

<p>1 Wednesday, 22 June 2016 2 (10.00 am) 3 Housekeeping 4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. Good morning. 5 MR HEPPINSTALL: Good morning, my Lord. 6 If we could just have a discussion about SB22. It 7 has grown overnight. 8 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. Is it going to stop growing? 9 MR HEPPINSTALL: I hope so, especially as we approach our 10 last witness. 11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 12 MR HEPPINSTALL: They are mainly papers that I think are 13 going to be put to Dr Haycock and he has had 14 an opportunity to look at them overnight, for which we 15 are grateful. 16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, I think we are going to have to 17 draw a line because to some extent these learned papers 18 are obviously very good for one's self-education into 19 these topics, or not as the case may be, but ultimately 20 they are mediated through the comments of the witnesses 21 that we hear or the experts are able to evaluate them. 22 MR HEPPINSTALL: Indeed. 23 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Bearing in mind the stage we are at, 24 I think the time has come down. 25 Since all the experts who are here to assist the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 1</p>	<p>1 relocate them elsewhere in the SBs but I've kept them 2 all in SB22, so I suspect we might be a tab out. 3 Otherwise, it was working yesterday. 4 Where are we up to now? 5 MR HEPPINSTALL: Operation Dominic went in at 14 yesterday. 6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 7 MR HEPPINSTALL: Then at 15 there's a male breast cancer 8 incidence and mortality risk by Mark Little, put in my 9 the Hogan Lovells appellants. 10 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes, I have that. If we just slow it 11 down and then my colleagues will have a chance to have 12 their files updated. 13 MR HEPPINSTALL: Yes. 14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: 16 is "Radiation exposure from CT scans 15 in childhood"? 16 MR HEPPINSTALL: Yes. 17 17, I think we are to learn about, I hope in 18 cross-examination because it appears to be 19 an authorless, explanatory note, but I think Mr ter Haar 20 is going to produce that in cross-examination. 21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Does that relate to the fact that 22 Mr Hallard did revise calculations on Mr Abdale and we 23 weren't entirely sure -- 24 MR HEPPINSTALL: No, I don't think so. 25 MR TER HAAR: My Lord, it is our document. It's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 3</p>
<p>1 Tribunal are here to assist the Tribunal, it does seem 2 to us that if, once we've absorbed lines of inquiry that 3 we think are relevant we then realise that there are 4 questions, we may want to have to pose questions to 5 experts. But we'll do that through transparent, normal 6 channels so you can see what's going. 7 MR HEPPINSTALL: That's fine. 8 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: But we don't want more interesting 9 questions and hypotheses and possibilities to emerge 10 from learned papers because we do have to bring a close 11 to it, but at the same time we want to do the best job 12 that we can on the material that is available. So there 13 we are. 14 MR HEPPINSTALL: Can I just check that there are -- all 15 three parties have added -- 16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Oh right, so it's a general update, is 17 it? 18 MR HEPPINSTALL: I think we have got to hand ours out, 19 although one e-mail -- 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I think our hard-working clerk has 21 updated mine, although I suspect what last appeared as 22 an index is no more than an indicator of what once it 23 was. 24 I have also a feeling that I've departed from one of 25 my annexes. I think I was meant to take them all and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 2</p>	<p>1 authorless -- I can explain -- done by one of the 2 members of the Hogan Lovells' team. It's simply 3 an exercise in taking Dr Haylock's calculations set out 4 in appendix 2 of his report and taking the first of 5 those whom I represent, that's Mr Abdale, and feeding in 6 what happens if you change the assumptions. It is 7 purely mathematical. 8 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes, I think interesting. Thank you very 9 much. 10 MR HEPPINSTALL: We'll see how Dr Haylock responds. 11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, I am glad someone has done that. 12 MR HEPPINSTALL: 18, a paper by Greenland and Robins. 13 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Thank you. 14 MR HEPPINSTALL: 19, another paper by Greenland, Bulletin of 15 Atomic Scientists. 16 20 Beyea and Greenland, "The importance of 17 specifying the underlying biologic model". 18 29, now I think this is from the BS appellants, 19 "Chromosome Aberrations Determined by FISH in Radiation 20 Workers from the Sellafield Nuclear Facility". 21 21, sorry. 22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: 21, and we've seen some papers by some of 23 these authors in the BS, tab 6. 24 MR HEPPINSTALL: I think so. 25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 4</p>

<p>1 MR HEPPINSTALL: 22 is --</p> <p>2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Chromosome aberration.</p> <p>3 MR HEPPINSTALL: Chromosome analysis.</p> <p>4 23 is a World Health Organisation paper.</p> <p>5 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Now, I think -- well, we do not have</p> <p>6 a tab at the moment.</p> <p>7 MR HEPPINSTALL: Ah, I think there are some new tabs for you</p> <p>8 (Handed).</p> <p>9 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: All right. So these are blank tabs. Oh</p> <p>10 right.</p> <p>11 23?</p> <p>12 MR HEPPINSTALL: Is what has just been handed to you.</p> <p>13 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: "Ionising radiation health effects of</p> <p>14 Chernobyl."</p> <p>15 MR HEPPINSTALL: Yes. Again that's from the BS appellants.</p> <p>16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes.</p> <p>17 MR HEPPINSTALL: Then 24 and 25 are going to be two</p> <p>18 documents from the Secretary of State which I'll hand</p> <p>19 up.</p> <p>20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I think bundle 22 is now beginning to</p> <p>21 complain that it is --</p> <p>22 MR HEPPINSTALL: 24 is the Health Protection Agency's</p> <p>23 response to the Rowland paper, because I detect that</p> <p>24 there is going to be some cross-examination of</p> <p>25 Dr Haylock at that point. It struck me if someone</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 5</p>	<p>1 have the references. I wonder if my learned friend</p> <p>2 would start again with his reference so I can identify</p> <p>3 what it is.</p> <p>4 MR HEPPINSTALL: So at tab 24, "Comments on New Zealand</p> <p>5 nuclear test veterans study by cytogenetic analysis" by</p> <p>6 Rowland.</p> <p>7 If you look at the end, this is from the Radiation</p> <p>8 Protection Division, Health Protection Agency,</p> <p>9 25 July 2007, so the predecessor body to Dr Haylock's</p> <p>10 current employer.</p> <p>11 That was in the library of documents at B12/157.</p> <p>12 Then tab 25. It's quite a long document and that's</p> <p>13 why I think it's set out in this format, a bit like the</p> <p>14 transcript although it does make the text hard to read.</p> <p>15 But the first page gives us the document UIN, if anybody</p> <p>16 is interested, so we know this has been disclosed in</p> <p>17 these proceedings. Then you'll see, actually, how it</p> <p>18 comes into the Secretary of State's possession because</p> <p>19 in fact --</p> <p>20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: 2005?</p> <p>21 MR HEPPINSTALL: The New Zealand Defence Force was asking</p> <p>22 for the Chief of Defence Staff's assistance with some</p> <p>23 information. Then over the page, you start to get into</p> <p>24 the report itself.</p> <p>25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Okay. Well, I think we have what it is.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 7</p>
<p>1 wanted his organisation's response to Rowland, the</p> <p>2 relevant expert agency have already provided it. It's</p> <p>3 from the library B12/157.</p> <p>4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: It's from the library. This is moving</p> <p>5 from these documents to this bundle, yes.</p> <p>6 MR HEPPINSTALL: Then at 25, this is "A history of the</p> <p>7 New Zealand Navy and the British nuclear test</p> <p>8 programmes" by JAB Crawford. It's a disclosed document.</p> <p>9 I can't actually now recall whether I handed it up to</p> <p>10 the last FTT but it didn't go into the bundles. So this</p> <p>11 is not in the library, but, rather than speculating on</p> <p>12 what the New Zealand sailors did, this actually tells</p> <p>13 you what they did.</p> <p>14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So this is a bit of historical data?</p> <p>15 MR HEPPINSTALL: Yes, it's a history commissioned by the</p> <p>16 New Zealand Government, by Headquarters New Zealand</p> <p>17 Defence Force in 1989. Crucially there is a table at</p> <p>18 the back which tells you --</p> <p>19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Can you just hold that whilst I catch up?</p> <p>20 We now just have tab 24.</p> <p>21 MR HEPPINSTALL: Yes.</p> <p>22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Hang on.</p> <p>23 MR TER HAAR: I am losing track of this. My learned friend</p> <p>24 is rattling through this, handing up documents to you</p> <p>25 and then coming late to us. So at the moment I do not</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 6</p>	<p>1 MR HEPPINSTALL: Fine.</p> <p>2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You don't want us to read it before we</p> <p>3 hear Dr Haylock?</p> <p>4 MR HEPPINSTALL: No.</p> <p>5 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: But I think I see it's a typescript</p> <p>6 document.</p> <p>7 MR HEPPINSTALL: Yes, there's a very useful table at the</p> <p>8 end.</p> <p>9 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: The table at the end that you were --</p> <p>10 hang on ... is that appendix 11?</p> <p>11 MR HEPPINSTALL: Sorry, I just shut my bundle.</p> <p>12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Appendix 2. No.</p> <p>13 MR HEPPINSTALL: Appendix 1 gives you the test. Then</p> <p>14 I think the location of the -- yes, appendix 2, exactly,</p> <p>15 it tells you where they were during the tests.</p> <p>16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. Okay.</p> <p>17 I anticipate that's all relevant when we come to</p> <p>18 look at the Wahiban(?) --</p> <p>19 MR HEPPINSTALL: Yes, I just thought instead of speculating</p> <p>20 about what they did, someone has thought about it and</p> <p>21 written it down.</p> <p>22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So that's the last update, is it?</p> <p>23 MR HEPPINSTALL: Yes, let's hope so.</p> <p>24 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right, well, let's just see what the</p> <p>25 bundle 22 is looking like groaning under the weight of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 8</p>

<p>1 this learning. I think probably that's getting close to 2 absorption point. Does anyone anticipate or expect that 3 any further data is to be supplied to us of this sort? 4 No? Okay. Good. 5 Right. 6 MR HEPPINSTALL: Dr Haylock. 7 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. Just give me just one moment to put 8 this ... He can come up. 9 DR RICHARD HAYLOCK (affirmed) 10 Examination-in-chief by MR HEPPINSTALL 11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right, are you happy to give your 12 evidence standing up? 13 A. Erm -- 14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: If you need to sit down or you would be 15 more comfortable, I think you may be here for 16 a substantial part of the day but others know better. 17 If you do sit down, make sure you can keep your voice up 18 so we can all hear you. 19 THE WITNESS: Okay. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Although the record is being taken it's 21 quite useful to understand you as we go along as well. 22 Yes? 23 MR HEPPINSTALL: SB2, tab 2.21, please. You'll find the SB 24 bundles to your right and it should be the second from 25 the left.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 9</p>	<p>1 MR HEPPINSTALL: I have no further questions. 2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Thank you very much. 3 Cross-examination by MR TER HAAR 4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 5 MR TER HAAR: Dr Haylock, good morning. 6 A. Good morning. 7 Q. You may well be aware that I represent some 12 8 appellants listed starting with Mr Abdale. 9 A. Mm-hm. 10 Q. And the questions I am going to ask are on behalf of 11 those appellants. 12 Do you still have that bundle still open? Could you 13 go back to tab 2.21, where you'll find the first of your 14 reports. 15 A. I have it. 16 Q. Unfortunately it's not paginated. It's one of the 17 annoyances of the Word system, I find, that you have to 18 remember to press the "paginate" button. But at any 19 rate, could you go through to the end of your report, 20 and then on after the very helpful references and 21 glossary to the appendix which has your curriculum 22 vitae. 23 A. Uh-huh I have it. 24 Q. Now, you set out there your academic qualifications. 25 A first degree and a second degree from the University</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 11</p>
<p>1 Turn to tab 2.21. Is that your first report this to 2 Tribunal? 3 A. Yes, it is. 4 Q. If you turn to the last page of that report, just under 5 section 2.5 -- Mr Battersby -- so not the references, 6 just before then, the last substantive page, there's 7 a heading "Statement of truth" and your signature. Do 8 you see that? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. Is that still the case today? 11 A. That's still the case. 12 Q. Then 2.22, please. You were asked questions by 13 Dr Christopher Busby and Group Captain Andrew Ades. Are 14 these your answers to those questions. 15 A. They are. 16 Q. Then, finally in the next tab, 2.23, you provided 17 a supplementary report to the Tribunal in respect of 18 a report provided by Professor Howard relating to the 19 Rabbitt Roth survey carried out in 1998. Is that your 20 supplementary report? 21 A. It is. 22 Q. Then, again, on the last page, you signed another 23 statement of truth. Is that still the position set out 24 in that statement of truth today? 25 A. It is.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 10</p>	<p>1 of Leicester and then a doctorate from the University of 2 Nottingham? 3 A. That's correct. 4 Q. Your first degree in mathematics is pure mathematics 5 presumably? 6 A. That's general mathematics so it incorporated some 7 aspects of and pure, applied and statistics. 8 Q. Then you did an MSc in medical statistics and 9 information technology? 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. To what extent would that involve you learning about 12 medicine as opposed to learning about the application of 13 statistics to medicine? 14 A. It involves nothing about medicine itself. It's just 15 about the application of statistics to medicine. 16 Q. Then you did your doctorate in statistics with a thesis 17 title that starts to make me go cross-eyed but certainly 18 looks to me like a very mathematical exercise in 19 statistics. 20 A. That's correct. It's a very mathematical part of 21 statistics, yes. 22 Q. Then you set out your employment. And do I get the 23 impression right that your role is to take 24 epidemiological data and with the expertise you have of 25 statistics, but particularly statistics relating to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 12</p>

<p>1 illness and morbidity and mortality, to process the 2 information which comes to you? 3 A. Yes, that's correct. 4 Q. And clearly you are very dependent upon medical 5 judgments made by others in order to make sense of the 6 statistics that you are considering? 7 A. To some degree, in that, for example, we rely on death 8 certificates so we rely on the accuracy of those, and on 9 the accurate diagnosis of cancer incidences so that's 10 probably the two main respects in which the statistics 11 rely upon directly medical expertise. 12 Q. Yes. Obviously -- I say "obviously", perhaps you'd 13 agree with me -- in assessing statistics often a degree 14 of history and common sense has to come into play in 15 order to try to understand where the bias might be in 16 the data you are considering? 17 A. Absolutely, yes. 18 Q. So if we look back in the main body of your report at 19 the third page, the top of the page starts: 20 "The epidemiological evidence for deriving the risks 21 to adverse health effects." 22 Do you have that page? 23 A. Yes. 24 Q. You are there dealing with the lifespan study or the 25 LSS. Clearly in considering the LSS you have to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 13</p>	<p>1 you are aware there were earlier proceedings -- 2 A. Mm-hm. 3 Q. -- Dr Brenner was described by Dr Lindahl as eminent and 4 by Dr Darroudi as very well respected. Would those 5 descriptions of Dr Brenner accord with what you know of 6 him? 7 A. As far as I know, yes, I would. 8 Q. His report comments upon -- this report as he has here 9 is primarily concerned with the Wahab and Rowland Report 10 on chromosomal abnormalities which have been 11 identified -- there's some argument about it, but 12 identified among the New Zealand naval representatives. 13 A. Mm-hm. 14 Q. Would I understand that your speciality is not one which 15 would enable you to comment upon what 16 a radio-biophysician has to say about that study? 17 A. That's correct. I'm not an expert on fish or any of 18 these techniques, so I would not want to comment on that 19 sort of study. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Fish and mFISH -- 21 A. Fish and mFISH. 22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: -- are therefore -- 23 A. Related. 24 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: -- medical analyses as opposed to 25 statistical analysis?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 15</p>
<p>1 understand the history of the people who are being 2 considered? 3 A. Indeed, yes. 4 Q. And I'll come back to some aspects of that in due 5 course. 6 Now, just so I can see where your assistance to this 7 Tribunal starts and ends could I ask you please, to take 8 up bundle SB11. To give yourself space do put the 9 bundle with your report in it back on the shelf to make 10 a little bit more space. 11 Turn to the very first divider, please. 12 A. Mm-hm. 13 Q. You should find there a relatively short report from 14 Dr Brenner who we can see if we go to page 6 of this is 15 not only a PhD but also a DSc, and he is a Professor of 16 Radiation Biophysics, Director of the Center for 17 Radiological Research at Columbia University Medical 18 Centre? 19 A. (Nodded assent). 20 Q. Was he somebody of whom you are aware? Do you know his 21 reputation? 22 A. I know him by reputation. I think I've met him once or 23 maybe twice. 24 Q. In two of the experts' reports filed by the 25 Secretary of State in the earlier proceedings -- I think</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 14</p>	<p>1 A. They are biological techniques, not medical techniques. 2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Biological techniques. 3 A. Biological techniques. 4 MR TER HAAR: I am going to take you in a moment to a paper 5 which sets out the history of it, which you may or may 6 not be able to confirm from the interplay between your 7 specialisation and the pure medical world. 8 Getting closer, though, to your field of expertise 9 is the next tab, that's to say tab 4, where we have 10 a report from Professor Parker. 11 Just so we can see what her expertise and experience 12 is, her report goes through to page 116, so if you get 13 to the very last page of her report. It's a long way 14 on. 15 Immediately after that you'll find her CV, personal 16 details. 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. We can see her experience. She's also an epidemiologist 19 coming from a rather more medical background? 20 A. Mm. 21 Q. Is Professor Parker somebody of whom you've heard, are 22 you aware? 23 A. Only in connection with this case. I've not heard of 24 her previously. 25 Q. But you would accept, wouldn't you, that she is somebody</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 16</p>

<p>1 who has a specialist interest in the epidemiology, in 2 particular in relation to the effects of ionising 3 radiation? 4 A. That may be so. But as I said, I've only known of her 5 through this case. So I don't have independent evidence 6 of that. 7 Q. But at any rate, you have no reason to doubt her 8 expertise? 9 A. I have no evidence one way or the other, I'm afraid. 10 Q. But what she does do in her report is to carry out 11 an extensive survey of the various epidemiological 12 studies which have been carried out which are of 13 relevance to especially whether or not radiation may or 14 may not have caused some cancers and other diseases in 15 what we call the nuclear veterans. 16 Have you been given the opportunity to read her 17 report and look at her comments on those epidemiological 18 studies? 19 A. I have looked at it but not in great detail. 20 Q. So for me to ask you detailed questions on this would be 21 pointless? 22 A. I think so, yes. 23 Q. But when you reviewed it, albeit not in depth, was there 24 anything which you came to the conclusion was outside 25 the range of views which a competent epidemiologist</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 17</p>	<p>1 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Okay. 2 MR TER HAAR: Let's see if we can do this quite quickly in 3 this sense. Go to page 113. She is commenting there 4 upon, in section 11.1, upon the NRPB studies. 5 First of all, were you involved in the NRPB studies 6 into the nuclear veterans? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. I thought you were. And so maybe this is one area where 9 you might not entirely agree with her. Can we just look 10 at some of the points she makes here. 11 If you look at the numbering, you see in paragraph 1 12 it says this: 13 "As a result of inadequacies in the Ministry of 14 Defence record keeping, it was not possible to fully and 15 unambiguously identify all participants." 16 You'd agree with that statement of fact? 17 A. I don't have information on that. As I said, I am 18 an epidemiologist statistician and I analysed the data 19 we have. I was not involved in the original collection 20 and setting up of the cohort. That occurred before 21 I joined the organisation. 22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So you don't know whether there were 23 missing participants or not? 24 A. No. 25 MR TER HAAR: I think it would follow from that that you're</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 19</p>
<p>1 could hold? 2 A. Some of the views appear to be somewhat different to 3 views I would probably have held given the same 4 information. 5 Q. That's an answer to a slightly different question. 6 That's why I put it as I did. 7 Obviously in science, as in other areas, views can 8 differ. 9 A. Mm. 10 Q. What I am asking you is whether or not the views which 11 she expressed are within the range of views which 12 a competent epidemiologist could hold. 13 A. I think I would have to look at each point in 14 particular. I think it's -- maybe some of the points 15 she raised I would agree; others, possibly not. 16 Q. Well -- 17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So just for me to understand your answer, 18 you would agree that there is a difference between you? 19 A. Yes. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: It's still a difference within a range of 21 reasonable options but some you think would fall outside 22 that? 23 A. Professor Parker makes a lot of different statements in 24 this report, some of which I would say are potentially 25 reasonable, others I would say are perhaps not.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 18</p>	<p>1 not able to comment on item 2: 2 "Participants not included in the NRPB studies are 3 likely to have a poorer outcome than those included." 4 A. I think you would have to know who were the people who 5 were not included to be able to make that statement. 6 I don't know how she knows that if they're not included 7 in the studies. 8 Q. Well, let's look at her reasoning. 9 It's in a number of places but if we go back to 10 page 4 and 5. She first of all at page 5 comments on 11 the uncertainty of who the participants were at 12 paragraph 2.1.6. 13 A. Mm-hm. 14 Q. And those certainly appear to be valid comments, do they 15 not? 16 A. Like I said, I was not involved in setting up the cohort 17 so I can't comment on how that was set up or what steps 18 were taken to do it. 19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Can you comment on 2.1.7 where, as I read 20 it, in summary she suggests that of the three NRPB 21 reports the second excluded 514 who had been included in 22 the first. That looks like that's something within the 23 NRPB dealing with the data as opposed to what was the 24 data provided to the NRPB in the first place. 25 A. It could well be. I would have to look at exactly why</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 20</p>

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

<p>1 these 514 were excluded to comment.</p> <p>2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You don't have that at your fingertips?</p> <p>3 A. No, I'm afraid not.</p> <p>4 MR TER HAAR: Then if you go on to page 7, this is the</p> <p>5 section where she deals with the second point I was</p> <p>6 putting to you earlier that participants not included</p> <p>7 are likely to have a poorer outcome.</p> <p>8 She says this at 2.1.10:</p> <p>9 "There are a number of further challenges in</p> <p>10 determining the extent to which the health outcome of</p> <p>11 the participants have been affected by their involvement</p> <p>12 in atomic weapon experiments. Some of these are the</p> <p>13 inherent difficulties of retrospective epidemiological</p> <p>14 studies and some were created and exacerbated by the</p> <p>15 inadequacy of the record-keeping at the time in the</p> <p>16 aftermath of the experiments. In particular: that the</p> <p>17 group of all participants is unknown means that the</p> <p>18 questions to the extent and nature of health detriments</p> <p>19 that may have been experienced by participants cannot be</p> <p>20 fully answered. The table on page 16 illustrates the</p> <p>21 extent to which the groups identified in the NRPB</p> <p>22 studies do and do not overlap and emphasised that there</p> <p>23 remains uncertainty in identifying the group of all true</p> <p>24 participants. This is discussed briefly here in more</p> <p>25 detail in section 2.1.10."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 21</p>	<p>1 issues with their health which had been drawn to the</p> <p>2 attention of their employers. These records could have</p> <p>3 been removed without any flag being put in place to</p> <p>4 point either to their existence or to fact they had been</p> <p>5 removed and for what purpose. Thus this creates</p> <p>6 a situation where less well participants were less</p> <p>7 likely to be included in the NRPB studies."</p> <p>8 That's the first point she makes. That's at least</p> <p>9 a plausible view, isn't it?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, it is.</p> <p>11 Q. Then she goes on:</p> <p>12 "Further evidence is provided by Rabbitt Roth in her</p> <p>13 report ..."</p> <p>14 Her more recent publications.</p> <p>15 Then if we go a bit further down:</p> <p>16 "Roth provides evidence of under ascertainment of</p> <p>17 serious health outcomes such as multiple myeloma,</p> <p>18 overall in the NRPB study, and especially in the</p> <p>19 estimated 15 per cent of participants not included in</p> <p>20 the NRPB studies. Roff proposed that the rate of some</p> <p>21 adverse outcomes (i.e multiple myeloma), was twice as</p> <p>22 high in the excluded 15 per cent of participants than in</p> <p>23 the 85 per cent included. This may be contributed to by</p> <p>24 the fact that ascertainment of RAF participants, who may</p> <p>25 well have had the greater radiation exposures, may have</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 23</p>
<p>1 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Isn't this section 2.1.10?</p> <p>2 MR TER HAAR: Yes.</p> <p>3 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I marked that up and I am confused of</p> <p>4 (inaudible) here.</p> <p>5 MR TER HAAR: Yes.</p> <p>6 We can see, though, that she does, further on in</p> <p>7 this section, actually deal with some of the problems.</p> <p>8 If we go on:</p> <p>9 "The group of participants included in the NRPB</p> <p>10 second and third reports was estimated by its authors to</p> <p>11 include around 85 per cent of all participants. It is</p> <p>12 important to also acknowledge that those categorised in</p> <p>13 the NRPB studies as participants will also include some</p> <p>14 non-participants. This again is discussed in more</p> <p>15 detail later in this document at section 4.3.4. The</p> <p>16 extrapolation of any findings from this 85 per cent</p> <p>17 sample to the larger group of all participants depends</p> <p>18 critically upon whether that missing 15 per cent of</p> <p>19 missing participants was likely to be similar or</p> <p>20 different to the known 85 per cent in terms of their</p> <p>21 exposure and experience of health outcome. There are</p> <p>22 two major pieces of evidence to suggest that two groups</p> <p>23 were probably different. Firstly, as detailed</p> <p>24 extensively in the NRPB R214 there were challenges in</p> <p>25 identifying the records of those participants who had</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 22</p>	<p>1 been as low as 74 per cent."</p> <p>2 Just stopping there, I know that on behalf of the</p> <p>3 Secretary of State there are substantial caveats</p> <p>4 expressed in relation to Rabbitt Roth, but the specific</p> <p>5 point that she deals with in the last sentence there</p> <p>6 would be significant, wouldn't it, if the RAF</p> <p>7 participants were under-represented?</p> <p>8 A. If their mortality rates were different to the rest of</p> <p>9 the other servicemen it potentially could, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Well, one of the reasons why it's suggested that that</p> <p>11 might be a problem is this. Some of the hapless RAF</p> <p>12 chaps were told to fly right the way through the middle</p> <p>13 of the nuclear cloud and therefore on any view got</p> <p>14 absolutely massive exposure to radiation and there is</p> <p>15 some evidence before the Tribunal that that resulted in</p> <p>16 incidences of very severe cancer cases. Are you aware</p> <p>17 of that?</p> <p>18 A. Only in general. I've not looked at those cases in any</p> <p>19 detail.</p> <p>20 Q. I think --</p> <p>21 A. It's not relevant to the kind of work we do.</p> <p>22 Q. You are coming from a different world in order to give</p> <p>23 such assistance as you can. I totally understand that.</p> <p>24 But I think what you are agreeing with at any rate</p> <p>25 is this. On the first point, if there had been</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 24</p>

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

<p>1 effectively some form of pre-selection of the records in 2 the sense some had been extracted because people who are 3 ill needed to get treatment, if so that would be a valid 4 point to take into account? 5 A. It would be. I can't comment on whether that actually 6 happened because, as I said, I was not employed and 7 I didn't -- I was not involved in the actual setting up 8 of the cohort. As I said, the important thing is that 9 the cohort that we see is a representative and unbiased 10 sample of all those people at the tests. That was 11 obviously the aim of the people who were setting it up. 12 Whether they succeeded, I don't know. 13 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Who was involved in setting it up? 14 A. My predecessors at the NRPB. 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So that would be an NRPB selection 16 process. 17 A. Yes. 18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Rather than simply something that had 19 gone on before it gets to the NRPB. 20 A. No, it was an NRPB -- 21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: But it's not within your personal 22 knowledge? 23 A. No. 24 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Is it within the institutional knowledge 25 of the NRPB?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 25</p>	<p>1 results. What I am suggesting is that when you look at 2 the exercise they've carried out it had the 3 disadvantage, as this Tribunal has the disadvantage, of 4 having to look back historically 50 years or however 5 many years it was then, and inevitably if you are trying 6 to look back that far the records are not likely to be 7 as complete as you might hope for, so the controls are 8 not up to, if you like, the best standards of 9 an epidemiological piece of research? 10 A. Yes, the standard of research is dependent directly on 11 the quality of the data. 12 Q. Can we go back to the conclusions, so back to page 113. 13 The third point which she makes: 14 "Controls included in the study were likely to be 15 healthier than all eligible controls." 16 Do you have the reference? 17 A. Sorry -- 18 Q. Page 113, paragraph 3, towards the top of the page. Do 19 you have it? 20 A. "Overall summary of conclusions." 21 Q. Then paragraph 3: 22 "Controls included in the study were likely to be 23 healthier ..." 24 A. Uh-huh. 25 Q. The point being raised here is that by and large what</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 27</p>
<p>1 A. Yes. 2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Presumably epidemiology has to identify 3 what it's doing to verify -- 4 A. The very first thing of a study is to identify what the 5 group of people you are going to study is. As 6 an epidemiologist the overriding factor is to make sure 7 your sample is unbiased. Even if it contained 8 50 per cent or 60 per cent or 70 per cent of the overall 9 population the important thing is that it's an unbiased 10 sample and it doesn't choose particular high dose people 11 or low dose people or all RAF people or all Army. It 12 needs to be unbiased in the sense that it is 13 representative of the population that it is trying to 14 represent. 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. But you would accept that if, in 16 selecting the sample that is going to be used for the 17 study, people who had reported health conditions to 18 their employers and for some reason those health records 19 had been removed and therefore they were not visible as 20 such and had been excluded from the study that would be 21 a potentially biasing factor? 22 A. Yes, it would. Whether that happened or not -- 23 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I have that bit. 24 MR TER HAAR: Just to be clear, I'm not in any way 25 suggesting that the NRPB deliberately skewed the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 26</p>	<p>1 the Armed Forces did was to collect young, healthy men 2 to go off to go and do hard work in the South Pacific, 3 and hence the point she makes, which appears to be 4 a valid one, I suggest, that "controls included in the 5 study were likely to be healthier than all eligible 6 controls". 7 A. Well, that would not have been the aim of the selection 8 of the controls from an NRPB point of view. We would 9 aim to have the controls as close in their selection as 10 to the cases as possible apart from the fact of going to 11 the test. Whether this happened or not, as I said, it's 12 down to the people who set up the cohort in the first 13 place and I was not one of those. So -- 14 Q. Item 4, a statement of what the study actually carried 15 out: 16 "Only cancers and deaths were included in the 17 definition of health outcome." 18 Can you confirm that? 19 A. Yes. 20 Q. That's because, and again it's perfectly natural, that's 21 where the main focus of concern had been, but 22 nevertheless it means it wasn't a full 23 across-all-diseases study? 24 A. No, no. 25 Q. Then at 5:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 28</p>

<p>1 "Cancers and deaths in participants were 2 incompletely ascertained because (a) there was no cancer 3 registration in the UK before 1971; (b) post 1971 cancer 4 registration was incomplete (c) death registration was 5 incomplete; (d) some participants were lost to follow-up 6 due to poor quality identifying information; (e) deaths 7 and cancers occurring abroad were not identified." 8 Again, all of those seem to be sound points, don't 9 they? 10 A. But the issue would be if these issues applied 11 differently to the cases and the controls. Because 12 I would not expect any of these issues to apply 13 differently to the cases and the controls, the numbers 14 and the data you get out are still comparable between 15 the two. 16 Q. They are comparable but with what has to be recognised 17 as substantial caveats? 18 A. I would not say "substantial". 19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So as long as problems about cancer 20 registration are consistent between your control and 21 your sample group -- 22 A. In a sense the two groups are still comparable. 23 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: It doesn't skew the results. It's only 24 if your study group or your control group is 25 disproportionately affected by --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 29</p>	<p>1 So you have a cancer diagnosis, that is then passed to 2 the registry and is put on your record. 3 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: But on your death certificate if you die 4 presumably it would tell you -- 5 A. If you die of cancer, it would also say exactly the same 6 thing. You might be diagnosed with a lung cancer, that 7 incident is passed to the registrations scheme. 8 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right, but does cancer registration -- 9 sorry to interrupt you but just to try and catch up my 10 understanding -- cancer registration includes people who 11 are diagnosed with cancer but die of it? 12 A. Yes. 13 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Got you. 14 A. But before 1971 the difference in those two was quite 15 small but is now diverging. 16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 17 MR TER HAAR: Well, I don't want to spend too much time on 18 this but let's take point (d): 19 "Some participants were lost to follow-up because of 20 poor quality identifying information." 21 That would be a concern, wouldn't it? 22 A. It would. I believe the proportion lost to follow-up, 23 though, is very small and again there would be no issue 24 unless that differed, that proportion differed 25 significantly, between the two populations, the cases in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 31</p>
<p>1 A. Yes, then it would not be a fair comparison. 2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 3 MR TER HAAR: Well, the problem is, just taking the first 4 point -- no cancer registration in the UK before 1971 -- 5 without such hard data it's very difficult to be sure 6 that your control is comparable. It may or may not be? 7 A. I have no reason to assume it wouldn't be. We do a lot 8 of work with cancer incidence statistics and from what 9 I've seen from other studies it appears to be very 10 reliable. And a point to take into consideration is 11 that decades ago, cancer was more quickly fatal so the 12 difference between -- sort of before 1971, the 13 difference between cancer incidence and mortality would 14 have been much less. The chances are that you've got 15 a cancer you died fairly quickly. That's not becoming 16 the case these days. People survive cancer a lot 17 longer, so the difference between cancer incidence 18 information and mortality information is beginning to 19 diverge. But in these early days, particularly for main 20 causes of cancer, that was not the case. 21 Q. Well, let's -- 22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Cancer registration is a specific form of 23 registration of death as recorded? What is cancer 24 registration? 25 A. Sorry, there is a National Cancer Registry in the UK.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 30</p>	<p>1 the controls -- sorry, the veterans and the controls. 2 Q. Let's look at point 6: 3 "As a result of inadequacies in the Ministry of 4 Defence's monitoring procedures and record-keeping, the 5 data on radiation exposure was unreliable." 6 Then she sets out four features. 7 Now, this is outside your expertise, isn't it, as to 8 whether the record-keeping of exposure was unreliable? 9 A. Indeed. 10 Q. Over the page, 11.1.3, it says this: 11 "These limitations of the NRPB studies and the 12 cumulative misclassification of participant status, 13 exposure status and health outcome (death and cancer) 14 status severely limit their ability to identify and 15 quantitate any deficit in health outcome of the 16 participants in the atomic weapons testing exercises. 17 Thus these studies did not report an increase in solid 18 cancers and other health outcomes in participants cannot 19 be taken as evidence that such excesses have not 20 occurred." 21 I think from what you said you disagree with that 22 view? 23 A. I would. 24 Q. You can see the logic by which she's come to that view? 25 A. I can see, based upon her point over the page, why she</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 32</p>

<p>1 would come to that view, yes. But I don't agree with 2 it. 3 Q. I understand that. 4 But can we go on though to 11.1.4 and this is where 5 I want to see what the interface is between your 6 expertise as a statistician and the medical world. 7 The background to this is do you remember we stopped 8 at Dr Brenner's report, the American gentleman who 9 comments from the point of view of a radiation 10 biophysicist on the Wahab and Rowland survey? 11 That's now referred to here and elsewhere in this 12 report by Professor Parker. 13 "The main findings of these studies were an 14 increased rate of leukaemia and an apparently transient 15 increase in the rate of multiple myeloma in 16 participants. Leukaemia is considered to be the most 17 radiogenic adult cancer and these results are consistent 18 with an effect of radiation exposure." 19 First of all, you wouldn't disagree with that, would 20 you? 21 A. No, that's -- that seems correct. 22 Q. "Given the limitations of the NRPB studies and the fact 23 that misclassification as occurred acts to obscure any 24 real effect, the implication of these findings is that 25 the radiation exposure in the participants was likely to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 33</p>	<p>1 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You can't comment? 2 A. No, I can't comment. 3 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Could I just see I've understood your 4 answers on the two parts of 11.1.4. 5 You disagree with the last sentence, but if the 6 premise of all the criticisms and observations made at 7 11.1.1 were factually sound, would the accumulation of 8 those omissions and problems -- I'll call them that -- 9 justify the conclusion that it severely -- what was 10 it? -- severely limits the ability of the NRPB to 11 identify and quantitate any deficit in the health 12 outcome? 13 A. I think it would depend upon the extent to which any of 14 these factors she alludes to were present. 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I am asking you hypothetically. If you 16 don't think you can answer it, don't, but I mean if all 17 these factors were present would that have the 18 capability of justifying "severely limit"? 19 A. In sufficient severity, yes. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. 21 Secondly, then going down, leaving all that debate 22 on the back-burner for the time being, what I think 23 I understand that second part of 1.4 to be saying is 24 I think there are problems with the extent you can rely 25 upon the NRPB studies, and if elsewhere you are getting</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 35</p>
<p>1 be higher than that recorded." 2 There, I think, you differ from her? 3 A. In a sense our study, where we're comparing the veterans 4 to the controls, takes no account of what radiation 5 exposure the veterans might have had. The whole idea is 6 to compare the population -- the two populations -- and 7 at a population level see: do they differ? And we do 8 see a difference in the rate of leukaemia. 9 Q. Then if we go on: 10 "That exposures were underestimated is consistent 11 with the findings of chromosomal changes in New Zealand 12 participants (Wahab et al, 2008), high rates of 13 leukaemia in New Zealand participants (Pearce et al, 14 1996), chromosomal changes [I think that should be 'in 15 UK participants', the letter is referred to] ... and 16 elevated rates of several cancers including leukaemia 17 and solid tumours in Australian weapons testing 18 experiment participants (Carter et al, 2006)." 19 Now, would I be right in thinking that those 20 comments in that sentence need to be assessed by 21 somebody with medical expertise in order to understand 22 exactly what those studies are showing? 23 A. I'm not an expert on the Wahab paper to comment on that 24 and certainly not on the chromosomal changes bit. 25 So ...</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 34</p>	<p>1 evidence of high rates of chromosomal changes and/or 2 leukaemia in biological studies, if I can call them 3 that -- biological, medical -- of other veterans, if you 4 did have that, again is that capable of raising 5 questions about the NRPB studies? 6 A. In our study we do acknowledge that there is a higher 7 incidence of leukaemia amongst the participants compared 8 to the control. So that is an agreement with what was 9 said in Australia. 10 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So the factor of higher leukaemias 11 wouldn't in your view severely limit your study? 12 Indeed, that is what you are saying? 13 A. No, we agree with that. 14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Okay. 15 A. With regard to the chromosome aberrations, the issue is 16 just because you are seeing increased chromosome 17 aberrations doesn't necessarily mean you are seeing 18 increased cancer. 19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. Okay. Can I just record that. 20 (Pause). Yes? 21 MR TER HAAR: Could I just pick up on that last point, 22 Dr Haylock? 23 A. Mm-hm. 24 Q. I think you may be help this far. There are at least 25 two schools of thought as to the extent to which</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 36</p>

<p>1 chromosomal aberrations may be an indicator or a link to 2 cancer. There are some who say that it can lead to 3 cancer or be a sign that cancer will follow, some who 4 say you can't make that link. 5 Do you agree with that as a general proposition 6 first of all? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. But what I think is common ground is that certain forms 9 of chromosomal aberrations, in particular 10 translocations, are a powerful indicator of exposure to 11 ionising radiation? 12 A. As I said, I'm not an expert on that, but my belief is 13 that there is a -- there is -- that is the case. But 14 I'm not an expert on chromosome aberration. 15 Q. You may at least be able to help this far: and the 16 received wisdom is that that sort of chromosomal 17 aberration is an indication not only of exposure to 18 ionising radiation, but to a high dose of ionising 19 radiation? 20 A. I'm not prepared to comment on that. I'm not -- 21 Q. Outside your territory? 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Fair enough. We have papers in the files which support 24 that view. 25 What I want to do is go on to another report. This</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 37</p>	<p>1 Again, a rather more medical and biological 2 background than yours? 3 A. Mm-hm. 4 Q. What she tells us -- this is where I think your world 5 and the world of the more medically qualified come 6 together -- is about problems of uncertainty in what she 7 describes as the low dose regions. Can I take you back 8 to page 6, please. 9 Paragraph 3.3, "Old paradigm": 10 "The old paradigm basically holds that there is a 11 linear relationship between radiation dose and 12 biological effect." 13 Now, this is slap bang in your territory, isn't it, 14 as epidemiological research? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. It's the result of epidemiological studies over the 17 years. Would you agree? 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. "It holds that DNA is the critical 'target' for 20 radiation damage and that the DNA double strand break is 21 the critical lesion. The number of double strand breaks 22 can be directly related to the dose. Arising from this 23 DNA damage, chromosome aberrations can occur due to 24 changes in the sequence of DNA bases (code sequences). 25 It should be noted that the old paradigm held that low</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 39</p>
<p>1 is at tab 7 of this bundle, and this is from 2 Dr Mothersill. 3 Now, again, in order to identify who she is, if you 4 go to the end of her report you get to numbered page 27, 5 and then there's a unnumbered page after that with her 6 signature on it. Then you should find her CV 7 immediately after that. 8 Now, she originally appears to have come from 9 studies in Dublin to do with zoology, but then she has 10 moved, if we see her employment history, through into 11 the world of medical physics having from 1983 to 1985 12 being a lecturer in medical physics and radiation 13 biology. She was seconded half-time to run the 14 Radiation Research Group at St Luke's Hospital, and 15 later at the Nuclear Energy Board in Dublin. 16 1995 to 2003, Scientific Director of the Radiation 17 and Environmental Science Centre at DIT. I'm not sure 18 what DIT -- 19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Dublin Institute of Technology. 20 MR TER HAAR: Thank you. I should already have got that. 21 Then we see from 2003 to the present, to 2010, she 22 was Professor and Tier 1 Canada Research Council Chair 23 at the Department of Medical Physics and Applied 24 Radiation Sciences at McMaster University, Hamilton, 25 Ontario.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 38</p>	<p>1 dose chronic irradiation does not necessarily have as 2 great an impact as a brief higher dose exposure - a 3 division factor of 2 was applied to the 'dose' if this 4 was accumulated of (sic) a long period. The direct 5 relationship between dose and DNA damage lent weight to 6 the LNT model which was supported by high dose 7 epidemiological data from the Japanese A-Bomb survivors 8 who had an increasing rate of cancer incidence as the 9 dose received increased. To determine risk at low 10 doses, the high dose data were extrapolated to zero dose 11 where there was zero effect. Of course in the low dose 12 region, it was not easy to assign causation to radiation 13 exposure due to the high background instance of cancer 14 and other diseases associated with radiation." 15 Now, first of all, as a statement if you like of 16 what certainly has been conventional wisdom would you 17 agree with what she says in paragraph 3.3? 18 A. Some of it. 19 Q. What do you disagree with? 20 A. I think from an epidemiological perspective the bit 21 about the exact mechanism is not particularly relevant. 22 We are looking -- we don't need to know what is the 23 particular mechanism to define the best mathematical 24 relationship between risk and dose. There we are going 25 through a mathematical process of finding in some sense</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 40</p>

<p>1 the best model which represents the data.</p> <p>2 So knowledge about any underlying mechanisms or</p> <p>3 hypotheses about them don't necessarily have to figure</p> <p>4 on that.</p> <p>5 So the epidemiological process is of trying to fit</p> <p>6 a model to the data and finding the best model. We</p> <p>7 don't necessarily need to know about what the underlying</p> <p>8 mechanism is.</p> <p>9 Q. Except for this: that if you understand the underlying</p> <p>10 mechanism you may need to re-visit the conclusions which</p> <p>11 come from the pure application of mathematics?</p> <p>12 A. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q. That I think is what she then proceeds to do, and tell</p> <p>14 me when it stops being in your territory, paragraph 3.4:</p> <p>15 "Uncertainties in the low dose region."</p> <p>16 I think before I go into this you would agree with</p> <p>17 me that the low dose region is an area where statistics</p> <p>18 have real problems?</p> <p>19 A. There are difficulties because of the lack of</p> <p>20 statistical power, yes.</p> <p>21 Q. And I'll come back to what UNSCEAR have to say about it.</p> <p>22 You probably know the 2006 UNSCEAR report where they</p> <p>23 deal with this at some length, don't they?</p> <p>24 A. Yes.</p> <p>25 Q. Let's look at what Dr Mothersill had to say:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 41</p>	<p>1 I think again that's a correct statement?</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 Q. It is probably obvious from your point of view.</p> <p>4 "The difficulty with this position is that we are</p> <p>5 exposed to natural radiation constantly from the earth,</p> <p>6 from food and tobacco, from each other and from air</p> <p>7 travel. We are also exposed to medical radiation. For</p> <p>8 this reason, effective thresholds have been set at which</p> <p>9 epidemiological studies have not had the power to detect</p> <p>10 any adverse risks to a population."</p> <p>11 So if we just look at -- I think the Tribunal are</p> <p>12 probably aware of biostatistical power but can we just</p> <p>13 look at that for a moment.</p> <p>14 If you survey a million people and discover that</p> <p>15 990,000 get a cold every winter you can say people are</p> <p>16 likely to get colds in the winter with a fair degree of</p> <p>17 certainty.</p> <p>18 If you study a million people and you find that one</p> <p>19 person gets a cold, it's very difficult to draw any</p> <p>20 conclusions from that.</p> <p>21 The difference -- I take a very extreme case -- is</p> <p>22 statistical power?</p> <p>23 A. Statistical power is the ability of the study you're</p> <p>24 referring to detect an alternative -- whether</p> <p>25 an alternative hypothesis is true compared to your null</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 43</p>
<p>1 "While LNT predicts that some cancers or other</p> <p>2 diseases will occur due to low dose it cannot say which</p> <p>3 cancers were or were not due to radiation exposure."</p> <p>4 That's obviously true?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. "The difficulty is the variability of response at low</p> <p>7 doses. There is no doubt that high doses of radiation</p> <p>8 are toxic and carcinogenic and some extrapolation from a</p> <p>9 high to low dose can be made."</p> <p>10 So far, so good?</p> <p>11 A. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q. "The difficulty lies in determining when this</p> <p>13 extrapolation is no longer valid."</p> <p>14 Again, yes?</p> <p>15 A. (Nodded assent).</p> <p>16 Q. You are nodding?</p> <p>17 A. Yes.</p> <p>18 Q. You agree?</p> <p>19 A. Yes, sorry.</p> <p>20 Q. The transcript doesn't pick up a nod.</p> <p>21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: If we get an answer then we can record</p> <p>22 it.</p> <p>23 MR TER HAAR: "The precautionary principle and the route</p> <p>24 taken by all radiation protection groups has been to say</p> <p>25 that any radiation dose has a potential to cause harm."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 42</p>	<p>1 hypothesis. So it's quite a complex thing, statistical</p> <p>2 power, it's not necessarily straightforward.</p> <p>3 Q. Unbelievably complicated. Some of the formulae I've</p> <p>4 seen in some of these papers make very complicated</p> <p>5 reading, let's put it that way.</p> <p>6 A. Yes, it is a complicated --</p> <p>7 Q. That is your speciality, isn't it, the application of</p> <p>8 these very high-powered algorithms and mathematical</p> <p>9 calculations to statistics?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, we can do that.</p> <p>11 Q. Let's come back to this.</p> <p>12 "For this reason effective thresholds have been set</p> <p>13 in which epidemiological studies have not had the power</p> <p>14 to detect any adverse risks to a population. This does</p> <p>15 not necessarily mean there is no detrimental effect to</p> <p>16 an individual within that population."</p> <p>17 Again, that's obviously right, isn't it?</p> <p>18 A. Mm-hm.</p> <p>19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You accept the previous sentence:</p> <p>20 "For this reason effective thresholds have been set</p> <p>21 at which epidemiological studies have not had the power</p> <p>22 to detect any adverse risk to a population"?</p> <p>23 A. We can look at individual studies and see the point at</p> <p>24 which -- the lowest point at which we can see</p> <p>25 a statistically significant effect. And that, for that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 44</p>

