1	BEFORE THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY					
2	RESEARCH INTEGRITY OFFICE					
3						
4	CONFIDENTIAL IN RE: V.C.					
5						
6						
7	INQUIRY INTERVIEW OF DR. RAMY E. ALI, Ph.D., Postdoctoral Researcher in Electrical Engineering, University of Southern California,					
	Complainant					
9	Thursday, September 2, 2021 3:00 p.m., via Zoom					
11						
12						
13	INQUIRY OFFICIAL PRESENT:					
14	DR. SEAN HALLGREN, Ph.D., Professor of Computer Science and Engineering, College of Engineering, Penn State					
15	ALSO PRESENT:					
16 17	DEBRA THURLEY, J.D., Assistant Vice President for Research, Deputy Research Integrity Officer					
18	DR. COURTNEY KARMELITA, D.Ed., Assistant Director of					
19	Research Quality and Integrity, Office for Research Protections					
20	KIMBERLY PETROSKY, J.D., Research Integrity Analyst, Office for Research Protections					
21						
22	SARAH MATTHEWS, Research Integrity Program Assistant, Office for Research Protections					
23						
24						
25	Transcription completed by: Lisa J. Berkey, Court Reporter, (570) 336-8114					

1	I N D E X		
2			
3	INTRODUCTION By Dr. Karmelita	PAGE 3	
5 6 7	<u>INTERVIEW</u> By Dr. Hallgren	7	
8 9	ERRATA SHEET	37	
10	REFERENCE TO PREMARKED EXHIBITS Exhibit A	13	
12 13	Exhibit B	17	
14 15			
16			
17 18			
19			
20 21			
22			
23 24			
25			

DR. KARMELITA: Hello.

2.1

DR. ALI: Good morning.

DR. KARMELITA: Thank you for joining us.

DR. ALI: [Unintelligible].

DR. KARMELITA: I just have a few slides that I am going to go through for some housekeeping reasons. So we'll get through that first. It will just take a few minutes to give you some information, and then we'll go ahead and we'll start with the questions.

So just as a reminder, we're all here today to just get more information about the allegation against Dr. Viveck Cadambe.

And to begin, before we get to the interview questions, we wanted to just let you know that our standard of practice is to record these interviews. We then send the interview to a transcriptionist who creates a transcript.

You will receive a copy of that transcript and you'll have the opportunity to comment on it, to clarify things. Sometimes information just doesn't come through on the transcript and you might want to give a little more context.

Once our final report is prepared, then we would delete this recording. So are there any objections to recording, or are you okay with that?

```
DR. ALI: Yeah, I'm fine with it.
1
2
              DR. KARMELITA: Thank you. So for the
3
    recording we actually all need to introduce ourselves
    so that the transcriptionist can orient our voices.
4
              And Candy Yekel, who is our Research
5
6
    Integrity Officer, is not able to attend today, but
    Debra Thurley, who can introduce herself momentarily,
7
    is able to join us. So, Debra, do you want to begin
8
    with the introductions?
10
              MS. THURLEY: Sure. Thank you. I'm Debra
11
    Thurley. I'm an Assistant Vice President for Research,
12
    and I'm also the Deputy Research Integrity Officer.
13
    Thank you for being here today.
14
              DR. KARMELITA: And I'm Courtney Karmelita.
    I'm the Assistant Director of Research Quality and
15
    Integrity.
16
17
              MS. PETROSKY: I'm Kim Petrosky. I'm the
18
    Research Integrity Analyst.
19
              MS. MATTHEWS: I'm Sarah Matthews.
20
    Research Integrity Program Assistant.
2.1
              DR. KARMELITA: And then we also are joined
22
    by our inquiry official. So if you wouldn't mind
23
    introducing yourself, Dr. Hallgren.
24
              DR. HALLGREN: I am Sean Hallgren.
                                                   I'm in
25
    Computer Science and I'm a professor there.
```

DR. KARMELITA: And then also, if you wouldn't mind introducing yourself, Ramy.

2.1

DR. ALI: Yeah. I am Ramy Ali. I am a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Southern California.

DR. KARMELITA: Thank you. So this is just a reminder that we are at the inquiry phase of our research misconduct process, and so at inquiry the purpose is not to determine if research misconduct occurred, but rather, if an investigation is warranted, by confirming that the allegation meets the definition of research misconduct. So we're still very much in an information gathering phase. We are not making any determinations at this point.

And then also, just reiterating the importance of confidentiality. We want to protect the identities of everyone involved. We know that privacy is of the utmost importance for both the Complainant and the Respondent, so we just ask that the information discussed here today remains confidential to the extent possible.

Sorry. My son just got home from school. (Pause)

The inquiry should normally be concluded within 90 days. So just as far as where we are in

timeline, that would be October 1st. And all of the information that we learn today, including the transcripts and a summary of this interview, will be included in the inquiry report.

And again, you will have the opportunity to review the transcripts and comment, and those comments would also be included within that report.

So just three more slides. First though, regarding process, does anyone have any questions?

(No response)

2.1

DR. KARMELITA: Okay. So now that we've reviewed the process, we just need to review the allegation. It actually does need to be read for the record. So, Ramy, I was hoping that you could read it, since you're most familiar with this work.

DR. ALI: All right. The Respondent,
Dr. Viveck Cadambe, allegedly plagiarized ideas and
work from Complainant, Dr. Ramy Ali, in the 2021 work
"CausalEC: A causally consistent data storage
algorithm based on cross-object erasure coding,"
authored by Respondent and Dr. -- actually, Shihang Lyu
wasn't a Ph.D. student, but that's fine -- by using the
same algorithm from the 2018 work "Erasure coding based
causally consistent distributed data storage," authored
by Respondent, Shihang Lyu, a Complainant, and Dr.

Bhuvan in the 2021 work, without providing appropriate credit to the Complainant.

2.1

DR. KARMELITA: So you're saying at the time of the work Shihang was a doctoral student, but he has since graduated with a Ph.D.?

DR. ALI: No, no. He graduated with a master degree. He wasn't a Ph.D. student.

DR. KARMELITA: Okay. We will correct that. We didn't have that correct then for the assessment. So now we're going to go ahead and turn it over to Dr. Hallgren to ask his questions.

DR. HALLGREN: Thank you. Yeah. I had just tried to outline some questions. They said nine. I don't know what the number is.

But after looking through the documents some more when I was preparing for this, I realized that it's -- you know, we don't have enough information to really understand what -- you know, to understand the allegation.

And so I'm going to back up and go to question zero, instead of question one, and I would like to ask if you could please help us understand this better. Like what -- you know, what is plagiarizing and the ideas, and so on? Like what happened?

DR. ALI: Well, what happened is that we were

working on this work, as just the old paper, "Erasure coding based causally consistent distributed data storage" in 2018. We started on January, or something like this.

2.1

And we submitted the version of this work at the conference called DISC (phonetic) in May. So we submitted an abstract and were planning to submit the full version of the paper, but then Viveck Cadambe asked us to withdraw the paper. He told us let's write it more clearly, we don't have to hurry in this work. So he has withdrawn the paper.

I was a coauthor of this. I was the second author first, and then he moved me to be the third. So we were four authors. Shihang was the first. In the final version Viveck was the second, I was the third, and Bhuvan, who is a professor at Computer Science Department, was the fourth.

So Viveck then has withdrawn this work, and he said that let's write it more clearly, and so on, and improve it. So we had more discussions after we have withdrawn the paper and we tried to improve things, write things more clearly, and so on.

And then we -- all of us stopped working on this for a while. And Shihang decided to write some modified version of this paper as his master's

dissertation, thesis. So he wanted to graduate, so he simplified this work in his dissertation and he graduated.

2.1

And after that, we were having some discussions until 2019, or so, and I was discussing with Viveck that we would submit it again, and he told me, yeah, we will do this, and so on.

And then in 2021 I have found the paper on arXiv without my name, so I -- that was a surprise for me. I don't know how this happened.

So I e-mailed him. I told him that I was a coauthor of the earlier version, how come I was removed. And also, I sent a text message to Shihang. I provided this text message to the coordinators.

So I told him how come I removed, and he told me this is probably by mistake from Viveck, and he doesn't know why I was removed. And he doesn't -- he wasn't aware of the whole thing, so he doesn't know how this happened.

So I e-mailed Viveck. I told him that how come I was removed. So he told me I will write an acknowledgment for you. So he updated the paper on arXiv with an acknowledgment.

The first version didn't have this acknowledgment at all. The second version he has this

acknowledgment, but he wrote totally incorrect information. He was saying that I helped in another work other than this work itself. In a vague way, I don't agree with this acknowledgment.

2.1

And he refused to add me as a coauthor. He said that he worked on this after I left Penn State, and that it has been a long time since I was involved with any of the discussion, and I will not add you.

So I told him I will just report this issue to Penn State and he can [unintelligible].

DR. HALLGREN: Okay. Thank you. So I'm familiar -- so that helps refresh my memory. You know, I've seen these documents and stuff, so that's good to see.

Now, when you looked at the paper on the arXiv, you know, what parts of that paper do you feel, you know, were taken from the draft?

DR. ALI: It is actually -- it is the same.

It is the same protocol. So the protocol in the original paper is called CausalEC. The protocol in the new paper is called CausalEC, and also it has the same -- it has the same elements. So he --

DR. HALLGREN: Like where would I look? I have them both sitting here. One's 22 pages, one's 54 pages. Where do I look to see that these algorithms

are the same?

