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10553 session. The Honorable Amit P. Mehta presiding THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. Please be seated.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: Good morning, Your Honor. This is Civil Action 20-3010, United States of America, et al., versus Google LLC.

Kenneth Dintzer for the DOJ.
Jonathan Sallet on behalf of Plaintiff States.

John Schmidtlein on behalf of Google.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, everyone.

So are we ready to move forward this morning?

MR. DINTZER: Absolutely, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let's pull the curtain on Professor Whinston.

MR. SEVERT: Good morning, Your Honor. Adam Severt for the United States.

The United States calls Professor Michael Whinston.

THE COURT: All right. Sorry, I wanted to make sure I had my hands on Professor Murphy's slide deck as well.

MICHAEL WHINSTON, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS ON REBUTTAL, HAVING BEEN PREVIOUSLY SWORN, RESUMED THE STAND AND TESTIFIED FURTHER AS FOLLOWS:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Professor Whinston, welcome back.

A Thanks. Yeah, me again.

Q Did you prepare us a slide deck to help facilitate your testimony today?

A I did.

Q Okay.

MR. SEVERT: Your Honor, may I approach?
THE COURT: You may.
BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Okay.

Professor Whinston --

Mr. Penado, if you could turn to Slide 2 of UPDX106.

And I want to start by talking about market definition and market power.

And I want to start with the questions that the Court raised.

During the testimony of Dr. Israel and Dr. Murphy, the Court asked some version of whether a monopolist of
general search services would have the incentive to restrict output. How would you answer that question?

A I'd answer it yes.
So, you know, I think if you're thinking about
this -- I guess a starting point is the kind of classic textbook Econ 101 monopolist which -- who sets a single price for everyone in the market.

And, you know, in that story, most of the time, it isn't necessary for output to be restricted, but most of the time the way a monopolist operates is to reduce output and raise price -- as part of raising price, and, you know, by doing so, make monopoly profits.

This market is different. This market has, you know, zero price on the user side, and so, you know, the way kind of the key variable for a monopolist in that setting is quality.

And so the monopolist in this setting, you know, has an incentive to reduce quality for -- and I think I touched on this, $I$ think, previously, that, you know, one aspect of, you know, and kind of a key aspect of reducing quality, is it lowers the cost that you incur.

When $I$ say "reduce quality," you know, that includes not increasing quality as fast as you might otherwise would. So by doing so, you save costs, and, you know, if you're going to keep your users either way and
make the ad revenue on them, then you raise your profits.
And so reducing -- now, what does reducing quality
do? Well, when you reduce quality of search, Your Honor, that's going to tend to make people search less. And so there is an output effect of that exercise of monopoly power.

I should say, reducing quality and reducing queries will also potentially have effects on the ad market because there will be less available ads and that can also drive up price on the ads side.

THE COURT: Can I just -- I'm sorry, can I just follow up?

Because I understood Professor Israel to say that a monopolist is defined by an entity that has the incentive to restrict output and that the primary way to do that is reducing production in the ordinary sense of somebody who's manufacturing widgets. You reduce the number of widgets you're making, the price goes up, the monopolist can make monopolist profits, right?

And I also understood him to say that in this setting, that he thought Google was not a monopolist because he saw no evidence of the restriction of output, which is what prompted me to ask the question of, well, in this market, would a monopolist even have the incentive to restrict output?

THE WITNESS: Right.
I read those questions.

THE COURT: Right.

THE WITNESS: And so I'd say a few different things and actually I'm going to have a few slides related to this.

So, first, I think Dr. Israel's formulation at the start of that, where he was talking kind of about the classic monopolist, is overly simplist.

So, you know the degree to which a monopolist has to reduce output in order to raise price depends on responsiveness of demand.

THE COURT: Right.

THE WITNESS: And so in some cases, if demand is not very responsive, you don't have to reduce output very much to raise that price. In fact, in some cases, you may not have to reduce demand output at all to raise the price, you may just have headroom to do it, okay?

A second thing is that kind of classic story is all about monopolist that's set a single price for the whole market. And so if a monopolist can price discriminate, charging different consumers different prices, it need not actually necessarily reduce output even in a case where it's not, demand -- I don't know if you remember, you know, Econ 101, the shape of demand.

THE COURT: It's been a while.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Sorry. Probably a good thing.

But, yeah, demand can be very steep or not steep. THE COURT: Yeah, no, I know.

THE WITNESS: Even when it's not steep, you know, when there is a responsiveness, if you can price discriminate, you can charge different prices to each of the consumers and capture all of that profit, all the surplus from consumers in the limit, if you can price discriminate very well and not even reduce output at all.

So on the ads side of the market here, that actually is what happened, not necessarily perfectly, of course, but, you know, Google does charge advertisers who have different willingnesses to pay for ads different prices through the way the auction works. So that's a first response. Is that, I think, Dr. Israel was saying that it's necessary to see output restriction, but it isn't actually necessary.

The second piece, I think, is we're going to address in just a moment. BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And, Professor Whinston, do you have an opinion whether Google's exercise of monopoly power has, in fact, resulted in a reduction in output?

A Yeah, I think it's clear that it has or very likely that it has in the sense that, you know, we see, and I talked about this the last time $I$ was here, Your Honor, that, for example, Google has responded to the kind of rare instances when it has more competitive pressure by increasing quality, by increasing the amount its spends on, you know, whether it was responding to Bing or Go Big in Europe or the more recent, you know, AI Chatbot responses, that you can see Google responding to competitive when it perceives a competitive threat.

And so that response to a competitive threat is also -- the flip side of it is, well, when there isn't a competitive threat, it's not making that investment and the quality is lower, and for the reasons $I$ said, if quality is lower, we expect that to have some effect on search -- on the amount that people search.

Q And, Professor Whinston, did you see Dr. Israel's testimony that total query volume on general search engines has more than doubled over the past ten years?

A $\quad$ I did.
Q Okay.
And is that evidence inconsistent with your conclusion that Google has monopoly power?

A So, Your Honor, this is exactly what comes to your question, the second part of your question is, you know,

Dr. Israel says, well, output has increased so much, I don't see any sign that output is going down.

So if you bring up the next slide, on the right is Dr. Israel -- on the bottom right, Your Honor, is Dr. Israel's graph of total search queries for Google going up over time.

The other three figures here are what output was doing in three very famous Section 2 monopolization cases, where in each case what I've done is graph a public source of output up to the date of a District Court opinion or a settlement.

So one of these was standard oil from back in 1908, 1909 and you can see output was increasing, despite the fact that standard oil was very, you know, was a monopolist.

On the top right is AT\&T, which was, you know, ended up -- had a Section 2 case that was settled where output for long distance calls was obviously increasing dramatically over time.

On the bottom left is the Microsoft case, where I'm plotting global shipments of PCs up to the date of the district court opinion. Dramatic increase in output.

And actually, after $I$ made this slide a couple days ago, $I$ was walking downstairs and there are eight placards of, it was striking, eight placards of the history
of the district court. You know one of them is devoted to two of these cases.

The main point, though, economically, is that there are lots of reasons why output and queries have been going up. The Internet has been expanding, connectivity has been improving. You know, many, many things have contributed to the output going up. So, you know, is there anything to take, like should we take anything from output going up here that there isn't monopoly power being exercised? No, we should not take anything from that.

And you can here, Your Honor, both -- Dr. Israel sort of waffled a little but he did push the point. Professor Murphy, when he started talking about output, you know, a few times, $I$ was here, he, distanced himself from saying, oh, $I$ can really say that this is a result of monopoly or a result of exclusion.

So, you know, I just don't really take anything from this, I think.

Q And, Professor, Dr. Israel also disputed the profits that Google earns from its distribution contracts, including with Apple, are revealing about its market power?

THE COURT: Before you move on, I'm sorry. Could I follow-up?

MR. SEVERT: Sure.

THE COURT: So I understand your position with
respect to the upward trajectory of output and Dr. Israel's position on it.

But $I$ understand you to now say that you believe that there is evidence that Google has restricted output by not making certain quality improvements, or at least a result of -- a consequence of not making quality improvements would reduce output, right?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

So the really direct evidence that $I$ was citing is evidence that the level of competition that Google perceives it faces has effects on how much effort it puts into quality.

The second piece of that is that quality does have an effect on searches. That is, you know, in some sense, you know, less direct evidence.

You know, the one piece of evidence that -I think, empirical evidence $I$ cite is the Google ablation studies. That's not looking at overall market output, to be clear, it's looking at what Google is getting. And it's, as I've testified, it's low responsiveness but it's not zero.

The fact that it's looking just at Google, I think, is not necessarily the -- a big distinguishing factor because Google is such a big part of the market.

But, you know, that's how I would describe what -why I say that there's evidence for this.

THE COURT: Okay.
I think you've just answered my question which is:
What do you think the record evidence is that -- of there being a consequence of even if you can't quantify it, of a reduction in output due to a reduction in quality.

THE WITNESS: Right.
So what $I$ think the record evidence is is, you know, the steps in this chain of logic. It's not that $I$ see a reduction in quality and $I$ actually am measuring total market output, okay. But $I$ see $a--$ you know, I should -sorry, I should step back.

I see a change in the level of competition and then $I$ see a change in the level of output. It's not that level kind of evidence.

The record evidence is, $I$ see a change in output, I see a responsiveness in quality. I also have evidence I see a change in quality, $I$ see some responsiveness in search behavior by consumers. Low but some.

So that's what $I$ would say the record evidence is. THE COURT: Okay.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Professor Whinston, turning to the profits that Google earns from distribution contracts, Dr. Israel disputed that those profits, including from the Apple contract, are revealing about its market power. Did you
have any reaction to that testimony?
A I did.
You know, I didn't -- this, I just didn't think made sense.

So, Your Honor, what Dr. Israel basically was saying, is look, Apple made all of these profits in this deal and doesn't that -- that tells me that Google didn't have a lot of market power.

But, you know, we've talked about -- I talked about last time that Google made, you know, a lot of profit in this -- you know, in these contracts, and it did so -you know, I think the record is clear it did so because it has a very -- you know, its position in the market is it has many, many advantages; it's much stronger than its competitors.

So if you bring up the next slide --
Q Slide 4.
A Slide 4. Sorry, I've fallen out of the habit. If you bring up Slide 4, this is evidence from Mr. Pichai.

And you can see, you know, actually, it's kind of an interesting question and answer when $I$ read it in the testimony transcripts, that, you know, he's asked, you know, did you communicate to Apple during these negotiations that they didn't really have any leverage in negotiating a
revenue share percentage because Google was the only viable option.

And he starts -- and he -- starts answering, well, there were many factors, da, da, da, da. And at the very end of his answer he goes, oh, and, by the way, yes, I did take into account what you were saying, which was why we didn't pay Apple the share that Apple -- we didn't pay the share that Apple wanted. And so, you know, it's clear that he was thinking about this market power that he had.

And, you know, the thing is -- just to add to that, yeah, I -- in some sense, I expect Apple to make money in the -- to get a good amount of profit out of this deal because Apple's bargaining position in this is it has a bunch of users and that only -- that it, in some sense, largely controls access to. So it's going to get a bunch of profit in these deals. The question is, how much profit is the other side going to get.

And like I said last time, if Google faced rivals that were kind of on par with it, Apple would be able to play them off each other and make almost all the profit in this deal. But instead, as you can see here, that wasn't the situation. Google had a lot of bargaining power as well.

Q And did Professor Murphy offer testimony that sheds light on this issue too?

A He did.

If you bring up Slide 5.

So Professor Murphy, if you read his reports, goes on and on about the advantages and how much stronger Google is.

In his testimony, you know, he said similar kinds of things. And this is just one point where he describes this particular negotiation saying, you know, there's lots of headroom between those numbers, meaning what they thought the clawback would be and the deal that they were doing. So what's the headroom? It's like, yeah, they were getting a lot of profit over and above what they would have gotten absent the deal. And why is that? It's because they had a strong bargaining position. And why did they have a strong bargaining position? Because they didn't have close rivals.

Q Let's talk about market definition for a moment. One of Dr. Israel's main points is that the three relevant markets, $I$ think if you use his words, define away competition. Do you think you defined away competition in this case?

A No, I absolutely don't.

Q Why not?
A Well, you know, I think when you -- and this is something $I$-- Your Honor, $I$ said at the very beginning,
it's now two times ago, when I talked about market definition, it's a zero one exercise.

There's always things that, in the end, are left out, right, that -- and it's not that they don't compete at all. There are some things that are, to some degree, competitors that, when you end up defining a relevant market, they're not included.

But it's not that you just like define the -- or I, certainly not in this case, have just defined the market and not paid any attention to what those things are. The process of thinking about what should be the relevant market is a process of thinking are those alternatives close, big constraints on the pricing of Google, say, of general search engines or of -- you know, are they competitive constraints on quality.

And so, you know, for me, I looked at many, many alternatives, both when $I$ was looking at the search services side and when $I$ was looking at the ads side, and came to the conclusion that those things would not prevent a hypothetical monopolist from exercising considerable market power.

Q And starting with general search services, Dr. Israel claimed that the market for general search services is not proper because it aggregates queries with dissimilar competitive conditions.

Do you agree with that claim?

A No, I don't.

THE COURT: Sorry. Can you repeat the question? MR. SEVERT: Sure.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Do you agree with Dr. Israel's claim that your general search services market is improper because it aggregates queries that have dissimilar competitive conditions?

A The answer was, no, I don't agree.
Q And why?
A So, you know, the thing about -- and, again, I testified about this last time -- two times ago, you know, general search services, I think a key characteristic of it is this one-stop shop being characteristic.

And it's -- you know, it's an example of what -like, if you -- in economics and, I guess, in the latest draft of the horizontal merger guidelines, it's called the "bundle market."

So what is a bundle market? A bundle market is a situation where the aggregation of the various things that a product is doing is in some sense more than the sum of its parts. Like that is a distinct product. And that's why, I think, in general search services, I don't agree at all with Dr. Israel.

Q All right. Let's talk about one-stop shops. Dr. Israel talked about consumers making a decision each time they make a new search. Is that consistent with Google's business model?

A No, it's not consistent -- not consistent really with Google's business model at all.

So, you know, Dr. Israel has this view that every time a consumer is coming up to a search, it's just separately thinking about where should $I$ go, each decision, every query is a separate decision.

And, you know, if that was the case, you know, Google wouldn't, in some sense, doing what it does. Like it would be fine for it to have, like, 20 specialized vertical platforms and not be offering google.com at all, because, like, well, why not, because we're offering all the same kinds of information and people can just go every single time to what they want. But that's not what it does. And it doesn't do that because if someone -- people value the one-stop shop feature.

And, actually, you know, Your Honor, I was -- at one point in working on this, I came across -- I know I have used this Marissa Mayer Swiss Army knife analogy. At one point, $I$ also came across this video where, you know, from the mid to late 2000 s where she's talking about what Google is doing and introducing universal search and putting
together all these things. And, like, literally in the video, she has this -- the background is a bunch of silos where she sang --

MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Your Honor, this is all
fascinating, but it wasn't disclosed in any of his reports or in any of his opinions. So I don't think we should be hearing about what Professor Whinston's been doing browsing the Internet since he started testifying.

THE COURT: I don't know that that's what he's saying. But $I$ don't -- if it's not something that he's relied upon, it sort of falls in the bucket of what we talked about yesterday.

MR. SEVERT: He's not relied upon the video specifically.

THE COURT: I'm sorry?
MR. SEVERT: He's not relied upon the video specifically.

THE COURT: Go ahead and move on. BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And -- well, first, did you have anything else to add to your last answer?

A At this point, $I$ don't remember the question.
Q Okay. Fair. Fair. Let's move on.
You previously testified that the fact that browsers only want a general search engine as a default,
that that supports your general search services market.

Dr. Israel argued that one needs to focus on the user side and not the browser side.

Does the fact that browsers are making the choice mean that this is not relevant for -- to understanding users' preferences?

A No, not at all.
I mean, browsers, you know, not perfectly by any means, but browsers are -- certainly, a very important consideration for a browser is what users want. And so the fact that users want -- have this one-stop shop preference makes browsers care about having a general search engine and a default for it.

Q And does the fact that browsers have these preferences tell you anything else about market definition?

A It does.

So, you know, Your Honor, like two -- one fact is that defaults really matter, defaults are very powerful.

A second fact is that browsers have this preference for general search engines, making them the default.

So those two facts together mean that that is an important differentiator for general search engines relative to alternative sources of information.

Q And I think, Professor Whinston, both you and

Professor Rangel both testified about the evidence showing the importance of defaults. Does the importance of defaults tell you anything about Dr. Israel's approach to market definition?

A Yeah.

Well, sort of.

As I was saying before, that, you know, this idea that every decision is a separate decision and we're just going to go -- you know, consumers -- you know, a hyperrational consumer is just thinking every single time, gee, what is it that -- where can $I$ get that information and doing it all separately. You know, defaults wouldn't really matter in that world.

You know, I think Dr. Israel talked about, oh, browsers want these things as backstops. Why would you need a backstop if that's how consumers behave?

Q You also presented evidence that Google recognizes general search services as a market.

Is Dr. Israel's approach to market definition consistent with Google's documents in ablation experiments?

A No.

So, you know, Dr. -- it's not consistent with Google's recognition of general search engines as distinct. It's advice in the choice screen. It's what it does with Chrome. It's not consistent with how variants description
of what the market is, his $3-$ to- 2 comments, his comment that if Google didn't exist, everyone would go to Bing. And it's not consistent, importantly, with the evidence of consumer responsiveness to Google's quality which as, you know, Google's own experiment show to be low.

Q All right, Professor Whinston, let's turn to the ads markets now.

THE COURT: Before you do that, can $I$ ask you, Professor Whinston, Professor Israel -- sorry -- Dr. Israel had an analysis that he did of sessions, a sessions analysis, in which he evaluated how long users were on Google, and I think he drew from that the notion that the evidence is not showing that people, in fact, do one-stop shop at Google, that they're not there bundling their searches in a way that would be consistent with your view that it's a one-stop shop.

I think I'm describing his analysis correctly, and, if $I$ am, what's your reaction to that?

THE WITNESS: So, Your Honor, when I testified before, I talked about various reasons why general search engines have this one-stop shop feature.

Dr. Israel's analysis, even taking it as it is, I mean, there are issues about it, but even taking it as it is, is really just talking about what was the first, which is, you know, is basically how difficult is it for me --
does it matter that I'm bundle in time different searches so that, like, oh, is it the case that I'm -- you know, searching for books and then immediately right after that searching for hardware, and right after that searching for shoes, you know.

And that analysis was kind of looking at that issue, and he would argue, he tried -- you know, his argument was, well, we don't see that it's close temporal connection.

THE COURT: Right.
THE WITNESS: And therefore, that doesn't seem to be a big thing.

But even taking that aside, you know, there were all of these other reasons and are all of these other reasons why it's a one -- why there's this one-stop-shop feature.

And so, you know, to me, a really big one is this mental energy point that, you know, if you are trying every single time that you are thinking where do $I$ go, you know, you have to think like in his world, like, people just instantly cautiously come up with exactly where they should be getting their information.

But, you know, to begin with, that mental process is costly, and, moreover, people may just not know about where things are. And, you know, that, I think, is a
significant factor. And you can see it in the fact that this is -- Google offers this kind of, you know, product that -- and I'm not -- okay, I'm not allowed to talk about the video, but, like that was -- is a big component of how I think what Google is doing.

And there were other things, including that it's a browser default and other things as well.

But $I$ think it's not really just temporal connection.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Let's turn to the ads markets.
I think last time you talked about Google's general search text ad pricing. Does that evidence relate to market definition or market power?

A It does.

Q And would it be both?

A Sorry, I didn't understand.
THE COURT: Can you restate the question.
BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Sure.

Does the evidence that you presented on general search text ad pricing relate to market definition, market power, or both?

A Okay. Thank you, thank you for asking him to repeat it, too, because $I$ kind of missed it.

Yeah, so it's both.
And the reason, you know, I talked about it as evidence of market power, but, you know, you can't have market power if -- you know, Google within this general search services hypo -- relevant market couldn't be exercising a lot of market power if it wasn't a relevant market to begin with, because, you know, what is a relevant market? It's a market where a hypothetical monopolist of all general search services would have market power.

Well, if just Google within it has -- not just because they're almost all of it, but if Google within it has significant market power, if you can see direct evidence of that, that's telling you that it's a relevant market.

Q And just to help frame the discussion, can you just remind the Court of your principal opinion regarding Google's ad pricing over time?

A Sure.
You know, my principal opinion about Google's ad pricing overtime is that Google has exercised significant market power by raising prices. And it has done so to capture advertiser surplus, you know, to try to capture as much of advertiser surplus as it can.

And, you know, that -- the ability that it has to do that, which comes from the low responsiveness of advertisers that you see in -- that you can see in the
experiments that Google has done, is reflective of its market power.

Q And have you reviewed Dr. Israel's testimony on this topic?

A I have.
Q And Dr. Israel testified that Google creates value for advertisers and sometimes set prices to share that value.

Is sharing value a commonly accepted reason for a price increase?

A Well, it's a commonly accepted reason if you have a lot of market power.

So, Your Honor, you know, if a firm is talking about, you know, that its price increases are to share the value of the quality improvements that it's doing, that is one thing that you see when firms have a lot of market power.

So to take a -- I think one thing that may be a contrast would be, think about the computer market in the last 20 years, okay, computers have dramatically increased their quality. Their prices really haven't gone up. And the reason is that computer manufacturers are competing and you know, they are improving quality but so are their rivals improving quality. And so that ends up meaning that it's consumers that benefit, not the computer manufacturers from
these quality improvements.
You know, no computer -- you know, Dell -- no computer manufacturer is sitting there talking about, well, you know, the memory has gotten bigger, we'll share the value, we're going to get a chunk of that.

In fact, we're going to try to actually make it so that consumers don't get any of it. They'd lose all their consumers.