<p>1 study, then represents the lowest dose at which we can</p> <p>2 make a comment. Other than that we are extrapolating</p> <p>3 using higher dose data down to lower dose regions on the</p> <p>4 assumption of the model.</p> <p>5 MR TER HAAR: It's that assumption --</p> <p>6 A. If it's a linear model then we're assuming a linear</p> <p>7 extrapolation down to the very low doses.</p> <p>8 Q. It's that assumption that Dr Mothersill describes as</p> <p>9 "the old paradigm", isn't it?</p> <p>10 A. I wouldn't say it's necessarily old. I think it's</p> <p>11 fairly current still, I would say.</p> <p>12 Q. We'll come to what she says about that in a moment.</p> <p>13 Anyway, so you agreed with the sentence:</p> <p>14 "This does not necessarily mean there is no</p> <p>15 detrimental effect to an individual within that</p> <p>16 population."</p> <p>17 Then she goes on to say this:</p> <p>18 "It is known that some subgroups of the population</p> <p>19 are exquisitely sensitive to radiation and it is likely</p> <p>20 that some of the background levels of disease in the</p> <p>21 population are in fact caused by the above listed</p> <p>22 exposures to radiation.</p> <p>23 "Although radiation epidemiology looks at</p> <p>24 abnormalities such as cancer, which have genetic changes</p> <p>25 and can be screened for, there may also be epigenetic</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 45</p>	<p>1 Young people, children, according to some studies,</p> <p>2 are more sensitive to radiation from CT scans.</p> <p>3 A. Mm-hm.</p> <p>4 Q. That would be an example of what she describes as</p> <p>5 a group exquisitely sensitive?</p> <p>6 A. I would say all children are equally sensitive. I think</p> <p>7 you couldn't define a particular sub-population of</p> <p>8 children who are exquisitely sensitive. There is</p> <p>9 variation in the sensitivity of people across the</p> <p>10 population that we see as a result of the large-scale</p> <p>11 studies, but to say that particular groups of people are</p> <p>12 exquisitely sensitive, no, I would disagree with that.</p> <p>13 Q. Would you at least go this far: certain human beings</p> <p>14 appear to be more sensitive to radiation than others?</p> <p>15 A. That might well be possible. I haven't seen good</p> <p>16 evidence to that effect.</p> <p>17 Q. Well, let's come back to that.</p> <p>18 What she says going back to the end of this</p> <p>19 paragraph:</p> <p>20 "All this leads to the uncertainty as to the effects</p> <p>21 of low dose exposure. This is compounded by efforts to</p> <p>22 relate endpoints measured at the molecular level to</p> <p>23 frank disease in the individual or efforts to link small</p> <p>24 clustered incidences of disease to a specific radiation</p> <p>25 exposure."</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 47</p>
<p>1 abnormalities."</p> <p>2 Can you explain to the Tribunal, what is an</p> <p>3 epigenetic abnormality?</p> <p>4 A. No.</p> <p>5 Q. You can't.</p> <p>6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: "Epi" means big, doesn't it, large?</p> <p>7 DR RAYNER: Around.</p> <p>8 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Around.</p> <p>9 A. I think it relates to the way in which genes are</p> <p>10 expressed. But that is as far as I'm prepared to go.</p> <p>11 That's not my field.</p> <p>12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: All right.</p> <p>13 MR TER HAAR: She gives an example which gives us some</p> <p>14 indication:</p> <p>15 "An example of this is peanut allergy or asthma</p> <p>16 where there is an abnormal response to a stimulus but no</p> <p>17 detectable genetic abnormality. All this leads to</p> <p>18 uncertainty as to the effects of low dose exposure."</p> <p>19 So, stopping there, I think you would agree with, so</p> <p>20 far as it's within your expertise, everything in that</p> <p>21 paragraph?</p> <p>22 A. Not entirely, no. I don't know quite how she comes to</p> <p>23 the conclusion that some people in the population are</p> <p>24 exquisitely sensitive. That doesn't ring true to me.</p> <p>25 Q. Let me give you an example.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 46</p>	<p>1 Now, that may be getting towards the outer limits of</p> <p>2 your expertise as an epidemiologist?</p> <p>3 A. We are not measuring endpoint at a molecular level. Our</p> <p>4 endpoints are deaths and incidences of disease.</p> <p>5 Q. You are looking at effects across the whole of the</p> <p>6 population?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. Now let's go to why she describes it as a new paradigm.</p> <p>9 3.5:</p> <p>10 "Within conventional radiobiology, as accepted in</p> <p>11 the 1950s continuing through to the late 1990s, there</p> <p>12 was no room for epigenetic effects because the</p> <p>13 traditional concept of radiobiology was based on target</p> <p>14 theory. In order to work, radiation had to hit</p> <p>15 a defined target within the cell assumed to be DNA. An</p> <p>16 assumption about the numbers of targets hit could then</p> <p>17 be made from measurements of dose and dose rate."</p> <p>18 Now this I imagine is outside your territory, isn't</p> <p>19 it?</p> <p>20 A. Mm-hm, yes.</p> <p>21 Q. She then goes on over the next couple of pages. If we</p> <p>22 go to page 8, she has a historical review of how methods</p> <p>23 of analysis from a radiobiological point of view have</p> <p>24 changed. And she does an extensive survey which goes</p> <p>25 all the way through to page 12.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 48</p>

<p>1 Now, I imagine on this you really would have to bow 2 to the expertise of the radiobiologists? 3 A. This work is outside my field of expertise. I can make 4 no comment. 5 Q. When we come to page 12, she there pulls together the 6 result of the references and makes a number of 7 propositions, starting towards the bottom of page 12 8 where she says: 9 "Looking at matters in a more thematic way ..." 10 Do you have that? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. That runs on to the end of page 14. 13 Now, of the points she makes it would seem to me -- 14 tell me if I'm wrong -- that you are not in a position 15 to agree or disagree perhaps with 1, 2 and 3. Do you 16 want to just quickly cast your eye over those? They 17 appear to be outside your territory. 18 A. Mm-hm, they are. 19 Q. It may be that paragraph 4 at page 14 is getting closer 20 to your territory. 21 A. Mm-hm, yes. 22 Q. She refers to criticism of the epidemiological research 23 undertaken after the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs. 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Is that within your territory?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 49</p>	<p>1 been made about the LSS study? 2 A. Yes. 3 Q. It appears to have some validity, doesn't it? 4 A. No. 5 Q. Why not? 6 A. Because it's inappropriate to consider the geographical 7 location as a measure of dose. The LSS studies that 8 I use and the data we use, the dose is assigned on 9 an individual basis according to the -- well, now the 10 DSO2 dosimetry system and previously the DS86 and 11 backwards. There you are looking at individual 12 measurements of dose. 13 Now just because -- so it takes account of the 14 person's shielding at the location they were exposed. 15 So just because somebody was a particular distance away, 16 their shielding would have an effect upon what dose they 17 received. So it's not appropriate to compare exposure 18 in a particular geographical location because that may 19 apply to the area but it may not apply to the person. 20 The appropriate way to look at this is to use the 21 individual doses that are derived for each person and 22 apply that to the rates of disease. 23 Q. I think that's missing the point, with the greatest of 24 respect. As I understand the point being made it is 25 that the mortality rate, increased mortality rate in the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 51</p>
<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. What we were told by Professor Sawada last week -- let 3 me take two parts of it. I don't think you were present 4 when he gave evidence, were you? 5 A. No, I wasn't. 6 Q. Well, I'll be corrected if I summarise it wrongly, but 7 he points to two areas of research. One in particular 8 deals with mortality rates, and what he says is 9 this: that in the LSS studies there is research for the 10 mortality rates which show an increased level of 11 mortality within an area of a 1 kilometre radius from 12 the hypocentre or epicentre of the explosion. This is 13 at Hiroshima. 14 A. Mm-hm. 15 Q. That it had always been assumed that that mortality rate 16 applied in that area, but that now it appears that the 17 increased mortality rate extends at the same level on 18 a radius 2 kilometres from the epicentre, which would 19 suggest that -- and his figure is a mortality rate of 20 20 times what would be otherwise expected, as I understand 21 it, from the control group. He says that suggests that 22 the level of radiation in the 1 to 2-kilometre zone must 23 have been a great deal higher than has so far been 24 assumed. 25 First of all, are you aware of that point which has</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 50</p>	<p>1 1 to 2-kilometre zone, which is identical to that within 2 the 1 kilometre zone, is consistent with people in the 3 1 to 2-kilometre zone being exposed to much higher 4 levels of exposure, of dose, than had previously been 5 assumed. Therefore, the study as to mortality rates 6 casts doubt as to what the dose was? 7 A. I would disagree with that. I think the geographical 8 distribution of the dose is not as reliable an indicator 9 of dose as individual measurements. 10 Q. But you don't have individual measurements. The 11 Americans come along, drop a bomb and some years later 12 you start studying. You don't have a reliable 13 indication of dose, do you? 14 A. We don't have a reliable geographical indicator of dose. 15 We didn't have dosimeters when bombs went off at 16 particular locations on the ground. So we're -- you 17 know, I don't believe his assertion that he can 18 accurately judge these things. 19 Q. Well, I think what you said is very helpful because it 20 actually illustrates many of the difficulties with the 21 LSS study. Can we just highlight some of them. Others 22 may have others to join to the list. 23 But first of all, of course, it wasn't a cohort 24 sample in the sense of looking ahead. I remember once 25 being told about the difference between "trohoc" and</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 52</p>

1 "cohort" samples. I don't know if you ever use that
 2 expression, where cohorts ideally you look ahead with
 3 the sample of population; trohoc is where you look
 4 backwards. Sir Richard Doll is the man who first
 5 thought of that distinction. Sir Richard Doll is
 6 thought of as being the father of epidemiology in this
 7 country.
 8 So the first problem you have is that obviously the
 9 Japanese on the ground didn't set up those circumstances
 10 for a proper controlled test or examination of what was
 11 about to happen to them?
 12 **A. Indeed.**
 13 Q. So things like what exposure there was on the ground
 14 have to be reconstructed on inevitably incomplete data,
 15 doing the best you can?
 16 **A. Absolutely.**
 17 Q. The second problem is that insofar as you are
 18 extrapolating information from the LSS study, the study
 19 didn't start for five years?
 20 **A. Mm-hm.**
 21 Q. By which time not only had many people died in the
 22 initial explosions from the acute effects of radiation
 23 but it's reasonable to suppose that many had died for
 24 what may be somewhere on the borderline between
 25 deterministic results and stochastic results; would you

Page 53

1 agree with that?
 2 **A. It's possible.**
 3 Q. Thirdly, there is powerful evidence that certainly in
 4 the 1940s, it may not be so true now, the incidence of
 5 cancer generally and particular cancers was different in
 6 the Japanese population from, for example, in the
 7 western world?
 8 **A. That remains true today.**
 9 Q. Not -- it's changing, but as the Japanese eat more
 10 hamburgers.
 11 **A. Yes.**
 12 Q. But that is also a problem if you are extrapolating from
 13 the Japanese data to cancer rates and exposure in other
 14 parts of the world?
 15 **A. The issue is how you extrapolate the risk and how you**
 16 **apply the risk from one population to another**
 17 **population. There are two ways of doing it. We can**
 18 **either define -- we can either do it additively or**
 19 **multiplicatively. So, for example, in the Japanese**
 20 **population you might find that you see -- for**
 21 **a particular dose you might see an increase of double**
 22 **the baseline rate in a particular population.**
 23 So the question is, if the baseline rate in the
 24 population you want to estimate risk to, say a western
 25 population, then if the baseline is the same then we

Page 54

1 **would say that's okay; if the baseline was half, should**
 2 **you still apply that factor of 2? Or should you look at**
 3 **the absolute number of cancers per head of population in**
 4 **the Japanese for a given dose and apply that to the**
 5 **other population? Do you apply the risk absolutely or**
 6 **relatively across the populations if the underlying**
 7 **rates are different?**
 8 **If they are the same, it doesn't matter, you end up**
 9 **with the same answer, but if they're different then you**
 10 **end up with different answers.**
 11 **At the moment we don't have an ideal -- we don't**
 12 **know exactly which is the best way of doing that for all**
 13 **cancers. Over time, more information has become**
 14 **available and for some cancers we now have a better**
 15 **idea. For others we don't, and in those cases we simply**
 16 **take an average of the two. So we transfer the risk and**
 17 **then simply take an average to accommodate our lack of**
 18 **knowledge --**
 19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You've explained this in your report?
 20 **A. I do, yes.**
 21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: About absolute and relative, 3 and 4?
 22 **A. Yes.**
 23 MR TER HAAR: What it comes to is this, a bit like on the
 24 NRPB studies we were looking at earlier: obviously
 25 statisticians are doing the best they can but with what

Page 55

1 is undoubtedly a very difficult exercise of comparison?
 2 **A. But it's not the same for the NRPB studies because we're**
 3 **not trying to estimate risk in a different population.**
 4 **We're trying to estimate it in the same population so**
 5 **the issue doesn't arise.**
 6 Q. I understand. Certainly if you are trying to
 7 extrapolate from the Japanese experience you have
 8 problems with the historical data as to what is being
 9 reported about exposure initially?
 10 **A. (Nodded assent).**
 11 Q. You have problems with the control against affected
 12 persons because the study started late?
 13 **A. The study started late, which means that it's -- if we**
 14 **wanted to use the Japanese lifespan study to estimate**
 15 **risks very early on after exposure then that would not**
 16 **be appropriate. But to use the study to estimate risks**
 17 **many years later then that should be fine.**
 18 Q. Then the final point, and it is the one we have just
 19 been exploring, is you have to at least make some
 20 allowance for the fact you have a different population?
 21 **A. Yes, and that's been extensively thought about and ICRP**
 22 **have made their recommendation, which is to do it on**
 23 **an average basis. But for some cancers now in the**
 24 **latest iteration of the ICRP recommendations we have**
 25 **some better information about that average and it's been**

Page 56

<p>1 weighted in some cases for certain cancers to take 2 account of more knowledge that we have. 3 Q. Could we then go back to this report, please, back to 4 page 14. The next paragraph, 3.7 -- 5 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Just before you move on, Mr ter Haar, 6 I've been recording your question and a little while 7 ago, some little ago when we were dealing with the 8 reference to Professor Sawada you said that there were 9 two areas of concern. 10 MR TER HAAR: You are quite right, my Lord. I haven't dealt 11 with the second one. 12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: The mortality rates. So it would be 13 helpful -- 14 MR TER HAAR: I didn't deal with the second point, and 15 I apologise. That's very helpful. 16 The first point which Professor Sawada made to the 17 Tribunal related to mortality rates in the 1 to 18 2-kilometre zone. 19 I think from what you said you were aware of that 20 point but you don't agree with it? 21 A. I don't agree with it because I think estimating dose on 22 the basis of geographical location isn't a sound way 23 of doing it. 24 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You told us that. 25 MR TER HAAR: The second point I think you will give the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 57</p>	<p>1 about that criticism but you can see that, if true, it 2 does cause some questions? 3 A. On the face of it, yes, but I think often you have to 4 look deeper into these issues to really understand them. 5 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Before we move on and leave 6 Professor Sawada behind, which I know we are going to be 7 doing shortly, you've read the article, have you, that's 8 cited at page 14.4 which is the starting point of these 9 questions, I think? 10 A. I have seen it. I haven't studied it in detail. 11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Have you read the report that he prepared 12 for us which includes I think at tab 6 the epilation 13 graph? 14 A. No, I haven't read it in detail. 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: And have you read the evidence that we've 16 managed to get out with some difficulty in 17 translation -- 18 A. Well, I read what I could of it but it didn't all make 19 a lot of sense to me, I'm afraid. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. Do you want to just have a look 21 at some stage at the graph in his evidence to us which 22 is I think what the questions that have just been put us 23 -- I mean, if you can't make any more sense of it that's 24 the end of it, but if you can it might conceivably be of 25 interest to have your comment.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 59</p>
<p>1 same answer to, which is this. 2 He pointed to the evidence in the LSS in relation to 3 depilation or epilation, i.e. losing your hair, and he 4 pointed to the projections that certain levels of 5 exposure are necessary in order to cause hair loss. He 6 pointed to the fact that the statistics as to those at 7 particular locations who had lost their hair and those 8 at certain distances of what the projected exposure to 9 dose was and said if you put the two together you 10 actually had inconsistency in the LSS between on the one 11 hand the depilation rates and on the other hand 12 projected exposure levels. 13 First of all, are you familiar with that comment 14 upon the LSS study? 15 A. Not particularly, no. I'm not, I'm afraid. 16 Q. Certainly it sounds logical, doesn't it? If people have 17 been assuming on the one hand you need a certain level 18 of dose in order to lose your hair, and on the other 19 that there's a fall-off in exposure geographically and 20 you'll find that people at the outer end of that 21 geographical limit are also losing their hair, the two 22 things don't seem to go together, that's point he's 23 making. 24 A. On the face of it. 25 Q. That was the second point and certainly you don't know</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 58</p>	<p>1 A. Okay. 2 MR TER HAAR: My Lord, I note the time. 3 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 4 MR TER HAAR: I note the question which your Lordship has 5 just asked. 6 I don't know whether you would be able to do it in 7 the the break we take for the shorthand writers but just 8 in case you can, in bundle SB2, it's a different bundle 9 from the one you have there, you'll find 10 Professor Sawada's report -- 11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: 2.6. 12 MR TER HAAR: -- at 2.6, and the graphs that we've just been 13 talking about are to be found at pages 11 and 12. 14 A. Sorry, what was the tab? 15 Q. I apologise. 2.6, towards the beginning. 16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes, it was figure 6, wasn't it? That 17 was the epilation? 18 MR TER HAAR: One needs to take 4, 5 and 6 together and the 19 text in between. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. Do you see page 11? 21 MR TER HAAR: I don't think the witness is there yet. Do 22 you have divider 2.6, first of all? 23 A. Mine starts at 2.14. 24 MR HEPPINSTALL: 2.6 in your SB1. 25 A. Oh, in my SB1.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 60</p>

<p>1 MR TER HAAR: Does that have 2.6 in it?</p> <p>2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right at the very back.</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Let's see if we can get there.</p> <p>5 MR TER HAAR: Then if you go to another page, 11.</p> <p>6 A. Yes.</p> <p>7 Q. You'll find two graphs at page 11. Those are figures 4</p> <p>8 and 5 and then another one at page 6. You may need to</p> <p>9 make sense of it to read the text which starts at the</p> <p>10 bottom paragraph of page 10 and then goes through,</p> <p>11 I think, to just above figure 6.</p> <p>12 Now, it may be possible, in the quarter of an hour</p> <p>13 we have, for you to master it, if you can. I think</p> <p>14 that's what the Tribunal is asking for your assistance</p> <p>15 on.</p> <p>16 A. Okay.</p> <p>17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Thank you very much. Quarter to 12,</p> <p>18 then, but if you had longer do you think you could do</p> <p>19 better?</p> <p>20 A. I'll see what I can do, my Lord.</p> <p>21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: If you are in the middle of some</p> <p>22 interesting calculation if you let us know we'll give</p> <p>23 you more time.</p> <p>24 A. Unfortunately I don't believe there are any calculations</p> <p>25 I can do on this.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 61</p>	<p>1 I hope you have there, tab 30.</p> <p>2 A. Mm-hm.</p> <p>3 Q. If you could just open up the first page, you probably</p> <p>4 immediately recognise what this is, but it's annex A to</p> <p>5 the 2006 UNSCEAR report.</p> <p>6 A. Uh-huh.</p> <p>7 Q. I imagine this is a document with which you are very</p> <p>8 well familiar.</p> <p>9 A. I've seen it once or twice before, yes.</p> <p>10 Q. Were you one of the authors?</p> <p>11 A. No, I wasn't.</p> <p>12 Q. But anyway, could you go, please, to the introduction</p> <p>13 which is after the table of contents, page 17 at the</p> <p>14 bottom of it.</p> <p>15 A. Yes.</p> <p>16 Q. I just wanted to, again in the context of the Japanese</p> <p>17 experiences, look at what UNSCEAR had to say.</p> <p>18 Paragraph 3, the top of the right-hand column:</p> <p>19 "Although resolving inconsistencies in the dosimetry</p> <p>20 for the survivors of the atomic bombings has reduced one</p> <p>21 source of uncertainty in estimating cancer risks to</p> <p>22 a population from doses of radiation, a considerable</p> <p>23 numbers of other sources of uncertainty remain. A major</p> <p>24 one relates to extrapolating risks from the moderate</p> <p>25 dose but high dose rate exposures received by survivors</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 63</p>
<p>1 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I mean, if you can't you'll let us know</p> <p>2 as well. There's not an expectation but it would be of</p> <p>3 interest if you can give us any assistance. I think</p> <p>4 that's as high as I can put it.</p> <p>5 A. Thank you.</p> <p>6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Quarter to 12 or such other time as you</p> <p>7 think you might usefully need.</p> <p>8 (11.32 am)</p> <p>9 (A short break)</p> <p>10 (11.47 am)</p> <p>11 MR TER HAAR: Dr Haylock, any progress?</p> <p>12 A. I'm sorry but this is just not do-able in the time</p> <p>13 I have available, my Lord. It's just too complicated</p> <p>14 and too --</p> <p>15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right, okay.</p> <p>16 A. It doesn't make sense enough, I'm afraid.</p> <p>17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: It doesn't make enough sense for you to</p> <p>18 comment.</p> <p>19 A. No. If I had enough time to analyse it in great detail,</p> <p>20 possibly, but I'm afraid --</p> <p>21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Rightly ho.</p> <p>22 MR TER HAAR: Unless the Tribunal has any more questions on</p> <p>23 that, could you put that bundle aside, please, and I am</p> <p>24 going to come back to Dr Mothersill's report in a moment</p> <p>25 but I want to take you first of all bundle SB21, which</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 62</p>	<p>1 of the atomic bombings to low doses and dose rates."</p> <p>2 That's a comment with which you'd agree, wouldn't</p> <p>3 you?</p> <p>4 A. Yes.</p> <p>5 Q. "This is also true for interpreting data on many</p> <p>6 therapeutically exposed groups. The topic has long been</p> <p>7 controversial and was discussed in annex G, 'Biological</p> <p>8 effects at low radiation doses', of the UNSCEAR 2000</p> <p>9 report. There's also uncertainty related to</p> <p>10 extrapolating cancer risks to the end of lifetime. In</p> <p>11 particular, about half of LSS cohort is at present still</p> <p>12 alive. IN estimating lifetime risk factors from the</p> <p>13 data on this cohort, it is vital to determine the</p> <p>14 pattern between radiation dose and expression of cancer</p> <p>15 risk for those who were exposed in childhood and who are</p> <p>16 now reaching the age at which larger numbers of cancers</p> <p>17 would be expected to arise spontaneously. Another</p> <p>18 source of uncertainty relates to the transfer of</p> <p>19 radiation-induced cancer risk estimates between</p> <p>20 populations with different underlying rates of cancer.</p> <p>21 For example, the rates of lung and breast cancer for the</p> <p>22 Japanese population tend to be lower than for many North</p> <p>23 American and Western European populations, whereas rates</p> <p>24 of stomach cancer tend to be much higher. The available</p> <p>25 evidence, most recently reviewed in the UNSCEAR 1994</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 64</p>

<p>1 report, did not suggest that there is an easy resolution 2 of this problem." 3 You would agree with that? It's a difficult area of 4 statistics? 5 A. Yes, as I said, in the latest ICRP/103 some progress in 6 the time since this has been written, some progress has 7 been made and for some cancers now ICRP recommends that 8 the transfer of risk is not just done on a straight 9 average between relative and absolute but it advises on 10 certain weighted averages according to various cancer 11 types. 12 Q. Can we go on to looking at the low dose problem as I can 13 call it. Go, please, to page 24. You see the numbers 14 are in the top left-hand corner, paragraph 15. 15 "Where the dose levels are low two other phenomena 16 affect the study results. The first occurs because 17 epidemiological studies are based on natural human 18 populations with their extraneous variability in genetic 19 make-up, diet, lifestyle and other exposures, rather 20 than having tightly controlled experimental conditions. 21 This means that there may be subtle differences between 22 exposed and unexposed groups in some unmeasured factors 23 that affect cancer risk. For a high dose study with 24 a large expected radiation effect such variations are 25 fairly inconsequential, but for a low dose study with</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 65</p>	<p>1 little above 5 per cent. Adequate statistical power is 2 usually taken as at least 80 per cent. If such a study 3 were to be repeated numerous times for the occasions 4 when there was a nominal statistically significant 5 excess the RR estimates would be about 9 times greater 6 on average than the true relative risk. However, in 7 a single given study the authors will usually derive the 8 best estimate of the true risk from their own estimate, 9 which is likely to be a substantial overestimate." 10 So arguments can go either way but low dose 11 epidemiology is really difficult stuff is the message. 12 A. It is. Yes. Yes. 13 Q. And then specifically in relation to the Japanese 14 studies, if we go to the next page, page 25, we see 15 there, don't we, at paragraph 21 and following some 16 discussions of the problems with extrapolation from the 17 LSS studies? 18 A. Mm-hm. 19 Q. If we go on to page 29 we have there a section headed 20 "Transfer of radiation risk estimates between 21 populations and interactions of carcinogens", and after 22 a lengthy analysis of the problems with the LSS study 23 and extrapolating it to other nations, at paragraph 46 24 on page 31, the authors say this: 25 "Much of environmental, nutritional and occupational</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 67</p>
<p>1 a small expected radiation effect the magnitude of such 2 extraneous variations may equal or surpass the size of 3 the expected radiation effect. Hence, for a low dose 4 study there is great potential for a false negative or 5 false positive result, and little way of even knowing 6 whether such an effect has occurred. This reduces the 7 credibility of the results. Assessment of the pattern 8 of results in low dose studies may sometimes provide 9 indications of artefactual findings. For example on the 10 basis of an analysis of results for non-malignant 11 respiratory disease relating to smoking which exhibited 12 negative trends with a radiation dose. Muirhead and 13 others suggest that smoking may confound the radiation 14 dose response relationship in some smoking-related 15 cancers." 16 16: 17 "Secondly, for a low dose study with small numbers 18 of cases or deaths expected, and therefore within 19 adequate statistical power, if any result for RR is 20 found to be statistically significant its magnitude is 21 in all likelihood a substantial over-estimate of the 22 true risk. For instance ...(reading to the words)... 23 with 19,100 spontaneous breast cancers during the same 24 period. If the study were on a cohort of a million such 25 women the statistical power would still be only at a</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 66</p>	<p>1 cancer epidemiology is concerned with identifying risk 2 factors that might account for some part of the 3 variation of site-specific underlying cancer rates among 4 populations. While there has been much progress the 5 problem is vast." 6 Is the author's conclusion: 7 "There is only limited information on the 8 interaction between radiation dose and lifestyle or 9 constitutional factors in terms of cancer risk." 10 They might have made some improvements in analysis 11 since but it's still a vast problem, isn't it? 12 A. There are problems. One of the things we do to try and 13 determine if the things we see in one study are real is 14 by comparing across different epidemiological studies. 15 If we see a consistent pattern of a disease being at 16 a raised risk across different large populations then 17 that gives us some confidence that that is a true effect 18 and not something that's occurred by random chance. 19 In terms of risks to the UK population, the study of 20 radiation workers in the UK that was started by the NRPB 21 many years ago, that does provide reassurance that the 22 overall risk we see in the LSS population do agree with 23 the risks we see in the -- and the worker population, 24 who have considerably lower doses. 25 So organisations like UNSCEAR and ICRP don't base</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 68</p>

1 **their pronouncements on single studies. It's**
 2 **a consensus across studies. If we see one study showing**
 3 **something then that's interesting but doesn't**
 4 **necessarily prove conclusive. We would like supporting**
 5 **evidence from other studies. There are now larger**
 6 **worker studies around now, which are beginning to**
 7 **provide good quality evidence to either support or**
 8 **refute what we see in the bomb survivors. So yes, it is**
 9 **still difficult but it's not completely impossible.**
 10 Q. Well, not completely impossible -- it isn't actually
 11 completely possible because there are difficulties but
 12 what you can do is make a best estimate?
 13 **A. Yes. All the studies we have, we're all the time making**
 14 **the best estimate of the risk we see on the basis of the**
 15 **data that we have and as that data changes and improves**
 16 **so our estimates evolve.**
 17 Q. I think it may be that where in a sense your answers to
 18 my questions reveal a difference between us is this.
 19 What you are I think constantly striving for -- in
 20 an ideal world you'll strive for certainty but we know
 21 you can't get certainty in these epidemiological fields,
 22 you'd agree with that?
 23 **A. (Nodded assent).**
 24 Q. I think you are nodding.
 25 **A. Yes.**

Page 69

1 Q. So the next best you can do is to look at degrees of
 2 probability?
 3 **A. Yes.**
 4 Q. What you are doing is taking as many samples as possible
 5 to see what level of probability you can arrive at as
 6 a matter of scientific consensus?
 7 **A. But it's not just as simple as a bigger sample means**
 8 **more certainty. It's about the size of the effect you**
 9 **are looking for. If we're looking for a very tiny**
 10 **radiation effect on top of a potentially large**
 11 **underlying baseline effect that is much more difficult**
 12 **to do, compared to a larger radiation effect.**
 13 Q. I quite agree.
 14 I was really at a much wider level of generality
 15 than that. The process you are doing is throughout the
 16 whole range of diseases you are trying to increase the
 17 levels of confidence in the data you have, but with some
 18 areas, i.e. because the diseases are very rare or
 19 because your statistical sample is very small, you end
 20 up with real difficulties?
 21 **A. You will find it increasingly difficult to detect risk**
 22 **in those circumstances, yes. If you don't detect a risk**
 23 **then the issue is: is that because there is no risk or**
 24 **is that because your sample or your study wasn't**
 25 **sufficiently statistically powerful enough to see a risk**

Page 70

1 **that is actually there?**
 2 Q. So you may have a problem that the disease itself is
 3 rare, which causes a statistical problem, do you agree?
 4 **A. It can do, yes.**
 5 Q. You may have a problem also sometimes when the disease
 6 is not rare, or indeed in some ways that's the most
 7 difficult area because if for example you know that six
 8 out of 10 people are going to die of a heart attack,
 9 trying to identify whether a seventh might die of
 10 a heart attack is much more difficult because -- I think
 11 statistically you are probably using larger numbers --
 12 if you have a very common disease which can be caused by
 13 a number of factors, to identify what the additional
 14 risk is from, for example, radiation is a difficult
 15 statistical exercise?
 16 **A. It depends upon the size of that additional risk. If**
 17 **it's a large risk then no, it's not difficult. If it's**
 18 **a small risk, then yes, it is.**
 19 Q. Yes. So you can have problems from a shortage -- I'll
 20 start again.
 21 You can have difficulties from a rarity of disease,
 22 statistically, and you can have difficulties from the
 23 fact that a disease is very common. Both can
 24 potentially cause problems?
 25 **A. Yes. One thing we can do is if a study doesn't show us**

Page 71

1 **a statistically significant effect we can look and see**
 2 **what is the smallest excess risk that we can exclude on**
 3 **the basis of the data we have. So we might be able to**
 4 **say: okay, we can't -- we don't detect a risk at a -- we**
 5 **might be -- we see no difference between two groups. We**
 6 **might say: well, our data supports that the true**
 7 **difference should therefore be less than some higher**
 8 **value.**
 9 Q. In particular in relation to what I've been asking you
 10 about, which is low dose effect, the problem with low
 11 doses is it's much more difficult to see a statistical
 12 conclusion which shows what the effect of -- as you go
 13 down towards the bottom of the dose range, what the
 14 actual statistical effect is of a low dose?
 15 **A. Yes, as the size of the effect you are looking for**
 16 **reduces in comparison to the underlying baseline rate it**
 17 **becomes more difficult, yes, which is why at the moment**
 18 **we use extrapolation from higher doses.**
 19 Q. I understand that. But can we go on back to UNSCEAR and
 20 go to their conclusions at page 137, quite a long way
 21 on.
 22 On this occasion the numbering is actually at the
 23 bottom of the page. Have you found it?
 24 **A. Mm-hm.**
 25 Q. Can we go to paragraph 589, please.

Page 72

<p>1 A. Yes. 2 Q. In summing up, UNSCEAR say this: 3 "The increased statistical precision associated with 4 the longer follow-up and the resulting larger number of 5 cancer cases observed in the above studies have also 6 been useful in the examination of dose response 7 relationships, particularly at lower doses. For 8 example, the most recent data for the survivors of the 9 atomic bombings are largely consistent with linear or 10 linear quadratic dose trends over a wide range of doses. 11 However, analyses restricted solely to low doses are 12 complicated by the limitations of statistical precision, 13 the potential for misleading findings owing to any small 14 undetected biases and the effects of performing multiple 15 tests of statistical significance in attempting to 16 establish a minimum dose at which elevated risks can be 17 detected." 18 All of that, I think, reflects the statistical 19 problems we've just been talking about? 20 A. Yes, that's correct. 21 Q. "Longer follow-up of large groups, such as survivors of 22 atomic bombs, should hopefully provide more information 23 at low doses." 24 Now is the part I really want to take you to. 25 "However, epidemiology alone will not be able to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 73</p>	<p>1 extrapolated and that gives us the ability to estimate 2 risks at lower doses. But if we're just talking about 3 estimates based upon low dose information on its own, 4 no, it's unlikely to be able to do that in a short to 5 medium term. 6 Q. Yes. It's at that stage in a sense that the enquirer 7 after truth turns to other sciences in order to see 8 whether the questions raised by or left open by the 9 epidemiological research can assist? 10 A. Yes, in a sense that is happening now. We're trying to 11 look at the mechanisms, the actual biological mechanisms 12 by which radiation causes cancer. So as 13 Professor Thomas mentioned about the multi-stage nature 14 of cancer -- initiation, promotion or progression -- we 15 are looking at: can we develop biologically inspired 16 models that will take the place of things likely LNT? 17 At the moment you can fit those sorts of models but they 18 don't provide any extra information. 19 Q. So would this be a fair summary. There's a recognition 20 that particularly in this low dose area, or low dose 21 region, there's a necessity to carry out further 22 research, that is ongoing -- and when I say further 23 research, cell sciences and biological studies -- those 24 are ongoing but the questions have not yet been 25 resolved?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 75</p>
<p>1 resolve the issue of whether there are dose thresholds 2 for risk. In particular, the inability to detect 3 increased risk at very low doses using epidemiological 4 methods does not mean that the underlying cancer risks 5 are not elevated. However, the high dose radiotherapy 6 studies of patients indicate that for some cancers, for 7 example bone, connective tissue, rectum, uterus and 8 small intestine, any risks of doses at below several 9 grays, if they exist, are small." 10 What that leads to is this, isn't it: that where you 11 are dealing with low dose analysis, epidemiology is 12 a limited tool for identifying whether risks exist or 13 the level of risks? You have to turn to other tools in 14 order to see what statistics you get. Is that a fair 15 general proposition? 16 A. There is a limit below which epidemiology will not be 17 able to detect risks at low doses without making 18 assumptions about the overall dose response relationship 19 at higher doses. Essentially, as your doses get lower 20 and lower, essentially your extra bit is lost in noise 21 of the rest of it. So it does become more difficult, 22 which is why we look at the whole pattern across the 23 whole dose response relationship from higher doses 24 downwards. 25 We do make assumptions about how dose can be</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 74</p>	<p>1 A. We can always do better but I think we have quite a good 2 handle on what the risks are, certainly down to a few 3 tens of millisieverts now. It's on a population level 4 that the estimates are quite solid at that point. 5 Q. Could you then put away the bundles you have and go back 6 to bundle 11. I don't know if you put it away or you 7 have it still out. 8 We were in divider 7. This is Dr Mothersill again. 9 Can we go, please, to page 16, paragraph 4.3: 10 "The new meaning of the linear non-threshold (LNT) 11 model. 12 "Given all the new uncertainties, the LNT model 13 cannot be called an LNT hypothesis any more. It is 14 clearly not correct to say a linear extrapolation 15 describes low dose radiation effects." 16 I think you probably wouldn't put it as firmly as 17 that, but you do say that as an epidemiologist you are 18 making assumptions as to whether there's a linear 19 effects in low doses; do you agree? 20 A. I would disagree with her statement that it's not 21 correct to say linear dose describes the low dose 22 radiation effects. I think it does describe them as 23 best we can at the moment. 24 Q. I think "as best as we can" is exactly where she's if 25 you like -- she says that it's --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 76</p>

<p>1 A. It's not just -- we're not talking about, for example, 2 just a single study saying this. A number of large 3 epidemiological studies also have the same result. 4 Q. But none of them get you to showing that there is 5 a linear effect at low doses. All you can say is that 6 there is a linear relationship down to a certain level 7 of dose? 8 A. Yes, that's true. 9 Q. And the new paradigm, which is basically how she 10 describes the radiobiological work that she had 11 explained -- do you remember we looked at that earlier, 12 leading to the conclusions which she drew at 13 paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and four at the bottom of page 12 and 14 13 and the top of 14? So that's the new paradigm she's 15 referring to. 16 "The new paradigm contains complexity and 17 unpredictability. There are arguments and data to 18 support any relationship between dose effect at low 19 doses, but the reality is that any outcome can happen to 20 an individual and there are ample data showing effects 21 at low doses." 22 Now, just taking that last part of that sentence, 23 it's right, isn't it, that there is a considerable body 24 of data which can be interpreted as showing effects at 25 low doses?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 77</p>	<p>1 "The possibility that there are no health effects at 2 low doses is very remote." 3 Well, I think you're assuming that there may be 4 effects at low doses. Do you agree? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. "The purpose of the LNT model now is to provide a tool 7 for regulation in an environment of uncertainty, and on 8 a scientific analysis the LNT dose effect relationship 9 has been rejected by various radiological bodies asked 10 to consider the evidence." 11 Which is the CERRIE minority and the majority 12 reports of 2003, 2004 and the French Academy of 13 Sciences. 14 Now we have heard about CERRIE in particular. Would 15 you go this far: that there is at least a body of 16 opinion which the CERRIE minority reflects? 17 A. I wouldn't say it's scientific opinion in terms of based 18 upon evidence. 19 Q. Now, let's go on because I am going to suggest -- 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: What about the French Academy of Science? 21 A. I'm not aware of that, my Lord. 22 MR TER HAAR: Well, we can look to the references and find 23 the reference in due course. 24 Go on to page 17, the following page: 25 "The cause of the uncertainty is simply that the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 79</p>
<p>1 A. The body of epidemiological data supports that there are 2 effects in line with the LNT. 3 Q. Well, I think we've already been through that. At low 4 doses you have in fact no epidemiological evidence other 5 than at higher doses there is a linear relationship? 6 A. And at no dose there is no risk. A fixed point at the 7 bottom as well. 8 Q. You are making a mathematician's assumption that because 9 the line keeps on coming on down and gets to a certain 10 point there's a gap where you get to 0? 11 A. The LNT model that we fit is the one that fits the data 12 best at the moment, if you fit it all in one go. 13 Q. Because you have to make an assumption between 0 and the 14 level at which epidemiology kicks in, if I can put it 15 that way? 16 A. Yes, you could in fact fit a number of different 17 relationships in that region -- many have been 18 suggested -- but if you look at the statistical 19 epidemiological data, none of those other models fit any 20 better than LNT. 21 Q. One of the things to always bear in mind from our point 22 of view is that this Tribunal is dealing with doubt, 23 reasonable doubt, not balance of probability which is 24 an important concept for the Tribunal. 25 Can we go back to page 16. She says this:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 78</p>	<p>1 simple DNA damage paradigm does not hold at low doses." 2 Now, I stop there, I am going to come on to the rest 3 of that sentence in a moment. That is a radiation 4 biologist's assessment of whether the DNA damage 5 paradigm, as she calls it, can stand with modern 6 biological research. 7 Just to remind you of what she's talking about, if 8 you go -- keep a finger in page 17 and go back to 9 page 6 -- there she describes what she calls the "old 10 paradigm", but it's a biological theory as to how 11 radiation damage is caused in DNA. 12 What she has done, if we just remind ourselves, is 13 she has gone from that which she calls the old paradigm 14 through the biological research that's taken place, 15 which she sets out at some length, as we saw, over pages 16 8 to 12. So that is based on what she says, that the 17 simple damage paradigm does not hold at low doses. 18 Now, as an epidemiologist you can't agree or 19 disagree with that, I assume, that's a biologist's 20 conclusion? 21 A. It is. 22 Q. She then says: 23 "Therefore, dose and effect cannot be linearly 24 related." 25 So what I think she is suggesting is, if you take</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 80</p>

<p>1 this zone where epidemiology cannot provide an answer, 2 she says in that area, the biologists enter, and so it 3 can't be the old DNA assumption, the old paradigm. 4 Again, that's outside your territory? 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. Then she goes on to say: 7 "Which way the curve will go depends on other 8 factors including genetic background and environmental 9 conditions." 10 Then I suspect you will be able to agree with 11 paragraph 4.5 but let's see: 12 "Relating dose effect to harm to risk. 13 "This is the key issue. It's always controversial, 14 and in dose ranges where epidemiology is a weak tool it 15 is usually difficult to assess whether a dose produced a 16 specific adverse consequence in any individual. The 17 reverse relationship, that an adverse health effect is 18 caused by a dose, is also difficult to assess." 19 Just stopping there, you'd agree with that, wouldn't 20 you, so far? 21 A. Epidemiology is not a tool really to estimate risks to 22 individuals. We are mainly concerned with populations, 23 to avoid the variability of individuals within 24 a population. So I can agree that when she's talking 25 about an individual, yes, it is difficult because</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 81</p>	<p>1 that we have to describe a risk in that region at the 2 moment. 3 Q. We've been over that. You say that as an epidemiologist 4 rather than as a cell scientist? 5 A. Well, the evidence shows that at the moment, yes. 6 Where she talks about the gold standard here, 7 I think she's assuming that just because you have 8 chromosome aberrations that's going to go on to cause 9 cancer, that there is some direct relationship. I don't 10 believe that's been shown to be the case. Just because 11 you have chromosome aberrations does not necessarily 12 mean you're going to go on and contract or die of 13 a radiation-induced cancer. 14 Q. Let's put it the other way round. It doesn't 15 necessarily mean -- I don't need to debate that with 16 you, others might do -- but that there is a school of 17 thought among suitably experienced people that there is 18 a connection between chromosomal aberrations and cancer 19 is the case, isn't it? 20 A. Yes, undoubtedly that there is some sort of 21 relationship, but it's not going to be a straightforward 22 one, I don't think. 23 Q. Your answer there illuminates really the whole of the 24 debate we're having, which is this: that over the last 25 20 years, something like that, the rapid advances in the</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 83</p>
<p>1 an individual is not always representative of the 2 population. 3 Q. I am grateful. You may have saved me several minutes of 4 cross-examination on something else there, but I totally 5 are with what you've just said. 6 Can we go on, though, and I think this is where 7 again we step outside your territory. 8 "However, some of the above tests are more 9 suggestive of a link between dose and effect than 10 others. The gold standard is of course chromosome 11 aberrations as these are evidence of a fixed genetic 12 change in dividing cells which is relevant to both 13 cancer and hereditary effects but induction of 14 cancer-associated proteomes, stress proteomes or genomic 15 changes in cancer-associated genes are also important, 16 even those these are not necessarily fixed and 17 transmissible." 18 I think what we are getting to is this. In this low 19 dose region you have to sort of give way to the 20 radiobiologists and the people who understand about cell 21 aberrations and that sort of science? 22 A. I think the issue is if we want to be -- if we want to 23 refine the LNT further in that region it will take 24 biology to do that. But at the moment, the evidence we 25 have so far suggests that LNT is the best relationship</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 82</p>	<p>1 study of cells, the study of chromosomes, has enabled 2 a great deal more light to be cast on to causes and 3 possible causes of cancers and other diseases. We can 4 take that as a general statement. You don't disagree 5 with that? 6 A. No, I don't disagree with that. 7 Q. All that the epidemiologists can say is whether or not 8 particular effects appear to be statistically 9 significant? 10 A. Mm-hm, correct. 11 Q. And what you are doing is looking at the rates of 12 certain effects in the population as a whole? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. So let's assume that we have a population of a million, 15 1,000 people are going to get a particular form of 16 cancer each year. You may well be able to find from 17 epidemiological studies that one of those may well be 18 affected by -- may be in whole or in part the result of 19 exposure to radiation. I mean that's the way that 20 epidemiology approaches the problem. 21 A. Well, for a particular individual we couldn't say that, 22 no. 23 Q. Absolutely. 24 So when you are looking at your figures in your 25 report and you say that there's a 99.9 per cent chance</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 84</p>

1 of such a disease being caused by other causes, the
 2 other side of it is that you can't say that a particular
 3 condition was not caused by radiation, because there's
 4 always that 0.1 per cent.
 5 **A. The evidence says what it says, that there is a 99**
 6 **whatever per cent chance that it's caused, therefore**
 7 **whatever remains is the possibility it was caused by**
 8 **other things.**
 9 Q. Putting it in the vernacular: it's perfectly possible it
 10 was caused, I just don't know?
 11 **A. Something else.**
 12 Q. But the important point from my point of view is it
 13 would be a perfectly accurate way of describing the
 14 result of that: it's perfectly possible, I can't tell
 15 you?
 16 **A. Yes.**
 17 Q. Can we just look together at a paper which has gone into
 18 the bundle today. Could you have bundle SB22. You may
 19 find it easier to get rid of some of the paper that is
 20 piling up.
 21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Have we finished with tab 11 for the time
 22 being?
 23 MR TER HAAR: We have indeed, I think probably for the rest
 24 of my cross-examination.
 25 So bundle 22, please, tab 19.

Page 85

1 Have you managed to -- is it in that bundle?
 2 **A. No.**
 3 Q. It hasn't been updated, I apologise.
 4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: We've been updating ours, but yours has
 5 not been. (Pause). (Handed).
 6 Can you helpfully slot it into tab 19?
 7 Thank you.
 8 MR TER HAAR: Now I think from what Mr Heppinstall said, you
 9 were provided with a copy of this paper overnight.
 10 **A. I was.**
 11 Q. And I am going to concentrate on this one, but I think
 12 you were given, I think it's four papers by
 13 Dr Greenland, either solely authored by him or written
 14 by him with others.
 15 **A. Okay.**
 16 Q. First of all, is Dr Greenland somebody with whom you are
 17 familiar?
 18 **A. No.**
 19 Q. He appears to be working in your sort of area of
 20 epidemiology with a special interest in --
 21 **A. There are quite a lot of people who work in**
 22 **epidemiology, though.**
 23 Q. But you had an opportunity to read this last night?
 24 **A. I had a read of it, yes.**
 25 Q. And it may be that the shortest way of looking at this

Page 86

1 is to deal with this: that if what you are faced with is
 2 trying to work out whether a particular individual
 3 suffered a particular disease as a result of exposure to
 4 radiation, which is what we are concerned with, if what
 5 you are trying to do is to establish something on the
 6 balance of probability, that causation issue on the
 7 balance of probability, then epidemiology may be able to
 8 assist because you can look at what are the chances of
 9 that person having got the same disease in any event?
 10 **A. Epidemiology can provide some measures that you could**
 11 **use to do that.**
 12 Q. If on the other hand you are looking at simply whether
 13 there's a possibility that a particular disease was
 14 caused by radiation, unless you come to the conclusion
 15 there's a zero connection then your epidemiological
 16 study always produces a result: for this person it might
 17 have been caused by that -- that disease might have been
 18 caused by that risk, maybe radiation. That's the nature
 19 of epidemiology?
 20 **A. If we have a risk model to relate that disease to**
 21 **a dose, then yes we, would come up with a probability of**
 22 **causation and unless that was zero then there would be**
 23 **some chance.**
 24 Q. By definition it's always possible?
 25 **A. It has to be, unfortunately.**

Page 87

1 Q. Yes. What Dr Greenland is drawing attention to in his
 2 papers is that there's a tendency to use epidemiology,
 3 I think he would say somewhat misleadingly for a number
 4 of reasons. First of all, an epidemiological study of
 5 mortality may not tell you whether somebody would have
 6 lived longer but for the disease. So that a pure
 7 mortality study, you may say this person died of cancer
 8 aged 60, but you can't tell from epidemiology whether he
 9 would otherwise have perhaps have lived on to 70.
 10 **A. You can do a lifetime risk calculation which you can**
 11 **estimate the expected loss of life, if somebody dies of**
 12 **a particular -- of a radiation-induced disease.**
 13 Q. And in particular if we're dealing with the particular
 14 problem this Tribunal is facing, which is whether
 15 somebody's condition was caused or exacerbated by
 16 radiation, in order to get a pension, it's a particular
 17 problem, isn't it, because the data on which you based
 18 your evidence is dealing with either morbidity figures,
 19 i.e. what percentage of the population will get
 20 a particular disease, or mortality, what percentage of
 21 the population die of a particular disease? But you're
 22 not dealing if you like with the middle territory of how
 23 many people might get the disease earlier than they
 24 otherwise would because of the combined effects of
 25 radiation with the rest of their life?

