

2

3 CASE No. 50 180 T 00150 05

4

5 SCOTIA PRINCE CRUISES, )  
6 LIMITED, )

7 Claimant )

8 vs. )

9 THE CITY OF PORTLAND, MAINE, )

10 Respondent. )

11

12

13 VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF BRYAN D. HARDIN, Ph.D.,

14 taken before Sheri DeBlieux, Notary Public, pursuant to

15 notice, at the offices of Petruccelli, Martin & Haddow,

16 LLP, 50 Monument Square, Portland, Maine, on December

17 20, 2006, commencing at 9:00 a.m.

18

19 APPEARANCES:

James B. Haddow, Esq.  
Clifford H. Ruprecht, Esq.

8:12,9,10:17

12 What was your involvement in the field of mold and  
13 mycotoxins prior to June of 2001?

14 A. None. Well, in my capacity as -- as a supervisor at  
15 NIOSH, I had the opportunity to -- to have a supervisory  
16 position relative to activities within NIOSH and at  
17 C.D.C., but no -- no personal direct involvement.

18 Q. How did you come to begin working more personally and

19 directly in the field of mold and mycotoxins?

20 A. As a freelance consultant, it was -- it was apparent  
21 that there was a lot of consulting work to be done in  
22 the field, so I began to study it. And I was approached  
23 by an industrial hygienist I knew in Atlanta whose  
24 company put on periodic training seminars, three-day  
25 seminars on mold remediation. And the industrial

9

1 hygienist asked me if I'd be interested in presenting a  
2 one-hour lecture on health effects of molds, which I  
3 did.

4 Q. So is it fair to say that you became active in mold and  
5 mycotoxin research and evaluation because that was an  
6 area in which your consulting business had an  
7 opportunity to expand?

8 A. I think so, yes. It was -- it was an area where  
9 consultants were needed and so I -- I began to -- to  
10 study and develop an expertise.

11 Q. In your capacity as a consultant starting in July of  
12 2000 -- strike that.

13 Were the clients of your consulting business who were  
14 looking for experts to work with them in the field of  
15 mold and mycotoxins primarily individuals or primarily  
16 businesses or a mix?

17 MR. RUPRECHT: Object to the form.

18 A. Well, the first -- the first engagement was as a  
19 lecturer in this periodic training course. As result of  
20 that, I began to get inquiries from people who  
21 considered engaging me.

22 Q. BY MR. HADDOW: And is it possible for you to say  
23 whether those inquiries were predominantly from  
24 employers who were concerned about mold in their  
25 workplaces or predominantly from insurers or  
1 predominantly from any particular segment of the  
2 business population?

3 MR. RUPRECHT: Objection.

4 A. I can't say. My recollection is -- and it probably  
5 isn't an exclusive representation. But my recollection  
6 is that the majority of those who inquired were  
7 plaintiff attorneys.

8 Q. BY MR. HADDOW: And of the plaintiff attorneys who  
9 inquired, for how many did you end up performing  
10 consulting services?

11 A. **None.** Because in the course of the conversation I guess  
12 they didn't -- they decided they didn't -- couldn't use  
13 my opinion and there was never a follow-up retention.

14 Q. **And up to this point today, have you ever been retained**  
15 **to provide consulting services in the field of mold or**  
16 **mycotoxins by a plaintiff's lawyer?**

17 A. **I personally have not.**

13:17 14:3

17 Q. Other than the letter that -- the letter to the editor  
18 that you described to me earlier that hasn't been listed  
19 on your C.V. as yet, are those four items all of the  
20 publications on which you are an author that address  
21 issues related to mold and mycotoxins?

22 A. Yes. Well, I -- we also -- we also wrote another -- we

14

23 were asked to write something that would be more  
24 generally accessible and less technical for the  
25 Manhattan Institute. I don't list that on my C.V.

1 Q. Is that derived from one of the other publications that  
2 is listed on your C.V.?

3 A. Yes. It's derivative from the A.C.O.E.M. statement.  
.....

15:20-16

20 Q. If you look further down the page, the third one up from  
21 the bottom, July 17th, 2003, there's a presentation to  
22 or presentation at a what looks like a seminar sponsored  
23 by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (sic) Institute for Legal  
24 Reform and the Manhattan Institute Center for Legal  
25 Policy. Do you see that one?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Can you explain to me what that presentation concerned?