Q And have you seen Google talk about extracting value from advertisers?

A I have.
So, you know, Your Honor, I don't want to -- if you bring in the next slide, Slide 6, you know, this is something I had up when $I$ was last here so I don't want to spend a lot of time on it.

But this was just this history of what was going on during this period of Google was making these quality improvements and it started tracking this measure of excess CPC, I think Dr. Israel talked about this as well, that it was increasing the amount of value advertisers -- those things were increasing the amount of value advertisers were getting because the amount of clicks, the number of clicks were going up.

So what Google sought out to do was to say, no, we -- we're increasing clicks, we're going to make -- we're
going to raise prices to make sure advertisers are not gaining from that, like, we're going to be the ones who gain from it.

And they first, you know, called it holistic pricing. And then back in -- once they kind of realized they had managed to do that, then in 2018 , they switched to calling it value-based pricing, and the aim there was to go further.

Q And did you see similar evidence on Slide 7?
A Yes.

So if you bring up Slide 7, you know, Your Honor, this is another document that I talked about when I was here in the past.

And this was just from this meeting, meeting -these are meeting minutes about how they were going to use the design of the auction to raise prices, and where, you know, over on the last item on the right, for example, was Adam Juda saying, like, what's the aim here, it's -- to basically price a penny below the breaking point of the top advertiser, i.e., let's extract all of -- let's try -- the ideal thing is to extract all of that advertiser's value.

MR. SEVERT: Mr. Penado, if we could go to Slide 8.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, before you do that, can I ask you: Is there not some tension in your position that

Google has had the ability to capture value of ad improvements, ad quality, with the idea that at least in the -- that in the search market, it has had an incentive to decrease quality or at least not increase quality at the rate at which it would have had in a competitive market?

THE WITNESS: So the thing that's really different is, in the search market, there are no prices. So here there are prices.

So if you raise your quality, you can try to capture it, if you have market power, through increasing price. You can't do that in the search market. So that's the difference.

THE COURT: Okay.
BY MR. SEVERT:
Q And so when you testified last time, you commented on Google's efforts to raise prices at the same time that it introduced the ad quality improvements, and Dr. Israel said this was needed to give Google an incentive to introduce the improvements, and it's reflected on the slide.

What do you think of that argument?
A So, you know, this is something I talked about, I think it was one of the last things I talked about two times ago when I was here.

And about this -- when talking about these quality improvements and the price change -- and these pricing
changes that -- yes, Google -- you know, I put up a document, which I think actually Dr. Israel put up the same document to talk about this episode so I think we're talking about the episode and the facts of what happened the same. We're pointing, in fact, to the same -- I think it's the same document or very close to it, about, you know, the ads quality team was increasing click-through rates, advertisers, if prices didn't rise, would have been benefiting from that, and that -- but it potentially thinned the auction and might lower prices.

And that was a concern at Google, like, oh, there are these quality improvements, and, you know, the document I showed and that Dr. Israel showed, was saying, well, if we don't have a mechanism to raise prices, we're going to not introduce these things because our profits will be lower when we raise quality.

And so what it did was all the things I talked about, you know, all the changes in the ad auction to quote share in the value, to capture the value to try to make it so they gained, rather than the advertisers, not --

And so, you know, that's what Dr. Israel also talked about and described as Mr. Severt's question said.

And you can see it here; I'll just point at the bottom part. You want to have incentives to make -- you want it, Google, to have incentives to make it, $I$ think,
"its" is what it should be, PCTR better, that is, you know, to increase -- shorthand for increase its qualities. You need some mechanism to deal with this issue, the issue being the thinning of the auction that may bring, which is the general one I talked about with knobs.

So what Dr. Israel is saying just this, that it's a good thing that Google can raise -- we need a mechanism for Google to introduce this, it's a good thing they could raise their prices.

You know, my position is really different, which is, there's a different mechanism that can lead Google to introduce quality improvements, which is competition. If it faced competition just like the computer manufacturers, it would have a different incentive, and that competition, I think I said it this way, you know, changes what's rational for a firm.

When Google has market power, it needs to share in the value for it to be rational to introduce the quality improvement. If instead it faces competition and rivals are also trying to innovate, trying to -- and improving, close rivals are improving their quality, it's going to have to do this or it's going to lose its advertisers. So that's the difference, I think, in our perspectives.

Q And so we've talked about Google's price increases. Let's talk to evidence about advertiser
reactions to price changes.

MR. SEVERT: And, Mr. Penado, if you could put up Slide 9.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q In your review of Dr. Israel's testimony, did you see him say that advertiser reactions are where competition comes in because advertisers react, given what their options are?

A I did.

And so you can see on Slide 9, Your Honor, you know, what Dr. Israel said.

I agree with this statement; that is, advertiser reactions is where you see competition coming in, if it exists.

The thing is, you know, Google has provided us, you know, evidence about what advertiser reactions are. And so that's what you -- they performed experiments where the -- what they did is they varied prices to advertisers, holding everything else fixed and saw what advertisers did. It's, you know, these kind of experiments can be kind of the gold standard of evidence because they hold things fixed.

So -- other things.
And so if you turn to the next -- bring up the next slide, Slide 10, I won't -- I'll describe this. Given that some things are redacted, I'll be careful about this.

This is -- if you remember, Your Honor, when I described this last time, I didn't show a slide, but I talked about how they did these experiments and they realized there was, quote, "stickage." So this time, I'm showing you actually the figure of one of these results of these experiments.

And so just to remind you just very, very quickly, they did these experiments of raising -- you know, when they were thinking, gee, how much can we raise prices, you know, to advertisers and get away with. They did, you know, these experiments raising prices, sometimes by as much as 15 percent to advertisers.

And they first did it for -- you know, six weeks. Then they were like, well, we're worried that the advertiser reactions may take more time so they did three-month experiments. And then they were worried again and they did six-month experiments. And every time what they found was raising prices was profitable.

So what you're looking at here, Your Honor, is a figure that is showing you, you know, how much ad revenue they're getting. You know, that's the -- the squiggly line is -- I think it's so small on my thing so I'm trying to remember, $I$ think it was day by day.

And then the sharp break is when they change prices in the experiment.

And what you can see is immediately total revenue jumps up because, of course, by that -- at that moment, advertisers haven't had a chance to react at all.

And then there's some decay over time, a little bit of decay where some advertisers do start reacting. But in the end, revenue asymptotes to something that is way higher than what it started at.

And the conclusion of this is, hey, if we raise prices, we'll be more profitable.

And so, why can -- what is that capturing? It's capturing advertisers were not responsive enough to price changes to prevent it being profitable to do them.

MR. SEVERT: Mr. Penado, if you could please turn to Slide 11.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And Dr. Israel raised a circle principle during his testimony. Can you just remind us what the circle principle says?

A Sure.

So the circle principle, Your Honor, is this idea that if you include in a relevant market, say, a substitute for Bing -- sorry -- a substitute, you know, for Google, you should include in your relevant market anything else that is a closer substitute.

So this comes from -- if you look at the
horizontal merger guidelines, there's an example sort of suggesting that, you know, ideally you might want to follow this principle.

You know, it's not completely clear, you know, so I don't want to be saying $I$ endorse this principle. I'm just trying to describe it. Because it's also true, for example, that the horizontal merger guidelines say that any relevant market is valid whether or not it satisfies this principle. And $I$ don't know of any evidence about whether doing things that satisfy the circle principle or not is a better idea or not.

So leaving that -- so I'm going to -- I've described it, we can go on.

Q Well -- and Dr. Israel said that your market definition violates the circle principle whether you agree with it or not. Do you agree that your markets violate his circle principle?

A I don't.
So, you know, in essence, the way I view the market is what's shown here, Your Honor, that the closest rivals to Google and ads are other general search engines. I think other specialized search engines are kind of in the next ring around, and that things like Facebook and TikTok and display ads -- I don't think we even have display ads on the figure -- are the furthest out.

So that's kind of how $I$ view what's going on here in terms of closeness of substitution and -- which would satisfy and does satisfy this circle principle.

Q And can you just briefly explain why you don't think ads on Facebook are closer substitutes for Google Search ads than ads on rival general search engines?

A Yes.

So, Your Honor, when $I$ was here, I talked about the ways in which ad products are substitutes for each other, can be substitutes. And so, there were a variety of different reasons why there's differentiation between -and, you know, the things that affect substitution between ad products.

For me, you know, the key thing about a search ad is that it -- and $I$ said this at the time, it reflects the intent of a consumer at the moment the consumer is expressing that intent and has that intent, and that's something that no -- nothing that's not a search ad does.

And then $I$ also, you know -- and it's, you know, able -- because of that targeting ability, search ads have a differential ability to, you know, in terms of the consumer purchase journey. Whether you think it's totally linear or people jump back up sometimes, it's still the case that, you know -- and I think there's been a lot of testimony about this as well, that there are important differences in the
relative strengths of different kinds of ads in terms of where they hit the funnel.

You know, I think if I'm remembering, I think actually Mr. Pichai even himself used the final as a -- at one point and referred to it.

So I think those differences are very important, and so that, I think, is the key driver for me.

MR. SEVERT: Mr. Penado, can you please turn to Slide 12.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And this is a slide Dr. Israel presented in his testimony.

And, Professor Whinston, I want to direct your attention to his first bullet.

And Professor Israel writes, "For two ads to be substitutes for one another, they must allow advertisers to reach overlapping audiences."

To you agree with that statement?
A I don't.
And actually -- so, Your Honor, the thing I really don't agree with here is the use of the word "must."

It's not that $I$-- you know, it is a factor that affects differentiation, audience overlap, and, in fact, as you can see, Dr. Israel refers to it as my Factor Number 2. So I talked about it when I was here.

It's just that $I$ think it's one factor among many. And as I said, I think an important factor. I don't think it is a necessary factor.

So just to -- I think a simple example that kind of explain this and why audience -- you know, Dr. Israel talked about ads in different cities. I think maybe it was Cleveland and Kansas City or something like that. And he talked about, well, imagine that, you know, we have an ad product that just reaches consumers in Kansas City and an ad product that just reaches consumers in Cleveland and, you know, according to him, those things are not substitutes because you can't reach the same consumer through the different ad products.

But, you know, think of -- I'm from Boston. Think of a hotel in Boston. It has 100 rooms a night that it wants to sell. It doesn't care whether it's filling its rooms with people from Kansas City or people from Cleveland. Those people are perfectly substitutable to that advertiser.

And so for that advertiser, those two ad products are substitutes. You know, it's willing -- if the price of reaching people in Cleveland goes up, it will switch and try to reach more people in Kansas City because it just wants to fill the rooms.

So, you know, I think this example just makes really clear that this idea that you must have overlap, you
know, in order for things to be substitutes is just not right.

Q And so, Professor, if audience overlap is not in and of itself determinative, what other factors are important for understanding substitution?

A Well, as $I$ said, $I$ think, you know, two really important factors is intent and, you know, the differences in the extent to which you know -- in search ads, you see the consumer expressing their intent at the moment they have it. And you don't see that for non-search ads in anywhere close to the same way, and there's just a lot of evidence in the record about that.

Q Did Dr. Israel's measure -- does Dr. Israel's analysis measure overlap in a way -- in any way that had to do with intent?

A Not at all.

So, you know, when you go and you see people on Facebook in the same -- you know, I think he did it by sessions again.

So when you go and you look at people on Facebook in that -- in what he described as the same session, you know, they're not necessarily at all having the same intent they had when they put a search in on Google. And for -- you know, they may be corresponding with their friends about the latest -- their ski trip for that weekend
or looking at what their friends' postings have been.
And so what's important to the advertiser is "can

I reach the consumer when they have that intent." And so, you know, this -- the measures that Dr. Israel is showing, while I'm not saying they're totally uninformative, but they're missing this whole aspect of intent.

THE COURT: Can I ask you -- sorry, Counsel.
But one of the points $I$ thought Dr. Israel to make is that, in a sense, Bing ads and Google Ads are not substitutes. And the reason he would say that is that they have relatively different audiences, you know, people who use Google, use Google. People who use Bing, use Bing. And in that sense, because there is no audience overlap, those really aren't substitutable ad products?

THE WITNESS: Right.
So it's the same as this example of the cities.

So think about the Boston hotel. It doesn't care whether it's filling its rooms with people who are on Bing or people who are on Google. They're substitutes for that hotel trying to fill its rooms.

THE COURT: Right. Okay.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Another thing that Dr. Israel presented was an analysis of the Nike boycott of Facebook. Did you review Dr. Israel's testimony about the boycott?

A I did.

MR. SEVERT: And, Mr. Penado, if you could put up Slide 13.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And I think this is Dr. Israel's slide on the Facebook boycott.

Do you have any concerns with Dr. Israel's analysis here?

A I did.
When I looked at it, you know, and especially looking at the figure on the right, you know, Dr. Israel presents this as evidence that the boycott of Facebook by Nike -- and, actually, let me just back up for one moment just to make sure we're all on the same page.

So, Your Honor, Dr. Israel was talking about this episode where Nike suspended its advertising on Meta products, Facebook and the other social media, Instagram, et cetera.

And in this figure, they did it in this period in the summer of 2020 in what is that gray -- on the right-hand figure --

And none of this is redacted, right? Okay. Just want to make sure.

So that gray band is the time period when it suspended it.

And so, first of all, I should just say even before we go any further, you know, this is evidence of what one advertiser did and not -- so, you know, it's very limited in its -- in what you can take from it, because it's not information about the market in general, but it is some information, but it's one -- you've got to remember it's one advertiser.

But what concerned me, aside from that, is he's using this -- so, Your Honor, the figure on the right, just to remind you, the dashed line is the Nike's advertising -measuring Nike's advertising in dollar value on Meta products, and you see it goes to zero during the boycott period.

The yellow line is how much it was spending on search. And he says, oh, look, during the boycott period, it went way up, okay?

So first thing when you look at it, you say to yourself, well, okay, it seems like if you look at that yellow line, it's going up all the time pretty much. And most noticeably, it doesn't go down when the boycott ends. So it seems like there's some trend in search -- in the amount Nike is spending on search ads that doesn't have anything to do with the boycott period. And that was kind of like a first kind of red flag for me about this is.

Q And Dr. Israel testified that he controlled for
the factors that you identified and that his analysis -- and redid his analysis and then his results were even stronger, is that correct?

A So, you know, what happened is, Your Honor, I both, in my rebuttal report, Your Honor, I both pointed this fact out and showed that if you control for this with a time trend, that, you know, control for these time effects, the result -- his result completely went away.

He then went and said, oh, no, there are, you know, I'll put in -- I'm going to -- I've put in other time controls supposedly for COVID, for example, that didn't really match what was going on with COVID.

So without getting into the weeds at this hour, but it's -- you know, it wasn't reliable what he did, and, you know, let me just say that.

Q And just maybe to cut to the chase if we could put up Slide 14, did you perform your own analysis of the Facebook boycott?

A I did.

So I did both a regression analysis, like I said, that said that the results went away, but $I$ also did something else, which is, you know, I plotted -- you know, other one other thing about what Dr. Israel did is he looked at things in terms of dollar values.

Now, the way economists usually measure
responsiveness, in fact, is through elasticities.

So what an elasticity is, is it's measuring proportional changes. And actually if you go just for a moment to Slide 15, you'll see that that is what Dr. Israel says he's doing. He says he's doing a measure of cross elasticity. What "cross" means the effect of the boycott, you know, of -- effectively when you boycott Nike, it's -sorry, when Nike boycotts Meta, it's like Meta's price went to infinity and we're looking at how much that shifted to search, how much it shifted to display.

That would be a cross elasticity if you did it in proportions but not when you do it in absolute dollars which is what his first graph was showing.

So the thing, if you go back to Slide 14 , this is in proportions. And what you can see here, color -I apologize the colors are different than the figure before, but. . .

So Meta here is black, it goes to zero in the boycott period.

Search is red, it hardly goes up at all proportionately.

Display is the aqua color, the greenish aqua color. That goes up significantly.

But the thing that really, really, really goes up a lot is non-Meta social media, you know, Pinterest
et cetera. That goes up, you know, in August 2020, it's -you know, 20 -- basically 22 times higher than it was in January 2020.

Q And then during his testimony, Dr. Israel showed the Court the slide that's on page 16 of your presentation from a Nike internal document. Are the results of your study consistent with Nike's ordinary course document?

A They are.

And so if you -- Your Honor, this is a figure that

I know you've seen before.

The before pause pie chart is labeled week 51 as before the boycott. The thing labeled during pause week 15, that's during the boycott period.

And what you can see here is before -- you know, a combination of Snapchat, Pinterest and Twitter combined before the pause was 1 percent of their ad spending. It goes up to 9 percent when -- actually this is -- it's really small for me, it might be 10 percent in here, during the -Twitter, Snapchat, Pinterest.

THE COURT: It's 10.

THE WITNESS: Ten. Thank you. Thanks. I didn't take my glasses off.

So it goes up, you know, just like the figure I showed you in this pie chart, display goes up from, you know, 18 percent to 31 percent, you know, just like in my
figure that $I$ showed you, kind of similar.
And the thing that -- and search goes from

48 percent to 51 percent of Nike's spend. So exactly these kind of proportional changes that I was showing you overall in the data is what this document is showing. BY MR. SEVERT:

Q All right.
And aside from the pie charts, is there anything else informative on this Nike slide?

A Yeah, I mean, I think the really -- the one thing that's really informative is the second bullet point at the bottom.

So what it's saying is during the pause, social investment shrunk, you know, by more than half to just 8 percent because we weren't doing Meta anymore.

Why? Due to limitations on scale opportunities within Snapchat, Pinterest and Twitter.

So literally what they're saying is we would have done more but, in essence, there were no more ads that were like worth buying on those social media sites.

And that is very much actually a reflection of another thing about this episode which is, it's a boycott, so it's effectively like an infinite price increase on Meta ads.

And so that's a lot of ads that you have to try to
move somewhere -- of ad budget that you're trying to move somewhere.

And if instead, for example, you were thinking about, say, a 5 percent or a 10 percent increase in price on Meta products, there would be much less that you were trying to move. And, like, I would expect to see even more of a shift to nonsocial here than what you see and even less of a shift to search than what you see here if it was a smaller price increase.

Q And, Professor, we have been talking about the arguments made by Dr. Israel. I'd now like to turn to the testimony of Professor Murphy.

MR. SEVERT: Mr. Penado, if we could turn to Slide 17. BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Professor Murphy argued that search defaults enhance competition. Is it your opinion that search defaults are inherently anti-competitive?

A Not at all.

You know, I think defaults can be good for
consumers. For all the reasons we've talked, they have this one-stop shop preference and, you know, they don't want to be thinking all the time about exactly what they're doing. So it's not that they're always good for consumers but they can be certainly good for consumers.

Q So if defaults aren't the problem, what is?
A So, you know, I think the thing is, saying, you know, Your Honor, $I$ was here and a lot, you know, the beginning of Professor Murphy's testimony, there was a lot, quite a bit of time to defaults and why defaults are good. It's missing the issue. The issue is not defaults and whether they're good or bad or anything else. The issue is Google's contracts that are giving it exclusive defaults, it's the exclusivity, and the exclusive contracts that are the issue, not whether defaults are good.

Q And you previously testified about the power of defaults.

Did you hear Professor Murphy testify that defaults have limited effects on search usage?

A I did.

Q And do you agree with Professor Murphy's assessment about the importance of defaults?

A I don't.

MR. SEVERT: If we could, Mr. Penado, put up
Slide 18.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And here, Professor Murphy argued that if a rival were to obtain Google Search defaults, it would gain only 15 to 20 percent of queries on the device.

Do you agree with that estimate?

A I don't, no.
Q Can you remind the Court of what you relied upon to come up with your estimate of the power of defaults?

A Sure.

So, Your Honor, the thing, before we go off of this Slide 18, you know, a key thing to notice here in Slide 18 is what Professor Murphy was relying on.

So you can see here to come up with his 15 to 20 percent number, he's relying on evidence from Windows, which was this comparison of Windows PCs to Mac PCs and the difference in Google's share between those, and also on the Mozilla Firefox default change evidence.

And both of those are on PCs. You know, one of them, clearly explicitly; the other, because Mozilla was almost all PC traffic.

And, you know, the majority of the covered queries through Google's contracts are on mobile, not on PCs. And on mobile, the evidence is, you know, very clear that defaults have a bigger effect.

So now if you go to Slide 19, you'll see, you know, kind of, Your Honor, what $I$ relied on in coming up with my estimates of the power of defaults or what $I$-sometimes, we referred to as share shifts. It's all redacted so I'm not going to say any of the numbers but you can see, you know, what did $I$ rely on. I relied on
estimates from Google, from Microsoft, from Apple that they all were using, when they were dealing with deals, business deals at which billions of dollars were at stake.

Moreover, you know, in the case of -- certainly in the case of Google and Microsoft, the documents that I looked at described exactly what evidence they cared about and they thought was relevant for their estimates.

So in the case of Google, they, a mobile estimate, I'm showing here on the left. And, you know, it was important to distinguish mobile versus desktop in my analysis because the documents made it clear that, for example, Google looked at different episodes, clearly thought mobile and desktop were different and looked at different historical episodes on mobile and desktop to come up with their estimates.

So on mobile, they relied on Apple Maps, and on Desktop, they relied on Mozilla.

Microsoft also had estimates, and I talked last time about what it based its estimates on.

And then Apple, I should say, the evidence that I had for Apple was, you know, a document instead where they talked -- they didn't break it out by mobile and desktop, they gave one number.

But the key things to take from this aside $--A$, this was, you know, in the course of a negotiation and
situation that involved billions and billions of dollars of business, and, you know, you, I think, you heard Mr. Roszak talk about how seriously he took it for Google, you heard Microsoft executive talk about how seriously Microsoft took it.

And so it was taken very seriously, the documents described what historical episodes they were looking at. They weren't just picking numbers out of a hat, they were, like, thinking hard and saying, well, what do we know about what has happened historically and, you know, in terms of how defaults have mattered.