Page 88

1 **A. The probability of causation calculation assumes the**
 2 **person has died of the disease and calculates the**
 3 **probability that a particular exposure was the cause.**
 4 **What you're asking can be calculated. You can do**
 5 **essentially a -- similar to a mortality calculation**
 6 **where you can estimate loss of life expectancy, also in**
 7 **terms of incidence data, you can do loss of**
 8 **cancer-free -- cancer-free life. And the difference**
 9 **between the two would give you an estimate of I think**
 10 **what you're asking.**
 11 Q. Yes.
 12 **A. The number of years you would be alive but having**
 13 **suffered a cancer.**
 14 Q. That's not what you've been asked to do?
 15 **A. No.**
 16 Q. To look at, in the case of individuals, whether they
 17 might have got cancer anyway but they might have got it
 18 later or might, in the case of people who have died,
 19 might have lived longer than they did; that's not what
 20 you've addressed?
 21 **A. No. We know the person has died of whatever disease and**
 22 **we're looking at, given that fact, what is the**
 23 **probability that it was caused by a certain factor?**
 24 Q. Thank you.
 25 I think the final area I want to ask you about is

Page 89

1 this. It's not clear from your report what materials
 2 you were given before advising.
 3 In these formal proceedings my clients filed
 4 a document which referred to probabilities and
 5 possibilities, which was what we call in the law courts
 6 effectively a pleading, a statement of case. That drew
 7 attention to the evidence in relation to each individual
 8 of papers which suggest that their particular cancer,
 9 bladder cancer or other conditions, was capable of being
 10 causally connected to radiation.
 11 My impression I is you weren't given the opportunity
 12 to look through that and to consider what my clients
 13 were saying on the basis of identified scientific
 14 papers.
 15 **A. I don't believe I was given that document.**
 16 Q. No. So I think what you've done is simply to say,
 17 "Taking this particular condition", so let's take
 18 bladder cancer which Mr Abdale suffered from, "the best
 19 statistical fit I can find is that there's
 20 a 99 per cent, 99.9 per cent chance at the radiation
 21 dose I've been told to assume"?
 22 **A. I used the doses provided by Mr Hallard.**
 23 Q. So that was your starting point?
 24 **A. Yes.**
 25 Q. And you did not go on to consider whether or not the

Page 90

1 scientific papers referred to by my clients would at
 2 least open up an area of debate which might cause you to
 3 think again about the figures that you had taken?
 4 **A. I think the process I went through, having determined**
 5 **what the disease was we were talking about, was to**
 6 **review what I consider to be the quality peer reviewed**
 7 **evidence to find an appropriate risk model for that**
 8 **disease to relate it to radiation dose and then I used**
 9 **that model to calculate the probability of causation in**
 10 **the case.**
 11 Q. Now, it's no part of what I want to do to suggest that
 12 you were careless or anything of that sort. You were
 13 doing it on the basis of what you were instructed to do.
 14 But if I understood it right, you were not asked to
 15 carry out this exercise, which was in the case of each
 16 person that you were considering, to set out for the
 17 benefit of the Tribunal if there was an alternative body
 18 of scientific evidence with which you might disagree and
 19 which could lead to an opposite conclusion? That was
 20 not part of what you were asked to do?
 21 **A. No.**
 22 Q. It's fair to say, isn't it, that in this area of cancer
 23 research -- not only cancer research but we concentrate
 24 on that -- there are a very wide spread of opinions,
 25 held by people with great expertise?

Page 91

1 **A. There are a wide variety of opinions. Some of those are**
 2 **supported by evidence, some are not.**
 3 Q. But what is also true, though, is that there are
 4 opinions in particular of evolving theory which are not
 5 yet of sufficient certainty for you to be able to
 6 include the results in your analysis. Do you understand
 7 the point I'm making?
 8 **A. Mm-hm.**
 9 Q. People are coming up with credible hypotheses which need
 10 to be proved?
 11 **A. They need to be shown that the evidence supports them or**
 12 **not.**
 13 Q. But it is in the nature of this sort of work, isn't it,
 14 that very often a hypothesis will emerge and it takes
 15 some time to prove or disprove the hypothesis?
 16 **A. That might be the case.**
 17 Q. And in the nature as you described the task you carried
 18 out you have not brought forward for the benefit of the
 19 Tribunal hypotheses which are as yet unproved, you've
 20 dealt with the world of what you regard as being proven
 21 hypotheses?
 22 **A. I have used the models which are the models that are**
 23 **currently supported best by the epidemiological**
 24 **evidence.**
 25 Q. I understand that. I think that is actually an accepted

Page 92

<p>1 proposition I put to you, because you are making 2 a selection from the wide range of material available to 3 you? 4 A. Mm-hm. 5 Q. That inevitably means that there is some part of the 6 material which you are putting on one side because you 7 don't regard it as being the best evidence? 8 A. Mm-hm. 9 Q. The very last thing I want to ask you about is this. 10 Again, into the bundle, 22, not yours, I think, but 11 for others, have been placed some calculations which 12 were done by a member of the solicitors who are 13 instructing me. 14 Those are now to be found at tab 17. You might have 15 it separately. 16 A. Sorry? 17 Q. You had the calculations separately. 18 A. I have the calculations I was given last night. 19 Q. Yes. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. At the end of this you could 21 probably put that in tab 17. It doesn't really matter 22 because no one else is going to be looking at tab 17 23 after you. 24 A. I've scribbled all over it, I'm afraid. 25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Then you keep it.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 93</p>	<p>1 the right order; is that right? 2 A. They are of the right order, yes. 3 Q. This is all a matter then for submission as to what the 4 right dose rate to take is. 5 A. Yes. 6 Q. The other factor is whether or not you take the DDREF of 7 2 or 1. 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. And in the explanatory note we can see the author says 10 this in the first page under the heading "The 11 appropriate DDREF": 12 "In his report Dr Haylock applies a dose rate 13 effectiveness factor [that's the DDREF] of 2, in effect 14 halving the radiation disease risk to take account of 15 the extrapolation to a very low dose. Dr Haylock does 16 not define in his report what he means by very low dose, 17 but suggests that it is a dose below a few tens of 18 millisievert. In his reply to the BS panel questions 19 dated 7 March 2016 Dr Haylock characterised a low dose 20 as 1 below 100 millisieverts or 100 milligray." 21 Can you first of all confirm, what do you mean by 22 a very low dose? 23 A. This is a slightly vague term, I have to admit. There 24 is a grey area in the middle where one might sometimes 25 apply it or not, depending upon what your particular</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 95</p>
<p>1 MR TER HAAR: Now I am not going to suggest that this was 2 done by a scientist but it's done by a very clever young 3 man. What he has attempted to do is simply to take the 4 figures that you have put in your appendix and make 5 different assumptions first of all as to the dose rate. 6 First of all, as a matter of mathematics, do you 7 have any reason to disagree with how he has done the 8 mathematics? 9 A. I looked at this last night and I tried to reproduce the 10 figures that he or she has done. I agreed with the 11 excess relative risk calculations but I couldn't agree 12 with the absolute risk calculations. I seem to be 13 an order of magnitude different in my values compared to 14 those there. 15 However, I do have to concede that because those are 16 so small, the absolute risk values are so small, that 17 doesn't actually materially make a huge deal of 18 difference to the overall results. 19 Q. So -- 20 A. But I can't -- I tried to see if I could work out why 21 they were different, and I couldn't. 22 Q. There may be an explanation. 23 At any rate, if we're looking at the figures which 24 are highlighted in yellow, whilst there would be some 25 modest difference because of that factor, they are of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 94</p>	<p>1 personal preference is on these things. But I would say 2 that in terms of the doses that we're talking about 3 here, i.e. I was talking about 4 millisieverts, that 4 I consider to be a very low dose indeed and therefore 5 I would apply a (inaudible) of 2 to it. 6 So I think that the border is between, say, 50 and 7 100 millisieverts, but it's not entirely clear, I have 8 to admit. People have different interpretations on it. 9 Certainly in terms of the doses I was given for the 10 appellants, I consider that they fell into the very low 11 dose category. 12 Q. You follow that through, if we go back to the 13 calculations -- 14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So anything below 15 millisieverts for 15 present purposes is in your view very low dose? 16 A. Indeed, yes. 17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. 18 I may have another question, but let's complete the 19 cross-examination. 20 MR TER HAAR: So if we go to the calculations, what I think 21 this means is if we take the first page of a 4 22 millisievert rate, there you would say 2 is the 23 appropriate DDREF? 24 A. Yes. 25 Q. Whereas if we go to the next page, where you are up to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 96</p>

<p>1 170, we would be looking at the bottom figure DDREF of 1 2 because you are above your threshold? 3 A. I would say so, yes. 4 Q. Similarly obviously if you go to the last calculation of 5 431, there in fact only one figure is taken. 6 So on your analysis, 4 millisieverts the probability 7 causation in fact worked out at slightly less than a 8 DDREF of 2 but it's of the order of 0.075 per cent. 9 If you are wrong, or if views differ about DDREF, 10 it's 0.15. 11 Otherwise, at the higher levels we are taking it's 12 6.6 per cent, roughly, at 170 millisieverts and 13, 13 almost 14 per cent at 431, there or thereabouts? 14 A. Yes. 15 MR TER HAAR: Would you just forgive me for a moment, 16 my Lord. 17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Of course. (Pause). 18 MR TER HAAR: I am grateful. Dr Haylock, thank you very 19 much for your time. I have no further questions for 20 you. 21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Just before we continue with questions 22 from Dr Busby, can I just go back to the very low dose 23 issue. 24 A. Uh-huh. 25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: And try to take that back to the earlier</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 97</p>	<p>1 A. And that has, at the last analysis, looked at 179,000 UK 2 workers, who received -- I think the average dose there 3 was down to 25 millisieverts over their lifetime. And 4 if you apply a DREF of 2 to the lifespan study and you 5 draw a straight line down to zero and you look at the 6 risks we get from the worker study then those two 7 straight lines virtually coincide for solid cancers and 8 for leukaemia. 9 So at least in a broad sense we see very good 10 agreement between what we see at the lifespan study at 11 high doses and applying a DREF of 2 to what we see at 12 the much lower dose worker studies that we have in the 13 UK. 14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: That could be 25 millisieverts? 15 A. The average is 25 millisieverts. Some is lower, some is 16 higher, some is higher, obviously. But, yes. 17 So that gives me confidence that, using the models 18 that we get from the LSS and applying a DREF of 2, would 19 in a broad sense be appropriate for somebody from the UK 20 population. 21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 22 A few moments ago, I think wrapping up some of the 23 propositions that Mr ter Haar was exploring with you, 24 you explained that you use what you considered the most 25 appropriate model.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 99</p>
<p>1 questions about one of the challenges to the science of 2 epidemiology generally. 3 I have the proposition that one of the ways you 4 proceed is to abstract and use the data from high dose 5 radiation in the assessment of low dose exposures. You 6 told us about that. 7 I also have at the other end of the scale when it's 8 zero, it's zero. 9 A. (Nodded assent). 10 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I think the debate is between the gap 11 between that and where you can reliably use high dose 12 extrapolation or where the model seems to work 13 consistently. 14 So what is the size of the gap? Is it anything 15 below 100 millisieverts is into the debatable territory? 16 Or is it higher? Is it 200 millisieverts or is it 50 17 millisieverts? 18 A. I believe that the LSS can inform us down to around 100 19 millisieverts. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. 21 A. Below that we take the LSS and we apply this factor. 22 I have confidence that that is an appropriate thing to 23 do because we have evidence from the UK workers' 24 studies, the study that we have started by NRPB. 25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 98</p>	<p>1 A. Uh-huh. 2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: And you didn't, or you weren't asked to 3 go and see whether, if you used a wholly different 4 model, whether that would have challenged or undermined 5 your results. 6 A. That's correct. 7 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You said, I think, it's the best model. 8 You're aware of other models, or are you not aware 9 of any other model? 10 A. There are a range of good and bad models out there, 11 my Lord. 12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. 13 A. I could have calculated probability of causation on the 14 basis of a whole range of models and presented a whole 15 range of possible probabilities of causation but I was 16 not asked to do that. I used my judgment and chose the 17 model I thought was best. 18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. It's a question of trying to get 19 some sense, if this is possible, and it may be we're 20 limiting -- as to what you may have discarded. I think 21 if you see a model which you think is a bad model, 22 I don't think that would be much use in you calculating 23 a dose using a model which you assess to be bad. But 24 are there models which are different to the one you used 25 which you don't necessarily think are bad?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 100</p>

<p>1 A. There are a range of other models. For instance, the 2 BIR Committee in America has produced some models 3 I could have directly used a model from our workers' 4 study. But, again, that would be based upon just 5 a single study. I defer to the judgment of ICRP and its 6 recommendation in 103 that it recommended the models of 7 the lifespan study as being the best currently available 8 for estimating risk, and as in general they do agree 9 with what we see in our UK worker study, that gives me 10 confidence that they could be applied. 11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. Just give me a date for the last 12 time the ICRP continued to issue that recommendation. 13 A. It was 2009, I believe. 14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: 2009. 15 A. I would have to double-check but I think it's 2009. 16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: It rings a bell. But I do not have it at 17 my fingertips. 18 In 2009 they would have at least seen the BIR study? 19 A. Yes, they reviewed all the material. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: And the lifetime worker study? 21 A. Yes. 22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: And they are still saying what they say? 23 A. Yes. 24 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Since that date, if it was 2009, has any 25 other candidate come on which has not yet been reviewed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 101</p>	<p>1 with matters immediately arising in the back of my mind. 2 I didn't want to forget about it. Yes, Dr Busby, do you 3 want to make a start now? 4 DR BUSBY: I can do, my Lord. 5 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Shall we do 10 minutes? 6 DR BUSBY: Yes. 7 Cross-examination by DR BUSBY 8 DR BUSBY: Dr Haylock, good morning. 9 A. Good morning. 10 Q. I think you have said what your area of expertise is but 11 I wonder if you could just distinguish between 12 biostatistics and epidemiology. Is there a distinction 13 that you could make? 14 A. They are fairly loose terms that are -- people call 15 themselves epidemiologists but there isn't necessarily 16 a particularly well-defined definition of that term. 17 People come from either a medical background or often, 18 as I do, from a mathematical statistical background. 19 I would suggest perhaps biostatisticians would come from 20 the latter, more of a statistical -- 21 Q. Would it be fair to say that you are an extremely clever 22 and competent processor of information that comes to you 23 from other people with regard to, if you like, the 24 inputs to you, if I can imagine you as a gigantic 25 computer, like Deep Thought, the input would be so many</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 103</p>
<p>1 by ICRP which might pose questions to the sufficiency -- 2 A. The only significant publications that I can recall at 3 the moment relate to the International Workers Study, 4 which is called INWORKS, and that was a follow-on to the 5 15 country study which -- these studies aim to bring 6 together worker cohorts from around the world to, again, 7 pool data, increase statistical power to detect risk 8 again at lower doses. So the 15 countries study took 9 place a while ago. More recently we've had INWORKS. 10 That had a slightly smaller overall population but the 11 population was followed for longer and there were more 12 deaths and cancer incidence in it. That study also was 13 in broad agreement with the lifespan study which again 14 gives me confidence that those models were appropriate. 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. So INWORKS, at least, far from 16 perhaps challenging ICRP 2009, is another form -- 17 A. It doesn't challenge it -- 18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: -- of supporting data? 19 A. Yes, yes. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: The 15 countries? 21 A. That was an earlier version of it and, yes, that broadly 22 agreed as well. 23 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: All right. 24 A. There were some slight difficulties with that one. 25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: All right. Thank you. That just deals</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 102</p>	<p>1 people have cancer in such and such population of such 2 and such ages and their doses were such and such and you 3 go -- all sorts of things happen in your head and the 4 answer comes out? 5 A. I'm afraid I'm not sufficiently clever to be expert in 6 all these various fields so, no, I do rely upon the 7 quality of the data that's provided to me. 8 Q. Quite. So your conclusions in this case in particular 9 are totally dependent on the input, if you like, if we 10 can call it that? 11 A. Of course. 12 Q. That might not perhaps be so certain in the case of 13 someone that you might call an epidemiologist rather 14 than a biostatistician because they would consider all 15 sorts of epidemiological aspects of the study, more 16 perhaps than you would? 17 A. I don't agree with that. 18 Q. You don't think that's true? 19 A. No. I have lots of expertise over many years looking at 20 different studies and reviewing their qualities and 21 issues. 22 Q. Right. But if, for example, there were some questions 23 over the input end of what it is that you've done, so 24 for example the doses that you have received from 25 Mr Hallard, if they were shown to be wrong or uncertain,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 104</p>

<p>1 then your conclusions would be uncertain or wrong in the 2 same proportion roughly?</p> <p>3 A. Obviously.</p> <p>4 Q. Right.</p> <p>5 Similarly, I'm not sure if you were here the whole 6 time that we were discussing these issues, if the 7 concept of dose was wrong -- I mean dose is the 8 covariate that you use, I mean perhaps the number that 9 you use in your calculations -- if there was a question 10 mark over the validity of the concept of dose, would 11 that also affect your conclusions?</p> <p>12 A. I think I've used the dose -- the concept of dose I've 13 used as provided by -- the dose provided by Mr Hallard 14 is the same as the concept of dose that is used in the 15 carrying out of the epidemiological studies. So they 16 are in a sense consistent. If they are all wrong, then 17 of course it's all meaningless but I don't believe 18 that's the case because of the fact that we seek 19 consistency across completely different populations 20 which would be difficult to imagine if the whole concept 21 was completely wrong.</p> <p>22 Q. But these different populations that you look at are 23 really mostly people who are exposed to external doses, 24 are they not?</p> <p>25 A. The worker populations, a good proportion of them, my</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 105</p>	<p>1 A. Yes.</p> <p>2 Q. Yes. Okay.</p> <p>3 Now, I think you said -- I just want to be sure 4 about this -- you don't really have any expertise in 5 other relevant areas like medicine, biology, 6 environmental modelling on exposure?</p> <p>7 A. No, my background is mathematical statistics.</p> <p>8 Q. You are, as I said, I sort of processing machine for 9 information?</p> <p>10 A. I take that as a compliment.</p> <p>11 Q. At the mathematical end of it -- yes, right.</p> <p>12 Now, your calculations also depend upon the safety 13 of essentially what we should call the model of the 14 ICRP. There are various versions of this but they are 15 all roughly the same.</p> <p>16 A. I chose the ICRP models to represent the best models 17 I could use to do the calculations I did.</p> <p>18 Q. But again, if the ICRP model were wrong for the 19 specific -- and you will have heard enough evidence here 20 that we are arguing that it is -- if it were then again 21 your own conclusions --</p> <p>22 A. Of course. If the model is substantially wrong then my 23 calculations would be wrong and my calculations are 24 based upon the model.</p> <p>25 Q. That's right, okay.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 107</p>
<p>1 best guess is perhaps around a half, are also exposed to 2 internal or are monitored for exposure to internal 3 radiation.</p> <p>4 Q. They are monitored?</p> <p>5 A. They are monitored. Whether --</p> <p>6 Q. But you don't know what the actual internal radiation 7 doses are, do you?</p> <p>8 A. Not in the UK worker study I referred to just now, no.</p> <p>9 Q. In fact not in any studies?</p> <p>10 A. Some studies have measured it, yes. For example, the 11 studies of the Russian radiation workers at the Mayak 12 plant, there are estimates of the internal exposures.</p> <p>13 Q. But those estimates are not based on dose -- on 14 analytical data, are they?</p> <p>15 A. Yes. They are based upon bioassay data that is then fed 16 into a dosimetry model to estimate doses.</p> <p>17 Q. Would you agree that there are various questions over 18 those studies because they are retrospective studies and 19 many people in the cohorts will have died or not be 20 included in the studies?</p> <p>21 A. The studies are not without issues, I admit. I --</p> <p>22 Q. Well, we don't have enough time to go into all this in 23 great depth but I think my point was that if there were 24 some concerns about the concept of dose it would affect 25 your conclusions, wouldn't it?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 106</p>	<p>1 Are you a member of the ICRP?</p> <p>2 A. No, I'm not.</p> <p>3 Q. Have you any relationship with the ICRP?</p> <p>4 A. I had -- for the latest recommendations, ICRP/103, I was 5 asked to reproduce the calculations of lifetime risk to 6 check that I got to the same answer as the chap who 7 calculated the risks in there and I --</p> <p>8 Q. Sorry, yes. Your predecessor, Dr Cooper, was a member 9 of the ICRP. He was also the head of the National 10 Radiological Protection Board at the same time.</p> <p>11 A. Uh-huh, correct.</p> <p>12 Q. So is it fair to say that the outfit that you come from 13 has very close connections with the ICRP and with all of 14 these risk agencies that you use for your calculations, 15 that you rely on for your calculations?</p> <p>16 A. Thankfully I work with some quite eminent people in 17 their fields and ICRP seeks out eminent people to do its 18 work, and therefore they have been asked. Yes, we do 19 have close relationships --</p> <p>20 Q. Quite right, what you might expect. But I think my 21 point, where I was going with this is that I want to ask 22 you about what you consider might be a sort of culture 23 of scientific thinking that in fact -- or might 24 I suggest to you, ask you for your comment, that ways of 25 seeing scientific information or evidence or data might</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 108</p>

<p>1 be coloured or biased -- I'm not saying in any bad way, 2 but just culturally by the group of people to whom the 3 scientist who is making the assessment belonged? 4 A. I would like to think that my colleagues are reputable 5 scientists who base their judgments on the evidence and 6 are not coloured in that way. 7 Q. Of course. I'm not suggesting -- 8 A. It's a matter of personal integrity of the individuals, 9 I believe. 10 Q. No, no, I'm not -- don't get me wrong. I'm not trying 11 to cast any aspersions here. I'm just asking about 12 a more philosophical or perhaps psychological point 13 which is relevant to all of this, which has to do with 14 the ways in which you see the world being coloured by 15 the people that you associate with, if I can put it like 16 that. 17 A. I suspect that's true of everyone. 18 Q. Yes, of course, of course, but in this case it may be 19 more important. 20 A. As I said, I think that the ICRP prides itself on the 21 fact that it bases its judgment on evidence and not 22 anything else. 23 Q. But what is emerging in the discussions here and in the 24 submissions that we have made and the evidence that we 25 have seen, particularly from Professor Schmitz</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 109</p>	<p>1 Now, you are in the middle of giving your evidence, 2 which means you can't talk to anyone about your evidence 3 until it's concluded. Thank you. We'll see you at 4 2 o'clock. 5 2 o'clock. Are you going to conclude your 6 cross-examination by 4.30 this afternoon? 7 DR BUSBY: Probably not, my Lord. 8 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, in which case I may need some 9 information as to when you think you are going to. 10 DR BUSBY: Well, we'll see where we get to. 11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes, we'll see where we get to, but we 12 should also be seeing what you're aiming at. 13 DR BUSBY: Yes, my Lord. 14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Thank you. 15 (1.05 pm) 16 (The short adjournment) 17 (2.00 pm) 18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 19 DR BUSBY: When we broke for lunch I was asking you about 20 scientific culture and how it might colour the way in 21 which one saw -- as a scientist, interpret the 22 information. 23 From time to time would you agree that science or 24 the scientific world view of something can change? 25 Throughout history we've seen large examples of how</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 111</p>
<p>1 Feuerhake, who has been in this game if you like since 2 about 1975, is the idea that there are groups of people 3 who have an interpretation of the facts. I think nobody 4 disagrees about the facts, although there are various 5 tiny disagreements, perhaps, but the overall facts are 6 up there if you like on the notice board but we have 7 groups of people that make an interpretation of those 8 facts in one direction, and another group of people, in 9 this case I am suggesting the ICRP and the National 10 Radiological Protection Board and all these eminent 11 people that have another view. 12 My question is, is it possible that the other side, 13 as it were, is actually right and that the ICRP way of 14 seeing it all, you know, might be unsafe? Is that 15 possible? 16 A. ICRP supports its position with evidence based upon 17 scientific research. If there was evidence to 18 support -- reputable evidence to support the other 19 propositions, I would like to hope that ICRP would 20 consider it along -- in the same way. I don't know that 21 it would not be the case. 22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Let's get the answer. I think that's 23 probably an appropriate time to break for lunch. 24 I'll just record that. (Pause) 25 We will resume at 2 o'clock please.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 110</p>	<p>1 a particular theory has been overthrown by some new 2 evidence. 3 A. Mm. 4 Q. Now in your opinion, could that be the case at the 5 moment that there is what's called a paradigm shift in 6 the understanding of radiation and health over the last, 7 say, 10/15 years, perhaps? 8 A. New hypotheses come along all the time but they are 9 treated only as hypotheses until they are supported by 10 evidence. The current system we see by ICRP is 11 supported by evidence. There has not to my knowledge 12 been any new system that has come along which has 13 demonstrated that it is any better than what we already 14 have with reference to the evidence that we have. 15 Q. I'm not suggesting that there's anything that might be 16 better than what we have but perhaps it is that the 17 evidence is now showing that what we have is wrong. 18 A. No, I disagree. 19 Q. You don't think so. 20 You don't think that the evidence put forward in 21 this case by Professor Mothersill, for example, who is 22 perhaps the world's greatest authority on genomic 23 instability, might have shaken the foundations, if I can 24 call it that, of the ICRP risk model for low doses? 25 A. No, the ICRP risk model is based upon epidemiological</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 112</p>

<p>1 evidence.</p> <p>2 Q. Right.</p> <p>3 A. That evidence still supports the model.</p> <p>4 There may be other hypotheses but they have not</p> <p>5 demonstrated they are better than what we already have</p> <p>6 at the moment.</p> <p>7 Q. Well --</p> <p>8 A. There are still hypotheses.</p> <p>9 Q. Of course. Let's look at some evidence now that goes</p> <p>10 the other way.</p> <p>11 So, for example, you obviously know about the</p> <p>12 Sellafield leukaemia cluster, the leukaemia clusters</p> <p>13 around all nuclear sites which occur at doses which are</p> <p>14 very, very small; is that correct?</p> <p>15 A. There are clusters around some sites, but there have</p> <p>16 also been shown to be clusters around sites where power</p> <p>17 stations might have been built but never were. So ...</p> <p>18 Q. But is it not true that the sites where power stations</p> <p>19 might have been built but never were are all by the sea?</p> <p>20 A. Most of our power stations are by the sea.</p> <p>21 Q. But that's not an answer to the question.</p> <p>22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, it may be.</p> <p>23 Do you want to go to specific evidence or are you</p> <p>24 asking a general question as to whether the leukaemia</p> <p>25 cluster evidence undermines the ICRP model?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 113</p>	<p>1 evidence that the model was wrong. All I am asking you</p> <p>2 is whether there is evidence that the model is wrong,</p> <p>3 but you deny the evidence on the basis that the dose is</p> <p>4 too low, which is the model. It's rather a circular</p> <p>5 argument, it seems to me.</p> <p>6 A. I think I've lost the point there. Can you ask the</p> <p>7 question again, please?</p> <p>8 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: No, I think you have answered it.</p> <p>9 You do not accept that the leukaemia cluster</p> <p>10 material is evidence of radiation at very low doses.</p> <p>11 A. Correct.</p> <p>12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: That's the answer.</p> <p>13 DR BUSBY: Sorry, my Lord --</p> <p>14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: That is the answer, and that is therefore</p> <p>15 an answer consistent with his previous answers that</p> <p>16 there is no evidence, there's a hypothesis.</p> <p>17 DR BUSBY: Well, sorry, my Lord, I have to say that it's</p> <p>18 evidence that if there is --</p> <p>19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: No, his answer is that it's not. Now</p> <p>20 that's his answer and that's what you have. You are not</p> <p>21 going to improve upon that by assertions as to its</p> <p>22 quality or nature.</p> <p>23 DR BUSBY: Could we go to some more evidence which is</p> <p>24 SB7/121.</p> <p>25 Are you familiar with this paper?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 115</p>
<p>1 DR BUSBY: I think that's my point, my Lord.</p> <p>2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: No, no, hang on. It's a question you can</p> <p>3 ask, not a statement.</p> <p>4 Let's just put it again. I think I have your answer</p> <p>5 but I think generically, without going into any</p> <p>6 particular detailed study but Sellafield was mentioned,</p> <p>7 it is put to you that the leukaemia cluster evidence</p> <p>8 points to something wrong with the ICRP model.</p> <p>9 A. No, I disagree with that, my Lord.</p> <p>10 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You are sufficiently familiar with the</p> <p>11 leukaemia cluster evidence to make an informed judgment</p> <p>12 on that question?</p> <p>13 A. Yes, I believe so. The estimated doses from the studies</p> <p>14 are way lower than could possibly be accounted for.</p> <p>15 DR BUSBY: But, with respect, that is exactly our point here</p> <p>16 in this Tribunal. That is what we are looking at.</p> <p>17 Because here again it's argued that the doses are far</p> <p>18 too low for the effects which are clearly observed and</p> <p>19 which we will talk about later on this afternoon.</p> <p>20 A. You're making the assumption that the clusters around</p> <p>21 the power stations are caused by radiation exposure.</p> <p>22 That's not necessarily the case. In fact, evidence</p> <p>23 might suggest that that's certainly not the case.</p> <p>24 Q. I think my point wasn't whether it was the case or not</p> <p>25 the case. It was that you said that there was no</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 114</p>	<p>1 A. I only have the top page. I have read it.</p> <p>2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You only have the top --</p> <p>3 DR BUSBY: You only have the abstract. You should have the</p> <p>4 full paper.</p> <p>5 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: If this has been a recent update, updates</p> <p>6 don't get into the witness' bundles unless someone does</p> <p>7 it. Do we have a spare of this? This is the full</p> <p>8 paper, is it? (Handed)</p> <p>9 You are not going to be deprived of that,</p> <p>10 Mr Heppinstall?</p> <p>11 MR HEPPINSTALL: No, no, don't worry.</p> <p>12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right.</p> <p>13 Have you read this paper before?</p> <p>14 A. I've read this paper before, my Lord.</p> <p>15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right, okay, you now have the full paper</p> <p>16 as well as the abstract.</p> <p>17 A. Yes, my Lord.</p> <p>18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Okay.</p> <p>19 DR BUSBY: Well, like the Sellafield paper, here is a paper</p> <p>20 that also appears to show evidence that there was</p> <p>21 an effect in northern Sweden from the Chernobyl</p> <p>22 accident. Do you agree with the authors of this paper</p> <p>23 that that is so?</p> <p>24 A. No.</p> <p>25 Q. No. Why not?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 116</p>

<p>1 A. It's a generally a poor quality paper and I don't 2 believe the fact that it uses geographical distribution 3 of doses in place of actual individual doses to be 4 a good point, and therefore I'm not convinced by the 5 evidence in it. 6 Q. Do you recall if the ICRP -- and you can see here that 7 this was written in 2004 -- do you recall if the ICRP 8 included discussion of this evidence in its 2007 report? 9 A. I do not recall. 10 Q. Well, I mean, it actually didn't, but if it didn't, 11 would you find that unusual or unacceptable? 12 A. No, because I don't believe it's a good quality study. 13 Q. Quite. So the ICRP probably also don't consider it's 14 a good quality study? 15 A. I'm not a member of ICRP to respond to that. 16 Q. But my point is that scientists, therefore, who have 17 a particular view of things can decide whether a study, 18 or what I might call the facts are acceptable on the 19 basis of their decision whether the study is good or 20 not. So they can exclude something from their 21 particular world view. 22 A. Yes. 23 Q. Do you think that's acceptable, that you can actually 24 exclude facts from your world view on the basis of 25 a subjective decision?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 117</p>	<p>1 make, anyway. 2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, we have that answer. 3 DR BUSBY: Okay. 4 Just to be certain that, yes, you don't believe that 5 there's a paradigm shift at the moment? 6 A. Not at the moment. 7 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You've explained the two reasons I've 8 recorded why you have issues with this paper. 9 A. Yes, the main reason is that doses are derived from -- 10 the assumption is that people in a particular area are 11 receiving a certain dose based upon the deposition in 12 that area. Now, the problem is the deposition -- the 13 dose received by a person does not necessarily correlate 14 well with the deposition in a particular area. 15 Individuals move around in an area. If you take some 16 sort of area average it's not very good. Therefore, the 17 dose measure is a poor quality. 18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So deposition evidence is not by itself 19 sufficient to make an assessment of effective or other 20 dose? 21 A. Yes, that's my ... 22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right, well, I record that. 23 Yes, we're moving back to another topic, are we, 24 Dr Busby? 25 DR BUSBY: We're cantering on, my Lord.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 119</p>
<p>1 A. I think if you review a paper and you feel that the 2 evidence isn't of sufficient quality then you should 3 reject it and that is the case, I believe, with this 4 paper. It doesn't meet the threshold for good evidence. 5 Q. So it's therefore possible that a particular view about 6 whether some area is right -- we're talking about the 7 ICRP risk model now -- can be, if you like, put into 8 a bubble and any evidence that shows that it may be 9 wrong can be just excluded on the subjective decision of 10 the people in the ICRP who don't like it, if I can put 11 it like that? 12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, he has explained the answer. 13 I don't think you are going to get much change from this 14 kind of question. It's not a question of "don't like 15 it". It is suggested that the evidence supporting the 16 conclusion is not sufficiently robust to sustain the 17 conclusion, if I understood your answer correctly? 18 A. That's correct, my Lord. 19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: If, therefore, the method, the 20 methodology and the conclusion, is insufficiently robust 21 to sustain the conclusion, it's not considered evidence 22 which requires a response from ICRP. Yes? 23 A. Yes, my Lord, yes. 24 DR BUSBY: Thank you, my Lord. 25 I think that was the point that I was trying to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 118</p>	<p>1 Yes, we leave that business about the paradigm 2 shifts. I just wanted to ask Dr Haylock about it. 3 Now, there are certain rules for experts which have 4 been discussed in this Tribunal. As I understand it, 5 one mandate is that an expert report should discuss any 6 different conclusions or opinions and explain why they 7 were not adopted and employed. 8 Have you read the expert reports in the statement of 9 case of the appellants? 10 A. I have. 11 Q. You have. Why have you not addressed any of the 12 arguments and information in those reports? 13 A. I was asked to do particular calculations for this 14 Tribunal. I have done those. I've also answered the 15 questions that were put to me by yourself and others. 16 And that's it, so ... 17 Q. But when you originally were asked to provide a report 18 were you directed not to go to any of the arguments? 19 A. I provided explanation for why I did what I did, in that 20 to me that was sufficient. I mean, I explained why 21 I chose particular models and on what basis I did that. 22 That seemed to me to be appropriate. 23 Q. Well, it may be appropriate but it doesn't seem to be 24 the way in which experts are supposed to write expert 25 reports in a legal framework as I understand it, but you</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 120</p>

<p>1 weren't told that. You didn't read the CPR35 rules for 2 experts? 3 A. Yes. 4 Q. You did read the CPR35 for experts? 5 A. (Nodded assent). 6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Your statement says so. You confirm at 7 para 1.2. 8 A. I did. 9 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I think if this is a legal debate, 10 Dr Busby, we might reserve it for submissions, and there 11 may be a difference between experts who are invited to 12 make calculations applying a conventional model and 13 other expressions of opinion. If you want to ask any 14 further questions by all means but I think probably you 15 are straying into legal rather than evidential inquiry. 16 DR BUSBY: You are quite right to point out, my Lord, that 17 I know nothing about the law but I did understand that 18 you directed the Secretary of State's experts to provide 19 a response to all of the points that were raised in the 20 statement of case. 21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: That sounds like a legal submission to 22 me. 23 DR BUSBY: Very good. I'll leave that then. 24 Could I ask you if it emerged that evidence of 25 a major new source of exposure suddenly appeared during</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 121</p>	<p>1 I'm not a dose expert to make that determination. 2 Q. Thank you. Yes, of course, it's an input/output 3 problem, isn't it? 4 Right, I'm going to move on now to epidemiology and 5 uranium. 6 Because Professor Thomas said to us that she wasn't 7 really an epidemiologist and she referred my questions 8 to her that I should ask them of you. So we're going to 9 go there now. 10 The excess relative risks that you employ in your 11 probability of causation are based on the ICRP, so the 12 ERRs which therefore depend on the Japanese lifespan 13 studies, is that roughly right? 14 A. That's right. 15 Q. I think Mr ter Haar asked you if you had read 16 Professor Sawada's criticisms of the lifespan study 17 which show that internal exposures to uranium and other 18 fallout and washout were invisible to the epidemiology 19 because all of the exposure groups were equivalently 20 contaminated. 21 So my question is -- well, first of all have you 22 read Professor Sawada's criticisms? 23 A. To the extent that they made any sense, yes. 24 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I mean, he has clearly given a paper -- 25 a witness statement which has some difficulties in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 123</p>
<p>1 the course of these discussions, would you accept that 2 your conclusions might be invalidated by that? 3 A. That could be possible, yes. 4 Q. Possible, yes. For example, yesterday we learned from 5 Mr Hallard that he had not included exposures to 6 carbon-14, and he told us the amount created in the test 7 was 1500 moles, which is a rather strange way of looking 8 at it, but this is the same as 10 to the power 9 15 becquerels which is not a small dose. 10 If you accept that it's 10 to the 15 becquerels -- 11 and you can do the calculation or anybody can -- this 12 must represent a significant missing component and dose, 13 especially as we are all made of carbon and so are all 14 the things people were eating on Christmas Island and so 15 forth -- 16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Question, please. Try to cut out the 17 statement if you possibly can. 18 DR BUSBY: Would you say this knowledge, if it were true, 19 had had any effect on your own calculations of 20 causation? 21 A. I'm not an expert on dosimetry and I would need to see 22 what difference including that source made to the 23 overall effective dose that I would use on the 24 calculations. If it made a very small difference, of 25 course it would have no effect on my calculations but</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 122</p>	<p>1 language -- 2 A. Yes. 3 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: -- re-reading it again. Just pause 4 there. 5 DR BUSBY: Sorry. 6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I think that he has published other 7 pieces on this topic which perhaps don't have those 8 difficulties. What have you read of Professor Sawada? 9 A. I've seen the paper we referred to this morning. 10 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: The 2007 paper? 11 A. Yes. I don't think I've seen others. 12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: He has published on this topic apart from 13 2007, hasn't he? 14 DR BUSBY: No, my Lord. He published a paper in Medicine 15 Conflict Survival in 2007 and since then most of these 16 have been unpublished reports. 17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: There are two Sawadas, are there? 18 DR BUSBY: Yes. We are going to go to the earlier Sawada 19 now. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Sorry, there is another Sawada who has 21 published on this topic. 22 So the witness that we heard last week, it is 2007 23 and his witness statement, those are the two sources of 24 data? 25 DR BUSBY: Yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 124</p>

1 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right.
 2 DR BUSBY: The black rain paper is by a different Sawada.
 3 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: That's where I've gone wrong. Thank you.
 4 DR BUSBY: Professor Sawada's report to this appeal made
 5 quite a clever analysis of the non-cancer effects.
 6 I know you've just read it and you said it's very
 7 difficult to understand, but it's really quite a simple
 8 thing that he did. He looked at the non-cancer effects,
 9 he looked at epilation and diarrhoea and things that
 10 happen almost immediately after the bombing, and he
 11 found that they occurred at distances which were too far
 12 from the hypocentre for any external radiation dose.
 13 Well out, 6 kilometres away, 7, 8, 9, 10 kilometres,
 14 people -- their hair was falling out, their teeth were
 15 bleeding, they had diarrhoea. They had all of these
 16 effects that other people got when they were exposed to
 17 external radiation. So they were radiation effects,
 18 well known radiation effects.
 19 If you accept that -- and it's in his report which
 20 you've looked, that's basically his point -- what he's
 21 saying is there must be something there, some sort of
 22 radiation exposure that is not the external gamma
 23 radiation from the initial explosion.
 24 Would you accept that?
 25 **A. No. I have looked at the DS86 dose calculations for the**

Page 125

1 **lifespan study done by RERF and their conclusion is that**
 2 **there was not significant effects of fallout on the**
 3 **people -- on the survivors in comparison to their**
 4 **external doses. And, therefore, I'm not sure what**
 5 **Professor Sawada shows but I don't think it's**
 6 **necessarily what he thinks it shows, that there is --**
 7 **there is a significant fallout effect.**
 8 Q. Well, the evidence he is using is actually taken from
 9 the Radiation Effects Research Foundation disk which
 10 gives the data for non-cancer effects, for these
 11 epilation and diarrhoea effects specifically for those.
 12 **A. These are early effects.**
 13 Q. Yes, early effects, correct.
 14 **A. Uh-huh, but the lifespan study is concerned with late**
 15 **effects, which are consistent with the type of effects**
 16 **we're interested in for this Tribunal.**
 17 Q. Of course. But that wasn't Professor Sawada's point.
 18 His point is that if -- well, let's put it this way.
 19 Let's say that we looked at the rates of epilation and
 20 diarrhoea, 8 kilometres away from the hypocentre and we
 21 found that they were significantly high. This is what
 22 he found. This is in the data. So his interpretation
 23 was that these were radiation effects but they were too
 24 far away from the hypocentre.
 25 Well, is it not a logical conclusion that there must

Page 126

1 have been therefore enough, if you like, radiation
 2 effects from some source at 6 to 8 kilometres away from
 3 the hypocentre? He is suggesting it's the black rain.
 4 He is suggesting that what happened is that there was
 5 an explosion and therefore rain fell out of the
 6 explosion and by that time of course the rain fell at
 7 some distance away from the hypocentre and that's his
 8 explanation for these radiation effects, these immediate
 9 ones.
 10 **A. I think I would put to you that the RERF has looked at**
 11 **the same data, if you are saying it's their data, and**
 12 **come to a different conclusion.**
 13 Q. I don't think they have. I have not seen any paper
 14 where they have done.
 15 **A. The DS86 dosimetry system does not include any component**
 16 **for fallout or effects relating to black rain or that**
 17 **sort of thing. They do not consider that it's**
 18 **a significant component of dose. The only significant**
 19 **component of dose that's been ascribed from the DS86**
 20 **system and the subsequent DSO2 is from the direct**
 21 **effects of the bomb.**
 22 Q. I think that's the point that Sawada is making, that
 23 that particular type of dosimetry which is based on
 24 external radiation dose, joules per kilogram, is not
 25 safe.