2.1

DR. ALI: Many places. So if you look into the summary of the contributions or the main idea of the protocol, in the arXiv version you will see that the main idea of the protocol something called cross-object coding. This is the main idea of the work. In the old version we were calling this inter-object coding. So it is the same idea, but it is explained in a better way, in a different way.

But I would like also to emphasize that the draft that is 21 pages or so, we were already working to improve this and writing things more and we were having some discussions, and in the new version on arXiv, he has motivating examples, he has more clarifications.

We already discussed this, although they were not written in the 21 pages paper. So I see this as this, but the longer one is more well explained, but the essence of the protocol is the same. This cross-object coding is the same here and here.

DR. HALLGREN: Okay. So I hear what you're saying, that the essence is the same. But, you know, to people who have not worked on this paper in particular, you know, it would help if you could like -- you know, to help other people understand what

```
you're saying. Somehow you have to give, you know,
1
    give a starting point even. Like where do we look?
2
    How do we --
3
4
              DR. ALI: I will tell you. Should I start
    from the abstract or what --
5
              DR. HALLGREN: Well, I don't know. I mean,
6
7
    you know, this can be a tough thing to do, to try and
    help other people understand --
8
              DR. ALI: Yeah.
              DR. HALLGREN: -- you know, what your feeling
10
    is about this, but. So, you know, we can talk about
11
12
    it, you can try some things, and then I can try and
    steer you if it's not helpful, if it is helpful, but
13
14
    somehow this has to --
15
              DR. ALI: I will try to share my screen and
    tell you what is it. So here he's saying that we are
16
17
    developing for the first time an erasure coding based
18
    algorithm called CausalEC. This protocol I was
    involved with in developing in the original paper.
19
                                                         So
20
    this is the same protocol, even in --
              DR. HALLGREN: Well, I understand that.
2.1
22
    Partly, you said, CausalEC is the -- you think it's the
23
    same, but the other paper's not a published paper,
    first of all.
2.4
25
              Second of all, you know, all we can do is
```

```
look at the other one for now. You can tell us also
1
2
    what happened, but it's not a matter of like these two
    sentences say the same thing. It's like, you know,
3
    where does the actual problem occur.
4
5
              DR. ALI: Yeah. Okay. I would like -- so
6
    this is the aspects that I mentioned, that the main
7
    idea of the algorithm is a cross-object erasure coding
    and --
8
              MS. PETROSKY: Okay. Sorry. I don't mean to
    interrupt, but just so that we can be clear for the
10
11
    transcript, we're looking at a copy of the 2021 arXiv
12
    paper. It looks like it's Version 2, the second
13
    version of the arXiv paper. So we'll call that
    Exhibit A.
14
              (Exhibit A identified)
15
16
              DR. ALI: Okay.
17
              DR. HALLGREN: But I guess what I'm getting
18
    at is like this stuff is just abstract, it's intro.
19
    Like people can write anything. Like even if they have
20
    the same words, it doesn't mean that the papers are the
2.1
    same like necessarily, right. It depends what happens
22
    in the paper. So can you help with what's in the
23
    paper?
24
              DR. ALI: Yeah, I agree. I just wanted to
25
    mention that this cross-object erasure coding is the
```

```
main idea of the report.
1
2
              DR. HALLGREN: Well, I don't -- okay.
3
    don't know if it's an idea. But okay, go ahead.
              DR. ALI: No. Actually, this is the main
4
    technique in this work.
                             This is the main --
5
6
              DR. HALLGREN: Okay.
              DR. ALI: -- novelty in this work.
7
              DR. HALLGREN: Okay. So that's the main
8
9
    technique. And was that technique in the previous
10
    paper?
11
              DR. ALI: Yeah, but it is called inter-object
12
    erasure coding.
              DR. HALLGREN: Okay. So you're saying that
13
14
    one thing people could do is they could look at
15
    cross-object erasure coding in the arXiv paper and
    compare it to what? What was the other one called?
16
17
              DR. ALI: Inter-object erasure.
18
              DR. HALLGREN: Inter-object. Okay.
    you've given now an example. Cross-object erasure is
19
20
    the main technique. It's called inter-object in the
2.1
    previous one. Can you say more about that specific
22
    example? Like how can we see those in the paper and
23
    see that they're the same?
24
              DR. ALI: Yeah. Okay. Okay. So first I
25
    would like to mention that this cross-object or
```

```
inter-object, this work is the first work to look at
1
2
    this. So this is the main technical aspect of this
3
    work.
              You can see this by, for an instance -- okay.
4
    So if you look into this figure, for an instance, this
5
6
    Figure 1, X1 is an object, X2 --
7
              DR. HALLGREN: Sorry. Which paper are you in
    right now, the arXiv --
8
9
              DR. ALI: This is the same exhibit,
10
    Exhibit A. This is the longer version.
11
              DR. HALLGREN: Which paper is it, the arXiv
12
    paper or --
13
              DR. ALI: The arXiv.
14
              DR. HALLGREN: The arXiv paper. Okay.
15
              DR. ALI: Okay. So that the main technique
    here is that here you have three objects, X1, X2 and
16
17
    X3. And cross-object means that --
18
              DR. HALLGREN: Sorry. First, can you just
    tell me, for like -- you know, I don't want to get
19
20
    saturated like not too quickly. So can you first tell
2.1
    me where in each paper we would look? Just give us a
22
    map, like if you look here, you'll see this, if you
23
    look here, you'll see that.
              DR. ALI: Yeah. Okay. So this is -- this
2.4
25
    section is Motivating Example, Section 1.1 --
```

```
DR. HALLGREN: Yeah.
1
2
              DR. ALI: -- in the arXiv version.
3
              DR. HALLGREN: Uh-huh.
              DR. ALI: Okay. This is just a simple
 4
5
    example to illustrate the main idea of this work, which
6
    is a cross-object, and the cross-object means that
7
    these circles here are servers.
8
              DR. HALLGREN: No. Sorry. Can you point in
9
    each paper where we would look? Like don't explain the
    technique. Show me where to look in each paper first.
10
11
              DR. ALI: Okay. So in the first draft, in
12
    the arXiv version, you will look into the Motivating
13
    Example, which is Section 1.1. Okay. In the old
14
    one -- okay.
15
              MS. PETROSKY: I can actually share a copy of
    that, if that would be helpful.
16
17
              DR. ALI: I have it printed. If you would
18
    like to share it, you can share it [unintelligible].
    Yeah. If you look into page 4 and page 5. Yeah,
19
20
    mainly page 5. Yeah.
2.1
              So the cross-object idea is explained here,
22
    is explained in this -- using this example that -- and
23
    this Section 4 also is explaining the same thing, so --
24
              MS. PETROSKY: And then just to clarify for
25
    the record, this is page 5, Section 4 of what we're
```

```
going to call Exhibit B, which is the 2018 article.
1
2
    And then you were referencing, I believe, also
    Section 1.1 of Exhibit A, the 2021 article.
3
               (Exhibit B identified)
 4
              DR. ALI: Yeah, yeah. For the older version,
5
6
    this idea of cross-object or inter-object is explained
7
    both in Section 3 and Section 4.
8
              DR. HALLGREN: How big -- so these, to me,
9
    look like just small examples. Whatever you're doing,
10
    this cross-object thing, does that scale? Or like
11
    what's the --
12
              DR. ALI: Yeah, yeah. It is at the scale.
    Here we are just explaining it as just small numeric
13
14
    examples, but in [unintelligible] these numbers here,
15
    if we assume that we have just two object or three
    object or so, the actual protocol is handling any
16
17
    number of objects.
18
              DR. HALLGREN: Okay. Can you show me where
    it scales in each paper?
19
20
              DR. ALI: Okay. Yeah, since we are here
2.1
    already, the actual protocol for any number of objects
22
    is at Section 4.2 in page 6. So this is the actual
23
    protocol. It is not for a specific example as what I
24
    was explaining earlier.
25
              Here it deals with any number of objects.
                                                           So
```

the objects are [unintelligible] to you and you deal with any number of objects. If you look into the arXiv one, the protocol is given in Section 4 also. Section 4, it is page 10. DR. HALLGREN: Okay. And then what should I be looking at here to see that they're the same? DR. ALI: So here, yeah, if you just fix the screen like this, I will present the CausalEC algorithm that is parametrized by this to store K objects. So here K is generic. It is not --DR. HALLGREN: Wait. First, no. Before we talk about ideas and details, I just want to know just at a high level. You know, like if I were to look at these two, should I be able to see that these are the same, or is it only you? Or, you know, how do you communicate to another person that these are the same? DR. ALI: It is the same because if you look into the old version of the paper, the 21 pages, it is saying that in general you have any number of objects, K objects, and then you do some encoding. In the new version of the paper on arXiv, also it is the same. You have K objects and you encode them using some erasure coding, using this cross-object technique. So --DR. HALLGREN: Well, that's a very vague

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

statement though. I mean, you know, lots of different 1 2 algorithms could do that. What makes these two specifically the same? 3 DR. ALI: Well, so there are two ideas that 4 5 is maybe the main ideas of this protocol. The first 6 idea is the cross-object. You will find that it is 7 used here and here. And the second idea is that each server is 8 9 storing some history, and you will see that here and here. And this work is the first to do this, so either 10 11 the old one or the new one. 12 DR. HALLGREN: Okay. Sorry. So let's go slowly. I'm supposed to look for something that's 13 14 called cross-object and I'm supposed to look for something state history, is that right -- or stored --15 no, that you store the history, right? 16 DR. ALI: Yeah. 17 18 DR. HALLGREN: Okay. So where do I see that 19 on these two pages? 20 DR. ALI: Okay. Actually, cross-object is 2.1 mentioned everywhere in the arXiv version. So should I 22 point out to a specific place? It is --23 DR. HALLGREN: Well, it's not enough just to 24 use the same word, right? I mean, you have to show me

that these are -- you have to explain that the steps

25

are the same, the ideas are the same. I mean, even to know if cross-object is the same, we'd have to look up definitions and stuff. So I don't want to get sidetracked by that so much yet.