And, third, the numbers are all pretty similar, okay? Microsoft's number for desktop is somewhat higher, but, you know, other than that, the numbers are all pretty similar.

THE COURT: And, I'm sorry, could you just tell me one more, these percentages represent what?

THE WITNESS: Sorry. My apologies.
These are the kind of -- if a default shift -- if Google lost the default, how much business would it lose to the rival who gained the default out of $--I$ should say, out of the traffic that was covered, out of the traffic that was previously going through the default.

So another way to put it is, what share of consumers stick with the default. You know, they don't --
whatever, you know, whatever the default was, even though the rival is much weaker, they're not following Google, they're sticking with the default.

So that's what this was. Is that clear? THE COURT: Uh-huh.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And did you hear Professor Murphy discount these estimates from these documents because the firms created them did not need to be precise?

A I did.

Q What do you make of that testimony?
A Yeah, I think that just doesn't make sense to me. It doesn't make sense to me for a couple of reasons.

One, as $I$ just said, these were deals that involved billions of dollars. You know, take Microsoft, for example, like, it literally offered to give all of what it thought the value of these defaults was over to Apple in order to try to win this deal. And, like, you get that wrong, you're going to really be in big trouble, okay? So that's one aspect of this.

I think Dr. Murphy tried to discount Google's use of this, that was actually through that -- that previous slide that we talked about headroom was also a slide that, you know, part of his testimony where he was talking about this and he was, like, oh, it didn't matter. They were
making so much profit in this, they didn't need to pay attention to what their outside -- what that would get if they lost, if they didn't get the deal.

And that's just, you know, it's -- I think it's wrong, both, conceptually and it's wrong factually. So conceptually -- okay, so I teach MBAs and executive MBAs, and when you're teaching the strategy of negotiation, in the business literature, one thing that gets talked about a lot is you have to pay a lot of attention to your BATNA, B-A-T-N-A. That's, you know, an acronym for best alternative to the negotiated agreement. What's your payoff?

And the reason is, it affects your bargaining position. It affects, like, how strong a bargaining position you have.

And so one thing you really want to do is think about what you would you get if this deal didn't happen and what would your rival get if this deal didn't happen. And that is a really important thing to keep in mind when you're bargaining because it tells you, you know, what is your risk compared to your bargaining counter-parties' risk if this deal doesn't get finalized. So that's conceptually.

Factually, you know, we had the previous slide, you know, about -- that I showed you, Your Honor, about Mr. Pichai. One of the things about that same quote is he
was thinking about -- a lot about what his -- what Apple's alternative -- you know, in that language $I$ just gave, what Apple's BATNA was, like what alternative do you have to me to Google, if you -- you, Apple, if you don't write a deal with me, okay?

And so he also, not on that slide, talked a lot about the uncertainty he felt when he was bargaining, that he really -- he wanted the deal to happen because he didn't know if the deal didn't happen, what would Apple do. Well, when he's thinking about that, he's thinking about what happens if $I$ don't get this deal, and the only way to do that is to know these numbers. And so it's clear that that was, for all of these parties, an important thing.

Q And Professor Murphy also suggested that you did not base your estimate on $I$ think what he called market evidence. Is that true?

A $\quad$ No.

So, I mean -- I guess I based it on -- you know, those numbers I talked about moment ago, they came from documents.

I guess a first statement is, I think documents -you know, ordinary course of business documents are market evidence that they are showing you things about how the market works and what's driving outcomes in the market and how people are thinking.

But also, very, very importantly, these parties were saying what historical market outcomes they were thinking about and looking to, to justify the estimates that they had.

And so, you know, yes, I didn't do -- actually in the case of Mozilla, $I$ did do separate analysis of it, but in the case of these -- you know, the other things that the parties were looking at, I didn't, but the parties did, and that's where they came up with the estimates that they did.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. Can I ask a different question and maybe you're going to get to it.

But one of the things Professor Murphy suggested was that there was not as great a foreclosure of the market due to the defaults because --

THE WITNESS: Due to the?

THE COURT: Due to the defaults.
THE WITNESS: Okay.

THE COURT: -- because there is, in his view, competition for search not through defaults. And he showed a pie chart of the shares of where search was happening on iOS devices default versus some other method of access.

And, you know, the numbers showed that a large percentage would go through the default but not as much as you might think.

THE WITNESS: So I take two things.

There's sort of two separate things that you're describing from Professor Murphy. One is, okay, with the contracts in place, how much traffic do the defaults shift? That's exactly the evidence that we -- you know, this power of defaults evidence.

So, like, yes, you can talk about how much is going through different places, but these are the estimates that these parties had about how important defaults were and what they shifted. So that's one.

A second thing is, he also talked about, well, you know, maybe all that doesn't really matter -- I'm going to paraphrasing here. So maybe all that doesn't matter because rivals can compete to be the defaults, can compete to be the exclusives, and that's like four slides away. BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And Professor Murphy, I think, showed the Court some analysis from a consultant in 2010 to suggest that default effects on Mobile were lower than what you relied upon in your analysis.

And if we could put that up, Mr. Penado. It's Slide 20.

And, Professor Whinston, do these examples presented by Professor Murphy change any of your opinions?

A No, they didn't.
Q Why not?

A So you can, I guess, bring up Slide 21.

So, Your Honor, you know, there was a lot of -- in my reports and rebuttal report, there was a lot about various ways in which problems that $I$ felt with those estimates, you know, about the quality -- potential quality of those estimates and their consistency with other evidence.

But not to spend going time going through all of that, $I$ think the two big points are, number one, no market participants relied on these numbers that Professor Murphy is saying are good evidence. What they relied on it, especially in the case of Google over and over and over again, is the evidence $I$ relied on, number one.

Number two, if you believe --
Actually, if you could just put up momentarily Slide 20 again.

If you believe that the -- you know, Google was going to get $90-$ plus percent on mobile phones no matter what and you were Google, you would never pay the revenue shares that they're paying. It would be a massive money loser, it would make no economic sense.

So if you go back to Slide 21.
You know, Your Honor, last time I talked about how the revenue shares can be viewed as kind of a lower bound on the effect of defaults, you know, in words -- like, you're
not going to pay --
I guess it's now -- I can now say the Apple number, it's now public, I guess -- or whatever the Apple number, it doesn't matter.

You're not going to pay that number if you think the amount -- if you're Google and you think the amount you're going to lose is what was on that slide a moment ago because you would lose billions and billions of dollars doing it.

So those, I think, just the two really big points about why I don't take that evidence seriously.

Q And, Professor Whinston, you testified last time -- I think we're starting to get to the Court's question, that your foreclosures measures fell in a range from 33 to 50 percent.

Can you just remind the Court what those numbers represent? I think you summarized it on the next slide.

A Sure.
So up on Slide 22.
So I talked, when I was here last time, quite a bit about this measure of foreclosure which I viewed as measuring the share of the market that's tied up by Google's exclusive contracts.

And that came from, you know, when I looked to, say, Areeda and Hovenkamp, for example, how they describe
foreclosure measures for the courts.

And what $I$ said at the time, was, well, it's -there's kind of a range, depending on how strong you think rivals are as to how much they tie up the business.

So in that range, $I$ described at the time was 33 to 50 percent. 50 percent was the share of U.S. queries covered by Google's exclusive contracts.

That's, you know, the first item on this slide. And what does that represent? That represents the share of U.S. queries where the default -- the fact that Google is the default could affect people's choices.

The 33 percent instead captured this -- of lower bound on the proportion of people who won't change their default.

So, you know, as we've talked about, you know, some people are just going to follow the default. I think Professor Murphy testified that he knows somebody whose parents are never -- are always going to follow the default -- or father, I think it was. You know, I think we all know people who are like that. Some of us maybe even are those people, that may be me.

So those people are going to follow the default. They're not accessible to rivals no matter -- for any plausible investments, these rivals can make to try to win these people. And that's where that 33 percent comes from.

And what it uses is the numbers that $I$ talked about it a few moments ago, these share-shift estimates.

Q And Professor Murphy criticizes your measure of foreclosure.

And let's put that up on Slide 23, Mr. Penado.

And says, "It needs to be measured relative to a but-for world." And we see his estimate is zero.

What's your answer to that?

A So I just really don't agree with this perspective, that, you know, I think what foreclosure -- you know, foreclosure is a useful measure of, you know, this idea that you're going to look at what the effect of the contracts is when they're in place at tying up business is a very useful thing to look at and understand as an input into competitive effects analysis when $I$ do consider what the effects are against but-for worlds, against alternatives.

So, you know, I think I -- I disagree with the idea of not measuring foreclosure in that way.

And the idea, you know, Professor Murphy, you know, I think -- actually, I literally -- it's not on this slide. I literally heard him say, "My but-for world is the actual world."

And, here, you can see, well, if your but-for world is the actual world then, by definition, foreclosure is zero.

I mean now I'm not saying he defined -- I want to be careful. I'm not saying he defined it away, but $I$ just don't agree that foreclosure is zero here. That a sense -maybe I should put this differently. That a sensible measure of foreclosure is zero.

MR. SEVERT: Mr. Penado, we can turn to Slide 24 , and Professor Murphy's opinions relating to competition for the contract.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And I think Professor Murphy made much of the fact -- and this is, I think, what the Court was asking about before -- that rivals can compete for default contracts. Did you see that testimony?

A I did.

Q And where does this competition for the contract framework fit into your thinking about the case?

A So, Your Honor, when $I$ kind of think about this -the effect of these exclusives, I sort of think about it in -- in some sense, in two pieces. I sort of, as a first step, which $I$ think is really, you know, essential, is to think, well, if the contracts are in place, what do they do? That's kind of the foreclosure analysis. Like, with the contracts in place, what do they do to traffic? How do they affect the amount of traffic that's available to rivals?

Once I do that, kind of a second step is to think,
okay, now let's think about -- given that $I$ know kind of what the contracts do, let's think about competition for them. And that's an analysis where -- that $I$ do, and thinking about how that competition would work is an analysis that $I$ do when $I$ think about competitive effects.

And I also do it for thinking about but-for world. Like, how do I think competition will play out more generally for -- including competition for the contract -for these contracts.

Q And Professor Murray argues that if Google is not allowed to compete for these exclusive contracts, competition would be harmed.

Are you offering an opinion that Google should be prohibited from competing in search?

A Not at all.

And, of course, you know, one sense is prohibited is a legal conclusion and I'm not offering legal conclusions.

But, you know, in terms of the economics, Your Honor, $I$ think for me the issue is not whether Google competes. We want Google to compete. The issue in this case is how it's competing.

And in this case, that, you know, it's competing for these exclusive contracts -- for these exclusionary contracts.

Q And Professor Murphy suggests that the fact that there was competition to win these contracts means that there was no harm from the exclusives. Do you agree with Professor Murphy there?

A No, I don't.
Q Why not?
A So, you know, it's -- competition for -- we know that these contracts have an effect of shifting a lot of traffic, that they are exclusionary in that sense.

Competition for the contract for these kinds of contracts is not going to solve, like, the problem. Now, you know, a first thing you could even ask, let me just say as an aside, is there really effective competition? Like, okay, that's one issue, I think, here. But separately, even if there is competition, and, you know, we do see Microsoft trying to win these deals, does that absolve these deals? Is it the case that if we just have competition, whenever -- for any contracts that have any exclusionary effect, like, it's a get-out-of-jail-free card if you're, you know, if there's some competition for them? No. And, you know, by -- and I mean get out of economics jail, just to be really clear. But, you know -- and so if you bring up the next slide, there really are three points, you know.

And so here, Your Honor, in some sense.

We're at a point where $I$ want to try to explain and kind of go through how competition for exclusives works, and in particular, $I$ want to talk about two kinds of things that are represented in these three bullet points.

One, you know, a first question you might just ask is, why would a distributor and a manufacturer find it worthwhile to agree to a contract that harms competition? So that's kind of just a first, like, base level of question, like, you know, maybe it's -- that something that's -- you know, that's something that not obvious at first but $I$ think it's worth talking about.

And that has nothing to do per se with there being rivals who are trying to get, also get those contracts, but it's just, is there a reason why an agreement that harms competition could be valuable and, you know, an agreement that those two parties might reach.

The second thing is, suppose there is competition for these agreements. Does that solve the problem? Does it mean that, no, you know, the -- if rivals -- so I'm going to explain to you why, when you have -- why a distributor and a dominant firm can find it worthwhile to sign such a contract.

And the next question you might ask, is, well, if rivals can bid to prevent that from happening, why isn't that enough?

And so the next two points that we'll follow are me explaining why that isn't enough.

Q Okay. And if we could turn to Slide 26, Mr. Penado?

THE COURT: Counsel, why don't we actually take our break at this point. Sounds like you're -Professor Whinston is transitioning to a more robust discussion. So why don't we go ahead and just take a break. We will resume at 11:15.

And just the same instruction as before with respect to discussing your testimony during the breaks. Thank you.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. This Court stands in recess.
(Recess from 10:56 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.)

COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. This Honorable Court is again in session.

THE COURT: Please be seated. Thank you, everyone.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Okay.

Professor Whinston, let's turn to Slide 26 of your presentation, and your first bullet point here.

What did you mean by -- in this first bullet?

A Okay.

So, Your Honor, I think we're kind of about to do exclusive contracting 101 in these next three bullets.

So as I've described it to you, the first thing I want to talk about is this question of, like, why would a dominant firm and a distributor even find it worthwhile to sign such a contract?

And so kind of a starting point for that is to think about the -- and $I$ highlight it here, you know, how do we think about competition? And a key thing about competition is that it's what economists refer to as a public good. So, you know, what do we mean by a public good? A good example to keep in mind -- to have in mind here would be, like, climate change.

So climate change is something that affects all of us, all different countries, all different people, and in that sense, is something that is public, but we each contribute individually to it. And so different countries, for example, are all doing things that may affect and do affect how much climate change there is.

So competition is kind of like that, because the actions of individual agents in a market can affect how much competition there's going to be.

And so let's think about, again, not yet thinking about competition for these contracts but let's just think about a dominant firm and a distributor.

A distributor, what does the distributor care about? The distributor cares about its profits. So, you know, that can be affected by what's happening to its users, you know, because it wants to attract, of course, users to its device or its browser, whatever.

But there are two things, you know, that it certainly leaves out, that it doesn't care about. It doesn't care about consumers that are elsewhere out in the market, and it certainly doesn't care about advertisers, okay?

And so the decisions of a distributor, it, to some extent may internalize, what economists would say internalize or care about, just short econotalk for care about, the impacts on its users, but there's a bunch of things that matter for others in the marketplace that it will not take account of.

Now, let's think about the dominant firm. The dominant firm had a -- you know, what's its view about the extent of competition. Well, it actually likes it when there's less.

So the combination of a distributor who doesn't care enough about preserving competition, because it doesn't consider advertisers, because it doesn't consider other consumers that aren't its users and a dominant firm that actually would like to reduce competition, means that
there's room for a deal that harms competition.

THE COURT: Why do you say or why do you suggest that a distributor would not, for example, care about advertisers in the sense that we've heard -- I think we've heard -- distributors say that, you know, the user experience matters to them, and the user experience would also include advertising on whatever general search engine they selected?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

So it may care about the user experience. What I'm just saying is if the price of advertising goes up and advertisers are worse off, that's not something it cares about.

It does care about what the user experience is on its device or on its browser.

So...

THE COURT: But if they're getting a revenue share, maybe this is your point, don't they align their interests with the advertisers in a sense?

THE WITNESS: Actually, the opposite. The more the advertisers pay, the better.

THE COURT: Right.

THE WITNESS: So actually, they like it when prices go up to advertisers. They like it when there's less competition for the advertisers.

THE COURT: I see what you're saying. Okay. THE WITNESS: So those are the specifics.

But I think, you know, the key, you know, the kind of stepping back from the specifics of who's benefited and who's hurt, what's clear is that the distributor is not fully considering the social good, that competition benefits many, okay?

And, of course, the dominant firm likes it when there's less competition.

So this combination of interest means that there's room for a mutually beneficial deal that harms competition because nobody is taking account enough of competition.

Just like nobody -- you know, no country is sufficiently taking account of climate change, of what they do to the climate, and that's a real problem for public welfare.

So that's -- and, you know, another way, maybe a shorthand way to put this would be, the dominant firm who wants competition to be reduced will find it worthwhile to pay the distributor to reduce it, to agree to something that reduces it.

So that's just kind of the first bullet point to just sort of understand why the incentives are such in these kind of negotiations, that when you have a dominant firm, you can see anti-competitive deals being reached.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Have you seen evidence of a distributor trying to promote competition despite the fact that it's a public good?

A We have.
So it's kind of an interesting -- this was a slide that came up, I think it was actually in Professor Murphy's testimony in 27, Mozilla, when it -- actually, I guess it was the cross-examination, sorry -- but it was when he was on the stand -- was looking at -- you know, thinking about why it might go to Yahoo! rather than Google.

In the mission statement, a key thing was if you look on the left here, why go with Yahoo!, well, opportunity to level the playing field in search, okay?

So Mozilla wanted -- would like there to be more competition in search, and actually Mitchell Baker testified to this, I think, and that, yeah, if there was more competition, that would be good for us.

But, you know, one of the things you realize when you think about Mozilla is they're tiny, and they can't really change in a substantial way, you know, the scale of rivals. They can affect it somewhat. But they're just a small piece of the marketplace, like a small country dealing with climate change and they can't do it on their own. And so that kind of shows you what the -- in some sense is a
nice illustration of what the problem is with public goods and why this kind of is an example of it.

Q And Professor Murphy argues that Apple's size, in contrast to Mozilla, gives it an incentive to support competition. What do you make of that point?

A Well, I think it's true that Apple has more of an incentive to promote competition, or certainly an ability to affect competition than Mozilla does, because it's much bigger.

But Apple still only, you know, is half the market. And so this externality point, this public good point, is still there.

MR. SEVERT: Mr. Penado, let's turn to Slide 28. BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And your bullet here is, "How is a dominant firm able to use its monopoly profits to ensure it wins here"?

A Okay.
So, Your Honor, the next two bullets, we've talked about why two parties, a dominant firm and a distributor, could find it worthwhile to write an anti-competitive agreement, to reach an anti-competitive agreement.

Now $I$ want to turn to, you know, is it enough if we have competitor -- rivals able to compete for agreements, is that enough to prevent such agreements from happening, anti-competitive deals from happening. And $I$ want to -- the
next two bullet points kind of explain why not.

So the first bullet point is saying that, you know, when competition is for an exclusive contract, a dominant firm, it basically, that kind of competition advantages a dominant firm, because -- and how -- well, the dominant firm is able to use the monopoly profits it protects to make sure that it wins.

So, you know, if you think about, you know, imagine a -- you know, Google is competing against a rival for an exclusive contract and who's going to win. And let's even imagine that they're, you know, otherwise maybe the rival is pretty -- if the rival wins, it's going to gain some scale and bring competition to the market, okay?

So the thing about bringing competition to the market is, you lower profits for firms in the industry, like you bring more competition, you know, Google and everyone starts having -- trying to innovate more or lower their in-search services or lower their ad prices, overall profits in the market go down. That's just what competition does.

And the result of that is that the rival will have less incentive to bid than Google will have to -- you know, to bid. So let's take a really extreme example. Imagine that the rival would bring so much competition that profits are driven to zero. How much will the rival bid for that? Close to zero, because it's not -- if it brings competition,
there's not going to be any profit there. How much will Google bid to prevent that from happening? The difference between its monopoly profits and zero.

And so the difference in their willingness to pay that comes from the fact that one of them is protecting monopoly and the other is bringing competition is a very important difference. And that is one reason why a dominant firm -- you know, why competition from rivals, you know, can fail to prevent these deals. So the rival needs to be much better in order to win.

Q And, Professor, did you see evidence in the record consistent with the idea that a dominant firm can outbid rivals for exclusives?

A I did.

So if you bring up the next slide, Slide 29.

So this is just from the testimony of Mr. Nadella where -- you know, what is he saying. Well, you know, the dominant player in search is paying a lot of money to maintain that share position.

So it's really kind of reflecting this same kind of idea, that a dominant firm will find it worthwhile to pay to prevent competition from happening.

MR. SEVERT: Mr. Penado, if we could turn to Slide 30.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And this is turning to your third bullet here, your final bullet.

Why does competition for exclusives, when there is a dominant firm, advantage the dominant firm?

A Okay.
So the last bullet point, Your Honor, the last thing $I$ wanted to talk about, is how competition for -another way that competition for exclusives that a dominant firm is advantaged when competition takes the form of competition for exclusives.

And a secondary consequence of that which is that that competition -- because the dominant firm is advantaged, the competition for those contracts can be less intense. So it will be kind of a two part thing.

So why is competition for exclusives advantage the dominant firm? It's because competition for exclusives is all or nothing.

And if you think about a dominant firm, the document firm -- when competition is all or nothing, the dominant firm -- to beat the rival, the dominant firm kind of has to be better on average for all the different uses and consumers compared to the rival.

If a rival is good for just some part of traffic, you know take DuckDuckGo for privacy or something, it still
can't compete for something that is an all or nothing deal. And so, as a result, you know, if -- I should say, if instead it wasn't competition for exclusives, it was not all or nothing, then, you know, DuckDuckGo would be bringing competition because Google would have to beat in the thing that DuckDuckGo is best at, okay? And that difference, you know, can end up softening competition.

So actually -- I know you asked the other day -I think you brought up grocery store question, ketchup, maybe. There was something about ketchup.

And so -- and it was interesting to me because I think -- when Mr. Severt was asking about my qualifications, I talked about the -- this antitrust -- this book of antitrust lectures that $I$ wrote in 2006 and '7. One of them was on exclusive dealing.

And one of them -- and in that exclusive dealing chapter, by the way -- actually, it was written, I think, very much, hoping people like you would read it. And I know you're going to have a vacation coming up on Thanksgiving so it's a page turner.