Page 127

1 **A. But DS86 does look at internal exposures and the effects**
 2 **of fallout and comes to a different conclusion.**
 3 Q. Well, would you say that if you did come to the Sawada
 4 conclusion it was something that was a possibility?
 5 **A. If, yes.**
 6 Q. No, I am saying -- I don't mean that. I mean when you
 7 look at the Sawada conclusion that there must have been
 8 something there in the way of radiation or genotoxic
 9 exposure or internal radiation or whatever --
 10 **A. I'm afraid I would want to look at Sawada's data myself**
 11 **before I would make that sort of conclusion. I wouldn't**
 12 **trust his calculations unless I'd seen them myself.**
 13 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You do not have enough material from what
 14 we've tried to give you over the short break?
 15 **A. It's challenging.**
 16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So, just so I understand, if you were
 17 being asked to examine those four charts we drew your
 18 attention to, what material would you really need to
 19 conduct your own review?
 20 **A. Well, I would want to see the original data from which**
 21 **those charts were drawn and their sources and their**
 22 **reliability.**
 23 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So --
 24 **A. But --**
 25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: -- you want to see the data supporting

Page 128

<p>1 the charts --</p> <p>2 A. Yes.</p> <p>3 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: -- before you are doing any calculation?</p> <p>4 A. Yes, and I think the premise on which they are working</p> <p>5 that you can relate dose to distance from the hypocentre</p> <p>6 is not necessarily correct and open to quite a lot of</p> <p>7 error.</p> <p>8 DR BUSBY: Well, the data is freely available from the RERF.</p> <p>9 Given that this is such an important issue, do you</p> <p>10 think it possible that the Health Protection Agency</p> <p>11 might ask you to do just that?</p> <p>12 A. I don't think it is an important issue. Dr Sawada or</p> <p>13 Professor Sawada has a hypothesis but RERF, who have</p> <p>14 looked at dosimetry a number of times over the years,</p> <p>15 I think we're on the third or fourth iteration now, have</p> <p>16 come to a completely different conclusion. They do not</p> <p>17 believe that there is significant other exposure to the</p> <p>18 survivors apart from the direct exposure from the bomb</p> <p>19 at the time.</p> <p>20 Q. So they don't believe that there's any fallout, is that</p> <p>21 what you're saying?</p> <p>22 A. As I understand it.</p> <p>23 Q. Well, we're now going to go and look at some evidence</p> <p>24 that there is some fallout at SB7/110.</p> <p>25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: We are in the same volume, I think, if we</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 129</p>	<p>1 manifestations of fallout from the Hiroshima atomic bomb</p> <p>2 are still detectable in the black rain area."</p> <p>3 That's just a statement that anybody would</p> <p>4 understand, Dr Haylock. I mean you don't need to be an</p> <p>5 expert to understand that. You could say that maybe</p> <p>6 this paper is wrong or the scientists got their sums</p> <p>7 wrong or they used the wrong instrumentation or</p> <p>8 something like that, but you would agree that this</p> <p>9 a paper that does draw attention to the existence of</p> <p>10 fallout some distance from the hypocentre including</p> <p>11 uranium?</p> <p>12 A. It may do, but without having read it or having any</p> <p>13 indication of its quality I wouldn't know whether this</p> <p>14 was a meaningful statement or not.</p> <p>15 Q. Well, I think that's as far as we can go with that.</p> <p>16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes, I think it's probably as far as we</p> <p>17 can go with this witness. This is apparently a 1983</p> <p>18 paper in the Journal of Radiation Research, is it?</p> <p>19 A. Yes.</p> <p>20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. So that's a recognised journal on</p> <p>21 this topic?</p> <p>22 A. Yes.</p> <p>23 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Given its age and the place where it was</p> <p>24 published, will this have come to the attention of ICRP?</p> <p>25 A. I would think so, my Lord, yes.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 131</p>
<p>1 go back to tab 110. This is the other Sawada who is the</p> <p>2 co-author of this paper.</p> <p>3 A. Yes.</p> <p>4 DR BUSBY: I also thought this was the same Sawada, my Lord,</p> <p>5 but then somebody told me it wasn't.</p> <p>6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, I am glad to know I am in good</p> <p>7 company.</p> <p>8 A. I'm afraid I'm not familiar with this paper, my Lord.</p> <p>9 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: No. Right, the witness is not familiar</p> <p>10 with the paper.</p> <p>11 What questions do you want to ask? You need to read</p> <p>12 the whole paper before you can answer any questions</p> <p>13 about it at all?</p> <p>14 A. It's looking like it's a fairly physics-related or</p> <p>15 dosimetry-related paper and, as I said before, I am not</p> <p>16 a dosimetrist or physicist.</p> <p>17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, have you read the abstract at the</p> <p>18 beginning?</p> <p>19 A. This strikes me as a paper that would be understood by</p> <p>20 dosimetrists, my Lord, and not by an epidemiologist.</p> <p>21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. That doesn't look like it's going</p> <p>22 to be a fruitful line of inquiry.</p> <p>23 DR BUSBY: Nevertheless, my Lord, I would just like to read</p> <p>24 one sentence here at the end of the abstract which says:</p> <p>25 "The results of this study suggest that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 130</p>	<p>1 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: And ICRP includes amongst those who</p> <p>2 constitute it or advise it, physicists?</p> <p>3 A. Most definitely, my Lord.</p> <p>4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: And dosimetrists?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Who can evaluate these conclusions?</p> <p>7 A. I would think so, my Lord.</p> <p>8 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Even though you are not the person to do</p> <p>9 that?</p> <p>10 A. Yes, my Lord.</p> <p>11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right.</p> <p>12 DR BUSBY: Would you be surprised, Dr Haylock, if I were to</p> <p>13 say to you that this paper doesn't appear in any of the</p> <p>14 documents of the ICRP or the United Nations Scientific</p> <p>15 Committee or the Biological Effects of Ionising</p> <p>16 Radiation Committee or indeed any of the committees with</p> <p>17 which your paradigm, if I can call it that, is</p> <p>18 associated?</p> <p>19 A. That may be because it wasn't considered of sufficient</p> <p>20 quality to be included. But, as I said, I'm not an</p> <p>21 expert on this field so I would not be able to comment</p> <p>22 on that.</p> <p>23 Q. Yes. Thank you.</p> <p>24 But once again we see that, if you like, evidence</p> <p>25 may be excluded -- I am just making the general point</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 132</p>

1 here that I made before -- if someone doesn't like it;
 2 they say it's not considered to be of sufficient
 3 quality.
 4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, you say "doesn't like it"; he says
 5 the evidence supporting the conclusion is not of
 6 sufficient quality to justify it. I think you've got to
 7 use his terminology if you are going to cross-examine
 8 about it, otherwise you are introducing your version of
 9 what's going on which the witness probably doesn't agree
 10 with.
 11 DR BUSBY: Can we then go to SB7/107.
 12 Would you agree this paper, another paper about
 13 residues at test sites, finds excess plutonium and
 14 uranium in human bones of the people who lived in --
 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Are you familiar with this paper?
 16 **A. I'm not familiar, no. I've not been asked to look at it**
 17 **and I've not. I'm not an expert on the --**
 18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Do you just want to read the abstract at
 19 the beginning to see whether it's something you can
 20 answer questions about? (Pause)
 21 **A. I've read it.**
 22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Okay.
 23 DR BUSBY: Yes. My question here is: do you agree that this
 24 paper provides evidence that people who live near the
 25 test sites, or were near the test sites, ended up with

Page 133

1 excess uranium and plutonium in their bodies?
 2 **A. I would question whether that -- I would agree with**
 3 **that. It says "the levels within the range found in**
 4 **human bone samples for other countries solely due to**
 5 **global fallout" for the plutonium. And for the uranium**
 6 **it says the levels were consistent with the UK but 10**
 7 **times higher than those residents of New York City and**
 8 **Japan. So I don't think your statement holds true.**
 9 Q. Well, I am just saying that -- I just asked if you
 10 thought that it meant that there was uranium in the
 11 bodies of people living near test sites?
 12 **A. If I understand correctly, we all have uranium in us**
 13 **because it's something we take in on a regular basis.**
 14 Q. But this is a particular isotopic ratio of uranium which
 15 identifies it as from fallout.
 16 **A. I'm not an expert on uranium to comment.**
 17 Q. Okay. We'll move on from there I was just trying to
 18 get -- we're going along this route of uranium
 19 genotoxicity.
 20 We are finished with that one now.
 21 My next question is this: if uranium had
 22 an anomalous genotoxicity, such that it could not be
 23 properly assessed by the ICRP model -- if, if, if, I am
 24 not saying it has, if -- would it follow that the excess
 25 relative risks per sievert obtained from the lifespan

Page 134

1 study would be wrong?
 2 **A. Not necessarily. The lifespan study provides estimates**
 3 **of risks for external gamma radiation. It would depend**
 4 **upon the distribution of the uranium in the participants**
 5 **as well. If the distribution was uniform or random**
 6 **across the population that would not necessarily**
 7 **invalidate the risks we get from external gamma**
 8 **radiation.**
 9 Q. Very good. So the risk -- so you would say that the
 10 ICRP model, the LSS analysis, if you like, is one of
 11 external radiation?
 12 **A. Absolutely, yes.**
 13 Q. And is invisible with regard to internal radiation, it
 14 cannot give us any information about internal radiation?
 15 **A. The RERF have determined and proposed that the LLS were**
 16 **only exposed to external gamma and that is the dose that**
 17 **they provide and therefore the models as a result of**
 18 **that of course only relate to external gamma.**
 19 Q. And they don't relate to uranium?
 20 **A. No.**
 21 Q. Well, let's now have a look at some studies which link
 22 exposure to uranium to apparent genotoxic effects. If
 23 I can take you to -- well, first of all, before I do
 24 that Professor Thomas characterised the uranium
 25 effects -- there is some argument about how it works,

Page 135

1 and there are a lot of papers which I won't take you to
 2 because you are not an expert in that area and we will
 3 just go nowhere with it. Professor Thomas characterised
 4 the genotoxic effects of uranium as due to heavy metal
 5 genotoxicity and Professor Howard referred to electron
 6 particle effects. I just want to be sure that you don't
 7 have any position on this, it is not your area of
 8 expertise.
 9 **A. Not at all.**
 10 Q. Let's go now to some epidemiological studies which we
 11 did put to Professor Thomas and she referred us to you
 12 and I will now quickly put these to you as
 13 an epidemiologist.
 14 Now, these are studies of a number of different
 15 people who were exposed to uranium. I want to start
 16 with uranium miners at SB7/124.
 17 We have here both the abstract, but we also have the
 18 paper there but it may not have made it into your
 19 bundle.
 20 **A. I have the paper.**
 21 Q. It has?
 22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Do you know this paper?
 23 **A. I had it handed to me the other day and I quickly**
 24 **glanced at it but no more than that.**
 25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So before the other day you weren't

Page 136

<p>1 familiar with it?</p> <p>2 A. No, I was not.</p> <p>3 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes.</p> <p>4 DR BUSBY: Well, the finding of the paper which is in</p> <p>5 Radiation Research -- would you categorise Radiation</p> <p>6 Research as a reputable journal?</p> <p>7 A. Yes.</p> <p>8 Q. You would. It's the sort of journal in which a lot of</p> <p>9 nuclear stuff is published. They publish -- the finding</p> <p>10 is in the title:</p> <p>11 "Unexpected rates of chromosome instabilities and</p> <p>12 alteration of hormone levels in Namibian uranium</p> <p>13 miners."</p> <p>14 If you could just quickly look at the numbers there</p> <p>15 and the P values and let us know as an epidemiologist if</p> <p>16 you also, if you had been one of the referees here,</p> <p>17 would have considered agreeing to it being published.</p> <p>18 A. Whether I would agree to it being published, I would</p> <p>19 have to read the whole paper. But my initial thoughts</p> <p>20 looking at this are that I see that the numbers are</p> <p>21 fairly small and therefore there's a risk that when you</p> <p>22 do see things with small numbers that they are occurring</p> <p>23 simply by random chance and not because they are</p> <p>24 indicative of some effect.</p> <p>25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Just remind us of what the kind of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 137</p>	<p>1 Q. So what does that mean? What does statistically</p> <p>2 significant mean in this context then? What are the</p> <p>3 odds that it could have occurred by chance, say, 1 in</p> <p>4 20?</p> <p>5 A. 1 in 10,000 in this sample.</p> <p>6 Q. So you would have had to do 10,000 of these studies in</p> <p>7 order to get the result that they got by chance; is that</p> <p>8 fair?</p> <p>9 A. But we would want to know: is this sample representative</p> <p>10 of the population from which it was drawn? If not, then</p> <p>11 it doesn't have any implications for the larger</p> <p>12 population.</p> <p>13 Q. You didn't answer my question there.</p> <p>14 A. Sorry, could you ask it again then, please.</p> <p>15 Q. That you would have had to do -- what did you say,</p> <p>16 10,000? You would have to have done 10,000 of these</p> <p>17 studies in order for this result to have appeared by</p> <p>18 chance, is that right?</p> <p>19 A. It means if you repeated this study 10,000 times you</p> <p>20 would expect to see as extreme or more extreme results</p> <p>21 less than 1 in 10,000 times.</p> <p>22 Q. So therefore it is unlikely that this is a chance</p> <p>23 finding, would you agree?</p> <p>24 A. It could be -- it could be a perfectly appropriate</p> <p>25 finding in this sample, but that does not mean this</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 139</p>
<p>1 numbers were involved in this study.</p> <p>2 A. Sorry, I think we seem to have 75 in the cohort and 31</p> <p>3 in the control group.</p> <p>4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: The control group.</p> <p>5 A. So I would question are these numbers representative of</p> <p>6 the groups from which they were drawn?</p> <p>7 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes.</p> <p>8 DR BUSBY: In epidemiology how does one deal with seeing</p> <p>9 whether a finding in a smallish group like that is</p> <p>10 statistically significant or not? What methodology do</p> <p>11 you use?</p> <p>12 A. We usually, if we see something in a study that we were</p> <p>13 not particularly looking for then we usually refer to</p> <p>14 that as a hypothesis-generating study, and in which case</p> <p>15 we would note it as an interesting fact but would want</p> <p>16 to see it replicated in other studies, ideally in other</p> <p>17 populations or larger populations before we would accept</p> <p>18 that it was not simply a chance finding.</p> <p>19 Q. So what does it mean here when it says about two-thirds</p> <p>20 of the way down:</p> <p>21 "A threefold increase in chromosome aberrations in</p> <p>22 the miners compared to non-exposed controls was</p> <p>23 recorded. P is less than 0.0001."</p> <p>24 What does that mean?</p> <p>25 A. Very statistically significant.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 138</p>	<p>1 sample is representative of the population as a whole</p> <p>2 and therefore that this result applies more widely. It</p> <p>3 certainly is a result relating to this particular</p> <p>4 sample. The question is: does that apply more widely?</p> <p>5 Q. Well, I mean at minimum you would say it was -- I think</p> <p>6 you did say -- that it was a hypothesis-generating</p> <p>7 study?</p> <p>8 A. Yes.</p> <p>9 Q. In which case we can look at some other studies that</p> <p>10 show similar sorts of things on the basis that we have</p> <p>11 generated a hypothesis that exposure to uranium causes</p> <p>12 chromosome damage.</p> <p>13 A. In a sample of Namibian uranium miners.</p> <p>14 Q. Well, in a sample of -- could we not agree on a sample</p> <p>15 of people exposed to uranium?</p> <p>16 A. In very specific conditions. These uranium miners might</p> <p>17 well also be exposed to other things as well. For</p> <p>18 example, they might well be exposed to radon. Has that</p> <p>19 been controlled for? I couldn't say from looking at it.</p> <p>20 But I know from experience that exposure to uranium,</p> <p>21 often at the same time as you are being exposed to</p> <p>22 uranium often you are being exposed to radon in the same</p> <p>23 situation. Has that been controlled for?</p> <p>24 Q. I think they did look at that. Anyway, without spending</p> <p>25 the whole day on this, let's just look at another</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 140</p>

<p>1 example of chromosome damage which is from your own 2 area. Well, perhaps not your area. Well, anyway, the 3 nuclear industry and that is SB7/106. 4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: It looks like 106 I've just got as 5 an abstract. 6 DR BUSBY: Oh right. So have I, my Lord. I think maybe -- 7 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, you know what we've been asking 8 for, ever since Friday week. 9 DR BUSBY: We thought we put it in, my Lord, according to my 10 daughter. Oh, we didn't, all right. 11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: If we are all in the same boat, I think 12 the possibility of a random error is statistically 13 insignificant, without trying to give evidence, of 14 course. 15 DR BUSBY: I am sure Dr Haylock could put a P value to it, 16 my Lord. 17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. 18 DR BUSBY: All right, well, we can't use that one then. 19 Let's go to SB7/119. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: "Chromosome aberration analysis in 21 peripheral lymphocytes of Gulf War and Balkans War 22 veterans", Schroeder, 2002. 23 DR BUSBY: Are you familiar with this one? Sorry, you 24 haven't got there yet. (Pause) 25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: What's your 119?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 141</p>	<p>1 A. 16, my Lord. 2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: 16 volunteers. Yes. 3 DR BUSBY: Would you consider this a hypothesis-generating 4 study? 5 A. Potentially. 6 Q. So we have two hypothesis-generating studies? 7 A. Yes. 8 Q. And they are the same hypothesis? 9 A. I would have to read them to confirm that. 10 Q. Well, the hypothesis is that exposure to uranium 11 causes chromosome aberrations. 12 A. I think this is depleted uranium. I'm not quite sure 13 that's exactly the same as in the other study, is it? 14 Q. The other one is uranium and this is depleted uranium. 15 A. Are they the same? 16 Q. Yes. 17 A. I'm afraid -- 18 Q. Essentially they are the same, yes? 19 A. Well, I'm not familiar enough to comment on that, 20 whether these do actually generate the same hypothesis. 21 Q. Okay. So let's go to another study that is also about 22 uranium and Gulf War veterans, and that is SB7/93. 23 We seem to have the wrong reference here, my Lord. 24 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I think you do. 25 MS BUSBY: Yes, so that is the right one but this is not in</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 143</p>
<p>1 A. Sorry, my Lord? 2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: 119. 3 A. Yes. 4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I think you have the abstract, page 1. 5 Flip that over and then you have the full paper, I hope; 6 yes? 7 A. Yes, my Lord. 8 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. 9 DR BUSBY: Well -- 10 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So the first question, are you familiar 11 with this paper? 12 A. I am not familiar with it, no, my Lord. 13 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. 14 DR BUSBY: Well, this paper, I'm not sure how far we can go 15 with it in the same way, but anyway if the -- 16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Shall we let him read the abstract to see 17 whether this is a topic on which he might be able to 18 help you with questions and answers? It's depleted 19 uranium, is it? (Pause) 20 A. I've read the abstract. My first thought would be that 21 they were looking at a very small group of volunteers 22 here that were exposed. Again I would question whether 23 such a small sample size enables us to draw the 24 conclusions that are more widely applicable. 25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: We have --</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 142</p>	<p>1 our bundle in the right place. 2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: "Prevalence of birth defects among 3 infants of Gulf War veterans in Arkansas, Arizona, 4 California, Georgia, Hawaii and Iowa"? 5 DR BUSBY: Yes, that's the one. 6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. Do you have that, 93? 7 A. Yes. 8 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Do you have the Areneta and others paper? 9 A. Yes, I do. 10 DR BUSBY: Our hypothesis-generating study of uranium miners 11 took us to another hypothesis-generating study of 12 uranium-exposed -- DU, it's the same thing -- soldiers, 13 and now we go to some more DU-exposed soldiers but we're 14 now looking not at chromosome damage but at birth 15 defects. 16 Now when I took this to Professor Thomas she said we 17 should ask you about this and ask you whether you 18 thought this was a reputable -- 19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Have you read this paper? 20 A. No, my Lord. 21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Were you asked to read it? 22 A. No. Sorry, my Lord. 23 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Do you want to read the abstract and see 24 what it's all about? Sit down by all means, if you 25 prefer. (Pause)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 144</p>

<p>1 DR BUSBY: Well, you'll see here that the population base 2 was 684,645 veterans who were deployed in the Gulf War. 3 Is that a large enough study to overcome the problems of 4 small numbers? 5 A. It might be, depending upon the size of the effect you 6 are looking for. 7 Q. Well, they found a significant effect on birth defects 8 so I think that's all we have. I mean, do you agree 9 from what you've seen -- 10 A. From what I can see from some very small writing, yes. 11 Q. Yes, I know this is all a bit -- so yes, that's a "yes". 12 So this is a paper that -- we've now gone from uranium 13 in miners to uranium in Gulf War veterans now to birth 14 defects in Gulf War veterans. 15 A. Could I point out, though, that birth defects is nothing 16 to do with cancer. You're talking about defects in 17 offspring of people. It bears no relation to cancer and 18 the risk of cancer in individuals who were exposed 19 themselves. 20 Q. I am not suggesting that that is the case. We're just 21 looking at the ICRP risk model and -- 22 A. The ICRP risk model says nothing about this. 23 Q. The ICRP risk model does actually give a relative risk 24 for birth defects. 25 A. Okay, but not in relation to the kind of models I was</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 145</p>	<p>1 A. Thank you. 2 DR BUSBY: Well, this is another study -- 3 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Are you still reading this one? 4 A. I think I've read as much as I can. 5 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Okay. 6 DR BUSBY: This is another study like the Areneta study that 7 you just looked at, and mainly I'm not asking you if 8 it's in your area of knowledge with regard to birth 9 defects and so on but basically as an epidemiologist 10 would you consider this to be a reasonable study because 11 we asked Professor Thomas and she referred us to you. 12 A. Certainly the size of the study looks good, but again 13 that could only be confirmed with proper calculations. 14 But it does appear on the face of it to have been 15 a properly conducted study, but ... 16 Q. And it was a study by the Environmental Epidemiology 17 Service of the Department of Veterans' Affairs, 18 Washington, and the Food and Drug Administration 19 Department of Health and Human Affairs, Washington, and 20 the Office of the Under Secretary for Health, Department 21 of Veterans' Affairs, Washington. 22 Would you consider those to be people that you might 23 listen to or -- 24 A. They sound good, but I have no personal knowledge of 25 these organisations myself.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 147</p>
<p>1 using to -- birth defects. Okay. 2 Q. I think, yes, well, we'll explore this relationship 3 between the birth defects and the cancer. But all I am 4 trying to do at the moment is to go along to show that 5 maybe uranium has not been adequately examined with 6 regard to its genotoxicity. 7 You would agree, would you not, in passing that 8 cancer is essentially a disease that follows from 9 genetic damage, from damage to DNA? 10 A. I'm an epidemiologist, not a medic or a biologist, so 11 I deal in deaths and cancer incidences and doses and the 12 calculation thereof but I would not agree to your 13 statement because I don't have that -- 14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You can't comment upon the causes of 15 cancer? 16 A. I'm not qualified in that area. 17 DR BUSBY: Okay. Just to continue with this quickly, we 18 want to look at Mr Kang which is SB7/98. 19 When you are ready. I understand that you are 20 not -- do you not have the main paper? 21 A. I only have the abstract, I'm afraid. 22 Q. The main paper, this one is there, so it must not have 23 gone into your bundle. Can somebody help? He doesn't 24 have this in his bundle. Well, he can have mine. 25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Hang on a moment. (Pause) (Handed)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 146</p>	<p>1 Q. No, but you wouldn't see them as dodgy characters if I 2 could put it like that? 3 A. As I said, I have no personal knowledge of them to 4 evaluate that. 5 Q. Okay, thank. But you might consider then that this is 6 another hypothesis-generating study? 7 A. What hypothesis are you suggesting. 8 Q. Well, that people who were exposed to something in the 9 Gulf War had a higher risk of congenital malformation in 10 their children? 11 A. It is suggesting that people who were at the Gulf War 12 have a higher risk but as far as I can see it's not 13 attributing that to anything. 14 Q. No, indeed, I'm not suggesting it is, but it's one 15 more -- if I may put it -- supporting piece of evidence 16 that there may be something wrong with the assessment of 17 risk of harm of genetic damage from uranium? 18 A. No, I disagree. It says nothing at all about uranium. 19 How can it -- 20 Q. Well, it's supporting evidence. If uranium causes some 21 damage then you go and look at people who are exposed to 22 uranium amongst other things -- 23 A. It's not saying these people were all exposed to 24 uranium. 25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I think what the witness has said is that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 148</p>

<p>1 from examining the abstract, as I understand is what 2 you've done, it shows that there is some outcome of 3 people who were employed in the Gulf War but it doesn't 4 show what caused that outcome, therefore you need to 5 have some evidence to say it was uranium exposure that 6 caused the outcome before you can go back to say there 7 is a failure in the risk model assessment of ICRP 8 because of uranium exposure. Do I have that right? 9 A. I believe so, my Lord, yes. 10 DR BUSBY: Can we go to SB7/122 now. 11 A. I have not seen this publication before and I would 12 question actually whether it is actually a peer reviewed 13 publication looking at what it says on the front that 14 it's a faculty publication. But maybe I am wrong there. 15 Q. I think it is a faculty publication, yes, rather like 16 the ICRP risk model. 17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: We're not going to get involved in that 18 kind of skirmishing, Dr Busby, so withdraw that. I am 19 going to police you to make sure that you are confining 20 this part of the hearing to asking questions of 21 witnesses whose expertise falls within the proper scope 22 of the questions. You are not going to be making 23 statements, they will be ignored. 24 DR BUSBY: Thank you, my Lord. 25 Well, how shall I put it? The authors of the study</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 149</p>	<p>1 of it these sorts of studies are usually of poorer 2 quality because they don't have individual estimates of 3 the exposure and assuming that the average for 4 a particular area is appropriate to be assigned to 5 individuals and that's in general not the case. 6 Q. So you discuss -- not discuss -- you dismiss this sort 7 of ecological approach that somebody in a particular 8 area can be categorised in terms of some quality 9 relating to that area? 10 A. I said that the issue is that in this sort of study 11 you're assigning the same value of exposure to everybody 12 in a particular area, and an example like this with 13 groundwater if it's being used for drinking, for 14 example, not everybody would drink the same amount. 15 People would not spend the same amount of time in the 16 area. The variability -- if you tried to do the 17 relationship between personal exposure and this average 18 it would be -- there's not a good relationship between 19 the two. 20 It is not impossible that you can do good quality 21 ecological studies but trying to draw any conclusions is 22 quite challenging, I'm afraid. 23 Q. Yes. Well, I mean the LSS study is exactly such 24 a study, is it not? 25 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: That's a statement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 151</p>
<p>1 are all based at the University of South Carolina. 2 Would you just discount this study? Because then we can 3 move on if you do because it has not been published in 4 peer reviewed literature. 5 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: He hasn't had much time to look at it. 6 What do you want to -- 7 DR BUSBY: I wanted to ask him if he thought it was 8 evidence -- more evidence -- that uranium -- because 9 these are very low levels of uranium in groundwater -- 10 caused cancer at doses that would not be expected on the 11 basis of the ICRP risk model. 12 A. I would caution drawing conclusions from a study like 13 this because it appears to be an ecological study, where 14 you are comparing risks in an area to exposure in 15 an area and that's a thing which can only be done with 16 great caution because you're assuming that everybody in 17 the same area has the same exposure and that is almost 18 certainly not the case. 19 Therefore, drawing these sorts of conclusions can be 20 very dangerous indeed. 21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: That's a point you made previously. 22 A. I would not want to put any weight on this, I'm afraid. 23 DR BUSBY: None at all? 24 A. Well, if I had the opportunity to read it in detail 25 I might find some interesting points. But on the face</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 150</p>	<p>1 A. I disagree, I'm afraid, because the LSS does have 2 individual dose estimates -- 3 DR BUSBY: How were they obtained? How were the individual 4 dose estimates obtained? 5 A. My understanding is they were obtained by using a model 6 and on information gleaned from individuals at interview 7 when the study was set up. 8 Q. Yes, but the model, was it not -- was it not true that 9 the model was based essentially on the distance the 10 individual was from the hypocentre as Mr ter Haar 11 suggested to you earlier? 12 A. But importantly also on shielding and it's more complex 13 than that, most certainly. 14 Q. But it is still an ecological model, is it not? 15 A. No, I disagree because there are individual personal 16 dose measurements. 17 Q. There were no dose measurements, Dr Haylock. 18 A. Well, calculated doses on an individual basis, not on 19 assigning a particular dose to everybody who was in 20 a particular area. That does not happen. 21 Q. As I understand it that's exactly what they did and then 22 later on they modified it with various shielding 23 co-efficients on the basis of questionnaires but the 24 initial dose was defined in terms of distance from the 25 hypocentre.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 152</p>

<p>1 A. But we are not using the initial doses. We're using 2 three iterations further down the line in terms of the 3 DSO2 dosimetry system which has been refined and 4 evaluated over a period of time. 5 Q. Professor Sawada was involved in actually building up 6 the DSO2 system and we do know that the way in which it 7 works is that essentially the doses were based on the 8 distance of the person and then that was modified by 9 shielding, so essentially the main -- nobody wore 10 dosimeters, did they? 11 A. No, definitely not. 12 Q. So all of this was done retrospectively on the basis of 13 two major components. One is how far they were and this 14 was carried out on the basis of Nevada test site 15 measurements with dosimeters with a similar bomb. Do 16 you agree with that? 17 A. I don't have any personal knowledge of that, but -- 18 Q. Then what they did was they built concrete walls and 19 they put dosimeters behind concrete walls and so 20 therefore they got various shielding of components and 21 then refined the dosimetry to the point where we have it 22 today. But the essential dosimetry was based on 23 distance and then it was refined afterwards. Would you 24 agree with that? 25 A. Yes, and shielding as well.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 153</p>	<p>1 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Do you know this one? 2 A. I have seen it before, yes, my Lord. 3 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right, okay. Hold fire then. Yes. He 4 has seen it before. 5 DR BUSBY: Are you familiar with the work of Dr Canu? 6 A. Only as a result of this -- 7 Q. This particular one? 8 A. Yes. 9 Q. She's written a whole series of papers on this issue. 10 A. Yes. 11 Q. Well, I won't go on and on about it. It's just one more 12 piece of evidence that there are -- 13 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: What conclusion do you want to put to the 14 witness to comment on? 15 DR BUSBY: Do you agree that this paper and maybe the other 16 ones you've seen -- 17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Deal with this paper. 18 DR BUSBY: -- suggests that there is an anomalous risk from 19 exposure to uranium and in this case we're talking about 20 French uranium workers, in this case there is an excess 21 risk of -- 22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Just pause there. The question is, 23 I think: do you agree with the authors of this paper 24 that there is an anomalous risk to radiation in this 25 study of French uranium workers?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 155</p>
<p>1 Q. So it is essentially, it is -- although it's maybe a bit 2 more sophisticated it is what you call an ecological 3 study? 4 A. But each individual as I understand it reported where 5 they were at the time of the bomb so that each 6 individual would have an individual dose measurement. 7 We're not talking about basing individual measurements 8 on an average of a particular area. So I still maintain 9 they are individual measurements and not measurements 10 defined on an area basis. 11 Q. Well, I think that's as far as I can take that one. 12 Let's just go to another one of these uranium 13 studies which is SB6/85. 14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So we can put volume 7 away, I hope, and 15 take out volume 6. 16 DR BUSBY: There are two papers in this tab. I am 17 interested in the Canu 2008 one. 18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I think I only have one. Anyway, Canu, 19 that's what we have, "Characterisation of protracted 20 low-level exposure to uranium in the workplace"? 21 DR BUSBY: Yes. 22 MS BUSBY: Just behind it is a second paper, I think, 23 my Lord. 24 DR BUSBY: It's the one that you mentioned, my Lord. That's 25 the one that I am interested in. (Pause)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 154</p>	<p>1 DR BUSBY: Yes. 2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: That's the question. 3 A. There does appear to be an elevated risk. My concern 4 about this paper is that it's not based upon what 5 I would say proper dose measurements. It's based upon 6 what we call a job exposure matrix system and 7 a categorical quantification of dose, so not real 8 measurements of dose. So I would say that it's 9 potentially hypothesis-generating but certainly not any 10 more than that. 11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I missed the first part. I have: "My 12 concern is the quantity of dose ..." 13 A. It's not a numerical measure of dose, my Lord. It's 14 based upon what we call a job exposure matrix system 15 whereby we look at what jobs people do -- 16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Job exposure? 17 A. -- and the exposure a typical worker might have and then 18 those are applied to other workers and therefore we have 19 that sort of system. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So the work proceeds on a hypothesis of 21 what a particular job function might be exposed to? 22 A. Yes. I think if I remember correctly we're talking 23 about low, medium or high exposure but there's no 24 indication that this is related -- I do not believe 25 there is anything as sophisticated as taking into</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 156</p>

<p>1 account the duration of exposure, the duration of 2 employment and things like that in the exposure. So at 3 the best I would categorise it as 4 a hypothesis-generating study. 5 DR BUSBY: So this is another hypothesis-generating study 6 and the hypothesis is that uranium might be anomalously 7 genotoxic, is that correct? That would be the 8 hypothesis that it's generating? 9 A. No, it's simply a hypothesis that you are seeing excess 10 risk in particular groups exposed to particular levels. 11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I think if you go to page 276, just 12 navigating through this paper of which I have absolutely 13 no knowledge, do you see there's a heading "Conclusion"? 14 A. Uh-huh. 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Do you want to just read that? (Pause) 16 Okay, is there anything else you want to say about 17 this paper? 18 A. Only that the authors do recommend at the end that 19 further investigation is required and that this is not 20 a definitive study by any stretch of the imagination. 21 I believe that is actually beginning to happen now, 22 my Lord. 23 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. Any other questions you want to 24 pose about this paper, Dr Busby? 25 DR BUSBY: Well, I just wanted to ask if you thought that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 157</p>	<p>1 going to put to this witness this afternoon, can you 2 make sure he is alerted to them so that if you want him 3 to refresh his memory from them over the break you can 4 pass that information on to Mr Heppinstall. 5 I would have expected by 4.30 that you would have 6 made very substantial progress in your 7 cross-examination. If you haven't concluded I am going 8 to indicate now that you've got to conclude by 9 11 o'clock tomorrow if we start at 10. Yes? 10 DR BUSBY: I can do that, my Lord. I think I'll possibly 11 not conclude today. 12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, I'm just trying to set some 13 parameters and then that would enable any 14 re-examination, I hope, within reason, and anything else 15 that we need to discuss before one o'clock. Yes? 16 DR BUSBY: Yes. 17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: That's just some timing. So see how far 18 we get. Obviously the more the witness is alerted to 19 these papers you may get a better quality answer. 20 DR BUSBY: Thank you, my Lord. 21 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Half past then. The same rules apply. 22 (3.15 pm) 23 (A short break) 24 (3.30 pm) 25 MR HEPPINSTALL: My Lord, I only rise at this stage perhaps</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 159</p>
<p>1 the authors of this paper, who worked differently for 2 Oakridge in Tennessee and for the French nuclear 3 industry, would be accepted to be, if you like, 4 acceptable scientific -- 5 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Are they credible experts in this -- 6 A. The only one I know personally is Margot Tirmarche, and 7 I believe she would be considered as a suitably expert 8 person. I don't know the others. 9 DR BUSBY: So Dr Haylock, they obviously thought there might 10 be a problem and that all of these hypotheses we have 11 been looking at -- 12 A. Like said, this is the kind of -- 13 Q. -- were sufficiently generated for them to get -- 14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right, it's a hypothesis -- 15 A. This is a hypothesis-generating study, yes. 16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I think that will probably do on that 17 topic. 18 DR BUSBY: Well, we were just going to -- I think Dr Haylock 19 has already admitted that there is a DoReMi study -- 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: On this paper, yes? 21 DR BUSBY: On this paper, yes. 22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: We are going to take a break. Take 23 a seat for a moment. We'll come back at half past. 24 Now, we will carry on this afternoon until 4.30. If 25 you know there are epidemiological papers that you are</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 158</p>	<p>1 through you to enquire of Dr Haylock how far he has got 2 with the list. It was quite a long list that was handed 3 to him. I'm told that it's to the end of the 4 cross-examination, not to the end of the day, and it 5 looks to me like it fills a whole page of A4. 6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, it's too little, too late, isn't 7 it, or too much, too late? 8 MR HEPPINSTALL: Can you indicate which ones you've read in 9 the last 15 minutes so Dr Busby knows? 10 A. I know about half of these, I suppose. 11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: All right. We'll just see how we go. 12 I think you are going to be back tomorrow morning. 13 Right. 14 DR BUSBY: Well, we talked about various uranium 15 hypotheses-generating studies and that took me to -- 16 I was about to show you -- I was about to go to SB7/112 17 and ask some questions about this. 18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So we are back to SB7 again. 19 DR BUSBY: This is DoReMi, my Lord. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 21 DR BUSBY: You are familiar with this document? 22 A. I am. 23 Q. So what I want to ask you about this is whether you 24 think that, if you like, the risk community, the 25 radiation risk community, has now concluded that it's</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 160</p>

<p>1 possible that there may be some anomalous radiogenetic 2 effects or radiological effects from uranium which are 3 not currently included in the ICRP model, if we can call 4 it that? 5 Is that a fair -- 6 A. I would say -- 7 Q. You don't think so? 8 A. No, I would say that this particular document proposes 9 a study that would provide more information on the 10 relative risks of uranium exposure in comparison to 11 external gamma exposure. It has the biological and 12 statistical aspects to look at a range of things. 13 I wouldn't say it specifically says anything about 14 genotoxicity. It's looking at a range of different -- 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: It is a document proposing a study rather 16 than drawing a conclusion on existing evidence. 17 A. It is proposing a study. It is not a study in itself. 18 It is saying: is a study possible? 19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 20 A. I believe it concludes it is possible. 21 DR BUSBY: I think my question is: why are they doing it 22 now? 23 A. Because we would like more information, more direct 24 evidence, for the difference, if there is one, in the 25 risk from external gamma exposure in comparison to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 161</p>	<p>1 together to look at: was it even feasible to do a study 2 to try and give us more information? 3 Q. So the fact that this was all done is quite coincidental 4 and nothing to do with any of these 5 hypothesis-generating studies that I drew attention to? 6 A. It may well be, it may not. I don't know. I was not 7 part of that high level group that decided the direction 8 of European research into the future. 9 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So as I understand your answer, for some 10 reason you are not party to the idea of whether a study 11 was considered to be a relevant inquiry, and they then 12 convened a group to see whether such a study was 13 possible? 14 A. Well, the European Commission DoReMi offered funding for 15 proposals, and I was party to the group which put 16 forward this proposal which said: we would like to see 17 if a uranium study is possible. 18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. But why were you asking the 19 question whether a uranium study was possible? 20 A. Because we know that both miners and radiation workers 21 in the UK, and other European countries for that matter, 22 are exposed to uranium and the current assumption is 23 that we can use this factor of 20 to translate the risk 24 from alpha to equivalent risk to gamma from uranium. 25 But we know that that value of 20, it's an overall</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 163</p>
<p>1 internal exposures such as uranium to which 2 occupationally exposed people receive exposures. 3 We currently rely on the factor of 20 to relate 4 alpha radiation to gamma. This sort of study would 5 provide direct evidence, at least the statistical part 6 of it would provide direct evidence as to whether that 7 was correct or whether there were grounds to look 8 elsewhere or reject it. 9 Q. Would you agree that the decision to go down this route 10 to put a lot of money into this -- and let's be clear 11 it's an awful lot of money going into this. 12 A. I thought it wasn't an awful lot of money. I wish it 13 was. 14 Q. Are you yourself involved in this research? 15 A. Yes, I wrote part of this document. 16 Q. You wrote part of the document, yes. 17 So why did you decide to -- why did the group, this 18 DoReMi group, why did they decide to look at uranium in 19 particular? 20 A. Because there was a high level expert group a few years 21 prior which looked at the areas that the European 22 Commission would like to fund research on, going up to 23 the next 20-odd years, and that group decided that this 24 was an area they would like more evidence on. 25 That is why this group that I was part of was put</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 162</p>	<p>1 value used for all alpha emitters but obviously the 2 Commission here is seeking additional evidence as to 3 whether that value is appropriate or whether this sort 4 of study might provide evidence that a different value 5 would be better. 6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. So the inquiry is testing the 7 hypothesis as to the way you assess alpha risk from 8 gamma risk? 9 A. Yes, it's saying: is this value of 20 that we use 10 appropriate or could there be a better value? 11 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. 12 DR BUSBY: A better value for uranium? 13 A. For uranium. 14 Q. Not just for alpha emitters but for uranium? 15 A. We're focusing on uranium here, yes. 16 Q. Is this possibly a concession or at least an attempt to 17 try and see if that value is wrong, the value you use 18 now? 19 A. Yes, absolutely. 20 Q. So it might be wrong? 21 A. It might be wrong, indeed, but we won't know until we 22 look at some evidence. 23 Q. Of course, but you know that the law relating to these 24 appeals has to do with reasonable doubt? 25 A. (Witness shrugged).</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 164</p>

<p>1 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Don't worry about the law. 2 A. The value of 20 that we use currently is the best value 3 that we have on the basis of the evidence that we have 4 at the minute. We would always like more evidence. 5 This was a project to try and provide more evidence, to 6 see if more evidence was feasible. 7 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So this was submitted March 2015? 8 A. Yes. 9 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Is it going forward, do we know? 10 A. I am myself at this very time working with some of these 11 other people here to put forward a proposal to the 12 current corps from the European Union to do this very 13 study. 14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right, so you put this one in but you 15 have to go back and knock on some door again? 16 A. Yes. We are asking for 5 million euros to do the work 17 but the Commission will have to decide whether they 18 would like us to or not. 19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So we don't know if it's going to happen 20 and if it does happen it will take some years 21 presumably. 22 A. The project we are planning will take three years. 23 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. The chances are we would have 24 written our determination by then. 25 Okay, thank you.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 165</p>	<p>1 in this, that as the cost of more comprehensive and 2 wide-ranging assays goes down we can afford to do more 3 of them in these sorts of studies. 4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes, all right. 5 DR BUSBY: So I am going to ask you about epidemiology. 6 This is to do with this. So it's not just a digression. 7 In epidemiology do we not normally go from the 8 effects to the cause? For example, in public health if 9 you had a Chinese restaurant and people suddenly started 10 to get ill you would start with the illness and then you 11 would go and see what the cause was, is that right? 12 A. It sounds plausible. 13 Q. That's the normal epidemiological approach. 14 In this case, though, it's not been done like that. 15 What's happening here is that we're going from the 16 effect to the cause, so in other words the doses we use, 17 to decide whether the effect is possible; is that 18 reasonable? 19 A. That sounds -- yes. We only have limited information 20 and therefore we are basing our study on what 21 information we do have. 22 Q. So what you are doing is you are comparing acutely 23 exposed Japanese survivors exposed to high levels of 24 external radiation and you are using that information to 25 decide whether or not people who are chronically exposed</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 167</p>
<p>1 DR BUSBY: We've discussed in some way a lot of studies 2 which suggest anomalous genotoxicity from uranium and 3 therefore we should at least provisionally think there 4 may be a causal relation and this is why this study is 5 being undertaken? 6 A. The study that this study proposes might reveal 7 something, indeed, but I am not a biologist to know 8 about genotoxicity of uranium. 9 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Page 58 and 59 appear to be the 10 conclusions. 11 A. Mm. 12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Is that a relevant place to search for 13 what you are telling us all about? 14 A. To a certain degree, my Lord. 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: But you've added to that in your -- 16 A. Again the technology for looking at the biological 17 aspects of radiation exposure is moving on abound and 18 I believe that some of the suggestions have been adapted 19 in the light of new and recent developments. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: In the light of what? 21 A. New developments. For example, when we were talking 22 about -- Professor Thomas talked about mFISH being 23 superseded by whole genome analysis. 24 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 25 A. And I believe that maybe that sort of thing is occurring</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 166</p>	<p>1 to uranium internally can or cannot have a real effect 2 as a result -- a causal effect. That's essentially what 3 you are doing, isn't it? 4 A. No, these studies would have subgroups within them of 5 workers who are -- or mainly workers who are only 6 exposed to external gamma radiation. They will provide 7 a separate estimate of the risk from external gamma with 8 which we can compare the risk we might see from uranium 9 in the same overall group. So we're not having to use 10 a separate population, a Japanese population, to 11 estimate our excess probability of risk from gamma 12 radiation. We've got within the same overall population 13 of workers. 14 In the UK we have many thousands of radiation 15 workers over the years and some have been exposed to 16 just gamma, some have been exposed to gamma and other 17 radionuclides. A few have only been exposed to things 18 like uranium, for example, Springfields plant in the UK. 19 And so we are able to get estimates of both uranium and 20 gamma from essentially the same overall population of 21 workers. So we're not doing what you are suggesting, 22 going to the Japanese and -- 23 Q. But the ICRP risk model is not predicated on any study 24 of internally exposed uranium workers at Springfields; 25 is that right?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 168</p>

<p>1 A. No. 2 Q. Sorry, I wasn't talking about DoReMi there. My 3 daughter ... 4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. 5 DR BUSBY: So I mean, I think my point is by implication 6 here are we not comparing apples and oranges? You know, 7 if you like nuclear workers externally exposed -- 8 agreed -- and people like Hiroshima survivors, 9 externally exposed -- agreed -- but we're comparing 10 these people with chronic internal exposure to uranium 11 in the Namibian miners, in the Gulf War veterans, in the 12 studies by Guseva Canu, and in the whole range of 13 studies I put to you, it's a different kind of exposure. 14 It is an internal exposure to uranium compared with a 15 dose which is devised on the basis of external 16 radiation? 17 A. Which is why this sort of study that is just looking 18 within UK workers -- sorry, European workers, shall we 19 say? It's going to be UK, French and -- 20 Q. Uranium workers. 21 A. It's why looking at just that population is a good idea. 22 It avoids the problems of having gamma estimated in one 23 population and uranium estimated in another population. 24 As you pointed out, I don't believe that the lifespan 25 study tells us anything about internal exposures. We</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 169</p>	<p>1 A. Yes. 2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Is there an epidemiological aspect to 3 these papers that you can help us with? 4 A. Not a lot, my Lord. 5 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So it's all primary biological modelling? 6 A. Mostly, and I would point out that the numbers are again 7 very small in this. 8 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 9 A. It's -- 10 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, I'm not sure -- but I don't know -- 11 that this paper is put forward as an epidemiological 12 paper as opposed -- 13 A. I wouldn't have said it was in the first instance. It 14 might use some epidemiological techniques and there is 15 a dose response relationship there I can see but 16 primarily I don't believe it is. 17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So it's an inquiry into a particular 18 group of servicemen. 19 Right, well, anyway let's see how we get on. What 20 questions would you like to ask? 21 DR BUSBY: Do you agree that this study is a significant 22 piece of evidence that the New Zealand veterans, at any 23 event, were exposed to a genotoxic agent, something that 24 caused chromosome aberration? 25 A. I'm not prepared to comment on that. I would need to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 171</p>
<p>1 are using this value of 20 to look at the ratio of the 2 harm from alpha to gamma and that's derived separately. 3 Q. Thank you, yes. Good. 4 Now we saw a number of studies which showed excess 5 risk for chromosome aberrations and congenital disease 6 after internal uranium exposure, or partly in some cases 7 internal uranium exposure but also possibly other 8 exposures which you categorised as 9 hypothesis-generating. 10 Can I now take you to the Rowland studies of the 11 New Zealand veterans which is SB7/123. 12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Now, behind tab 123, I believe -- are you 13 there? 14 A. I am, my Lord. 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You should have original article, Wahab, 16 Nickless, et cetera, and Rowland, and then five pages in 17 do you have a second document in the tab, a cytogenetic 18 analysis? 19 A. I do. 20 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. So far, so good. Yes. Are you 21 familiar with these papers? 22 A. I have glanced at the first one but not the second. 23 DR BUSBY: Your -- 24 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So you know from the first one what the 25 content is?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 170</p>	<p>1 read it in detail. I'm sorry. 2 Q. All right. 3 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: If you did read it in detail, would you 4 be able to comment? 5 A. I might well be able to, yes, my Lord. 6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. Well, I think this is one that 7 I would like you to read overnight, please. 8 A. Okay, I'll do that. 9 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I think it's probably best to read this 10 one and the second document in the tab as well, because 11 I think that gives more information. It may be there is 12 some other information in other documents that 13 a cautious approach would direct you to. But I'm 14 sorry -- if you are able to read it tonight we may want 15 to turn to this theme tomorrow. 16 Thank you. 17 A. I will try. 18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 19 DR BUSBY: We'll leave that aside and go to something that 20 is more in your line of work, which is the -- hang on -- 21 the linearity of the dose response curve. The ICRP has 22 this LNT model in which a line is drawn through all the 23 data points as you go through the origin -- that's 24 correct -- and that's called the linear no threshold 25 model.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 172</p>

<p>1 Now, can I first take you to -- before I do so, can 2 we agree that cancer is essentially -- it starts as 3 a genetic disease, that it's a mutagen-driven effect? 4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Are you able to assist us on this? 5 A. That's my understanding but only as a layman, my Lord. 6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: He has no expertise upon it. I think 7 he's told us that already, but yes? 8 DR BUSBY: So can I take you to Professor Schmitz 9 Feuerhake's genetic paper, SB6/89. This is also as 10 an epidemiologist because we discussed -- we tried to 11 discuss this paper with Professor Thomas but she made 12 various remarks about it and essentially asked us to 13 talk to you about it as an epidemiologist, which she 14 said she wasn't. 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Do you have that? 16 A. I have the paper, my Lord. But I am not familiar with 17 it. 18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. 19 DR BUSBY: Have you read this paper? 20 A. No, I'm afraid I haven't. 21 Q. We asked Professor Thomas to -- 22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I don't think it's got through that this 23 witness -- do you want -- this is a paper of some 24 significance to your cross-examination, Dr Busby? 25 DR BUSBY: Yes, it is.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 173</p>	<p>1 What exactly is the basis of the linear no threshold 2 response? Why do you think they adopt it? Do you have 3 any position on that? 4 A. It represents the simplest model which best fits the 5 data. 6 Q. But is that really true? Is there -- 7 A. I believe so. 8 Q. -- no other model that fits the data better? 9 A. We can compare models statistically and see how well 10 they fit in comparison to each other and the linear no 11 threshold represents the simplest of those models. 12 Q. What does it mean by "model" in this context? 13 A. So -- 14 Q. May -- 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Hang on. Do you want an answer to the 16 question? 17 DR BUSBY: I thought he was huffing and puffing a bit, 18 my Lord. I thought it might make it easier. 19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: The thing is if you are going to ask 20 a question, give him a chance to respond before you move 21 on to the next one. Are you able to answer that 22 question? 23 A. I can try, my Lord. 24 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. 25 A. Okay, so if we imagine we have our two axes, our dose</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 175</p>
<p>1 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Shall we get him to read that overnight 2 and return to it tomorrow morning? 3 DR BUSBY: Yes, we could. 4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Would that be -- 5 A. I'll do my best, my Lord. 6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Without overdoing it, yes. This paper 7 has emerged more than once in the course of this 8 hearing. So if you are able to offer any assistance 9 we'd like to know what it is. 10 DR BUSBY: It is mainly I want to ask you about your expert 11 view of it as an epidemiologist. There were some 12 epidemiological points raised by Professor Thomas which 13 she said that she would hope you might be able to give 14 more -- 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So you want to ask this witness to 16 comment upon the epidemiology used in the construction 17 of this paper, yes? 18 DR BUSBY: Essentially yes, my Lord, yes. 19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right. 20 Thank you. Shall we pass over that one then? Where 21 else did you want to go? 22 DR BUSBY: So one thing that I can put to you which is in 23 this paper which I could ask you about anyway with 24 regard to the -- we can go along with this question of 25 the linear no threshold response.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 174</p>	<p>1 across the bottom and our risk up the side. We have 2 data plotted on our graph. We would like to determine 3 the best fitting relationship to that data that best 4 describes it. So what we would do is let's say we fit 5 a -- choose a relationship we are going to try first. 6 Let's call it the linear relationship. So effectively 7 what we're doing is sticking a drawing pin with a piece 8 of string in in the bottom left-hand corner at 00 and 9 moving our line until we find where the string would go 10 to best describe the data. 11 Now we do that in terms of in a computer. And in 12 order to find the best position on the line we have 13 essentially a quality a fit function, we have a 14 mathematical function which describes how well that 15 straight line describes the data. 16 The computer will maximise that function, so find 17 the straight line which best fits the data. So we can 18 do that and get an answer to that question. 19 We would then choose a different function -- call it 20 linear quadratic -- so we essentially have some sort of 21 curved line and we would repeat the process. We would 22 choose the parameters of that function so that it 23 maximises this quality of fit function. 24 And what we would expect to see is that the quality 25 fit function, the quality fit value of the more</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 176</p>

1 complicated function is a bit better. So the more --
 2 the linear quadratic which has more parameters fits the
 3 data slightly better. But the question is: does it fit
 4 to the data sufficiently more betterer (sic) than the
 5 linear given the fact it's got an extra parameter? So
 6 we look at the difference in the quality of fit function
 7 and refer that to a statistical distribution and come
 8 out with a P value which represents how much better the
 9 more complicated function fits the data than the simpler
 10 function. If it fits it sufficiently more better then
 11 we would adopt that in preference to the simpler
 12 function. If not, we would stick with the simpler
 13 function.

14 That process can be repeated many times with as many
 15 different functions as you like and that's essentially
 16 what we do until we've exhausted all the potential
 17 functions and find what we consider to be "the best".

18 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Am I on the right lines when I think
 19 I seem to have read somewhere that the papers show other
 20 models, such as a minimum threshold or a curved line
 21 response, have in the past been examined as well?

22 A. Yes, yes. The point is that you could fit a model with
 23 a threshold but it would have an extra parameter in it
 24 but it would have to be seen to be fitting significantly
 25 better to be worthwhile having that in. If it doesn't

Page 177

1 do that, we stick with the simpler model.

2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: So a simpler model unless a more
 3 complicated model is significantly better --

4 A. Yes, that's right, my Lord.

5 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: -- in fitting the data?

6 A. To date we find that essentially the linear model for
 7 the low dose region fits best.

8 DR BUSBY: But the best model would be one where you just
 9 took a piece of string and you stuck a load of pins in
 10 the data points and you wound the string around the data
 11 points, wouldn't it? That would be a much more accurate
 12 model?

13 A. Indeed, if we had a parameter in the model for each item
 14 of data it would fit perfectly.

15 Q. It would be a difficult mathematical model to construct
 16 but it would do it?

17 A. It would perfectly represent the set of data you have
 18 but would be useless for predicting risk in other
 19 populations.

20 Q. You could, for instance, apply a version of that which
 21 is called a low S model, a local regression model?

22 A. There are various different types of regression like
 23 that, yes.

24 Q. They get closer and closer to the string around the data
 25 points is my point.

Page 178

1 A. As I said, there are different ways you can fit the
 2 model. There are variations.

3 Q. I think what I am getting at is that in order to do
 4 this, in order for the ICRP to do this or for you to do
 5 this or for all these various models to be fitted,
 6 somebody has to decide on a range of models that seems
 7 plausible; is that not right?

8 A. That is correct.

9 Q. Nobody decides on a model that they think is
 10 implausible.

11 A. Obviously not.

12 Q. Why would they?

13 A. Indeed.

14 Q. So they have a preconceived notion of various things to
 15 do with what happens when radiation increases?

16 A. But I think it's clear if you look at the data from
 17 a lot of these studies they are plotting -- the point of
 18 the data gives you an idea of models that you think are
 19 likely to fit well and models that are not.

20 Q. One of which could have been the spring around the data
 21 points model?

22 A. Well, that would always be a good fit --

23 Q. The best fit, in fact?

24 A. -- to that specific set of data, but it would not be
 25 good for predicting risks in other populations. That's

Page 179

1 why I say that in terms of when we're doing the fitting
 2 process in order to add an extra parameter the model has
 3 to fit statistically significantly better than the
 4 simpler model.