3 A. That was basically a press conference that -- that they  
4 held to roll out the publication of two documents, one  
5 of which was the one that we had written that was a  
6 derivative of the A.C.O.E.M. statement.

7 Q. What is the U.S. Chamber of Congress Institute for Legal  
8 Reform?

9 A. I don't know very much about them. I'm familiar with  
10 the Chamber of Congress of course, but I had never  
11 previously heard of the Institute for Legal Reform.

7 Q. What is the U.S. Chamber of Commerce(sic)Institute for  
8 Legal Reform?

9 A. I don't know very much about them. I'm familiar with  
10 the Chamber of Commerce (sic) of course, but I had never  
11 previously heard of the Institute for Legal Reform.

12 Q. And do you know what the Manhattan Institute Center for  
13 Legal Policy is?

14 A. Again, I had never heard of them until we were retained  
15 by them to do the work. I don't know very much about  
16 them.

17 Q. Are you under the impression that they are lobbying  
18 groups of some sort?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. And are you under the impression that they lobby for --  
21 well, let me strike that.

22 Is it your impression that the written work that you  
23 prepared for them was used by them as part of their  
24 lobbying efforts?

25 A. I would assume so, yes.

**Marianne Dreger**

**From:** Jonathan Borak [jborak@att.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 06, 2002 2:45 PM  
**To:** Dean Grove (E-mail)  
**Cc:** Edward J. Bernacki MD, MPH (E-mail); Barry Eisenberg (E-mail); Tim Key MD (E-mail)  
**Subject:** mold



ACOEM Mold - revised  
draft.rtf...

Dean et al:

I am having quite a challenge in finding an acceptable path for the proposed position paper on mold. Even though a great deal of work has gone in, it seems difficult to satisfy a sufficient spectrum of the College, or at least those concerned enough to voice their views.

I have received several sets of comments that find the current version, much revised, to still be a defense argument. On the other hand, Bryan Hardin and his colleagues are not willing to further dilute the paper. They have done a lot, and I am concerned that we will soon have to either endorse or let go. I do not want this to go to the BOD and then be rejected. That would be an important violation of Bryan—I have assured him that if we do not use it he can freely make whatever other use he might want to make. If we “officially” reject it, then we turn his efforts into garbage.

As this was an effort that you, Dean, asked me to initiate I thought that you might have a good idea about what might be done.

The problem is the same as when this began. Mold is a litigation mine field. Everybody involved in the topic has a strong view and there is little middle ground. If we have a statement that deals only with science, we will be accused of ignoring the “Public Health” issues. If we embrace the Public Health, then we will be regarded as not scientific.

I have not previously been involved in an ACOEM issue that raised provoked emotions among member peer reviewers. My own feeling is that it may not be worth the disruptive effects that might result from forcing the issue. Also, I think that the authors are not willing to let this just sit for awhile. they have done a lot of work and want to see it in print.

For your interests, I have attached the latest version.

Jonathan

**Marianne Dreger**

---

From: Jonathan Borak [jborak@att.net]  
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2002 2:49 PM  
To: Marianne Dreger (E-mail)  
Subject: FW: Mold position paper

-----Original Message-----

From: Douglas A. Swift, M.D., M.S.P.H. [mailto:dswift@tulane.edu]  
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2002 3:36 PM  
To: jborak@att.net  
Subject: Re: Mold position paper

Absolutely, I realize the process.

I didn't know where along the approval timeline it was.

I appreciate your confidence.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Jonathan Borak" <jborak@att.net>  
To: "Douglas A. Swift, M.D., M.S.P.H." <dswift@tulane.edu>  
Sent: Friday, October 04, 2002 2:04 PM  
Subject: RE: Mold position paper

> Doug:

>

> Thanks for your feedback. I will share it with the authors.

>

> Please do not cite or refer to this document until after the Board of

> Directors has the opportunity to vote -- 10/27. As you appreciate, this

> is as controversial and litigious a subject as any in our field. It would be

> of potential embarrassment and pain to both the College and the authors if

> it were cited before completion and adoption.

>

> It was sent to you as a peer reviewer. I will let you know when it is for

> public consumption. Thanks for your understanding.