Anyway, more seriously, it had an example which I think also kind of illustrates this idea.

So, you know, imagine that you have a -- the example was potato chips so I'll do potato chips and stick with it because that's what I'm used to.

But imagine that there's a dominant potato chip manufacturer and there's also a different potato chip that has -- is really good for one -- its manufacturer, but it doesn't have like the general, you know, attractiveness, but it is really good, say, at, you know, light potato chips or salt-free potato chips. Let's do salt-free potato chips.

And think about the difference if the dominant manufacturer wants to keep that smaller firm -- salt-free firm out of the grocery store think about two different situations. One where the dominant firm is just trying to buy shelf space, okay?

And the other, where it's -- you know, say it offers the grocery store, I'll pay you a certain amount for each foot of good shelf space, and the other where it's competing for an exclusive -- it says, no, a grocery store, I want to be -- I'm going to only offer you to be the exclusive potato chip in your store.

In the first case, it's hard -- it's much harder to keep the special, you know, the salt-free manufacturer out of the store, because like if there's some people who want that salt-free thing, you know, the grocery store is going to find some place on the shelf to it put.

In the case where it's all or nothing, it's -- you know, the salt-free manufacturers, they're going to lose. They're just not going to be able to compete against the
dominant potato chip manufacturer to be the one in the store.

And so, you know, that just kind of, $I$ guess in a different setting, kind of illustrates this idea of all or nothing.

And I think one of the things that's really telling, if you go back to Professor Murphy's testimony, is how many times he used the word "win."

Win is happening -- you know, the fact that it's win or lose is happening because it's exclusive contracts, it's all or nothing.

And if you're instead, say, and we'll talk about, you know, I talked about last time, competing, say, with unconditional revenue shares, which are kind of like bidding for shelf space, then it's not win or lose. Like it's how much is each going to get and what special -- and, you could imagine, you know, if there -- there might be a search engine like DuckDuckGo that's good for privacy and another search engine, maybe Microsoft is good in the U.S. on PCs and et cetera that there might be competition in this way that pressures Google and makes Google compete harder.

THE COURT: So how does your thinking about this marry up with the DuckDuckGo example on Apple or privacy mode? In other words, this is an example it seems to me of wanting to -- or DuckDuckGo attempting to compete in what
it's good at.

THE WITNESS: Right.

It's exactly that. It's just -- you know, if instead of Google saying, hey, it's, you know, our exclusive or no rev share -- you know, Google is offering a rev share for revenue that was coming -- whatever revenue Apple gave it out of its Safari default, and then DuckDuckGo, Apple would have a very different incentive for giving DuckDuckGo the privacy traffic. So that's the sense in which I think it marries up.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And I think you touched on the exclusive contracts can make competition less intense. How is that?

A Well, it follows from what $I$ just said in this example that if, when it's all or nothing, the dominant firm, Google, only, you know, has to basically be better on average, and it's way better on average than its rivals.

But if it's instead not all or nothing, now -- and a different way to put it, if Google wants to win all the default traffic the way it has it now, it has to beat the rivals and offer more in the thing that the rivals are good at and not just like on average. So the alternatives that it's competing against are, you know, the things the rivals are best at.

And so that can end up meaning that competition --
that the revenue share Google offers is higher when its unconditional revenue share is being offered than when it's competition for exclusives.

And there's actually an economic literature that formally models this, and it's exactly this kind of result. When you have a firm that -- an asymmetric situation where rivals are a dominant -- there's a dominant firm, competition for exclusives ends up -- you know, applying it to this setting, competition for exclusives results in lower revenue shares than when you have unconditional not all for nothing -- all for -- all or nothing competition.

Q And I think that's a good segue.

Mr. Penado, if you could put up Slide 31.

I want to now talk about the procompetitive justifications Professor Murphy presented.

And Professor Murray argued that the procompetitive benefits of Google's contracts outweigh any harm to competition. Do you agree with that?

A I don't.
Q And Professor Murphy suggested that if Google cannot enter into exclusive contracts, payments to distributors will go down. Do you agree with that?

A I don't.
Q And why do you say that -- I think you touched on this in the last question. Why do you say that payments
could be larger under less restrictive alternatives?

A Well, it's a combination of two things.

One, Your Honor, is -- and we talked about this last time -- that if there are less restrictive alternatives, rivals are likely to have a better chance to gain traffic and gain scale, and that's going to make them stronger competitors.

And having stronger competitors puts pressure, you know, even -- it doesn't just put pressure on Google to have higher quality for consumers, say, or for advertisers, but it also puts more pressure on Google in these negotiations over revenue share.

Like you saw in the Apple 2016 that Microsoft being in there, this, $I$ guess, you know, matters potentially for what Google has to pay.

And I think Mr. Nadella commented -- and it may have been other Microsoft businesses as well -- but like we've -- you know, done more for, you know, Apple than we've done for ourselves in some sense, like by raising what Google ended up -- what Google ended up having to pay.

So if rivals get stronger, actually that will tend to push revenue shares up.

But a second thing is what $I$ just talked about a moment ago, that if competition for these things is not all or nothing, that also can push revenue shares up.

Q And what are some examples of less restrictive alternatives under which there would be greater competition in today?

A So the two I talked about last time that I thought about -- and, again, Your Honor, just to remind you, like when I started thinking about but-for worlds and competitive effects, it was challenging because like exactly what Google would do, rolling back the clock, what would be legally permissible, what Google's counsel would find legally permissible.

So what I did is I focused on what I regarded as a couple of less restrictive alternatives.

One was Google using kind of -- what you might think of as most favored supplier contracts, where it shouldn't be treated worse than anyone else. That, you know, for example, could lead -- allow a choice screen -for a distributor to do a choice screen.

Another were unconditional revenue share payments. That was the other thing that $I$ talked about.

Q And what do you mean by an "unconditional revenue share payment"?

A So unconditional -- I know Professor Murphy commented, he wasn't sure exactly what I meant.

I mean, I think there actually are a range of things that it could be.

So one possibility is I offer -- you know, Google offers a distributor a revenue share for any traffic coming from the device.

Another possibility is it offers revenue share for any traffic coming from the search access point. So, for example -- sorry about that.

For example, to offer Apple -- like whenever we are -- whenever we are -- you put us as the default in Safari, maybe you put us for non-private search or whatever it is, whenever you make us the default, we'll share revenue with you.

Now, the thing about that, of course, is -- and this comes back to the point about defaults versus exclusives, Apple is perfectly free to, you know, make Google a default all the time then if it wants to. But isn't obligated to, it's not restricted by the exclusion -by the exclusivity term.

Q And Professor Murphy testified that Google wouldn't pay for any of these kinds arrangements. Do you agree with that?

A I don't.

Q Why not?
A Well, I think, you know, first of all, take the case of unconditional revenue share payments. I just said that what the literature actually seems to suggest and
indicate is that Google would pay more than it's paying now if it was unconditional. So that would be one thing to look at.

As well, you know, in a choice screen, you know, one -- if, like, this most favorite supplier contract, I think Professor Murphy was like, well, we know we're going to be in the choice screen anyway so we're not going to pay.

But if rivals are offering revenue share payments, say, suppose rivals are offering unconditional revenue share payments, it may be tempting for the distributor to make the rival, you know, have the default all the time and turn down the offer from Google, and that's going to make Google pay. So that, you know, that is why I say that.

Q Are unconditional revenue share payments used -revenue share agreements used in the real world?

A They are.

Q Can you give the Court an example?
MR. SCHMIDTLEIN: Objection, Your Honor.
This -- all this testimony, none of it was disclosed in his expert reports. The words "unconditional revenue share payments" did not appear in his first report, and he provides no examples of any real-world examples of unconditional revenue shares anywhere in his reports.

THE COURT: All right. I'll overrule the objection. I mean, Professor Murphy did spend some time
yesterday speaking about -- or it was the day before -about unconditional revenue share, and so I think this is an appropriate rebuttal testimony.

Go ahead.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Can you give the Court an example of an unconditional revenue share?

A Sure.

So, you know, the default change menu, for example, on a browser, like, it's just kind of what $I$ said, that you ought -- these -- a rival -- firms offer revenue share payments that say, you know, we're in that menu, and if put us in the -- if -- sorry -- if a consumer chooses to switch to us, we'll pay you revenue share then.

Another example would be the second -- you know, I described to you how there were different iterations of the choice screen in Europe. The second one, not the one that I looked at for the data that $I$ showed you, Google designed an auction for firms to be in the choice screen, and firms were bidding to be in the choice screen and paying Google. BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And going back --

THE COURT: Sorry, what does that mean, to be in the choice screen?

THE WITNESS: So consumers -- the second version
of the choice screen, consumers were faced with a choice of search providers. Once a quarter, the firm -- search engines would -- and it had to be general search engines like I described to you -- would say how much they were willing to pay for each time they were chosen by a consumer.

And so the one -- base -- it was constructed, kind of like the ad auction, as a second price -- as a generalized second-price auction, you know, there were five slots, just like there are ad slots on a SERP, on a search-results page, there were a certain number of slots in this chose screen menu for consumers, and so advertisers -advertisers, sorry -- general search engines would bid --

THE COURT: To be -- as to where they would be ranked?

THE WITNESS: Well, what they --
THE COURT: Well, not ranked, but placed, I should say.

THE WITNESS: I'm just trying to think back to what I remember about it.

So I don't -- I think -- so there's two issues. One is, they would bid to be in and the highest bidder would pay, you know, the amount that would be better than the second highest bidder; second highest bidder, the amount, the third.

So they were paying, and each time a consumer
chose them, they would pay that amount, just like each time a consumer clicks on an ad, the advertiser pays.

The one thing I'm not 100 percent sure of is whether the order in the choice screen was determined by how much you paid --

THE COURT: I'm trying to --
THE WITNESS: -- or whether it was randomized.

And I'm not sure about that, to be honest. I know I knew it, I just don't remember it sitting here now.

THE COURT: Because I'm just trying to understand why -- what the bidding is for.

THE WITNESS: The bidding is to be in it, as opposed to not be in it.

Now, what $I$ can't remember is, is it also the case that you might be bidding higher so you would be in a higher position on the list, and I'm just not remembering that. BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Just outside of the search context, are unconditional revenue shares used?

A Sure.

I mean, unconditional revenue share payments are used all the time. You know, Your Honor, like contingency fees for lawyers. Like, what a party in a lawsuit cares about, say, maybe it's a negligence case or something, is what recovery -- how many dollars are they going to get in
recovery. And they pay the lawyer a share of that in a contingency fee.

And, you know, the thing -- you know, what they're doing is paying for the thing they care about, right?

Just like in a revenue share, in an unconditional revenue share payment, what you're paying for is revenue. You're paying a share of revenue, and revenue is what you care about when you're a search engine, like...

So it's very analogous in that sense.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q All right, Professor Whinston, just going back to what will happen under lesser alternatives. Let's just now assume, as Professor Murphy argues, that payments of distributors would fall?

THE COURT: I'm sorry, what?

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q That payments of distributors would go down?
A We're assuming that.
Q Just assume that's --

A Contrary to what $I$ said but, yes, okay, I got it.
Q Did Professor Murphy present any reliable evidence that this would harm consumers by leading to more expensive devices because of passthrough?

A I see.

So you're asking me about passthrough issues.

So, you know, Professor Murphy testified that revenue share payments end up getting, you know, are passed through to consumers in the form of lower prices on devices or maybe higher quality devices or the like.

You know, the evidence that he pointed to, I think, was not reliable. You know, he showed you something about margins and talked about margins in Apple and prices over time.

In my reports, I talk about a bunch of problems with that, but, you know, I think a bottom line of this is like Professor Murphy himself sat here saying, well, it could just be a coincidence, like that was the whole coincidence discussion.

So, you know, I don't think there's any reliable evidence that he pointed to.

Q And is there any evidence that you have identified where Google has looked at that, what has Google looked at?

A So if you bring up Slide 32.
So, Your Honor, this is a slide I showed you previously when $I$ was talking about the profitability of Google's contracts, how much profit it was earning in these contracts, and in particular, this is about its projections of the profitability in its contract with Apple, and as I said, this is the same slide.

But I'm bringing it back up because, in this
slide, you know, Google is making, as I talked about previously, you know, very detailed calculations about what the profits are that it sees -- the incremental profits are, the benefits of this deal are to it.

But in addition, it's not only -- it's doing that first, looking at what are profit -- its profits would be under the current revenue share level in the deal. That's under the heading that says "Current Economics," okay, and you can see what the revenue share was then.

But it's also doing it just below that in the revenue share that Apple was asking for, which was quite a bit higher, okay.

All the numbers -- you know, it's impossible, of course, from this slide, to go see the numbers, but the bottom line is, if you went and you looked at these detailed numbers, nowhere in this is Google thinking or modeling, oh, if we -- you pay this higher revenue share, Apple is going to sell more phones, and that's going to have impacts on our profits.

So, like, when it -- and this was true whenever I've seen these kind of deal evaluations looking at revenue shares. It thinks about what the revenue is -- the total revenue generated in the deal is and it -- changing the revenue share changes how that's split up between the partner, the distributor, and Google. But it's not
saying -- there's nothing in these documents saying, well, the benefit of paying a higher revenue share is they'll be, you know, consumers will have lower prices and they'll be more phones purchased or anything like that.

Q Professor, I'd like to now turn to some of Professor Murphy's arguments about the Android agreement specifically, and $I$ think those are listed on Slide 33. Starting with the first one, Google -- or Professor Murphy argues that Google's Android agreements promote competition between Android and iOS. What effects do Google's contracts have on its incentives to push Android?

A So, Your Honor, this came up, I think, briefly the last time I was here. I can't remember whether it was you or someone else who asked me a question. But my response was, at the time, that it's complex, like, exactly the -how these deals affect Google's incentives to promote Android.

And in particular, the deal that it has with Apple, where it's making money when an Apple phone -- when an Apple phone is sold to a consumer, Google, because of the arrangements that it has, being the exclusive default, makes money on the searches that come from that phone, and that actually undermines the incentives Google has to promote Android.

So, like, a really good way to think about this, I think, it just makes it really clear, is, imagine Apple enters into search, serving all the search results for Apple consumers, for Apple users so that Google no longer is making money or making much less money on Apple, searches from Apple users. It's clear then, you know, that Google's incentives to push Android phones to really make consumers buy Android phones would go way up. So you can kind of -you know, because that's how they would -- they'd be making much, much more on Android phones in that case compared to iOS, you know, Apple phones.

So that's kind of what $I$ meant last time when $I$ said it's complex.

Q And can you give the Court an example of how that might work?

THE COURT: I'm sorry, what was the question? BY MR. SEVERT:

Q Sorry, do you have an example of how that might work?

A How that might work.
Q Sorry, I'll withdraw.
Professor Murphy's second point is that the contracts ensure a consistent out-of-the-box Android experience. What's your response to that?

A My response to that is twofold.

One, you know, Mr. Pichai, when he -- you know, he was asked, are there significant incentives for distributors to give a really good experience on Android, you know, whether it's consistency or security updates or the like, the answer was, yes, yes, they do.

I guess the second thing I'd say is, like if it's really about consistency, like another way to have consistency is to always have a choice screen, that's very consistent. So it's not -- you know, I don't see the link between exclusivity and consistency.

Q And turning to the third claim, the MADA barter. What's your response to Professor Murphy's MADA barter benefit?

A So, you know, Professor Murphy, you know, says that because Google is offering the -- essentially, the Play Store for free, as well as other GMS apps, that allows distributors to have low priced Android phones, okay?

And here my response is kind of, you know, more about that there are less restrictive alternatives that could accomplish the same thing.

And so, for example, if Google was charging, you know -- wasn't bundling -- you know, wasn't essentially bundling or paying for the widget and the placement restrictions but instead just licensed GMS, it could offer lower license fees for low priced phones, and, you know,
that could make the license fee conditional on the features of the phone.

And, actually, if you look in Europe, Google was free to decide -- you know, when they unbundled, Google was free, Your Honor, to set the prices as it wanted, you know, in the way that it wanted. And what it did is it offered licenses that were, you know, dependent on what country you were in and also dependent on the features of the phone which correlated with what the phone prices were.

Q And then, Professor, in your opinion, while we're talking about the MADA, what makes the MADA anti-competitive?

A So what makes the MADA anti-competitive or at least the focus here is on the restrictions, on the placement restrictions, that basically -- you know, that Google is effectively paying for, you know, placement of the widget.

And it's doing it by giving away the Play Store for free. And the Play Store is so valuable that it's just must have. So no one is going -- no one can have a commercially viable Android phone without the Play Store, and, thus, no one can effectively get around having -agreeing to these placement restrictions.

It's not -- you know, a separate issue is like does the bundling matter in some other way, that would be a
tying claim. That's not, at least, my understanding of what the government's argument -- claim is in the case.

Q Okay.

Professor Whinston, if we could turn to Slide 34, turn to our last topic today of investment incentives.

Do you recall hearing Professor Murphy testify that the challenged agreements do not hinder rivals' ability or incentives to invest?

A I do.

Q And do you agree with that?

A I don't.

Q And why not?

A So, you know, the challenged agreements, as I said last time $I$ was here, have two kinds of effects on incentives to invest. One is on rival -- on the costs of improving quality, and the other side of this is on the benefits.

And, you know, as I said last time, you know, basic economic model of investment is we're going to look at benefits -- you know, benefit cost analysis. So with higher costs and low -- you know, lower benefits, it's less attractive to invest.

Q And Professor Murphy testified that Google's agreements neither raise investment costs nor lower investment benefits. Why do you think that's wrong?

A So on the cost side -- now, frankly, I just -I don't know how to put -- I didn't understand --

Q Sure.

A -- follow.

No. I understood your question.

I didn't understand what Professor Murphy's -- it didn't make sense to me.

You know, I think there's lots of evidence about how denying rivals' scale ends up making rivals unable to, for example, do experiments that help rivals improve their quality. And so those things make it more difficult to improve quality, or, in economist language, raise the costs of quality investment.

Q What about the benefits of investment?

A So the benefits of investment really are the point about foreclosure, right, that when we talked about foreclosure last time and the foreclosure measure, what these contracts do is they end up locking up traffic. And so if a rival improves its quality, it doesn't, you know -a bunch of the traffic is tied up by Google's agreements.

And so that directly lowers the traffic that rivals can get by getting better, and, in turn, ends up lowering their investment incentives.

Q And Professor Murphy points to the results of the European choice screen to say there's hardly any effect on

Google's -- of Google's exclusive defaults. Why is that wrong?

A Well, the funny thing -- you know -- I don't know funny, sorry, may be the wrong word.

The thing about the choice screen is it's actually exactly showing you this point, that the -- you know, the difference between a rival -- when a rival improves -- has high quality, what does it get when there's a choice screen versus what does it get when it faces Google's contracts, Google's defaults.

And so what we saw in the choice screen, okay, Google is much stronger than its rivals. It gets -- in the choice screen, it got 90 percent of the choices -- or I should say more in Europe, but then adjusted for the U.S. with my regression analysis.

And it's not surprising. Like, if you're a much -- if you have really high quality and your rivals don't, what do we expect consumers to do? Choose the high quality firm.

But with the defaults in place, the foreclosure analysis is saying to you, like, no, if the Google has these agreements in place and a rival is foreseeing becoming much higher quality, it's not going to get the same kind of traffic, and that's going to -- when a rival thinks about is it worthwhile investing, the answer is going to be, well,
it's much less worthwhile investing when I'm facing these defaults.

Q And is your claim about a large effect of benefits from investment just a prediction you're making based on economic theory?

A No.

I mean, it comes directly from market evidence -from, you know, the market evidence.

So one piece of it that $I$ just talked about is coming from the foreclosure analysis, that's what happens if the contracts are in place.

The other piece of it is evidence from the choice screen.

And, yeah -- I mean, which is completely intuitive if you are good and consumers have the option of choosing you, they will.

Q And I think -- and you talked a bit about European choice screen and how it can sort of hide the effects of Google's contracts with weak rivals.

Does this matter for one how -- for how one might view the contracts' competitive effects?

A It does.

So, Your Honor, last time when $I$ was here, I talked about how if you have a situation with a dominant firm that's very strong and rivals that are weak, you know,
and you compare a choice screen to the current situation -you know, situation with defaults, you may not see much effect, that it hides the power of defaults because the rivals are weak and no one wants to choose them in a choice screen or few people do, okay?

But, you know, that's hiding -- you know, when you think about the competitive effects analysis, to just look at that, which is what Professor Murphy kind of keeps wanting you to do, is ignoring this whole point that it affects the likelihood of rivals gaining higher quality, of them investing and gaining higher quality.

And so one way to kind of put it is it ignores the fact that a significant part of the reason why -- you know, Professor Murphy kept talking about the world as it is. A significant part of the reason why the world is as it is, is the contracts.

And so, you know, that's, I think, a really key thing for thinking about what's going on here.

THE COURT: So could you just explain one more time your view of why the relationship between the choice screen and investment incentives, I'm not sure $I$ followed.

THE WITNESS: Sure, I'd be happy to.
So, you know, if you're thinking about a but-for world, for example, and, you know, Professor Murphy, for example, talked a lot about -- he looks at the choice
screen, okay. But he looks at the choice screen in a very different way than $I$ do, okay.

For me, what I'm trying to do is I'm thinking about, well, if a rival is thinking about investing and getting stronger, what are its incentives when Google has these defaults compared to a world where Google -- it's a level playing field.

And we'll call the choice screen a level playing field, okay?

So what the foreclosure analysis said was -- well, let's start on the other side.

What the choice screen tells us is weak rivals in a choice screen who aren't very good don't get very much choice, not many people choose them. Some do, for whatever -- some people may not like Google for various reasons. But not, surprisingly, if the rivals are not very good, not many people choose them.

And Google, who's very -- who's much stronger, gets the vast majority, over 90 percent, of the choices.