I'm just trying to get a map of like, you

2.1

2.4

know, here's where you would look to see that blah, blah, blah, but with more detail. Like which -- like I don't see -- like where is the store history idea and the cross-object idea appearing in these two algorithms?

DR. ALI: Okay. So the main -- here, I don't know if this answer your question or no. "The main technical novelty of our paper lies in handling algorithmic challenges associated with developing consistent data storage system that uses cross-object erasure coding."

And then you would like to show how this cross-object is working. You are saying I shouldn't explain on this example, right?

DR. HALLGREN: No. An example's not enough. You know, small things might work, but when you scale it, it might not. So we have to see that the scaling thing actually works in both papers, like, you know.

DR. ALI: Yeah. I would like -- I just would like to find the specific base [unintelligible]

algorithm. Just one second. 1 2 (Pause) DR. HALLGREN: Who's sharing the screen? 3 Ιs 4 that you, Ramy, or somebody else? 5 DR. ALI: Yeah, yeah. I'm sharing my screen. DR. HALLGREN: Okay. 6 7 DR. ALI: So in both of the protocols you are given this K object, okay, and you are using some code, 8 C, which takes this object and code occurs then. 10 DR. HALLGREN: No. Sorry. Again, you're 11 like getting into details about stuff. I want like a 12 map of where I see it in the paper. I need to be able to verify what you're saying, and I can't think real 13 14 time and understand the algorithm on the spot so --15 DR. ALI: Okay. DR. HALLGREN: -- you have to give me a map 16 17 that says like here is where that idea appears, it's in 18 these four lines of the code, or whatever, and, you know, here's with the other thing. 19 20 So the high level stuff doesn't help because 2.1 -- you know, just to give you an example, I'm writing a 22 paper right now where I think I know what's true and 23 then I write it down and then everything falls apart and breaks and, you know, it's not true, so I have to 24 25 keep changing what it says.

```
But so I really need to see in the -- you
1
2
    know, somewhere in the -- you have to show me where the
3
    details are, without explaining the details,
 4
    necessarily.
              DR. ALI: This idea of cross-object actually
5
6
    is mentioned in all -- everywhere.
7
              DR. HALLGREN: It's just a word though.
    have to show me where it actually is implemented, where
8
    it happens, right.
10
              DR. ALI: Okay.
11
              DR. HALLGREN: Where it's -- I mean, are
12
    there proofs, do you prove things work? Like how do
    you -- like is it a theory paper? Do you prove things,
13
14
    or how does that work?
15
              DR. ALI: Yeah.
              DR. HALLGREN: Okay. So then do you have to
16
    prove that the cross-object part works?
17
18
              DR. ALI: Yeah.
19
              DR. HALLGREN: Okay. So, you know, so where
20
    is the cross-object part in each paper and where are
2.1
    the proofs in each paper? Are the proofs the same?
22
              DR. ALI: They have the same ideas, but they
23
    may not be identical.
2.4
              DR. HALLGREN: Okay. Well, that's what we
25
    should try and establish. Like what's equal, what's,
```

you know, maybe not identical, what's using the same 1 2 idea? You have to tease that apart for everybody else because other people won't be able to understand that, 3 won't be able to determine that. 4 DR. ALI: Yeah. It will take some time to 5 6 point out things. Wait one second. 7 DR. HALLGREN: Do you see the -- so I had asked them to send you questions like this a couple of 8 times. Did you understand that this was what I was asking for before? 10 11 DR. ALI: No, I --12 DR. HALLGREN: Okay. That's what I -- I kind 13 of guessed that by your response, that --14 DR. KARMELITA: So we could also always 15 have -- when we work on the comparison, to point out specific components within the paper to demonstrate the 16 17 similarity, and you could always send that to us after 18 the fact so that you're not necessarily put on the spot 19 or trying to go through it. 20 But before we agree to do that, do you feel 2.1 you have a good understanding of specifically what 22 Dr. Hallgren's looking for? Dr. Hallgren, do you want 23 to add to what you're asking, or what I just expressed?

DR. HALLGREN: Well, I think we should pin

down one example now so that we -- you know, so we have

24

25

an example, and then you can do it like throughout the 1 2 paper, or whatever. But we at least need to find one part where I 3 can look at it and say, okay, now I see, if I spend all 4 5 my time looking at this part, I will be able to see what you're saying. But we're not to that --6 7 DR. ALI: And you are saying that example is not sufficient to do this? 8 DR. HALLGREN: No, because the claim is that something scales, and so that is -- you know, simple 10 examples can always work, but the scaling might not 11 12 work. 13 DR. ALI: Okay. 14 DR. HALLGREN: So I need to see the scaling part together with the proof of the scaling part to see 15 if the ideas are the same. 16 DR. ALI: Okay. I need more time to do this, 17 18 but I am trying to do it now. 19 DR. HALLGREN: Well, okay. There's no rush. 20 But if you can try and just find something now. I can 2.1 just keep saying no to everything you put up, and then 22 whatever's left you use that afterwards. 23 (Pause) 24 DR. ALI: Yeah, it is hard to do it in this 25 [unintelligible]. I see the ideas written in the

```
protocol in many places, but I don't know how to
1
2
    explain it.
              DR. HALLGREN: Okay. Do you think you can
3
    try it if you have time off line to like think through
4
    it?
5
              DR. ALI: Yeah, I think so, but just can you
6
7
    say again what specific thing you are looking for, just
    to be clear?
8
              DR. HALLGREN: Well, okay. It's hard to
    explain, you know, but there are like different levels.
10
11
    Like the text could be equal, okay, text isn't equal.
12
    There could be an idea that's the same in both papers.
13
              DR. ALI: That's the cross-object that I am
14
    saying.
              DR. HALLGREN: Okay. Hold on. But let me
15
    just bleh, bleh, bleh. That idea might be in every
16
17
    paper you look at, right, or it might be a new idea.
18
              DR. ALI: No, that's --
19
              DR. HALLGREN: No. I'm not talking about
20
    this one. I'm just saying. I'm giving you like
2.1
    different levels of things to look at, what you have to
22
    help us understand.
23
              You have to help us understand. You also
24
    have to say this stuff is standard, everyone does it,
25
    but this part is new. Like it's not enough just to say
```

these parts look the same. You know what I mean? You have to say like this part's standard, this part's not, this is the new part, here's where you look.

2.1

So in particular, if you're saying that these two techniques are new and that they were in the original paper and they scaled and there's proofs in both papers, I would think that that would be possible to point out.

Like here's where they're used, here's why
they're -- you know, explain why they're the same,
explain which parts are -- you know. I mean, somehow
we have to establish, you know, did the ideas come from
you through those earlier meetings, or was it just
taken from the -- you see what I'm saying? Like we
have nothing to go on right now.

DR. ALI: Okay. I have mentioned this before, but this cross-object or inter-object is not standard, it is the first -- this proposed for the first time.

DR. HALLGREN: I understand, but that's a word. You have to show us where that -- okay. So first of all, I don't know the definition. So if you're saying there's a definition in the paper, then say here's the definition, it's in both papers. Okay?

DR. ALI: Is that cross-object meaning that

```
you have some objects and it encodes them. Okay.
1
2
    is explained here and this is explained here.
    standard approach is taking one object and encoding it.
3
              DR. HALLGREN: No. But you have to show us
 4
5
    in the paper where this is explained so that we can see
    that the concept is the same.
6
7
              DR. ALI: So should I highlight both of the
    papers supports that explains the cross-object coding?
8
              DR. HALLGREN: Sure. Yeah, yeah.
                                                 I mean,
10
    you show us where it's defined in each paper, then you
11
    show us where it's used in each paper. So we can say,
12
    okay, we see the definition is the same, now there's an
13
    algorithm, I guess. Is that right, there's an
14
    algorithm? Is there one algorithm or many algorithms?
    I don't even know.
15
16
              DR. ALI: It is one algorithm, but it has
17
    many smaller components, but it is one.
18
              DR. HALLGREN: Oh, so there's one like all
19
    these different smaller pieces get put together?
20
              DR. ALI: Yeah.
2.1
              DR. HALLGREN: Okay. So there's like what's
22
    the high level claim about that whole thing when you
23
    put it together? Show me, you know, where in each
24
    paper is that claim made so we can say, okay, that same
25
    claim is made in both papers.
```

1 DR. ALI: Okay. 2 DR. HALLGREN: And then, you know, how is 3 that claim established in both papers. If it's like boxes one, four and five in one, and six, seven and 4 5 eight in the other, or whatever. Like how do you put 6 it together? And then where's the proof of -- is it 7 proof of correctness or running time, or what? 8 DR. ALI: Yeah, yeah, correctness and 9 liveness. 10 DR. HALLGREN: And what? 11 DR. ALI: Liveness. 12 DR. HALLGREN: What's live --13 DR. ALI: Liveness means that the protocol is 14 progressing, it is not halting algorithm. 15 DR. HALLGREN: Oh, it's not halting. Okay. So then you show where the proofs are, so we -- you 16 17 know, you have to be able to say here's where it is in 18 this paper, here's where it is in this paper. 19 though if they don't look the same, if you read these 20 two proofs, you will see it's the exact same technique. 2.1 You know what I mean? 22 DR. ALI: Yeah. For me the cross-object and 23 the inter-object is the technique here, is the technique here, and it is introduced for the first time 24 25 so that this is the key --

DR. HALLGREN: I don't doubt for a minute that you understand it a hundred percent, but you have to communicate it. That's the hard part. You have to now communicate what you know to people, you know, who are not you, basically.

