:22 189:17	owe 92:12	223:13 264:10
31:3 49:16	189:19 232:3	own 47:21	panelist 11:22
76:5 90:11	240:11 263:11	73:13 91:6	198:6
131:19 290:3	269:3 274:20	149:1 162:3,20	panelists 5:3
organoid 69:9	274:22 281:18	231:4 275:3	107:5 153:20
organs 35:8	outline 31:20	oxygen 35:21	167:4,18 168:1
147:11 196:13	50:8	p	197:20 213:11
original 66:18	outlined 7:22	p 2:1,1 3:1,1	223:6 290:2
69:3	26:15 106:4	5:1 152:3	panels 161:2
originally 69:3	outside 15:10	253:22	paperwork
oropharynx	18:2 70:5,21	p.m. 11:7,8,14	271:17
133:5,10	226:13 233:2	11:14 166:5	paradigm
orphan 46:14	outsider 220:5	290:9	40:13 78:15
47:12,19 48:12	overall 126:5	pack 62:13	105:21
48:13	126:19 127:1,5	package 179:7	parallel 16:7
oscillator 62:5	135:9 138:11	page 4:2 11:21	paralytic 134:5
ot 74:2	151:12,21	97:4 104:3	174:22
outbreak 5:17	162:14 185:2	paid 44:11	parameters
5:22	223:1 243:8	pain 138:19	258:19
outbreaks	overburden	palsy 73:22	paramount
205:14	238:14	pancreas	90:6
outcome 19:3,9	overcome 80:4	117:12	parechovirus
19:13 39:22	80:18	pandemic	113:3,6,7,10
40:6 41:6	overheard	94:22 127:19	116:8 153:4
97:17 129:5,9	63:14	197:13 227:18	parechoviruses
129:11,22	overlap 37:9		114:3 115:3
137:20 138:10			

parent 13:18	participated	partly 123:10	197:15
24:14 29:7	66:18	partner 214:10	pathology
59:7 235:9	participating	partnering	209:9 252:5,10
parental 272:5	110:18 167:1	237:10	pathophysiol
272:6	participation	partners 79:4	37:9
parenteral	18:13 24:22	165:1 205:1,2	pathophysiol
55:7	29:16 231:1	205:22 214:14	37:22
parenthood	290:2	215:14 217:7	pathway 8:12
60:12	particle 113:20	partnership	pathways
parents 15:14	113:22 114:2,5	214:9	46:13
24:16,20 28:18	114:8,15,17	partnerships	patient 18:2
29:5 43:21	116:20	79:22 80:3	27:3 37:1
65:9 213:15,15	particles	85:4 184:17	38:21 40:15,15
230:20 234:18	114:19 163:16	parts 52:12	43:19 63:17
273:16 283:20	163:17	212:19 213:1	71:20 72:12
284:1	particular 42:3	partum 136:16	77:18 78:2
parietal 63:5	48:15 65:21	passably	79:2 82:2,18
park 197:3,5	66:13 68:15	144:16	86:11 90:4
197:17	69:11 71:15	passage 105:22	93:17 100:10
park's 198:9	100:15 107:11	passive 122:20	103:19 123:6
part 7:1 20:21	116:5 133:20	122:21 123:18	199:13,16
27:5 33:16	149:17 156:14	279:2	224:20 226:9
59:17 66:3	162:3 192:9	past 30:11 33:1	226:18 229:1
73:5 94:6	194:7 199:14	48:12 61:14	235:12 237:15
103:22 104:10	201:22 221:4	62:16 73:19	238:8,12 251:6
149:21 184:22	226:9 254:16	74:15 94:10	patients 9:3
190:6 210:4	261:13 262:9	125:1 128:8	33:21 34:17
224:22 225:6	270:9 285:9	patent 84:17	35:4 39:13
243:10 272:22	particularly	path 95:20	45:5 50:1,6,13
partially 241:3	36:6 78:7	104:10,17	50:21 51:2,17
participant	80:19 87:7,7	219:12,17	51:22 52:20
28:4 110:5	89:3 134:9	227:20 274:10	53:17 54:19
participants	141:4,4 163:2	pathogen	55:4 76:22
10:14 23:19	170:13 206:18	174:21	78:20 79:1,21
participate	207:5 256:4	pathogenesis	81:6 83:20
14:19 31:4	parties 291:12	117:3 209:9	85:7 90:8
76:6 230:22	291:14 292:8	pathogens	92:12 101:8,11
284:2	292:11	172:7 197:13	102:6 111:12

			,
117:14,16	34:10,17 37:4	167:14,16	perception
124:4 128:20	37:18 46:8,15	peds 51:4	238:14
128:22 129:8	46:19,21,22	penetration	perfect 262:14
129:12,21	47:4,14,21	56:11,11,21,21	perform
151:15 172:14	49:14,22 50:6	57:1	129:16 187:8
226:6 259:19	50:10,12,16,20	pentamer	performing
265:8 269:13	50:21 51:2,11	114:18	123:11
272:11 280:22	51:17,22 52:7	pentamers	pericarditis
284:1 288:2,5	52:11,15,20,22	114:12	133:21
pattern 130:7	53:1,8,17	people 47:9	perinatal
patterns 82:18	54:18 55:4,21	60:14 65:3	134:14 138:19
126:18 127:13	57:11 58:7,16	67:10 68:20	152:21 224:5,5
128:5	63:21 75:15,17	69:19 70:5	perinatally
pbpk 54:1,9	75:18 76:8,8	71:3 97:20	157:15
58:6	76:10,18,22	156:21 161:2	period 35:9
pcori 69:1	77:3,6,11,14	175:19 180:14	38:20 65:21
237:16,17	77:19 78:2,4,8	182:2,12 186:5	72:18 125:5
pcr 118:12	78:13,20 79:7	190:3,7 193:8	135:12 138:20
137:6 182:21	79:11,14 80:5	200:20,21	155:22 162:20
250:15,18	80:7,9,11,14	207:20 208:14	periods 126:9
251:6,16,22	80:16,19 81:6	225:7 227:21	160:1
263:5	81:8,12,17,19	229:10 259:9	peripheral
pd 43:13 51:5	82:12,20,21	266:9 277:8	133:10
peak 126:15	83:11,16,20	282:8 288:14	periventricular
127:17 146:4	84:1,2,7,13	peptides 69:19	141:5
peaked 128:12	85:7,12,16,21	perceived	permission
peaking 128:8	86:13 87:9	87:10	13:18 14:16
130:8	88:9,19,22	percent 34:10	15:12 17:3
peaks 126:8,10	89:8,9,15,22	77:20 124:16	24:14 25:16
126:13	90:7 101:8	125:9 128:7	28:16
pediatric 7:13	102:6 123:22	129:4,9 138:16	permit 9:2
8:13,16 9:1,3	166:13 167:9	141:13 142:13	persist 118:17
11:1 12:16,18	176:19,22	142:14 143:13	persistent
13:2,8 14:7	pediatrician	143:19,22	77:13 134:16
30:8,11,19,20	284:21	151:2 152:5	142:15
32:7,9,10,14	pediatrics 51:7	282:20	person 208:19
32:15,17,20,22	88:18 104:18	percentage	261:21 289:10
33:5,20,21	131:9,13	136:18 155:8	

personally	280:14 288:14	192:15 193:16	picture 133:3
221:15 277:15	288:16,17,19	195:6 196:21	133:16 141:9
persons 7:2	288:20	199:20 201:17	piece 196:3
127:11 128:22	phases 82:16	204:12 206:9	pieces 217:15
130:6	100:1	207:8 208:21	251:13
perspective	phenobarb	211:21 213:8	piggyback
31:6 59:16	74:19	214:16 215:5	233:20
68:6,7 70:15	phenobarbital	215:18 217:1	pilon 2:12 4:7
76:2 109:3	73:18	218:7 219:22	12:11 59:5,9
168:14 185:17	phil 205:11	223:5,12	59:12 75:12
192:16 216:17	phis 143:16	225:17 229:13	198:13,19
218:17 233:21	phone 215:15	231:9 232:19	237:4
238:12 247:8	phrase 254:20	233:18 237:2	pilon's 59:6
271:21 272:9	262:12	239:4 240:22	pilot 104:5
perspectives	phrases 18:7	243:20 244:7	148:12
59:10 198:17	physical 28:12	244:21 245:21	pipeline 39:12
199:21 229:14	63:21	247:7 248:3	69:8
238:8	physician 64:1	249:6 250:6	pis 250:13
ph 71:17 116:9	236:4	251:14 257:1	pivot 24:12
ph.d. 2:3,4,15	physicians 44:1	257:12 260:17	pivotal 80:10
2:16,17,20 3:8	physiological	263:22 264:7	pk 43:13 45:7
pharm 50:11	35:18 44:15	266:18 267:8	50:22 51:4,8,9
pharm.d. 2:11	physiological	269:17 283:7	51:14,22 53:5
2:13	54:1	286:20 289:20	53:8,9 54:15
pharmaceutical	physiology	pick 110:13	54:16,17,17
32:13 165:1	58:12	180:8 231:13	56:15,17,22
pharmacokin	pica 2:15 4:10	256:5	57:18 58:6
54:2 75:7	112:3 121:12	picked 230:3	88:8 109:4
195:21	131:6 153:12	259:1	place 27:19
pharmacology	156:19 157:2,4	picking 103:15	135:19,19
49:19,20,21	159:10 161:5	158:7	143:9 228:16
50:5 55:3	164:10 166:2,9	picornaviridae	placebo 23:1,3
pharmacy	170:5 171:12	112:20	23:5,9,11,16
158:8	173:9 174:10	picornavirus	24:10 27:21
phase 82:21	176:3 178:13	117:3 197:4,12	107:15,16
175:8 215:2,2	179:18 183:11	picornaviruses	108:17 110:15
224:11 225:13	183:22 185:16	112:13,18	110:18,20
225:13 262:4	190:9,14	113:18	111:10 150:11

150:19 151:1,8	played 33:9	98:8 99:13,18	164:15,19
151:13,18	players 162:19	100:13 101:6	165:6,6,10,15
151:13,18	plays 52:6	102:8 103:21	224:11,21
165:10,16	86:19 209:7	102.8 103.21	230:2,16 233:1
254:2 267:16	please 5:10,15	104.13 103.3	253:20 257:18
	_ ·	105.18 100.8	
267:18 268:21	6:1,12 7:8 8:10 9:21 10:15		260:3 261:19
269:9,16,19		112:8 113:17	282:13 287:4
270:7,21 272:3	11:9,15,21	117:2,19 118:9	pleconaril's
273:13,20	12:3,5,8 13:3,5	119:2 120:20	260:10
275:4,9,13	13:22 14:10	121:9 122:5,18	plot 143:12
276:7 277:12	15:17,21 16:13	124:7,15 125:6	165:21
278:8,16	17:5 18:4	125:11 126:17	plots 143:6
279:15 280:22	19:17 20:16	127:4,12,20	plotted 151:6
placebos 23:20	21:17 22:21	128:3,10,15	165:8
24:2	24:11 25:7,12	129:3,7,13	plug 236:18
placed 15:9	25:17 26:10	130:3 131:1	plus 60:13
placental 36:1	27:15 28:15	132:2,12	68:17 113:5
places 181:13	29:17 30:1,5	133:19 134:20	144:22 165:6
228:4	30:17 31:9,19	135:13 136:6	183:5
plan 8:9 31:12	32:8 33:2,18	137:11 138:2	pmda 89:3
60:11 97:13	34:20 36:8	139:10 140:2,3	pneumonitis
planned 60:5	38:10 40:1,20	140:15 142:19	140:8,19
planning 33:17	41:14 42:21	144:2 145:9	141:16
72:7 241:13	45:1,19 46:6	149:11 150:8	pocapavir
plaque 117:22	46:17 47:16	151:4 153:20	149:20 152:19
120:10	48:22 49:7	163:12 166:21	162:4,21 251:2
plasma 148:6,9	59:14 60:2,18	167:18,22	269:20
152:15 157:14	65:14 68:12	168:5 188:9	pocket 163:16
158:4,13,16,19	70:13 73:12	237:3 253:7	187:18
158:20,22	76:12,15 77:9	255:12 270:6	point 39:8,18
plates 118:7	78:12 79:12	pleasure 12:14	43:6 75:10
platform 12:7	80:13 81:18	112:9 284:17	95:2 97:16
81:11 104:13	82:11 83:21	pleconaril	104:12 107:18
197:19	85:8 87:17	149:16 150:12	107:19 146:5
plausibility	88:15 89:11	150:19 151:1,9	171:13 173:10
149:3	90:9 91:4,11	151:11,17,22	179:10 185:21
play 80:9 83:12	92:15 93:13	152:16 162:9	186:4 192:22
83:12 85:5	94:2 95:8 96:1	162:12,22	193:18 195:5