5 Q. In all these models it's assumed -- and this is part of
 6 the model approach -- it must be assumed that there is
 7 a monotonic increase in effect with dose; that is to say
 8 the more dose, the more effect. It doesn't have to be
 9 more effect linearly, it could be more effect in all
 10 sorts of ways, but there is always more effect. Is that
 11 right?

12 A. It doesn't have to be, no. You could have a quadratic
 13 relationship where it does that sort of shape.

14 Q. Do you know of any model that's attempted to be fitted
 15 like that?

16 A. No, because that doesn't fit that sort of data well.

17 Q. Well, let's just look at some of the things that we are
 18 going to talk about tomorrow in terms of the effects of
 19 genetic damage causing congenital malformations.

20 Now with cancer there are lots of problems because
 21 it takes a long time, do you agree, between the exposure
 22 and the manifestation of the disease and lots of things
 23 can happen in between, so that kind of epidemiology is
 24 rather more tricky, would you agree?

25 A. We recommend when we're talking about leukaemia that it

Page 180

<p>1 is likely to occur no sooner than two years after 2 exposure and potentially up to certainly 25 and maybe 3 even 40 and in fact the latest indications of the 4 lifespan study are that it may even be longer than that 5 as well. For solid cancers, the sort of lowest estimate 6 we have is five years, and my preference is to go for 7 ten years to be the shortest period of time. But then 8 cancers could occur from then any time during the rest 9 of the persons's lifetime.</p> <p>10 Q. Lots of other things can happen between the exposure and 11 then?</p> <p>12 A. Absolutely.</p> <p>13 Q. Lots of control-confounding possibilities?</p> <p>14 A. If you're a smoker or if you happen to be a sky diver 15 you might find --</p> <p>16 Q. Yes, but with regard to congenital malformation which 17 occurs in people who have been exposed to radiation that 18 occurs pretty soon after the exposure, doesn't it? It's 19 not a long gap?</p> <p>20 A. I don't know the answer to that question.</p> <p>21 Q. No.</p> <p>22 Well, I just want to take you through this linear 23 dose response for congenital malformation because 24 earlier you agreed that the ICRP does actually provide 25 a risk factor for heritable damage, a doubling dose?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 181</p>	<p>1 Q. Now at some point you get a miscarriage or the child 2 dies in the womb and there's an abortion and so the baby 3 is not born and there's no effect; would you agree with 4 that?</p> <p>5 A. It might well be the case.</p> <p>6 Q. In other words, it's not a linear no threshold, it's a 7 linear -- it goes up and then it will come down again, 8 will it not?</p> <p>9 A. It might do.</p> <p>10 Q. So if you fitted -- if you didn't know that that was the 11 case and you were trying to investigate, say, for the 12 ICRP or in order to provide a paper that might inform 13 this area, you found that there was no increase after 14 a certain dose and you drew a straight line through it, 15 the line would be wrong, wouldn't it, because it would 16 take into consideration something that couldn't exist? 17 As a mathematician now I am asking you.</p> <p>18 A. As a mathematician, possible.</p> <p>19 Q. Yes.</p> <p>20 So I think what I am getting at is to ask you 21 whether you think it's possible that the linear no 22 threshold dose response might not be the correct model 23 to apply to the data points.</p> <p>24 A. For congenital abnormalities?</p> <p>25 Q. Certainly for congenital abnormalities but for cancer as</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 183</p>
<p>1 A. It does, yes.</p> <p>2 Q. And that the assumption again is that there's no safe 3 dose and then it continues in a linear way, would you 4 agree?</p> <p>5 A. I must admit I can't recall off the top of my head.</p> <p>6 Q. Never mind.</p> <p>7 So let's just imagine the increasing exposure of 8 some parent and then the sperm and the egg and then the 9 fertilised egg in the womb and then all the way up 10 through to the child that is born with the congenital 11 malformation.</p> <p>12 A. Mm-hm.</p> <p>13 Q. Now, as we increase the dose from zero, would you agree 14 that the effect would increase?</p> <p>15 A. It seems plausible. I must admit it's not something 16 I've studied in detail. It's not my particular 17 speciality.</p> <p>18 Q. I just want to go through this thought experiment with 19 you. So then if you increase the dose even more then 20 you might have more of an effect -- increasing the dose 21 you get more and more effect; yes?</p> <p>22 A. It's possible. As I said, I'm not a particular expert.</p> <p>23 Q. So we have a monotonically increasing effect with dose 24 here from zero?</p> <p>25 A. Possibly.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 182</p>	<p>1 well.</p> <p>2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Deal with congenital abnormalities first, 3 if you can.</p> <p>4 DR BUSBY: Congenital malformations.</p> <p>5 A. I believe the evidence is quite poor on this subject at 6 the moment. I'm not even sure ICRP does fit a linear 7 dose response relationship to congenital abnormalities. 8 As far as I'm aware they talked about a risk of 1 in 500 9 live births per -- in the first two generations. I'm 10 not sure that they even do put such a linear dose 11 response on.</p> <p>12 So I'm afraid I'm not sure I agree with you.</p> <p>13 Q. Well, okay.</p> <p>14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Then do you want an answer about cancer?</p> <p>15 DR BUSBY: Well, I was going to -- before you answer about 16 cancer I was going to ask you if you thought maybe the 17 similar sort over effect -- we've heard from Mr Hallard 18 about hot particles and about high doses to cells and so 19 on. He says that above a certain dose the cells are 20 killed and therefore they can't become cancer.</p> <p>21 So my question to you, is it possible that that also 22 is a component of an understanding of cancer? In other 23 words, at high doses to cells there would be a reduction 24 in effect at some point?</p> <p>25 A. I wouldn't say there would be -- in terms of when you're</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 184</p>

<p>1 talking about exposure of a whole body we don't see the 2 stochastic effects, late effects, we don't see 3 a reduction and we do see in the lifespan study 4 a plateauing of risk above very high doses, which we do 5 ascribe to cell killing. But I wouldn't say it 6 decreases, no. 7 Q. I mean, if we look at the nuclear worker studies, for 8 example, which I'm sure you're very familiar with, are 9 they not -- in terms of excess relative risk per unit 10 dose, are not the excess relative risk per unit dose 11 highest at the lowest doses? 12 A. We don't fit that sort of model, we are fitting 13 a relative risk to the whole dose relationship. We 14 don't compare excess relative risk at the bottom with an 15 excess relative at the top. We are fitting one excess 16 relative risk model to the whole thing -- 17 Q. But this is a decision you've made, isn't it? 18 A. -- is linear at the moment. 19 Q. This is a subjective judgment, though. If we'd have 20 tied a bit of string around it we can just have ignored 21 all the high doses. But the effect at low dose would be 22 higher than the effect at high dose, that's my question. 23 A. But, like I said, we don't do that because it doesn't 24 make sense because then that model would be useless at 25 predicting risk elsewhere.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 185</p>	<p>1 indeed. Although, of course, the uncertainty on the 2 dose -- on the slope -- does increase because we have 3 less powerful data. 4 But there is high consistency between the slope we 5 get just using the low doses and the slope we get using 6 all the doses. 7 Q. Well, I want to actually follow this up by going to the 8 Cardis 2005 -- 9 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You don't want to ask about cancers, 10 I take it. 11 DR BUSBY: This is about cancer, my Lord. I take his 12 answer, but I think we ought to look at some data. 13 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Do you want to ask him first a general 14 question about whether the LNT model might not be the 15 correct model for cancers, or do you not? 16 DR BUSBY: I thought he had answered that. 17 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: No, he hadn't. You had been asking about 18 other things, as I understand it. I asked you whether 19 you wanted to deal with cancer and you said you wanted 20 to continue with genetic -- 21 DR BUSBY: We were just talking about cancer just now, 22 my Lord. But, anyway, yes, then I will ask you that 23 question, since it appears that you haven't answered it. 24 Is that do you believe that the linear no threshold 25 model is an accurate representation of the effects of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 187</p>
<p>1 Q. Well, it would be jolly useful for people who got low 2 doses, wouldn't it? 3 A. No, because it's specific to that set of data. The more 4 points you put on that line to make it specific to that 5 set of data the less use it is to predict risk in other 6 situations because it becomes more and more specific to 7 the data you have. 8 Q. Well, let's say you didn't have any data above 20 9 millisieverts. Let's just say that you just didn't. 10 A. Right. 11 Q. And you decided to use the data up to 20 millisieverts 12 to define risk. I think my question is would that risk 13 factor not be much higher than it is if you take the 14 line, using that between the data points where you go to 15 the high doses? 16 A. We actually do, usually as part of our studies -- and 17 I think I put it in one of my responses to one of your 18 questions -- that in the INWORKS project where we were 19 looking at leukaemia risk we do actually fit an excess 20 relative risk linear dose response to the whole dataset, 21 and then we step down, removing the higher doses and 22 only using the lower dose data, and looking at does the 23 linear dose response relationship change when we do 24 that? In fact, for the leukaemia that we saw in the 25 INWORKS paper there, it doesn't, it remains very stable</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 186</p>	<p>1 radiation when we look at cancer effects? 2 A. I believe at a population level it is the best we have 3 on the available data, yes. 4 Q. Bear with me a minute, I am trying to find this paper. 5 I have it written down here but I got a bit wrong footed 6 because we had to leapfrog. 7 Yes, here it is, SB6/68. Would you say that this 8 was an authoritative study? 9 A. Yes. 10 Q. In fact, it is not your own study that you had in your 11 report -- your INWORKS study -- it's a subset of these 12 people, isn't it? 13 A. This is an earlier -- this is based on an earlier set of 14 data. This looks at 15 countries. The INWORKS study 15 takes three of those countries, USA, UK and France, and 16 uses data sets with longer follow-up together. So this 17 had 400,000 workers, I believe. We had only 300,000 in 18 the INWORKS study. 19 But because of the longer follow-up we had more 20 person years and more cancer deaths and instances. So, 21 in a sense, we believe that the later study is more 22 statistically powerful than this. 23 There were also, unfortunately, some problems with 24 the Canadian data in this study, which means that some 25 of the results might well be not as good as they</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 188</p>

<p>1 possibly could be. 2 Q. What was wrong with the Canadian data? 3 A. There was some missing data, as I understand it, there 4 was a subsequent paper published that confirmed this 5 fact that they had missed out people with, if I remember 6 correctly, with a group of people with low doses, that 7 would have skewed the results. I would have to double 8 check on the precise paper, though. 9 So, if you look, it does, somewhere in here -- 10 I would have to look carefully to find it -- it does 11 note that and notes that the overall value of risk 12 changes notably if you take out the dodgy Canadian data. 13 Q. Well, who decided that it was dodgy then? 14 A. The Canadians themselves subsequently published a paper 15 saying that they thought it was. 16 Q. The Canadian study does actually show a higher relative 17 risk, doesn't it? 18 A. I believe so but, as I said, there was problems with the 19 data that I believe invalidated it at the time. 20 Q. It's not that the problems with the data was that it 21 showed a higher relative risk? 22 A. It was missing a proportion of the workers -- 23 Q. It's all right -- 24 A. -- I can refer to the paper, if you like. 25 Q. No, no, it's okay.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 189</p>	<p>1 to table 1 and see the exact numbers here -- the data 2 points themselves appear to show that the risk is quite 3 high at the very lowest doses. 4 In fact, if you take the leukaemia -- take the 5 leukaemia little black circle here, quite close to the 6 origin, and if you go along to the right with it, you 7 find that you have to get to 250 millisieverts before 8 you hit the same level? 9 A. Mm-hm. But I think you'll note that there's a very wide 10 confidence interval on that point. 11 Q. Of course, yes, there's a wide confidence interval that 12 gets larger as you get towards larger doses, but the 13 confidence intervals are smaller at the lower dose, 14 aren't they, because there are more people -- 15 A. In general. But that raised point you are pointing to 16 there, if I can see correctly, leukaemia lymphatic, is 17 quite wide. I believe it extends below the horizontal 18 there. So it would not be seen to be, in itself, 19 statistically significant. 20 Q. But none of these are significant, are they? It's the 21 line that is significant. It's the regression line. 22 A. Yes, the important thing is the regression line. Here 23 we're looking at just comparing small pieces of data in 24 each dose group. 25 Q. I think my point is -- I'll ask you this again -- that</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 191</p>
<p>1 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Canada is mentioned at 404, table 2, risk 2 estimates, and over the page. So whether they explain 3 why. Yes, I think it is at page 405, the first 4 paragraph. Do you see page 405? 5 A. Yes. 6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: First column. If you take up "risk 7 estimates in the two countries with the largest numbers 8 of deaths, a significantly reduced risk received the 9 cohorts" ... 10 A. Yes. They did a bit where they excluded one country at 11 a time, and if we excluded the Canadian data then you 12 ended up with a different level of risk. 13 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. 14 DR BUSBY: Right. Well, the first thing that I want to ask 15 you about this is if we look at table -- no -- figure 1, 16 page 404. If we look at -- well, it's hard to see -- 17 but if you look down at the lines that are drawn through 18 this, the various lines that are drawn through this, 19 would you agree that, although they may be the best 20 regression line, if you were to put the bits of string 21 over the data points you would find quite a high point 22 at low doses, would you not? 23 A. I'm not sure I understand what you mean here. 24 Q. Well, if you take the central estimate, the little 25 circle for leukaemia excluding CLL -- in fact, we can go</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 190</p>	<p>1 the assumption of the regression line is what gives you 2 your significance. Is that right? 3 A. It's one way of doing it, yes. We are looking at -- 4 here we're comparing -- likely they'll have compared 5 a regression line with just a flat line showing no 6 change in risk with dose. 7 Q. Yes, but my point is -- 8 A. The fact is that the -- 9 Q. Sorry, go on. 10 A. -- the fact that the confidence intervals -- the width 11 of the confidence intervals tell you whether that is 12 statistically significant or not. So if the confidence 13 interval dips below the horizontal then that raised line 14 is not different from no risk at all across dose. 15 Q. Well, let me put it this way. Let's say that there was 16 some mechanism which we don't understand which causes 17 a high level of risk at very low doses. But then, at 18 higher doses, it fell back to the normal regression 19 line, if you like, because the cells have been killed 20 or, for some reason which we don't understand but might 21 discover one day, or maybe isn't even true. 22 The choice of the regression line, the choice of the 23 linear no threshold model, would completely ignore that, 24 it would just go straight through it and assume it was 25 an outlier. Is that not right?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 192</p>

<p>1 A. It would go through that, it would ignore it, yes. What 2 we would need to do is to compare the straight line 3 regression line with a line which has some function to 4 describe what you are suggesting in it -- 5 Q. But nobody has done that. 6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Let him answer the question. 7 A. Again, as I said, it would be a matter of statistically 8 comparing the relative fit of those two models to see if 9 the data that you are suggesting at that low point is 10 strong enough to say that your alternative model fits 11 the data better than the linear dose response model. 12 DR BUSBY: But what if there was just -- I mean, even as it 13 is, the confidence intervals, as you pointed out, are 14 pretty large. 15 A. Mm-hm. 16 Q. So it would be quite hard to get statistical 17 significance for such a data point. Nevertheless, it 18 would not necessarily be -- it would not necessarily be 19 correct to dismiss it on the basis of a preconceived 20 notion about what the dose response should be. That's 21 my point. 22 Does that make sense? 23 A. I can see it makes sense, yes. I mean, you could fit, 24 as I say, you fit any relationship you like, but we are 25 using the dataset as a whole dataset and trying to</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 193</p>	<p>1 causation if you use the excess relative risk at low 2 dose than if you took the excess relative risk from the 3 gradient of the line. 4 A. Yes, but that's not what the data supports, the data 5 does not support that. 6 Q. Well, let's look at the data and see if it does support 7 that, shall we? Let's look at table 1. Let's look at 8 solid cancers. If we look at table 1 and we go -- this 9 is a table where, unlike in your INWORKS paper and in 10 most of these papers, the actual numbers are not given, 11 you give a graph. We'll come to that as well because 12 I have some comments about the graph. 13 But, before we go there, let's look at this. 14 We're looking at solid cancer. So there are 4,770 15 solid cancers in these 1,993 nuclear workers. Yes? 16 That's the second column, it says "cause of death, solid 17 cancer, number 4770". 18 A. Yes. 19 Q. There we have "observed" and "expected". We see that in 20 the less than 5 group, observed and expected, there are 21 fewer observed than was expected by some small amount. 22 A. Mm-hm. 23 Q. But then if we go to the next group, which is 5 to 10 24 millisieverts, it goes up - 512 over 493. So that is 25 an increase, is it not?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 195</p>
<p>1 describe the best relationship overall. 2 The statistical power of the data at the bottom end, 3 on its own, is relatively low. But if there were 4 extremely high risks at low doses like that then I would 5 expect you to actually be able to see that. But 6 obviously it doesn't appear to be the case. 7 Q. Well, they wouldn't be extremely high risks, would they, 8 not in absolute high terms, but they would be extremely 9 high risks in terms of the excess relative risk per 10 sievert? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. We can distinguish between those two things. 13 So, in other words, let's say there is a, I don't 14 know, say a 5 per cent excess risk, or let's say 15 10 per cent excess risk at a dose of 20 millisieverts, 16 for example. Just as a matter of argument here. Then 17 we can convert that into an excess relative risk per 18 sievert by multiplying by 50. Is that correct? That's 19 how it's done? 20 A. Mm-hm. 21 Q. So if that were real, if there were such a thing, and 22 you were to then come along and put that excess relative 23 risk per sievert into your probability of causation 24 calculation -- and we're going to come to that at some 25 point -- you would get a much higher probability of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 194</p>	<p>1 A. It is. 2 Q. Well, if that were real -- and I know you are going to 3 say, well, this is all (inaudible) of chance and so 4 forth -- but if it were not, if it were real, and if you 5 go down those columns -- and I am not going to do it now 6 because it will take all day -- you will find many many 7 cases where there are higher risks in the low dose 8 region which then come down and then go up again. Would 9 you accept that? I mean, without me having to go 10 through it all and us having to tediously look at it? 11 Or maybe you would like to look at it overnight and come 12 back on it? 13 A. There may well be. 14 Q. Right. 15 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Does that have relevance to the linear no 16 dose threshold -- 17 A. I don't think so, I think it's picking out little bits 18 of data. Whereas what we're doing is looking at the 19 data overall, which is where the statistical power is. 20 These individual dose groups -- there's not a lot of 21 statistical power in each little bit of information on 22 its own, you need to put all the information together to 23 get the statistical power to demonstrate the dose 24 response. 25 DR BUSBY: This effect is very clear in the LSS study of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 196</p>

1 colon cancer. Do you remember the graph for colon
 2 cancer in the LSS? I haven't brought it along, but
 3 maybe you remember it?
 4 **A. Not off the top of my head.**
 5 Q. No. Well, I won't take this much further. My only
 6 point is that if you did -- if you were to use all of
 7 the low dose effects and to compare -- and to use those
 8 as the driving force to produce your excess relative
 9 risk per sievert, it would be much higher if than if you
 10 used your higher no linear threshold line through all of
 11 the points?
 12 **A. One other thing to point out is the fact that these**
 13 **groupings of dose here, I mean we're talking about**
 14 **estimates of dose for these people. It seems to -- when**
 15 **you look at a table like this you get the impression**
 16 **that you have a particular dose that falls in the**
 17 **category and the person's dose is the person's dose, end**
 18 **of story. That's not necessarily the case. The**
 19 **person's dose is the best estimate we can, we can**
 20 **estimate for that person. We have a degree of**
 21 **uncertainty on that as well, which you don't see in this**
 22 **table.**
 23 **So I think (inaudible) as well. There's uncertainty**
 24 **in both ways.**
 25 Q. Of course. I have one more question, my Lord, and then

Page 197

1 we can wind it up for today, if that is acceptable.
 2 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right.
 3 DR BUSBY: We'll just go back to the same paper now, we'll
 4 go back to figure 1. This your graph. Not your graph,
 5 but Dr Cardis. The figure 1 is the Cardis graph, it is
 6 on page 404.
 7 **A. I'm afraid, I'm lost.**
 8 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: You are lost. I think you are about to
 9 be asked a question in the same paper in tab 68,
 10 page 404, figure 1.
 11 **A. I've got you. Sorry.**
 12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Hold fire until we get the question.
 13 DR BUSBY: This is -- are you ready? -- this says:
 14 "Excess relative risk by dose category."
 15 It has these nice straight lines.
 16 It goes through the origin, zero.
 17 But that's not true, is it? I mean, the excess
 18 relative risk is actually not zero because these people
 19 are healthy and their relative risk is in fact not the
 20 same as the national population, it's already been
 21 factored in. Is that not right? They are healthy
 22 workers.
 23 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Do you understand that question?
 24 **A. I think so. I mean, this is an internal -- an internal**
 25 **estimate -- an internal study -- so we're not comparing**

Page 198

1 these people in any sense with the general population.
 2 So it's perfectly appropriate for this to go through 00.
 3 It's in relation to the underlying risk within this
 4 group, not within -- not comparing that group to any
 5 sort of bigger population.
 6 So it doesn't matter what the underlying -- how the
 7 underlying risk in this group might vary according to
 8 the general population, it should still go through 00,
 9 even if these were healthier compared to the general
 10 population, because they're all the same, in a sense,
 11 healthy people, all the same radiation workers. You've
 12 not got radiation workers with radiation dose and
 13 a matching group of controls who were not radiation
 14 workers, they're all radiation workers.
 15 DR BUSBY: But none of them have zero dose, have they?
 16 A. Probably not.
 17 DR BUSBY: No, not probably not.
 18 A. The best estimates might not be. Again, it's certainly
 19 possible that -- actually, that's not true, I'm sorry,
 20 they might well have zero dose. We have radiation
 21 workers who are monitored for whom they've never had
 22 a dose shown on their badges. So effectively they do
 23 have zero dose. Our best estimate of their dose is
 24 zero, so that's not true, I'm mistaken.
 25 Q. Well, if we go back to table 1, it says less than 5 in

Page 199

1 table 1.
 2 **A. Yes.**
 3 Q. So that's the first data point you have is less than 5,
 4 it's not zero.
 5 **A. We group the people in that bottom end together.**
 6 Q. Exactly. So this data point that says zero is not real?
 7 **A. Don't forget, this is only -- the group's data you see**
 8 **here are only for interpreting, they are not actually**
 9 **used in the generation of the dose response. It's the**
 10 **individual data there that are used.**
 11 Q. I think my point here is, apart from the fact that you
 12 haven't got any zero dose people, or at least not in the
 13 study, only --
 14 **A. -- do you mean by zero occupational dose, I think we**
 15 **probably do our best estimate of some of the people in**
 16 **our cohort is they have had zero dose, they've worn**
 17 **dosimeters, they've done their job, and none of the**
 18 **dosimeters have come back with a reading. Therefore,**
 19 **their dose is what we term below the limit of detection,**
 20 **or whatever that might be. So our best guess is they do**
 21 **have zero dose.**
 22 Q. I think my point is that what you call zero dose --
 23 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: What's the question?
 24 DR BUSBY: The question is, is it true that what you call
 25 zero dose and what is actually zero dose are two

Page 200

<p>1 different things?</p> <p>2 A. Zero occupational dose, do you mean, or zero dose --</p> <p>3 Q. No, zero dose. I mean, everybody gets a dose, don't</p> <p>4 they?</p> <p>5 A. Yes.</p> <p>6 Q. Yes. So --</p> <p>7 A. This is relating to -- this is on top of the dose that</p> <p>8 we all get, and this is in relation to occupational</p> <p>9 dose --</p> <p>10 Q. Yes, and that's in a range of 0 to 5 millisieverts?</p> <p>11 A. We group people in that range --</p> <p>12 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: That's enough now. We've had five</p> <p>13 supplementary questions beyond your last point.</p> <p>14 Take a seat for a second so we can just discuss</p> <p>15 tomorrow. Now, we've reached 4.30, so we will adjourn</p> <p>16 for tomorrow. As I've indicated, you are going to have</p> <p>17 to complete whatever other course you are going to take</p> <p>18 by the time we reach the break tomorrow at 11.30.</p> <p>19 On the back-burner we have the Rowland paper, the</p> <p>20 Wahab Rowland paper, insofar as you can comment upon</p> <p>21 epidemiology. If you can't comment on it, having read</p> <p>22 it, that's it, no one is going to ask you to (inaudible)</p> <p>23 you out of your expertise. And the Feuerhake paper to</p> <p>24 which we referred.</p> <p>25 Now, I'm told you presented quite a long list of</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 201</p>	<p>1 Can you give that back to the witness, please.</p> <p>2 (Handed)</p> <p>3 So, in the course of this afternoon, we've had two</p> <p>4 papers that we've reserved over. If you are able to</p> <p>5 read those and see whether you can offer some</p> <p>6 assistance. As I say, if it's apparent that the subject</p> <p>7 matter of the paper, the epidemiological element is very</p> <p>8 limited or marginal and there is nothing you can say or</p> <p>9 very limited you can say, don't struggle on with the</p> <p>10 questions which you are not competent to answer.</p> <p>11 If you can deal with the next most important ones.</p> <p>12 But there's a limit to what you are expected to do.</p> <p>13 Obviously, if you whizz through all of those, because</p> <p>14 there's nothing that you can comment upon, you might be</p> <p>15 able to look at something else. But I don't know what's</p> <p>16 in the paper, I don't know what is on the list and I am</p> <p>17 not expecting you to do anything which is unreasonable</p> <p>18 given the circumstances of the case. But, since you'll</p> <p>19 be our last witness, and you are coming to an end, if</p> <p>20 there is anything else you can assist us on, I would be</p> <p>21 grateful. Yes.</p> <p>22 MR HEPPINSTALL: My Lord, the other matter I wanted to raise</p> <p>23 was the contractual relationship between the Government</p> <p>24 Legal Department and the stenography company. We have</p> <p>25 to give 24 hours notice to avoid charge, I am told.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 203</p>
<p>1 reading. I'm afraid it's not fair or reasonable to</p> <p>2 expect overnight all of those documents to be looked at.</p> <p>3 Is there one other or two other documents which is going</p> <p>4 to be an important part of where you are going to go</p> <p>5 tomorrow?</p> <p>6 DR BUSBY: We can -- yes.</p> <p>7 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Which are those?</p> <p>8 DR BUSBY: I would have to indicate those -- we don't have</p> <p>9 the list, my Lord.</p> <p>10 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Don't you know what you are going to go</p> <p>11 to? (Pause)</p> <p>12 DR BUSBY: SB22/22.</p> <p>13 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Just mark them down. (Pause). You have</p> <p>14 two, you can choose two more.</p> <p>15 DR BUSBY: Can't we have four, my Lord?</p> <p>16 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: I don't know whether that is going to be</p> <p>17 reasonable. If you put four down -- you certainly know</p> <p>18 more --</p> <p>19 DR BUSBY: I will put them in order of importance, shall I?</p> <p>20 There we are.</p> <p>21 MS BUSBY: Some of them it is only --</p> <p>22 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well --</p> <p>23 DR BUSBY: Some are very short.</p> <p>24 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Well, that's what I've indicated. Right.</p> <p>25 Do you have that?</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 202</p>	<p>1 I think the company has been stood down for Friday and</p> <p>2 Monday. I just wanted to make sure that that was a safe</p> <p>3 decision that had been --</p> <p>4 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes, I am not going to re-visit those.</p> <p>5 MR HEPPINSTALL: Fine. So we are not sitting Friday, not</p> <p>6 sitting Monday.</p> <p>7 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Yes. The present proposal, assuming that</p> <p>8 the time limits I've just indicated to Dr Busby will</p> <p>9 enable you to complete re-examination before one o'clock</p> <p>10 comfortably and any other tidying up issues that we can</p> <p>11 deal with, we will terminate tomorrow round about the</p> <p>12 lunch and adjournment.</p> <p>13 MR HEPPINSTALL: Yes.</p> <p>14 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: We will come back on Tuesday. We will</p> <p>15 not be sitting on Thursday afternoon, Friday or Monday.</p> <p>16 I hope, however, that each of you will be thinking about</p> <p>17 how to present your final submissions.</p> <p>18 MR HEPPINSTALL: Yes, my Lord.</p> <p>19 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: And that, giving you some time, will</p> <p>20 facilitate the presentation for final submissions. We</p> <p>21 may also have some discussion that what, in a world --</p> <p>22 what we consider would be helpful to us -- but I'll</p> <p>23 reserve that until, perhaps, five to one or some other</p> <p>24 such time tomorrow.</p> <p>25 MR HEPPINSTALL: I am grateful, my Lord.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Page 204</p>

1 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: It may be that what I would like is not
 2 going to be what I am going to get. No doubt there is
 3 a graph of expectations versus satisfaction.
 4 Is that clear?
 5 MR HEPPINSTALL: Very clear, my Lord, thank you.
 6 MR JUSTICE BLAKE: Right.
 7 Thank you, see you tomorrow at ten o'clock. You
 8 have an indication of how long you are going to go for,
 9 and I hope you are able to work through that material
 10 without ruining your evening. Or some of it, at least.
 11 Yes.
 12 (4.35 pm)
 13 (The court adjourned until
 14 Thursday, 23 June 2016 at 10.00 am)
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 205

1 INDEX
 2
 3 Housekeeping1
 4 DR RICHARD HAYLOCK (affirmed)9
 5 Examination-in-chief by MR HEPPINSTALL9
 6 Cross-examination by MR TER HAAR11
 7 Cross-examination by DR BUSBY103
 8
 9
 10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

Page 206

A				
A-Bomb 40:7	133:18 136:17	addressed 89:20	aged 88:8	alerted 159:2,18
A4 160:5	141:5 142:4,16,20	120:11	agencies 108:14	algorithms 44:8
Abdale 3:22 4:5	144:23 146:21	adequate 66:19	agency 6:2 7:8	alive 64:12 89:12
11:8 90:18	149:1	67:1	129:10	allergy 46:15
aberration 5:2	academic 11:24	adequately 146:5	Agency's 5:22	allowance 56:20
37:14,17 141:20	Academy 79:12,20	Ades 10:13	agent 171:23	alludes 35:14
171:24	accept 16:25 26:15	adjourn 201:15	ages 104:2	alpha 162:4 163:24
aberrations 4:19	44:19 115:9 122:1	adjourned 205:13	ago 30:11 57:7,7	164:1,7,14 170:2
36:15,17 37:1,9	122:10 125:19,24	adjournment	68:21 99:22 102:9	alteration 137:12
39:23 82:11,21	138:17 196:9	111:16 204:12	agree 13:13 18:15	alternative 43:24
83:8,11,18 138:21	acceptable 117:18	Administration	18:18 19:9,16	43:25 91:17
143:11 170:5	117:23 158:4	147:18	33:1 36:13 37:5	193:10
ability 32:14 35:10	198:1	admit 95:23 96:8	39:17 40:17 41:16	America 101:2
43:23 75:1	accepted 48:10	106:21 182:5,15	42:18 46:19 49:15	American 33:8
able 1:21 16:6 20:1	92:25 158:3	admitted 158:19	54:1 57:20,21	64:23
20:5 37:15 60:6	accident 116:22	adopt 175:2 177:11	64:2 65:3 68:22	Americans 52:11
72:3 73:25 74:17	accommodate	adopted 120:7	69:22 70:13 71:3	amount 122:6
75:4 81:10 84:16	55:17	adult 33:17	76:19 79:4 80:18	151:14,15 195:21
87:7 92:5 132:21	accord 15:5	advances 83:25	81:10,19,24 94:11	ample 77:20
142:17 168:19	account 25:4 34:4	adverse 13:21	101:8 104:17	analyse 62:19
172:4,5,14 173:4	51:13 57:2 68:2	23:21 43:10 44:14	106:17 111:23	analysed 19:18
174:8,13 175:21	95:14 157:1	44:22 81:16,17	116:22 131:8	analyses 15:24
194:5 203:4,15	accounted 114:14	advise 132:2	133:9,12,23 134:2	73:11
205:9	accumulated 40:4	advises 65:9	137:18 139:23	analysis 5:3 7:5
abnormal 46:16	accumulation 35:7	advising 90:2	140:14 145:8	15:25 48:23 66:10
abnormalities	accuracy 13:8	Affairs 147:17,19	146:7,12 153:16	67:22 68:10 74:11
15:10 45:24 46:1	accurate 13:9	147:21	153:24 155:15,23	79:8 92:6 97:6
183:24,25 184:2,7	85:13 178:11	affect 65:16,23	162:9 171:21	99:1 125:5 135:10
abnormality 46:3	187:25	105:11 106:24	173:2 180:21,24	141:20 166:23
46:17	accurately 52:18	affirmed 9:9 206:3	182:4,13 183:3	170:18
abortion 183:2	acknowledge 22:12	afford 167:2	184:12 190:19	analytical 106:14
abound 166:17	36:6	afraid 17:9 21:3	agreed 45:13 94:10	and/or 36:1
abroad 29:7	across-all-diseases	58:15 59:19 62:16	102:22 169:8,9	Andrew 10:13
absolute 55:3,21	28:23	62:20 93:24 104:5	181:24	annex 63:4 64:7
65:9 94:12,16	acts 33:23	128:10 130:8	agreeing 24:24	annexes 2:25
194:8	actual 25:7 72:14	143:17 146:21	137:17	annoyances 11:17
absolutely 13:17	75:11 106:6 117:3	150:22 151:22	agreement 36:8	anomalous 134:22
24:14 53:16 55:5	195:10	152:1 173:20	99:10 102:13	155:18,24 161:1
84:23 135:12	acute 53:22	184:12 198:7	Ah 5:7	166:2
157:12 164:19	acutely 167:22	202:1	ahead 52:24 53:2	anomalously 157:6
181:12	adapted 166:18	aftermath 21:16	aim 25:11 28:7,9	answer 18:5,17
absorbed 2:2	add 180:2	afternoon 111:6	102:5	35:16 42:21 55:9
absorption 9:2	added 2:15 166:15	114:19 158:24	aiming 111:12	58:1 81:1 83:23
abstract 98:4 116:3	additional 71:13,16	159:1 203:3	air 43:6	104:4 108:6
116:16 130:17,24	164:2	204:15	al 34:12,13	110:22 113:21
	additively 54:18	age 64:16 131:23	albeit 17:23	114:4 115:12,14

115:15,19,20 118:12,17 119:2 130:12 133:20 139:13 159:19 163:9 175:15,21 176:18 181:20 184:14,15 187:12 193:6 203:10 answered 21:20 115:8 120:14 187:16,23 answers 10:14 35:4 55:10 69:17 115:15 142:18 anticipate 8:17 9:2 anybody 7:15 122:11 131:3 anyway 45:13 63:12 89:17 119:1 140:24 141:2 142:15 154:18 171:19 174:23 187:22 apart 28:10 124:12 129:18 200:11 apologise 57:15 60:15 86:3 apparent 135:22 203:6 apparently 33:14 131:17 appeal 125:4 appeals 164:24 appear 18:2 20:14 47:14 49:17 84:8 132:13 147:14 156:3 166:9 191:2 194:6 appeared 2:21 121:25 139:17 appears 3:18 28:3 30:9 38:8 50:16 51:3 86:19 116:20 150:13 187:23 appellants 3:9 4:18 5:15 11:8,11	96:10 120:9 appendix 4:4 8:10 8:12,13,14 11:21 94:4 apples 169:6 applicable 142:24 application 12:12 12:15 41:11 44:7 applied 12:7 29:10 38:23 40:3 50:16 101:10 156:18 applies 95:12 140:2 apply 29:12 51:19 51:19,22 54:16 55:2,4,5 95:25 96:5 98:21 99:4 140:4 159:21 178:20 183:23 applying 99:11,18 121:12 approach 1:9 151:7 167:13 172:13 180:6 approaches 84:20 appropriate 51:17 51:20 56:16 91:7 95:11 96:23 98:22 99:19,25 102:14 110:23 120:22,23 139:24 151:4 164:3,10 199:2 area 19:8 41:17 50:11,16 51:19 65:3 71:7 75:20 81:2 86:19 89:25 91:2,22 95:24 103:10 118:6 119:10,12,14,15 119:16 131:2 136:2,7 141:2,2 146:16 147:8 150:14,15,17 151:4,8,9,12,16 152:20 154:8,10 162:24 183:13 areas 18:7 50:7	57:9 70:18 107:5 162:21 Areneta 144:8 147:6 argued 114:17 arguing 107:20 argument 15:11 115:5 135:25 194:16 arguments 67:10 77:17 120:12,18 arising 39:22 103:1 Arizona 144:3 Arkansas 144:3 Armed 28:1 Army 26:11 arrive 70:5 artefactual 66:9 article 59:7 170:15 ascertained 29:2 ascertainment 23:16,24 ascribe 185:5 ascribed 127:19 aside 62:23 172:19 asked 10:12 60:5 79:9 89:14 91:14 91:20 100:2,16 108:5,18 120:13 120:17 123:15 128:17 133:16 134:9 144:21 147:11 173:12,21 187:18 198:9 asking 7:21 18:10 35:15 61:14 72:9 89:4,10 109:11 111:19 113:24 115:1 141:7 147:7 149:20 163:18 165:16 183:17 187:17 aspect 171:2 aspects 12:7 14:4 104:15 161:12 166:17	aspersions 109:11 assays 167:2 assent 14:19 42:15 56:10 69:23 98:9 121:5 assertion 52:17 assertions 115:21 assess 81:15,18 100:23 164:7 assessed 34:20 134:23 assessing 13:13 assessment 66:7 80:4 98:5 109:3 119:19 148:16 149:7 assign 40:12 assigned 51:8 151:4 assigning 151:11 152:19 assist 1:25 2:1 75:9 87:8 173:4 203:20 assistance 7:22 14:6 24:23 61:14 62:3 174:8 203:6 associate 109:15 associated 40:14 73:3 132:18 assume 30:7 80:19 84:14 90:21 192:24 assumed 48:15 50:15,24 52:5 180:5,6 assumes 89:1 assuming 45:6 58:17 79:3 83:7 150:16 151:3 204:7 assumption 45:4,5 45:8 48:16 78:8 78:13 81:3 114:20 119:10 163:22 182:2 192:1 assumptions 4:6 74:18,25 76:18	94:5 asthma 46:15 atomic 4:15 21:12 32:16 63:20 64:1 73:9,22 131:1 attack 71:8,10 attempt 164:16 attempted 94:3 180:14 attempting 73:15 attention 23:2 88:1 90:7 128:18 131:9 131:24 163:5 attributing 148:13 Australia 36:9 Australian 34:17 author 95:9 author's 68:6 authored 86:13 authoritative 188:8 authority 112:22 authorless 3:19 4:1 authors 4:23 22:10 63:10 67:7,24 116:22 149:25 155:23 157:18 158:1 available 2:12 55:14 62:13 64:24 93:2 101:7 129:8 188:3 average 55:16,17 56:23,25 65:9 67:6 99:2,15 119:16 151:3,17 154:8 averages 65:10 avoid 81:23 203:25 avoids 169:22 aware 11:7 14:20 15:1 16:22 24:16 43:12 50:25 57:19 79:21 100:8,8 184:8 awful 162:11,12 axes 175:25
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

B	54:25 55:1 70:11 72:16	bell 101:16	biologist 146:10 166:7	31:3,8,13,16 35:1 35:3,15,20 36:10 36:14,19 38:19 42:21 44:19 46:6 46:8,12 55:19,21 57:5,12,24 59:5 59:11,15,20 60:3 60:11,16,20 61:2 61:4,17,21 62:1,6 62:15,17,21 79:20 85:21 86:4 93:20 93:25 96:14,17 97:17,21,25 98:10 98:20,25 99:14,21 100:2,7,12,18 101:11,14,16,20 101:22,24 102:15 102:18,20,23,25 103:5 110:22 111:8,11,14,18 113:22 114:2,10 115:8,12,14,19 116:2,5,12,15,18 118:12,19 119:2,7 119:18,22 121:6,9 121:21 122:16 123:24 124:3,6,10 124:12,17,20 125:1,3 128:13,16 128:23,25 129:3 129:25 130:6,9,17 130:21 131:16,20 131:23 132:1,4,6 132:8,11 133:4,15 133:18,22 136:22 136:25 137:3,25 138:4,7 141:4,7 141:11,17,20,25 142:2,4,8,10,13 142:16,25 143:2 143:24 144:2,6,8 144:19,21,23 146:14,25 147:3,5 148:25 149:17 150:5,21 151:25 154:14,18 155:1,3
b 29:3	bases 39:24 109:21	belonged 109:3	biologist's 80:4,19	
B12/157 6:3 7:11	basically 39:10	benefit 91:17 92:18	biologists 81:2	
baby 183:2	77:9 125:20 147:9	best 2:11 27:8	biology 38:13 82:24 107:5	
back 6:18 11:13	basing 154:7 167:20	40:23 41:1,6	biophysicist 33:10	
13:18 14:4,9 20:9	basis 51:9 56:23	53:15 55:12,25	Biophysics 14:16	
27:4,6,12,12 39:7	57:22 66:10 69:14	67:8 69:12,14	biostatistical 43:12	
41:21 44:11 47:17	72:3 90:13 91:13	70:1 76:23,24	biostatistician	
47:18 57:3,3 61:2	100:14 115:3	78:12 82:25 90:18	104:14	
62:24 72:19 76:5	117:19,24 120:21	92:23 93:7 100:7	biostatisticians	
78:25 80:8 96:12	134:13 140:10	100:17 101:7	103:19	
97:22,25 103:1	150:11 152:18,23	106:1 107:16	biostatistics 103:12	
119:23 130:1	153:12,14 154:10	157:3 165:2 172:9	BIR 101:2,18	
149:6 158:23	165:3 169:15	174:5 175:4 176:3	birth 144:2,14	
160:12,18 165:15	175:1 193:19	176:3,10,12,17	145:7,13,15,24	
192:18 196:12	Battersby 10:5	177:17 178:7,8	146:1,3 147:8	
198:3,4 199:25	bear 78:21 188:4	179:23 188:2	births 184:9	
200:18 203:1	Bearing 1:23	190:19 194:1	bit 6:14 7:13 14:10	
204:14	bears 145:17	197:19 199:18,23	23:15 26:23 34:24	
back-burner 35:22	becoming 30:15	200:15,20	40:20 55:23 74:20	
201:19	becquerels 122:9	better 9:16 55:14	145:11 154:1	
background 16:19	122:10	56:25 61:19 76:1	175:17 177:1	
33:7 39:2 40:13	beginning 5:20	78:20 112:13,16	185:20 188:5	
45:20 81:8 103:17	30:18 60:15 69:6	113:5 159:19	190:10 196:21	
103:18 107:7	130:18 133:19	164:5,10,12 175:8	bits 190:20 196:17	
backwards 51:11	157:21	177:1,3,8,10,25	black 125:2 127:3	
53:4	behalf 11:10 24:2	178:3 180:3	127:16 131:2	
bad 100:10,21,23	beings 47:13	193:11	191:5	
100:25 109:1	belief 37:12	betterer 177:4	bladder 90:9,18	
badges 199:22	believe 31:22 52:17	Beyea 4:16	BLAKE 1:4,8,11	
balance 78:23 87:6	61:24 83:10 90:15	beyond 201:13	1:16,23 2:8,16,20	
87:7	98:18 101:13	bias 13:15	3:6,10,14,21 4:8	
Balkans 141:21	105:17 109:9	biased 109:1	4:11,13,22,25 5:2	
bang 39:13	114:13 117:2,12	biases 73:14	5:5,9,13,16,20 6:4	
base 68:25 109:5	118:3 119:4	biasing 26:21	6:14,19,22 7:20	
145:1	129:17,20 149:9	big 46:6	7:25 8:2,5,9,12,16	
based 32:25 48:13	156:24 157:21	bigger 70:7 199:5	8:22,24 9:7,11,14	
65:17 75:3 79:17	158:7 161:20	bioassay 106:15	9:20 11:2,4 15:20	
80:16 88:17 101:4	166:18,25 169:24	biologic 4:17	15:22,24 16:2	
106:13,15 107:24	170:12 171:16	biological 16:1,2,3	18:17,20 19:1,22	
110:16 112:25	175:7 184:5	36:2,3 39:1,12	20:19 21:2 22:1,3	
119:11 123:11	187:24 188:2,17	64:7 75:11,23	25:13,15,18,21,24	
127:23 150:1	188:21 189:18,19	80:6,10,14 132:15	26:2,15,23 29:19	
152:9 153:7,22	191:17	161:11 166:16	29:23 30:2,22	
156:4,5,14 188:13		171:5		
baseline 54:22,23		biologically 75:15		