2.1

Because like, you know, one thing like when you're a, you know, a grad student, you spend like a year working on a problem, you know, you sort of know everything inside and out, and you totally lose track that when -- until you talk to people, you don't realize how little everyone else knows about whatever you're doing. You know what I mean?

And then you slowly have to shape your story to make it easier and less, you know -- so that's kind of your job here. You take something that you obviously understand very well, but you have to pull it out into something that, you know, kind of anyone can understand.

DR. ALI: Okay. So I --

DR. HALLGREN: I mean, if you have a roommate who's never seen this before, your roommate should be able to read what you wrote and be like, okay, at least I see like how I would piece this together if I wanted to spend time on it.

DR. ALI: Okay. So just to make sure I

understand, you would like the two drafts and I 1 2 highlight the similarities between them, like this, or is that --3 DR. HALLGREN: This is not super helpful. 4 5 You're making a claim about an algorithm, so I want to 6 go straight to the algorithm. I don't like -- you 7 know, I don't want to -- I can write whatever I want in 8 an abstract. It might be true, it might be false, right. I mean, that's not evidence. Evidence would be here's the algorithm, here are the ideas. 10 11 Like I have lots of ideas that don't work, so 12 I could write a paper that says I have this great idea. I think, you know, if you put these two things together 13 14 and color it red and then tape it on the other side, it's going to, you know, do my homework for me, or 15 something. You know, it doesn't mean it works. 16 17 doesn't mean anything, right. So you just have to 18 establish that through concrete parts of the paper. 19 DR. ALI: So what is the response -- what is 20 the format of the response that you would like from me? 2.1 DR. HALLGREN: Page numbers and line numbers, 22 for example, would be one thing. 23 DR. ALI: Okay. 24 DR. HALLGREN: I mean, in particular, the definition, the algorithm statement, the algorithm, 25

```
where it is, the algorithm proof. Just that part, you
1
2
    know. And then you say where those ideas appear so we
    can see it if we look, you know.
3
 4
              DR. ALI: Okay.
5
              DR. HALLGREN: I mean, I think the fact that
6
    you're having a hard time is also an indication, right?
7
    It's not easy. I mean, this is like hard stuff to get
8
    through.
              DR. ALI: Yeah. I thought explaining that
    both of them use this cross-object and it is used for
10
    the first time is sufficient, but I can try to do more.
11
12
              DR. HALLGREN: Well, cross-object is just a
    word.
13
              DR. ALI: But it is here for the first time,
14
    and in the old version for the first time.
15
16
              DR. HALLGREN: No. But you have to convince
17
    us.
18
              DR. ALI: Okay. Yeah.
19
              DR. KARMELITA: So, Dr. Hallgren -- oh,
20
    sorry. Go ahead.
2.1
              DR. ALI: So just to be clear, the
22
    cross-object or the inter-object is the main technique,
23
    and the main guarantee is that the system is causally
24
    consistent and this is proved both in the old version
25
    and the new version. So that's what I will point out.
```

```
DR. HALLGREN: Okay. Well, you can start
1
2
    with two sentences that say those two things, but then
3
    say what -- give page numbers and line numbers where
    the definitions of each of those things are.
4
5
              DR. ALI: Okay.
                               There is no line numbers,
    but I will try.
6
7
              DR. KARMELITA: Did you want to -- do you
    feel that you have a clear understanding of what's
8
    being asked? And then we can -- if so, we can go ahead
10
    and just move on to possibly the authorship questions,
11
    Dr. Hallgren.
12
              DR. ALI: Okay.
              DR. HALLGREN: I don't know if we need those
13
14
    yet --
15
              DR. KARMELITA: Okay.
16
              DR. HALLGREN: -- because it's going to
17
    depend on what the papers look like.
              DR. KARMELITA:
18
                               Okay.
19
              DR. ALI: Yeah, I believe we will take -- it
20
    is not [unintelligible], so I will send you something,
2.1
    you will say it is not clear. I don't know if it is
    from the first time I will be able to do this.
22
23
              DR. HALLGREN: That's fine.
              DR. KARMELITA: And our team will work with
24
25
    you. So Sarah, Kim or myself, we will send you a
```

```
follow-up e-mail. We've taken notes on specifically
1
2
    what's being asked. And then you can respond to us and
3
    we'll share that with Dr. Hallgren.
              DR. ALI: Yeah.
 4
              DR. KARMELITA: So we'll be the in-between.
5
              DR. ALI: Yeah, sure.
 6
7
              DR. HALLGREN: I hope I don't come across
    wrong when I say, you know, you have to convince us.
8
    It's like a friendly challenge. Like you have this
10
    work, so it's a friendly challenge to try and -- you
11
    know.
12
              DR. ALI: Yeah. I know it is hard to show
    this, but for me I see the technique is the same, the
13
14
    claim is the same. I was coauthor of the old one.
    was removed. So it is very clear for me, but I need to
15
16
    convince you.
17
              DR. HALLGREN: Yeah. Show us how to see it
18
    also.
19
              DR. ALI: Okay. I will --
20
              DR. HALLGREN: From the papers.
2.1
              DR. ALI: Yeah.
                               Sure. Is there a date I
22
    should respond by? Because I have a deadline
23
    [unintelligible].
              DR. KARMELITA: Well, the deadline for the
2.4
25
    inquiry is October 1st, so I would say you need to give
```

```
enough time for us to review it before then, ideally,
1
2
    and to write the report. So does a week seem
3
    reasonable to you?
              DR. ALI: I actually have the deadline
4
    September 8.
5
6
              DR. KARMELITA: Perfect.
7
              DR. ALI: No. That's my deadline, so I would
    like to be able to --
8
9
              DR. KARMELITA: Oh, sorry. I was like, yes,
10
    get that to us on September 8th, too.
11