198:2 200:16			
170.2 200.10	194:16 197:10	170:14 176:22	possibilities
200:17 202:5	205:2,8 206:5	193:1 201:15	69:17
204:10,13,19	poliovirus	207:2 230:7	possibility
207:22 209:15	115:1 117:17	234:11,15	29:14 61:10
210:18 214:11	149:20,21	243:11 244:19	196:7 282:4
218:7 219:11	162:3 174:21	245:1 248:16	286:16
222:11 225:14	polioviruses	258:18 262:10	possible 108:3
232:2,6 233:22	134:6 150:1	266:19 267:3,5	163:20 164:6
238:2 239:4	162:11 207:16	281:3	169:19 180:13
241:17,22	209:6	populations	211:14 212:8
242:7 246:19	polyclonal	7:13 9:1,9,12	267:15 276:1
248:13 250:7	120:9,14	26:5 29:13	276:21 284:14
252:21 259:14	194:12 202:6	32:7 42:1	possibly 26:12
264:3 275:16	polymerase	58:16 81:17	post 83:12 92:3
275:21	116:15 204:19	83:16 181:7	136:15 187:10
pointed 173:13	205:3	207:18 208:19	220:3 246:16
189:15 203:22	polymorphism	223:17 240:3	254:12
207:12 209:10	192:6	260:22 281:9	posterior 133:5
241:19	polypeptide	portend 156:2	postmenstrual
pointing	115:17 116:13	portion 47:10	45:10
241:17	116:14	97:5	postnatal 45:10
	11011	77.5	posinatai +3.10
points 30:3	pooling 81:3	pose 77:19	potential 9:17
			_
points 30:3	pooling 81:3	pose 77:19	potential 9:17
points 30:3 38:14 61:5	pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3	pose 77:19 posed 282:8	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15
points 30:3 38:14 61:5 105:20 140:21	pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3 poorly 9:16	pose 77:19 posed 282:8 positioned	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15 65:18 82:13,19
points 30:3 38:14 61:5 105:20 140:21 154:19 173:12	pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3 poorly 9:16 popped 253:19	pose 77:19 posed 282:8 positioned 254:15	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15 65:18 82:13,19 83:7,8,17
points 30:3 38:14 61:5 105:20 140:21 154:19 173:12 174:15 176:3,6	pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3 poorly 9:16 popped 253:19 popularity	pose 77:19 posed 282:8 positioned 254:15 positive 39:4	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15 65:18 82:13,19 83:7,8,17 88:13 92:1
points 30:3 38:14 61:5 105:20 140:21 154:19 173:12 174:15 176:3,6 217:1 261:12	<pre>pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3 poorly 9:16 popped 253:19 popularity 94:20</pre>	pose 77:19 posed 282:8 positioned 254:15 positive 39:4 112:21 137:6,6	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15 65:18 82:13,19 83:7,8,17 88:13 92:1 94:16 129:21
points 30:3 38:14 61:5 105:20 140:21 154:19 173:12 174:15 176:3,6 217:1 261:12 265:12	pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3 poorly 9:16 popped 253:19 popularity 94:20 population 8:6	pose 77:19 posed 282:8 positioned 254:15 positive 39:4 112:21 137:6,6 145:4 180:10	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15 65:18 82:13,19 83:7,8,17 88:13 92:1 94:16 129:21 130:21 164:18
points 30:3 38:14 61:5 105:20 140:21 154:19 173:12 174:15 176:3,6 217:1 261:12 265:12 policy 75:14	<pre>pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3 poorly 9:16 popped 253:19 popularity 94:20 population 8:6 8:14,17 9:18</pre>	pose 77:19 posed 282:8 positioned 254:15 positive 39:4 112:21 137:6,6 145:4 180:10 182:12,13,20	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15 65:18 82:13,19 83:7,8,17 88:13 92:1 94:16 129:21 130:21 164:18 165:17 187:1,8
points 30:3 38:14 61:5 105:20 140:21 154:19 173:12 174:15 176:3,6 217:1 261:12 265:12 policy 75:14 89:7 90:5,20	pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3 poorly 9:16 popped 253:19 popularity 94:20 population 8:6 8:14,17 9:18 17:10 18:12	pose 77:19 posed 282:8 positioned 254:15 positive 39:4 112:21 137:6,6 145:4 180:10 182:12,13,20 182:20 224:17	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15 65:18 82:13,19 83:7,8,17 88:13 92:1 94:16 129:21 130:21 164:18 165:17 187:1,8 187:21 188:10
points 30:3 38:14 61:5 105:20 140:21 154:19 173:12 174:15 176:3,6 217:1 261:12 265:12 policy 75:14 89:7 90:5,20 91:7 105:7 polio 120:9,18 121:17 124:10	pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3 poorly 9:16 popped 253:19 popularity 94:20 population 8:6 8:14,17 9:18 17:10 18:12 26:1,2,8 27:3	pose 77:19 posed 282:8 positioned 254:15 positive 39:4 112:21 137:6,6 145:4 180:10 182:12,13,20 182:20 224:17 243:4,4,8	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15 65:18 82:13,19 83:7,8,17 88:13 92:1 94:16 129:21 130:21 164:18 165:17 187:1,8 187:21 188:10 202:21 213:13
points 30:3 38:14 61:5 105:20 140:21 154:19 173:12 174:15 176:3,6 217:1 261:12 265:12 policy 75:14 89:7 90:5,20 91:7 105:7 polio 120:9,18 121:17 124:10 162:5 175:4,11	pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3 poorly 9:16 popped 253:19 popularity 94:20 population 8:6 8:14,17 9:18 17:10 18:12 26:1,2,8 27:3 34:1,7 38:13 42:20 43:3 45:4 54:16,17	pose 77:19 posed 282:8 positioned 254:15 positive 39:4 112:21 137:6,6 145:4 180:10 182:12,13,20 182:20 224:17 243:4,4,8 250:15,18	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15 65:18 82:13,19 83:7,8,17 88:13 92:1 94:16 129:21 130:21 164:18 165:17 187:1,8 187:21 188:10 202:21 213:13 218:12 222:18
points 30:3 38:14 61:5 105:20 140:21 154:19 173:12 174:15 176:3,6 217:1 261:12 265:12 policy 75:14 89:7 90:5,20 91:7 105:7 polio 120:9,18 121:17 124:10	pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3 poorly 9:16 popped 253:19 popularity 94:20 population 8:6 8:14,17 9:18 17:10 18:12 26:1,2,8 27:3 34:1,7 38:13 42:20 43:3	pose 77:19 posed 282:8 positioned 254:15 positive 39:4 112:21 137:6,6 145:4 180:10 182:12,13,20 182:20 224:17 243:4,4,8 250:15,18 251:6,16	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15 65:18 82:13,19 83:7,8,17 88:13 92:1 94:16 129:21 130:21 164:18 165:17 187:1,8 187:21 188:10 202:21 213:13 218:12 222:18 224:13 231:2
points 30:3 38:14 61:5 105:20 140:21 154:19 173:12 174:15 176:3,6 217:1 261:12 265:12 policy 75:14 89:7 90:5,20 91:7 105:7 polio 120:9,18 121:17 124:10 162:5 175:4,11 178:19 179:7,8 179:16 180:3	pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3 poorly 9:16 popped 253:19 popularity 94:20 population 8:6 8:14,17 9:18 17:10 18:12 26:1,2,8 27:3 34:1,7 38:13 42:20 43:3 45:4 54:16,17 55:21,22 57:18 78:2 80:20	pose 77:19 posed 282:8 positioned 254:15 positive 39:4 112:21 137:6,6 145:4 180:10 182:12,13,20 182:20 224:17 243:4,4,8 250:15,18 251:6,16 255:18 256:1 270:4 positivity	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15 65:18 82:13,19 83:7,8,17 88:13 92:1 94:16 129:21 130:21 164:18 165:17 187:1,8 187:21 188:10 202:21 213:13 218:12 222:18 224:13 231:2 238:21 252:22
points 30:3 38:14 61:5 105:20 140:21 154:19 173:12 174:15 176:3,6 217:1 261:12 265:12 policy 75:14 89:7 90:5,20 91:7 105:7 polio 120:9,18 121:17 124:10 162:5 175:4,11 178:19 179:7,8	pooling 81:3 poorer 145:3 poorly 9:16 popped 253:19 popularity 94:20 population 8:6 8:14,17 9:18 17:10 18:12 26:1,2,8 27:3 34:1,7 38:13 42:20 43:3 45:4 54:16,17 55:21,22 57:18	pose 77:19 posed 282:8 positioned 254:15 positive 39:4 112:21 137:6,6 145:4 180:10 182:12,13,20 182:20 224:17 243:4,4,8 250:15,18 251:6,16 255:18 256:1 270:4	potential 9:17 39:11 42:2,15 65:18 82:13,19 83:7,8,17 88:13 92:1 94:16 129:21 130:21 164:18 165:17 187:1,8 187:21 188:10 202:21 213:13 218:12 222:18 224:13 231:2 238:21 252:22 255:11 262:22

potentially	precisely 40:7	preexisting	presentation
6:14 18:18	precision 279:8	253:2 258:16	12:17 16:12
42:15 204:8	preclinical	preferred 55:7	25:6 30:10,13
277:5 281:3	69:8 79:17	pregnancy	31:20 59:1
power 240:3	173:19 174:3,4	60:21 138:8	86:12 91:8
powered 9:18	precompetitive	pregnant 48:9	124:4,17
powerful 69:6	79:15	preliminary	144:19 146:20
prabha 2:9 4:4	precursors	124:14 154:15	153:17 154:18
12:10,15	116:20	premature	157:6 255:5
109:18 259:6	predict 55:15	57:14,21,22	256:14
272:1	58:13,15 109:9	138:13 144:20	presentations
practical 87:5	156:1 178:10	prematurity	11:1,5,11
89:10 182:6	178:10 184:6	44:17 138:10	89:13 90:14
practically	188:22 196:18	144:18	106:13,22
275:8	251:8 265:19	prenatally	107:3,13
practice 17:8	predicted 54:1	136:9	110:12 132:16
31:16 34:2	54:4,9,12	prepared 172:1	135:6 145:16
53:15 54:21	prediction	292:3	145:22 153:13
58:14 73:19	54:21 55:16	preparedness	153:15 221:20
97:16 99:4	predictive	197:14	285:1
245:9	156:7,11	preparing	presented
practices 62:16	255:17,18	286:7	124:13 129:15
71:6 72:12	263:14	prescribe 34:4	150:16 155:17
235:13	predictor	presence	241:10
practitioners	255:18,22	117:13 118:10	presenter
79:3	263:10	118:14,20	141:16
pragmatic 23:6	predictors	120:3 121:2	presenting
159:5	153:6 177:18	159:6	122:6 123:22
pre 35:10 43:8	177:18 240:15	present 5:7	139:22 250:20
218:10 251:22	255:15,22	30:11 115:3	252:1
prea 32:16	266:1,10	122:2 124:8	presently
preaching	predicts 155:18	131:21 132:8	170:14
76:16	predominant	139:13,15,21	presents 103:6
prebreak	126:21	142:7 146:6	146:13 256:2
227:13	preemies 61:13	155:7,17,21	president
preceding	preemptively	158:16 250:3	167:6
138:15	200:20 201:5	256:13 257:6	prespecified
			103:14