But if you think now let's compare that to a situation where Google has defaults. And what the foreclose -- and so in the current situation where the rivals are weak, think about covered queries, they're not getting any of them, right?

What the foreclosure analysis told you is that out
of the 50 percent of covered queries, if a rival, you know, unimaginably, implausibly -- I'm sorry to use the Super Duck term -- but like became -- is much better than Google as Google got better -- is now with the rivals, it would get 17 percent of the 50 percent of covered queries, or -sorry. I didn't say that right. 17 percent of U.S. queries out of 50 percent that are covered, so a third of them. So if you think about it, with the contracts in place, this rival who thought about investing would say to itself, I'm going to get a third of the covered queries. With the contract not in place, with a choice screen, the rival would say I'm going to get more than 90 percent of those queries if $I$ get that much better.

And so that's what $I$ mean when I'm thinking -like, I'm comparing those two situations and thinking, what's the implication for a firm that maybe is weak now when it thinks about the benefits that it would get through gaining traffic.

THE COURT: So is the bottom line point you're making is that with a choice screen, a weaker rival has more incentive to invest?

THE WITNESS: Correct. THE COURT: To gain greater market share? THE WITNESS: Correct.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And how, Professor, does the Go Big in Europe fit with your analysis of incentives in a choice screen world?

A So, you know, Go Big in Europe is a situation -I guess, it's focused on Google's incentives.

And, you know, so a second piece of this, Your Honor, that $I$ talked about last time is not just what rivals' incentives are but also how does having a more even playing field, having stronger rivals, having more competition, more competitive threat for Google effect its incentives.

We've seen, you know, in Go Big in Europe, the rivals, you know, Google responded by investing more -- by giving higher quality to consumers. It did the same, of course, when -- as I testified before, with Bing as well, when Bing was introduced.

Q Professor Murphy also argued that your opinions on incentive -- investments incentives are flawed because Microsoft did not invest when it had easier access distribution. What did you make of that testimony?

A Well, Microsoft definitely did invest. I mean, it had this -- they tried to buy Yahoo! for many billions of dollars in the late 2000 s, which it didn't -- it ended up not being able to do. It invested in developing Bing.

You know, Microsoft -- Bing lost billions -- you
know, billions and billions of dollars. I talk about this in my report. It only became profitable in 2015 on a yearly basis, after losing tons and tons of money before.

So it's not that Microsoft didn't invest. Whether it was successful so far is a different question.

MR. SEVERT: Mr. Penado, if you could please put up Slide 35.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And Professor Murphy used -- Slide 35 relates to the Microsoft Yahoo! deal that you've talked about and Professor Murphy also talked about.

Professor Murphy used this slide to suggest that the Yahoo! deal from Microsoft did not lead to a material improvement in Bing's quality. Do you agree with that?

A No.

Q And why not?

A Well, I think as was brought out in cross-examination, this slide is talking about the gap between Google and Bing, you know, the difference in their quality scores, not Bing's quality score.

And, Your Honor, we know, you know, given the evidence that I talked about last time, that during this time period, Google was feeling threatened by Bing, and, you know, responded by pouring resources into trying to get better and into quality improvements and, you know,
precision improvements.

And so you know, in fact, in my rebuttal --

I think it was rebuttal, but one of my two reports -- if you bring up the next slide.

Q I think it's your reply report.
A Okay. Sorry.
In my reply report.
This is just a graph from -- in 20 -- over a period from February 2011 to October of 2012 of what was happening to Bing's precision score as measured by Google.

And so you can see it. I mean, it is going up.
Now, the gap, Google is also, you know,
responding -- and, you know, starting to -- in this period, starting to improve its quality as well. And so the gap -at this point, the gap didn't narrow.

Q So we've been talking about what Microsoft did in the past. Now I want to just talk about what Microsoft is doing today.

Have you seen any evidence about investments Microsoft is or is willing to make today?

A Well, what -- I mean, I guess in the testimony I saw, that -- you know, I think the bottom line is Microsoft is willing to invest when it has distribution, that it is -when it -- in PCs, it does and is willing to invest. And I think what Mr. Nadella testified to is that Microsoft is
very willing to invest but not when it can't get traffic. And so in mobile, that's kind of a big problem right now.

MR. SEVERT: And, Mr. Penado, if you could turn to Slide 37.

BY MR. SEVERT:

Q And at the beginning of his presentation to the Court, this was his fourth slide, Professor Murphy identified two high level questions that we put here on your Slide 37.

Do you agree that these are two big questions in this case?

A Yeah, I mean, the questions are very high level.
It's hard to -- it's hard to have a qualm with these two questions.

Like, yes, we want to know whether challenged agreements harm competition.

And second, we want to know whether there are any pro-competitive efficiencies.

Q And do you agree with the answers Professor Murphy provided in his testimony?

A No. I mean, my answers to these questions are very, very different than Professor Murphy's.

So, you know, when $I$ look at the evidence in this case, the -- you know, the documents, the data, how this
market works, I see, you know, that, $A$, you know, defaults are really, really important in this market first.

Second, that, you know -- and I should say as well, looking at all that information and applying the relevant economic principles to it.

So if $I$ look at that, $I$ see that defaults are really, really important.

B, that competitive -- you know, the fact that there might be competition in some cases for these exclusive contracts does not solve the problem and that the claimed pro-competitive effects, I either don't see convincing evidence of or think that there are less restrictive alternatives that could achieve them.

MR. SEVERT: Your Honor, at this time, I move to admit UPXD106 to complete Professor Whinston's testimony.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll admit it.
(Plaintiffs' Exhibit UPXD106 received into evidence.)
MR. SEVERT: Pass the witness.

THE COURT: Okay. Why don't we, instead of starting the cross, why don't we just go ahead and break for lunch now. So we will resume at 1:15. See everybody then.

COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. This Court stands in recess.
(Recess from 12:13 p.m. to 1:15 p.m.)
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| 10516/17 10516/2 | $\begin{aligned} & 19[1] 10497 / 20 \\ & 1908[1] \quad 10457 / 13 \\ & 1909[1] \quad 10457 / 13 \\ & 1: 15[2] \quad 10553 / 21 \\ & 10553 / 24 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| 10517/1 10525/22 |  | 42 [1] 10446/7 434-5000 [1] 10448/4 450 [1] 10447/7 48 percent [1] 10494/3 | according [1] <br> 10486/11 | 10484/6 10484/20 |
| 10531/24 10532/23 |  |  |  | 10486/6 10487/8 10487/10 10488/9 10488/9 10490/22 |
| 105 |  |  | ```account [4] 10462/6 10515/16 10517/12 10517/14 achieve [1] 10553/13 acronym [1] 10501/10 across [2] 10466/21 10466/23 Action [1] 10450/7 actions [1] 10514/21 actual [2] 10508/22``` |  |
| 10534/10 |  | 5 |  |  |
| 10535/15 10539/16 | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 5 \text { percent [1] 10495/4 } \\ & 50 \text { [2] 10507/6 10507/6 } \\ & 50 \text { percent [4] } \\ & 10506 / 1510548 / 1 \\ & 10548 / 51054887 \\ & 5000 \text { [1] 10448/4 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 10546/19 10548/19 | 20 [6] 10466/13 <br> 10474/20 10493/2 <br> 10504/21 10505/16 <br> 10551/8 <br> 20 percent [2] <br> 10496/24 10497/9 |  |  |  |
| 10548/23 10553/16 |  |  |  |  |
| 10553/19 |  |  |  |  |
| THE WITNESS: [29] 10454/1 10454/4 10454/14 10455/2 |  |  |  | advantaged [2] $10522 / 10 \text { 10522/13 }$ |
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| A | 10501/9 | basis [1] 10550/3 | /15 | benefits [11] 10517/6 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| as... [71] 10459/19 | attract [1] 10515/4 | NA [2] 10501/9 | 10480/7 10480/21 | $05271710537 / 4$ |
| 10462/21 10462/22 | attractive [1] 10542/22 | 10502/3 | 10482/2 10483/6 | 17 10542/2 |
| 10467/25 10469/7 | attractiveness [1] | be [103] 10 | 10484/20 10486/1 | 2/21 10542/2 |
| 10469/15 10469/18 | 10524/4 | 10452/9 10453/9 | 10486/22 10488/13 | 43/14 10543/15 |
| 10469/23 10470/4 | auction [8] 1045 | 10455/4 10459/18 | 10490/4 10494/15 | /3 10548/17 |
| 10470/22 10470/23 | 10476/16 10478/10 | 10462/19 10463/1 | 98 | 0501/10 |
| 10472/7 10473/2 | 10478/18 | 10 | 10500/8 10501/20 |  |
| 10473/21 10473/22 | 532/19 10533/7 | 10466/14 10467/6 | 503/14 | er [14] 10479/1 |
| 10475/19 10478/22 | 10533/8 | 10470/5 10470/15 | 0504/13 | 83/11 10516/21 |
| 10481/11 10481/11 | audience [4] 1048 | 2 10471/22 | /8 10514/20 | 21/10 10522/22 |
| 10484/25 10485/4 | 86/5 10487/3 | 472/16 10473/5 | 15/4 10515/22 | 526/16 10526/17 |
| 10485/23 10485/24 | 13 | 10474/18 10474/19 | 10515/23 10517/1 | 0528/5 10533/22 |
| 10486/2 10487/6 | audiences [2] | 10476/2 10478/15 | 10519/8 10520/5 | 0543/22 10548/3 |
| 10487/21 10488/16 | 10485/17 10488/11 | 10479/1 10479/18 | 10520/25 10522/13 | 0548/4 10548/13 |
| 10489/12 10493/11 | August [1] 10493/1 | 10480/20 10480/25 | 10522/17 10523/5 | 0550/25 |
| 10497/23 10500/14 | available [2] 10453/9 | 10482/9 10483/5 | 10523/11 10523/2 | between [11] 1046 |
| 10503/13 10503/23 | 10509/24 | 10484/10 10485/15 | 10524/20 10525/10 | 10484/11 10484/12 |
| 10503/23 10505/24 | Avenue [2] 10448/3 | 10487/1 10487/24 | 10529/7 1053 | 10497/11 10521/3 |
| 10506/21 10507/4 | 10448/8 | /18 | 105 | 10537/24 10538/10 |
| 10507/15 10508/14 | average [4] | 10495/5 10495/20 | 10 | 10540/10 10544/7 |
| 10509/19 10511/13 | 10526/17 10526 | 10495/23 10495/25 | 10540/15 10546/3 | 10546/20 10550/19 |
| 10513/10 10514/3 | 10526/22 | 10500/9 10500/19 | 10549/18 | bid [7] 10512/24 |
| 514/10 10523/2 | away [8] 10463/19 | 10504/13 10504/14 | bec | 0520/22 |
| 10528/17 10529/11 |  | 10507/21 10508/6 |  | 10520/24 |
| 10529/14 10530/8 |  |  |  |  |
| 10531/4 10533/7 | 10504/14 10509/2 | 10509/2 $10510 / 2$ | 10455/1 10458/4 | bidder [3] 10533/21 |
| 10533/7 10533/13 |  | 10 | $10467 / 7$ 10478/8 |  |
| 12 10535/13 | B | 10514/13 10514/2 | 10484/24 10488/1 | 10534/1 |
| 10536/23 10537/1 | B-A-T-N-A | 10515/3 10517/18 | 10495/10 10528/17 | 10534/12 10534/1 |
| 540 | 10501/10 | 10517/19 10518/1 | 10551/16 | big [15] 1045 |
| 10542/13 | back [16] 10451/7 | 10518/18 10521/1 | before [19] 10446 | 4559/22 10459/23 |
| 10542/18 10546/14 | 10457/12 10460/11 | 10521/9 10522/14 | 10458/22 10469/7 | 10464/12 10471/12 |
| 10548/3 | 10476/5 10484/23 | 10522/15 10522/22 | 10470/8 10470/20 | 10471/17 10472/4 |
| 549/15 10549/15 | 10489/13 10492/14 | 10523/4 10524/16 | 10476/24 10490/2 | 10500/19 10505/9 |
| 5551/14 10553/3 | 10505/22 10517/4 | 10524/16 10524/25 | 10492/16 10493/10 | 10 10549/2 |
|  | 0525/7 10529/8 | 10525/1 10525/17 | 10493/11 10493/12 | 10549/4 10549/12 |
| 10490/8 10494/8 | 0530/13 10532/22 | 10525/20 10526/1 | /16 | 10552/2 10552/11 |
| 10498/24 10511/13 | 0533/18 10535/1 | 10528/1 10529/2 | 9/2 | bigger [3] 10475/4 |
| ask [8] 10453/23 | 36/25 | 10529/8 10529/1 | 105 | 0497/19 105 |
| 10470/8 10476/25 | background [1] | 529/25 10531/ | 10549/15 10550 | lions [10] 1049 |
| 10488/7 10503/10 | 10467/2 | 10531/7 10531 | begin [2] 10471/23 | 0499/1 10499/1 |
| 10511/12 10512/5 | kstop [1] 10469/16 | 532/15 10532/19 | 10473/7 | 10500/15 105066 |
| 10512/23 | backstops [1] | 10532/20 10532 | beginning [3] | 06/8 10549/2 |
| asked [5] 10451/25 |  | 10533/3 10533/1 | 10463/25 10496 | 5105 |
| 10461/23 10523/8 |  | 1053 | behalf [2] 10 | 10550/1 |
| 0538/15 10540/2 | Baker [1] 10518/16 band [1] 10489/24 | $\begin{aligned} & 10533 / 2210534 / 8 \\ & 10534 / 1210534 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | behalf [2] 10450 $10450 / 11$ | Bing [13] 10456/7 10470/2 10482/22 |
| asking [5] 10472/24 | bargaining [9] | 10534/15 10534/1 | behave [1] 10469/16 | 10488/9 10488/12 |
| 10509/11 10523/12 | 10462/13 10462/22 | 10536/12 10537/6 | behavior [1] 10460/18 | 10488/12 10488/18 |
| 10535/25 10537/11 aspect [4] 10452/20 | 10463/14 10463/15 | 10538/2 10538/3 | being [11] 10458/9 | 10549/15 10549/16 |
| aspect [4] 10452/20 <br> 10452/20 10488/6 | 10501/13 10501/14 | 10539/9 10541/25 | 10460/4 10465/15 | 10549/24 10549/2 |
|  | 10501/20 10501/21 | 10544/4 10544/25 | 10479/3 10482/12 | 10550/19 10550/23 |
|  | 10502/7 | 10546/22 10553/9 | 10512/12 10517/25 | Bing's [3] 10550/14 |
| assessment <br> 10496/17 | Barrett [1] | beat [3] 10522/21 | 10527/2 10528/14 | 10550/20 10551/10 |
| assume [2] 10535/13 | barter [2] 10540/11 | 10523/5 10526/20 | 10538/22 10549/2 | bit [5] 10482/5 1049 |
| 10535/19 | 40/12 | became [2] 10548 | believe [3] 10459/3 | 506/21 10537/1 |
| assuming [1] 10535/18 | base [3] 1 | 10550/2 | 10505/14 10505/17 | 10545/17 |
| ymmetric [1] |  | because [62] 10453/9 | below [2] 10476/1 | ack [1] 10492/18 |
| 27/6 |  |  | 10537/10 | [1] 10523/14 |
| asymptotes |  |  | BENCH [1] 10 | books [1] |
| 0482/6 | basic [1] 10542/19 | 10463/13 1046 | ${ }^{\text {beneficial }}$ benefit [4] 10474 | Boston [3] 10486/14 |
| RR [1] 10447/6 | basically [7] 10461/5 | 10464/24 10465 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { benetit [4] } \\ & 10538 / 210540 / 4 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | both [12] 10458/11 |
| attempting [1] | 10470/25 10476/19 | 66/15 10466 | 10542/20 | 464/17 10468/25 |
|  | 10493/2 10520/4 | 10466/18 10472/25 | benefited [1] 10517/ | 10469/1 10472/16 |
| $10485 / 1410501 / 2$ | 10526/16 10541/15 | 10473/7 10473/11 | benefiting [1] 10478/9 | 10472/23 10473/1 |


| B | 10462/15 10467/2 | 10517/25 10518/22 | certify [1] 10554/2 | chose [2] 10533/11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| both... [5] 10491/5 | 10543/20 | 10 | [3] |  |
| 10491/5 10491/20 | 10543/20 | 10522/14 10523/7 | 10493/1 10525/20 CH [1] 10448/8 | [1] 10533/5 |
| 10497/13 10501/5 | bundle [4] 10465/ $10465 / 20 \quad 10465 / 20$ | 10526/13 10526/2 | CH [1] 10448/8 chain [1] 10460/8 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ome }[1] ~ 10469 / 2 \\ & \text { nk }[1] ~ \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| bottom [8] 10457/4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10465/20 10465/20 } \\ & 10471 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10528/25 10531/17 } \\ & 10532 / 6 \text { 10537/9 } \end{aligned}$ | chain [1] 10460/8 <br> challenged [3] 10542/7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { nk [1] } 10475 / 5 \\ & \text { le [7] } 10482 / 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| 10457/20 10478/24 | bundling [4] 10 | 10539/8 10539/14 | 10542/13 10552/16 | 10482/17 10482/20 |
| 10494/12 10536/10 | 10540/22 10540/23 | 10541/20 10541/22 | challenging [ | 10483/10 10483/15 |
| 10537/15 10548/19 | 10541/25 | 10543/22 10545/1 | 10529/7 | 10483/17 10484/3 |
| 51/22 | bus | 105 | chance [2] 10482/3 | [1] 10459/17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { bound [2] } \\ & 10507 / 13 \end{aligned}$ | 10466/6 104 | Ca | 10528/5 | es [2] 10486/6 |
| box [1] 10539/23 | 10499/2 10499/2 | can't [10] 10460 | change [16] 10460 | 10488/16 |
| boycott [15] 10488/2 | 10501/8 10502/2 | 10473/3 10477/1 | 10460/13 10460/15 | citing [1] 10459/9 |
| 10488/25 10489/6 | 10507/4 10508/1 | 10486/12 10518/20 | 460/17 10477/2 | City [4] 10486/7 |
| 10489/12 10490/12 | businesses [1] | 10518/24 10523/1 | 10481/24 10497/1 | 86/9 10486/ |
| 10490/15 10490/20 | 10528/17 | 10534/14 10538/1 | 10504/23 10507/ | 0486/22 |
| 10490/23 10491/18 | [3] 10524/11 | 10552/1 | 10514/13 10514/14 | Civil [1] 10450/7 |
| 10492/6 10492/7 | buying [1] | cannot [1] $10527 / 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10514/19 10517// } \\ & 10518 / 21 \text { 10518/2 } \end{aligned}$ | claim [6] 10465/1 10465/6 10540/11 |
| 10492/19 10493/12 |  | 10473/21 10473/2 | 10532/9 | 10542/1 10542/2 |
| 493/13 10494/22 | C | 10477/1 | changes [8] 1047 | 10545/3 |
| boycotts [1] 10492/8 | cal |  | 478/18 10479/1 | claimed [2] 10464/23 |
| break [5] 10481/24 10498/22 10513/6 | 10 | captured [1] 10507/12 | 10480/1 10482/12 | 10553/10 |
| $10513 / 8 \text { 10553/20 }$ | call [1] 1054 | capturing [2] 10482/10 | 10492/3 10494/4 | classic [3] 10452 |
| ing [1] 10476/ | called [3] 10465/1 | 10482/11 | 10537/24 | 10454/9 10454/19 |
| [1] | 10476/4 10502/15 | card [1] | changing [1] 10537/23 | clawback [1] 10463/ |
| briefly [2] 10484/4 | calling [1] 10476/7 | care [15] | chapter [1] 10523 | clear [14] 10456/1 |
| 10538/13 | calls [2] 10450/19 | 10486/16 10488/17 | characteristic [2] | 10459 |
| bring [16] 10457/3 | 10457/18 | 10515/1 10515/7 | 10465/14 10465/1 | 3/4 |
| 10461/16 10461/19 | came [8] 10464/18 | 10515/8 10515/9 | charge [2] 10455/8 | 486/25 10497/1 |
| 10463/2 10475 | 466/21 10466/23 | 10515/13 10515/13 | 10455/14 | 10498/11 10500/4 |
| 10476/11 10479 | 10502/19 10503/9 | 10515/22 10516/3 | charging [2] 10454/2 | 502/12 10511/2 |
| 10480/23 10505/1 | 10506/24 | 10516/10 10516/1 | 10540/21 | 517/5 10539/2 |
| 10511/23 10520/13 |  | 10535/8 | rt [3] 104 |  |
| 10520/16 10520/23 | 10453/11 10453/11 |  |  |  |
| 10521/15 10536/18 | 10453/18 10454/21 | 10509/2 | chase [1] 10491/16 |  |
| 10551/4 | 10455/4 10455/7 | cares [3] 1051 | Chatbot [1] 10456/8 | 0486/10 10486/17 |
| bringing [4] 10520/1 | 10455/8 10455/10 | 10516/12 10534/23 | chip [4] 10524/1 | 10486/21 |
| 21/6 1052 | 10456/9 10457/13 | Carr [1] 10447/ | 10524/2 10524/1 | click [1] 10478/7 |
| [1] | 10458/11 10458 | case [28] 10454/23 | 525/ | hrough [1] |
| ings [1] 10520 | 10461/21 10462/21 | 10457/9 10457/17 | chips [5] 10523/24 | 0478/7 |
| ay | 10465/3 10466/16 | 10457/20 10463/21 | 10523/24 10524/5 | cks [4] 10475/2 |
|  | 10469/11 10470/8 | 10464/9 10466/1 | 10524/6 10524 | 0475/22 10475/25 |
| brought [2] 10523/9 10550/17 | 10472/1 10472/18 | 10471/2 10484/23 | choice [33] 10468/4 | 534/2 |
|  | 10473/12 10473/14 | 10498/4 10498/5 | 10469/24 10529/16 | climate [6] 10514/13 |
| 10468/10 10472/7 | 10473/22 10473/25 | 10498/8 10503/6 | 0529/17 10531/4 | 10514/14 10514/19 |
| 10515/5 10516/15 | 10476/24 10477/9 | 10503/7 10505/12 | 10531/7 10532/1 | 0517/14 10517/15 |
| 10532/10 | 10478/23 10479/7 | 10509/16 10510/22 | 10532/19 10532/2 | 0518/24 |
| browsers [8] 10467/25 | 10479/11 10480/10 | 10510/23 10511/17 | 10532/24 10533 | clock [1] 10529/8 |
| 10468/4 10468/8 | 10480/20 10481/9 | 10524/18 10524/23 | 10533/1 10534 | close [7] 10463/16 |
| 10468/9 10468/12 | 10482/1 10482/10 | 10530/24 10534/14 | 10540/8 10543/25 | 0464/12 10471/8 |
| 10468/14 10468/19 | 10482/17 10483/13 | 10534/24 10539/10 | 10544/5 10544/8 | 10478/6 10479/20 |
| 10469/15 | 10484/4 10484/10 | 10542/2 10552/12 | 10544/11 10544/13 | 10487/11 10520/2 |
| browsing [1] 10467/7 | 10485/8 10485/24 | 10552/25 | 10545/12 10545/4 | closeness [1] 1048 |
| Bruce [1] 10447/11 | 10488/2 10488/7 | cases [5] 10454/14 | 10546/1 10546 | closer [2] 10482/24 |
| bucket [1] 10467/11 | 10490/4 10492/15 | 10454/16 10457/8 | 10546/20 10546/2 | 10484/5 |
| budget [1] 10495/1 | $1410495$ | 10458/2 10553/9 | 10547/1 10547 | closest [1] 10483 |
| bullet [12] 10485/14 | 10495/25 10497/2 | cautiously [1] | 547/12 10547/13 | [1] 10447/15 |
| 10494/11 10512/4 | 10503/10 10504/6 | 10471/21 <br> Center [1] 104 | 10547/14 10548/11 | coag.gov [1] 10447/16 coincidence [2] |
| 10513/23 10513/24 | 10504/13 10504/13 | certain [3] 10459/ | choices [3] 10507/ | $10536 / 1210536 / 13$ |
| 10517/22 10519/15 | 10505/1 10505/ | 10524/13 10533/10 | 10544/13 10547/19 | Ior [3] 1049 |
| 520/1 10520/2 | 10506/2 10506/16 | certainly [7] 10464/9 | choose [4] 10544/1 | 10492/22 10492/23 |
| $522 / 2 \text { 10522/3 }$ | 7/24 10508/23 | 0468/9 10495/25 | 546/4 10547/14 | Colorado [3] |
|  | 610509 | 8/4 10515 | 10547/17 | 10 |
| $\left[\begin{array}{c} \text { buliest [2] } \\ 10519 / 18 \end{array}\right.$ | 10512/21 10512/24 | 10515/9 10 | ch | colors [1] 10492/16 |
| bunch [6] 10462/14 | 10514/21 10515/3 | Certified [1] 10448/7 | choosing [1] 10545/15 | COLUMBIA [1] |