              DR. ALI: I would like mid September. Does
    that work?
12
13
              DR. KARMELITA: Yes.
              MS. THURLEY: Yeah, I think that would be
14
    fine. So you're thinking September 10th or 13th,
15
16
    around that time frame?
17
              DR. ALI: [Unintelligible]. I would like
18
    15th, something like this, but I'll [unintelligible]
19
    earlier, but I would like to set this date. I will
20
    probably send it earlier.
2.1
              MS. THURLEY: Okay.
22
              DR. KARMELITA: So at this time do we have
23
    any other questions?
2.4
               (No response)
25
              DR. KARMELITA: Okay then. Well, thank you
```

```
everyone for taking your time out of your day for this.
1
    We will be in touch with a follow-up e-mail that you
2
3
    can respond to that, and we will go from there.
               DR. ALI: Okay. Thank you very much.
4
5
               DR. HALLGREN: Thank you.
               DR. KARMELITA: Bye.
6
7
               MS. THURLEY: Bye-bye.
8
               MS. MATTHEWS: Bye everyone.
9
               (Interview concluded)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE I hereby certify that the recorded interview in this matter was transcribed by me to the best of my ability. Lisa J. Berkey, Court Reporter September 16, 2021 (570) 336-8114

1	ERRATA SHEET
2	INTERVIEW OF DR. RAMY E. ALI, 9/2/2021
3	PAGE LINE
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	I have inspected and read my interview transcript and
23	have listed all changes, corrections and/or additions.
24	Date:
25	Signature:

32:4

contributions [1] - 11:3

1	Α	37:1	Candy [1] - 4:5	convince [3] - 31:16,
_		Ali [2] - 5:3, 6:18	CausalEC [6] - 6:19,	33:8, 33:16
1 [1] - 15:6	ability [1] - 36:5	allegation [4] - 3:11,	10:20, 10:21, 12:18,	coordinators [1] - 9:14
1.1 [3] - 15:25, 16:13,	able [11] - 4:6, 4:8,	5:11, 6:13, 7:19	12:22, 18:8	copy [3] - 3:18, 13:11,
17:3	18:14, 21:12, 23:3,	allegedly [1] - 6:17	causally [4] - 6:19, 6:24,	16:15
10 [1] - 18:4	23:4, 24:5, 28:17,	ALSO [1] - 1:15	8:2, 31:23	correct [2] - 7:8, 7:9
10th [1] - 34:15	29:22, 32:22, 34:8	Analyst [2] - 1:20, 4:18	CERTIFICATE [1] - 36:1	corrections [1] - 37:23
13 [1] - 2:11	abstract [4] - 8:7, 12:5,	answer [1] - 20:12	certify [1] - 36:3	correctness [2] - 28:7,
13th [1] - 34:15	13:18, 30:8	apart [2] - 21:23, 23:2	challenge [2] - 33:9,	28:8
15th [1] - 34:18	acknowledgment [5] -	appear [1] - 31:2	33:10	couple [1] - 23:8
16 [1] - 36:8	9:22, 9:23, 9:25, 10:1,	appearing [1] - 20:9	challenges [1] - 20:14	Court [2] - 1:25, 36:7
17 [1] - 2:12	10:4		changes [1] - 37:23	Courtney [1] - 4:14
1st [2] - 6:1, 33:25	actual [4] - 13:4, 17:16,	approach [1] - 27:3		
131 [2] 0.1, 00.20	17:21, 17:22	appropriate [1] - 7:1	changing [1] - 21:25	COURTNEY [1] - 1:18
2	add [3] - 10:5, 10:8,	article [2] - 17:1, 17:3	circles [1] - 16:7	creates [1] - 3:17
2	23:23	arXiv [17] - 9:9, 9:23,	claim [7] - 24:9, 27:22,	credit [1] - 7:2
2 [2] - 1:9, 13:12	additions [1] - 37:23	10:16, 11:4, 11:14,	27:24, 27:25, 28:3,	cross [33] - 6:20, 11:6,
2018 [3] - 6:23, 8:3, 17:1	afterwards [1] - 24:22	13:11, 13:13, 14:15,	30:5, 33:14	11:20, 13:7, 13:25,
2019 [1] - 9:5		15:8, 15:11, 15:13,	clarifications [1] - 11:15	14:15, 14:19, 14:25,
2021 [7] - 1:9, 6:18, 7:1,	agree [3] - 10:4, 13:24, 23:20	15:14, 16:2, 16:12,	clarify [2] - 3:20, 16:24	15:17, 16:6, 16:21,
9:8, 13:11, 17:3, 36:8		18:2, 18:21, 19:21	clear [6] - 13:10, 25:8,	17:6, 17:10, 18:23,
21 [3] - 11:11, 11:17,	ahead [5] - 3:9, 7:10,	aspect [1] - 15:2	31:21, 32:8, 32:21,	19:6, 19:14, 19:20,
18:18	14:3, 31:20, 32:9	aspects [1] - 13:6	33:15	20:2, 20:9, 20:15,
22 [1] - 10:24	algorithm [18] - 6:20,	assessment [1] - 7:9	clearly [3] - 8:10, 8:19,	20:18, 22:5, 22:17,
22 [1] - 10.24	6:23, 12:18, 13:7,	Assistant [6] - 1:16,	8:22	22:20, 25:13, 26:17,
2	18:8, 21:1, 21:14,	1:18, 1:21, 4:11, 4:15,	coauthor [4] - 8:12,	26:25, 27:8, 28:22,
3	27:13, 27:14, 27:16,	4:20	9:12, 10:5, 33:14	31:10, 31:12, 31:22
3 [2] - 2:3, 17:7	28:14, 30:5, 30:6,	associated [1] - 20:14	code [3] - 21:8, 21:9,	cross-object [33] - 6:20,
336-8114 [2] - 1:25, 36:8	30:10, 30:25, 31:1	assume [1] - 17:15	21:18	11:6, 11:20, 13:7,
37 [1] - 2:8	algorithmic [1] - 20:14	attend [1] - 4:6	coding [14] - 6:20, 6:23,	13:25, 14:15, 14:19,
3:00 [1] - 1:9	algorithms [4] - 10:25,	author [1] - 8:13	8:2, 11:6, 11:8, 11:20,	14:25, 15:17, 16:6,
3.00 [1] - 1.9	19:2, 20:10, 27:14	authored [2] - 6:21, 6:24	12:17, 13:7, 13:25,	16:21, 17:6, 17:10,
4	ALI [89] - 1:6, 3:2, 3:4,	authors [1] - 8:14	14:12, 14:15, 18:23,	18:23, 19:6, 19:14,
4	4:1, 5:3, 6:16, 7:6,	1	20:16, 27:8	19:20, 20:2, 20:9,
4 [6] - 16:19, 16:23,	7:25, 10:18, 11:2,	authorship [1] - 32:10	College [1] - 1:14	20:15, 20:18, 22:5,
16:25, 17:7, 18:3, 18:4	12:4, 12:9, 12:15,	aware [1] - 9:18	color[1] - 30:14	22:17, 22:20, 25:13,
4.2 [1] - 17:22	13:5, 13:16, 13:24,			26:17, 26:25, 27:8,
[.]	14:4, 14:7, 14:11,	В	comment [2] - 3:19, 6:6	28:22, 31:10, 31:12,
5	14:17, 14:24, 15:9,	base [1] - 20:25	comments [1] - 6:6	31:22
3	15:13, 15:15, 15:24,	based [4] - 6:20, 6:23,	communicate [3] -	31.22
5 [3] - 16:19, 16:20,	16:2, 16:4, 16:11,	8:2, 12:17	18:16, 29:3, 29:4	D
16:25	16:17, 17:5, 17:12,		compare [1] - 14:16	ן ט
54 [1] - 10:24	17:20, 18:7, 18:17,	BEFORE [1] - 1:1	comparison [1] - 23:15	D.Ed [1] - 1:18
570 [2] - 1:25, 36:8	19:4, 19:17, 19:20,	begin [2] - 3:13, 4:8	Complainant [5] - 1:8,	data [4] - 6:19, 6:24, 8:2,
-, -, -, -, -	20:11, 20:24, 21:5,	Berkey [2] - 1:25, 36:7	5:18, 6:18, 6:25, 7:2	20:15
6	21:7, 21:15, 22:5,	best [1] - 36:4	completed [1] - 1:24	date [2] - 33:21, 34:19
		better [2] - 7:23, 11:9	components [2] - 23:16,	Date [1] - 37:24
6 [1] - 17:22	22:10, 22:15, 22:18,	between [2] - 30:2, 33:5	27:17	days [1] - 5:25
	22:22, 23:5, 23:11,	Bhuvan [2] - 7:1, 8:16	Computer [3] - 1:13,	-
7	24:7, 24:13, 24:17,	big [1] - 17:8	4:25, 8:16	deadline [4] - 33:22,
	24:24, 25:6, 25:13,	blah [3] - 20:6, 20:7	concept [1] - 27:6	33:24, 34:4, 34:7
7 [1] - 2:6	25:18, 26:16, 26:25,	bleh [3] - 25:16	concluded [2] - 5:24,	deal [1] - 18:1
	27:7, 27:16, 27:20,	boxes [1] - 28:4	35:9	deals [1] - 17:25
8	28:1, 28:8, 28:11,	breaks [1] - 21:24	concrete [1] - 30:18	Debra [3] - 4:7, 4:8, 4:10
	28:13, 28:22, 29:19,	bye [4] - 35:6, 35:7, 35:8		DEBRA [1] - 1:16
8 [1] - 34:5	29:25, 30:19, 30:23,	bye-bye [1] - 35:7	conference [1] - 8:6	decided [1] - 8:24
8th [1] - 34:10	31:4, 31:9, 31:14,		confidential [1] - 5:20	defined [1] - 27:10