>

> Jonathan

>

>

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Douglas A. Swift, M.D., M.S.P.H. [mailto:dswift@tulane.edu]

> Sent: Friday, October 04, 2002 2:47 PM

> To: jborak@att.net

> Subject: Mold position paper

>

>

> Jonathan,

>

> Excellent overview of the topic.

>

> I'm giving a talk to a group of insurance related clients. Is it quotable

> and if so, how should I reference it?

>

**Marianne Dreger**

**From:** Harber, Philip M.D. [PHarber@mednet.ucla.edu]  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 15, 2002 11:06 AM  
**To:** 'Marianne Dreger'; 'Carson, Arch I'; 'Cowl, Clayton T'; 'Deldios, George';  
'Eschenbacher, William, MD'; Harber, Philip M.D.; 'Jolly, Athena'; 'Jonathan Borak';  
'Larry Lindesmith MD'; 'Lockey, James'; 'Markham, Thomas'; 'McKay, Roy T.,  
PhD'; 'Raymond, Lawrence'; 'Sherson, David'; 'Smith, Dorsett D., MD'; 'Stuart  
M. Brooks, MD'; 'Townsend, Mary C'; 'Velez, Henry'; 'Wintermeyer, Stephen E'  
**Cc:** 'Debbie Paddack'  
**Subject:** RE: Lung Committee Review of Position Statement on Indoor Mold

Thank you for sending this for review. A clear, written summary of background and purpose we greatly facilitate review. As most of you know, many consider this issue to be the "asbestos of the decade". Here in California, there are an enormous number of lawsuits involving stachybotrys, and this has become the new issue for Erin Bronkovich. The Los Angeles Times reported that the number of water damage claims has doubled and that many insurers will no longer cover mold damage.

I believe it is therefore essential that the process of development and review be carefully considered. Many of you may recall that the plaintiff bar sued officers of the American Thoracic Society when they released the statement on "diagnosis of non-malignant disease due to asbestos". . . Because of the extensive litigation, it is inevitable that our representatives will be subject to subpoena to describe the process.

Therefore, before we focus on the (more important) scientific issues, I hope we can define the process. Specifically: 1. Who appointed this committee? 2. Was this proposed statement developed in response to a request from the Board or Committee, or was the committee approached by its authors? 3. Recognizing the "political" controversy, are we assured that the committee was appointed with attention to balance of viewpoints? 4. Will the document be reviewed by the Industrial Hygienists, since their organization has a somewhat different position statement? (not necessarily a correct one!) 5. Will ACOEM indemnify us as commentators if we are sued in the course of our organizational service? 6.. Should we request disclosure of potential conflicts of interest? (Being involved in litigation should certainly not exclude someone from participating, but failure to disclose soils the process). 7. What is the time course of this project?

Please do not interpret these remarks as negative concerning the substance of the document itself; it makes some very important points which need to be said loud and clear. This is a highly litigated area, and therefore we need to be particularly careful about process. I personally strongly support the need for ACOEM to make a position statement concerning this area.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Marianne Dreger  
**To:** 'Carson, Arch I'; 'Cowl, Clayton T'; 'Deldios, George'; 'Eschenbacher,  
William, MD'; 'Harber, Philip'; 'Jolly, Athena'; 'Jonathan Borak'; 'Larry Lindesmith  
MD'; 'Lockey, James'; 'Markham, Thomas'; 'McKay, Roy T., PhD';  
'Raymond, Lawrence'; 'Sherson, David'; 'Smith, Dorsett D., MD'; 'Stuart M.  
Brooks, MD'; 'Townsend, Mary C'; 'Velez, Henry'; 'Wintermeyer, Stephen E'  
**Cc:** Debbie Paddack  
**Sent:** 6/14/02 1:53 PM  
**Subject:** Lung Committee Review of Position Statement on Indoor Mold

Attached is a draft of the Position Statement on Indoor Mold that was prepared for ACOEM by ACOEM members Bryan Hardin and David Kelman, and by



