

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY, ALABAMA

----- x
 HEATHER BROWN, a Disabled :
 Minor, by and through Her :
 Parents and Next Friends, :
 :
 Plaintiffs, :
 : Civil Action No.:
 v. : CV 09-900734
 :
 GEORGE W. DEMUTH, M.D., :
 et al., :
 :
 Defendants. :
 ----- x

Tuesday, July 9, 2013

Rockville, Maryland

Videotaped Deposition of

THOMAS LAUGHREN, M.D.

a witness, called for examination by counsel for the
 plaintiffs, pursuant to notice, held at the Hilton
 Washington DC/Rockville Hotel, 1750 Rockville Pike,
 Rockville, Maryland, beginning at 8:09 a.m., before
 Frances M. Freeman, a Notary Public in and for the
 State of Maryland, when were present on behalf of the
 respective parties:

Page 2

1 APPEARANCES:

2 For the Plaintiffs:

3 RIP ANDREWS, ESQUIRE
 4 Marsh, Rickard & Bryan, P.C.
 5 800 Shades Creek Parkway
 6 Suite 600-D
 7 Birmingham, Alabama 35209
 8 205/879-1981
 9

10 For the Defendants:

11 JOHN R. IPSARO, ESQUIRE
 12 Ulmer & Berne
 13 600 Vine Street
 14 Suite 2800
 15 Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
 16 513/234-4268
 17

19 Also Present:

20 STEVEN JONES, Videographer
21

Page 3

1 CONTENTS

2 WITNESS EXAMINATION BY
 3 Thomas Laughren, M.D. Mr. Andrews: 5

4 EXHIBITS

Deposition Exhibit No.	Page
1. Notice	17
1(a). Notes on Glenmullen documents	81
2. 11/16/2006 memo	92
3. 10/25/1996 memo	93
4. Citalopram study report	107
5. Premarking Studies report	113
6. 9/16/2002 memo	124
7. Review and Evaluation of Clinical Data	127
8. 12/13/2001 memo	156
9. 9/4/2003 memo	172
10. 2/18/2004 memo	177
11. Letter	174
12. 8/21/2003 memo	178
13. Senate Committee on Finance memo	203
14. News article	227

Page 4

1 EXHIBITS (Continued)

Deposition Exhibit No.	Page
15. 1/5/2004 memo	181
16. Advisory committee transcript	245
17. Hammad article	235
18. Hammad slides	260
19. Review and Evaluation of Clinical Data	261
20. Patient Narratives	288
21. Lexapro document	289
22. 5/22/2008 memo	290
23. Study report	291
24. Study report	292
25. Study report	293
26. Agreement with Forest	311
27. FDA's website	335
28. Thomas Laughren's LinkedIn	337
29. Article on placebo-controlled trials	339
30. Invoice	350
31. CV and bio	360
32. Witness' stack of documents	372
33. 11/12/2004 memo	278

Page 5

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This marks the beginning
 3 of Videotape Number 1 in the Deposition of Dr. Thomas
 4 Laughren. We are on the record at 8:09 a.m.,
 5 July 9th, 2013, in the matter of Heather Brown, et
 6 al., versus George W. Demuth, et al., before the
 7 Circuit Court of Montgomery County, Alabama, Civil
 8 Action Number CV 09-900734.

9 At this time, would all attorneys please
 10 identify themselves for the record.

11 MR. ANDREWS: I'm Rip Andrews for Heather
 12 Brown and her family.

13 MR. IPSARO: John Ipsaro on behalf of the
 14 Forest defendants.

15 Thereupon,

16 THOMAS LAUGHREN, M.D.
 17 a witness, called for examination by counsel for the
 18 plaintiffs, and after having been first duly sworn by
 19 the Notary Public, was examined and testified as
 20 follows:

21 EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR THE PLAINTIFFS

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

Page 298

1 drug. And I can elaborate on that.

2 It turns out that even though the
3 R-Citalopram is not active at all at the serotonin
4 transporter, both the R and the S-Citalopram are
5 active on cardiac function.

6 And we recently -- FDA recently modified the
7 labeling for Citalopram to limit the dose because of
8 a concern about a particular cardiac effect that
9 occurs at roughly twice the frequency with Citalopram
10 because both the R and the S contribute to it.

11 And so in that sense, they are different
12 drugs. But from the standpoint of activity at the
13 serotonin transporter, they are essentially the same
14 drug.

15 BY MR. ANDREWS:

16 Q Do we know the mechanism by which
17 antidepressants, SSRIs, can cause suicidality in
18 adolescents?

19 MR. IPSARO: Objection.

20 THE WITNESS: We do not.

21 BY MR. ANDREWS:

Page 299

1 Q Could it have anything to do with the S
2 enantiomer or the R enantiomer?

3 MR. IPSARO: Objection.

4 THE WITNESS: I don't -- I don't know the
5 answer to that. I would have to speculate. I don't
6 know.

7 However, we have already made the judgment
8 that all antidepressants, regardless of mechanism,
9 have the risk of inducing suicidality. So the warning
10 applies to all antidepressants regardless of the
11 mechanism whether it's, you know, through serotonin
12 reuptake or norepinephrine reuptake or even recently
13 atypical antipsychotics that have been approved for
14 antidepressant use have gotten this class warning.