| C | 17 | concern [1] 10478/11 | 10532/25 10533/1 | costly [1] 10471/24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COLUMBIA... [1] | 10514/9 10514/10 | concerned [1] | 10533/11 10535/22 | costs [5] 10452/24 |
| 10446/1 | 10514/20 10514/22 | concerns [1] 10489/7 | 10536/3 10538/3 | 10542/15 1054 |
| combination [4] | 10514/24 10515/19 | conclusion [4] | 10539/4 10539/7 | 22/24 105 |
| 10493/15 10515/21 | 10515/22 10515/25 | 10456/23 1046 | /18 10545/1 | could [33] 10451/18 |
| 10517/10 10528/2 | $\begin{aligned} & 10516 / 1110516 / 2 \\ & 10517 / 610517 / 9 \end{aligned}$ | 10482/8 10 | 10549/14 context [1] 10534 | 10458/22 10476/2 10479/8 10480/2 |
| combined [1] | 10517/11 10517/12 | 10510/18 | ntingency [2] | 10482/13 10489/2 |
| 10493/15 | 10517/19 10518/3 | conditional | 10534/22 10535/2 | 0491/16 10495/ |
| come [5] 10471/2 | 10518/16 10518/1 | 10541/1 | CONTINUED [1] | 0496/19 10499 |
|  | 10519/5 10519/7 | conditions | 10448/1 | 10504/20 10505 |
|  | 10519/8 10520/3 | 10464/25 10465 | contract [13] 1046 | 10507/11 10511/ |
| 3] 10456/24 | 10520/4 10520/13 | connection [2] | 10509/8 10509/15 | 512/15 10513/3 |
|  | 10520/14 10520/16 | 10471/9 10472/9 | 10510/8 10511/10 | 10519/20 10521/2 |
| 10521/5 10530/13 | 10520/19 10520/23 | connectivity [1] | 10512/7 10512/2 | 525/16 10527/ |
|  | 10520/25 10521/6 | 10458/5 | 10514/6 10520/3 | 528/1 10529/16 |
|  | 10521/8 10521/2 | CONNOLLY [1] | 10520/10 10531/5 | 0529/25 10536/1 |
| 3 | 105 | 10448/2 | 10536/23 10548/1 | 540/20 10540/24 |
| 23/19 1052 | 2/9 10522/1 | co | contracting | 10541/1 10542/4 |
| 10530/2 10530/5 | 2/11 10522 |  |  | 10546/19 10550/6 |
| 545/10 | /14 1052 | 522/12 | tracts | 10552/4 10553/13 |
| comment [1] 10 | 710522 | consider [3] 1050 | 458/2 | couldnt [1] 10473/5 |
| commented [3] | 10523/3 10523/5 | 10515/23 10515/23 | 10461/11 10496/8 | counsel [3] 10488/7 |
| 10477/15 10528/16 | 10523/7 10525 | considerable [1] | 10496/9 104 | 10513/5 10529/9 |
| 10529/23 | 10526/13 10526/2 | 10464/20 | 10504/3 10506/2 | unter [1] 10501/2 |
| comments [1] 10470/1 | 10527/3 10527/8 | sideration [1] | 0507/7 10508/1 | unter-parties' [1] |
| commercially [1] | $10$ | conside | 131050 |  |
|  | 10529/2 10538/10 | 10517/6 | 10510/9 10510/11 | 10514/17 |
| 10474/1 | 10549/10 10552/17 | consistency [5] | 10510/24 10510/2 | country [3] 10517/1 |
|  | 10553/9 | 10505/6 10540 | 10511/2 10511 | 10518/23 10541/7 |
| mb1/24 | competitive [25] | 10540/7 10540/8 | 10511/11 10511/18 | couple [3] 10457/23 |
| compare [2] 10546/1 | 10456/5 10456/9 | 10540/10 | 10512/13 10514/2 | 10500/13 10529/12 |
| 10547/20 | 10456/10 10456 | consistent [12] | 10522/14 10525/10 | course [11] 10455/1 |
| compared | 10456/13 10464 | 10466/4 10466/5 | 10526/12 1052717 | 10482/2 10493/7 |
| 10501/21 10522/23 | 10464/25 10465/8 | 10466/5 10469 | 10527/21 1052 | 0498/2 |
| 10539/10 10547/6 | 10477/5 10495/18 | 10469/22 10469/25 | 10536/21 10536/2 | 0510/16 1051 |
| comparing [1] | 10508/15 10510/5 | 10470/3 10470/15 | 10538/11 10539 | 053 |
| 10548/15 | 10517/25 10519/20 | 10493/7 10521/1 | 10543/18 10544 | 5537/14 105 |
| comparison | 10519/21 10519/2 | 10539/23 10540/9 | 0545/11 10545 | urt [22] 10446/1 |
| 10497/10 | 10529/6 10541/12 | Constitution [1] | 10546/16 10548/8 | 0448/6 10448/7 |
| compete [11] | 10541/13 10545/21 | 10448/8 | 5553/10 | 045 |
| 10504/13 10504/13 | 10546/7 10549 | constraint | contracts' [1] | 10457 |
| 10509/12 10510/11 | $\begin{aligned} & 10552 / 1910553 \\ & 10553 / 11 \end{aligned}$ | 10464/13 10464/1 | 10545/21 <br> Contrary [1] 10535/20 | 10457/22 10458/1 <br> 10473/15 10493/5 |
| 10510/21 10519/23 | 10553/11 competito | constructed [1] | Contrary [1] 10535/20 contrast [2] 10474/19 | $\begin{aligned} & 10473 / 1510493 / 5 \\ & 10497 / 2 \text { 10504/16 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 10523 / 110524 / 25 \\ & 105251211055 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | 10519/23 | consultant | 10519/4 | 0506/16 10509/1 |
| competes [1] 10510/21 | competitors [4] | 10504/17 | contribute [1] | 513/13 10513/1 |
| competing [8] | 10461/15 10464/6 | consumer [15] | 14/17 | 10531/17 10532/6 |
| 10474/22 10510/14 | 10528/7 10528/8 | 10447/12 10466/8 | contributed [1] | 10539/14 10552/8 |
| 10510/22 10510/23 | complete [1] 10553/15 | 10469/10 10470/3 | 10458/7 | 10553/22 |
| 10520/9 10524 | completely [3] 10483/4 | 10484/16 10484/16 | control [2] 10491/ | Court's [1] 1050 |
| 10525/13 10526/23 | 10491/8 10545/14 | 10484/21 10486/12 | 10491/7 | courts [1] 10507/ |
| competition [89] | complex [2] 10538/16 | $\begin{aligned} & 10487 / 910488 \\ & 10532 / 131053 \end{aligned}$ | controlled | covered [8] 10497/16 10499/22 10507/7 |
| /10 10460/12 | component [1] | 10533/25 10534 | controls [2] 10462/1 | 10547/23 10548/1 |
| 10479/12 10479/13 | 10472/4 | 10538/21 | 10491/11 | 5548/5 10548/7 |
| 10479/15 10479/19 | computer [7] 10448/11 | consumers | cing | 548/1 |
| 10480/6 10480/13 | $\begin{aligned} & 10474 / 1910474 / 22 \\ & 10474 / 2510475 / 2 \end{aligned}$ | 10454/22 10455/9 <br> 10455/10 10460/18 |  | COVID [2] 10491/1 10491/12 |
| 10495/17 10503/19 | 10475/3 10479/13 | 10466/2 10469/9 | 10548/22 10548/24 | CPC [1] 10475/19 |
| 10509/7 10509/15 | computer-aided [1] | 10469/16 10474/2 | 10554/3 | created [1] 10500/8 |
| 510/2 10510/4 <br> 510/7 10510/8 | 10 | 75/7 10475 | correctly [1] 10470/17 | creates [1] 10474/6 |
| 10510/12 10511/2 | computers | 10486/9 1 | rrelated [1] 1054 | izes [1] 10508/3 |
| 10511/7 1 | 10474/20 | 10495/21 10495 | corresponding [1] | ross [7] 10449/4 |
| 10511/14 10511/15 | conceptually [3] | 10495/25 10499/2 | 10487/24 | 0492/5 10492/6 |
| 10511/18 1051 | 10501/5 10501/6 10501/22 | $10515 / 810515 / 24$ $10522 / 2310528 / 10$ | st [3] 10452/21 | 10492/11 10518/ |
| 10512/2 10512/7 | 10501/22 | 10522/23 10528/10 | 10542/20 10543/1 | 10550/18 10553/20 |

## C

cross-examination [2] 10518/9 10550/18
CRR [2] 10554/2 10554/8
current [4] 10537/7 10537/8 10546/1 10547/22
curtain [1] 10450/15 cut [1] 10491/16 CV [1] 10446/4

## D

D.C [5] 10446/5 10447/3 10447/8 10448/3 10448/9
da [4] 10462/4 10462/4 10462/4 10462/4 dashed [1] 10490/10 data [3] 10494/5 10532/18 10552/25 date [3] 10457/10 10457/21 10554/7 day [5] 10446/7 10481/23 10481/23 10523/8 10532/1
days [1] 10457/24 deal [25] 10461/7 10462/12 10462/21 10463/10 10463/13 10479/3 10500/18 10501/3 10501/17 10501/18 10501/22 10502/4 10502/8 10502/9 10502/11 10516/1 10517/11 10523/1 10537/4 10537/7 10537/21 10537/23 10538/19 10550/10 10550/13 dealing [4] 10498/2 10518/23 10523/15 10523/16
deals [10] 10462/16 10498/2 10498/3 10500/14 10511/16 10511/17 10517/25 10519/25 10521/9 10538/17
decay [2] 10482/4 10482/5
decide [1] 10541/4 decision [5] 10466/3 10466/9 10466/10 10469/8 10469/8
decisions [1] 10515/11 deck [2] 10450/22 10451/9
decrease [1] 10477/4 default [30] 10467/25 10468/13 10468/21 10472/7 10497/12 10499/19 10499/20 10499/21 10499/23 10499/25 10500/1 10500/3 10503/21 10503/23 10504/18 10507/10 10507/11

10507/14 10507/16 10507/19 10507/22 10509/12 10526/7 10526/20 10530/8 10530/10 10530/15 10531/11 10532/9 10538/22
defaults [42] 10468/18 10468/18 10469/2 10469/2 10469/12 10495/16 10495/18 10495/20 10496/1 10496/5 10496/5 10496/6 10496/8 10496/10 10496/12 10496/14 10496/17 10496/23 10497/3 10497/19 10497/22 10499/11 10500/17 10503/14 10503/16 10503/19 10504/3 10504/5 10504/8 10504/13 10505/25 10530/13 10544/1 10544/10 10544/20 10545/2 10546/2 10546/3 10547/6 10547/21 10553/1 10553/6
Defendant [2] 10446/7 10448/2 define [2] 10463/19 10464/8
defined [5] 10453/14 10463/20 10464/9 10509/1 10509/2
defining [1] 10464/6 definitely [1] 10549/21 definition [10] 10451/21 10463/17 10464/2 10468/15 10469/4 10469/19 10472/14 10472/22 10483/15 10508/24
degree [2] 10454/10 10464/5
Dell [1] 10475/2 demand [6] 10454/12 10454/14 10454/17 10454/24 10454/25 10455/4
Denver [1] 10447/15 denying [1] 10543/9
DEPARTMENT [2] 10447/2 10447/11 dependent [2] 10541/7 10541/8
depending [1] 10507/3 depends [1] 10454/11 describe [4] 10459/24 10480/24 10483/6 10506/25
described [10] 10478/22 10481/2 10483/13 10487/21 10498/6 10499/7 10507/5 10514/3 10532/16 10533/4
describes [1] 10463/7 describing [2] 10470/17 10504/2 description [1] 10469/25
design [1] 10476/16
designed [1] 10532/18
desktop [6] 10498/10 10498/13 10498/14 10498/17 10498/22 10499/13
despite [2] 10457/13 10518/3
detailed [2] 10537/2 10537/15 determinative [1] 10487/4 determined [1] 10534/4 developing [1] 10549/24
device [4] 10496/24 10515/5 10516/15 10530/3
devices [4] 10503/21 10535/23 10536/3 10536/4 devoted [1] 10458/1 did [68] 10451/9 10451/11 10456/17 10456/20 10458/12 10460/25 10461/2 10461/11 10461/12 10461/24 10462/5 10462/24 10463/1 10463/14 10467/20 10470/10 10476/9 10478/17 10480/5 10480/9 10480/18 10480/19 10481/3 10481/8 10481/10 10481/13 10481/15 10481/16 10487/13 10487/18 10488/24 10489/1 10489/9
10489/19 10490/3
10491/14 10491/17 10491/19 10491/20 10491/21 10491/23 10492/11 10496/13 10496/15 10497/25 10500/7 10500/9 10500/10 10502/14 10503/6 10503/8 10503/9 10509/13 10509/14 10513/24 10521/11 10521/14 10529/11 10531/21 10531/25 10535/21 10541/6 10549/14 10549/19 10549/20 10549/21 10550/13 10551/16 did you [5] 10451/9 10461/24 10488/24 10491/17 10549/20 didn't [31] 10461/3 10461/3 10461/7

10461/25 10462/7
10462/7 10463/15
10470/2 10472/17
10478/8 10481/2
10491/11 10493/21
10498/22 10500/25
10501/1 10501/3
10501/17 10501/18 10502/8 10502/9 10503/5 10503/8 10504/24 10543/2 10543/6 10543/7 10548/6 10549/23 10550/4 10551/15 difference [10] 10477/12 10479/23 10497/11 10521/2 10521/4 10521/7 10523/6 10524/7 10544/7 10550/19
differences [3] 10484/25 10485/6 10487/7
different [36] 10452/13 10454/4 10454/22 10454/22 10455/8 10455/15 10455/15 10471/1 10477/6 10479/10 10479/11 10479/14 10484/11 10485/1 10486/6 10486/13 10488/11 10492/16 10498/12 10498/13 10498/14 10503/10 10504/7 10514/15 10514/15 10514/17 10522/22 10524/2 10524/9 10525/4 10526/8 10526/19 10532/16 10547/2 10550/5 10552/23
differential [1] 10484/21
differentiation [2] 10484/11 10485/23 differentiator [1] 10468/23
differently [1] 10509/4 difficult [2] 10470/25 10543/11
Dintzer [2] 10447/2 10450/9
direct [6] 10449/4
10451/5 10459/9 10459/15 10473/12 10485/13
directly [2] 10543/21
10545/7
disagree [1] 10508/17
disclosed [2] 10467/5
10531/20
discount [2] 10500/7 10500/21
discriminate [3] 10454/21 10455/8 10455/10 discussing [1]

10513/11
discussion [3] 10473/14 10513/8 10536/13
display [5] 10483/24 10483/24 10492/10 10492/22 10493/24
disputed [2] 10458/19 10460/24
dissimilar [2] 10464/25 10465/8
distance [1] 10457/18
distanced [1] 10458/14
distinct [2] 10465/23
10469/23
distinguish [1] 10498/10
distinguishing [1] 10459/22
distribution [4] 10458/20 10460/23 10549/20 10551/23 distributor [18] 10512/6 10512/20 10514/5 10514/25 10515/1 10515/1 10515/2 10515/11 10515/21 10516/3 10517/5 10517/20 10518/2 10519/19 10529/17 10530/2 10531/10 10537/25 distributors [6] 10516/5 10527/22 10535/14 10535/17 10540/2 10540/17 district [6] 10446/1 10446/1 10446/10 10457/10 10457/22 10458/1
Division [1] 10447/7 do [93] 10453/3 10453/15 10454/18 10455/23 10460/3 10463/20 10465/1 10465/6 10466/18 10470/8 10470/13 10471/19 10473/24 10475/24 10476/6 10476/24 10477/11 10477/20 10479/21 10482/5 10482/12 10483/16 10487/15 10489/7 10490/23 10492/12 10496/16 10496/25 10499/9 10500/11 10501/16 10502/3 10502/9 10502/11 10503/5 10503/6 10504/3 10504/22 10508/15 10509/21 10509/21 10509/23 10509/23 10509/23 10509/25 10510/2 10510/3 10510/5 10510/6 10510/7 10511/3 10511/16 10512/12
do... [40] 10514/1 10514/8 10514/11 10514/18 10516/2 10516/2 10517/15 10518/24 10519/5 10523/24 10524/6 10527/18 10527/22 10527/24 10527/25 10529/8 10529/17 10529/20 10530/19 10538/11 10539/18 10540/5 10542/6 10542/7 10542/9 10542/10 10542/25 10543/10 10543/18 10544/18 10544/18 10546/5 10546/9 10547/2 10547/3 10547/14 10549/24 10550/14 10552/11 10552/20
do you [17] 10465/1 10465/6 10483/16 10496/16 10496/25 10500/11 10511/3 10516/2 10519/5 10527/18 10527/22 10530/19 10542/6 10542/10 10550/14 10552/11 10552/20 do you have [3] 10455/23 10502/3 10539/18

## document [10]

 10476/12 10478/2 10478/3 10478/6 10478/12 10493/6 10493/7 10494/5 10498/21 10522/20 documents [10] 10469/20 10498/5 10498/11 10499/6 10500/8 10502/20 10502/21 10502/22 10538/1 10552/25does [38] 10453/2 10455/14 10459/13 10466/12 10466/17 10468/4 10468/14 10468/16 10469/2 10469/24 10471/1 10472/13 10472/15 10472/21 10484/3 10484/18 10487/13 10507/9 10509/15 10511/17 10512/18 10512/18 10515/1 10516/14 10519/8 10520/19 10522/4 10525/22 10532/23 10541/25 10544/8 10544/9 10545/20 10545/22 10549/2 10549/8 10551/24 10553/10
doesn't [22] 10461/7 10466/18 10471/11

10486/16 10488/17 10490/20 10490/22 10500/12 10500/13 10501/22 10504/11 10504/12 10506/4 10515/7 10515/8 10515/9 10515/21 10515/22 10515/23 10524/4 10528/9 10543/19
doing [23] 10452/12 10452/24 10457/8 10463/10 10465/22 10466/12 10466/25 10467/7 10469/12 10472/5 10474/15 10483/10 10492/5 10492/5 10494/15 10495/23 10506/9 10514/18 10535/4 10537/5 10537/10 10541/18 10551/18 DOJ [3] 10447/2 10447/6 10450/9 DOJ-ATR [1] 10447/6 dollar [2] 10490/11 10491/24 dollars [8] 10492/12 10498/3 10499/1 10500/15 10506/8 10534/25 10549/23 10550/1
dominant [34] 10512/21 10514/5 10514/25 10515/17 10515/18 10515/24 10517/8 10517/18 10517/24 10519/15 10519/19 10520/4 10520/5 10520/6 10521/7 10521/12 10521/18 10521/21 10522/5 10522/5 10522/9 10522/13 10522/17 10522/19 10522/21 10522/21 10524/1 10524/7 10524/10 10525/1 10526/15 10527/7 10527/7 10545/24 don't [55] 10454/15 10454/24 10457/1 10458/17 10463/22 10464/4 10465/2 10465/10 10465/24 10467/6 10467/9 10467/10 10467/22 10471/8 10475/7 10475/12 10475/14 10478/14 10483/5 10483/9 10483/18 10483/24 10484/4 10485/19 10485/21 10486/2 10487/10 10495/22 10496/18 10497/1 10499/25 10502/4 10502/11 10506/11 10508/9