	31:18, 31:21, 32:5,	_	confidentiality [1] - 5:16	definition [6] - 5:11,
9	32:12, 32:19, 33:4,	C	confirming [1] - 5:11	26:22, 26:23, 26:24,
0/2/2024 141 27:4	33:6, 33:12, 33:19,	Cadambe [3] - 3:12,	consistent [5] - 6:19,	27:12, 30:25
9/2/2021 [1] - 37:1 90 [1] - 5:25	33:21, 34:4, 34:7,	6:17, 8:8	6:24, 8:2, 20:15, 31:24	definitions [2] - 20:3,
	34:11, 34:17, 35:4,	0.17, 0.0	context [1] - 3:22	

California [2] - 1:7, 5:5

34:11, 34:17, 35:4,

degree [1] - 7:7 delete [1] - 3:24 demonstrate [1] - 23:16 **Department** [1] - 8:17 Deputy [2] - 1:17, 4:12 detail [1] - 20:7 details [4] - 18:12, 21:11, 22:3 determinations [1] -5.14 determine [2] - 5:9, 23:4 developing [3] - 12:17, 12:19. 20:14 different [5] - 11:9, 19:1, 25:10, 25:21, 27:19 **Director** [2] - 1:18, 4:15 **DISC** [1] - 8:6 discussed [2] - 5:20, 11:16 discussing [1] - 9:5 discussion [1] - 10:8 discussions [3] - 8:20, 9:5, 11:13 dissertation [2] - 9:1, 9.2 distributed [2] - 6:24, 8:2 doctoral [1] - 7:4 documents [2] - 7:15, 10:13 doubt [1] - 29:1 down [2] - 21:23, 23:25 **DR** [190] - 1:6, 1:13, 1:18, 3:1, 3:2, 3:3, 3:4, 3:5, 4:1, 4:2, 4:14, 4:21, 4:24, 5:1, 5:3, 5:6, 6:11, 6:16, 7:3, 7:6, 7:8, 7:12, 7:25, 10:11, 10:18, 10:23, 11:2, 11:21, 12:4, 12:6, 12:9, 12:10, 12:15, 12:21, 13:5, 13:16, 13:17, 13:24, 14:2, 14:4, 14:6, 14:7, 14:8, 14:11, 14:13, 14:17, 14:18, 14:24, 15:7, 15:9, 15:11, 15:13, 15:14, 15:15, 15:18, 15:24, 16:1, 16:2, 16:3, 16:4, 16:8, 16:11, 16:17, 17:5, 17:8, 17:12, 17:18, 17:20, 18:5, 18:7, 18:11, 18:17, 18:25, 19:4, 19:12, 19:17, 19:18, 19:20, 19:23, 20:11, 20:20, 20:24, 21:3, 21:5, 21:6, 21:7, 21:10, 21:15, 21:16, 22:5, 22:7, 22:10,

22:11, 22:15, 22:16, 22:18, 22:19, 22:22, 22:24, 23:5, 23:7, 23:11, 23:12, 23:14, 23:24, 24:7, 24:9, 24:13, 24:14, 24:17, 24:19, 24:24, 25:3, 25:6, 25:9, 25:13, 25:15, 25:18, 25:19, 26:16, 26:20, 26:25, 27:4, 27:7, 27:9, 27:16, 27:18, 27:20, 27:21, 28:1, 28:2, 28:8, 28:10, 28:11, 28:12, 28:13, 28:15, 28:22, 29:1, 29:19, 29:20, 29:25, 30:4, 30:19, 30:21, 30:23, 30:24. 31:4. 31:5. 31:9, 31:12, 31:14, 31:16, 31:18, 31:19, 31:21, 32:1, 32:5, 32:7, 32:12, 32:13, 32:15, 32:16, 32:18, 32:19, 32:23, 32:24, 33:4, 33:5, 33:6, 33:7, 33:12, 33:17, 33:19, 33:20, 33:21, 33:24, 34:4, 34:6, 34:7, 34:9, 34:11, 34:13, 34:17, 34:22, 34:25, 35:4, 35:5, 35:6, 37:1 **Dr** [14] - 2:3, 2:6, 3:12, 4:23, 6:17, 6:18, 6:21, 6:25, 7:11, 23:22, 31:19, 32:11, 33:3 **draft** [3] - 10:17, 11:11, 16:11 drafts [1] - 30:1

E

e-mail [2] - 33:1, 35:2 e-mailed [2] - 9:11, 9:20 easier [1] - 29:14 easy [1] - 31:7 eight [1] - 28:5 either [1] - 19:10 Electrical [1] - 1:7 elements [1] - 10:22 **emphasize** [1] - 11:10 encode [1] - 18:22 encodes [1] - 27:1 encoding [2] - 18:20, 27:3 Engineering [3] - 1:7, 1:14 equal [3] - 22:25, 25:11 erasure [10] - 6:20, 12:17, 13:7, 13:25,

14:12, 14:15, 14:17, 14:19, 18:23, 20:16 Erasure [2] - 6:23, 8:1 **ERRATA** [2] - 2:8, 37:1 essence [2] - 11:19, 11:22 establish [3] - 22:25, 26:12, 30:18 established [1] - 28:3 everywhere [2] - 19:21, 22:6 evidence [2] - 30:9 exact [1] - 28:20 example [11] - 14:19, 14:22, 16:5, 16:22, 17:23, 20:19, 21:21, 23:25, 24:1, 24:7, 30:22 Example [2] - 15:25, 16:13 example's [1] - 20:20 examples [4] - 11:14, 17:9, 17:14, 24:11 Exhibit [8] - 2:11, 2:12, 13:14, 13:15, 15:10, 17:1, 17:3, 17:4 exhibit [1] - 15:9 **EXHIBITS** [1] - 2:10 explain [7] - 16:9, 19:25, 20:19, 25:2, 25:10, 26:10, 26:11 explained [8] - 11:9, 11:18, 16:21, 16:22, 17:6, 27:2, 27:5 **explaining** [5] - 16:23, 17:13, 17:24, 22:3, 31:9 **explains** [1] - 27:8 **expressed** [1] - 23:23 extent [1] - 5:20

F

fact [2] - 23:18, 31:5 falls [1] - 21:23 false [1] - 30:8 familiar [2] - 6:15, 10:12 far [1] - 5:25 few [2] - 3:5, 3:8 **figure** [1] - 15:5 Figure [1] - 15:6 final [2] - 3:23, 8:15 fine [4] - 4:1, 6:22, 32:23, 34:15 **first** [24] - 3:7, 6:8, 8:13, 8:14, 9:24, 12:17, 12:24, 14:24, 15:1, 15:18, 15:20, 16:10, 16:11, 18:11, 19:5, 19:10, 26:18, 26:19,

26:22, 28:24, 31:11, 31:14, 31:15, 32:22 five [1] - 28:4 fix [1] - 18:7 follow [2] - 33:1, 35:2 follow-up [2] - 33:1, 35:2 format [1] - 30:20 four [3] - 8:14, 21:18, 28:4 fourth [1] - 8:17 frame [1] - 34:16 friendly [2] - 33:9, 33:10 full [1] - 8:8

G

gathering [1] - 5:13 general [1] - 18:19 generic [1] - 18:10 given [3] - 14:19, 18:3, 21:8 grad [1] - 29:7 graduate [1] - 9:1 graduated [3] - 7:5, 7:6, 9:3 great [1] - 30:12 guarantee [1] - 31:23 guess [2] - 13:17, 27:13 guessed [1] - 23:13

Hallgren [8] - 2:6, 4:23,

4:24, 7:11, 23:22,

31:19, 32:11, 33:3 HALLGREN [75] - 1:13, 4:24, 7:12, 10:11, 10:23, 11:21, 12:6, 12:10, 12:21, 13:17, 14:2, 14:6, 14:8, 14:13, 14:18, 15:7, 15:11, 15:14, 15:18, 16:1, 16:3, 16:8, 17:8, 17:18, 18:5, 18:11, 18:25, 19:12, 19:18, 19:23, 20:20, 21:3, 21:6, 21:10, 21:16, 22:7, 22:11, 22:16, 22:19, 22:24, 23:7, 23:12, 23:24, 24:9, 24:14, 24:19, 25:3, 25:9, 25:15, 25:19, 26:20, 27:4, 27:9, 27:18, 27:21, 28:2, 28:10, 28:12, 28:15, 29:1, 29:20, 30:4, 30:21, 30:24, 31:5, 31:12, 31:16, 32:1, 32:13, 32:16, 32:23, 33:7, 33:17, 33:20,

35:5 Hallgren's [1] - 23:22 halting [2] - 28:14, 28:15 handling [2] - 17:16, 20:13 hard [6] - 24:24, 25:9, 29:3, 31:6, 31:7, 33:12 hear [1] - 11:21 hello [1] - 3:1 help [8] - 7:22, 11:24, 11:25, 12:8, 13:22, 21:20, 25:22, 25:23 helped [1] - 10:2 helpful [4] - 12:13, 16:16, 30:4 helps [1] - 10:12 hereby [1] - 36:3 herself [1] - 4:7 **high** [3] - 18:13, 21:20, 27:22 highlight [2] - 27:7, 30:2 **history** [4] - 19:9, 19:15, 19:16, 20:8 hold [1] - 25:15 home [1] - 5:22 homework [1] - 30:15 hope [1] - 33:7 hoping [1] - 6:14 housekeeping [1] - 3:6 hundred [1] - 29:2 hurry [1] - 8:10

1

idea [21] - 11:3, 11:5, 11:6, 11:8, 13:7, 14:1, 14:3, 16:5, 16:21, 17:6, 19:6, 19:8, 20:8, 20:9, 21:17, 22:5, 23:2, 25:12, 25:16, 25:17, 30:12 ideally [1] - 34:1 ideas [13] - 6:17, 7:24, 18:12. 19:4. 19:5. 20:1, 22:22, 24:16, 24:25, 26:12, 30:10, 30:11, 31:2 identical [2] - 22:23, 23.1 identified [2] - 13:15, 17:4 **identities** [1] - 5:17 illustrate [1] - 16:5 implemented [1] - 22:8 importance [2] - 5:16, 5.18 improve [3] - 8:20, 8:21, 11:12 **IN** [1] - 1:4