pressure 190:3	previously	probably	204:7 217:22
200:8 205:9	41:21 51:19	111:15 169:4	218:17 234:19
presumably	87:10 159:15	180:7,15	236:11,13,15
213:4	primarily 47:7	195:18 205:19	236:17 238:2
presumed	142:2 150:5	205:20 232:10	processed
150:17	162:15 172:1	239:20 242:17	114:11 115:18
pretty 74:16	primary 48:9	243:10 246:5	processes 93:6
146:1 173:3	117:9 141:19	246:15 274:4	produce 57:15
188:20 189:3,5	191:20 220:16	278:3	132:17
189:16,20	220:18 248:7	problem 103:8	produced
190:3 212:14	248:11 259:22	191:22 197:5	158:16
212:19 236:7	prime 69:2	237:11 275:19	producing
267:6 271:14	115:9,11	281:21 287:21	118:22
278:4 284:18	170:19 205:15	problematic	product 7:14
284:18	209:11 234:12	191:13 238:20	8:16 27:8 32:5
prevalence	primers 182:16	problems	33:6 36:6 42:6
47:8 82:18	183:3,10	103:7,8 190:15	45:9 48:16
prevent 19:14	principal	procapsid	77:4 78:9
24:8 206:2	112:10	116:19	83:15 84:16
242:20 245:2	principle 8:20	procedural	91:9 93:21
246:13 253:5	11:1	22:13,15	94:17 101:5
279:18	principles	procedure 21:7	148:21 159:1
preventable	25:15 76:18,20	104:8	160:10 202:10
179:6	prior 34:9	procedures	202:11 249:3
preventing	37:15 45:2	24:8 28:21	272:15 274:15
14:15 15:5	46:18,19	29:2,3 43:22	productive 5:9
25:16 27:16	136:22 224:10	proceeding	products 7:5
102:5	258:2 291:5	1:13 292:4	7:12 31:13
prevention	priority 47:11	proceedings	32:3,18 34:22
48:8 57:13	48:1 176:15	291:3,5,6,9	47:12 77:1
121:19 130:22	priorly 119:7	292:6	92:11 106:9
167:13 241:14	private 85:4	process 28:18	112:11 136:10
242:1,3	privilege 5:7	44:4 62:2,9	147:5 219:12
previewed	12:21	71:1 72:20	professor
217:19	proactive 72:6	73:10 79:21	131:9 167:7,13
previous 70:2	probability	99:20,22 104:9	167:16
119:22 173:11	151:22	116:9 175:5	profile 211:10
176:6		185:2 199:18	

prognosis	prominent	proteases	24:6,19 31:5
141:7,8 145:3	138:20	115:19	31:21 32:4
285:21	promise 264:16	protect 105:10	45:17 82:10,17
prograf 101:10	promising	120:11,16	84:4,12 111:8
program 32:14	80:17	196:16	123:13 197:8
47:11 48:14,14	promote 49:13	protecting	219:19 268:6
48:15 49:4,6	87:22 105:10	78:16,17	275:3 289:17
52:4,10,11,15	pronounced	protection	provided 28:6
53:5 91:15,22	78:7	117:15	30:9,9 95:17
93:2,5 106:3	proof 19:5	protective	280:16
197:3,16 206:4	260:7	119:19 196:10	provider
218:10 250:12	propensity	protein 114:1	165:12 272:7
274:5	289:8,11,16	114:14 115:8	providers 23:7
programs	properties	116:3,6,6	78:10
46:16 48:13	168:20	164:7	provides 88:7
49:2 51:12	prophylaxis	proteins	88:11 99:10
52:22 58:8	101:11 148:10	113:21,21	providing 86:5
77:4 86:14	proposals	114:10 115:20	91:12 93:6
89:10 197:14	10:13	proteolytically	111:20 166:3
218:19 219:7	proposed 47:2	114:11 115:18	215:8 290:3
280:21	206:8	protocol 17:12	proxy 15:15
progress 33:19	prospect 13:15	20:20,21 21:21	pt 74:2
33:22 89:20	16:22 17:16	24:7 27:10	ptn 84:8,10
239:22 243:11	18:7,22 21:9	86:4 96:17	90:12
progressing	21:13 26:17	184:9	public 1:4 10:5
255:9	110:4	protocols 13:11	10:9 26:6 85:4
progression	prospective	protomers	105:10 107:7
50:21 51:2	22:19 143:1	114:13	153:22 167:20
154:13 242:3	153:3,5 221:2	prototype	179:17 291:18
246:6	279:6	142:3 144:19	publication
project 104:5	prospectively	163:22 197:13	52:8,9 88:6
104:11	103:13 270:15	197:15	publications
projects 91:16	270:22 278:15	proved 263:8	235:10,15
93:11 95:19	278:15,18	proven 108:6	published 49:4
106:6	protease 163:2	134:1	53:8 95:11
prolonged	164:7,8 206:7	provide 6:21	98:10 285:8
110:2 142:9	210:8 213:5	10:11 15:15	publishes
		17:16 18:5	29:19

pulled 97:17	question 98:13	153:15,16	radiological
100:11	101:2 107:6,9	154:1 156:20	92:22
pulmonary	108:13,16,16	166:3 167:21	raise 107:5
150:7	108:18 109:12	175:14 198:4,6	153:20 167:18
punctures	109:16,20	198:7,8 200:3	177:5 198:7
27:11	110:9,14	217:18,21	raised 198:11
purely 260:10	111:18 153:21	218:11,19	198:14 261:12
purports 7:19	154:3,5 155:3	236:5,10,11	271:4 287:2
purpose 40:19	155:20 157:7	239:7 260:19	raising 284:13
purposes 22:3	157:18 159:11	279:9 287:2	randomization
27:14 47:22	160:8 161:6,21	quick 67:16	267:17,18
pushed 73:17	164:13,14,20	189:4,6 198:19	randomized
73:17	164:22 176:7	199:15 200:12	96:13 97:7,12
put 5:17 16:4	177:17 179:13	205:5	98:2 101:13
29:8 143:5	179:22 188:6	quicker 68:21	105:21 110:19
159:8 160:21	192:12 200:7	quickly 160:6,9	148:11,15
170:9 203:9	201:19 202:3,5	188:20 201:19	149:18 150:11
207:10 219:18	208:11 209:1	209:13 244:20	150:19 165:4
222:5 231:9	212:5 214:4	257:6 278:5	165:10,11
236:18 250:21	215:12 225:21	quite 25:19	221:3 282:13
281:1	226:20 227:1	143:11 183:11	286:17
putting 219:15	241:2 242:15	189:11 217:13	range 44:15
222:18	242:16 247:4	222:9 225:4	45:9 58:1 86:2
q	252:13 254:7	233:7 244:15	108:4,4,10,11
qd 54:6	257:14,16	244:15 250:12	134:2 135:6
qualified 83:9	259:7,9 260:16	285:3 286:22	142:12,14
291:7	264:9,9,21	quote 38:17	163:4 171:3
qualitative 8:4	265:15,17	48:4 61:15	241:20 274:19
quality 77:7	281:14 282:8	96:13,14	274:20 276:7
99:21 279:8	286:7 289:9	181:17	ranging 276:20
quandary	questioned	r	rapid 35:7
288:1	237:14	r 2:1 3:1 5:1	49:10 141:21
quantifying 8:4	questions 12:5	rabbit 57:22	158:18 159:6
quantitying 0.4	24:20 60:7	261:16	160:14 169:12
263:5	71:8 75:9	rachel 84:18	186:7 212:21
query 143:15	107:3,8 111:20	radiation 22:9	253:20 256:3
query 173.13	121:11,13	iddiddiddi 22.)	rapidly 94:7
	131:4 153:11		156:12 158:22

[rare - really] Page 63

rare 6:20 7:1	rcts 101:16	100:15,17	80:8,15 81:15
30:19 32:7	rds 57:13	101:9,19	82:1,3,6,8,15
40:9 46:8,12	reach 82:9	102:10,12,12	83:18 85:2,9
46:15,18,21,22	196:1 259:14	102:16 103:2	85:10,11 87:1
47:4,10,18,20	reached 63:20	103:20,22	87:14 88:10,12
48:4 49:14	react 202:18	104:1,4,4,13	89:5,12 90:3
170:10,11	203:1 247:2	104:19,21	96:7 107:13
171:3 173:12	reactions 42:1	105:1 106:2,3	109:22 111:5
185:4 216:2,21	reactive 120:3	106:11,14,15	118:21 134:18
220:22 221:7	121:3	175:1 177:22	134:22 135:21
221:11,17,22	reactivity	237:11 242:16	143:8 145:11
222:7 232:3	190:20 191:6,7	244:11 248:12	145:22 146:4
254:8 267:2	194:11 202:1	254:19 266:4	147:2 148:11
279:10	203:12	270:8 272:16	148:18 152:12
rarity 35:3	read 85:10	273:1 274:10	154:16 155:2,3
42:2 170:15	125:17 196:22	278:2 283:10	158:4 163:4,18
171:2 172:19	201:19 209:1	288:13	164:1,4 169:19
rash 132:22	264:20 265:9	realistic 205:19	170:20 172:11
rashes 132:21	283:14	reality 96:5,15	174:17 175:12
139:19,20	readily 159:18	256:18	175:21 176:8
rate 137:1	160:14	realize 216:5	176:11,12,21
141:12,22	reading 220:20	really 13:13	177:4,12,20
142:21 143:19	249:1	14:4 16:14,15	182:3,21 184:7
143:21 151:6	readout 194:13	18:11 19:1	185:1,1,22
205:4 259:13	reads 269:6	20:17 22:16	187:20 189:8
rates 73:2	ready 100:7	23:8 24:15,19	190:2,5 191:3
143:7,12 152:2	172:8,12	29:6,10 31:22	191:6 192:8,12
152:6 153:5	reagents 203:3	34:13 40:15	192:13 194:19
181:19,22	real 33:9 40:2	44:3 48:16	195:1 198:19
205:3 236:8	90:19,21,22	49:11,12 64:19	200:19,20
rather 78:17	91:13,15,17,17	65:1 67:16	203:11 204:22
99:22 126:7	92:1,16 93:1	68:22 69:10	206:5 209:16
139:1,13,14	93:16,19,22	70:2,12 71:3,5	209:17 212:2
204:8 249:12	94:4,5,17,20	71:12 73:3	228:9 230:9,20
270:21,22	95:3,3,12	75:6 76:1 77:7	233:13,16
278:14 279:17	97:13,20 98:1	77:12 78:9,14	234:9,15,15,15
ratio 22:20	98:16,21 99:6	78:16,18,21	234:18 236:1,7
151:1	99:8,9,20	79:5,9,13,22	236:9 239:19