10509/3 10511/5 10513/5 10513/8 10516/18 10527/19 10527/23 10530/21 10533/20 10534/9 10536/14 10540/9 10542/11 10543/2 10544/3 10544/18 10547/13 10553/11 10553/19 10553/20 done [6] 10457/9
10473/20 10474/1 10494/19 10528/18 10528/19
doubled [1] 10456/19 down [6] 10457/2 10490/20 10520/19 10527/22 10531/11 10535/17 downstairs [1] 10457/24 Dr [1] 10469/22 Dr. [56] 10451/24 10451/24 10454/7 10455/17 10456/17 10457/1 10457/4 10457/5 10458/11 10458/19 10459/1 10460/23 10461/5 10463/18 10464/23 10465/6 10465/25 10466/2 10466/7 10468/2 10469/3 10469/14 10469/19 10470/9 10470/22 10474/3 10474/6 10475/19 10477/17 10478/2 10478/13 10478/21 10479/6 10480/5 10480/11 10482/16 10483/14 10485/11 10485/24 10486/5 10487/13 10487/13 10488/4 10488/8 10488/23 10488/25 10489/5 10489/7 10489/11 10489/15 10490/25 10491/23 10492/4 10493/4 10495/11 10500/21

## Dr. Israel [38]

10451/24 10455/17 10457/1 10457/4 10458/11 10458/19 10460/23 10461/5 10464/23 10465/25 10466/2 10466/7 10468/2 10469/14 10470/9 10474/6 10475/19 10477/17 10478/2 10478/13 10478/21 10479/6 10480/11 10482/16 10483/14 10485/11 10485/24 10486/5 10488/4 10488/8 10488/23 10489/11

10489/15 10490/25
10491/23 10492/4 10493/4 10495/11 Dr. Israel's [16] 10454/7 10456/17 10457/5 10459/1 10463/18 10465/6 10469/3 10469/19 10470/22 10474/3 10480/5 10487/13 10487/13 10488/25 10489/5 10489/7
Dr. Murphy [2] 10451/24 10500/21 draft [1] 10465/18 Dramatic [1] 10457/22 dramatically [2] 10457/19 10474/20 drew [1] 10470/12 drive [1] 10453/10 driven [1] 10520/24 driver [1] 10485/7 driving [1] 10502/24 Duck [1] 10548/2 DuckDuckGo [8] 10522/25 10523/4 10523/6 10525/18 10525/23 10525/25 10526/7 10526/8 due [5] 10460/5 10494/16 10503/14 10503/15 10503/16 during [13] 10451/24 10461/24 10475/17 10482/16 10490/12 10490/15 10493/4 10493/12 10493/13 10493/18 10494/13 10513/11 10550/22

## E

each [12] 10455/8 10457/9 10462/20 10466/3 10466/9 10484/9 10514/16 10524/14 10525/16 10533/5 10533/25 10534/1
earning [1] 10536/21 earns [2] 10458/20 10460/23
easier [1] 10549/19
Econ [2] 10452/6 10454/25
Econ 101 [1] 10454/25 economic [5] 10505/21 10527/4 10542/19 10545/5 10553/5
economically [1] 10458/3
economics [4] 10465/17 10510/19 10511/22 10537/8
economist [1] 10543/12
economists [3] 10491/25 10514/10 10515/12
econotalk [1] 10515/13 effect [14] 10453/5 10456/15 10459/14 10492/6 10497/19 10505/25 10508/12 10509/18 10511/8 10511/19 10543/25 10545/3 10546/3 10549/10
effective [1] 10511/13 effectively [4] 10492/7 10494/23 10541/16 10541/22
effects [15] 10453/8 10459/11 10491/7 10496/14 10504/18 10508/15 10508/16 10510/5 10529/7 10538/10 10542/14 10545/18 10545/21 10546/7 10553/11
efficiencies [1] 10552/19
effort [1] 10459/11
efforts [1] 10477/16
eight [2] 10457/24 10457/25
either [2] 10452/25 10553/11
elasticities [1] 10492/1
elasticity [3] 10492/2
10492/6 10492/11
else [9] 10467/20
10468/15 10480/19 10482/23 10491/22 10494/9 10496/7 10529/15 10538/15
elsewhere [1] 10515/8
Email [5] 10447/4 10447/9 10447/16 10448/4 10448/5 empirical [1] 10459/17 end [8] 10462/5 10464/3 10464/6 10482/6 10523/7 10526/25 10536/2 10543/18
ended [4] 10457/17 10528/20 10528/20 10549/23
endorse [1] 10483/5 ends [5] 10474/24 10490/20 10527/8 10543/9 10543/22
energy [1] 10471/18 engine [6] 10467/25 10468/12 10516/7 10525/18 10525/19 10535/8
engines [12] 10456/18 10464/14 10468/20 10468/23 10469/23 10470/21 10483/21 10483/22 10484/6 10533/3 10533/3 10533/12
enhance [1] 10495/17
enough [7] 10482/11

E
enough... [6] 10512/25
10513/2 10515/22 10517/12 10519/22 10519/24
ensure [2] 10519/16 10539/23
enter [1] 10527/21
enters [1] 10539/3
entity [1] 10453/14
episode [4] 10478/3
10478/4 10489/16 10494/22
episodes [3] 10498/12
10498/14 10499/7
especially [2] 10489/10 10505/12
essence [2] 10483/19 10494/19
essential [1] 10509/20 essentially [2]
10540/15 10540/22
estimate [5] 10496/25
10497/3 10498/8 10502/15 10508/7
estimates [13] 10497/22 10498/1 10498/7 10498/15 10498/18 10498/19 10500/8 10503/3 10503/9 10504/7 10505/5 10505/6 10508/2
et [5] 10446/3 10450/8 10489/18 10493/1 10525/20
et al [1] 10450/8 et cetera [3] 10489/18 10493/1 10525/20
Europe [7] 10456/8 10532/17 10541/3 10544/14 10549/2 10549/4 10549/12
European [2] 10543/25 10545/17
evaluated [1] 10470/11
evaluations [1] 10537/21
even [22] 10453/24
10454/23 10455/6
10455/11 10460/4
10470/22 10470/23
10471/13 10483/24 10485/4 10490/1 10491/2 10495/6 10495/7 10500/1 10507/20 10511/12 10511/15 10514/5 10520/11 10528/9 10549/8
every [7] 10466/7 10466/10 10466/16 10469/8 10469/10 10471/18 10481/17
everybody [1] 10553/21
everyone [6] 10450/4 10450/12 10452/7

10470/2 10513/19 10520/16
everything [1] 10480/19 evidence [60] 10453/22 10456/22 10459/4 10459/9 10459/10 10459/15 10459/16 10459/17 10459/25 10460/3 10460/7 10460/14 10460/15 10460/16 10460/19 10461/19 10469/1 10469/17 10470/3 10470/13 10472/13 10472/21 10473/3 10473/12 10476/9 10479/25 10480/16 10480/21 10483/9 10487/11 10489/12 10490/2 10497/9 10497/12 10497/18 10498/6 10498/20 10502/16 10502/23 10504/4 10504/5 10505/7 10505/11 10505/13 10506/11 10518/2 10521/11 10535/21 10536/5 10536/15 10536/16 10543/8 10545/7 10545/8 10545/12 10550/22 10551/19 10552/24 10553/12 10553/17 exactly [12] 10456/24 10471/21 10494/3 10495/23 10498/6 10504/4 10526/3 10527/5 10529/7 10529/23 10538/16 10544/6
examination [3] 10451/5 10518/9 10550/18
example [36] 10456/4 10465/16 10476/17 10483/1 10483/7 10486/4 10486/24 10488/16 10491/11 10495/3 10498/12 10500/16 10506/25 10514/12 10514/18 10516/3 10519/2 10520/22 10523/21 10523/24 10525/23 10525/24 10526/15 10529/16 10530/6 10530/7 10531/17 10532/6 10532/10 10532/15 10539/14 10539/18 10540/21 10543/10 10546/24 10546/25
examples [4] 10504/22 10529/1 10531/22 10531/22
excess [1] 10475/18
exclusion [2] 10458/16 $10515 / 12$ 10515/19 10530/16
exclusionary [3]
10510/24 10511/9 10511/19
exclusive [20] 10496/8
10496/9 10506/23
10507/7 10510/11
10510/24 10514/2
10520/3 10520/10
10523/15 10523/16
10524/15 10524/17
10525/10 10526/4
10526/12 10527/21
10538/22 10544/1
10553/9
exclusives [15]
10504/14 10509/18
10511/3 10512/2
10521/13 10522/4
10522/9 10522/11
10522/16 10522/17
10523/3 10527/3
10527/8 10527/9
10530/14
exclusivity [3] 10496/9
10530/17 10540/10
executive [2] 10499/4 10501/6
exercise [3] 10453/5
10455/24 10464/2
exercised [2] 10458/10 10473/19
exercising [2]
10464/20 10473/6
Exhibit [1] 10553/17
EXHIBITS [1] 10449/8
exist [1] 10470/2
exists [1] 10480/14
expanding [1] 10458/5
expect [4] 10456/15
10462/11 10495/6
10544/18
expensive [1]
10535/22
experience [6] 10516/6
10516/6 10516/10
10516/14 10539/24
10540/3
experiment [2]
10470/5 10481/25
experiments [11]
10469/20 10474/1
10480/17 10480/20
10481/3 10481/6
10481/8 10481/11
10481/16 10481/17
10543/10
expert [1] 10531/20
explain [6] 10484/4
10486/5 10512/1
10512/20 10520/1
10546/19
explaining [1] 10513/2
explicitly [1] 10497/14
expressing [2]
10484/17 10487/9
extent [3] 10487/8
externality [1]
10519/11
extract [2] 10476/20 10476/21
extracting [1] 10475/9 extreme [1] 10520/22 F
Facebook [9] 10483/23 10484/5 10487/18 10487/20 10488/24 10489/6 10489/12 10489/17 10491/18 faced [3] 10462/18 10479/13 10533/1
faces [3] 10459/11 10479/19 10544/9
facilitate [1] 10451/9 facing [1] 10545/1 fact [26] 10454/16 10455/24 10457/14 10459/21 10467/24 10468/4 10468/11 10468/14 10468/17 10468/19 10470/13 10472/1 10475/6 10478/5 10485/23 10491/6 10492/1 10507/10 10509/11 10511/1 10518/3 10521/5 10525/9 10546/13 10551/2 10553/8
factor [7] 10459/23 10472/1 10485/22 10485/24 10486/1 10486/2 10486/3
factors [4] 10462/4 10487/4 10487/7 10491/1
facts [2] 10468/22 10478/4
factually [2] 10501/5 10501/23
fail [1] 10521/9
Fair [2] 10467/23 10467/23
fall [1] 10535/14
fallen [1] 10461/18
falls [1] 10467/11
famous [1] 10457/8
far [1] 10550/5
fascinating [1] 10467/5
fast [1] 10452/23
father [1] 10507/19
favored [1] 10529/14
favorite [1] 10531/5
feature [3] 10466/19 10470/21 10471/16
features [2] 10541/1 10541/8
February [1] 10551/9 fee [2] 10535/2 10541/1
feeling [1] 10550/23
fees [2] 10534/23

10540/25
fell [1] 10506/14
felt [2] 10502/7
10505/4
few [5] 10454/4
10454/5 10458/14
10508/1 10546/5
field [4] 10518/14 10547/7 10547/9
10549/9
Fifth [1] 10447/7
figure [11] 10481/5 10481/20 10483/25 10489/11 10489/19 10489/21 10490/9 10492/16 10493/9 10493/23 10494/1
figures [1] 10457/7 fill [2] 10486/23 10488/20
filling [2] 10486/16 10488/18
final [2] 10485/4 10522/3
finalized [1] 10501/22
find [8] 10512/6
10512/21 10514/5
10517/19 10519/20
10521/21 10524/22
10529/9
fine [1] 10466/13
Firefox [1] 10497/12
firm [38] 10474/13
10479/16 10512/21
10514/5 10514/25
10515/17 10515/18
10515/24 10517/8
10517/18 10517/24
10519/15 10519/19
10520/4 10520/5
10520/6 10521/8
10521/12 10521/21
10522/5 10522/5
10522/10 10522/13
10522/17 10522/19
10522/20 10522/21
10522/21 10524/8
10524/9 10524/10
10526/16 10527/6
10527/7 10533/2
10544/19 10545/25 10548/16
firms [6] 10474/16
10500/8 10520/15
10532/11 10532/19 10532/19
first [29] 10454/7
10455/16 10467/20 10470/24 10476/4 10481/13 10485/14 10490/1 10490/17 10490/24 10492/13 10502/21 10507/8 10509/19 10511/12 10512/5 10512/8 10512/11 10513/23 10513/24 10514/3
10517/22 10520/2
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10562
first... [6] 10524/18 10530/23 10531/21 10537/6 10538/8 10553/2
fit [2] 10509/16 10549/2
five [1] 10533/8 fixed [2] 10480/19 10480/21
flag [1] 10490/24
flawed [1] 10549/18
flip [1] 10456/12
Floor [1] 10447/14 focus [2] 10468/2 10541/14
focused [2] 10529/11 10549/5
follow [8] 10453/12 10458/23 10483/2 10507/16 10507/18 10507/22 10513/1 10543/4
follow-up [1] 10458/23
followed [1] 10546/21
following [1] 10500/2
follows [2] 10451/4 10526/14
foot [1] 10524/14
foreclose [1] 10547/22
foreclosure [18]
10503/13 10506/21
10507/1 10508/4 10508/10 10508/11 10508/18 10508/24 10509/3 10509/5 10509/22 10543/16 10543/17 10543/17 10544/20 10545/10 10547/10 10547/25
foreclosures [1] 10506/14
foregoing [1] 10554/3 foreseeing [1] 10544/22
form [2] 10522/10 10536/3
formally [1] 10527/5 formulation [1] 10454/7
forward [1] 10450/13
found [1] 10481/17
four [1] 10504/14
fourth [1] 10552/8
frame [1] 10473/14
framework [1]
10509/16
frankly [1] 10543/1
free [12] 10511/20 10524/6 10524/6 10524/8 10524/19 10524/21 10524/24 10530/14 10540/16 10541/4 10541/5 10541/19
friends [1] 10487/25
friends' [1] 10488/1
fully [1] 10517/6

$-$| funnel [1] | $10485 / 2$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| funny [2] | $10544 / 3$ |
| $10544 / 4$ |  |
| further [3] | $10451 / 4$ |
| $10476 / 8$ | $10490 / 2$ |
| furthest | [1] |

G
gain [6] 10476/2 10496/23 10520/12 10528/6 10528/6 10548/23
gained [2] 10478/20 10499/21 gaining [4] 10476/2 10546/10 10546/11 10548/18
gap [4] 10550/18 10551/12 10551/14 10551/15
gave [3] 10498/23 10502/2 10526/6 gee [2] 10469/11 10481/9
general [28] 10452/1 10456/18 10464/13 10464/22 10464/23 10465/7 10465/14 10465/24 10467/25 10468/1 10468/12 10468/20 10468/23 10469/18 10469/23 10470/20 10472/13 10472/21 10473/4 10473/9 10479/5 10483/21 10484/6 10490/5 10516/7 10524/4 10533/3 10533/12

## generalized [1]

 10533/8generally [1] 10510/8 generated [1] 10537/23
get [37] 10462/12
10462/15 10462/17
10469/11 10475/5 10475/7 10481/10 10500/18 10501/2 10501/3 10501/17
10501/18 10501/22 10502/11 10503/11 10505/18 10506/13 10511/20 10511/22 10512/13 10512/13 10525/16 10528/21 10534/25 10541/22 10543/22 10544/8 10544/9 10544/23 10547/13 10548/4 10548/10 10548/12 10548/13 10548/17 10550/24 10552/1 get-out-of-jail-free [1] 10511/20
gets [3] 10501/8 10544/12 10547/19 getting [11] 10459/19

10463/12 10471/22
10475/22 10481/21
10491/13 10516/17
10536/2 10543/22
10547/5 10547/24
give [6] 10477/18
10500/16 10531/17
10532/6 10539/14 10540/3
given [4] 10480/7 10480/24 10510/1 10550/21
gives [1] 10519/4 giving [4] 10496/8 10526/8 10541/18 10549/14
glasses [1] 10493/22 global [1] 10457/21 GMS [2] 10540/16 10540/24
go [36] 10456/7
10466/9 10466/16 10467/18 10469/9 10470/2 10471/19 10476/7 10476/22 10483/13 10487/17 10487/20 10490/2 10490/20 10492/3 10492/14 10497/5 10497/20 10503/23 10505/22 10512/2 10513/8 10516/24 10518/11 10518/13 10520/19 10525/7 10527/22 10532/4 10535/17 10537/14 10539/8 10549/2 10549/4 10549/12 10553/20
go ahead [3] 10467/18 10532/4 10553/20
goes [15] 10453/18 10462/5 10463/3 10486/21 10490/12 10492/18 10492/20
10492/23 10492/24 10493/1 10493/17
10493/23 10493/24 10494/2 10516/11 going [74] 10452/25 10453/4 10454/5 10455/20 10457/2 10457/5 10458/5 10458/7 10458/9 10462/15 10462/17 10469/9 10475/5 10475/6 10475/16 10475/23 10475/25 10476/1 10476/2 10476/15 10478/14 10479/21 10479/22 10483/12 10484/1 10490/19 10491/10 10491/12 10497/24 10499/23 10500/19 10503/11 10504/7 10504/11 10505/8 10505/8 10505/18

10506/1 10506/5 10506/7 10507/16 10507/18 10507/22 10508/12 10511/11 10512/19 10514/22 10520/10 10520/12 10521/1 10523/19 10524/16 10524/22 10524/24 10524/25 10525/16 10528/6 10531/6 10531/7 10531/12 10532/22 10534/25 10535/11 10537/17 10537/18 10541/20 10542/19 10544/23 10544/24 10544/25 10546/18 10548/10 10548/12 10551/11
gold [1] 10480/21
gone [1] 10474/21
good [36] 10450/4 10450/6 10450/12 10450/17 10455/2 10462/12 10479/7 10479/8 10495/20 10495/24 10495/25 10496/5 10496/7 10496/10 10505/11 10514/11 10514/12 10514/12 10517/6
10518/4 10518/18
10519/11 10522/24
10524/3 10524/5
10524/14 10525/18 10525/19 10526/1
10526/21 10527/12 10539/1 10540/3 10545/15 10547/13 10547/17
Good morning [2] 10450/4 10450/12 goods [1] 10519/1 GOOGLE [136] Google LLC [1] 10450/8
Google's [33] 10455/24 10466/4 10466/6 10469/20 10469/23 10470/4 10470/5 10472/12 10473/16 10473/18 10477/16 10479/24 10496/8 10497/11 10497/17 10500/21 10506/22 10507/7 10527/17 10529/9 10536/21 10538/9 10538/11 10538/17 10539/6 10542/23 10543/20 10544/1 10544/1 10544/9 10544/10 10545/19 10549/5
google.com [1] 10466/14 got [4] 10490/6 10535/20 10544/13

10548/4
gotten [2] 10463/13
10475/4
government's [1] 10542/2
graph [4] 10457/5
10457/9 10492/13 10551/8
gray [2] 10489/20 10489/24
great [1] 10503/13
greater [2] 10529/2 10548/23
greenish [1] 10492/22
grocery [5] 10523/9
10524/9 10524/13
10524/15 10524/21
guess [13] 10452/5
10465/17 10502/18 10502/21 10505/1 10506/2 10506/3 10518/8 10525/3 10528/14 10540/6 10549/5 10551/21
guidelines [3] 10465/18 10483/1 10483/7
H
habit [1] 10461/18
had [24] 10450/22
10457/17 10462/9
10462/22 10463/14 10470/10 10475/14 10476/6 10477/1 10477/3 10477/5 10482/3 10487/14 10487/23 10498/18 10498/21 10501/23 10503/4 10504/8 10515/18 10523/21 10533/3 10549/19 10549/22
half [2] 10494/14 10519/10
hand [1] 10489/20
hands [1] 10450/22
happen [5] 10501/17
10501/18 10502/8 10502/9 10535/12
happened [4]
10455/13 10478/4 10491/4 10499/10
happening [10]
10503/20 10512/24
10515/3 10519/24
10519/25 10521/2
10521/22 10525/9
10525/10 10551/10
happens [2] 10502/11 10545/10
happy [1] 10546/22
hard [4] 10499/9
10524/18 10552/14 10552/14
harder [2] 10524/18
10525/21
hardly [2] 10492/20
hardly... [1] 10543/25 hardware [1] 10471/4 harm [4] 10511/3 10527/18 10535/22 10552/17
harmed [1] 10510/12 harms [4] 10512/7 10512/14 10516/1 10517/11
has [54] 10452/13 10452/18 10453/14 10454/10 10455/24 10456/1 10456/2 10456/4 10456/5 10456/19 10456/23 10457/1 10458/5 10458/5 10459/4 10459/11 10461/13 10461/13 10462/13 10466/7 10467/2 10473/10 10473/12 10473/19 10473/20 10473/23 10474/1 10475/4 10477/1 10477/3 10479/17 10480/15 10484/17 10486/15 10499/10 10512/12 10519/6 10522/22 10524/3 10526/16 10526/20 10526/20 10528/15 10536/17 10536/17 10538/19 10538/22 10538/24 10544/7 10544/21 10547/5 10547/21 10548/20 10551/23
hat [1] 10499/8 have [105] 10452/1 10453/8 10453/24 10454/5 10454/15 10454/17 10454/18 10455/15 10455/23 10456/15 10458/4 10458/6 10459/13 10460/16 10461/1 10461/8 10461/25 10463/13 10463/15 10463/15 10464/9 10465/8 10466/13 10466/21 10467/20 10468/11 10468/14 10468/19 10470/21 10471/20 10473/3 10473/9 10474/3 10474/5 10474/11 10474/16 10474/20 10475/9 10475/11 10477/5 10477/10 10478/8 10478/14 10478/24 10478/25 10479/14 10479/21 10483/24 10484/20 10486/8 10486/25 10487/9 10488/1 10488/3 10488/11 10489/7 10490/22