in-between [1] - 33:5 included [2] - 6:4, 6:7 including [1] - 6:2 incorrect [1] - 10:1 **indication** [1] - 31:6 information [8] - 3:8, 3:11, 3:20, 5:13, 5:19, 6:2, 7:17, 10:2 inquiry [6] - 4:22, 5:7, 5:8, 5:24, 6:4, 33:25 **INQUIRY** [2] - 1:6, 1:12 inside [1] - 29:9 inspected [1] - 37:22 instance [2] - 15:4, 15:5 instead [1] - 7:21 **INTEGRITY** [1] - 1:1 Integrity [9] - 1:17, 1:18, 1:20, 1:21, 4:6, 4:12, 4:16, 4:18, 4:20 inter [10] - 11:8, 14:11, 14:17, 14:18, 14:20, 15:1, 17:6, 26:17, 28:23, 31:22 inter-object [10] - 11:8, 14:11, 14:17, 14:18, 14:20, 15:1, 17:6, 26:17, 28:23, 31:22 interrupt [1] - 13:10 **INTERVIEW** [3] - 1:6, 2:5, 37:1 interview [5] - 3:13, 3:16, 6:3, 36:3, 37:22 Interview [1] - 35:9 interviews [1] - 3:15 intro [1] - 13:18 introduce [2] - 4:3, 4:7 introduced [1] - 28:24 introducing [2] - 4:23, 5:2 INTRODUCTION [1] -2:2 introductions [1] - 4:9 investigation [1] - 5:10 involved [3] - 5:17, 10:7, 12:19 issue [1] - 10:9 itself [1] - 10:3

J

J.D [2] - 1:16, 1:20 January [1] - 8:3 job [1] - 29:15 join [1] - 4:8 joined [1] - 4:21 joining [1] - 3:3

K

KARMELITA [26] - 1:18,

3:1, 3:3, 3:5, 4:2, 4:14, 4:21, 5:1, 5:6, 6:11, 7:3, 7:8, 23:14, 31:19, 32:7, 32:15, 32:18, 32:24, 33:5, 33:24, 34:6, 34:9, 34:13, 34:22, 34:25, 35:6

Karnelita [2] - 2:3, 4:14

keep [2] - 21:25, 24:21

key [1] - 28:25

Kim [2] - 4:17, 32:25

KIMBERLY [1] - 1:20

kind [3] - 23:12, 29:14, 29:17

knows [1] - 29:11

15:2, 15:15, 16:5,

19:5, 20:11, 20:12,

map [4] - 15:22, 20:5,

31:22, 31:23

21:12, 21:16

master [1] - 7:6

4:19, 35:8

31:5, 31:7

28:13

14:25

master's [1] - 8:25

matter [2] - 13:2, 36:4

MATTHEWS [3] - 1:21,

mean [19] - 12:6, 13:9,

13:20, 19:1, 19:24,

20:1, 22:11, 26:1,

26:11, 27:9, 28:21,

29:12, 29:20, 30:9,

30:16, 30:17, 30:24,

means [3] - 15:17, 16:6,

meaning [1] - 26:25

meetings [1] - 26:13

memory [1] - 10:12

mention [2] - 13:25,

mentioned [4] - 13:6,

19:21, 22:6, 26:16

message [2] - 9:13, 9:14

might [8] - 3:21, 20:21,

20:22, 24:11, 25:16,

meets [1] - 5:11

mid [1] - 34:11

25:17, 30:8

mind [2] - 4:22, 5:2

minute [1] - 29:1

minutes [1] - 3:8

mistake [1] - 9:16

modified [1] - 8:25

morning [1] - 3:2

most [1] - 6:15

move [1] - 32:10

moved [1] - 8:13

35:7, 35:8

MS [10] - 4:10, 4:17,

4:19, 13:9, 16:15,

16:24, 34:14, 34:21,

16:12

momentarily [1] - 4:7

motivating [1] - 11:14

Motivating [2] - 15:25,

5:9, 5:12

misconduct [3] - 5:8,

Matthews [1] - 4:19

L

learn [1] - 6:2 least [2] - 24:3, 29:22 left [2] - 10:6, 24:22 less [1] - 29:14 level [3] - 18:13, 21:20, 27:22 levels [2] - 25:10, 25:21 lies [1] - 20:13 **LINE** [1] - 37:2 line [4] - 25:4, 30:21, 32:3, 32:5 lines [1] - 21:18 Lisa [2] - 1:25, 36:7 listed [1] - 37:23 live [1] - 28:12 liveness [3] - 28:9, 28:11, 28:13 look [31] - 10:23, 10:25, 11:2, 12:2, 13:1, 14:14, 15:1, 15:5, 15:21, 15:22, 15:23, 16:9, 16:10, 16:12, 16:19, 17:9, 18:2, 18:13, 18:17, 19:13, 19:14, 20:2, 20:6, 24:4, 25:17, 25:21, 26:1, 26:3, 28:19, 31:3, 32:17 looked [1] - 10:15 looking [6] - 7:15, 13:11, 18:6, 23:22, 24:5, 25:7 looks [1] - 13:12 lose [1] - 29:9 Lyu [2] - 6:21, 6:25

M

mail [2] - 33:1, 35:2

mailed [2] - 9:11, 9:20

main [17] - 11:3, 11:5,

14:5, 14:8, 14:20,

11:6, 13:6, 14:1, 14:4,

N

name [1] - 9:9 necessarily [3] - 13:21, 22:4, 23:18 need [11] - 4:3, 6:12, 6:13, 21:12, 22:1,

24:3, 24:14, 24:17, 32:13, 33:15, 33:25 never [1] - 29:21 new [9] - 10:21, 11:13, 18:21, 19:11, 25:17, 25:25, 26:3, 26:5, 31:25 nine [1] - 7:13 normally [1] - 5:24 notes [1] - 33:1 nothing [1] - 26:15 novelty [2] - 14:7, 20:13 number [6] - 7:14, 17:17, 17:21, 17:25, 18:2, 18:19 numbers [6] - 17:14, 30:21, 32:3, 32:5 numeric [1] - 17:13

once [1] - 3:23 one [25] - 7:21, 11:18, 13:1, 14:14, 14:16, 14:21, 16:14, 18:3, 19:11, 21:1, 23:6, 23:25, 24:3, 25:20, 27:3, 27:14, 27:16, 27:17, 27:18, 28:4, 29:6, 30:22, 33:14 one's [2] - 10:24 opportunity [2] - 3:19, 6:5 orient [1] - 4:4 original [3] - 10:20, 12:19, 26:6 ourselves [1] - 4:3 outline [1] - 7:13

0

object [49] - 6:20, 11:6, 11:8, 11:20, 13:7, 13:25, 14:11, 14:15, 14:17, 14:18, 14:19, 14:20, 14:25, 15:1, 15:6, 15:17, 16:6, 16:21, 17:6, 17:10, 17:15, 17:16, 18:23, 19:6. 19:14. 19:20. 20:2. 20:9. 20:15. 20:18, 21:8, 21:9, 22:5, 22:17, 22:20, 25:13, 26:17, 26:25, 27:3, 27:8, 28:22, 28:23, 31:10, 31:12, 31.22 objections [1] - 3:25 objects [11] - 15:16, 17:17, 17:21, 17:25, 18:1, 18:2, 18:9, 18:19, 18:20, 18:22, 27:1 obviously [1] - 29:16 occur [1] - 13:4 occurred [1] - 5:10 occurs [1] - 21:9 October [2] - 6:1, 33:25 **OF** [2] - 1:6, 37:1 OFFICE [1] - 1:1 Office [3] - 1:18, 1:20, 1:22 Officer [3] - 1:17, 4:6, 4:12 official [1] - 4:22 **OFFICIAL** [1] - 1:12 old [8] - 8:1, 11:7, 16:13, 18:18, 19:11, 31:15, 31:24, 33:14 older [1] - 17:5

Ρ

p.m [1] - 1:9 page [8] - 16:19, 16:20, 16:25, 17:22, 18:4, 30:21, 32:3 **PAGE** [2] - 2:2, 37:2 pages [6] - 10:24, 10:25, 11:11, 11:17, 18:18, 19.19 paper [52] - 8:1, 8:8, 8:9, 8:11, 8:21, 8:25, 9:8, 9:22, 10:15, 10:16, 10:20, 10:21, 11:17, 11:23, 12:19, 12:23, 13:12, 13:13, 13:22, 13:23, 14:10, 14:15, 14:22, 15:7, 15:11, 15:12, 15:14, 15:21, 16:9, 16:10, 17:19, 18:18, 18:21, 20:13, 21:12, 21:22, 22:13, 22:20, 22:21, 23:16, 24:2, 25:17, 26:6, 26:23, 27:5, 27:10, 27:11, 27:24, 28:18, 30:12, 30:18 paper's [1] - 12:23 papers [10] - 13:20, 20:23, 25:12, 26:7, 26:24, 27:8, 27:25, 28:3, 32:17, 33:20 parametrized [1] - 18:9 part [10] - 22:17, 22:20. 24:3, 24:5, 24:15, 25:25, 26:3, 29:3, 31:1 part's [2] - 26:2 particular [3] - 11:24, 26:4, 30:24 partly [1] - 12:22 parts [4] - 10:16, 26:1, 26:11, 30:18

Pause [1] - 5:23 pause [2] - 21:2, 24:23 Penn [3] - 1:14, 10:6, 10:10 PENNSYLVANIA [1] -1.1 people [8] - 11:23, 11:25, 12:8, 13:19, 14:14, 23:3, 29:4, 29.10 percent [1] - 29:2 perfect [1] - 34:6 person [1] - 18:16 Petrosky [1] - 4:17 PETROSKY [5] - 1:20, 4:17, 13:9, 16:15, 16:24 **Ph.D** [5] - 1:6, 1:13, 6:22, 7:5, 7:7 **phase** [2] - 5:7, 5:13 **phonetic** [1] - 8:6 piece [1] - 29:23 pieces [1] - 27:19 **pin** [1] - 23:24 place [1] - 19:22 places [2] - 11:2, 25:1 plagiarized [1] - 6:17 plagiarizing [1] - 7:23 planning [1] - 8:7 point [8] - 5:14, 12:2, 16:8, 19:22, 23:6, 23:15, 26:8, 31:25 possible [2] - 5:21, 26:7 possibly [1] - 32:10 postdoctoral [1] - 5:4 Postdoctoral [1] - 1:7 practice [1] - 3:15 **PREMARKED** [1] - 2:10 prepared [1] - 3:23 preparing [1] - 7:16 present [1] - 18:8 **PRESENT** [2] - 1:12, 1.15 President [2] - 1:16, 4:11 previous [2] - 14:9, 14:21 printed [1] - 16:17 privacy [1] - 5:17 problem [2] - 13:4, 29:8 process [3] - 5:8, 6:9, 6:12 Professor [1] - 1:13 professor [2] - 4:25, 8.16 Program [2] - 1:21, 4:20 progressing [1] - 28:14 proof [4] - 24:15, 28:6,

28:7, 31:1