243:14 248:4	receiving 23:16	recombined	referred
248:18 250:3	46:18 101:12	205:16	191:10
255:21 256:15	recent 41:5	recommenda	referring 16:11
256:18 257:16	88:5,6 142:4	10:13 87:14	177:10
258:4 259:15	143:20 282:8	reconvene	refined 223:3
262:22 263:3	recently 49:3	111:22 223:9	reflect 106:1
264:21 265:12	95:9 149:4	record 97:17	reflecting
265:22 267:2	receptor 57:5	100:11 112:2	143:9
272:7,19 273:6	109:7 115:2	166:8 223:11	reflection
274:22 288:1	116:3 191:12	291:9 292:5	192:8
realm 229:6	receptors	recorded 11:18	reflects 40:5
reason 148:3	35:15 116:4	291:6	refusal 272:6
182:11 193:10	168:16	recording	regard 33:20
197:8 206:1	recipients	291:8 292:4	36:20,21 95:11
224:22 225:6	110:20 151:1	recordings	99:8 260:21
268:11	151:22 152:1	11:19	285:9
reasonable	165:15	records 98:17	regarding 5:18
22:19 211:16	recognition	99:16	60:14,15 93:20
253:3 265:5	77:5	recover 247:21	164:18 198:9
267:6 280:14	recognize	recovered	264:11 283:9
280:15	45:12,15 76:21	158:10	283:17 287:3
reasonably	222:11	recovery 74:17	regardless
162:15	recognized	recruiting	28:14 60:8
reasons 9:14	142:2	81:16	64:19 93:22
34:21 147:15	recognizes	rectal 128:19	111:13
222:13	78:19	red 37:11	regenerative
receipt 149:8	recollection	reduce 207:6	142:16
receive 15:10	257:20	reduced 291:7	regimen 54:6
23:19 24:22	recombinants	refer 44:19	54:14 56:4
111:10 148:15	205:14	48:20 285:6	regions 135:18
150:19 152:14	recombination	reference 44:22	registries 81:10
152:19 189:20	183:6 204:20	160:2 208:1	registry 98:17
230:18	205:1,2,22	referenced	regs 227:1
received 62:10	207:1,17 209:5	16:2 32:5	regular 87:22
73:22 148:21	209:7,15	202:9	regularly 11:21
151:12 207:19	210:13,17	references 25:5	regulate
208:19 282:5	recombine	41:4	115:12
	210:1,4,14		

regulated	166:12 175:16	rely 40:17	replication
116:9	177:16 215:12	122:22 253:3	116:16
regulates	291:11 292:7	remainder	report 14:12
116:15	relationship	16:12	16:2,3 129:16
regulation	39:22 51:3	remaining	157:12
102:1	52:20	267:9	reported 1:19
regulations	relationships	remains 61:12	123:6,9 124:10
13:12 15:20	132:4	105:7	124:21,22
16:5,14 19:21	relative 35:2	remark 5:8	125:13 126:6
20:5 24:13,14	224:10 291:13	remarks 25:20	127:2,15,15,18
93:1 98:18	292:10	remember 43:7	127:22 128:1
99:1	relatively	43:16 261:19	142:13 143:6
regulators 79:3	162:9 170:10	remembering	reporter 244:6
80:1 81:2	181:22 188:2	157:11	reporting
84:12	202:14	remind 76:17	122:22 123:7
regulatory	release 115:10	272:10 282:7	129:10,11,18
6:21 7:10	116:8	reminder 27:1	129:19
10:12 30:21	released 114:9	28:5 153:16	reports 123:3
36:10,12,18	116:11,21	167:18	135:22 136:3
69:18 77:6	relevance	remote 1:13	137:5,8 142:4
86:6 87:9,22	238:1	removed 115:9	143:14 148:5
88:4,11,17,19	relevant 16:16	282:21	149:18
89:2,8 90:5	21:21 31:7	removing	represent
98:22 101:2,4	32:2 36:19	191:17	31:11 40:12
166:14 184:22	38:15 43:2	renewed 105:3	96:22 171:2
185:14 228:8	46:9 49:1	repair 196:17	representation
228:11 286:12	94:18 96:10	204:5	61:12
reintubated	98:6 100:21	repairing	representative
62:13	102:18 105:13	196:10	102:11 129:17
rejection	132:3 158:7	replace 105:22	144:1 174:13
101:11 102:5	161:2 169:20	replicate 116:1	represented
rejoined 74:22	194:19 199:1	175:4	33:7 125:9,15
relate 179:14	209:17	replicated	126:19
related 22:12	reliability	116:18	representing
44:17 88:19	39:21	replicating	125:20
91:8,18 93:16	reliable 96:10	249:10,12	represents
107:3 153:15	96:10 100:20	250:3,16	35:14 78:15
153:17 159:12	102:17	253:17 254:4	105:2

repurposed	199:15 224:18	respond 176:4	retrieval 136:9
69:17 70:4	229:6 235:21	200:2 201:18	retrospective
109:3	237:18	212:7 243:21	148:5 149:5
request 46:22	researchers	246:2 257:13	221:2
require 14:6	65:19 68:15	273:10 275:6	return 11:3
32:16 87:15	79:2 81:1	288:11	reversion
103:19 267:16	residual 141:14	responding	205:3,4,7,8
required 7:12	resistance	249:13 281:14	reverts 209:12
29:15 53:10	188:11 200:8	response 45:7	review 5:12
87:9 116:15	200:12,14	51:3,8 52:20	36:10 46:13,19
requirement	201:2 204:17	111:8 119:19	47:11 49:4
7:11 20:13	205:18 206:12	120:4 121:3	93:7 112:12
requirements	207:7 208:3	147:18 179:3	143:20 145:12
25:3 26:15	210:19 211:2	191:1,3,4,17	185:10
92:4 101:4	212:20 213:3	191:19 193:2,7	reviewer
requires 78:20	resistant	193:9,14,19	218:22
169:14 216:12	212:17	194:16 195:10	reviewers
216:13	resource 67:5	204:7 206:10	218:18 219:4
requiring	resources	215:8 229:18	reviewing
154:6	29:18 32:4	244:1 252:8	48:18
rescue 75:2	45:20 46:1	253:15 274:20	reye's 134:4
research 10:7	48:20 49:13	responses	rhino 182:12
13:13 14:7	71:3 72:15	192:18 287:16	250:19 251:16
16:21 18:3	79:17 81:3	responsibly	rhinovirus
27:14 32:15	235:15 236:19	7:18	117:18 120:8
65:19 66:9	237:7,19	rest 11:4 76:5	120:19 123:14
68:17 73:11	244:14	90:14	123:21 128:5
75:14 77:7,8	respect 188:9	restricted	128:11 150:6
78:16,17 80:9	220:8 225:1	21:10	182:20
80:14,18 81:5	253:22 258:8	result 78:8	rhinoviruses
81:12,20 82:5	280:3,19	87:12 130:10	113:5 115:1
82:12,22 83:11	respiratory	138:20 249:5	ribosome
84:1 85:14,22	57:13 117:6	results 53:11	115:14
86:13 91:16	122:15 123:16	54:18 57:11	ribosomes
93:10 94:10 100:12 104:7	128:6,13 133:17 136:20	94:14 120:22	116:12
112:12 119:4	138:18 139:22	165:21	right 16:8 33:15 67:18
	138:18 139:22	resume 166:5	69:1 71:12
167:5,8 185:15	147.3		09.1 /1.12

Meeting

May 7, 2024

78:15 81:1	255:9 265:18	249:6,8 250:7	243:1
82:7 84:1	265:20 266:1	259:10	safeguard 14:8
100:4 114:13	266:11	rosenfeld's	safeguards
133:9 140:10	risks 14:15	112:13 193:19	14:6 16:9
146:13 152:2	15:1,2,7 17:19	rossman's	safely 28:4
156:17,18	22:14 26:11	163:21	safest 287:15
196:14 203:2	93:20 111:12	rounds 63:14	safety 7:12
207:12 226:1	rivaroxaban	route 55:5,7,8	34:6 36:5
226:14 227:15	53:13,15	195:18	41:17,18 42:13
231:13 242:7	rna 112:21	routes 195:14	42:15 43:13
243:14 251:5	115:13 116:11	195:17	44:7,9 50:22
251:11 254:11	116:14,14	routine 20:3	51:5,8,10,15
254:16 262:2	118:10,14,16	43:14	52:1 56:14
264:8 265:14	118:20 208:4	routinely 93:18	83:3,17,18
267:5 269:19	road 181:16	row 98:18	88:8 101:5
270:1,9 281:12	211:5 262:19	rows 98:11,16	211:10
rigor 88:11	robert 3:3	rpd 47:10,22	sample 53:4
260:5	robust 105:7	48:14 49:4	56:16,17,22
rigorous 77:2	283:9 289:22	rt 118:12	57:1 80:6
105:16 270:8	role 33:9 52:7	rule 201:9	108:12 118:1
rise 16:4	80:10 83:12	ruled 146:18	205:20 216:6
114:14	85:5 86:19	146:22	216:12
risk 6:17 13:16	131:20 209:7	rules 201:15	samples 181:10
13:17 16:21	roles 80:14	run 11:17	sampling 43:10
17:7,14,22	roll 262:15	211:15	43:12 53:5
19:19,19 20:1	room 59:20	running 107:1	181:17
20:1,5,11,14	226:5 259:8	222:7 283:8	sars 119:16
20:18 21:2,11	roots 177:8	rwd 95:14 96:4	181:10
21:14,15 22:5	rosenfeld 2:16	rwe 95:14 96:4	satisfied 26:9
22:9,11,19	4:11 112:6,10	S	satisfy 92:3
23:11 24:13	112:15,16	s 2:1 3:1 4:1	saw 37:15
25:15 26:19,21	121:12 163:10	5:1	119:16 135:22
26:22 27:2,3,7	163:13 164:11	sabin 205:7	169:6 185:18
27:9 144:4,13	174:10,12	209:12	saying 98:15
147:20 154:9	179:19 182:10	safe 77:17	105:6 192:22
154:12 155:22	190:9,12,15	92:13 211:14	193:6 218:1
156:4,7 181:7	192:16,21	211:19 242:22	221:8 231:12
184:11 199:6	204:14,15	, = \$ = 1 -1-2	268:13 274:13

284:18	screen 12:6	45:16 61:20	seen 44:22
says 265:1	screening 6:8	62:3 63:7,8,9,9	172:4 199:8
273:19 276:13	197:9 243:5,6	74:3,5 85:17	232:15 257:6
scale 105:4	screenshot	99:11,12	266:10,22
scattered 146:1	92:16 99:15	114:18 118:2	segment
scenario 51:1,6	104:2	118:15 120:13	125:18
scenarios	se 165:19 209:8	120:15 126:1	segments 10:21
140:18 187:2	season 136:19	127:1 133:8	segue 264:9
schematic	171:5	135:5,11,17	283:16 284:12
115:20	seasonal 128:5	138:3 139:13	seizure 235:3,5
schematics	130:7,12	140:18 143:8	235:18 237:18
119:10	seasons 171:17	145:21 148:18	seizures 74:20
scheme 53:5	second 14:14	150:22 151:10	74:21 87:8
schleiss 3:7	18:21 23:15	151:21 152:6	141:2
157:1,3,5	24:1 26:11	174:1 198:10	select 50:15
178:14,16	51:1 52:13	200:1 205:13	51:15 52:21
179:19,22	55:9 96:12	214:14 227:15	53:3,4,8 54:18
school 2:20	108:18 109:12	236:21 240:4	57:11 97:15
131:10 167:15	176:9 185:20	242:9 243:13	232:4
208:7	211:8 213:10	246:20 248:19	selected 54:9
science 66:19	244:1	249:11 257:16	57:21 91:14
168:6 248:21	secondarily	261:18 266:16	selection 9:19
scientific 10:2	17:21 18:14	270:21 271:8	49:22 50:6,12
14:22 26:6	secondary 69:6	274:19 277:20	52:13 55:3
34:13 88:11	73:7 117:9	284:9 286:6	280:15
89:6 101:1	220:19 248:10	seeing 39:6	selective 163:8
105:2 166:14	secondly 15:1	71:16 106:17	205:9
222:22 272:8	184:16	172:2 178:11	self 114:11,12
scientist 174:13	secretions	249:3	seminal 175:10
scope 48:19	136:20	seeking 219:20	send 271:10
123:10	section 6:21	seem 162:3,21	sending 160:1
score 118:7	62:7 102:1	169:3 173:14	senior 121:16
289:8	107:11 131:11	226:13	sense 231:21
scores 289:11	sections 93:8	seems 110:16	259:5 267:1
289:16	sedation 22:13	176:2 226:20	270:14,20
scoring 265:18	22:15	242:6 267:6	285:16
266:10	see 13:11 16:1	269:11 271:14	sensitive 67:5
	33:14 37:7	283:19 284:4	191:14