**Marianne Dreger**

**From:** Delclos, George [GDelclos@sph.uth.tmc.edu]  
**Sent:** Sunday, June 16, 2002 2:10 PM  
**To:** Harber, Philip M.D.; Marianne Dreger; 'Carson, Arch I'; 'Cowl, Clayton T'; 'Delclos, George'; 'Eschenbacher, William, MD'; Harber, Philip M.D.; 'Jolly, Athena'; 'Jonathan Borak'; 'Larry Lindesmith MD'; 'Lockey, James'; 'Markham, Thomas'; 'McKay, Roy T., PhD'; 'Raymond, Lawrence'; 'Sherson, David'; 'Smith, Dorsett D., MD'; 'Stuart M. Brooks, MD'; 'Townsend, Mary C'; 'Velez, Henry'; 'Wintermeyer, Stephen E'  
**Cc:** Debbie Paddack  
**Subject:** RE: Lung Committee Review of Position Statement on Indoor Mold

I strongly support Phil's comments. In Texas we are facing many of the same issues. The whole process, caveats and contingencies included, should be made clear before a statement such as this is launched into the public domain.

Thanks - George.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Harber, Philip M.D. [mailto:PHarber@mednet.ucla.edu]  
**Sent:** Sat 6/15/2002 11:05 AM  
**To:** 'Marianne Dreger'; 'Carson, Arch I'; 'Cowl, Clayton T'; 'Delclos, George'; 'Eschenbacher, William, MD'; Harber, Philip M.D.; 'Jolly, Athena'; 'Jonathan Borak'; 'Larry Lindesmith MD'; 'Lockey, James'; 'Markham, Thomas'; 'McKay, Roy T., PhD'; 'Raymond, Lawrence'; 'Sherson, David'; 'Smith, Dorsett D., MD'; 'Stuart M. Brooks, MD'; 'Townsend, Mary C'; 'Velez, Henry'; 'Wintermeyer, Stephen E'  
**Cc:** 'Debbie Paddack'  
**Subject:** RE: Lung Committee Review of Position Statement on Indoor Mold

Thank you for sending this for review. A clear, written summary of background and purpose we greatly facilitate review. As most of you know, many consider this issue to be the "asbestos of the decade". Here in California, there are an enormous number of lawsuits involving stachybotrys, and this has become the new issue for Erin Bronkovich. The Los Angeles Times reported that the number of water damage claims has doubled and that many insurers will no longer cover mold damage.

I believe it is therefore essential that the process of development and review be carefully considered. Many of you may recall that the plaintiff bar sued officers of the American Thoracic Society when they released the statement on "diagnosis of non-malignant disease due to asbestos".

Because of the extensive litigation, it is inevitable that our representatives will be subject to subpoena to describe the process.

Therefore, before we focus on the (more important) scientific issues, I hope we can define the process. Specifically: 1. Who appointed this committee? 2. Was this proposed statement developed in response to a request from the Board or Committee, or was the committee approached by its authors? 3.

Recognizing the "political" controversy, are we assured that the committee was appointed with attention to balance of viewpoints? 4. Will the document be reviewed by the Industrial Hygienists, since their organization has a somewhat different position statement? (not necessarily a correct one!) 5. Will ACOEM indemnify us as commentators if we are sued in the course of our organizational service? 6.. Should we request disclosure of

**Marianne Dreger**

**From:** Jonathan Borak [jborak@att.net]

**Sent:** Sunday, June 16, 2002 12:22 PM

**To:** 'Harber, Philip M.D.'

**Cc:** Dean Grove (E-mail); Edward J. Bernacki MD, MPH (E-mail); John Holland M.D., MPH (E-mail); Tim Key MD (E-mail); Barry Eisenberg (E-mail); Pamela Hymel (E-mail); Marianne Dreger (E-mail); Bryan D. Hardin PhD (E-mail)

**Subject:** Your comments on Position Statements

Phil:

Your comments below on the Mold position statement raises a number of key issues. I am copying the Exec Committee because the policy implications are broad.

Background: This past February, Dean Grove (as President) asked me (as Chair of CSA) to develop a position statement on indoor mold. With Dean's agreement, I approached Bryan Hardin -- former Deputy Director of NIOSH-- to develop such a statement. In return for his efforts, Dean and Barry approved the granting of a one-year courtesy membership to Bryan, who was not then a member (although his co-author, Bruce Kelman, was a dues-paying member).