155:13,17,22	bone 74:7 134:4	76:5 116:6	calculate 91:9	37:3,3 40:8,13
156:2,11,16,20	bones 133:14	Busby 10:13 97:22	calculated 89:4	45:24 54:5,13
157:11,15,23	border 96:6	103:2,4,6,7,8	100:13 108:7	63:21 64:10,14,19
158:5,14,16,20,22	borderline 53:24	111:7,10,13,19	152:18	64:20,21,24 65:10
159:12,17,21	born 182:10 183:3	114:1,15 115:13	calculates 89:2	65:23 68:1,3,9
160:6,11,18,20	bottom 49:7 61:10	115:17,23 116:3	calculating 100:22	73:5 74:4 75:12
161:15,19 163:9	63:14 72:13,23	116:19 118:24	calculation 61:22	75:14 82:13 83:9
163:18 164:6,11	77:13 78:7 97:1	119:3,24,25	88:10 89:1,5 97:4	83:13,18 84:16
165:1,7,9,14,19	176:1,8 185:14	121:10,16,23	122:11 129:3	88:7 89:13,17
165:23 166:9,12	194:2 200:5	122:18 124:5,14	146:12 194:24	90:8,9,18 91:22
166:15,20,24	bow 49:1	124:18,25 125:2,4	calculations 3:22	91:23 102:12
167:4 169:4	break 39:20 60:7	129:8 130:4,23	4:3 44:9 61:24	104:1 145:16,17
170:12,15,20,24	62:9 110:23	132:12 133:11,23	93:11,17,18 94:11	145:18 146:3,8,11
171:2,5,8,10,17	128:14 158:22	137:4 138:8 141:6	94:12 96:13,20	146:15 150:10
172:3,6,9,18	159:3,23 201:18	141:9,15,18,23	105:9 107:12,17	173:2 180:20
173:4,6,15,18,22	breaks 39:21	142:9,14 143:3,25	107:23,23 108:5	183:25 184:14,16
174:1,4,6,15,19	breast 3:7 64:21	144:5,10 145:1	108:14,15 120:13	184:20,22 187:11
175:15,19,24	66:23	146:17 147:2,6	121:12 122:19,24	187:19,21 188:1
177:18 178:2,5	Brenner 14:14 15:3	149:10,18,24	122:25 125:25	188:20 195:14,17
184:2,14 187:9,13	15:5	150:7,23 152:3	128:12 147:13	197:1,2
187:17 190:1,6,13	Brenner's 33:8	154:16,21,22,24	California 144:4	cancer-associated
193:6 196:15	brief 40:2	155:5,15,18 156:1	call 17:15 35:8 36:2	82:14,15
198:2,8,12,23	briefly 21:24	157:5,24,25 158:9	65:13 90:5 103:14	cancer-free 89:8,8
200:23 201:12	bring 2:10 102:5	158:18,21 159:10	104:10,13 107:13	cancers 17:14
202:7,10,13,16,22	British 6:7	159:16,20 160:9	112:24 117:18	28:16 29:1,7
202:24 204:4,7,14	broad 99:9,19	160:14,19,21	132:17 154:2	32:18 34:16 42:1
204:19 205:1,6	102:13	161:21 164:12	156:6,14 161:3	42:3 54:5 55:3,13
blank 5:9	broadly 102:21	166:1 167:5 169:5	176:6,19 200:22	55:14 56:23 57:1
bleeding 125:15	broke 111:19	170:23 171:21	200:24	64:16 65:7 66:15
board 38:15 108:10	brought 92:18	172:19 173:8,19	called 76:13 102:4	66:23 74:6 84:3
110:6,10	197:2	173:24,25 174:3	112:5 172:24	99:7 181:5,8
boat 141:11	BS 4:18,23 5:15	174:10,18,22	178:21	187:9,15 195:8,15
bodies 79:9 134:1	95:18	175:17 178:8	calls 80:5,9,13	candidate 101:25
134:11	bubble 118:8	184:4,15 187:11	Canada 38:22	cantering 119:25
body 7:9 13:18	building 153:5	187:16,21 190:14	190:1	Canu 154:17,18
77:23 78:1 79:15	built 113:17,19	193:12 196:25	Canadian 188:24	155:5 169:12
91:17 185:1	153:18	198:3,13 199:15	189:2,12,16	capability 35:18
bomb 52:11 69:8	Bulletin 4:14	199:17 200:24	190:11	capable 36:4 90:9
127:21 129:18	bundle 5:20 6:5	202:6,8,12,15,19	Canadians 189:14	Captain 10:13
131:1 153:15	8:11,25 11:12	202:21,23 204:8	cancer 3:7 13:9	carbon 122:13
154:5	14:8,9 38:1 60:8,8	206:5	24:16 29:2,3,19	carbon-14 122:6
bombing 125:10	62:23,25 76:6	business 120:1	30:4,8,11,13,15	carcinogenic 42:8
bombings 63:20	85:18,18,25 86:1	button 11:18	30:16,17,20,22,23	carcinogens 67:21
64:1 73:9	93:10 136:19	<hr/>	30:25 31:1,5,6,8	Cardis 187:8 198:5
bombs 49:23 52:15	144:1 146:23,24	C	31:10,11 32:13	198:5
73:22	bundles 6:10 9:24	<hr/>	33:17 36:18 37:2	carefully 189:10
		c 29:4		

careless 91:12	97:7 100:13,15	183:14 184:19	95:19 135:24	clear 26:24 90:1
Carolina 150:1	122:20 123:11	certainly 12:17	136:3	96:7 162:10
carried 10:19 17:12	194:23 195:1	20:14 34:24 40:16	characters 148:1	179:16 196:25
27:2 28:14 92:17	cause 42:25 58:5	54:3 56:6 58:16	charge 203:25	205:4,5
153:14	59:2 71:24 79:25	58:25 76:2 96:9	charts 128:17,21	clearly 13:4,25
carry 17:10 75:21	83:8 89:3 91:2	114:23 140:3	129:1	76:14 114:18
91:15 158:24	167:8,11,16	147:12 150:18	check 2:14 108:6	123:24
carrying 105:15	195:16	152:13 156:9	189:8	clerk 2:20
Carter 34:18	caused 17:14 45:21	181:2 183:25	Chernobyl 5:14	clever 94:2 103:21
case 1:19 10:10,11	71:12 80:11 81:18	199:18 202:17	116:21	104:5 125:5
16:23 17:5 30:16	85:1,3,6,7,10	certainty 43:17	Chief 7:22	clients 90:3,12 91:1
30:20 37:13 43:21	87:14,17,18 88:15	69:20,21 70:8	child 182:10 183:1	CLL 190:25
60:8 83:10,19	89:23 114:21	92:5	childhood 3:15	close 2:10 9:1 28:9
89:16,18 90:6	149:4,6 150:10	certificate 31:3	64:15	108:13,19 191:5
91:10,15 92:16	171:24	certificates 13:8	children 47:1,6,8	closer 16:8 49:19
104:8,12 105:18	causes 30:20 71:3	cetera 170:16	148:10	178:24,24
109:18 110:9,21	75:12 84:2,3 85:1	Chair 38:22	Chinese 167:9	cloud 24:13
111:8 112:4,21	140:11 143:11	challenge 102:17	choice 192:22,22	cluster 113:12,25
114:22,23,24,25	146:14 148:20	challenged 100:4	choose 26:10 176:5	114:7,11 115:9
118:3 120:9	192:16	challenges 21:9	176:19,22 202:14	clustered 47:24
121:20 138:14	causing 180:19	22:24 98:1	chose 100:16	clusters 113:12,15
140:9 145:20	caution 150:12,16	challenging 102:16	107:16 120:21	113:16 114:20
150:18 151:5	cautious 172:13	128:15 151:22	Christmas 122:14	co-author 130:2
155:19,20 167:14	caveats 24:3 29:17	chance 3:11 68:18	Christopher 10:13	co-efficients 152:23
183:5,11 194:6	cell 48:15 75:23	84:25 85:6 87:23	chromosomal	code 39:24
197:18 203:18	82:20 83:4 185:5	90:20 137:23	15:10 34:11,14,24	cohort 19:20 20:16
cases 24:16,18	cells 82:12 84:1	138:18 139:3,7,18	36:1 37:1,9,16	25:8,9 28:12
28:10 29:11,13	184:18,19,23	139:22 175:20	83:18	52:23 53:1 64:11
31:25 55:15 57:1	192:19	196:3	chromosome 4:19	64:13 66:24 138:2
66:18 73:5 170:6	cent 22:11,16,18,20	chances 30:14 87:8	5:2,3 36:15,16	200:16
196:7	23:19,22,23 24:1	165:23	37:14 39:23 82:10	cohorts 53:2 102:6
cast 49:16 84:2	26:8,8,8 67:1,2	change 4:6 82:12	83:8,11 137:11	106:19 190:9
109:11	84:25 85:4,6	111:24 118:13	138:21 140:12	coincide 99:7
casts 52:6	90:20,20 97:8,12	186:23 192:6	141:1,20 143:11	coincidental 163:3
catch 6:19 31:9	97:13 194:14,15	changed 48:24	144:14 170:5	cold 43:15,19
categorical 156:7	Center 14:16	changes 34:11,14	171:24	colds 43:16
categorise 137:5	central 190:24	34:24 36:1 39:24	chromosomes 84:1	colleagues 3:11
157:3	Centre 14:18 38:17	45:24 69:15 82:15	chronic 40:1	109:4
categorised 22:12	CERRIE 79:11,14	189:12	169:10	collect 28:1
151:8 170:8	79:16	changing 54:9	chronically 167:25	collection 19:19
category 96:11	certain 37:8 47:13	channels 2:6	circle 190:25 191:5	colon 197:1,1
197:17 198:14	57:1 58:4,8,17	chap 108:6	circular 115:4	colour 111:20
causal 166:4 168:2	65:10 77:6 78:9	chaps 24:12	circumstances 53:9	coloured 109:1,6
causally 90:10	84:12 89:23	Characterisation	70:22 203:18	109:14
causation 40:12	104:12 119:4,11	154:19	cited 59:8	Columbia 14:17
87:6,22 89:1 91:9	120:3 166:14	characterised	City 134:7	column 63:18

190:6 195:16 columns 196:5 combined 88:24 come 1:24 8:17 9:8 13:14 14:4 32:24 33:1 38:8 39:5 41:11,21 44:11 45:12 47:17 49:5 52:11 62:24 80:2 87:14,21 101:25 103:17,19 108:12 112:8,12 127:12 128:3 129:16 131:24 158:23 177:7 183:7 194:22,24 195:11 196:8,11 200:18 204:14 comes 7:18 13:2 46:22 55:23 103:22 104:4 128:2 comfortable 9:15 comfortably 204:10 coming 6:25 16:19 24:22 78:9 92:9 203:19 comment 15:15,18 20:1,17,19 21:1 25:5 34:23 35:1,2 37:20 45:2 49:4 58:13 59:25 62:18 64:2 108:24 132:21 134:16 143:19 146:14 155:14 171:25 172:4 174:16 201:20,21 203:14 commenting 19:3 comments 1:20 7:4 15:8 17:17 20:10 20:14 33:9 34:20 195:12 Commission 162:22 163:14	164:2 165:17 commissioned 6:15 Committee 101:2 132:15,16 committees 132:16 common 13:14 37:8 71:12,23 community 160:24 160:25 company 130:7 203:24 204:1 comparable 29:14 29:16,22 30:6 compare 34:6 51:17 168:8 175:9 185:14 193:2 197:7 compared 36:7 43:25 70:12 94:13 138:22 169:14 192:4 199:9 comparing 34:3 68:14 150:14 167:22 169:6,9 191:23 192:4 193:8 198:25 199:4 comparison 30:1 56:1 72:16 126:3 161:10,25 175:10 competent 17:25 18:12 103:22 203:10 complain 5:21 complete 27:7 96:18 201:17 204:9 completely 69:9,10 69:11 105:19,21 129:16 192:23 complex 44:1 152:12 complexity 77:16 complicated 44:3,4 44:6 62:13 73:12 177:1,9 178:3	compliment 107:10 component 122:12 127:15,18,19 184:22 components 153:13 153:20 compounded 47:21 comprehensive 167:1 computer 103:25 176:11,16 concede 94:15 conceivably 59:24 concentrate 86:11 91:23 concept 48:13 78:24 105:7,10,12 105:14,20 106:24 concern 28:21 31:21 57:9 156:3 156:12 concerned 15:9 68:1 81:22 87:4 126:14 concerns 106:24 concession 164:16 conclude 111:5 159:8,11 concluded 111:3 159:7 160:25 concludes 161:20 conclusion 17:24 35:9 46:23 68:6 72:12 80:20 87:14 91:19 118:16,17 118:20,21 126:1 126:25 127:12 128:2,4,7,11 129:16 133:5 155:13 157:13 161:16 conclusions 27:12 27:20 41:10 43:20 72:20 77:12 104:8 105:1,11 106:25 107:21 120:6	122:2 132:6 142:24 150:12,19 151:21 166:10 conclusive 69:4 concrete 153:18,19 condition 85:3 88:15 90:17 conditions 26:17 65:20 81:9 90:9 140:16 conduct 128:19 conducted 147:15 confidence 68:17 70:17 98:22 99:17 101:10 102:14 191:10,11,13 192:10,11,12 193:13 confining 149:19 confirm 16:6 28:18 95:21 121:6 143:9 confirmed 147:13 189:4 Conflict 124:15 confound 66:13 confused 22:3 congenital 148:9 170:5 180:19 181:16,23 182:10 183:24,25 184:2,4 184:7 connected 90:10 connection 16:23 83:18 87:15 connections 108:13 connective 74:7 consensus 69:2 70:6 consequence 81:16 consider 51:6 79:10 90:12,25 91:6 96:4,10 104:14 108:22 110:20 117:13 127:17 143:3 147:10,22 148:5 177:17	204:22 considerable 63:22 77:23 considerably 68:24 consideration 30:10 183:16 considered 14:2 33:16 99:24 118:21 132:19 133:2 137:17 158:7 163:11 considering 13:6 13:16,25 91:16 consistency 105:19 187:4 consistent 29:20 33:17 34:10 52:2 68:15 73:9 105:16 115:15 126:15 134:6 consistently 98:13 constantly 43:5 69:19 constitute 132:2 constitutional 68:9 construct 178:15 construction 174:16 contained 26:7 contains 77:16 contaminated 123:20 content 170:25 contents 63:13 context 63:16 139:2 175:12 continue 97:21 146:17 187:20 continued 101:12 continues 182:3 continuing 48:11 contract 83:12 contractual 203:23 contributed 23:23 control 29:20,24 30:6 36:8 50:21
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

56:11 138:3,4 control-confoun... 181:13 controlled 53:10 65:20 140:19,23 controls 27:7,14,15 27:22 28:4,6,8,9 29:11,13 32:1,1 34:4 138:22 199:13 controversial 64:7 81:13 convened 163:12 conventional 40:16 48:10 121:12 convert 194:17 convinced 117:4 Cooper 108:8 copy 86:9 corner 65:14 176:8 corps 165:12 correct 12:3,20 13:3 15:17 33:21 43:1 73:20 76:14 76:21 84:10 100:6 108:11 113:14 115:11 118:18 126:13 129:6 157:7 162:7 172:24 179:8 183:22 187:15 193:19 194:18 corrected 50:6 correctly 118:17 134:12 156:22 189:6 191:16 correlate 119:13 cost 167:1 Council 38:22 countries 102:8,20 134:4 163:21 188:14,15 190:7 country 53:7 102:5 190:10 couple 48:21 course 14:5 40:11	52:23 79:23 82:10 97:17 104:11 105:17 107:22 109:7,18,18 113:9 122:1,25 123:2 126:17 127:6 135:18 141:14 164:23 174:7 187:1 191:11 197:25 201:17 203:3 court 205:13 courts 90:5 covariate 105:8 CPR35 121:1,4 Crawford 6:8 created 21:14 122:6 creates 23:5 credibility 66:7 credible 92:9 158:5 critical 39:19,21 critically 22:18 criticism 49:22 59:1 criticisms 35:6 123:16,22 cross-examination 3:18,20 5:24 11:3 82:4 85:24 96:19 103:7 111:6 159:7 160:4 173:24 206:4,5 cross-examine 133:7 cross-eyed 12:17 Crucially 6:17 CT 3:14 47:2 culturally 109:2 culture 108:22 111:20 cumulative 32:12 current 7:10 45:11 112:10 163:22 165:12 currently 92:23	101:7 161:3 162:3 165:2 curriculum 11:21 curve 81:7 172:21 curved 176:21 177:20 cut 122:16 CV 16:15 38:6 cytogenetic 7:5 170:17 <hr/> D <hr/> d 29:5 31:18 206:1 damage 39:20,23 40:5 80:1,4,11,17 140:12 141:1 144:14 146:9,9 148:17,21 180:19 181:25 dangerous 150:20 Darroudi 15:4 data 6:14 9:3 12:24 13:16 19:18 20:23 20:24 27:11 29:14 30:5 32:5 40:7,10 41:1,6 45:3 51:8 53:14 54:13 56:8 64:5,13 69:15,15 70:17 72:3,6 73:8 77:17,20,24 78:1 78:11,19 88:17 89:7 98:4 102:7 102:18 104:7 106:14,15 108:25 124:24 126:10,22 127:11,11 128:10 128:20,25 129:8 172:23 175:5,8 176:2,3,10,15,17 177:3,4,9 178:5 178:10,10,14,17 178:24 179:16,18 179:20,24 180:16 183:23 186:3,5,7 186:8,11,14,22 187:3,12 188:3,14	188:16,24 189:2,3 189:12,19,20 190:11,21 191:1 191:23 193:9,11 193:17 194:2 195:4,4,6 196:18 196:19 200:3,6,7 200:10 dataset 186:20 193:25,25 date 101:11,24 178:6 dated 95:19 daughter 141:10 169:3 day 9:16 136:23,25 140:25 160:4 192:21 196:6 days 30:16,19 DDREF 95:6,11,13 96:23 97:1,8,9 deal 22:7 41:23 50:23 57:14 84:2 87:1 94:17 138:8 146:11 155:17 184:2 187:19 203:11 204:11 dealing 13:24 20:23 57:7 74:11 78:22 88:13,18,22 deals 21:5 24:5 50:8 102:25 dealt 57:10 92:20 death 13:7 29:4 30:23 31:3 32:13 195:16 deaths 28:16 29:1,6 48:4 66:18 102:12 146:11 188:20 190:8 debatable 98:15 debate 35:21 83:15 83:24 91:2 98:10 121:9 decades 30:11 decide 117:17	162:17,18 165:17 167:17,25 179:6 decided 162:23 163:7 186:11 189:13 decides 179:9 decision 117:19,25 118:9 162:9 185:17 204:3 decreases 185:6 Deep 103:25 deeper 59:4 defects 144:2,15 145:7,14,15,16,24 146:1,3 147:9 Defence 6:17 7:21 7:22 19:14 Defence's 32:4 defer 101:5 deficit 32:15 35:11 define 40:23 47:7 54:18 95:16 186:12 defined 48:15 152:24 154:10 definitely 132:3 153:11 definition 28:17 87:24 103:16 definitive 157:20 degree 11:25,25 12:4 13:7,13 43:16 166:14 197:20 degrees 70:1 deliberately 26:25 demonstrate 196:23 demonstrated 112:13 113:5 deny 115:3 departed 2:24 Department 38:23 147:17,19,20 203:24 depend 35:13
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

107:12 123:12 135:3 dependent 13:4 27:10 104:9 depending 95:25 145:5 depends 22:17 71:16 81:7 depilation 58:3,11 depleted 142:18 143:12,14 deployed 145:2 deposition 119:11 119:12,14,18 deprived 116:9 depth 17:23 106:23 derive 67:7 derived 51:21 119:9 170:2 deriving 13:20 describe 76:22 83:1 176:10 193:4 194:1 described 15:3 92:17 describes 39:7 45:8 47:4 48:8 76:15 76:21 77:10 80:9 176:4,14,15 describing 85:13 descriptions 15:5 detail 17:19 21:25 22:15 24:19 59:10 59:14 62:19 150:24 172:1,3 182:16 detailed 17:20 22:23 114:6 details 16:16 detect 5:23 43:9,24 44:14,22 70:21,22 72:4 74:2,17 102:7 detectable 46:17 131:2 detected 73:17	detection 200:19 determination 123:1 165:24 determine 40:9 64:13 68:13 176:2 determined 4:19 91:4 135:15 determining 21:10 42:12 deterministic 53:25 detrimental 44:15 45:15 detriments 21:18 develop 75:15 developments 166:19,21 devised 169:15 diagnosed 31:6,11 diagnosis 13:9 31:1 diarrhoea 125:9,15 126:11,20 die 31:3,5,11 71:8,9 83:12 88:21 died 30:15 53:21,23 88:7 89:2,18,21 106:19 dies 88:11 183:2 diet 65:19 differ 18:8 34:2,7 97:9 differed 31:24,24 difference 18:18,20 30:12,13,17 31:14 34:8 43:21 52:25 69:18 72:5,7 89:8 94:18,25 121:11 122:22,24 161:24 177:6 differences 65:21 different 18:2,5,23 22:20,23 24:8,22 54:5 55:7,9,10 56:3,20 60:8 64:20 68:14,16 78:16 94:5,13,21 96:8 100:3,24	104:20 105:19,22 120:6 125:2 127:12 128:2 129:16 136:14 161:14 164:4 169:13 176:19 177:15 178:22 179:1 190:12 192:14 201:1 differently 29:11 29:13 158:1 difficult 30:5 43:19 56:1 65:3 67:11 69:9 70:11,21 71:7,10,14,17 72:11,17 74:21 81:15,18,25 105:20 125:7 178:15 difficulties 21:13 41:19 52:20 69:11 70:20 71:21,22 102:24 123:25 124:8 difficulty 42:6,12 43:4 59:16 digression 167:6 dips 192:13 direct 40:4 83:9 127:20 129:18 161:23 162:5,6 172:13 directed 120:18 121:18 direction 110:8 163:7 directly 13:11 27:10 39:22 101:3 Director 14:16 38:16 disadvantage 27:3 27:3 disagree 32:21 33:19 35:5 40:19 47:12 49:15 52:7 76:20 80:19 84:4	84:6 91:18 94:7 112:18 114:9 148:18 152:1,15 disagreements 110:5 disagrees 110:4 discarded 100:20 disclosed 6:8 7:16 discount 150:2 discover 43:14 192:21 discuss 120:5 151:6 151:6 159:15 173:11 201:14 discussed 21:24 22:14 64:7 120:4 166:1 173:10 discussing 105:6 discussion 1:6 117:8 204:21 discussions 67:16 109:23 122:1 disease 45:20 47:23 47:24 48:4 51:22 66:11 68:15 71:2 71:5,12,21,23 85:1 87:3,9,13,17 87:20 88:6,12,20 88:21,23 89:2,21 91:5,8 95:14 146:8 170:5 173:3 180:22 diseases 17:14 40:14 42:2 70:16 70:18 84:3 disk 126:9 dismiss 151:6 193:19 disproportionately 29:25 disprove 92:15 distance 51:15 127:7 129:5 131:10 152:9,24 153:8,23 distances 58:8	125:11 distinction 53:5 103:12 distinguish 103:11 194:12 distribution 52:8 117:2 135:4,5 177:7 DIT 38:17,18 diver 181:14 diverge 30:19 diverging 31:15 divider 14:11 60:22 76:8 dividing 82:12 division 7:8 40:3 DNA 39:19,20,23 39:24 40:5 48:15 80:1,4,11 81:3 146:9 do-able 62:12 doctorate 12:1,16 document 3:25 6:8 7:12,15 8:6 22:15 63:7 90:4,15 160:21 161:8,15 162:15,16 170:17 172:10 documents 5:18 6:5 6:24 7:11 132:14 172:12 202:2,3 dodgy 148:1 189:12 189:13 doing 26:3 53:15 54:17 55:12,25 57:23 59:7 70:4 70:15 84:11 91:13 129:3 161:21 167:22 168:3,21 176:7 180:1 192:3 196:18 Doll 53:4,5 Dominic 3:5 door 165:15 DoReMi 158:19 160:19 162:18
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

163:14 169:2 dose 26:10,11 37:18 39:7,11,22 40:1,2,5,6,9,10,10 40:11,24 41:15,17 42:2,9,25 45:1,3,3 46:18 47:21 48:17 48:17 51:7,8,12 51:16 52:4,6,8,9 52:13,14 54:21 55:4 57:21 58:9 58:18 63:25,25 64:1,14 65:12,15 65:23,25 66:3,8 66:12,14,17 67:10 68:8 72:10,13,14 73:6,10,16 74:1,5 74:11,18,23,25 75:3,20,20 76:15 76:21,21 77:7,18 78:6 79:8 80:23 81:12,14,15,18 82:9,19 87:21 90:21 91:8 94:5 95:4,12,15,16,17 95:19,22 96:4,11 96:15 97:22 98:4 98:5,11 99:2,12 100:23 105:7,7,10 105:12,12,13,14 106:13,24 115:3 119:11,13,17,20 122:9,12,23 123:1 125:12,25 127:18 127:19,24 129:5 135:16 152:2,4,16 152:17,19,24 154:6 156:5,7,8 156:12,13 169:15 171:15 172:21 175:25 178:7 180:7,8 181:23,25 182:3,13,19,20,23 183:14,22 184:7 184:10,19 185:10 185:10,13,21,22	186:20,22,23 187:2 191:13,24 192:6,14 193:11 193:20 194:15 195:2 196:7,16,20 196:23 197:7,13 197:14,16,17,17 197:19 198:14 199:12,15,20,22 199:23,23 200:9 200:12,14,16,19 200:21,22,25,25 201:2,2,3,3,7,9 dose' 40:3 doses 40:10 42:7,7 45:7 51:21 63:22 64:1 68:24 72:11 72:18 73:7,10,11 73:23 74:3,8,17 74:19,19,23 75:2 76:19 77:5,19,21 77:25 78:4,5 79:2 79:4 80:1,17 90:22 96:2,9 99:11 102:8 104:2 104:24 105:23 106:7,16 112:24 113:13 114:13,17 115:10 117:3,3 119:9 126:4 146:11 150:10 152:18 153:1,7 167:16 184:18,23 185:4,11,21 186:2 186:15,21 187:5,6 189:6 190:22 191:3,12 192:17 192:18 194:4 doses' 64:8 dosimeters 52:15 153:10,15,19 200:17,18 dosimetrist 130:16 dosimetrists 130:20 132:4 dosimetry 51:10	63:19 106:16 122:21 127:15,23 129:14 153:3,21 153:22 dosimetry-related 130:15 double 39:20,21 54:21 189:7 double-check 101:15 doubling 181:25 doubt 17:7 42:7 52:6 78:22,23 164:24 205:2 downwards 74:24 Dr 1:13 4:3,10 5:25 7:9 8:3 9:6,9 10:13 11:5 14:14 15:3,3,4,5 33:8 36:22 38:2 41:25 45:8 46:7 62:11 62:24 76:8 86:13 86:16 88:1 95:12 95:15,19 97:18,22 103:2,4,6,7,8,8 108:8 111:7,10,13 111:19 114:1,15 115:13,17,23 116:3,19 118:24 119:3,24,25 120:2 121:10,16,23 122:18 124:5,14 124:18,25 125:2,4 129:8,12 130:4,23 131:4 132:12,12 133:11,23 137:4 138:8 141:6,9,15 141:15,18,23 142:9,14 143:3 144:5,10 145:1 146:17 147:2,6 149:10,18,24 150:7,23 152:3,17 154:16,21,24 155:5,5,15,18 156:1 157:5,24,25	158:9,9,18,18,21 159:10,16,20 160:1,9,14,19,21 161:21 164:12 166:1 167:5 169:5 170:23 171:21 172:19 173:8,19 173:24,25 174:3 174:10,18,22 175:17 178:8 184:4,15 187:11 187:16,21 190:14 193:12 196:25 198:3,5,13 199:15 199:17 200:24 202:6,8,12,15,19 202:23 204:8 206:3,5 draw 1:17 43:19 99:5 131:9 142:23 151:21 drawing 88:1 150:12,19 161:16 176:7 drawn 23:1 128:21 138:6 139:10 172:22 190:17,18 DREF 99:4,11,18 drew 77:12 90:6 128:17 163:5 183:14 drink 151:14 drinking 151:13 driving 197:8 drop 52:11 Drug 147:18 DS86 51:10 125:25 127:15,19 128:1 DSc 14:15 DSO2 51:10 127:20 153:3,6 DU 144:12 DU-exposed 144:13 Dublin 38:9,15,19 due 14:4 29:6 39:23	40:13 42:2,3 79:23 134:4 136:4 duration 157:1,1 <hr/> E <hr/> e 29:6 206:1 e-mail 2:19 earlier 14:25 15:1 21:6 55:24 77:11 88:23 97:25 102:21 124:18 152:11 181:24 188:13,13 early 30:19 56:15 126:12,13 earth 43:5 easier 85:19 175:18 easy 40:12 65:1 eat 54:9 eating 122:14 ecological 150:13 151:7,21 152:14 154:2 effect 33:18,24 39:12 40:11 44:15 44:25 45:15 47:16 51:16 65:24 66:1 66:3,6 68:17 70:8 70:10,11,12 72:1 72:10,12,14,15 77:5,18 79:8 80:23 81:12,17 82:9 95:13 116:21 122:19,25 126:7 137:24 145:5,7 167:16,17 168:1,2 173:3 180:7,8,9,9 180:10 182:14,20 182:21,23 183:3 184:17,24 185:21 185:22 196:25 effective 43:8 44:12 44:20 119:19 122:23 effectively 25:1 90:6 176:6 199:22
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

effectiveness 95:13	enable 15:15	epidemiologists	198:25 199:23	113:23,25 114:7
effects 5:13 13:21	159:13 204:9	84:7 103:15	200:15	114:11,22 115:1,2
17:2 46:18 47:20	enabled 84:1	epidemiology 17:1	estimated 22:10	115:3,10,16,18,23
48:5,12 53:22	enables 142:23	26:2 45:23 53:6	23:19 114:13	116:20 117:5,8
64:8 73:14 76:15	ended 133:25	67:11 68:1 73:25	169:22,23	118:2,4,8,15,21
76:19,22 77:20,24	190:12	74:11,16 78:14	estimates 64:19	119:18 121:24
78:2 79:1,4 82:13	endpoint 48:3	81:1,14,21 84:20	67:5,20 69:16	126:8 129:23
84:8,12 88:24	endpoints 47:22	86:20,22 87:7,10	75:3 76:4 106:12	132:24 133:5,24
114:18 125:5,8,16	48:4	87:19 88:2,8 98:2	106:13 135:2	141:13 148:15,20
125:17,18 126:2,9	ends 14:7	103:12 123:4,18	151:2 152:2,4	149:5 150:8,8
126:10,11,12,13	Energy 38:15	138:8 147:16	168:19 190:2,7	155:12 161:16,24
126:15,15,23	enquire 160:1	167:5,7 174:16	197:14 199:18	162:5,6,24 164:2
127:2,8,16,21	enquirer 75:6	180:23 201:21	estimating 57:21	164:4,22 165:3,4
128:1 132:15	enter 81:2	epigenetic 45:25	63:21 64:12 101:8	165:5,6 171:22
135:22,25 136:4,6	entirely 3:23 19:9	46:3 48:12	et 34:12,13,18	184:5
161:2,2 167:8	46:22 96:7	epilation 58:3	170:16	evidential 121:15
180:18 185:2,2	environment 79:7	59:12 60:17 125:9	European 64:23	evolve 69:16
187:25 188:1	environmental	126:11,19	162:21 163:8,14	evolving 92:4
197:7	38:17 67:25 81:8	equal 66:2	163:21 165:12	exacerbated 21:14
efforts 47:21,23	107:6 147:16	equally 47:6	169:18	88:15
egg 182:8,9	Epi 46:6	equivalent 163:24	euros 165:16	exact 40:21 191:1
either 23:4 54:18	epicentre 50:12,18	equivalently	evaluate 1:21 132:6	exactly 8:14 20:25
54:18 67:10 69:7	epidemiological	123:19	148:4	31:5 34:22 55:12
86:13 88:18	12:24 13:20 17:11	Erm 9:13	evaluated 153:4	76:24 114:15
103:17	17:17 21:13 27:9	error 129:7 141:12	evening 205:10	143:13 151:23
electron 136:5	39:14,16 40:7,20	ERRs 123:12	event 87:9 171:23	152:21 175:1
element 203:7	41:5 43:9 44:13	especially 1:9 17:13	everybody 150:16	200:6
elevated 34:16	44:21 49:22 65:17	23:18 122:13	151:11,14 152:19	examination 53:10
73:16 74:5 156:3	68:14 69:21 74:3	essential 153:22	201:3	73:6
eligible 27:15 28:5	75:9 77:3 78:1,4	essentially 74:19,20	evidence 9:12	Examination-in-...
emerge 2:9 92:14	78:19 84:17 87:15	89:5 107:13	13:20 17:5,9	9:10 206:4
emerged 121:24	88:4 92:23 104:15	143:18 146:8	22:22 23:12,16	examine 128:17
174:7	105:15 112:25	152:9 153:7,9	24:15 32:19 36:1	examined 146:5
emerging 109:23	136:10 158:25	154:1 168:2,20	47:16 50:4 54:3	177:21
eminent 15:3	167:13 171:2,11	173:2,12 174:18	58:2 59:15,21	examining 149:1
108:16,17 110:10	171:14 174:12	176:13,20 177:15	64:25 69:5,7 78:4	example 13:7 46:13
emitters 164:1,14	203:7	178:6	79:10,18 82:11,24	46:15,25 47:4
emphasised 21:22	epidemiologist	establish 73:16	83:5 85:5 88:18	54:6,19 64:21
employ 123:10	16:18 17:25 18:12	87:5	90:7 91:7,18 92:2	66:9 71:7,14 73:8
employed 25:6	19:18 26:6 48:2	estimate 54:24 56:3	92:11,24 93:7	74:7 77:1 104:22
120:7 149:3	76:17 80:18 83:3	56:4,14,16 67:8,8	98:23 107:19	104:24 106:10
employer 7:10	104:13 123:7	69:12,14 75:1	108:25 109:5,21	112:21 113:11
employers 23:2	130:20 136:13	81:21 88:11 89:6	109:24 110:16,17	122:4 140:18
26:18	137:15 146:10	89:9 106:16 168:7	110:18 111:1,2	141:1 151:12,14
employment 12:22	147:9 173:10,13	168:11 181:5	112:2,10,11,14,17	166:21 167:8
38:10 157:2	174:11	190:24 197:19,20	112:20 113:1,3,9	168:18 185:8

194:16 examples 111:25 excess 67:5 72:2 94:11 123:10 133:13 134:1,24 155:20 157:9 168:11 170:4 185:9,10,14,15,15 186:19 194:9,14 194:15,17,22 195:1,2 197:8 198:14,17 excesses 32:19 exclude 72:2 117:20,24 excluded 20:21 21:1 23:22 26:20 118:9 132:25 190:10,11 excluding 190:25 exercise 4:3 12:18 27:2 56:1 71:15 91:15 exercises 32:16 exhausted 177:16 exhibited 66:11 exist 74:9,12 183:16 existence 23:4 131:9 existing 161:16 expect 9:2 29:12 108:20 139:20 176:24 194:5 202:2 expectancy 89:6 expectation 62:2 expectations 205:3 expected 50:20 64:17 65:24 66:1 66:3,18 88:11 150:10 159:5 195:19,20,21 203:12 expecting 203:17 experience 16:11	16:18 22:21 56:7 140:20 experienced 21:19 83:17 experiences 63:17 experiment 34:18 182:18 experimental 65:20 experiments 21:12 21:16 expert 6:2 15:17 34:23 37:12,14 104:5 120:5,8,24 122:21 123:1 131:5 132:21 133:17 134:16 136:2 158:7 162:20 174:10 182:22 expertise 12:24 13:11 16:8,11 17:8 32:7 33:6 34:21 46:20 48:2 49:2,3 91:25 103:10 104:19 107:4 136:8 149:21 173:6 201:23 experts 1:21,25 2:5 120:3,24 121:2,4 121:11,18 158:5 experts' 14:24 explain 4:1 46:2 120:6 190:2 explained 55:19 77:11 99:24 118:12 119:7 120:20 explanation 94:22 120:19 127:8 explanatory 3:19 95:9 explore 146:2 exploring 56:19 99:23 explosion 50:12	125:23 127:5,6 explosions 53:22 exposed 43:5,7 51:14 52:3 64:6 64:15 65:22 105:23 106:1 125:16 135:16 136:15 140:15,17 140:18,21,22 142:22 145:18 148:8,21,23 156:21 157:10 162:2 163:22 167:23,23,25 168:6,15,16,17,24 169:7,9 171:23 181:17 exposure 3:14 22:21 24:14 32:5 32:8,13 33:18,25 34:5 37:10,17 40:2,13 42:3 46:18 47:21,25 51:17 52:4 53:13 54:13 56:9,15 58:5,8,12,19 84:19 87:3 89:3 106:2 107:6 114:21 121:25 123:19 125:22 128:9 129:17,18 135:22 140:11,20 143:10 149:5,8 150:14,17 151:3 151:11,17 154:20 155:19 156:6,14 156:16,17,23 157:1,2 161:10,11 161:25 166:17 169:10,13,14 170:6,7 180:21 181:2,10,18 182:7 185:1 exposures 23:25 34:10 45:22 63:25 65:19 98:5 106:12	122:5 123:17 128:1 162:1,2 169:25 170:8 expressed 18:11 24:4 46:10 expression 53:2 64:14 expressions 121:13 exquisitely 45:19 46:24 47:5,8,12 extends 50:17 191:17 extensive 17:11 48:24 extensively 22:24 56:21 extent 1:17 12:11 21:10,18,21 35:13 35:24 36:25 123:23 external 105:23 125:12,17,22 126:4 127:24 135:3,7,11,16,18 161:11,25 167:24 168:6,7 169:15 externally 169:7,9 extra 74:20 75:18 177:5,23 180:2 extracted 25:2 extraneous 65:18 66:2 extrapolate 54:15 56:7 extrapolated 40:10 75:1 extrapolating 45:2 53:18 54:12 63:24 64:10 67:23 extrapolation 22:16 42:8,13 45:7 67:16 72:18 76:14 95:15 98:12 extreme 43:21 139:20,20 extremely 103:21	194:4,7,8 eye 49:16 <hr/> F <hr/> face 58:24 59:3 147:14 150:25 faced 87:1 facilitate 204:20 Facility 4:20 facing 88:14 fact 3:21 7:19 19:16 23:4,24 28:10 33:22 45:21 56:20 58:6 71:23 78:4,16 89:22 97:5,7 105:18 106:9 108:23 109:21 114:22 117:2 138:15 163:3 177:5 179:23 181:3 186:24 188:10 189:5 190:25 191:4 192:8,10 197:12 198:19 200:11 factor 26:6,21 36:10 40:3 55:2 89:23 94:25 95:6 95:13 98:21 162:3 163:23 181:25 186:13 factored 198:21 factors 35:14,17 64:12 65:22 68:2 68:9 71:13 81:8 facts 110:3,4,5,8 117:18,24 factually 35:7 faculty 149:14,15 failure 149:7 fair 30:1 37:23 43:16 74:14 75:19 91:22 103:21 108:12 139:8 161:5 202:1
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

fairly 30:15 45:11 65:25 103:14 130:14 137:21	fewer 195:21	first 4:4 7:15 10:1 11:13,25 12:4 14:11 19:5 20:10 20:22,24 23:8 24:25 26:4 28:12 30:3 33:19 37:6 40:15 50:25 52:23 53:4,8 57:16 58:13 60:22 62:25 63:3 65:16 86:16 88:4 94:5,6 95:10 95:21 96:21 123:21 135:23 142:10,20 156:11 170:22,24 171:13 173:1 176:5 184:2 184:9 187:13 190:3,6,14 200:3	focus 28:21	155:20,25 158:2 169:19
fall 18:21	field 16:8 46:11 49:3 132:21	followed 102:11	following 67:15 79:24	Friday 141:8 204:1 204:5,15
fall-off 58:19	fields 69:21 104:6 108:17	follows 146:8	force 6:17 7:21 197:8	friend 6:23 7:1
falling 125:14	figure 41:3 50:19 60:16 61:11 97:1 97:5 190:15 198:4 198:5,10	food 43:6 147:18	Forces 28:1	front 149:13
fallout 123:18 126:2,7 127:16 128:2 129:20,24 131:1,10 134:5,15	figures 61:7 84:24 88:18 91:3 94:4 94:10,23	footed 188:5	forget 103:2 200:7	fruitful 130:22
falls 149:21 197:16	filed 14:24 90:3	force 6:17 7:21 197:8	forgive 97:15	FTT 6:10
false 66:4,5	files 3:12 37:23	force 6:17 7:21 197:8	form 25:1 30:22 84:15 102:16	full 28:22 116:4,7 116:15 142:5
familiar 58:13 63:8 86:17 114:10 115:25 130:8,9 133:15,16 137:1 141:23 142:10,12 143:19 155:5 160:21 170:21 173:16 185:8	fills 160:5	form 25:1 30:22 84:15 102:16	formal 90:3	fully 19:14 21:20
far 15:7 27:6 36:24 37:15 42:10 46:10 46:20 47:13 50:23 79:15 81:20 82:25 102:15 114:17 125:11 126:24 131:15,16 142:14 148:12 153:13 154:11 159:17 160:1 170:20 184:8	final 56:18 89:25 204:17,20	format 7:13	forms 37:8	function 156:21 176:13,14,16,19 176:22,23,25 177:1,6,9,10,12 177:13 193:3
fatal 30:11	finally 10:16	formulæ 44:3	forth 122:15 196:4	functions 177:15 177:17
father 53:6	find 9:23 11:13,17 14:13 16:15 38:6 43:18 54:20 58:20 60:9 61:7 70:21 79:22 84:16 85:19 90:19 91:7 117:11 150:25 176:9,12 176:16 177:17 178:6 181:15 188:4 189:10 190:21 191:7 196:6	forward 92:18 112:20 163:16 165:9,11 171:11	found 60:13 66:20 72:23 93:14 125:11 126:21,22 134:3 145:7 183:13	fund 162:22
feasible 163:1 165:6	finding 40:25 41:6 137:4,9 138:9,18 139:23,25	found 60:13 66:20 72:23 93:14 125:11 126:21,22 134:3 145:7 183:13	Foundation 126:9	funding 163:14
features 32:6	findings 22:16 33:13,24 34:11 66:9 73:13	fits 78:11 175:4,8 176:17 177:2,9,10 178:7 193:10	foundations 112:23	further 9:3 11:1 21:9 22:6 23:12 23:15 75:21,22 82:23 97:19 121:14 153:2 157:19 197:5
fed 106:15	finds 133:13	fitted 179:5 180:14 183:10	four 32:6 77:13 86:12 128:17 202:15,17	future 163:8
feeding 4:5	fine 2:7 8:1 56:17 204:5	fitting 176:3 177:24 178:5 180:1 185:12,15	fourth 129:15	
feel 118:1	finger 80:8	five 53:19 170:16 181:6 201:12 204:23	framework 120:25	G
feeling 2:24	fingertips 21:2 101:17	fixed 78:6 82:11,16	France 188:15	G 64:7
fell 96:10 127:5,6 192:18	finished 85:21 134:20	flag 23:3	frank 47:23	game 110:1
fertilised 182:9	fire 155:3 198:12	flat 192:5	freely 129:8	gamma 125:22 135:3,7,16,18 161:11,25 162:4 163:24 164:8 168:6,7,11,16,16 168:20 169:22 170:2
Feuerhake 110:1 201:23	firmlly 76:16	Flip 142:5	French 79:12,20	gap 78:10 98:10,14 181:19
Feuerhake's 173:9		fly 24:12		general 2:16 12:6 24:18 37:5 74:15 84:4 101:8 113:24 132:25 151:5 187:13 191:15 199:1,8,9

generality 70:14	203:1,25	148:21 149:6,10	gold 82:10 83:6	109:2 110:8 138:3
generally 54:5 98:2 117:1	given 17:16 18:3 33:22 55:4 67:7	154:12 155:11	good 1:4,5,18 9:4 11:5,6 42:10	138:4,9 142:21
generate 143:20	76:12 86:12 89:22	157:11 160:11,16	47:15 69:7 76:1	162:17,18,20,23
generated 140:11 158:13	90:2,11,15 93:18	162:9 165:15	99:9 100:10 103:8	162:25 163:7,12
generating 157:8	96:9 123:24 129:9	167:7,11 172:19	103:9 105:25	163:15 168:9
generation 200:9	131:23 177:5	172:23 174:21,24	117:4,12,14,19	171:18 189:6
generations 184:9	195:10 203:18	176:9 181:6	118:4 119:16	191:24 195:20,23
generically 114:5	gives 7:15 8:13	182:18 186:14	121:23 130:6	199:4,4,7,13
genes 46:9 82:15	46:13,13 68:17	190:25 191:6	135:9 147:12,24	200:5 201:11
genetic 45:24 46:17 65:18 81:8 82:11	75:1 99:17 101:9	192:9,24 193:1	151:18,20 169:21	group's 200:7
146:9 148:17	102:14 126:10	195:8,13,23 196:5	170:3,20 179:22	groupings 197:13
173:3,9 180:19	172:11 179:18	199:2,8,25 202:4	179:25 188:25	groups 21:21 22:22
187:20	192:1	202:10 205:8	Government 6:16 203:23	29:22 42:24 47:11
genome 166:23	giving 111:1 204:19	goes 16:12 23:11	gradiant 195:3	64:6 65:22 72:5
genomic 82:14 112:22	glad 4:11 130:6	45:17 48:21,24	graph 59:13,21	73:21 110:2,7
genotoxic 128:8 135:22 136:4	glanced 136:24 170:22	61:10 81:6 113:9	176:2 195:11,12	123:19 138:6
157:7 171:23	gleaned 152:6	167:2 183:7	197:1 198:4,4,5	157:10 196:20
genotoxicity	global 134:5	195:24 198:16	205:3	growing 1:8
134:19,22 136:5	glossary 11:21	going 1:8,13,16 2:6	graphs 60:12 61:7	grown 1:7
146:6 161:14	go 6:10 9:21 11:13	3:20 5:17,24	grateful 1:15 82:3	guess 106:1 200:20
166:2,8	11:19 12:17 14:14	11:10 16:4 26:5	97:18 203:21	Gulf 141:21 143:22
gentleman 33:8	19:3 20:9 21:4	26:16 28:10 35:21	204:25	144:3 145:2,13,14
geographical 51:6 51:18 52:7,14	22:8 23:15 27:12	40:24 47:18 59:6	grays 74:9	148:9,11 149:3
57:22 58:21 117:2	28:2,2 33:4 34:9	62:24 71:8 79:19	great 17:19 40:2	169:11
geographically	37:25 38:4 41:16	80:2 83:8,12,21	50:23 62:19 66:4	Guseva 169:12
58:19	46:10 47:13 48:8	84:15 86:11 93:22	84:2 91:25 106:23	
Georgia 144:4	48:22 57:3 58:22	94:1 108:21 111:5	150:16	H
getting 9:1 16:8	61:5 63:12 65:12	111:9 114:5	greater 23:25 67:5	Haar 3:19,25 6:23
35:25 48:1 49:19	65:13 67:10,14,19	115:21 116:9	greatest 51:23	11:3,5 16:4 19:2
82:18 179:3	72:12,19,20,25	118:13 123:4,8	112:22	19:25 21:4 22:2,5
183:20	76:5,9 78:12,25	124:18 129:23	Greenland 4:12,14	26:24 30:3 31:17
gigantic 103:24	79:15,19,24 80:8	130:21 133:7,9	4:16 86:13,16	36:21 38:20 42:23
give 9:7,11 14:8	80:8 81:7 82:6	134:18 149:17,19	88:1	45:5 46:13 55:23
24:22 46:25 57:25	83:8,12 90:25	149:22 158:18,22	grey 95:24	57:5,10,14,25
61:22 62:3 82:19	96:12,20,25 97:4	159:1,7 160:12	groaning 8:25	60:2,4,12,18,21
89:9 101:11	97:22 100:3 104:3	162:11,22 165:9	ground 37:8 52:16	61:1,5 62:11,22
128:14 135:14	106:22 113:23	165:19 167:5,15	53:9,13	79:22 85:23 86:8
141:13 145:23	115:23 120:18	168:22 169:19	grounds 162:7	94:1 96:20 97:15
163:2 174:13	123:9 124:18	175:19 176:5	groundwater 150:9	97:18 99:23
175:20 195:11	129:23 130:1	180:18 184:15,16	151:13	123:15 152:10
	131:15,17 133:11	187:7 194:24	group 10:13 21:17	206:4
	136:3,10 141:19	196:2,5 201:16,17	21:23 22:9,17	hair 58:3,5,7,18,21
	142:14 143:21	201:22 202:3,4,10	26:5 29:21,24,24	125:14
	144:13 146:4	202:16 204:4	38:14 47:5 50:21	half 55:1 64:11
		205:2,2,8		106:1 158:23
				159:21 160:10

half-time 38:13	head 55:3 104:3	204:18,25 205:5	holds 39:10,19	163:5 170:9
Hallard 3:22 90:22	108:9 182:5 197:4	206:4	134:8	hypothetically
104:25 105:13	headed 67:19	hereditary 82:13	hope 1:9 3:17 8:23	35:15
122:5 184:17	heading 10:7 95:10	heritable 181:25	27:7 63:1 110:19	
halving 95:14	157:13	high 23:22 26:10	142:5 154:14	I
hamburgers 54:10	Headquarters 6:16	34:12 36:1 37:18	159:14 174:13	i.e 23:21 58:3 70:18
Hamilton 38:24	health 5:4,13,22	40:6,10,13 42:7,9	204:16 205:9	88:19 96:3
hand 2:18 5:18	7:8 13:21 21:10	62:4 63:25 65:23	hopefully 73:22	ICRP 56:21,24
58:11,11,17 87:12	21:18 22:21 23:1	74:5 98:4,11	horizontal 191:17	65:7 68:25 101:5
handed 5:8,12 6:9	23:17 26:17,18	99:11 126:21	192:13	101:12 102:1,16
86:5 116:8 136:23	28:17 32:13,15,18	156:23 162:20	hormone 137:12	107:14,16,18
146:25 160:2	35:11 79:1 81:17	163:7 167:23	Hospital 38:14	108:1,3,9,13,17
203:2	112:6 129:10	184:18,23 185:4	hot 184:18	109:20 110:9,13
handing 6:24	147:19,20 167:8	185:21,22 186:15	hour 61:12	110:16,19 112:10
handle 76:2	healthier 27:15,23	187:4 190:21	hours 203:25	112:24,25 113:25
hang 6:22 8:10	28:5 199:9	191:3 192:17	Housekeeping 1:3	114:8 117:6,7,13
114:2 146:25	healthy 28:1	194:4,7,8,9	206:2	117:15 118:7,10
172:20 175:15	198:19,21 199:11	high-powered 44:8	Howard 10:18	118:22 123:11
hapless 24:11	hear 1:21 8:3 9:18	higher 34:1 36:6,10	136:5	131:24 132:1,14
happen 53:11	heard 16:21,23	40:2 45:3 50:23	huffing 175:17	134:23 135:10
77:19 104:3	79:14 107:19	52:3 64:24 72:7	huge 94:17	145:21,22,23
125:10 152:20	124:22 184:17	72:18 74:19,23	human 47:13 65:17	149:7,16 150:11
157:21 165:19,20	hearing 149:20	78:5 97:11 98:16	133:14 134:4	161:3 168:23
180:23 181:10,14	174:8	99:16,16 134:7	147:19	172:21 179:4
happened 25:6	heart 71:8,10	148:9,12 185:22	hypocentre 50:12	181:24 183:12
26:22 28:11 127:4	heavy 136:4	186:13,21 189:16	125:12 126:20,24	184:6
happening 75:10	held 18:3 39:25	189:21 192:18	127:3,7 129:5	ICRP/103 65:5
167:15	91:25	194:25 196:7	131:10 152:10,25	108:4
happens 4:6 179:15	help 36:24 37:15	197:9,10	hypotheses 2:9	idea 34:5 55:15
happy 9:11	142:18 146:23	highest 185:11	41:3 92:9,19,21	110:2 163:10
hard 7:14 28:2 30:5	171:3	highlight 52:21	112:8,9 113:4,8	169:21 179:18
190:16 193:16	helpful 11:20 52:19	highlighted 94:24	158:10	ideal 55:11 69:20
hard-working 2:20	57:13,15 204:22	Hiroshima 49:23	hypotheses-gene...	ideally 53:2 138:16
harm 42:25 81:12	helpfully 86:6	50:13 131:1 169:8	160:15	identical 52:1
148:17 170:2	Heppinstall 1:5,9	historical 6:14	hypothesis 43:25	identified 15:11,12
Hawaii 144:4	1:12,22 2:7,14,18	48:22 56:8	44:1 76:13 92:14	21:21 29:7 90:13
Haycock 1:13	3:5,7,13,16,24	historically 27:4	92:15 115:16	identifies 134:15
Haylock 4:10 5:25	4:10,12,14,24 5:1	history 6:6,15	129:13 140:11	identify 7:2 19:15
8:3 9:6,9 11:5	5:3,7,12,15,17,22	13:14 14:1 16:5	143:8,10,20 148:7	26:2,4 32:14
36:22 62:11 95:12	6:6,15,21 7:4,21	38:10 111:25	156:20 157:6,8,9	35:11 38:3 71:9
95:15,19 97:18	8:1,4,7,11,13,19	hit 48:14,16 191:8	158:14 164:7	71:13
103:8 120:2 131:4	8:23 9:6,10,23	ho 62:21	hypothesis-gener...	identifying 21:23
132:12 141:15	11:1 60:24 86:8	Hogan 3:9 4:2	138:14 140:6	22:25 29:6 31:20
152:17 158:9,18	116:10,11 159:4	hold 6:19 18:1,12	143:3,6 144:10,11	68:1 74:12
160:1 206:3	159:25 160:8	80:1,17 155:3	148:6 156:9 157:4	ignore 192:23
Haylock's 4:3 7:9	203:22 204:5,13	198:12	157:5 158:15	193:1

ignored 149:23 185:20	201:22	increasingly 70:21	152:6 159:4 161:9	61:22 69:3 138:15
ill 25:3 167:10	incidence 3:8 30:8	independent 17:5	161:23 163:2	150:25
illness 13:1 167:10	30:13,17 36:7	index 2:22	167:19,21,24	interface 33:5
illuminates 83:23	40:8 54:4 89:7	indicate 74:6 159:8	172:11,12 196:21	internal 106:2,2,6
illustrates 21:20	102:12	160:8 202:8	196:22	106:12 123:17
52:20	incidences 13:9	indicated 201:16	informed 114:11	128:1,9 135:13,14
imagination 157:20	24:16 47:24 48:4	202:24 204:8	inherent 21:13	162:1 169:10,14
imagine 48:18 49:1	146:11	indication 37:17	initial 53:22 125:23	169:25 170:6,7
63:7 103:24	incident 31:7	46:14 52:13	137:19 152:24	198:24,24,25
105:20 175:25	include 22:11,13	131:13 156:24	153:1	internally 168:1,24
182:7	92:6 127:15	205:8	initially 56:9	International
immediate 127:8	included 20:2,3,5,6	indications 66:9	initiation 75:14	102:3
immediately 16:15	20:21 21:6 22:9	181:3	input 103:25 104:9	interplay 16:6
38:7 63:4 103:1	23:7,19,23 27:14	indicative 137:24	104:23	interpret 111:21
125:10	27:22 28:4,16	indicator 2:22 37:1	input/output 123:2	interpretation
impact 40:2	106:20 117:8	37:10 52:8,14	inputs 103:24	110:3,7 126:22
implausible 179:10	122:5 132:20	individual 44:16,23	inquiry 2:2 121:15	interpretations
implication 33:24	161:3	45:15 47:23 51:9	130:22 163:11	96:8
169:5	includes 31:10	51:11,21 52:9,10	164:6 171:17	interpreted 77:24
implications	59:12 132:1	77:20 81:16,25	insignificant	interpreting 64:5
139:11	including 34:16	82:1 84:21 87:2	141:13	200:8
importance 4:16	81:8 122:22	90:7 117:3 151:2	insofar 53:17	interrupt 31:9
202:19	131:10	152:2,3,10,15,18	201:20	interval 191:10,11
important 22:12	incomplete 29:4,5	154:4,6,6,7,9	inspired 75:15	192:13
25:8 26:9 78:24	53:14	196:20 200:10	instabilities 137:11	intervals 191:13
82:15 85:12	incompletely 29:2	individuals 81:22	instability 112:23	192:10,11 193:13
109:19 129:9,12	inconsequential	81:23 89:16 109:8	instance 40:13	interview 152:6
191:22 202:4	65:25	119:15 145:18	66:22 101:1	intestine 74:8
203:11	inconsistencies	151:5 152:6	171:13 178:20	introducing 133:8
importantly 152:12	63:19	induction 82:13	instances 188:20	introduction 63:12
impossible 69:9,10	inconsistency	industry 141:3	Institute 38:19	invalidate 135:7
151:20	58:10	158:3	institutional 25:24	invalidated 122:2
impression 12:23	incorporated 12:6	inevitably 27:5	instructed 91:13	189:19
90:11 197:15	increase 32:17	53:14 93:5	instructing 93:13	investigate 183:11
improve 115:21	33:15 54:21 70:16	infants 144:3	instrumentation	investigation
improvements	102:7 138:21	inform 98:18	131:7	157:19
68:10	180:7 182:13,14	183:12	insufficiently	invisible 123:18
improves 69:15	182:19 183:13	information 7:23	118:20	135:13
inability 74:2	187:2 195:25	12:9 13:2 18:4	integrity 109:8	invited 121:11
inadequacies 19:13	increased 33:14	19:17 29:6 30:18	interaction 68:8	involve 12:11
32:3	36:16,18 40:9	30:18 31:20 53:18	interactions 67:21	involved 19:5,19
inadequacy 21:15	50:10,17 51:25	55:13 56:25 68:7	interest 17:1 59:25	20:16 25:7,13
inappropriate 51:6	73:3 74:3	73:22 75:3,18	62:3 86:20	138:1 149:17
inaudible 22:4 96:5	increases 179:15	103:22 107:9	interested 7:16	153:5 162:14
196:3 197:23	increasing 40:8	108:25 111:9,22	126:16 154:17,25	involvement 21:11
	182:7,20,23	120:12 135:14	interesting 2:8 4:8	involves 12:14