sensitivity	serial 117:22	183:18 189:3	162:20 166:17
234:10	series 143:2,7	197:19 248:7	169:3,5 172:20
sensorineural	143:10,11	setting 15:11	178:4 184:7
42:7	258:17 269:3	34:3 61:8	189:17,19
sent 112:21	serious 6:14	147:8 148:4,10	192:1,2,7,7
146:18	41:22 47:6	157:9 159:3	199:6 201:15
sentinel 62:20	174:15	177:21,21	239:10 240:17
separate 93:1	seroconversi	181:9	242:3,9,12,20
265:2	120:22	settings 97:16	243:14 245:2,3
separated 62:6	seroconverted	99:4 137:10	246:6 247:19
separation	119:18	settled 285:13	248:1 249:9,11
36:1 67:8	seropositivity	setup 80:10	249:12,20
sepsis 28:11	121:1 186:10	seven 77:16	250:4,4 251:2
112:14,18	190:19	115:12 144:7	251:9 253:5
113:11,16	serosurveys	146:5 164:3	255:9 257:19
134:14 135:6	120:22	255:16 256:12	257:19,20
140:8 150:13	serotype	several 10:22	258:1,2,11
153:4 160:4,4	144:10 147:21	33:1 41:5,19	259:20 265:19
160:12 173:8	148:2,7 149:1	44:10 46:4	266:1,11
200:18 201:13	156:9 178:1	48:17 73:4	severely 199:9
203:18 208:18	serotypes	80:12 94:11	240:1,10 281:7
224:8 252:16	117:18 133:15	99:17 126:8	severity 44:21
september 33:3	145:6 162:7	171:8,9,17	239:9 241:17
128:8,12	serum 145:4	190:15,16	251:10 281:3
sequalae	256:1	264:18 287:2	sewage 180:8
141:15	serve 89:6	severe 5:18	180:15 181:13
sequelae 38:8	services 28:13	6:15 117:8,15	181:15 182:5
38:18 155:12	104:8 197:9	129:12,20	shame 186:1
sequence	session 11:6,6	130:9 134:11	248:12
202:12	11:12 12:22	136:1,4 137:22	shane 292:2,15
sequencing	90:18 107:1	138:6,19 139:6	share 50:4 51:7
169:14 180:13	108:18 111:22	140:6,18 141:9	73:14 79:16
212:21	112:4 131:5	141:17,22	198:2 264:22
sequentially	137:21 153:14	142:5,6 144:6	shared 10:18
165:15	153:19 157:19	144:20 145:2	89:14
sera 117:14	176:10 198:17	146:7 147:20	sharing 59:10
120:9,11,14,22	set 5:8 31:4	152:11 154:7	89:6 197:17
121:1	140:1 171:1	155:9,16 156:2	207:21

shed 136:19	151:6,15	significance	simply 93:21
shedding	251:22	243:15	94:19 193:6
118:22	shrink 284:20	significant	254:10 258:9
shelf 158:8	shukla 1:8	32:20 35:11	simulation
shift 78:15,18	shut 173:5	77:19 89:16	50:11 52:6
shifted 239:17	shutting 287:5	152:3,8 165:22	53:4,11,15
shopping 98:13	sick 55:6 62:5	195:22 216:13	54:21 58:14
shoptalk 97:10	65:1 138:12	233:14	109:2
short 39:4 40:6	186:19 195:19	significantly	simultaneously
42:12 102:14	206:20 224:20	82:13	108:4 109:13
155:11 223:9	230:3,6,7,10	signing 28:20	single 96:18
233:12 238:3	230:14 231:5	29:6	112:21 115:16
shortly 17:18	231:14 232:7,8	signs 139:11	126:5 185:7
show 143:11	233:3,3 234:15	154:6	192:5 202:11
148:20 151:20	238:13 239:21	silence 266:22	208:19 211:1
152:1 165:14	240:1,21	silos 70:15	275:2 284:14
173:21 195:21	248:17 251:22	similar 6:9 9:1	286:4
231:22 260:8	254:18 256:16	41:20 51:2,7	singular
262:4 287:15	258:18 279:18	51:16 53:17	286:10
showcasing	279:19 283:22	76:22 96:19	sister 63:20
84:2	sicker 244:18	113:19 128:5	sit 168:13
showed 63:4	sickest 230:3,7	133:7 182:14	256:10 262:20
149:7 165:4	231:14 233:16	207:10 210:20	268:1
169:7 196:12	239:19 240:21	235:6 269:12	site 71:1 115:2
253:19 258:3	248:17 256:10	276:22	117:9 185:11
260:4 266:8	256:13 260:8	similarity	191:20 209:11
showing 252:2	side 33:15	183:4	213:7 216:14
shown 34:8	62:12 68:3	similarly 39:1	227:8 254:15
94:11 97:3	114:18 133:9	84:20 128:11	sites 66:8 83:9
126:11 132:22	140:7,10 152:2	168:22	97:15 117:10
133:3 134:18	181:16 271:20	simple 18:17	151:7 171:1,22
137:2 142:5	272:7 276:9	22:4 96:13	172:8 185:12
145:5 146:2,15	sights 185:6	97:22 175:14	216:14,14
151:3 211:13	signaling 35:16	simplex 146:19	226:7
255:21	signals 130:13	187:1,2	sitting 256:16
shows 100:5	signature	simplified 94:5	situation 60:6
124:22 125:12	114:15 291:16	simplistic	64:22 210:21
127:14 140:4	292:14	14:12	220:8 230:21

[situation - sort]

244:17	12.21 12.5	129.2 10 15	100.2 200.10
six 66:14	42:21 43:5 44:22 45:1,2	128:3,10,15	190:3 200:19 200:20 204:3
	,	129:3,7,13	
234:14 256:12	45:16,19 46:6	130:3 131:1	205:18 208:3,4
sizable 239:2	46:17 47:16	132:2,5,12	243:10 285:18
size 9:18 41:18	48:21,22 49:7	133:19 134:20	286:16
44:9 53:5 56:1	50:7,18,19	134:22 135:13	smaller 135:4
78:1 108:12	51:13 52:5	136:6 137:11	152:7 201:14
216:12	53:6,12 55:1,2	138:2 139:10	smart 261:21
sizes 80:6	57:8 58:5,17	140:2,2,4,15	smarter 227:21
216:6	58:19 59:14	140:16,21	snps 192:6
skewed 61:12	60:2,18 65:14	142:19 144:2	social 60:15
skills 291:10	68:12 70:13	145:9 146:8	sociologically
292:6	73:12 75:8	147:12 149:11	94:20
skin 117:11	76:12,15 77:9	150:8,14 151:4	solely 88:18
skip 30:2	78:12 79:12	151:14 152:9	113:6
sleep 74:13	80:13 81:18	166:21,21	solid 22:6
sleeves 262:15	82:11 83:21	167:22 241:7,8	119:10 145:19
slew 74:3	85:8,9,11	246:8	solutions 27:17
slide 5:10,15	86:15 87:17	slides 11:19	40:22 272:21
6:1,12 7:8,21	88:15 89:11	34:9 37:3	solving 237:11
8:10 9:4,21	90:9 91:4	58:21 80:12	somebody
10:15 11:9,15	92:10,17 95:8	82:10 90:13	174:20 236:9
12:8,13 13:3,5	97:2,6 98:8,11	95:21 106:12	273:19
13:22 14:10	98:15 99:13,18	157:13	somewhat 20:7
15:17,21 16:1	100:13 101:6	slight 133:8	94:5 175:16
16:13 17:5	102:8 103:21	slog 64:19	221:13 251:15
18:4 19:17	104:15 105:5	slot 102:13	265:16
20:16 21:17	105:18 106:19	slow 19:14	sooner 139:1
22:21 24:11	112:8,19	160:1	sorry 215:20
25:5,7,12,17	113:17 115:5	slowing 254:4	244:3 289:18
26:10 27:15	115:22 117:2	small 9:18	sort 60:15
28:15 29:17	117:19 118:9	28:21 43:8	107:17 143:13
30:1,4,5,17	119:2,22 120:1	69:9 78:1 80:6	178:2 179:7,13
31:9,19 32:8	120:20 121:9	126:18 129:15	187:10,12
33:2,15,18	122:5,18,19	133:4 148:11	195:5 202:12
34:20 36:8	124:7,15,19	169:7 183:1	207:22 226:6
37:16 38:10	125:6,11 127:4	188:17,18,20	227:12 229:5
40:1,20 41:14	127:12,20	189:12,16,21	230:22 232:11
		·	

[sort - stands] Page 72

243:7,11	197:20 290:1	specificity	stability 62:13
255:21 270:4	speaking 30:20	202:12 210:7	stacked 126:12
278:1,19	90:21 232:11	210:12	staff 30:11
sorting 180:17	speaks 98:22	specimen	137:9
sorts 69:21	specialists 74:3	128:18	stage 5:8 31:5
sound 8:8	specialization	specimens	83:13 260:12
183:11 215:9	93:3	128:6 137:7	stages 82:21
276:9	specialized	146:18	210:11
sounds 66:20	162:17	spectrum 43:2	staggered
246:4 260:15	specialties 82:1	64:8 162:11	53:20
source 228:3,9	85:18,20	163:9 197:7	staining 118:3
sources 49:13	specialty 82:8	240:9,20	stakeholder
93:18 94:13	species 113:5,7	241:16 248:18	70:21 93:8
95:4 96:5	113:12 117:4	268:22	stakeholders
98:16 102:17	specific 7:10	speculation	10:6 33:9
103:2,3,20	25:3 31:12	137:4	71:20 78:21
128:5 194:12	32:11 34:19	spend 22:22	79:16 80:22
202:7 284:16	38:8 41:8	38:11 122:7	stakes 67:4
space 37:17	44:16 46:5	spending 216:6	standard 28:6
87:8 234:8,21	49:11 70:5	spent 40:21	36:12 65:22
235:16	82:19 89:8	217:20,20,21	66:1 74:20
spaces 236:20	117:4 121:6	spirited 213:9	92:10 110:17
spanned	147:1 148:2	sponsor 46:18	110:19 146:12
143:21	149:12 159:20	52:2 54:5,9,13	221:20 222:1
sparse 56:17	161:12,17	98:13 101:18	288:7
speak 75:11	163:14 166:17	216:4	standardized
90:11 112:17	182:16 183:19	sponsor's	28:8
131:3,20 234:4	191:5 194:17	102:15	standards 77:6
234:5 244:10	201:22 202:16	sponsors 7:11	87:22 98:18
277:8	204:5 212:7	81:2 83:7	101:22 104:3
speaker 11:18	246:20	84:11 99:7	105:9 106:10
11:22 12:15	specifically	sporadic 137:8	standpoint
70:2 90:18	6:15 84:9,17	spot 268:15	23:3,8 42:10
112:10	152:4 153:18	spotting 100:2	172:16,17
speakers 5:3	154:4 164:21	spread 117:5	186:8 220:12
11:17 51:18	181:4 186:9	137:9	231:16
111:20 121:14	221:17 223:14	sprowl 292:2	stands 87:20
166:3,22	245:20 266:11	292:15	

[start - study] Page 73

start 19:14	stead 159:8	stratify 45:5	34:11,15 35:1
41:11 91:20	stem 69:19	streamline	36:14 39:15
98:2 138:13	134:9 205:7	79:20	41:3 43:2,11
166:10 168:1	stemming	streamlined	43:17,20 44:5
175:14 231:1	89:16	185:7 271:14	53:10 55:14
233:15 240:15	step 7:9 174:16	strengthened	68:21 73:3,4
240:16 256:5	steps 8:7 41:6	130:17	77:3 81:10
260:1 261:7	221:17	strengthening	87:9,15 94:12
267:12 273:15	steve 3:8	130:18	96:14,20 97:7
started 66:14	167:11 170:8	strengthens	97:8,9,19 98:4
108:22 170:8	182:11 183:8	77:7	99:3 103:6
201:8 217:17	stimulating	strengths 82:7	105:12,12,16
217:18	58:22	stress 18:21	117:16 118:15
starting 91:13	stimuli 67:1	stressful 43:21	121:1,4 136:18
92:6	stock 118:1	62:18	155:15 170:16
starts 59:17	stone 258:9	stressing 13:14	170:20,22
175:21 219:6	stool 128:18	strict 225:4	171:7 174:8
state 146:10	stop 73:15	strive 263:19	177:11 187:11
169:15 179:1	98:12 153:10	strong 146:4	194:4 211:12
183:16 287:12	178:12 266:7	158:4 249:3	213:20 214:5
291:19	stopped 201:9	strongly 64:10	216:2 217:17
stated 8:2	stops 219:6	261:21	217:18 220:15
222:6	stories 64:12	struck 70:2	221:1,2,2,3,9
states 7:3 123:9	story 60:19	107:12	224:4 225:12
130:17 152:18	70:9 179:7	structure 16:8	225:13 228:8
181:3,4,5	248:19 262:8	113:19	230:14 234:1,2
283:17	storyline 249:2	structures	234:2 252:6
statistical 8:9	straight 277:12	81:21	260:20 261:4
242:19 243:15	straightforwa	structuring	262:18 263:17
statistically	38:13 286:2	14:3	265:18 266:5
152:8 165:22	strains 157:8	struggled	269:12 289:12
status 93:17	171:18	235:4	study 18:12,16
152:11 255:4	strand 116:17	studied 41:17	20:19,20,22
statutory 47:18	stranded	41:21 268:8,11	21:6 27:1 28:3
47:21	112:21	284:6	34:22 42:22
stay 155:11	strategies 27:4	studies 9:18	43:22 53:19,20
240:15,20	29:5 213:13	27:12 29:12,22	53:22 57:11
261:16		32:15,17,21	69:1,5,6 72:8