Since then, I have been approached by others who heard (from Dean Grove) that this was an issue to be addressed by ACOEM. One sent written info, and others expressed interest. Nobody who initiated contact on the issue has been involved in its development.

As is our standard method, the draft has been circulated to members of the CSA with requests that it be distributed to their committee members for comments. I would not normally have sent an ACOEM position statement to AIHA, or ACGIH, or AAOHN, or anyone else unless this was to be a "joint statement" with that other group. On the other hand, I intended to send whatever comes back after the CSA to those members of ACOEM who have expressed interests in the topic. Moreover, I would be open to recommendations of other outside peer reviewers with appropriate academic/scientific expertise.

Your question about disclosure of "conflicts of interest" is interesting, but I am not sure who should be asked to make such disclosure. There are few individuals with the necessary knowledge and willingness to voluntarily author such a detailed position statement who do not already have some vested concerns. Is that an a priori basis to reject? Is your concern that all peer reviewers should disclose their involvement? I hope that a meaningful peer review would protect against scientific error and bias.

As for me, my disclosure statement is simple: I have no business interests in the issue; neither my clients nor my patients have posed related issues or concerns (although my wife currently has a candida paronychia on her right index finger!), nor do I anticipate that this position statement will have any impact upon my financial status (other than the unpaid time devoted to its development).

As for indemnification of officers and others, that is an issue that had not occurred to me. I think it is critical that Bernacki et al consider it. The implication is that ACOEM might need to avoid anything controversial.

As for other issues of "process" implicit in your questions, this has been done in the "standard manner" which means that it is based on tradition, not proscribed protocol. I have no problem adopting a "protocol", and I would be happy to discuss your suggestions or proposals.

The bottom line is that you raise extremely important issues that should be seen as generalized, not related solely to indoor mold or Erin Brockovich. My personal preference would be for those with concerns to perform a meticulous peer review so that we can determine whether this position statement is scientifically correct (as opposed to its political correctness) and that we do it as much as possible within the existing College traditional process. My next preference would be that we develop a new College process and imply it across-the-board. My lowest preference

Jonathan Borak

From: Bryan D. Hardin Ph.D. (bhardin@adelphia.net)  
Sent: Friday, August 16, 2002 2:36 PM  
To: jborak@att.net  
Cc: bkeiman@globaltox.com; ASaxon@MedNet.ucla.edu  
Subject: Reaction to Hodgson/Dearborn Letter

Jonathan -- We do not think it appropriate for us to revise the draft ACOEM position paper to incorporate a "response," "rebuttal," or other revision that would address overtly or implicitly the Hodgson - Dearborn letter appearing in the August issue of JOEM.

This letter is poorly focused and more personal and political than scientific in content. While Hodgson and Dearborn suggest they will "lay out" a hypothesis to explain an association between *Stachybotrys chartarum* and human disease, in fact there is no statement of a hypothesis. Instead, they indiscriminately stir a potpourri of anecdotes, unrelated and irrelevant occupational exposures, and uncritical references to in vivo and in vitro toxicity studies without consideration of dose - the first principle in toxicology. Their letter offers no new data for consideration; it raises no new issues; it marshals no arguments not already addressed in our draft.

Even if the Hodgson - Dearborn letter had scientific merit, we would object to revising our article to respond to it because there always will be another paper. Given the volume of publications in this area, it is unavoidable that meritorious research papers may pre-date the actual publication of the ACOEM position paper but not be included in it. If we were to attempt to avoid that by adding something on the latest new data, then each revision will call for another round of review during which yet another paper may appear.

We are confident that the draft as written is an accurate reflection of the current state of the science. The position we take is, of course, subject to revision if warranted by the accumulation of new evidence, but we have no new evidence here. If we cannot expect to react to every meritorious peer-reviewed research report, we surely should not attempt to react to non-peer reviewed letters to the editor that are of questionable scientific merit.

Finally, we also would object to involving Drs. Hodgson or Dearborn or others outside the normal ACOEM process for position papers. So far as we can ascertain, they have no standing in ACOEM, e.g., as members of your or another committee, the Board of Directors, the JOEM Editorial Board, the House of Delegates, etc. We have welcomed the thorough, impartial, and scientifically rigorous peer review to date, but would think it inappropriate to add ad hoc reviewers who are highly visible advocates for a point of view the draft position paper analyzes and finds lacking. We can be sure that advocates for various points of view will express their opinions in response to the position paper following its publication.