INWORKS 102:4 102:9,15 186:18 186:25 188:11,14 188:18 195:9	judgment 100:16 101:5 109:21 114:11 185:19	119:18,22 121:6,9 121:21 122:16 123:24 124:3,6,10 124:12,17,20 125:1,3 128:13,16 128:23,25 129:3 129:25 130:6,9,17 130:21 131:16,20 131:23 132:1,4,6 132:8,11 133:4,15 133:18,22 136:22 136:25 137:3,25 138:4,7 141:4,7 141:11,17,20,25 142:2,4,8,10,13 142:16,25 143:2 143:24 144:2,6,8 144:19,21,23 146:14,25 147:3,5 148:25 149:17 150:5,21 151:25 154:14,18 155:1,3 155:13,17,22 156:2,11,16,20 157:11,15,23 158:5,14,16,20,22 159:12,17,21 160:6,11,18,20 161:15,19 163:9 163:18 164:6,11 165:1,7,9,14,19 165:23 166:9,12 166:15,20,24 167:4 169:4 170:12,15,20,24 171:2,5,8,10,17 172:3,6,9,18 173:4,6,15,18,22 174:1,4,6,15,19 175:15,19,24 177:18 178:2,5 184:2,14 187:9,13 187:17 190:1,6,13 193:6 196:15 198:2,8,12,23 200:23 201:12	202:7,10,13,16,22 202:24 204:4,7,14 204:19 205:1,6 justify 35:9 133:6 justifying 35:18	160:10 163:6,20 163:25 164:21,23 165:9,19 166:7 169:6 170:24 171:10 174:9 180:14 181:20 183:10 194:14 196:2 202:10,16 202:17 203:15,16	
ionising 5:13 17:2 37:11,18,18 132:15	judgments 13:5 109:5		justifying 35:18	171:10 174:9 180:14 181:20 183:10 194:14 196:2 202:10,16 202:17 203:15,16	
Iowa 144:4	July 7:9		<hr/> K <hr/>	knowing 66:5	
irradiation 40:1	June 1:1 205:14		Kang 146:18	knowledge 25:22 25:24 41:2 55:18 57:2 112:11 122:18 147:8,24 148:3 153:17 157:13	
Island 122:14	JUSTICE 1:4,8,11 1:16,23 2:8,16,20 3:6,10,14,21 4:8 4:11,13,22,25 5:2 5:5,9,13,16,20 6:4 6:14,19,22 7:20 7:25 8:2,5,9,12,16 8:22,24 9:7,11,14 9:20 11:2,4 15:20 15:22,24 16:2 18:17,20 19:1,22 20:19 21:2 22:1,3 25:13,15,18,21,24 26:2,15,23 29:19 29:23 30:2,22 31:3,8,13,16 35:1 35:3,15,20 36:10 36:14,19 38:19 42:21 44:19 46:6 46:8,12 55:19,21 57:5,12,24 59:5 59:11,15,20 60:3 60:11,16,20 61:2 61:4,17,21 62:1,6 62:15,17,21 79:20 85:21 86:4 93:20 93:25 96:14,17 97:17,21,25 98:10 98:20,25 99:14,21 100:2,7,12,18 101:11,14,16,20 101:22,24 102:15 102:18,20,23,25 103:5 110:22 111:8,11,14,18 113:22 114:2,10 115:8,12,14,19 116:2,5,12,15,18 118:12,19 119:2,7			keep 9:17 80:8 93:25 keeping 19:14 keeps 78:9 kept 3:1 key 81:13 kicks 78:14 killed 184:20 192:19 killing 185:5 kilogram 127:24 kilometre 50:11 52:2 kilometres 50:18 125:13,13 126:20 127:2 kind 24:21 118:14 137:25 145:25 149:18 158:12 169:13 180:23 knock 165:15 know 7:16 9:16 14:20,22 15:5,7 19:22 20:4,6 24:2 25:12 40:22 41:7 41:22 46:22 52:17 53:1 55:12 58:25 59:6 60:6 61:22 62:1 69:20 71:7 76:6 85:10 89:21 106:6 110:14,20 113:11 121:17 125:6 130:6 131:13 136:22 137:15 139:9 140:20 141:7 145:11 153:6 155:1 158:6,8,25	known 17:4 22:20 45:18 125:18 knows 20:6 160:9
isotopic 134:14				<hr/> L <hr/>	
issue 29:10 31:23 36:15 54:15 56:5 70:23 74:1 81:13 82:22 87:6 97:23 101:12 129:9,12 151:10 155:9				lack 41:19 55:17	
issues 23:1 29:10 29:12 59:4 104:21 105:6 106:21 119:8 204:10				language 124:1	
item 20:1 28:14 178:13				large 27:25 46:6 65:24 68:16 70:10 71:17 73:21 77:2 111:25 145:3 193:14	
iteration 56:24 129:15				large-scale 47:10	
iterations 153:2				largely 73:9	
<hr/> J <hr/>				larger 22:17 64:16 69:5 70:12 71:11 73:4 138:17 139:11 191:12,12	
JAB 6:8				largest 190:7	
Japan 134:8				late 6:25 48:11 56:12,13 126:14 160:6,7 185:2	
Japanese 40:7 53:9 54:6,9,13,19 55:4 56:7,14 63:16 64:22 67:13 123:12 167:23 168:10,22				latest 56:24 65:5 108:4 181:3	
job 2:11 156:6,14 156:16,21 200:17				law 90:5 121:17 164:23 165:1	
jobs 156:15				layman 173:5	
join 52:22				lead 37:2 91:19	
joined 19:21				leading 77:12	
jolly 186:1				leads 46:17 47:20	
joules 127:24					
journal 131:18,20 137:6,8					
judge 52:18					

74:10	level 34:7 47:22	176:12,15,17,21	187:14	203:15
leapfrog 188:6	48:3 50:10,17,22	177:20 183:14,15	load 178:9	looked 17:19 24:18
learn 3:17	58:17 70:5,14	186:4,14 190:20	local 178:21	77:11 94:9 99:1
learned 1:17 2:10	74:13 76:3 77:6	191:21,21,22	location 8:14 51:7	125:8,9,20,25
6:23 7:1 122:4	78:14 162:20	192:1,5,5,13,19	51:14,18 57:22	126:19 127:10
learning 9:1 12:11	163:7 188:2	192:22 193:2,3,3	locations 52:16	129:14 147:7
12:12	190:12 191:8	195:3 197:10	58:7	162:21 202:2
leave 59:5 120:1	192:17	linear 39:11 45:6,6	logic 32:24	looking 8:25 40:22
121:23 172:19	levels 45:20 52:4	73:9,10 76:10,14	logical 58:16	48:5 49:9 51:11
leaving 35:21	58:4,12 65:15	76:18,21 77:5,6	126:25	52:24 55:24 65:12
lecturer 38:12	70:17 97:11 134:3	78:5 172:24	long 7:12 16:13	70:9,9 72:15
left 9:25 75:8	134:6 137:12	174:25 175:1,10	29:19 40:4 64:6	75:15 84:11,24
left-hand 65:14	150:9 157:10	176:6,20 177:2,5	72:20 160:2	86:25 87:12 89:22
176:8	167:23	178:6 181:22	180:21 181:19	93:22 94:23 97:1
legal 120:25 121:9	library 6:3,4,11	182:3 183:6,7,21	201:25 205:8	104:19 114:16
121:15,21 203:24	7:11	184:6,10 185:18	longer 30:17 42:13	122:7 130:14
Leicester 12:1	lies 42:12	186:20,23 187:24	61:18 73:4,21	137:20 138:13
length 41:23 80:15	life 88:11,25 89:6,8	192:23 193:11	88:6 89:19 102:11	140:19 142:21
lengthy 67:22	lifespan 13:24	196:15 197:10	181:4 188:16,19	144:14 145:6,21
lent 40:5	56:14 99:4,10	linearity 172:21	look 1:14 7:7 8:18	149:13 158:11
lesion 39:21	101:7 102:13	linearly 80:23	13:18 17:17 18:13	161:14 166:16
let's 8:23,24 19:2	123:12,16 126:1	180:9	19:9,11 20:8,25	169:17,21 186:19
20:8 30:21 31:18	126:14 134:25	lines 2:2 99:7	27:1,4,6 32:2	186:22 191:23
32:2 41:25 44:5	135:2 169:24	177:18 190:17,18	41:25 43:11,13	192:3 195:14
44:11 47:17 48:8	181:4 185:3	198:15	44:23 51:20 53:2	196:18
61:4 79:19 81:11	lifestyle 65:19 68:8	link 37:1,4 47:23	53:3 55:2 59:4,20	looks 12:18 20:22
83:14 84:14 90:17	lifetime 64:10,12	82:9 135:21	63:17 70:1 72:1	45:23 141:4
96:18 110:22	88:10 99:3 101:20	list 52:22 160:2,2	74:22 75:11 78:18	147:12 160:5
113:9 114:4	108:5 181:9	201:25 202:9	79:22 85:17 87:8	188:14
126:18,19 135:21	light 84:2 166:19	203:16	89:16 90:12 99:5	loose 103:14
136:10 140:25	166:20	listed 11:8 45:21	105:22 113:9	Lord 1:5 3:25
141:19 143:21	likelihood 66:21	listen 147:23	128:1,7,10 129:23	57:10 60:2 61:20
154:12 162:10	limit 32:14 35:18	literature 150:4	130:21 133:16	62:13 79:21 97:16
171:19 176:4,6	36:11 58:21 74:16	little 3:8 14:10 57:6	135:21 137:14	100:11 103:4
180:17 182:7	200:19 203:12	57:7 66:5 67:1	140:9,24,25	111:7,13 114:1,9
186:8,9 192:15	limitations 32:11	160:6 190:24	146:18 148:21	115:13,17 116:14
194:13,14 195:6,7	33:22 73:12	191:5 196:17,21	150:5 156:15	116:17 118:18,23
195:7,13	limited 68:7 74:12	live 133:24 184:9	161:12 162:7,18	118:24 119:25
letter 34:15	167:19 203:8,9	lived 88:6,9 89:19	163:1 164:22	121:16 124:14
leukaemia 33:14,16	limiting 100:20	133:14	170:1 177:6	130:4,8,20,23
34:8,13,16 36:2,7	limits 35:10 48:1	living 134:11	179:16 180:17	131:25 132:3,7,10
99:8 113:12,12,24	204:8	LLS 135:15	185:7 187:12	141:6,9,16 142:1
114:7,11 115:9	Lindahl 15:3	LNT 40:6 42:1	188:1 189:9,10	142:7,12 143:1,23
180:25 186:19,24	line 1:17 78:2,9	75:16 76:10,12,13	190:15,16,17	144:20,22 149:9
190:25 191:4,5,16	99:5 130:22 153:2	78:2,11,20 79:6,8	195:6,7,7,8,13	149:24 154:23,24
leukaemias 36:10	172:20,22 176:9	82:23,25 172:22	196:10,11 197:15	155:2 156:13

157:22 159:10,20 159:25 160:19 166:14 170:14 171:4 172:5 173:5 173:16 174:5,18 175:18,23 178:4 187:11,22 197:25 202:9,15 203:22 204:18,25 205:5 Lordship 60:4 lose 58:18 losing 6:23 58:3,21 loss 58:5 88:11 89:6 89:7 lost 29:5 31:19,22 58:7 74:20 115:6 198:7,8 lot 18:23 30:7,16 59:19 86:21 129:6 136:1 137:8 162:10,11,12 166:1 171:4 179:17 196:20 lots 104:19 180:20 180:22 181:10,13 Lovells 3:9 Lovells' 4:2 low 24:1 26:11 39:7 39:25 40:9,11 41:15,17 42:2,6,9 45:7 46:18 47:21 64:1,8 65:12,15 65:25 66:3,8,17 67:10 72:10,10,14 73:11,23 74:3,11 74:17 75:3,20,20 76:15,19,21 77:5 77:18,21,25 78:3 79:2,4 80:1,17 82:18 95:15,16,19 95:22 96:4,10,15 97:22 98:5 112:24 114:18 115:4,10 150:9 156:23 178:7,21 185:21 186:1 187:5 189:6	190:22 192:17 193:9 194:3,4 195:1 196:7 197:7 low-level 154:20 lower 45:3 64:22 68:24 73:7 74:19 74:20 75:2 99:12 99:15 102:8 114:14 186:22 191:13 lowest 44:24 45:1 181:5 185:11 191:3 LSS 13:25,25 50:9 51:1,7 52:21 53:18 58:2,10,14 64:11 67:17,22 68:22 98:18,21 99:18 135:10 151:23 152:1 196:25 197:2 Luke's 38:14 lunch 110:23 111:19 204:12 lung 31:6 64:21 lymphatic 191:16 lymphocytes 141:21 <hr/> M <hr/> machine 107:8 magnitude 66:1,20 94:13 main 13:10,18 28:21 30:19 33:13 119:9 146:20,22 153:9 maintain 154:8 major 22:22 63:23 121:25 153:13 majority 79:11 make-up 65:19 making 58:23 69:13 74:17 76:18 78:8 92:7 93:1 109:3 114:20	127:22 132:25 149:22 male 3:7 malformation 148:9 181:16,23 182:11 malformations 180:19 184:4 man 53:4 94:3 managed 59:16 86:1 mandate 120:5 manifestation 180:22 manifestations 131:1 March 95:19 165:7 marginal 203:8 Margot 158:6 mark 3:8 105:10 202:13 marked 22:3 massive 24:14 master 61:13 matching 199:13 material 2:12 93:2 93:6 101:19 115:10 128:13,18 205:9 materially 94:17 materials 90:1 mathematical 4:7 12:18,20 40:23,25 44:8 103:18 107:7 107:11 176:14 178:15 mathematician 183:17,18 mathematician's 78:8 mathematics 12:4 12:4,6 41:11 94:6 94:8 matrix 156:6,14 matter 55:8 70:6 93:21 94:6 95:3	109:8 163:21 193:7 194:16 199:6 203:7,22 matters 49:9 103:1 maximise 176:16 maximises 176:23 Mayak 106:11 McMaster 38:24 mean 35:16 36:17 44:15 45:14 59:23 62:1 74:4 83:12 83:15 84:19 95:21 105:7,8 117:10 120:20 123:24 128:6,6 131:4 138:19,24 139:1,2 139:25 140:5 145:8 151:23 169:5 175:12 185:7 190:23 193:12,23 196:9 197:13 198:17,24 200:14 201:2,3 meaning 76:10 meaningful 131:14 meaningless 105:17 means 21:17 28:22 46:6 56:13 65:21 70:7 93:5 95:16 96:21 111:2 121:14 139:19 144:24 188:24 meant 2:25 134:10 measure 51:7 119:17 156:13 measured 47:22 106:10 measurement 154:6 measurements 48:17 51:12 52:9 52:10 152:16,17 153:15 154:7,9,9 156:5,8 measures 87:10	measuring 48:3 mechanism 40:21 40:23 41:8,10 192:16 mechanisms 41:2 75:11,11 mediated 1:20 medic 146:10 medical 12:8 13:4 13:11 14:17 15:24 16:1,7,19 33:6 34:21 36:3 38:11 38:12,23 39:1 43:7 103:17 medically 39:5 medicine 12:12,13 12:14,15 107:5 124:14 medium 75:5 156:23 meet 118:4 member 93:12 108:1,8 117:15 members 4:2 memory 159:3 men 28:1 mentioned 75:13 114:6 154:24 190:1 message 67:11 met 14:22 metal 136:4 method 118:19 methodology 118:20 138:10 methods 48:22 74:4 mFISH 15:20,21 166:22 middle 24:12 61:21 88:22 95:24 111:1 milligray 95:20 million 43:14,18 66:24 84:14 165:16 millisievert 95:18 96:22
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

millisieverts 76:3 95:20 96:3,7,14 97:6,12 98:15,16 98:17,19 99:3,14 99:15 186:9,11 191:7 194:15 195:24 201:10	195:22	moles 122:7	multi-stage 75:13	111:8 122:21
mind 1:23 78:21 103:1 182:6	model 4:17 40:6 41:1,6,6 45:4,6 76:11,12 78:11 79:6 87:20 91:7,9 98:12 99:25 100:4 100:7,9,17,21,21 100:23 101:3 106:16 107:13,18 107:22,24 112:24 112:25 113:3,25 114:8 115:1,2,4 118:7 121:12 134:23 135:10 145:21,22,23 149:7,16 150:11 152:5,8,9,14 161:3 168:23 172:22,25 175:4,8 175:12 177:22 178:1,2,3,6,8,12 178:13,15,21,21 179:2,9,21 180:2 180:4,6,14 183:22 185:12,16,24 187:14,15,25 192:23 193:10,11	moment 5:6 6:25 9:7 16:4 43:13 45:12 55:11 62:24 72:17 75:17 76:23 78:12 80:3 82:24 83:2,5 97:15 102:3 112:5 113:6 119:5,6 146:4,25 158:23 184:6 185:18	multiple 23:17,21 33:15 73:14	128:18 130:11 131:4 149:4 159:15 171:25 193:2 196:22
mine 2:21 60:23 146:24	modelling 107:6 171:5	moments 99:22	multiplicatively 54:19	needed 25:3
miners 136:16 137:13 138:22 140:13,16 144:10 145:13 163:20 169:11	models 75:16,17 78:19 92:22,22 99:17 100:8,10,14 100:24 101:1,2,6 102:14 107:16,16 120:21 135:17 145:25 175:9,11 177:20 179:5,6,18 179:19 180:5 193:8	Monday 204:2,6,15	multiplied 194:18	needs 26:12 60:18
minimum 73:16 140:5 177:20	modest 94:25	money 162:10,11 162:12	mutagen-driven 173:3	negative 66:4,12
Ministry 19:13 32:3	modified 152:22 153:8	monitored 106:2,4 106:5 199:21	myeloma 23:17,21 33:15	Nevada 153:14
minority 79:11,16	modelling 107:6 171:5	monitoring 32:4	<hr/> N <hr/>	never 113:17,19 182:6 199:21
minute 165:4 188:4	modelling 107:6 171:5	monotonic 180:7	N 206:1	nevertheless 28:22 130:23 193:17
minutes 82:3 103:5 160:9	models 75:16,17 78:19 92:22,22 99:17 100:8,10,14 100:24 101:1,2,6 102:14 107:16,16 120:21 135:17 145:25 175:9,11 177:20 179:5,6,18 179:19 180:5 193:8	monotonically 182:23	Nagasaki 49:23	new 5:7 6:7,12,16 6:16 7:4,21 15:12 34:11,13 48:8 76:10,12 77:9,14 77:16 112:1,8,12 121:25 134:7 166:19,21 170:11 171:22
miscarriage 183:1	moderate 63:24	morbidity 13:1 88:18	Namibian 137:12 140:13 169:11	6:16 7:4,21 15:12 34:11,13 48:8 76:10,12 77:9,14 77:16 112:1,8,12 121:25 134:7 166:19,21 170:11 171:22
misclassification 32:12 33:23	modern 80:5	morning 1:4,5 11:5 11:6 103:8,9 124:9 160:12 174:2	national 30:25 108:9 110:9 198:20	nice 198:15
misleading 73:13	modern 80:5	Mothersill 38:2 41:25 45:8 76:8 112:21	nations 67:23 132:14	Nickless 170:16
misleadingly 88:3	modified 152:22 153:8	Mothersill's 62:24	natural 28:20 43:5 65:17	night 86:23 93:18 94:9
missed 156:11 189:5	molecular 47:22 48:3	move 57:5 59:5 119:15 123:4 134:17 150:3 175:20	nature 21:18 75:13 87:18 92:13,17 115:22	nod 42:20
missing 19:23 22:18,19 51:23 122:12 189:3,22	modelling 107:6 171:5	Moving 6:4 119:23 166:17 176:9	naval 15:12	Nodded 14:19 42:15 56:10 69:23 98:9 121:5
mistaken 199:24	modelling 107:6 171:5	MSc 12:8	navigating 157:12	nodding 42:16 69:24
Mm 16:20 18:9 112:3 166:11	modelling 107:6 171:5	Muirhead 66:12	Navy 6:7	noise 74:20
Mm-hm 11:9 14:12 15:2,13 20:13 36:23 39:3 44:18 47:3 48:20 49:18 49:21 50:14 53:20 63:2 67:18 72:24 84:10 92:8 93:4,8 182:12 191:9 193:15 194:20	modelling 107:6 171:5		near 133:24,25 134:11	nominal 67:4

North 64:22	numerous 67:3	Oh 2:16 5:9 60:25	74:14 75:7 88:16	overthrown 112:1
northern 116:21	nutritional 67:25	141:6,10	94:13 95:1,2 97:8	owing 73:13
notably 189:12		okay 7:25 8:16 9:4	139:7,17 176:12	
note 3:19 60:2,4	O	9:19 19:1 36:14	179:3,4 180:2	
95:9 138:15	o'clock 110:25	36:19 55:1 60:1	183:12 202:19	P 137:15 138:23
189:11 191:9	111:4,5 159:9,15	61:16 62:15 72:4	organisation 5:4	141:15 177:8
noted 39:25	204:9 205:7	86:15 107:2,25	19:21	Pacific 28:2
notes 189:11	Oakridge 158:2	116:15,18 119:3	organisation's 6:1	page 7:15,23 10:4,6
notice 110:6 203:25	obscure 33:23	133:22 134:17	organisations	10:22 13:19,19,22
notion 179:14	observations 35:6	143:21 145:25	68:25 147:25	14:14 16:12,13
193:20	observed 73:5	146:1,17 147:5	origin 172:23 191:6	19:3 20:10,10
Nottingham 12:2	114:18 195:19,20	148:5 155:3	198:16	21:4,20 27:12,18
NRPB 19:4,5 20:2	195:21	157:16 165:25	original 19:19	27:18 32:10,25
20:20,23,24 21:21	obtained 134:25	172:8 175:25	128:20 170:15	38:4,5 39:8 48:22
22:9,13,24 23:7	152:3,4,5	184:13 189:25	originally 38:8	48:25 49:5,7,12
23:18,20 25:14,15	obvious 43:3	old 39:9,10,25 45:9	120:17	49:19 57:4 59:8
25:19,20,25 26:25	obviously 1:18	45:10 80:9,13	ought 187:12	60:20 61:5,7,8,10
28:8 32:11 33:22	13:12,12 18:7	81:3,3	outcome 20:3 21:7	63:3,13 65:13
35:10,25 36:5	25:11 42:4 44:17	omissions 35:8	21:10 22:21 28:17	67:14,14,19,24
55:24 56:2 68:20	53:8 55:24 97:4	once 2:2,22 14:22	32:13,15 35:12	72:20,23 76:9
98:24	99:16 105:3	52:24 63:9 132:24	77:19 149:2,4,6	77:13 78:25 79:24
nuclear 4:20 6:7	113:11 158:9	174:7	outcomes 23:17,21	79:24 80:8,9
7:5 17:15 19:6	159:18 164:1	one's 1:18	32:18	95:10 96:21,25
24:13 38:15	179:11 194:6	ones 127:9 155:16	outer 48:1 58:20	116:1 142:4
113:13 137:9	203:13	160:8 203:11	outfit 108:12	157:11 160:5
141:3 158:2 169:7	occasion 72:22	ongoing 75:22,24	outlier 192:25	166:9 190:2,3,4
185:7 195:15	occasions 67:3	Ontario 38:25	outside 17:24 18:21	190:16 198:6,10
null 43:25	occupational 67:25	open 11:12 63:3	32:7 37:21 48:18	pages 48:21 60:13
number 20:9 21:9	200:14 201:2,8	75:8 91:2 129:6	49:3,17 81:4 82:7	80:15 170:16
39:21 49:6 55:3	occupationally	Operation 3:5	over-estimate	paginate 11:18
71:13 73:4 77:2	162:2	opinion 79:16,17	66:21	paginated 11:16
78:16 88:3 89:12	occur 39:23 42:2	112:4 121:13	overall 23:18 26:8	panel 95:18
105:8 129:14	113:13 181:1,8	opinions 91:24	27:20 68:22 74:18	paper 4:12,14 5:4
136:14 170:4	occurred 19:20	92:1,4 120:6	94:18 102:10	5:23 16:4 34:23
195:17	32:20 33:23 66:6	opportunity 1:14	110:5 122:23	85:17,19 86:9
numbered 38:4	68:18 125:11	17:16 86:23 90:11	163:25 168:9,12	115:25 116:4,8,13
numbering 19:11	139:3	150:24	168:20 189:11	116:14,15,19,19
72:22	occurring 29:7	opposed 12:12	194:1 196:19	116:22 117:1
numbers 29:13	137:22 166:25	15:24 20:23	overcome 145:3	118:1,4 119:8
48:16 63:23 64:16	occurs 65:16	171:12	overdoing 174:6	123:24 124:9,10
65:13 66:17 71:11	181:17,18	opposite 91:19	overestimate 67:9	124:14 125:2
137:14,20,22	odds 139:3	options 18:21	overlap 21:22	127:13 130:2,8,10
138:1,5 145:4	offer 174:8 203:5	oranges 169:6	overnight 1:7,14	130:12,15,19
171:6 190:7 191:1	offered 163:14	order 13:5,15	86:9 172:7 174:1	131:6,9,18 132:13
195:10	Office 147:20	24:22 34:21 38:3	196:11 202:2	133:12,12,15,24
numerical 156:13	offspring 145:17	48:14 58:5,18	overriding 26:6	136:18,20,22

137:4,19 142:5,11 142:14 144:8,19 145:12 146:20,22 154:22 155:15,17 155:23 156:4 157:12,17,24 158:1,20,21 171:11,12 173:9 173:11,16,19,23 174:6,17,23 183:12 186:25 188:4 189:4,8,14 189:24 195:9 198:3,9 201:19,20 201:23 203:7,16 papers 1:12,17 2:10 4:22 37:23 44:4 86:12 88:2 90:8,14 91:1 136:1 154:16 155:9 158:25 159:19 170:21 171:3 177:19 195:10 203:4 para 1.2 121:7 paradigm 39:9,10 39:25 45:9 48:8 77:9,14,16 80:1,5 80:10,13,17 81:3 112:5 119:5 120:1 132:17 paragraph 19:11 20:12 27:18,21 39:9 40:17 41:14 46:21 47:19 49:19 57:4 61:10 63:18 65:14 67:15,23 72:25 76:9 81:11 190:4 paragraphs 77:13 parameter 177:5 177:23 178:13 180:2 parameters 159:13 176:22 177:2 parent 182:8	Parker 16:10,21 18:23 33:12 part 9:16 12:20 35:23 68:2 73:24 77:22 84:18 91:11 91:20 93:5 149:20 156:11 162:5,15 162:16,25 163:7 180:5 186:16 202:4 participant 32:12 participants 19:15 19:23 20:2,11 21:6,11,17,19,24 22:9,11,13,17,19 22:25 23:6,19,22 23:24 24:7 29:1,5 31:19 32:16,18 33:16,25 34:12,13 34:18 36:7 135:4 participants' 34:15 particle 136:6 particles 184:18 particular 17:2 18:14 21:16 26:10 37:9 40:23 47:7 47:11 50:7 51:15 51:18 52:16 54:5 54:21,22 58:7 64:11 72:9 74:2 79:14 84:8,15,21 85:2 87:2,3,13 88:12,13,13,16,20 88:21 89:3 90:8 90:17 92:4 95:25 104:8 112:1 114:6 117:17,21 118:5 119:10,14 120:13 120:21 127:23 134:14 140:3 151:4,7,12 152:19 152:20 154:8 155:7 156:21 157:10,10 161:8 162:19 171:17 182:16,22 197:16	particularly 12:25 30:19 40:21 58:15 73:7 75:20 103:16 109:25 138:13 parties 2:15 partly 170:6 parts 35:4 50:3 54:14 party 163:10,15 pass 159:4 174:20 passed 31:1,7 passing 146:7 patients 74:6 pattern 64:14 66:7 68:15 74:22 pause 36:20 86:5 97:17 110:24 124:3 133:20 141:24 142:19 144:25 146:25 154:25 155:22 157:15 202:11,13 peanut 46:15 Pearce 34:13 peer 91:6 149:12 150:4 pension 88:16 people 14:1 20:4 25:2,10,11 26:5 26:10,11,11,17 28:12 30:16 31:10 43:14,15,18 46:23 47:1,9,11 52:2 53:21 58:16,20 71:8 82:20 83:17 84:15 86:21 88:23 89:18 91:25 92:9 96:8 103:14,17,23 104:1 105:23 106:19 108:16,17 109:2,15 110:2,7 110:8,11 118:10 119:10 122:14 125:14,16 126:3 133:14,24 134:11 136:15 140:15	145:17 147:22 148:8,11,21,23 149:3 151:15 156:15 162:2 165:11 167:9,25 169:8,10 181:17 186:1 188:12 189:5,6 191:14 197:14 198:18 199:1,11 200:5,12 200:15 201:11 percentage 88:19 88:20 perfectly 28:20 85:9,13,14 139:24 178:14,17 199:2 performing 73:14 period 40:4 66:24 153:4 181:7 peripheral 141:21 person 43:19 51:19 51:21 87:9,16 88:7 89:2,21 91:16 119:13 132:8 153:8 158:8 188:20 197:20 person's 51:14 197:17,17,19 personal 16:15 25:21 96:1 109:8 147:24 148:3 151:17 152:15 153:17 personally 158:6 persons 56:12 persons's 181:9 perspective 40:20 PhD 14:15 phenomena 65:15 philosophical 109:12 physicist 130:16 physicists 132:2 physics 38:11,12,23 physics-related 130:14	pick 36:21 42:20 picking 196:17 piece 27:9 148:15 155:12 171:22 176:7 178:9 pieces 22:22 124:7 191:23 piling 85:20 pin 176:7 pins 178:9 place 20:24 23:3 28:13 75:16 80:14 102:9 117:3 131:23 144:1 166:12 placed 93:11 places 20:9 planning 165:22 plant 106:12 168:18 plateauing 185:4 plausible 23:9 167:12 179:7 182:15 play 13:14 pleading 90:6 please 9:23 10:12 14:7,11 39:8 57:3 62:23 63:12 65:13 72:25 76:9 85:25 110:25 115:7 122:16 139:14 172:7 203:1 plotted 176:2 plotting 179:17 plutonium 133:13 134:1,5 pm 111:15,17 159:22,24 205:12 point 5:25 9:2 18:13 21:5 23:4,8 24:5,25 25:4 27:13,25 28:3,8 30:4,10 31:18 32:2,25 33:9 36:21 43:3 44:23
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

44:24 48:23 50:25 51:23,24 56:18 57:14,16,20,25 58:22,25 59:8 76:4 78:6,10,21 85:12,12 90:23 92:7 106:23 108:21 109:12 114:1,15,24 115:6 117:4,16 118:25 121:16 125:20 126:17,18 127:22 132:25 145:15 150:21 153:21 169:5 171:6 177:22 178:25 179:17 183:1 184:24 190:21 191:10,15,25 192:7 193:9,17,21 194:25 197:6,12 200:3,6,11,22 201:13 pointed 58:2,4,6 169:24 193:13 pointing 191:15 pointless 17:21 points 18:14 19:10 29:8 49:13 50:7 114:8 121:19 150:25 172:23 174:12 178:10,11 178:25 179:21 183:23 186:4,14 190:21 191:2 197:11 police 149:19 pool 102:7 poor 29:6 31:20 117:1 119:17 184:5 poorer 20:3 21:7 151:1 population 26:9,13 34:6,7 43:10 44:14,16,22 45:16	45:18,21 46:23 47:10 48:6 53:3 54:6,16,17,20,22 54:24,25 55:3,5 56:3,4,20 63:22 64:22 68:19,22,23 76:3 81:24 82:2 84:12,14 88:19,21 99:20 102:10,11 104:1 135:6 139:10,12 140:1 145:1 168:10,10 168:12,20 169:21 169:23,23 188:2 198:20 199:1,5,8 199:10 populations 31:25 34:6 55:6 64:20 64:23 65:18 67:21 68:4,16 81:22 105:19,22,25 138:17,17 178:19 179:25 pose 2:4 102:1 157:24 position 10:23 43:4 49:14 110:16 136:7 175:3 176:12 positive 66:5 possession 7:18 possibilities 2:9 90:5 181:13 possibility 79:1 85:7 87:13 128:4 141:12 possible 19:14 28:10 47:15 54:2 61:12 69:11 70:4 84:3 85:9,14 87:24 100:15,19 110:12,15 118:5 122:3,4 129:10 161:1,18,20 163:13,17,19 167:17 182:22	183:18,21 184:21 199:19 possibly 18:15 62:20 114:14 122:17 159:10 164:16 170:7 182:25 189:1 post 29:3 potential 42:25 66:4 73:13 177:16 potentially 18:24 24:9 26:21 70:10 71:24 143:5 156:9 181:2 power 41:20 43:9 43:12,22,23 44:2 44:13,21 66:19,25 67:1 102:7 113:16 113:18,20 114:21 122:8 194:2 196:19,21,23 powerful 37:10 54:3 70:25 187:3 188:22 pre-selection 25:1 precautionary 42:23 precise 189:8 precision 73:3,12 preconceived 179:14 193:19 predecessor 7:9 108:8 predecessors 25:14 predicated 168:23 predict 186:5 predicting 178:18 179:25 185:25 predicts 42:1 prefer 144:25 preference 96:1 177:11 181:6 premise 35:6 129:4 prepared 37:20 46:10 59:11 171:25	present 35:14,17 38:21 50:3 64:11 96:15 204:7,17 presentation 204:20 presented 100:14 201:25 press 11:18 presumably 12:5 26:2 31:4 165:21 pretty 181:18 193:14 Prevalence 144:2 previous 44:19 115:15 previously 16:24 51:10 52:4 150:21 prides 109:20 primarily 15:9 171:16 primary 171:5 principle 42:23 prior 162:21 probabilities 90:4 100:15 probability 70:2,5 78:23 87:6,7,21 89:1,3,23 91:9 97:6 100:13 123:11 168:11 194:23,25 probably 9:1 13:10 18:3 22:23 41:22 43:3,12 63:3 71:11 76:16 85:23 93:21 110:23 111:7 117:13 121:14 131:16 133:9 158:16 172:9 199:16,17 200:15 problem 24:11 30:3 53:8,17 54:12 65:2,12 68:5,11 71:2,3,5 72:10 84:20 88:14,17	119:12 123:3 158:10 problems 22:7 29:19 35:8,24 39:6 41:18 56:8 56:11 67:16,22 68:12 71:19,24 73:19 145:3 169:22 180:20 188:23 189:18,20 procedures 32:4 proceed 98:4 proceedings 7:17 14:25 15:1 90:3 proceeds 41:13 156:20 process 13:1 25:16 40:25 41:5 70:15 91:4 176:21 177:14 180:2 processing 107:8 processor 103:22 produce 3:20 197:8 produced 81:15 101:2 produces 87:16 Professor 10:18 14:15 16:10,21 18:23 33:12 38:22 50:2 57:8,16 59:6 60:10 75:13 109:25 112:21 123:6,16,22 124:8 125:4 126:5,17 129:13 135:24 136:3,5,11 144:16 147:11 153:5 166:22 173:8,11 173:21 174:12 programmes 6:8 progress 62:11 65:5,6 68:4 159:6 progression 75:14 project 165:5,22 186:18 projected 58:8,12
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

<p>projections 58:4 promotion 75:14 pronouncements 69:1 proper 53:10 147:13 149:21 156:5 properly 134:23 147:15 proportion 31:22 31:24 105:2,25 189:22 proposal 163:16 165:11 204:7 proposals 163:15 proposed 23:20 135:15 proposes 161:8 166:6 proposing 161:15 161:17 proposition 37:5 74:15 93:1 98:3 propositions 49:7 99:23 110:19 protection 5:22 7:8 7:8 42:24 108:10 110:10 129:10 proteomes 82:14 82:14 protracted 154:19 prove 69:4 92:15 proved 92:10 proven 92:20 provide 66:8 68:21 69:7 73:22 75:18 79:6 81:1 87:10 120:17 121:18 135:17 161:9 162:5,6 164:4 165:5 168:6 181:24 183:12 provided 6:2 10:16 10:18 20:24 23:12 86:9 90:22 104:7 105:13,13 120:19</p>	<p>provides 23:16 133:24 135:2 provisionally 166:3 psychological 109:12 public 167:8 publication 149:11 149:13,14,15 publications 23:14 102:2 publish 137:9 published 124:6,12 124:14,21 131:24 137:9,17,18 150:3 189:4,14 puffing 175:17 pulls 49:5 pure 12:4,7 16:7 41:11 88:6 purely 4:7 purpose 23:5 79:6 purposes 96:15 put 1:13 3:8 9:7 14:8 18:6 23:3 31:2 44:5 58:9 59:22 62:4,23 76:5,6,16 78:14 83:14 93:1,21 94:4 109:15 112:20 114:4,7 118:7,10 120:15 126:18 127:10 136:11,12 141:9 141:15 148:2,15 149:25 150:22 153:19 154:14 155:13 159:1 162:10,25 163:15 165:11,14 169:13 171:11 174:22 184:10 186:4,17 190:20 192:15 194:22 196:22 202:17,19 putting 21:6 85:9 93:6</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <p>quadratic 73:10 176:20 177:2 180:12 qualifications 11:24 qualified 39:5 146:16 qualities 104:20 quality 27:11 29:6 31:20 69:7 91:6 104:7 115:22 117:1,12,14 118:2 119:17 131:13 132:20 133:3,6 151:2,8,20 159:19 176:13,23,24,25 177:6 quantification 156:7 quantitate 32:15 35:11 quantity 156:12 quarter 61:12,17 62:6 question 18:5 54:23 57:6 60:4 96:18 100:18 105:9 110:12 113:21,24 114:2,12 115:7 118:14,14 122:16 123:21 133:23 134:2,21 138:5 139:13 140:4 142:10,22 149:12 155:22 156:2 161:21 163:19 174:24 175:16,20 175:22 176:18 177:3 181:20 184:21 185:22 186:12 187:14,23 193:6 197:25 198:9,12,23 200:23,24 questionnaires</p>	<p>152:23 questions 2:4,4,9 10:12,14 11:1,10 17:20 21:18 36:5 59:2,9,22 62:22 69:18 75:8,24 95:18 97:19,21 98:1 102:1 104:22 106:17 120:15 121:14 123:7 130:11,12 133:20 142:18 149:20,22 157:23 160:17 171:20 186:18 201:13 203:10 quickly 19:2 30:11 30:15 49:16 136:12,23 137:14 146:17 quite 7:12 9:21 19:2 31:14 44:1 46:22 57:10 70:13 72:20 76:1,4 86:21 104:8 108:16,20 117:13 121:16 125:5,7 129:6 143:12 151:22 160:2 163:3 184:5 190:21 191:2,5,17 193:16 201:25</p>	<p>47:2,14,24 48:14 50:22 53:22 63:22 64:8,14 65:24 66:1,3,12,13 67:20 68:8,20 70:10,12 71:14 75:12 76:15,22 80:3,11 84:19 85:3 87:4,14,18 88:16,25 90:10,20 91:8 95:14 98:5 106:3,6,11 112:6 114:21 115:10 125:12,17,17,18 125:22,23 126:9 126:23 127:1,8,24 128:8,9 131:18 132:16 135:3,8,11 135:13,14 137:5,5 155:24 160:25 162:4 163:20 166:17 167:24 168:6,12,14 169:16 179:15 181:17 188:1 199:11,12,12,13 199:14,20 radiation-induced 64:19 83:13 88:12 radio-biophysician 15:16 radiobiological 48:23 77:10 radiobiologists 49:2 82:20 radiobiology 48:10 48:13 radiogenetic 161:1 radiogenic 33:17 radiological 14:17 79:9 108:10 110:10 161:2 radionuclides 168:17 radiotherapy 74:5 radius 50:11,18</p>
			<p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <p>R214 22:24 Rabbitt 10:19 23:12 24:4 radiation 3:14 4:19 5:13 7:7 14:16 17:3,13 23:25 24:14 32:5 33:9 33:18,25 34:4 37:11,18,19 38:12 38:14,16,24 39:11 39:20 40:12,14 42:3,7,24,25 43:5 43:7 45:19,22,23</p>	

radon 140:18,22	re-visit 41:10 204:4	167:18 202:1,17	referees 137:16	related 15:23 39:22
RAF 23:24 24:6,11	reach 201:18	reasoning 20:8	reference 7:2 27:16	57:17 64:9 80:24
26:11	reached 201:15	reasons 24:10 88:4	57:8 79:23 112:14	156:24
rain 125:2 127:3,5	reaching 64:16	119:7	143:23	relates 46:9 63:24
127:6,16 131:2	read 7:14 8:2 17:16	reassurance 68:21	references 7:1 10:5	64:18
raise 203:22	20:19 59:7,11,14	recall 6:9 102:2	11:20 49:6 79:22	relating 10:18
raised 18:15 27:25	59:15,18 61:9	117:6,7,9 182:5	referred 33:11	12:25 66:11 81:12
68:16 75:8 121:19	86:23,24 116:1,13	receive 162:2	34:15 90:4 91:1	127:16 140:3
174:12 191:15	116:14 120:8	received 37:16 40:9	106:8 123:7 124:9	151:9 164:23
192:13	121:1,4 123:15,22	51:17 63:25 99:2	136:5,11 147:11	201:7
raising 36:4	124:8 125:6	104:24 119:13	201:24	relation 17:2 24:4
random 68:18	130:11,17,23	190:8	referring 43:24	58:2 67:13 72:9
135:5 137:23	131:12 133:18,21	receiving 119:11	77:15	90:7 145:17,25
141:12	137:19 142:16,20	recognise 63:4	refers 49:22	166:4 199:3 201:8
range 17:25 18:11	143:9 144:19,21	recognised 29:16	refine 82:23	relationship 39:11
18:20 70:16 72:13	144:23 147:4	131:20	refined 153:3,21,23	40:5,24 66:14
73:10 93:2 100:10	150:24 157:15	recognition 75:19	reflects 73:18 79:16	74:18,23 77:6,18
100:14,15 101:1	160:8 172:1,3,7,9	recommend 157:18	refresh 159:3	78:5 79:8 81:17
134:3 161:12,14	172:14 173:19	180:25	refute 69:8	82:25 83:9,21
169:12 179:6	174:1 177:19	recommendation	regard 36:15 92:20	108:3 146:2
201:10,11	201:21 203:5	56:22 101:6,12	93:7 103:23	151:17,18 171:15
ranges 81:14	reading 44:5 66:22	recommendations	135:13 146:6	176:3,5,6 180:13
rapid 83:25	147:3 200:18	56:24 108:4	147:8 174:24	184:7 185:13
rare 70:18 71:3,6	202:1	recommended	181:16	186:23 193:24
rarity 71:21	ready 146:19	101:6	region 40:12 41:15	194:1 203:23
rate 11:19 17:7	198:13	recommends 65:7	41:17 75:21 78:17	relationships 73:7
23:20 24:24 33:14	real 33:24 41:18	reconstructed	82:19,23 83:1	78:17 108:19
33:15 34:8 40:8	68:13 70:20 156:7	53:14	178:7 196:8	relative 55:21 65:9
48:17 50:15,17,19	168:1 194:21	record 9:20 19:14	regions 39:7 45:3	67:6 94:11 123:10
51:25,25 54:22,23	196:2,4 200:6	31:2 36:19 42:21	registration 29:3,4	134:25 145:23
63:25 72:16 94:5	realise 2:3	110:24 119:22	29:4,20 30:4,22	161:10 185:9,10
94:23 95:4,12	reality 77:19	record-keeping	30:23,24 31:8,10	185:13,14,15,16
96:22	really 49:1 59:4	21:15 32:4,8	registrations 31:7	186:20 189:16,21
rates 24:8 34:12,16	67:11 70:14 73:24	recorded 30:23	registry 30:25 31:2	193:8 194:9,17,22
36:1 50:8,10	81:21 83:23 93:21	34:1 119:8 138:23	regression 178:21	195:1,2 197:8
51:22 52:5 54:13	105:23 107:4	recording 57:6	178:22 190:20	198:14,18,19
55:7 57:12,17	123:7 125:7	records 22:25 23:2	191:21,22 192:1,5	relatively 14:13
58:11 64:1,20,21	128:18 175:6	25:1 26:18 27:6	192:18,22 193:3	55:6 194:3
64:23 68:3 84:11	reason 17:7 26:18	rectum 74:7	regular 134:13	relevance 17:13
126:19 137:11	30:7 43:8 44:12	reduced 63:20	regulation 79:7	196:15
ratio 134:14 170:1	44:20 94:7 119:9	190:8	reject 118:3 162:8	relevant 2:3 6:2
rattling 6:24	159:14 163:10	reduces 66:6 72:16	rejected 79:9	8:17 24:21 40:21
RAYNER 46:7	192:20	reduction 184:23	relate 3:21 47:22	82:12 107:5
re-examination	reasonable 18:21	185:3	87:20 91:8 102:3	109:13 163:11
159:14 204:9	18:25 53:23 78:23	refer 138:13 177:7	129:5 135:18,19	166:12
re-reading 124:3	147:10 164:24	189:24	162:3	reliability 128:22

reliable 30:10 52:8 52:12,14	represent 4:5 11:7 26:14 107:16	respiratory 66:11	reviewed 17:23 64:25 91:6 101:19	right-hand 63:18
reliably 98:11	122:12 178:17	respond 117:15 175:20	101:25 149:12	Righty 62:21
relocate 3:1	representation 187:25	responds 4:10	150:4	ring 46:24
rely 13:7,8,11 35:24 104:6	representative 25:9 26:13 82:1 138:5	response 5:23 6:1 42:6 46:16 66:14	reviewing 104:20	rings 101:16
108:15 162:3	139:9 140:1	73:6 74:18,23	revise 3:22	rise 159:25
remain 63:23	representatives 15:12	118:22 121:19	Richard 9:9 53:4,5 206:3	risk 3:8 40:9,24 44:22 54:15,16,24
remains 21:23 54:8 85:7 186:25	represents 41:1 45:1 175:4,11	171:15 172:21	rid 85:19	55:5,16 56:3
remarks 173:12	177:8	174:25 175:2	right 2:16 4:25 5:9 5:10 8:16,24 9:5	64:12,15,19 65:8
remember 11:18 33:7 52:24 77:11	reproduce 94:9 108:5	177:21 181:23	9:11,24 12:23	65:23 66:22 67:6
156:22 189:5	reputable 109:4 110:18 137:6	183:22 184:7,11	24:12 26:15 31:8	67:8,20 68:1,9,16
197:1,3	144:18	186:20,23 193:11	34:19 35:20 36:19	68:22 69:14 70:21
remind 80:7,12 137:25	reputation 14:21 14:22	193:20 196:24	44:17 46:12 57:10	70:22,23,25 71:14
remote 79:2	required 157:19	200:9	59:20 61:2 62:15	71:16,17,18 72:2
removed 23:3,5 26:19	requires 118:22	responses 186:17	77:23 91:14 93:20	72:4 74:2,3 78:6
removing 186:21	RERF 126:1 127:10 129:8,13	rest 24:8 74:21 80:2 85:23 88:25	95:1,1,2,4 96:17	81:12 83:1 87:18
repeat 176:21	135:15	181:8	98:20 100:12,18	87:20 88:10 91:7
repeated 67:3 139:19 177:14	research 14:17 27:9,10 38:14,22	restaurant 167:9	102:15,23,25	94:11,12,16 95:14
replicated 138:16	39:14 49:22 50:7	restricted 73:11	104:22 105:4	101:8 102:7 108:5
reply 95:18	50:9 75:9,22,23	result 19:13 32:3 39:16 47:10 49:6	107:11,25 108:20	108:14 112:24,25
report 4:4 7:24 10:1,4,17,18,20	80:6,14 91:23,23	66:5,19 77:3	110:13 113:2	118:7 135:9
11:19 13:18 14:9	110:17 126:9	84:18 85:14 87:3	116:12,15 118:6	137:21 145:18,21
14:13 15:8,8,9	131:18 137:5,6	87:16 135:17	119:22 121:16	145:22,23,23
16:10,12,13 17:10	162:14,22 163:8	139:7,17 140:2,3	123:4,13,14 125:1	148:9,12,17 149:7
17:17 18:24 23:13	reserve 121:10 204:23	155:6 168:2	130:9,21 131:20	149:16 150:11
32:17 33:8,12	reserved 203:4	resulted 24:15	132:11 139:18	155:18,21,24
37:25 38:4 41:22	residents 134:7	resulting 73:4	141:6,10,17,18	156:3 157:10
55:19 57:3 59:11	residues 133:13	results 27:1 29:23 33:17 53:25,25	142:8,13 143:25	160:24,25 161:25
60:10 62:24 63:5	resolution 65:1	65:16 66:7,8,10	144:1,6 149:8	163:23,24 164:7,8
64:9 65:1 84:25	resolve 74:1	92:6 94:18 100:5	155:3 157:23	168:7,8,11,23
90:1 95:12,16	resolved 75:25	130:25 139:20	158:14 160:11,13	170:5 176:1
117:8 120:5,17	resolving 63:19	188:25 189:7	163:18 164:6,11	178:18 181:25
125:4,19 188:11	respect 10:17 51:24 114:15	resume 110:25	165:14 167:4,11	184:8 185:4,9,10
reported 26:17 56:9 154:4	respects 13:10	retrospective 21:13 106:18	168:25 169:4	185:13,14,16,25
reports 11:14 14:24 20:21 22:10 79:12		retrospectively 153:12	170:20 171:19	186:5,12,12,19,20
120:8,12,25		return 174:2	172:2,6 173:18	189:11,17,21
124:16		reveal 69:18 166:6	174:19 175:24	190:1,6,8,12
		reverse 81:17	177:18 178:4	191:2 192:6,14,17
		review 48:22 91:6 118:1 128:19	179:7 180:11	194:9,14,15,17,23
			186:10 189:23	195:1,2 197:9
			190:14 191:6	198:14,18,19
			192:2,25 196:14	199:3,7
			198:2,21 202:24	risks 13:20 43:10 44:14 56:15,16
			205:6	63:21,24 64:10
				68:19,23 73:16