73:6 77:20	282:1,13,19,20	subpart 16:11	suck 63:9
84:21 92:3	283:1,5,5,18	16:11,14	sudden 173:2
94:1 95:4,18	284:3,15 286:5	subpopulations	suffer 233:13
96:5 100:22	288:14	41:22	sufficient 19:12
101:3,20,21	studying 70:17	subsequent	34:5 95:7
108:3 111:3	156:17 216:6	32:21	191:3 209:13
148:11,12,16	216:20 273:7	subset 137:14	216:6
149:5 150:9,10	stuff 159:22	224:16	sufficiently
150:15 151:16	164:4 249:19	subsets 240:9	8:22 51:7
151:16,20	271:3,15,18	substantial	suggest 121:3
153:1,2,9	sub 19:15	7:15 8:13,19	172:10 252:6
155:3 156:18	240:8	36:12,20 37:13	262:8
165:4 172:18	subclinical	41:16 92:10	suggesting
178:9 184:14	74:21	104:22 215:10	164:16 165:17
185:11 195:20	subcontracting	221:21	184:9 191:19
214:6 215:2,11	228:14	substantially	268:5
220:17 223:17	subdivided	229:5	suggestion
224:7,11,15,21	113:7	subtherapeutic	148:19
224:22 225:22	subject 13:21	108:7 109:21	suggests
226:2,5,6,7,10	17:17,20 18:11	268:19,20	118:13 120:21
226:18 229:19	18:12 111:13	274:21 275:8	260:11
229:20 230:2,5	subjects 14:20	subtract 156:4	suitable 103:1
230:7,8,8,16	14:21 16:21	282:5	suite 98:12
230:16,22	17:1 110:18	subtypes	suited 157:19
231:2 233:1,8	151:16 171:20	161:19 188:13	summaries
233:12 236:11	196:1 216:11	succeed 208:9	99:12
239:20 240:7	216:15 282:5	success 71:2	summarize
240:14 241:9	submission	successes	29:20 98:15
241:11,13	84:15 86:7	234:20	130:4 140:17
242:8 243:17	submissions	successful	summarized
244:15 245:22	98:20 102:13	37:18 83:22	98:10
253:20 257:18	102:13	104:14 201:12	summary
258:2 260:2,3	submit 12:5	259:22	14:13 26:16
262:4 263:4	submitted	successfully	30:2 49:8
264:4 266:14	101:17,18	37:13 208:15	89:12 105:20
267:15 268:6	submitting	successor	summed
269:5,9 273:20	99:6	224:6	127:22
275:3 280:8			

summer 127:17	156:10 159:13	survives 37:1	142:7
130:8 135:17	160:20 185:19	40:14	syndromes
172:2	187:7 188:15	survivors	134:2 174:2,3
sunita 1:8	190:7,10	141:13 142:14	186:17
super 279:18	193:18 202:4	142:16	synergistic
279:19	203:11 209:6	susceptibility	88:12 164:15
supervisory	214:20,21	42:3,20 162:4	164:16
30:16,18	215:10 217:17	188:14	synergy 164:18
supplemental	228:20 229:7	susceptible	165:18,19,19
101:18	236:4,22	162:21 210:15	synthetic 57:16
supplementary	270:20 275:7	suspected	system 56:11
83:3,16	281:14 287:1	74:10 160:3,19	63:15 117:11
support 2:6,7	surface 56:1	sustaining 90:6	122:15,16,21
19:1,7 26:17	113:22 114:1	swabs 128:18	123:17,18
36:1 37:13	114:19 115:3	128:19 129:2	180:10,15
47:1 49:13	116:3,6 168:20	swallow 63:10	181:15 282:16
64:14,15 65:7	surfactant	sway 288:13	285:2
66:17 72:6,15	57:15,17	sweet 268:15	systematic
78:8 84:12	surgery 74:1	switching	129:18
92:2 119:10	74:16 75:3	194:2	systematically
203:13 216:18	surrogate	sworn 291:5	44:8
267:6 289:15	39:19,21	symmetry	systemic 60:16
290:4	surrounding	114:16,21	68:5
supported	104:21 249:19	symposium	systems 35:22
46:12 265:7	surrounds	279:11	36:5 122:8,9
supporting	114:20	symptomatic	122:13,20,22
81:9 147:3,5	surveillance	6:16 48:10	123:12 130:1
supportive	122:4,6,8,11	132:19 135:5	181:13 279:2,7
28:8 147:2	122:13,14,16	239:11 245:1	285:2
152:12 286:5	122:17,21,21	symptomology	t
supports 73:1	123:12,17,20	139:22 146:14	t 4:1,1
supposed 176:9	130:1,17,19	symptoms	table 118:8
195:12	178:19 179:3	137:16 138:17	278:4 285:11
sure 27:19,19	179:14,15	138:18 139:4	tackle 212:10
43:1 71:2 73:2	182:6	139:11 140:1	239:7
81:14 92:13	survival 151:15	147:3,4	tacrolimus
103:14 106:16	151:21 152:8	syndrome	101:10
106:17 107:11	165:8,14	57:13 134:4	

[tail - tga] Page 76

tail 169:8	191:5 213:12	torgots 168:22	tension 35:21
tah 109.8 take 14:1 27:19	213:22 223:8	targets 168:22 210:3	110:16 111:2
75:4,9 76:17	224:4 227:12	task 102:11	term 35:10,11
107:2 111:21	235:22 241:20	tatiana 2:22	39:4,5,7,9,17
121:11 125:7	265:13 266:9	taxonomy 93:5	42:7,9,12,13
126:17 131:4	273:11 279:16	team 30:19	43:8 61:3,16
143:13 153:15	talked 181:2	49:19 121:17	63:14 65:1,3,6
155:20 166:4	186:5 226:8	131:3 290:3	83:17 94:21
174:15 175:7	230:12 234:12	technical 98:5	97:20 138:8
180:2 184:19	260:3	109:3,11	141:15 155:12
192:1,13	talking 17:18	215:21	203:15 233:13
196:22 214:3	23:1 42:5	teed 241:2	terminal 118:6
220:1 221:9	62:19 63:3	tell 146:10	119:21
229:4,4 248:1	69:19 98:6	149:19 158:18	terms 63:18
265:8,9 270:10	131:22 163:7	194:15 230:5	95:2,6,14
273:22 274:9	175:21 176:21	238:3 263:5	166:1 172:12
286:12	177:9 179:6	282:12	200:11 216:8
taken 210:10	191:21 194:5	telling 256:15	219:11 221:20
218:8 221:17	194:11,11,13	275:9 288:2	222:17 223:1
229:2 291:3,12	206:16 207:19	tells 210:1	240:10 249:4
292:9	208:17 213:19	temperate	253:12
takes 55:9	220:9 222:8	135:18	terribly 180:11
169:18 182:21	233:4 238:13	temperature	terrific 255:22
216:1 227:8	264:3 265:21	183:4	tertiary 248:10
271:9	279:1 288:14	temporal 125:7	282:14,15
talk 18:8 31:10	talks 79:9	127:13	test 169:15
46:7 48:19	tangentially	temptation	175:15 211:14
50:8,9,10 59:6	177:15	19:13	224:16
59:15 65:2,13	target 26:7	ten 49:5 174:3	testament
68:13,16 75:16	56:12 164:6	285:14	37:17
76:7 80:9,11	196:2,13,16,16	tend 127:17	testifying 291:5
84:4 95:4 97:6	196:17 209:18	135:17 144:21	testing 129:10
102:1 108:17	210:7 212:3	145:1 163:3	129:19 180:3,5
108:19 112:13	215:11 231:13	284:20 285:19	181:3,10,17
113:1,9 120:21	targeting 42:6	tends 141:21	188:14
131:14 134:13	170:13 177:3	tenfold 117:22	tests 243:3,4
147:13 160:20	249:15 250:2	tenor 227:1	tga 89:4
184:14 186:21			

[thank - think] Page 77

thank 12:18,21	256:19 257:3	196:19 212:1	173:17 184:3,4
30:13,14 31:1	260:13 266:18	253:4	185:13,22
31:2,3 49:16	281:13 283:7	therapies 39:3	186:16 189:3
49:17 50:2,3	284:10 286:18	85:1 86:5	207:21 209:4
58:18,20 59:1	289:6,18,20,20	132:1,9 161:10	213:5 217:5,6
59:3,9,12	290:1	206:2	219:6 225:3
75:10,12,19,20	thanks 122:1	therapist 63:21	228:22,22
76:1,5 90:10	131:19 155:2	therapy 28:10	235:17 236:16
90:14,16 91:1	168:11 180:1	28:12 29:14	237:1,9,13,20
91:2 106:20,21	195:6 196:20	146:11 147:14	238:6,16 245:8
108:15 110:10	207:7 223:10	148:3,19 149:3	246:10,11,13
110:12 111:3,4	229:7 231:8	149:13 152:13	248:8 250:21
111:17,19	232:20 233:19	152:16 155:13	255:20 274:1
112:15,16	283:6 286:20	159:9 206:6	281:15 286:13
121:11,12,14	290:2,7	260:11 286:5	think 7:9 15:1
121:20,22	theme 212:2	thereof 19:7	15:2 21:20
131:2,6,17,18	267:14	135:8	25:19 38:16
152:10 153:11	themes 166:19	thermo 203:4	56:4,5,9 57:4
153:12 155:1	theoretically	thing 23:10	59:22 60:13
156:19 159:10	190:4,5	172:15 178:2,3	66:15,19 71:16
164:10 166:2,6	therapeutic	185:7,19	77:11 78:21
167:1 170:3	5:12 16:18	186:12 187:3	82:15 96:18
178:13,16	19:15 33:13	189:13 194:22	97:20 98:5
179:18 183:12	37:19 39:10	202:4 213:5	108:16,17,22
183:22 185:16	40:10 61:9	229:6 232:16	109:13 110:6,8
192:15 195:8	85:16 90:7	251:5 255:21	111:5,9,15
196:21 197:17	108:6 168:7	265:4 270:4	139:1 145:11
199:20 201:17	178:12 194:4	271:2,9,17	156:3,15,22
208:21 211:21	213:16 234:14	274:10 276:9	159:8,13 163:6
213:8 215:5,19	236:3 238:21	276:18	164:12 168:12
218:13 219:8	277:1 280:5	things 21:20	169:9 171:12
219:21 221:14	therapeutics	25:1 29:20	172:20 173:10
223:4,5,5	2:5 12:16 30:8	65:13 68:5	174:6,7,14
224:2 225:17	30:20 47:14	69:21 70:1	176:7 177:20
225:17 229:13	76:18 78:3,11	74:7 107:12	178:14 179:2,9
229:16 239:3,4	88:1,14 89:22	132:6 146:11	180:22 182:8
240:22 252:11	143:5 166:13	160:1 161:18	182:18 184:12
253:6 255:2,13	167:5 179:8	168:21 173:4	184:15,21