Bryan D. Hardin, Ph.D.  
Assistant Surgeon General (Retired)  
Suite 4A PMB 344  
33 Office Park Road  
Hilton Head Island, SC 29928

Telephone / Fax 843-363-9466  
Cell Phone 678-770-9150  
E-mail BHardin@Adelphia.Net

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

---

KARI KILIAN,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	CIV 02-1272-PHX-FJM
	)	
vs.	)	Phoenix, Arizona
	)	June 22, 2004
EQUITY RESIDENTIAL TRUST,	)	9:32 a.m.
et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

---

BEFORE: THE HONORABLE FREDERICK J. MARTONE, JUDGE

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRIAL TO THE COURT

VOLUME V  
(Pages 749 through 950, inclusive.)

**APPEARANCES:**

For the Plaintiff:

Law Offices of Richard Langerman  
By: **RICHARD W. LANGERMAN**, ESQ.  
3216 North 3rd Street, Suite 200  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

For the Defendants:

Shorall McGoldrick Brinkmann  
By: **TOM SHORALL, JR.**, ESQ.  
3030 North Central Avenue, Suite 1000  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Official Court Reporter:

Linda Schroeder-Willis, RDR, CRR  
Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Suite 312  
401 West Washington Street, Spc. 32  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2151  
(602) 322-7249

Proceedings Reported by Stenographic Court Reporter  
Transcript Prepared by Computer-Aided Transcription

COPY

INDEX OF WITNESSES

<u>WITNESSES FOR THE</u> <u>DEFENDANTS:</u>	<u>Direct</u>	<u>Cross</u>	<u>Redirect</u>	<u>Voir Dire</u>
SAXON, Andrew	751 803	831	848	802
KELMAN, Bruce J.	852	901	940 943	942

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

<u>EXHIBIT NO.:</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION:</u>	<u>RECEIVED:</u>
207	December 2000 California Department of Health Services Bulletin Entitled "Misinterpretation of Stachybotrys Serology"	801
208	November 2000 California Department of Health Services Bulletin Regarding Serology Testing	801
210	IBT Reference Laboratory Comments About Serology Testing	802
213	Rule 26 Report and CV of Andrew Saxon	815
216	Rule 26 Report and CV of Bruce Kelman	886

1           So they would go to someone and request that they  
2 write the statement. Then they would get the statement back,  
3 and they would review it, and they often send it out to  
4 members of the society for comment. It varies a little bit  
5 between societies.

6           For the American College of Occupational and  
7 Environmental Medicine, I've been told that more than 100  
8 physicians looked at this, and most of them critically  
9 reviewed it.

10           Then at that point it goes back to the Council on  
11 Scientific Affairs, and I believe the process then is that the  
12 council recommends to the college council that -- or the  
13 directors of the college of medicine that the statement be  
14 accepted.

15           So at that point it's been extensively reviewed and,  
16 although it has been written by someone, it's then a position  
17 of the College of Medicine.

18 Q. Not just Dr. Saxon and Dr. Kelman's position?

19 A. That's correct. In fact, this is probably the most  
20 extensive reviewed peer review publication I've ever done.

21 Q. In that regard, have you published peer reviewed articles  
22 or publications before the one that we're referring to?

23 A. Oh, certainly.

24 Q. Have any of them undergone the scientific scrutiny and  
25 expansive evaluation and review, to your knowledge, that the

## Marianne Dreger

---

**From:** Jonathan Borak [jborak@worldnet.att.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 22, 2003 5:10 PM  
**To:** 'Bryan D. Hardin PhD'  
**Cc:** Barry Eisenberg; Marianne Dreger  
**Subject:** RE: Peer Review

Bryan:

I do not know how many because I do not know how many reviewed the MS and agreed, but did not respond. Also, I have not maintained any of the files or emails. It was certainly more than a dozen: there are more than that on the Board alone.

Jonathan

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Bryan D. Hardin PhD [mailto:bhardin@adelphia.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 22, 2003 1:36 PM  
**To:** Borak, Jonathan at Jonathan Borak & Company  
**Subject:** Peer Review

Can you give an idea how many people were involved in the various stages of reviews?