15 BY MR. ANDREWS:

16 Q Let me ask you to -- well, yes, let me ask
17 you to pick up Exhibit 6. We're going way back in
18 time here. It's your memo about Celexa.

19 A Okay.

20 Q All right. And then Exhibit 7 you remember
21 was the Hearst -- the first three pages of the Hearst

Page 300

1 memo. Would there be documents like this at the FDA
2 regarding the FDA's investigation into pediatric
3 approval of Lexapro?

4 A Oh, yes.

5 Q And we can make a FOIA request and say --
6 what would you suggest we ask for?

7 A The, you know, the relevant reviews and
8 memoranda related to the approval of and the approval
9 letter for -- you have the supplement number. I
10 forget what the supplement number was.

11 Q I do, too. It's probably in Exhibit -- well,
12 no. It wouldn't be. Anyway. Okay. That helps me.

13 Focusing on Exhibit 6, Page 3, about
14 two-thirds of the way down on the page, there is a
15 note from you. Do you see that?

16 A Yes.

17 Q And it says, There was a packaging error
18 resulting in tablets being distinguishable for drug
19 and placebo for nine patients (although still
20 blinded).

21 That is a representation of the reality that

Page 301

1 there was at the beginning of the Study 18 trial a
2 potentially unblinding event. Correct?

3 A Potentially. Correct.

4 Q I mean, that's what we're calling it. There
5 was a potentially unblinding event. Correct?

6 A Yes. With an emphasis on potential.

7 Q Yes, sir. We don't know one way or the other
8 whether it would have unblinded the study.

9 MR. IPSARO: Objection. Right.

10 BY MR. ANDREWS:

11 Q Right?

12 A Correct.

13 Q And then you say, A reanalysis without these
14 patients yielded a P value of .52 in favor of
15 Citalopram. Correct?

16 A Correct.

17 Q And .52 would be not statistically
18 significant. Correct?

19 A That's correct.

20 Q So if this potentially unblinding event, if
21 these patients were removed, this would no longer be a

76 (Pages 298 to 301)

Page 302

1 positive study?

2 A That's correct.

3 Q So the approval of Lexapro was based on --
4 for pediatric use was based on an Escitalopram
5 positive study and a Citalopram positive study where
6 if you removed nine patients who were potentially
7 unblinded, it was actually a negative?

8 A If you remove nine patients. We considered
9 the issue and made a judgment that they should not be
10 removed.

11 Q Seems like a lot of hoops to jump through to
12 approve this drug for pediatric use.

13 A I didn't consider this a huge hoop. I
14 considered this a nonissue. That there is no reason
15 to believe that -- the fact that tablets have a
16 different color. Any one patient would only get one
17 color tablet.

18 Q I'm saying you're making exception and using
19 a different drug and a different drug study had a
20 potentially unblinding event that would have made the
21 study negative. Is Forest getting some type of

Page 303

1 special treatment regarding pediatric depression?

2 A Absolutely not.

3 Q What was your personal involvement in the
4 approval of Lexapro for pediatric use?

5 A Again, I was the -- well, at that point, I
6 was -- I believe I was the division director. I would
7 have to go back and look at the dates of when it was
8 approved.

9 Q Did you have a role in making that decision?

10 A Sure. Ultimately, it was my decision, but
11 there would have been a reviewer and very likely a
12 team leader. I mean, we can get that package. And
13 there probably would have been a review by a primary
14 reviewer, a team leader, and then probably a memo of
15 some sort from me.

16 Q Do you believe that pharmaceutical
17 manufacturers such as Forest have a duty to warn
18 doctors of any potential dangers associated with their
19 drugs?

20 MR. IPSARO: Objection.

21 THE WITNESS: I mean, they have a duty to

Page 304

1 provide labeling that includes the information that
2 FDA considers to be important to provide clinicians
3 with the information they need to prescribe the drugs.

4 BY MR. ANDREWS:

5 Q And I'm going to stick on this one. Do you
6 hold the opinion that pharmaceutical manufacturers
7 such as Forest have a duty to warn doctors of any
8 potential dangers associated with their prescription
9 drugs?

10 MR. IPSARO: Objection.

11 BY MR. ANDREWS:

12 Q Yes, no, or you can't answer the question the
13 way it's phrased?

14 MR. IPSARO: Objection.

15 THE WITNESS: I can't answer the question the
16 way it's phrased.

17 BY MR. ANDREWS:

18 Q Let me ask you to look at the label again.
19 It's Exhibit 21. Let me ask you to look at Page 4?

20 A Okay.

21 Q Under warnings, the first one is clinical

Page 305

1 worsening and suicide risks. Correct?

2 A Correct.

3 Q And then the middle paragraph begins, The
4 discussion of pooled analysis. Correct?

5 A Correct.

6 Q Let me ask you to look in the middle of that
7 paragraph, a sentence near the right that begins,
8 There was considerable variation. Do you see that?

9 A Yes.

10 Q What it says is, There was considerable
11 variation in risk among drugs, but a tendency toward
12 an increase for almost all drugs studied. Correct?

13 A Correct.

14 Q Does that leave open the interpretation to a
15 physician that some of the drugs studied did not have
16 an increase?

17 A That's not the way I read it. The way I read
18 that initial clause in that sentence is that -- this
19 is what it was intended to convey: That despite the
20 considerable variation and risk among drugs, almost
21 all of them show an increase.

77 (Pages 302 to 305)