[think - time] Page 78

186:12,14,16	248:15,21	285:13	threshold
187:6 188:15	249:22 250:2,5	thinks 242:6	258:1 286:11
188:16,22	250:6,22 251:3	third 14:15	thrives 177:1
189:1,2,13,14	251:4 252:2	15:5 27:16	throat 129:2
190:4 192:11	253:22 255:5	51:6,9 52:14	thrombocyto
192:17 193:5	255:16,19	98:18 133:22	142:9
193:20 194:1,3	256:4 258:7	214:10	throw 183:10
194:18 195:4	259:15 260:7	thought 27:18	thrust 63:6
195:13 196:1,4	260:19 261:1,9	29:8 93:5	tid 54:14
196:7,19	261:9,11 262:7	114:7 117:12	tie 179:4
198:10 199:22	262:11 263:21	180:22 181:6	tied 144:12
200:16,22	264:8,21 265:2	198:1 199:1	tighter 224:20
201:3 202:4	265:11 267:1,5	223:8 242:17	time 5:16 14:1
203:7 204:16	267:8 268:10	258:1	17:8 24:7,9,16
206:9,15 207:3	269:5,10,18	thoughts 154:6	24:19 28:20
207:9,15	270:13,16,16	158:2 178:18	38:12 40:6,21
208:16 210:18	272:22 273:17	179:13 215:15	43:22 55:9
211:4,9,15,18	275:12 276:9	247:5	62:11,14,18
212:8,11 214:7	276:11 277:10	thousands	63:2 64:18
214:16 217:5	278:2,8,17	180:16 207:20	65:21 67:5
217:10,10,13	279:9,13	threads 220:14	72:17 83:19
218:7 219:10	280:10,15	threat 20:10	94:12 99:21
220:6 221:6,6	281:5,22 282:4	threatening	102:14 103:8,9
221:11,12	282:10 283:15	6:15 47:6	125:5 126:8,21
223:7 225:8	284:6 286:6,9	176:19,20	136:20 138:15
230:19 231:11	286:21 287:8	three 50:9,19	144:15,16
231:15,15,21	287:13,16,20	52:12 58:2	151:6 153:11
232:9,10,12	287:22 288:2,3	65:11 66:22	158:14 160:1
233:22 234:16	288:4	93:10 99:2	160:21 164:12
236:7,15 238:9	thinking 70:21	113:20 122:12	169:19,20
239:6,17 240:6	161:9 195:10	122:20 145:15	171:8,8,11
240:20 241:1	196:4,5 208:1	149:7,9,15	172:1 177:22
241:16 242:10	210:16 220:4	184:4 201:4	195:20 199:9,9
244:7,11,14,21	241:5,6 244:22	203:10 205:15	206:13 213:10
245:5,10 246:7	245:21 253:12	256:11 273:21	216:1,5,5,19
246:12,15,22	255:3 256:17	281:18	217:20,22
247:9,13,17,18	266:3 270:17	threefold	219:5,15
247:22 248:13	270:18 285:8	114:15	223:14 231:19

234:10 237:11	165:2 198:13	topic 5:4 26:12	tracts 55:19
245:7 250:4	219:16 220:10	65:15 158:2	traditional
252:1 256:1	222:8,16	179:15 213:11	97:12 101:13
265:5,9 271:5	226:11 265:12	264:12,15	traditionally
278:11 280:21	290:4	topics 31:11	80:22
281:4 283:8	today's 93:9	153:18 166:19	trained 174:19
288:13	together 16:4	198:17	235:21
timeliness	32:19 63:10	tossed 248:11	training 29:7
39:19	81:1 84:22	total 47:8	71:1,3 227:10
timely 77:16	140:12 143:5	125:9,20	transaminases
times 22:10	143:14 228:22	totality 161:18	225:3
67:19 142:9	250:22 259:8	248:16	transcriber
172:11 232:11	tokenization	totally 95:7	292:1
274:9	70:17	161:4 194:14	transcript
timing 145:12	told 65:8	227:2	292:3,5
158:10	241:13 248:20	touch 29:21	transcriptionist
tissue 191:9,18	262:8	66:22 76:9	291:8
tissues 35:8	tolerable 187:7	79:8 86:16	transcripts
titer 148:22	tolerance 21:14	109:19	11:19
158:6 159:20	tomorrow	touched 213:18	transferred
194:7	10:17 76:20	265:16	61:8,21 62:1,5
titers 194:8	84:19 93:9	tough 214:20	67:10 257:7
title 131:14	220:10 274:3	279:12	282:18
150:9	290:6,6	tougher 279:14	
tlr3 191:17	tomorrow's	toward 126:15	282:22
today 10:1,17	93:9	129:12,20	transfusions
11:8 15:20	ton 73:7 243:14	253:21	28:21
17:4 25:10	took 191:16	towards 10:18	transient 61:17
31:11 48:19	194:5 195:22	61:12 90:2	62:22
50:4 59:10,20	tool 23:20	284:4	transition
61:5 65:13	44:19	toxicities 39:5	15:18 35:19
75:11 76:6,20	toolbox 203:16	187:5	transitional
80:9 89:13	tools 40:18	toxicity 19:14	61:19
90:12 103:4	45:22 79:17	187:8 275:14	translate 40:2
113:1 121:20	204:11 236:16	traceable	72:3
122:2 124:13	top 104:6 126:7	100:20	translated
129:15 131:2,4	126:15 151:19	tract 35:22	116:12
131:20 137:21	285:14 287:13		

translation	263:6	trends 123:2	286:14,17,18
115:13	treatment 1:1	125:8 127:1	287:8,9 288:22
translational	5:5 7:5 8:4,8	130:12 220:14	trial's 214:12
167:8	10:3 19:12	trial 8:2,3,18	trialist 287:17
transmission	24:4 28:4,9,14	9:19 14:22	trialists 288:10
136:7 181:14	32:3 38:19	15:3,6,8 18:14	trials 7:17 8:1
transmit 137:5	48:10 66:4,5	19:4,10 23:10	9:12 12:18
144:15 208:13	66:21 82:18	23:17,19 24:5	13:2 14:20
transmitted	83:2 86:7	25:1 29:1	26:13 27:21
144:17	96:16 97:1	52:14 59:8	32:1 39:19
transparency	130:22 132:10	70:22 72:18	40:4 41:6 46:4
90:5	146:12,17,21	74:6 75:18	50:16 57:1,12
transplant	148:10,16	76:8 80:4,7	58:3 65:16
102:5 147:9	152:11 154:8	81:10,17 82:22	66:3,18 67:3,7
transplantation	168:3,7 180:9	83:8,8 86:6	68:8 71:5
101:15	188:10,13	97:14 101:13	73:15 78:5
transplants	209:16 213:16	102:18 105:21	79:7 80:11
101:12	223:19 224:11	107:16 110:20	81:11,13 84:7
transporter	224:11 225:12	111:11 149:19	84:13 85:1
57:5 109:8	229:21 230:2	150:12 154:8	87:5 96:14,15
transporters	230:16,16	166:6,11	96:19 97:13,15
35:15	233:11 241:15	177:21 178:12	97:16,18 98:2
trauma 60:8,16	242:4 247:12	188:4 223:2,15	98:3,19 99:2,3
67:21 68:1	247:16 263:13	223:19 229:21	99:3 100:7
traumatic 60:4	265:3 267:10	235:3,11,18	103:12 153:8
treat 47:3	275:3 277:3	244:13 245:6	173:20 187:9
48:16 151:20	280:18 284:5	247:9 251:4	188:3 202:8
154:10 184:10	treatments	255:11 259:21	212:19 222:7
186:18,20	28:5 34:18	260:22 261:18	223:18 228:6
187:1,14 197:6	77:17 85:6	261:20 262:6	234:8,14 235:5
201:13 203:21	166:17 170:3	264:5 265:4,7	236:8,20
251:2	173:5 188:2	267:19 268:11	237:10 261:5
treated 151:19	211:6 217:8	269:20 270:8	265:2,3 272:12
263:12,12	tremendous	270:21 273:6,8	272:13 273:5
268:3 269:13	121:7	278:8,16,19	273:13 276:20
treating 16:17	trend 151:11	279:15 281:8,9	277:4 281:1
236:4 247:11	221:3 253:21	281:17 283:21	289:12
253:5 260:8		284:15 286:4	

[tried - under] Page 81

tried 73:4	128:16 154:14	168:19 169:12	ulcerations
triggered 36:1	168:9 169:19	177:2 179:8	133:9
trileptal 74:22	200:2 246:2	187:16 194:17	ultimate
75:1	283:13 284:8	209:20,22	252:10
troubling	turned 12:5	210:2 226:19	ultimately
277:16	turning 128:4	289:8	79:21 89:8
true 17:15 48:7	223:14	typed 123:14	111:14 151:2
48:8 165:18	turns 278:1	212:4	201:15 207:3
172:22 175:1	two 13:20 14:4	types 51:19,22	219:18 262:3
269:9 291:9	16:15 17:4	95:4 96:5	280:16
292:5	23:6 25:9	124:3,11,20	ultra 216:21
truly 176:18	26:13 27:19	125:4,8,14	umbilical 62:4
truth 220:15	31:8 51:19,21	126:7,8,21	un 116:8
221:1	72:16 92:6	127:5,8 128:18	149:14
try 108:22	93:7 95:17,20	130:5,15	unable 15:9
121:5 154:10	95:21 98:16	135:19 168:16	unacceptable
177:5 186:14	117:21 123:12	169:9 171:19	272:8
187:6,20 207:9	124:8 125:1	204:1 222:2	unavailable
211:16 213:6	132:6 139:8	279:9	129:22
215:1 225:7	147:1 148:13	typewriting	unc 2:20
228:4,5 230:3	156:7 169:21	291:7	167:14
231:11 235:12	184:3,18,19	typical 60:22	uncertainty
244:10 267:9	194:2 196:12	280:5	39:20 55:15
270:14 277:16	201:4 203:10	typically 61:13	unchanged
283:3	204:18 206:19	130:8 146:16	92:11
trying 41:1	214:22,22	216:8 250:19	uncommon
65:2 68:7	216:15 220:9	typing 123:9	140:9 141:5
69:10 71:7	222:2,12	123:11 129:16	uncomplicated
154:16 157:9	229:17 250:22	129:17 130:18	137:18 138:9
172:17 219:2,2	265:14 279:11	169:17 180:12	145:17
226:2 279:13	twofold 114:16	212:6 289:18	under 7:19
280:21 287:14	tying 179:15	typo 100:3	12:2 18:15
288:22 289:8	259:8	u	20:22 21:6
tube 63:11	type 39:15 94:1	u.s. 32:9 94:16	80:2 84:10
tuesday 1:9	123:4 125:1,15	u01 104:6	94:13 124:18
tumors 284:20	126:6 132:15	ubiquitous	140:5 184:3
turn 19:19 25:8	134:7 157:9	180:6	228:12
26:11 49:15	159:7 163:7		