proofs [6] - 22:12, 22:21, 26:6, 28:16, proposed [1] - 26:18 protect [1] - 5:16 **Protections** [3] - 1:19, 1:20, 1:22 protocol [15] - 10:19, 10:20, 11:4, 11:5, 11:19, 12:18, 12:20, 17:16, 17:21, 17:23, 18:3, 19:5, 25:1, 28:13 protocols [1] - 21:7 prove [3] - 22:12, 22:13, 22:17 proved [1] - 31:24 provided [1] - 9:14 providing [1] - 7:1 **published** [1] - 12:23 **pull** [1] - 29:16 purpose [1] - 5:9 put [6] - 23:18, 24:21, 27:19, 27:23, 28:5, 30:13

Q

Quality [2] - 1:18, 4:15 questions [8] - 3:9, 3:14, 6:9, 7:11, 7:13, 23:8, 32:10, 34:23 quickly [1] - 15:20

R

Ramy [5] - 5:2, 5:3, 6:14, 6:18, 21:4 **RAMY** [2] - 1:6, 37:1 rather [1] - 5:10 **RE**[1] - 1:4 read [5] - 6:13, 6:14, 28:19, 29:22, 37:22 real [1] - 21:13 realize [1] - 29:11 realized [1] - 7:16 really [2] - 7:18, 22:1 reasonable [1] - 34:3 reasons [1] - 3:6 receive [1] - 3:18 record [3] - 3:15, 6:14, 16:25 recorded [1] - 36:3 recording [3] - 3:24, 3:25, 4:3 red [1] - 30:14 **REFERENCE** [1] - 2:10 referencing [1] - 17:2 refresh [1] - 10:12 refused [1] - 10:5 regarding [1] - 6:9

reiterating [1] - 5:15 remains [1] - 5:20 reminder [2] - 3:10, 5:7 removed [5] - 9:13, 9:15, 9:17, 9:21, 33:15 report [6] - 3:23, 6:4, 6:7, 10:9, 14:1, 34:2 Reporter [2] - 1:25, 36:7 **RESEARCH** [1] - 1:1 research [3] - 5:8, 5:9, Research [14] - 1:17, 1:18. 1:20. 1:20. 1:21. 1:22. 4:5. 4:11. 4:12. 4:15, 4:18, 4:20 researcher [1] - 5:4 Researcher [1] - 1:7 respond [3] - 33:2, 33:22, 35:3 **Respondent** [4] - 5:19, 6:16, 6:21, 6:25 response [5] - 6:10, 23:13, 30:19, 30:20, 34:24 review [3] - 6:6, 6:12, 34:1 reviewed [1] - 6:12 roommate [2] - 29:20, 29.21 running [1] - 28:7 rush [1] - 24:19

S

SARAH [1] - 1:21 **Sarah** [2] - 4:19, 32:25 **saturated** [1] - 15:20 scale [3] - 17:10, 17:12, 20:21 scaled [1] - 26:6 scales [2] - 17:19, 24:10 scaling [4] - 20:22, 24:11, 24:14, 24:15 school [1] - 5:22 Science [3] - 1:13, 4:25, 8:16 screen [4] - 12:15, 18:8, 21:3, 21:5 Sean [1] - 4:24 **SEAN** [1] - 1:13 second [8] - 8:12, 8:15, 9:25, 12:25, 13:12, 19:8, 21:1, 23:6 section [1] - 15:25 Section [10] - 15:25, 16:13, 16:23, 16:25, 17:3, 17:7, 17:22, 18:3, 18:4 see [32] - 10:14, 10:25, 11:4, 11:17, 14:22,

14:23, 15:4, 15:22, 15:23, 18:6, 18:14, 19:9, 19:18, 20:6, 20:8, 20:22, 21:12, 22:1, 23:7, 24:4, 24:5, 24:14, 24:15, 24:25, 26:14, 27:5, 27:12, 28:20, 29:23, 31:3, 33:13, 33:17 seem [1] - 34:2 send [6] - 3:16, 23:8, 23:17, 32:20, 32:25, 34.20 sent [1] - 9:13 sentences [2] - 13:3, 32.2 September [6] - 1:9, 34:5, 34:10, 34:11, 34:15, 36:8 server [1] - 19:8 servers [1] - 16:7 set [1] - 34:19 seven [1] - 28:4 **shape** [1] - 29:13 **share** [5] - 12:15, 16:15, 16:18, 33:3 **sharing** [2] - 21:3, 21:5 **SHEET** [2] - 2:8, 37:1 **Shihang** [6] - 6:21, 6:25, 7:4, 8:14, 8:24, 9:13 show [14] - 16:10, 17:18, 19:24. 20:17. 22:2. 22:8. 26:21. 27:4. 27:10, 27:11, 27:23, 28:16, 33:12, 33:17 side [1] - 30:14 sidetracked [1] - 20:4 Signature [1] - 37:25 similarities [1] - 30:2 similarity [1] - 23:17 simple [2] - 16:4, 24:10 simplified [1] - 9:2

sitting [1] - 10:24
six [1] - 28:4
slides [2] - 3:5, 6:8
slowly [2] - 19:13, 29:13
small [3] - 17:9, 17:13,
20:21
smaller [2] - 27:17,
27:19
sometimes [1] - 3:20
somewhere [1] - 22:2
son [1] - 5:22
sorry [9] - 5:22, 13:9,
15:7, 15:18, 16:8,
19:12, 21:10, 31:20,

34:9

sort [1] - 29:8

Southern [2] - 1:7, 5:4

specific [6] - 14:21,

specifically [3] - 19:3, 23:21, 33:1 **spend** [3] - 24:4, 29:7, 29:24 **spot** [2] - 21:14, 23:18 **standard** [5] - 3:15, 25:24, 26:2, 26:18, 27:3 start [3] - 3:9, 12:4, 32:1 started [1] - 8:3 starting [1] - 12:2 **STATE** [1] - 1:1 state [1] - 19:15 State [3] - 1:14, 10:6, 10:10 statement [2] - 19:1, 30:25 **steer** [1] - 12:13 **steps** [1] - 19:25 **still** [1] - 5:12 stopped [1] - 8:23 storage [4] - 6:19, 6:24, 8:3, 20:15 store [3] - 18:9, 19:16, 20.8 stored [1] - 19:15 **storing** [1] - 19:9 **story** [1] - 29:13 straight [1] - 30:6 student [4] - 6:22, 7:4, 7:7, 29:7 stuff [7] - 10:13, 13:18, 20:3, 21:11, 21:20, 25:24, 31:7 submit [2] - 8:7, 9:6 submitted [2] - 8:5, 8:7 sufficient [2] - 24:8, 31:11 **summary** [2] - 6:3, 11:3 **super** [1] - 30:4 **supports** [1] - 27:8 **supposed** [2] - 19:13, 19:14 **surprise** [1] - 9:9 system [2] - 20:15, 31:23

17:23, 19:22, 20:25,

23:16, 25:7

Т

tape [1] - 30:14 team [1] - 32:24 tease [1] - 23:2 technical [2] - 15:2, 20:13 technique [12] - 14:5, 14:9, 14:20, 15:15, 16:10, 18:24, 28:20, 28:23, 28:24, 31:22,

33:13 **UNIVERSITY** [1] - 1:1 Υ techniques [1] - 26:5 **University** [1] - 5:4 year [1] - 29:8 text [4] - 9:13, 9:14, university [1] - 1:7 Yekel [1] - 4:5 25:11 **up** [5] - 7:20, 20:2, yourself [2] - 4:23, 5:2 THE [1] - 1:1 24:21, 33:1, 35:2 theory [1] - 22:13 updated [1] - 9:22 Ζ thesis [1] - 9:1 uses [1] - 20:15 thinking [1] - 34:15 utmost [1] - 5:18 zero [1] - 7:21 third [2] - 8:13, 8:15 **Zoom** [1] - 1:9 V three [3] - 6:8, 15:16, 17:15 **V.C** [1] - 1:4 throughout [1] - 24:1 vague [2] - 10:3, 18:25 **THURLEY** [5] - 1:16, verify [1] - 21:13 4:10, 34:14, 34:21, version [21] - 8:5, 8:8, 35:7 8:15, 8:25, 9:12, 9:24, Thurley [2] - 4:7, 4:11 9:25, 11:4, 11:7, **Thursday** [1] - 1:9 11:13, 13:13, 15:10, timeline [1] - 6:1 16:2, 16:12, 17:5, **TO** [1] - 2:10 18:18, 18:21, 19:21, today [5] - 3:10, 4:6, 31:15, 31:24, 31:25 4:13, 5:20, 6:2 Version [1] - 13:12 together [6] - 24:15, **via** [1] - 1:9 27:19, 27:23, 28:6, Vice [2] - 1:16, 4:11 29:23, 30:13 Viveck [8] - 3:12, 6:17, totally [2] - 10:1, 29:9 8:8, 8:15, 8:18, 9:6, touch [1] - 35:2 9:16, 9:20 tough [1] - 12:7 voices [1] - 4:4 track [1] - 29:9 transcribed [1] - 36:4 W transcript [5] - 3:17, 3:18, 3:21, 13:11, wait [2] - 18:11, 23:6 37:22 warranted [1] - 5:10 Transcription [1] - 1:24 week [1] - 34:2 transcriptionist [2] whatever's [1] - 24:22 3:16, 4:4 whole [2] - 9:18, 27:22 transcripts [2] - 6:3, 6:6 withdraw [1] - 8:9 tried [2] - 7:13, 8:21 withdrawn [3] - 8:11, true [3] - 21:22, 21:24, 8:18, 8:21 30:8 word [4] - 19:24, 22:7, **try** [10] - 12:7, 12:12, 26:21, 31:13 12:15, 22:25, 24:20, words [1] - 13:20 25:4, 31:11, 32:6, works [3] - 20:23, 22:17, 33:10 30:16 trying [3] - 20:5, 23:19, write [10] - 8:9, 8:19, 24:18 8:22, 8:24, 9:21, turn [1] - 7:10 13:19, 21:23, 30:7, two [13] - 13:2, 17:15, 30:12, 34:2 18:14, 19:2, 19:4, writing [2] - 11:12, 19:19, 20:9, 26:5, 21:21 28:20, 30:1, 30:13, written [2] - 11:17, 32:2 24:25 wrote [2] - 10:1, 29:22 U X unintelligible [5] -17:14, 18:1, 20:25, **X1** [2] - 15:6, 15:16 32:20, 34:18 **X2** [2] - 15:6, 15:16 unintelligible] [6] - 3:4, **X3** [1] - 15:17 10:10, 16:18, 24:25, 33:23, 34:17