74:4,8,12,13,17 75:2 76:2 81:21 99:6 108:7 123:10 134:25 135:3,7 150:14 161:10 179:25 194:4,7,9 196:7 Robins 4:12 robust 118:16,20 Roff 23:20 role 12:23 room 48:12 Roth 10:19 23:12 23:16 24:4 roughly 97:12 105:2 107:15 123:13 round 83:14 204:11 route 42:23 134:18 162:9 Rowland 5:23 6:1 7:6 15:9 33:10 170:10,16 201:19 201:20 RR 66:19 67:5 ruining 205:10 rules 120:3 121:1 159:21 run 38:13 runs 49:12 Russian 106:11	satisfaction 205:3 saved 82:3 saw 80:15 111:21 170:4 186:24 Sawada 50:2 57:8 57:16 59:6 124:8 124:18,20 125:2 126:5 127:22 128:3,7 129:12,13 130:1,4 153:5 Sawada's 60:10 123:16,22 125:4 126:17 128:10 Sawadas 124:17 saying 35:23 36:12 77:2 90:13 101:22 109:1 125:21 127:11 128:6 129:21 134:9,24 148:23 161:18 164:9 189:15 says 19:12 21:8 32:10 40:17 45:12 47:18 49:8 50:8 50:21 76:25 78:25 80:16,22 81:2 85:5,5 95:9 121:6 130:24 133:4 134:3,6 138:19 145:22 148:18 149:13 161:13 184:19 195:16 198:13 199:25 200:6 SB 9:23 SB1 60:24,25 SB11 14:8 SB2 9:23 60:8 SB21 62:25 SB22 1:6 3:2 85:18 SB22/22 202:12 SB6/68 188:7 SB6/85 154:13 SB6/89 173:9 SB7 160:18 SB7/106 141:3	SB7/107 133:11 SB7/110 129:24 SB7/112 160:16 SB7/119 141:19 SB7/121 115:24 SB7/122 149:10 SB7/123 170:11 SB7/124 136:16 SB7/93 143:22 SB7/98 146:18 SBs 3:1 scale 98:7 scans 3:14 47:2 scheme 31:7 Schmitz 109:25 173:8 school 83:16 schools 36:25 Schroeder 141:22 science 18:7 38:17 79:20 82:21 98:1 111:23 sciences 38:24 75:7 75:23 79:13 scientific 38:16 70:6 79:8,17 90:13 91:1,18 108:23,25 110:17 111:20,24 132:14 158:4 scientist 83:4 94:2 109:3 111:21 scientists 4:15 109:5 117:16 131:6 scope 149:21 screened 45:25 scribbled 93:24 sea 113:19,20 search 166:12 seat 158:23 201:14 second 9:24 11:25 20:21 21:5 22:10 35:23 53:17 57:11 57:14,25 58:25 154:22 170:17,22	172:10 195:16 201:14 seconded 38:13 Secondly 35:21 66:17 Secretary 5:18 7:18 14:25 24:3 121:18 147:20 section 10:5 19:4 21:5,25 22:1,7,15 67:19 see 2:6 4:10 7:17 8:5,24 10:8 14:6 14:14 16:11,18 19:2,11 22:6 25:9 32:24,25 33:5 34:7,8 35:3 38:10 38:21 44:23,24 47:10 54:20,21 59:1 60:20 61:4 61:20 65:13 67:14 68:13,15,22,23 69:2,8,14 70:5,25 72:1,5,11 74:14 75:7 81:11 94:20 95:9 99:9,10,11 100:3,21 101:9 109:14 111:3,10 111:11 112:10 117:6 122:21 128:20,25 132:24 133:19 137:20,22 138:12,16 139:20 142:16 144:23 145:1,10 148:1,12 157:13 159:17 160:11 163:12,16 164:17 165:6 167:11 168:8 171:15,19 175:9 176:24 185:1,2,3 190:4,16 191:1,16 193:8,23 194:5 195:6,19 197:21 200:7 203:5 205:7 seeing 36:16,17	108:25 110:14 111:12 138:8 157:9 seek 105:18 seeking 164:2 seeks 108:17 seen 4:22 30:9 44:4 47:15 59:10 63:9 101:18 109:25 111:25 124:9,11 127:13 128:12 145:9 149:11 155:2,4,16 177:24 191:18 selecting 26:16 selection 25:15 28:7,9 93:2 self-education 1:18 Sellafeld 4:20 113:12 114:6 116:19 sense 13:5,14 19:3 25:2 26:12 29:22 34:3 40:25 52:24 59:19,23 61:9 62:16,17 69:17 75:6,10 99:9,19 100:19 105:16 123:23 185:24 188:21 193:22,23 199:1,10 sensitive 45:19 46:24 47:2,5,6,8 47:12,14 sensitivity 47:9 sentence 24:5 34:20 35:5 44:19 45:13 77:22 80:3 130:24 separate 168:7,10 separately 93:15,17 170:2 sequence 39:24 sequences 39:24 series 155:9 serious 23:17 Service 147:17
S				
S 178:21 safe 127:25 182:2 204:2 safety 107:12 sailors 6:12 sample 22:17 25:10 26:7,10,16 29:21 52:24 53:3 70:7 70:19,24 139:5,9 139:25 140:1,4,13 140:14,14 142:23 samples 53:1 70:4 134:4				

servicemen 24:9 171:18	shown 83:10 92:11 104:25 113:16 199:22	87:12 90:16 94:3 137:23 138:18 157:9	smoking 66:11,13 smoking-related 66:14	185:12 199:5
set 4:3 7:13 10:23 11:24 12:22 20:17 28:12 43:8 44:12 44:20 53:9 91:16 152:7 159:12 178:17 179:24 186:3,5 188:13	shows 72:12 83:5 118:8 126:5,6 149:2	single 67:7 69:1 77:2 101:5	soldiers 144:12,13 solely 73:11 86:13 134:4	sorts 75:17 104:3 104:15 140:10 150:19 151:1 167:3 180:10
sets 16:5 32:6 80:15 188:16	shrugged 164:25	Sir 53:4,5	solicitors 93:12	sound 29:8 35:7 57:22 147:24
setting 19:20 20:16 25:7,11,13	shut 8:11	sit 9:14,17 144:24	solid 32:17 34:17 76:4 99:7 181:5 195:8,14,15,16	sounds 58:16 121:21 167:12,19
seventh 71:9	sic 40:4 177:4	site-specific 68:3	somebody 14:20 16:21,25 34:21 51:15 86:16 88:5 88:11 99:19 130:5 146:23 151:7 179:6	source 63:21 64:18 121:25 122:22 127:2
severe 24:16	side 85:2 93:6 110:12 176:1	sites 113:15,16,18 133:13,25,25 134:11	somewhat's 88:15	sources 63:23 124:23 128:21
severely 32:14 35:9 35:10,18 36:11	sides 113:13	sitting 204:5,6,15	soon 181:18	South 28:2 150:1
severity 35:19	sievert 134:25 194:10,18,23 197:9	situation 23:6 140:23	sooner 181:1	space 14:8,10
shaken 112:23	sign 37:3	situations 186:6	sophisticated 154:2 156:25	spare 116:7
shape 180:13	signature 10:7 38:6	six 71:7	sorry 4:21 8:11 27:17 30:25 31:9 32:1 42:19 60:14 62:12 93:16 108:8 115:13,17 124:5 124:20 138:2 139:14 141:23 142:1 144:22 169:2,18 172:1,14 192:9 198:11 199:19	special 86:20
shelf 14:9	signed 10:22	size 66:2 70:8 71:16 72:15 98:14 142:23 145:5 147:12	sort 9:3 15:19 30:12 37:16 82:19 82:21 83:20 86:19 91:12 92:13 107:8 108:22 119:16 125:21 127:17 128:11 137:8 151:6,10 156:19 162:4 164:3 166:25 169:17 176:20 180:13,16 181:5 184:17	specialisation 16:7
shielding 51:14,16 152:12,22 153:9 153:20,25	significance 73:15 173:24 192:2 193:17	skew 29:23	so 181:18	specialist 17:1
shift 112:5 119:5	significant 24:6 44:25 66:20 67:4 72:1 84:9 102:2 122:12 126:2,7 127:18,18 129:17 138:10,25 139:2 145:7 171:21 191:19,20,21 192:12	skewed 26:25 189:7	sooner 181:1	speciality 15:14 44:7 182:17
shifts 120:2	significantly 31:25 126:21 177:24 178:3 180:3 190:8	skirmishing 149:18	sophisticated 154:2 156:25	specific 24:4 30:22 47:24 81:16 107:19 113:23 140:16 179:24 186:3,4,6
short 14:13 62:9 75:4 111:16 128:14 159:23 202:23	signed 10:22	sky 181:14	soon 181:18	specifically 67:13 126:11 161:13
shortage 71:19	significance 73:15 173:24 192:2 193:17	slap 39:13	sooner 181:1	specifying 4:17
shortest 86:25 181:7	significantly 31:25 126:21 177:24 178:3 180:3 190:8	slight 102:24	sophisticated 154:2 156:25	speculating 6:11 8:19
shorthand 60:7	signed 10:22	slightly 18:5 95:23 97:7 102:10 177:3	so 181:18	spend 31:17 151:15
shortly 59:7	significance 73:15 173:24 192:2 193:17	slope 187:2,4,5	sooner 181:1	spending 140:24
show 50:10 71:25 116:20 123:17 140:10 146:4 149:4 160:16 177:19 189:16 191:2	significantly 31:25 126:21 177:24 178:3 180:3 190:8	slot 86:6	sooner 181:1	sperm 182:8
showed 170:4 189:21	similar 22:19 89:5 140:10 153:15 184:17	slow 3:10	sooner 181:1	spontaneous 66:23
showing 34:22 69:2 77:4,20,24 112:17 192:5	Similarly 97:4 105:5	small 31:15,23 47:23 66:1,17 70:19 71:18 73:13 74:8,9 94:16,16 113:14 122:9,24 137:21,22 142:21 142:23 145:4,10 171:7 191:23 195:21	sooner 181:1	spontaneously 64:17
	simple 70:7 80:1,17 125:7	skirmishing 149:18	sooner 181:1	spread 91:24
	simpler 177:9,11 177:12 178:1,2 180:4	sky 181:14	sooner 181:1	spring 179:20
	simplest 175:4,11	slap 39:13	sooner 181:1	Springfields 168:18,24
	simply 4:2 25:18 55:15,17 79:25	slight 102:24	sooner 181:1	St 38:14
		slightly 18:5 95:23 97:7 102:10 177:3	sooner 181:1	stable 186:25
		slope 187:2,4,5	sooner 181:1	Staff's 7:22
		slot 86:6	sooner 181:1	stage 1:23 59:21
		slow 3:10	sooner 181:1	
		small 31:15,23 47:23 66:1,17 70:19 71:18 73:13 74:8,9 94:16,16 113:14 122:9,24 137:21,22 142:21 142:23 145:4,10 171:7 191:23 195:21	sooner 181:1	
		smaller 102:10 191:13	sooner 181:1	
		smallest 72:2	sooner 181:1	
		smallish 138:9	sooner 181:1	
		smoker 181:14	sooner 181:1	

75:6 159:25 stand 80:5 standard 27:10 82:10 83:6 standards 27:8 standing 9:12 start 7:2,23 52:12 53:19 71:20 103:3 136:15 159:9 167:10 started 56:12,13 68:20 98:24 167:9 starting 11:8 49:7 59:8 90:23 starts 12:17 13:19 14:7 60:23 61:9 173:2 State 5:18 14:25 24:3 State's 7:18 121:18 statement 10:7,23 10:24 19:16 20:5 28:14 40:15 43:1 76:20 84:4 90:6 114:3 120:8 121:6 121:20 122:17 123:25 124:23 131:3,14 134:8 146:13 151:25 statements 18:23 149:23 stations 113:17,18 113:20 114:21 statistical 15:25 41:20 43:22,23 44:1 66:19,25 67:1 70:19 71:3 71:15 72:11,14 73:3,12,15,18 78:18 90:19 102:7 103:18,20 161:12 162:5 177:7 193:16 194:2 196:19,21,23 statistically 44:25 66:20 67:4 70:25	71:11,22 72:1 84:8 138:10,25 139:1 141:12 175:9 180:3 188:22 191:19 192:12 193:7 statistician 19:18 33:6 statisticians 55:25 statistics 12:7,8,13 12:15,16,19,21,25 12:25 13:6,10,13 30:8 41:17 44:9 58:6 65:4 74:14 107:7 status 32:12,13,14 stenography 203:24 step 82:7 186:21 steps 20:17 stick 177:12 178:1 sticking 176:7 stimulus 46:16 stochastic 53:25 185:2 stomach 64:24 stood 204:1 stop 1:8 80:2 stopped 33:7 stopping 24:2 46:19 81:19 stops 41:14 story 197:18 straight 65:8 99:5,7 176:15,17 183:14 192:24 193:2 198:15 straightforward 44:2 83:21 strand 39:20,21 strange 122:7 straying 121:15 stress 82:14 stretch 157:20 strikes 130:19 string 176:8,9	178:9,10,24 185:20 190:20 strive 69:20 striving 69:19 strong 193:10 struck 5:25 struggle 203:9 stuck 178:9 studied 59:10 182:16 studies 17:12,18 19:4,5 20:2,7 21:14,22 22:13 23:7,20 30:9 32:11,17 33:13,22 34:22 35:25 36:2 36:5 38:9 39:16 43:9 44:13,21,23 47:1,11 50:9 51:7 55:24 56:2 65:17 66:8 67:14,17 68:14 69:1,2,5,6 69:13 73:5 74:6 75:23 77:3 84:17 98:24 99:12 102:5 104:20 105:15 106:9,10,11,18,18 106:20,21 114:13 123:13 135:21 136:10,14 138:16 139:6,17 140:9 143:6 151:1,21 154:13 160:15 163:5 166:1 167:3 168:4 169:12,13 170:4,10 179:17 185:7 186:16 study 7:5 13:24 15:16,19 23:18 26:4,5,17,20 27:14,22 28:5,14 28:23 29:24 34:3 36:6,11 43:18,23 45:1 51:1 52:5,21 53:18,18 56:12,13 56:14,16 58:14	65:16,23,25 66:4 66:17,24 67:2,7 67:22 68:13,19 69:2 70:24 71:25 77:2 84:1,1 87:16 88:4,7 98:24 99:4 99:6,10 101:4,5,7 101:9,18,20 102:3 102:5,8,12,13 104:15 106:8 114:6 117:12,14 117:17,19 123:16 126:1,14 130:25 135:1,2 138:1,12 138:14 139:19 140:7 143:4,13,21 144:10,11 145:3 147:2,6,6,10,12 147:15,16 148:6 149:25 150:2,12 150:13 151:10,23 151:24 152:7 154:3 155:25 157:4,5,20 158:15 158:19 161:9,15 161:17,17,18 162:4 163:1,10,12 163:17,19 164:4 165:13 166:4,6,6 167:20 168:23 169:17,25 171:21 181:4 185:3 188:8 188:10,11,14,18 188:21,24 189:16 196:25 198:25 200:13 studying 52:12 stuff 67:11 137:9 sub-population 47:7 subgroups 45:18 168:4 subject 184:5 203:6 subjective 117:25 118:9 185:19 submission 95:3	121:21 submissions 109:24 121:10 204:17,20 submitted 165:7 subsequent 127:20 189:4 subsequently 189:14 subset 188:11 substantial 9:16 24:3 29:17,18 66:21 67:9 159:6 substantially 107:22 substantive 10:6 subtle 65:21 succeeded 25:12 suddenly 121:25 167:9 suffered 87:3 89:13 90:18 sufficiency 102:1 sufficient 35:19 92:5 118:2 119:19 120:20 132:19 133:2,6 sufficiently 70:25 104:5 114:10 118:16 158:13 177:4,10 suggest 22:22 28:4 50:19 65:1 66:13 79:19 90:8 91:11 94:1 103:19 108:24 114:23 130:25 166:2 suggested 24:10 78:18 118:15 152:11 suggesting 26:25 27:1 80:25 109:7 110:9 112:15 127:3,4 145:20 148:7,11,14 168:21 193:4,9 suggestions 166:18
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

suggestive 82:9	73:8,21 126:3	187:10,11 189:12	tens 76:3 95:17	147:1 148:5
suggests 20:20	129:18 167:23	190:6,24 191:4,4	ter 3:19,25 6:23	149:24 159:20
50:21 82:25 95:17	169:8	196:6 197:5	11:3,5 16:4 19:2	165:25 170:3
155:18	suspect 2:21 3:2	201:14,17	19:25 21:4 22:2,5	172:16 174:20
suitably 83:17	81:10 109:17	taken 9:20 20:18	26:24 30:3 31:17	205:5,7
158:7	sustain 118:16,21	32:19 42:24 67:2	36:21 38:20 42:23	Thankfully 108:16
summarise 50:6	Sweden 116:21	80:14 91:3 97:5	45:5 46:13 55:23	thematic 49:9
summary 20:20	system 11:17 51:10	126:8	57:5,10,14,25	theme 172:15
27:20 75:19	112:10,12 127:15	takes 34:4 51:13	60:2,4,12,18,21	theory 48:14 80:10
summing 73:2	127:20 153:3,6	92:14 180:21	61:1,5 62:11,22	92:4 112:1
sums 131:6	156:6,14,19	188:15	79:22 85:23 86:8	therapeutically
superseded 166:23		talk 111:2 114:19	94:1 96:20 97:15	64:6
supplementary	T	173:13 180:18	97:18 99:23	thereabouts 97:13
10:17,20 201:13	tab 3:2 4:23 5:6	talked 160:14	123:15 152:10	thereof 146:12
supplied 9:3	6:20 7:4,12 9:23	166:22 184:8	206:4	thesis 12:16
support 37:23 69:7	10:1,16 11:13	talking 60:13 73:19	term 75:5 95:23	thing 25:8 26:4,9
77:18 110:18,18	16:9,9 38:1 59:12	75:2 77:1 80:7	103:16 200:19	31:6 44:1 71:25
195:5,6	60:14 63:1 85:21	81:24 91:5 96:2,3	terminate 204:11	93:9 98:22 125:8
supported 40:6	85:25 86:6 93:14	118:6 145:16	terminology 133:7	127:17 144:12
92:2,23 112:9,11	93:21,22 130:1	154:7 155:19	terms 22:20 68:9	150:15 166:25
supporting 69:4	154:16 170:12,17	156:22 166:21	68:19 79:17 89:7	174:22 175:19
102:18 118:15	172:10 198:9	169:2 180:25	96:2,9 103:14	185:16 190:14
128:25 133:5	table 6:17 8:7,9	185:1 187:21	151:8 152:24	191:22 194:21
148:15,20	21:20 63:13 190:1	197:13	153:2 176:11	197:12
supports 72:6 78:1	190:15 191:1	talks 83:6	180:1,18 184:25	things 52:18 53:13
92:11 110:16	195:7,8,9 197:15	target 48:13,15	185:9 194:8,9	58:22 68:12,13
113:3 195:4	197:22 199:25	target' 39:19	territory 37:21	75:16 78:21 85:8
suppose 53:23	200:1	targets 48:16	39:13 41:14 48:18	96:1 104:3 117:17
160:10	tabs 5:7,9	task 92:17	49:17,20,25 81:4	122:14 125:9
supposed 120:24	take 2:25 12:23	team 4:2	82:7 88:22 98:15	137:22 140:10,17
sure 3:23 9:17 26:6	14:7 16:4 25:4	techniques 15:18	test 6:7 7:5 8:13	148:22 157:2
30:5 38:17 105:5	30:10 31:18 39:7	16:1,1,2,3 171:14	28:11 53:10 122:6	161:12 168:17
107:3 126:4 136:6	43:21 50:3 55:16	technology 12:9	133:13,25,25	179:14 180:17,22
141:15 142:14	55:17 57:1 60:7	38:19 166:16	134:11 153:14	181:10 187:18
143:12 149:19	60:18 62:25 73:24	tediously 196:10	testing 32:16 34:17	194:12 201:1
159:2 171:10	75:16 80:25 82:23	teeth 125:14	164:6	think 1:12,16,24
184:6,10,12 185:8	84:4 90:17 94:3	tell 31:4 41:13	tests 8:15 25:10	2:3,18,20,25 3:17
190:23 204:2	95:4,6,14 96:21	49:14 85:14 88:5	73:15 82:8	3:19,24 4:8,18,24
surpass 66:2	97:25 98:21	88:8 192:11	text 7:14 60:19	5:5,7,20 7:13,25
surprised 132:12	107:10 119:15	telling 166:13	61:9	8:5,14 9:1,15
survey 10:19 17:11	134:13 135:23	tells 6:12,18 8:15	thank 4:8,13 11:2	14:22,25 17:22
33:10 43:14 48:24	136:1 154:11,15	39:4 169:25	38:20 61:17 62:5	18:13,14,21 19:25
Survival 124:15	158:22,22 165:20	ten 181:7 205:7	86:7 89:24 97:18	20:4 24:20,24
survive 30:16	165:22 170:10	tend 64:22,24	102:25 111:3,14	32:21 34:2,14
survivors 40:7	173:1,8 181:22	tendency 88:2	118:24 123:2	35:13,16,22,24
63:20,25 69:8	183:16 186:13	Tennessee 158:2	125:3 132:23	36:24 37:8 39:4

40:20 41:13,16 43:1,11 45:10 46:9,19 47:6 50:3 51:23 52:7,19 57:19,21,25 59:3 59:9,12,22 60:21 61:11,13,18 62:3 62:7 69:17,19,24 71:10 73:18 76:1 76:16,22,24 78:3 79:3 80:25 82:6 82:18,22 83:7,22 85:23 86:8,11,12 88:3 89:9,25 90:16 91:3,4 92:25 93:10 96:6 96:20 98:10 99:2 99:22 100:7,20,21 100:22,25 101:15 103:10 104:18 105:12 106:23 107:3 108:20 109:4,20 110:3,22 111:9 112:19,20 114:1,4,5,24 115:6,8 117:23 118:1,13,25 121:9 121:14 123:15 124:6,11 126:5 127:10,13,22 129:4,10,12,15,25 131:15,16,25 132:7 133:6 134:8 138:2 140:5,24 141:6,11 142:4 143:12,24 145:8 146:2 147:4 148:25 149:15 154:11,18,22 155:23 156:22 157:11 158:16,18 159:10 160:12,24 161:7,21 166:3 169:5 172:6,9,11 173:6,22 175:2 177:18 179:3,9,16	179:18 183:20,21 186:12,17 187:12 190:3 191:9,25 196:17,17 197:23 198:8,24 200:11 200:14,22 204:1 thinking 34:19 108:23 204:16 thinks 126:6 third 13:19 22:10 27:13 129:15 Thirdly 54:3 Thomas 75:13 123:6 135:24 136:3,11 144:16 147:11 166:22 173:11,21 174:12 thought 8:19,20 19:8 36:25 53:5,6 56:21 83:17 100:17 103:25 130:4 134:10 141:9 142:20 144:18 150:7 157:25 158:9 162:12 175:17,18 182:18 184:16 187:16 189:15 thoughts 137:19 thousands 168:14 three 2:15 20:20 153:2 165:22 188:15 threefold 138:21 threshold 97:2 118:4 172:24 174:25 175:1,11 177:20,23 183:6 183:22 187:24 192:23 196:16 197:10 thresholds 43:8 44:12,20 74:1 Thursday 204:15 205:14 tidying 204:10	tied 185:20 Tier 38:22 tightly 65:20 time 1:24 2:11 21:15 31:17 35:22 53:21 55:13 60:2 61:23 62:6,12,19 65:6 69:13 85:21 92:15 97:19 101:12 105:6 106:22 108:10 110:23 111:23,23 112:8 127:6 129:19 140:21 150:5 151:15 153:4 154:5 165:10 180:21 181:7,8 189:19 190:11 201:18 204:8,19,24 times 50:20 67:3,5 129:14 134:7 139:19,21 177:14 timing 159:17 tiny 70:9 110:5 Tirmarche 158:6 tissue 74:7 title 12:17 137:10 tobacco 43:6 today 10:10,24 54:8 85:18 153:22 159:11 198:1 told 24:12 50:2 52:25 57:24 90:21 98:6 121:1 122:6 130:5 160:3 173:7 201:25 203:25 tomorrow 159:9 160:12 172:15 174:2 180:18 201:15,16,18 202:5 204:11,24 205:7 tonight 172:14 tool 74:12 79:6 81:14,21	tools 74:13 top 13:19 27:18 63:18 65:14 70:10 77:14 116:1,2 182:5 185:15 197:4 201:7 topic 64:6 119:23 124:7,12,21 131:21 142:17 158:17 topics 1:19 totally 24:23 82:4 104:9 toxic 42:8 track 6:23 traditional 48:13 transcript 7:14 42:20 transfer 55:16 64:18 65:8 67:20 transient 33:14 translate 163:23 translation 59:17 translocations 37:10 transmissible 82:17 transparent 2:5 travel 43:7 treated 112:9 treatment 25:3 trends 66:12 73:10 Tribunal 2:1,1 10:2 10:17 14:7 24:15 27:3 43:11 46:2 57:17 61:14 62:22 78:22,24 88:14 91:17 92:19 114:16 120:4,14 126:16 tricky 180:24 tried 94:9,20 128:14 151:16 173:10 trohoc 52:25 53:3 true 21:23 42:4	43:25 46:24 54:4 54:8 59:1 64:5 66:22 67:6,8 68:17 72:6 77:8 92:3 104:18 109:17 113:18 122:18 134:8 152:8 175:6 192:21 198:17 199:19,24 200:24 trust 128:12 truth 10:7,23,24 75:7 try 13:15 31:9 68:12 97:25 122:16 163:2 164:17 165:5 172:17 175:23 176:5 trying 26:13 27:5 41:5 56:3,4,6 70:16 71:9 75:10 87:2,5 100:18 109:10 118:25 134:17 141:13 146:4 151:21 159:12 183:11 188:4 193:25 Tuesday 204:14 tumours 34:17 turn 10:1,4 14:11 74:13 172:15 turns 75:7 twice 14:23 23:21 63:9 two 5:17 13:10 14:24 22:22,22 29:15,22 31:14,25 34:6 35:4 36:25 50:3,7 54:17 55:16 57:9 58:9 58:21 61:7 65:15 72:5 89:9 99:6 119:7 124:17,23 143:6 151:19 153:13 154:16
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

175:25 181:1 184:9 190:7 193:8 194:12 200:25 202:3,14,14 203:3 two-thirds 138:19 type 126:15 127:23 types 65:11 178:22 typescript 8:5 typical 156:17	72:16 74:4 199:3 199:6,7 undermined 100:4 undermines 113:25 understand 9:21 13:15 14:1 15:14 18:17 24:23 33:3 34:21 35:23 41:9 50:20 51:24 56:6 59:4 72:19 82:20 92:6,25 120:4,25 121:17 125:7 128:16 129:22 131:4,5 134:12 146:19 149:1 152:21 154:4 163:9 187:18 189:3 190:23 192:16,20 198:23 understanding 31:10 112:6 152:5 173:5 184:22 understood 35:3 91:14 118:17 130:19 undertaken 49:23 166:5 undetected 73:14 undoubtedly 56:1 83:20 Unexpected 137:11 unexposed 65:22 unfortunately 11:16 61:24 87:25 188:23 uniform 135:5 Union 165:12 unit 185:9,10 United 132:14 University 11:25 12:1 14:17 38:24 150:1 unknown 21:17 unmeasured 65:22 unnumbered 38:5 unpredictability	77:17 unproved 92:19 unpublished 124:16 unreasonable 203:17 unreliable 32:5,8 unsafe 110:14 UNSCLEAR 41:21 41:22 63:5,17 64:8,25 68:25 72:19 73:2 unusual 117:11 update 2:16 8:22 116:5 updated 2:21 3:12 86:3 updates 116:5 updating 86:4 uranium 123:5,17 131:11 133:14 134:1,5,10,12,14 134:16,18,21 135:4,19,22,24 136:4,15,16 137:12 140:11,13 140:15,16,20,22 142:19 143:10,12 143:14,14,22 144:10 145:12,13 146:5 148:17,18 148:20,22,24 149:5,8 150:8,9 154:12,20 155:19 155:20,25 157:6 160:14 161:2,10 162:1,18 163:17 163:19,22,24 164:12,13,14,15 166:2,8 168:1,8 168:18,19,24 169:10,14,20,23 170:6,7 uranium-exposed 144:12 USA 188:15	use 51:8,8,20 53:1 56:14,16 72:18 87:11 88:2 98:4 98:11 99:24 100:22 105:8,9 107:17 108:14 122:23 133:7 138:11 141:18 163:23 164:9,17 165:2 167:16 168:9 171:14 186:5,11 195:1 197:6,7 useful 8:7 9:21 73:6 186:1 usefully 62:7 useless 178:18 185:24 uses 117:2 188:16 usually 67:2,7 81:15 138:12,13 151:1 186:16 uterus 74:7	65:10 79:9 104:6 106:17 107:14 110:4 152:22 153:20 160:14 173:12 178:22 179:5,14 190:18 vary 199:7 vast 68:5,11 verify 26:3 vernacular 85:9 version 102:21 133:8 178:20 versions 107:14 versus 205:3 veterans 7:5 17:15 19:6 32:1 34:3,5 36:3 141:22 143:22 144:3 145:2,13,14 169:11 170:11 171:22 Veterans' 147:17 147:21 view 23:9 24:13 28:8 32:22,24 33:1,9 36:11 37:24 43:3 48:23 78:22 85:12 96:15 110:11 111:24 117:17,21,24 118:5 174:11 views 17:25 18:2,3 18:7,10,11 97:9 virtually 99:7 visible 26:19 vitae 11:22 vital 64:13 voice 9:17 volume 129:25 154:14,15 volunteers 142:21 143:2
U				
Uh-huh 11:23 27:24 63:6 97:24 100:1 108:11 126:14 157:14 UIN 7:15 UK 29:3 30:4,25 34:15 68:19,20 98:23 99:1,13,19 101:9 106:8 134:6 163:21 168:14,18 169:18,19 188:15 ultimately 1:19 unacceptable 117:11 unambiguously 19:15 Unbelievably 44:3 unbiased 25:9 26:7 26:9,12 uncertain 104:25 105:1 uncertainties 41:15 76:12 uncertainty 20:11 21:23 39:6 46:18 47:20 63:21,23 64:9,18 79:7,25 187:1 197:21,23 under-represented 24:7 underestimated 34:10 underlying 4:17 41:2,7,9 55:6 64:20 68:3 70:11				
				V
				vague 95:23 valid 20:14 25:3 28:4 42:13 validity 51:3 105:10 value 72:8 141:15 151:11 163:25 164:1,3,4,9,10,12 164:17,17 165:2,2 170:1 176:25 177:8 189:11 values 94:13,16 137:15 variability 42:6 65:18 81:23 151:16 variation 47:9 68:3 variations 65:24 66:2 179:2 variety 92:1 various 17:11
				W
				Wahab 15:9 33:10 34:12,23 170:15

52:11 53:19 56:17 68:21 83:25 89:12 104:19 112:7 129:14 162:20,23 165:20,22 168:15 181:1,6,7 188:20 yellow 94:24 yesterday 3:3,5 122:4 York 134:7 young 28:1 47:1 94:2	198:10 199:25 200:1 206:2 1,000 84:15 1,993 195:15 1.05 111:15 1.4 35:23 10 61:10 71:8 103:5 122:8,10 125:13 134:6 159:9 194:15 195:23 10,000 139:5,6,16 139:16,19,21 10.00 1:2 205:14 10/15 112:7 100 95:20,20 96:7 98:15,18 103 101:6 206:5 106 141:4 11 8:10 60:13,20 61:5,7 76:6 85:21 159:9 206:4 11.1 19:4 11.1.1 35:7 11.1.3 32:10 11.1.4 33:4 35:4 11.30 201:18 11.32 62:8 11.47 62:10 110 130:1 113 19:3 27:12,18 116 16:12 119 141:25 142:2 12 11:7 48:25 49:5 49:7 60:13 61:17 62:6 77:13 80:16 123 170:12 13 77:14 97:12 137 72:20 14 3:5 49:12,19 57:4 77:14 97:13 14.4 59:8 15 3:7 22:18 23:19 23:22 65:14 96:14 102:5,8,20 122:9 122:10 160:9 188:14	1500 122:7 16 3:14 21:20 66:16 76:9 78:25 143:1 143:2 17 3:17 63:13 79:24 80:8 93:14,21,22 170 97:1,12 179,000 99:1 18 4:12 19 4:14 85:25 86:6 19,100 66:23 1940s 54:4 1950s 48:11 1971 29:3,3 30:4,12 31:14 1975 110:2 1983 38:11 131:17 1985 38:11 1989 6:17 1990s 48:11 1994 64:25 1996 34:14 1998 10:19	20 4:16 50:19 83:25 139:4 162:3 163:23,25 164:9 165:2 170:1 186:8 186:11 194:15 20-odd 162:23 200 98:16 2000 64:8 2002 141:22 2003 38:16,21 79:12 2004 79:12 117:7 2005 7:20 187:8 2006 34:18 41:22 63:5 2007 7:9 117:8 124:10,13,15,22 2008 34:12 154:17 2009 101:13,14,15 101:18,24 102:16 2010 38:21 2015 165:7 2016 1:1 95:19 205:14 21 4:21,22 67:15 22 1:1 5:1,20 8:25 85:25 93:10 23 5:4,11 205:14 24 5:17,22 6:20 7:4 65:13 203:25 25 5:17 6:6 7:9,12 67:14 99:3,14,15 181:2 250 191:7 27 38:4 276 157:11 29 4:18 67:19	3.7 57:4 30 63:1 300,000 188:17 31 67:24 138:2
<hr/> Z <hr/> Zealand 6:7,12,16 6:16 7:4,21 15:12 34:11,13 170:11 171:22 zero 40:10,11 87:15 87:22 98:8,8 99:5 182:13,24 198:16 198:18 199:15,20 199:23,24 200:4,6 200:12,14,16,21 200:22,25,25 201:2,2,3 zone 50:22 52:1,2,3 57:18 81:1 zoology 38:9	<hr/> 0 <hr/> 0 78:10,13 201:10 0.0001 138:23 0.075 97:8 0.1 85:4 0.15 97:10 00 176:8 199:2,8	<hr/> 2 <hr/> 2 4:4 8:12,14 20:1 40:3 49:15 50:18 55:2 77:13 95:7 95:13 96:5,22 97:8 99:4,11,18 110:25 111:4,5 190:1 2-kilometre 50:22 52:1,3 57:18 2.00 111:17 2.1.10 21:8,25 22:1 2.1.6 20:12 2.1.7 20:19 2.14 60:23 2.21 9:23 10:1 11:13 2.22 10:12 2.23 10:16 2.5 10:5 2.6 60:11,12,15,22 60:24 61:1	<hr/> 3 <hr/> 3 27:18,21 49:15 55:21 63:18 77:13 3.15 159:22 3.3 39:9 40:17 3.30 159:24 3.4 41:14 3.5 48:9	<hr/> 4 <hr/> 4 16:9 20:10 28:14 49:19 55:21 60:18 61:7 96:3,21 97:6 4,770 195:14 4.3 76:9 4.3.4 22:15 4.30 111:6 158:24 159:5 201:15 4.35 205:12 4.5 81:11 40 181:3 400,000 188:17 404 190:1,16 198:6 198:10 405 190:3,4 431 97:5,13 46 67:23 4770 195:17 493 195:24
<hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 8:13 19:11 38:22 49:15 50:11,22 52:1,2,3 57:17 77:13 95:7,20 97:1 139:3,5,21 142:4 184:8 190:15 191:1 195:7,8 198:4,5	<hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 8:10 60:13,20 61:5,7 76:6 85:21 159:9 206:4 11.1 19:4 11.1.1 35:7 11.1.3 32:10 11.1.4 33:4 35:4 11.30 201:18 11.32 62:8 11.47 62:10 110 130:1 113 19:3 27:12,18 116 16:12 119 141:25 142:2 12 11:7 48:25 49:5 49:7 60:13 61:17 62:6 77:13 80:16 123 170:12 13 77:14 97:12 137 72:20 14 3:5 49:12,19 57:4 77:14 97:13 14.4 59:8 15 3:7 22:18 23:19 23:22 65:14 96:14 102:5,8,20 122:9 122:10 160:9 188:14	<hr/> 5 <hr/> 5 20:10,10 28:25 60:18 61:8 67:1 165:16 194:14 195:20,23 199:25 200:3 201:10 50 26:8 27:4 96:6 98:16 194:18 500 184:8 512 195:24 514 20:21 21:1 58 166:9 589 72:25 59 166:9	<hr/> 5 <hr/> 5 20:10,10 28:25 60:18 61:8 67:1 165:16 194:14 195:20,23 199:25 200:3 201:10 50 26:8 27:4 96:6 98:16 194:18 500 184:8 512 195:24 514 20:21 21:1 58 166:9 589 72:25 59 166:9	
<hr/> 0 <hr/> 0 78:10,13 201:10 0.0001 138:23 0.075 97:8 0.1 85:4 0.15 97:10 00 176:8 199:2,8	<hr/> 0 <hr/> 0 78:10,13 201:10 0.0001 138:23 0.075 97:8 0.1 85:4 0.15 97:10 00 176:8 199:2,8	<hr/> 2 <hr/> 2 4:4 8:12,14 20:1 40:3 49:15 50:18 55:2 77:13 95:7 95:13 96:5,22 97:8 99:4,11,18 110:25 111:4,5 190:1 2-kilometre 50:22 52:1,3 57:18 2.00 111:17 2.1.10 21:8,25 22:1 2.1.6 20:12 2.1.7 20:19 2.14 60:23 2.21 9:23 10:1 11:13 2.22 10:12 2.23 10:16 2.5 10:5 2.6 60:11,12,15,22 60:24 61:1	<hr/> 3 <hr/> 3 27:18,21 49:15 55:21 63:18 77:13 3.15 159:22 3.3 39:9 40:17 3.30 159:24 3.4 41:14 3.5 48:9	<hr/> 4 <hr/> 4 16:9 20:10 28:14 49:19 55:21 60:18 61:7 96:3,21 97:6 4,770 195:14 4.3 76:9 4.3.4 22:15 4.30 111:6 158:24 159:5 201:15 4.35 205:12 4.5 81:11 40 181:3 400,000 188:17 404 190:1,16 198:6 198:10 405 190:3,4 431 97:5,13 46 67:23 4770 195:17 493 195:24
<hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 8:13 19:11 38:22 49:15 50:11,22 52:1,2,3 57:17 77:13 95:7,20 97:1 139:3,5,21 142:4 184:8 190:15 191:1 195:7,8 198:4,5	<hr/> 1 <hr/> 1 8:10 60:13,20 61:5,7 76:6 85:21 159:9 206:4 11.1 19:4 11.1.1 35:7 11.1.3 32:10 11.1.4 33:4 35:4 11.30 201:18 11.32 62:8 11.47 62:10 110 130:1 113 19:3 27:12,18 116 16:12 119 141:25 142:2 12 11:7 48:25 49:5 49:7 60:13 61:17 62:6 77:13 80:16 123 170:12 13 77:14 97:12 137 72:20 14 3:5 49:12,19 57:4 77:14 97:13 14.4 59:8 15 3:7 22:18 23:19 23:22 65:14 96:14 102:5,8,20 122:9 122:10 160:9 188:14	<hr/> 5 <hr/> 5 20:10,10 28:25 60:18 61:8 67:1 165:16 194:14 195:20,23 199:25 200:3 201:10 50 26:8 27:4 96:6 98:16 194:18 500 184:8 512 195:24 514 20:21 21:1 58 166:9 589 72:25 59 166:9	<hr/> 5 <hr/> 5 20:10,10 28:25 60:18 61:8 67:1 165:16 194:14 195:20,23 199:25 200:3 201:10 50 26:8 27:4 96:6 98:16 194:18 500 184:8 512 195:24 514 20:21 21:1 58 166:9 589 72:25 59 166:9	
<hr/> 0 <hr/> 0 78:10,13 201:10 0.0001 138:23 0.075 97:8 0.1 85:4 0.15 97:10 00 176:8 199:2,8	<hr/> 0 <hr/> 0 78:10,13 201:10 0.0001 138:23 0.075 97:8 0.1 85:4 0.15 97:10 00 176:8 199:2,8	<hr/> 2 <hr/> 2 4:4 8:12,14 20:1 40:3 49:15 50:18 55:2 77:13 95:7 95:13 96:5,22 97:8 99:4,11,18 110:25 111:4,5 190:1 2-kilometre 50:22 52:1,3 57:18 2.00 111:17 2.1.10 21:8,25 22:1 2.1.6 20:12 2.1.7 20:19 2.14 60:23 2.21 9:23 10:1 11:13 2.22 10:12 2.23 10:16 2.5 10:5 2.6 60:11,12,15,22 60:24 61:1	<hr/> 3 <hr/> 3 27:18,21 49:15 55:21 63:18 77:13 3.15 159:22 3.3 39:9 40:17 3.30 159:24 3.4 41:14 3.5 48:9	<hr/> 6 <hr/> 6 4:23 14:14 32:2 39:8 59:12 60:16 60:18 61:8,11 80:9 125:13 127:2 154:15

6.6 97:12
60 26:8 88:8
68 198:9
684,645 145:2

7

7 21:4 38:1 76:8
95:19 125:13
154:14
70 26:8 88:9
74 24:1
75 138:2

8

8 48:22 80:16
125:13 126:20
127:2
80 67:2
85 22:11,16,20
23:23

9

9 67:5 125:13 206:3
206:4
93 144:6
99 85:5 90:20
99.9 84:25 90:20
990,000 43:15
995 38:16