

To: Eric Topol [REDACTED]
From: Elizabeth Holmes
Sent: Sat 5/10/2014 11:47:45 PM
Importance: Normal
Subject: RE: reporter's followup
Received: Sat 5/10/2014 11:47:43 PM

Thanks for forwarding. I've got follow up for you this week – very much looking forward to our next conversation –

Elizabeth

From: Eric Topol [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, May 09, 2014 12:18 PM
To: Elizabeth Holmes
Subject: FW: reporter's followup

FYI—my responses back to Roger/Fortune
 Best,
 Eric

From: Eric Topol [REDACTED]
Date: Friday, May 9, 2014 at 12:16 PM
To: Roger Parloff <roger_parloff@fortune.com>
Subject: Re: reporter's followup

Hi Roger
 Thanks for your note..not surprising that the threatened entities would come back with these points...I respond below
 Best,
 Eric

.....
 Eric J. Topol, MD | Director, Scripps Translational Science Institute
 Chief Academic Officer, Scripps Health
 Professor of Genomics, The Scripps Research Institute
 [REDACTED] ph [REDACTED]
 EA: Uyen Nguyen | [REDACTED]

From: Roger Parloff <roger_parloff@fortune.com>
Date: Friday, May 9, 2014 at 11:21 AM
To: Eric Topol [REDACTED]
Subject: reporter's followup

Eric--
 I'm the Fortune reporter who spoke with you a couple weeks about Theranos and Elizabeth Holmes. I've had some background discussions with some officials with an incumbent blood analytics company and, not surprisingly, they were pooh-poohing what they understand to be Theranos's accomplishments in a number of ways, and I wondered if you had time and felt competent to discuss, either by email or phone. (This is not a huge rush; some time next week would be fine.)
 They claim, for instance,
 1. There really aren't that many patients that have a problem with venipuncture. Patients who don't get blood tests done after doctors issue requisitions for them probably fail to do so out of general apathy rather than fear of blood draws or inaccessibility or other factors Theranos can change.
 Wrong. *No one likes* venipuncture. But what is a bigger deal is so much less blood taken, at lower costs, with quick results back to the patient, at a convenient setting like a Walgreen's store

2. Reflex testing of the type Theranos facilitates is already available with conventional tubes and the fact that it might require taking an extra tube or two of blood initially is not really a problem. Once the needle is in the arm, the patient doesn't notice if an extra tube or two is drawn.

I disagree but this is a minor point. Less blood is better, and that is indisputable.

3. infants can be tested through heelsticks today (creating dry blood spots composed of 20-30 micro liters of blood, so the microdraw isn't a big advance for them).

Heel sticks are traumatic to babies and even more to their parents—they are off base here, too.

4. universal turnarounds of 2-4 hours are not really necessary, and doctors aren't seeking them. when quick turnarounds are needed, stat labs are usually available that can already achieve turnarounds of about 4 hours.

They don't get it. Patients want their results, and the more promptly the better. The incumbents are still living in the doctor dominated era, which is quickly going to change. It's the patient's blood tests and they will own the results in the future.

thanks for any help you can provide!

Roger

[REDACTED] (cell)

alternatively, i'll be back in the office Monday at [REDACTED]

Roger Parloff

Senior Editor

Fortune Magazine

1271 Avenue of the Americas

Room 24-206

New York, NY 10020-1393

work [REDACTED]

cell [REDACTED]