underappreci	206:17 241:3	unrealistic	284:14 287:3,7
103:7	284:17 288:8	265:6	used 19:4,11
underestimat	unicorn 40:4,5	unusual 254:8	26:17 37:13
284:5	241:8,10 242:8	update 84:16	50:22 51:5,9
undergoes	243:1,17	updated 69:14	51:10 54:18
27:13	245:22 279:17	updates 11:21	58:7 95:14
undergoing	uninterpretable	upper 16:8	101:14 107:21
22:10	28:3	97:5	120:10 126:22
undergone	unique 9:7	use 7:20 13:10	130:12,14
34:5 77:1	15:4 25:22	15:20 18:6	143:9 148:4,9
underlying	42:3,19 49:9	21:4,8 23:21	150:1 172:4
69:3	50:21 51:22	24:2 31:15	200:17,19,20
understand	57:17 61:2	37:19 38:9	201:5,12 207:4
24:20 58:12	86:17,20 173:7	50:14,15 51:14	209:14 224:10
71:20 72:1,3	uniquely 85:15	53:7,13 56:5,7	244:12 257:22
75:6 105:13	unit 28:20	56:7 57:9,10	266:6
122:10 176:1	united 7:3	58:14,14,18	useful 123:1
205:21 222:19	130:17 135:22	72:12 78:3,10	182:9 214:7
227:11 249:17	152:18	81:10 92:1	220:19 256:1,5
250:2 273:1	universal 6:8	94:17 97:13	263:8,9
understanding	universe	100:18,19	useless 279:4
109:5,6 130:19	155:21	103:9 104:21	uses 117:21
175:17 192:5	university 2:4	106:14 118:5,5	using 12:5 45:4
219:16 260:21	2:18 3:5	118:12 119:8	54:1 143:16
understood	131:10 167:10	119:19 120:13	148:6 157:14
9:16 83:19	167:17	143:2 155:22	159:9 182:22
undertaking	unmet 10:8,19	168:16 182:8	187:15 188:11
177:13 183:8	26:2	188:17 211:9	197:9 202:20
224:7	unofficial	235:19 242:14	235:20 255:6
underway	10:13	250:12 254:20	264:4 269:11
237:11	unpack 272:2	254:21 267:22	283:18
undoubtedly	unplanned	268:10 269:21	usually 52:15
9:13	60:5	271:1,3 274:2	146:21 155:11
unethical	unpredictabil	274:5 278:10	155:12 171:8
269:11,12	171:10	278:16 279:14	194:13 283:4
unfortunately	unquote 38:17	280:20,21	utah 183:16
5:21 40:8	48:4 61:15	281:6 282:6,10	utero 35:9,19
94:21 197:18		282:17 283:9	35:19

utilization	variables 45:13	video 12:4	248:9 254:10
201:14	65:18	255:14	255:1
utterly 265:6	variant 205:8	videos 29:7	virological
v	varies 59:21	vie 71:17	150:21
vaccine 122:17	123:7	view 13:8	virologist
123:19 179:6	variety 64:8	14:12 55:21	174:13
181:5 194:16	81:19 93:18	218:4	virtual 1:4
205:10 207:16	138:17 139:19	viewed 204:7	232:22 244:2
207:19 208:20	140:4 143:2	288:5	virtually 59:20
209:5,14	various 69:8	views 29:20	viruria 149:2
vaccines	78:21 79:16	31:11 91:5	virus 114:8
112:12	280:4 287:10	viral 112:11,22	116:20 117:21
vaginal 137:3	vary 86:3	113:21,21	118:14,16,18
valganciclovir	286:5	114:1,14 115:6	118:21 119:1,7
51:14	vast 137:12	115:7,8,10,13	119:12 120:12
valid 94:14	180:19	115:18 116:8	120:17 121:6
148:19 282:11	ventricular	116:16,18,19	122:16 123:4
validated 40:19	147:8	118:1,12,14,16	123:17 125:1,3
valuable 5:9	verbally	119:11 121:18	125:8 126:5,7
82:17	197:21	133:22 134:14	126:8,21 127:5
value 152:3	version 152:22	135:6,7 138:14	130:15 136:9
155:13 253:22	210:14	139:3,5 145:4	136:19 137:5
255:19 263:5	versus 51:17	145:17 153:4	144:15 146:19
263:13,14	52:21 53:17	167:12 189:8	158:7,12,18
values 39:1	68:18 71:13	191:8 192:8,9	159:6,7,20,21
vapendavir	96:14 162:13	212:6 249:13	161:17,19,22
150:4	182:17 202:9	252:3,8,17	163:19 164:9
variability 43:3	208:18 231:14	254:6 256:1,2	181:21 182:16
56:18 67:5	239:11 240:16	269:2 280:6	186:8 189:6,7
135:18 171:10	242:3 254:1	287:12	189:12 191:5
171:18 178:6	258:4 275:9	viremia 136:11	191:17,20,22
209:22,22	276:6 286:4	149:2	192:1,2,10
258:9	vesicles 133:4,5	viremic 158:12	193:6,8,13
variable 66:11	viability 55:13	175:8 252:1	194:7,20 195:1
141:6 148:1	55:14 118:4	virodefense 2:3	205:15 209:12
149:22 162:6	vice 131:12	167:7	212:6 231:19
178:6 287:11	167:7	virologic	241:19 246:20
		148:18 231:16	249:10,12,14

240.15 16 22	wital 02.12	rm0 114.1 4	170.6 9 176.4
249:15,16,22	vital 83:12	vp0 114:1,4	170:6,8 176:4
250:3,17	86:19	116:22	177:14 183:13
253:17,21	vogt 2:20	vp2 114:5	192:11 193:18
254:4 287:12	159:11,13	117:1	195:9,12
viruses 112:21	160:11,16,19	vp4 114:18	201:18 211:4
112:22 113:10	161:4 167:13	117:1	212:11 213:10
116:1 117:4	173:9,10	vpg 115:8	213:21 216:17
119:15 121:8	185:18,19	vulnerabilities	217:3 218:8
133:2,20	188:7,15	49:10	230:11 242:14
135:11 141:1	192:17 193:16	vulnerable	245:2,12 246:2
141:11,19	193:18 200:2	14:6 36:4	246:15 254:9
142:4 145:7	201:18 202:2,4	\mathbf{w}	256:8 257:2
169:12 173:14	206:10 207:8,9	wait 63:7,8,9,9	261:6 272:10
176:17 180:14	208:21 225:19	121:13 262:21	272:20 274:3
187:16,17	225:21 227:4	waiting 187:22	274:10,10
188:21 190:7	228:1,17,20	188:13 277:8	283:14 287:7
191:13 205:12	229:7 231:10	waivers 87:9	wanted 10:20
208:2,4,6	231:11 239:14	wake 74:13	38:11 92:17
212:17,18	239:21 241:1	walked 59:20	176:5 178:17
247:2,3 249:18	244:13,22	walking 60:1	198:12,15
285:20	245:15,17,19	74:9	203:13 233:19
visibility 177:6	245:21 246:4	wand 289:16	237:4 252:20
vision 73:16	266:21 269:17	want 18:8,21	264:11,20,20
74:1	269:18 275:7	19:19 21:18	265:16 280:2
visualize	277:9,10 280:2	22:22 37:4	wanting
126:20,22	vogt's 200:16	41:1 48:2	171:17 238:14
viswanathan	voice 103:3	53:13 56:5,7,7	278:7
2:9 4:4 12:10	voices 90:4	57:9 58:18	wants 265:4
12:15,20 30:14	volume 43:7	59:19,21 71:22	warm 172:9
109:17,18	voluntary	75:10 76:17	warmup 62:10
111:7 154:2	32:14 122:22	95:2 99:11	warrant 42:9
170:4 221:14	129:18	102:9 103:14	42:12 247:16
259:6,7 271:22	volunteered	110:11,11,13	washington
272:1 275:5	202:2	119:17 146:10	1:14 2:7
276:19 280:3	voucher 46:13	154:15 156:18	wastewater
viswanathan's	46:19 47:11	154.13 130.18	178:19 179:3
12:17	vouchers 48:1	163:18 168:9	179:14 180:3,5
		103.10 100.7	180:9 181:3,17
	1	1	l

182:1,6	248:13 264:12	widely 101:14	worked 63:15
wave 289:16	265:16,21	wild 179:8	81:1 146:14
way 19:9 54:4	wean 73:17	william 292:2	188:19 235:8
54:11 60:14	website 11:20	292:15	275:18
77:2 84:3	12:1 104:2	willing 221:10	workflow 44:1
108:8 111:12	week 60:20	248:20	working 72:10
125:18 156:12	136:21 137:17	willingness	102:10 199:13
158:5 160:14	139:9 193:11	78:3	203:5 215:1
161:9 170:20	206:18	willy 271:2	225:10 249:18
179:4 180:11	weeks 11:20	window 234:14	267:4 274:11
187:8 197:18	60:20,22 61:14	wish 107:6	278:5 284:1
201:2 203:20	65:11 102:19	153:21 167:19	288:21
203:20 211:3	139:8 148:13	withholding	works 38:17
220:13,13	150:16 189:7	28:3	163:21 261:18
227:1,19 228:5	189:10 193:15	witness 291:4	262:9 273:4
229:10 244:12	weight 45:14	woman 254:16	287:20 288:2,4
244:14 250:13	56:2,5,7	women 48:10	289:1
255:8 257:17	welcome 5:3	wondered	workshop 1:4
258:10,10	112:3 166:9,22	157:20 158:1	5:4,9 10:5,17
270:16,17	166:22 167:3	word 97:4	10:22 11:14
271:2,16 276:3	179:20 223:12	260:16 269:11	12:12 13:21
285:12 289:7	260:14	work 10:2	31:18 51:20
ways 22:13	welcoming	33:16 41:1,7	76:6 79:9 93:9
64:9 71:7	290:5	46:11 65:19	93:10 219:15
106:16 159:18	wellbeing 14:9	68:14 71:11,17	222:14 290:6
160:6,9 169:12	20:11	87:12 97:11	workshops
169:17 172:6	wendy 3:4	104:1 161:14	10:9
we've 68:18	went 62:8 67:3	161:15 164:1	world 69:14
73:3 75:4	whim 270:9	168:6 173:19	90:19,21,22
97:12 110:13	278:20	188:20 189:1	91:13,15,17,17
135:16 153:16	white 141:4	191:15 205:6	92:1,17 93:2
177:16 180:2	145:17 255:4	205:10 222:22	93:16,19,22
194:1 195:11	255:20	227:18 228:12	94:4,5,17,20
201:4 206:14	who've 242:17	229:2 237:6,16	95:3,3,12
212:1 227:3	252:6 271:13	237:17 254:13	97:13,21 98:1
232:15 234:16	wide 45:3 64:8	268:21 272:19	98:16,21 99:6
234:19 235:4,8	102:13 241:20	275:12 286:14	99:8,9,20
236:13 237:15			100:15,18

[world - zoom] Page 86

101:9,19	X	72:16 74:1,9	zoom 12:6
102:10,12,12	x 146:2 274:2	74:14,14 77:16	107:6 153:21
102:16 103:2		92:6,7 95:10	167:19 197:19
103:20 104:1,1	y	99:17 120:5	
104:4,4,13,19	y 97:10 125:19	126:9,16	
104:21 105:1	yeah 108:21	127:22 128:9	
106:2,3,11,14	111:7 155:1	142:1 143:15	
106:15 189:22	157:5 158:3	143:21 145:12	
243:1,17	160:11,13,16	145:13 148:12	
244:11 254:19	170:7 171:12	150:11 157:12	
266:4 283:11	171:15 176:5	171:9 179:1	
worldwide	178:17 179:18	189:7 201:3	
64:11	180:1 182:20	210:10,11	
worried 181:13	183:15 190:9	216:9,9,10	
186:19 203:18	192:20 198:19	239:17 241:4	
206:20	200:9 202:20	255:6,7	
worrisome	206:11 208:3	yeruk 2:13 4:8	
138:1	209:3 214:16	yield 86:13	
worry 65:10	217:1 218:13	yodit 2:8 4:3	
210:12 271:2,6	228:7,17 237:4	5:11 76:5	
worse 144:21	239:15 243:10	188:5 252:12	
145:1,7 155:18	245:15,17,19	279:22	
261:13 263:10	249:8 250:6,11	york 179:1	
worsen 138:10	261:8 264:2	180:4 181:20	
worst 274:20	276:13 289:3,6	young 25:22	
worth 124:9	year 5:16 46:2	26:8 29:10,10	
wow 289:22	74:15 123:7,8	55:6,12,12,16	
wrap 49:8	125:13 126:7	58:12,13	
105:6	128:13 130:13	176:22 255:4	
written 63:16	130:13 135:18	younger 14:21	
258:9,17,17	135:19,21	53:21 54:10,10	
wrong 194:9	171:9,9 180:7	58:9 129:21	
289:7	183:7 193:3	176:19	
wu 2:11 4:6	216:15 285:8	Z	
12:11 49:19,20	year's 75:3	zero 103:8	
50:2,3 59:3	years 47:7 49:5	zika 118:16	
108:20,21	60:20 62:17		
	63:12 68:17		