10494/18 10494/25 10495/10 10495/21 10496/14 10497/19 10499/11 10501/9 10501/15 10502/3 10511/8 10511/18 10511/19 10512/20 10514/12 10517/24 10518/2 10518/5 10519/23 10520/20 10520/21 10523/5 10523/19 10523/23 10524/4 10526/8 10527/6 10527/10 10528/5 10528/9 10528/17 10531/11 10536/16 10537/18 10538/3 10538/11 10539/18 10540/7 10540/8 10540/17 10541/20 10541/20 10542/14 10544/17 10545/15 10545/24 10551/19 10552/14
haven't [2] 10474/21 10482/3
having [10] 10451/3 10468/12 10487/22 10520/17 10528/8 10528/20 10541/22 10549/8 10549/9 10549/9
he [58] 10453/21 10453/22 10454/8 10458/12 10458/13 10458/14 10462/3 10462/3 10462/5 10462/9 10462/9 10463/1 10463/6 10463/7 10467/8 10470/10 10470/11 10470/12 10471/7 10471/7 10486/7 10487/18 10487/21 10488/10 10490/15 10490/25 10491/9 10491/14 10491/23 10492/5 10499/3 10500/24 10500/25 10501/25 10502/6 10502/7 10502/7 10502/8 10502/8 10502/8 10502/15 10503/19 10504/10 10507/17 10509/1 10509/2 10518/9 10521/17 10525/8 10529/23 10531/22 10536/5 10536/6 10536/15 10540/1 10540/1 10546/25 10547/1
he didn't [1] 10502/8 he said [1] 10463/6 he's [11] 10461/23 10467/9 10467/10 10467/13 10467/16 10490/8 10492/5

10492/5 10497/9 10502/10 10502/10
heading [1] 10537/8 headroom [4] 10454/18 10463/9 10463/11 10500/23 hear [2] 10496/13 10500/7
heard [5] 10499/2 10499/3 10508/21 10516/4 10516/5 hearing [2] 10467/7 10542/6
help [3] 10451/9 10473/14 10543/10 here [53] 10455/12 10456/3 10457/7 10458/9 10458/11 10458/14 10462/21 10475/14 10476/12 10476/18 10477/7 10477/23 10478/23 10481/19 10483/20 10484/1 10484/8 10485/21 10485/25 10489/8 10492/15 10492/18 10493/14 10493/18 10495/7 10495/8 10496/3 10496/22 10497/6 10497/8 10498/9 10504/12 10506/20 10508/23 10509/3 10511/14 10511/25 10513/23 10514/8 10514/13 10518/13 10519/15 10519/16 10522/2 10534/9 10536/11 10538/14 10540/18 10541/14 10542/14 10545/23 10546/18 10552/9 hey [2] 10482/8 10526/4
hide [1] 10545/18 hides [1] 10546/3 hiding [1] 10546/6 high [5] 10544/8 10544/17 10544/18 10552/9 10552/13
higher [16] 10482/7 10493/2 10499/13 10527/1 10528/10 10534/15 10534/15 10536/4 10537/12 10537/17 10538/2 10542/20 10544/23 10546/10 10546/11 10549/14
highest [3] 10533/21 10533/23 10533/23 highlight [1] 10514/8 him [5] 10453/20 10472/24 10480/6 10486/11 10508/21 himself [3] 10458/14 10485/4 10536/11 hinder [1] 10542/7
his [32] 10462/5
10463/3 10463/6 10463/19 10467/5 10467/6 10470/1 10470/1 10470/17 10471/7 10471/20 10482/17 10483/16 10485/11 10485/14 10491/1 10491/2 10491/2 10491/8 10492/13 10493/4 10497/8 10500/24 10502/1 10503/18 10508/7 10531/20 10531/21 10531/23 10552/7 10552/8 10552/21
historical [3] 10498/14 10499/7 10503/2 historically [1] 10499/10
history [2] 10457/25
10475/16
hit [1] 10485/2
hold [1] 10480/21
holding [1] 10480/19 holistic [1] 10476/4
honest [1] 10534/8
Honor [53] 10450/6
10450/14 10450/17 10451/13 10453/3 10456/3 10456/24 10457/4 10458/11 10461/5 10463/25 10466/20 10467/4 10468/17 10470/19 10474/13 10475/12 10476/11 10480/10 10481/1 10481/19 10482/20 10483/20 10484/8 10485/20 10489/15 10490/9 10491/4 10491/5 10493/9 10496/3 10497/5 10497/21 10501/24 10505/2 10505/23 10509/17 10510/20 10511/25 10514/1 10519/18 10522/7 10528/3 10529/5 10531/18 10534/22 10536/19 10538/13 10541/5 10545/23 10549/7 10550/21 10553/14
HONORABLE [3] 10446/9 10450/3 10513/16
hoping [1] 10523/18 horizontal [3] 10465/18 10483/1 10483/7
hotel [3] 10486/15 10488/17 10488/20
hour [1] 10491/13
Hovenkamp [1] 10506/25 how [69] 10452/2

10459/11 10459/24 10462/16 10463/4 10469/16 10469/25 10470/11 10470/25 10472/4 10476/15 10481/3 10481/9 10481/20 10484/1 10490/14 10492/9 10492/10 10499/3 10499/4 10499/11 10499/20 10501/14 10502/23 10502/25 10504/3 10504/6 10504/8 10505/23 10506/25 10507/3 10507/4 10509/23 10510/4 10510/7 10510/22 10512/2 10514/8 10514/19 10514/21 10519/15 10520/5 10520/24 10521/1 10522/8 10525/8 10525/15 10525/22 10526/13 10532/16 10533/4 10534/4 10534/25 10536/21 10537/24 10538/17 10539/9 10539/14 10539/18 10539/20 10543/2 10543/9 10545/18 10545/20 10545/20 10545/24 10549/2 10549/8 10552/25
huh [1] 10500/5 hurt [1] 10517/5 hyperrational [1] 10469/10
hypo [1] 10473/5 hypothetical [2] 10464/20 10473/8

I also [6] 10453/20 10460/16 10466/23 10484/19 10491/21 10510/6
I apologize [1] 10492/16
I can [2] 10458/15 10506/2
I did [14] 10456/20 10461/2 10462/5 10480/9 10489/1 10489/9 10491/19 10491/20 10496/15 10500/10 10503/6 10509/14 10521/14 10529/11
I didn't [6] 10461/3 10481/2 10493/21 10503/5 10503/8 10543/2
I don't [23] 10454/24 10465/10 10465/24 10467/6 10467/9
10467/10 10467/22 10483/9 10483/18

I don't... [14] 10483/24 10485/19 10486/2 10496/18 10497/1 10506/11 10527/19 10527/23 10530/21 10533/20 10536/14 10542/11 10543/2 10544/3
I guess [13] 10452/5
10465/17 10502/18 10502/21 10505/1 10506/2 10506/3 10518/8 10525/3 10528/14 10540/6 10549/5 10551/21
I have [3] 10466/21 10474/5 10475/11
I just [10] 10458/17 10461/3 10500/14 10502/2 10508/9 10526/14 10530/24 10534/9 10543/1 10545/9
I know [7] 10455/5 10466/21 10493/10 10510/1 10523/8 10523/18 10529/22
I mean [13] 10468/8 10470/23 10494/10 10502/18 10509/1 10511/22 10529/24 10531/25 10545/7 10548/14 10549/21 10551/21 10552/13 I say [2] 10459/25 10531/13 I should [9] 10453/7 10460/10 10460/11 10490/1 10499/21 10509/4 10523/2 10533/16 10553/3 It think [105] 10452/4 10452/18 10452/19 10454/7 10455/17 10455/20 10456/1 10458/18 10459/17 10459/22 10460/2 10460/7 10461/12 10463/24 10465/14 10468/25 10469/14 10470/12 10470/17 10471/25 10472/5 10472/8 10472/12 10474/18 10475/19 10477/22 10478/2 10478/5 10478/25 10479/15 10479/23 10481/22 10481/23 10483/22 10484/24 10485/3 10485/3 10485/7 10486/1 10486/2 10486/4 10486/6 10486/24 10487/6 10487/18 10489/5 10494/10 10495/20 10496/2 10499/2 10500/12

10500/21 10501/4 10502/15 10502/21 10504/16 10505/9 10506/10 10506/13 10506/17 10507/16 10507/19 10508/10 10508/17 10508/20 10509/10 10509/11 10509/20 10510/7 10510/20 10511/14 10512/11 10514/1 10516/4 10517/3 10518/7 10518/17 10519/6 10523/9 10523/12 10523/17 10523/22 10525/6 10526/12 10527/12 10527/24 10528/16 10529/24 10530/23 10531/6 10532/2 10533/20 10536/6 10536/10 10538/7 10538/13 10539/2 10543/8 10545/17 10546/17 10550/17 10551/3 10551/5 10551/22 10551/25 I thought [2] 10488/8 10529/4
I understand [2] 10458/25 10459/3 I want [11] 10451/20 10451/22 10485/13 10509/1 10512/1 10512/3 10519/22 10519/25 10524/16 10527/14 10551/17
I wanted [1] 10450/21
I was [12] 10456/3 10458/14 10459/9 10464/17 10466/20 10469/7 10475/14 10477/23 10485/25 10496/3 10538/14 10542/14
I'd [6] 10452/3 10454/4 10495/11 10538/5 10540/6 10546/22 I'II [8] 10478/23 10480/24 10480/25 10491/10 10523/24 10524/13 10531/24 10539/21
I'm [49] 10453/11 10454/5 10457/21 10458/22 10467/15 10470/17 10471/1 10471/2 10472/3 10472/3 10476/24 10481/4 10481/22 10483/6 10483/12 10485/3 10486/14 10488/5 10491/10 10497/24 10498/9 10499/16 10503/10 10504/11 10509/1 10509/2 10510/17 10512/19 10516/11

10523/25 10524/16 10533/18 10534/3 10534/6 10534/8
10534/10 10534/16 10535/15 10536/25 10539/16 10545/1 10546/21 10547/3 10547/3 10548/2 10548/10 10548/12 10548/14 10548/15
I'm -- you [1] 10471/2
I'm going [8] 10454/5 10483/12 10491/10 10504/11 10512/19 10524/16 10548/10 10548/12
I'm just [4] 10483/6 10516/11 10533/18 10534/10
I'm not [7] 10472/3
10472/3 10488/5
10497/24 10509/1 10509/2 10510/17 I'm not sure [2] 10534/8 10546/21
I'm sorry [9] 10453/11
10458/22 10467/15 10476/24 10499/16 10503/10 10535/15 10539/16 10548/2
I'm thinking [2] 10547/3 10548/14 I've [7] 10457/9 10459/20 10461/18 10483/12 10491/10 10514/3 10537/21
i.e [1] 10476/20 idea [12] 10469/7 10477/2 10482/20 10483/11 10486/25 10508/12 10508/18 10508/19 10521/12 10521/21 10523/22 10525/4
ideal [1] 10476/21
ideally [1] 10483/2
identified [3] 10491/1 10536/16 10552/9
ignores [1] 10546/12 ignoring [1] 10546/9 illustrates [2] 10523/22 10525/4
illustration [1] 10519/1 imagine [8] 10486/8 10520/9 10520/11 10520/22 10523/23 10524/1 10525/17 10539/2
immediately [2]
10471/3 10482/1
impacts [2] 10515/14 10537/18
implausibly [1] 10548/2
implication [1] 10548/16 importance [3] 10469/2 10469/2

| $10496 / 17$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| important [15] 10468/9 |

increasing [10] 10452/23 10456/6 10468/23 10484/25 10456/6 10457/13 10485/6 10486/2 10487/5 10487/7
10488/2 10498/10
10501/19 10502/13 10504/8 10521/7
10553/2 10553/7
importantly [2]
10470/3 10503/1 impossible [1] 10537/13
improper [1] 10465/7
improve [3] 10543/10
10543/12 10551/14
improvement [2]
10479/19 10550/14
improvements [13]
10459/5 10459/7 10474/15 10475/1
10475/18 10477/2
10477/17 10477/19
10477/25 10478/12
10479/12 10550/25
10551/1
improves [2] 10543/19 10544/7
improving [6] 10458/6
10474/23 10474/24
10479/20 10479/21
10542/16
incentive [13] 10452/1
10452/18 10453/14 10453/24 10477/3
10477/18 10479/14 10519/4 10519/7
10520/21 10526/8
10548/21 10549/18
incentives [19]
10478/24 10478/25
10517/23 10538/11
10538/17 10538/24
10539/7 10540/2
10542/5 10542/8
10542/15 10543/23
10546/21 10547/5
10549/3 10549/5
10549/8 10549/11 10549/18
include [3] 10482/21 10482/23 10516/7
included [1] 10464/7
includes [1] 10452/23
including [4] 10458/21
10460/24 10472/6 10510/8
inconsistent [1]
10456/22
increase [8] 10457/22 10474/10 10477/4 10479/2 10479/2
10494/23 10495/4 10495/9
increased [2] 10457/1 10474/20
increases [2] 10474/14 intuitive [1] 10545/14
10479/25

10457/18 10475/20
10475/21 10475/25
10477/10 10478/7
incremental [1] 10537/3
incur [1] 10452/21
INDEX [2] 10449/2 10449/8
indicate [1] 10531/1
individual [1] 10514/21
individually [1]
10514/17
industry [1] 10520/15
infinite [1] 10494/23
infinity [1] 10492/9
information [7]
10466/16 10468/24
10469/11 10471/22
10490/5 10490/6 10553/4
informative [2]
10494/9 10494/11
inherently [1]
10495/18
innovate [2] 10479/20 10520/17
input [1] 10508/14 Instagram [1] 10489/17
instances [1] 10456/5 instantly [1] 10471/21 instead [11] 10462/21 10479/19 10495/3 10498/21 10507/12 10523/3 10525/12 10526/4 10526/18 10540/24 10553/19
instruction [1] 10513/10
intense [2] 10522/14 10526/13
intent [9] 10484/16 10484/17 10484/17 10487/7 10487/9 10487/15 10487/23 10488/3 10488/6
interest [1] 10517/10 interesting [3] 10461/22 10518/6 10523/11
interests [1] 10516/19 internal [1] 10493/6 internalize [2] 10515/12 10515/13 Internet [2] 10458/5 10467/8
introduce [5] 10477/18 10478/15 10479/8 10479/12 10479/18 introduced [2] 10477/17 10549/16 introducing [1] 10466/25 invest [10] 10542/8

| I | 10510/21 10511/14 | 10450/9 | 10472/12 10474/20 | 10552/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| invest... [9] 10542/15 | 10541/24 | kenneth.dintzer2 [1] | 10475/14 10 | age [1] 10461/25 |
| 10542/22 10548/21 | issues [3] 10470/23 | 10447/5 | 10477/15 10477/22 | ense [2] 10540/25 |
| 10549/19 10549/21 | 10533/20 10535/25 | kept [1] 10546/ | 10481/2 10498/18 | 541/1 |
| 10550/4 10551/23 | it [325] | ketchup [2] 10523/9 | 10505/23 10506/12 | licensed [1] 10540/24 |
| 10551/24 10552/1 | it would be [2] | 0523/10 | 10506/20 10522/7 | enses [1] 1054 |
| invested [1] 10549/24 | 0466/13 10505 | key [11] 10452/15 | 10522/7 10525/13 | light [2] 10462/25 |
| investing [6] 10544/25 | it's [165] | 10452/20 10465/14 | 10527/25 10528/4 | 10524/5 |
| 10545/1 10546/11 | item [2] 10476/17 | 10484/14 10485/7 | 10529/4 10538/14 | like [103] 10458/8 |
| 10547/4 10548/9 | 10507/8 | 10497/6 10498/24 | 10539/12 10542/5 | 10462/18 10463/11 |
| 10549/13 | iterations [1] 10532/16 | 10514/9 10517/3 | 10542/14 10542/18 | 10464/8 10465/17 |
| investment [12] | its [42] 10456/6 | 10518/12 10546/17 | 10543/17 10545/23 | 465/23 10466/ |
| 10456/13 10494/14 | 10458/20 10458/21 | kind [63] 10452/5 | 10549/7 10550/22 | 466/13 10466/ |
| 10542/5 10542/19 | 10460/25 10461/13 | 10452/15 10452/20 | late [2] 10466/24 | 10467/1 10468/17 |
| 10542/24 10542/25 | 10461/14 10465/22 | 10454/8 10454/19 | 10549/23 | 10471/2 10471/20 |
| 10543/13 10543/14 | 10474/1 10474/14 | 10456/4 10460/14 | latest [2] 10465/17 | 10471/20 10472/4 |
| 10543/15 10543/23 | 10479/1 10479/2 | 10461/21 10462/19 | 10487/25 | 10476/2 10476/18 |
| 10545/4 10546/21 | 10479/22 10486/16 | 10471/6 10472/2 | LAW [1] 10447/1 | 0478/11 10479/1 |
| vestments [3] | /18 10488/20 | 472/25 10476/5 | lawsuit [1] 10534/23 | 10481/14 10483/23 |
| 10507/24 10549/18 | 10489/16 10490/4 | 10480/20 10480/20 | lawyer [1] 10535/1 | 0486/7 10490 |
| 10551/19 | 10498/19 10515/2 | 10483/22 10484/1 | lawyers [1] 10534/23 | 10490/21 10490/ |
| involved [2] 10499/1 | 10515/3 10515/5 | 10486/4 10490/23 | lead [3] 10479/11 | 10491/20 10492 |
| 10500/15 | 10515/5 10515/14 | 10490/24 10494/1 | 10529/16 10550/13 | 10493/23 10493 |
| iOS [3] 10503/21 | 10515/18 10515/24 | 10494/4 10497/21 | leading [1] 10535/22 | 0494/2 |
| 10538/10 10539/11 | 10516/15 10516/15 | 10499/19 10505/24 | least [5] 10459/5 | 10495/6 10495/1 |
| is [416] | 10519/16 10521/3 | 10507/3 10509/17 | 10477/2 10477/4 | 10499/9 10500/1 |
| is there [5] 10458/7 | 10524/3 10526/7 | 10509/22 10509/25 | 10541/14 10542/1 | 10500/18 10500 |
| 10476/25 10494/8 | 10526/17 10527/1 | 10510/1 10512/2 | leaves [1] 10515/7 | 10501/14 10502/3 |
| 10512/14 10536/16 | 10536/22 10536/23 | 10512/8 10514/1 | leaving [1] 10483/12 | 10504/6 10504/14 |
| isn't [7] 10452/9 | 10537/6 10538/11 | 10514/7 10514/20 | lectures [1] 10523/14 | 10505/25 10507/20 |
| 10455/18 10456/12 | 10543/19 10544/12 | 10517/3 10517/22 | left [4] 10457/20 | 10509/22 10510/7 |
| 10458/9 10512/24 | 10547/5 | 10517/24 10518 | 10464/3 10498/9 | 10511/11 10511/14 |
| 10513/2 10530/16 | 0551/14 | 10518/25 10519/2 | 10518/ | 511/19 10512/8 |
| Israel [41] 10451/24 | itself [2] 10487/4 | 10520/1 10520/4 | legal [2] 10510/17 | 0512/9 10513/6 |
| 10453/13 10455/17 |  | 521/20 10521/20 | 10510/17 | 4/4 10514/13 |
| 10457/1 10457/4 | J | 10523/22 10525/3 |  |  |
| 0458/19 | jail [2] 10511/20 | 10525/4 10525/14 | less [20] 10453/4 | 517/13 1051 |
| 10460/23 10461/5 | 10511/22 | 10527/5 10529/13 | 10453/9 10459/15 | 0518/23 10520 |
| 4/23 10465/2 | January [1] 10493/3 | 10532/10 10533/6 | 10495/5 10495/7 | 10523/18 1052 |
| 10466/2 10466/7 | John [2] 10448/2 | 10537/21 10539/8 | 10515/20 10516/24 | 10524/20 10525 |
|  | 10450/11 | 10539/12 10540/18 | 10517/9 10520/21 | 10525/15 10525/18 |
|  | jon.sallet [1] 10447/16 | 10544/23 10546/8 | 10522/14 10526/13 | 10526/22 10528/13 |
| 10477/17 10478/2 | Jonathan [2] 10447/11 | 10546/12 10552/2 | 10528/1 10528/4 | 10528/17 10528/19 |
| 10478/13 10478/21 | 10450/10 | kinds [7] 10463/6 | 10529/1 10529/12 | 10529/5 10529/7 |
|  | journey [1] 10484/22 | 10466/16 10485/1 | 10539/5 10540/19 | 10530/7 10531/5 |
| 10482/16 10483/14 | jschmidtlein [1] | 10511/10 10512/3 | 10542/21 10545/1 | 10531/6 10532/10 |
| 10485/11 10485/15 | 10448/4 | 10530/19 10542/14 | 10553/12 | 10533/4 10533/7 |
| 10485/24 10486/5 | Juda [1] 10476/18 | knew [1] 10534/8 | lesser [1] 10535/12 | 10533/9 10534/1 |
| 10488/4 10488/8 | JUDGE [1] 10446/10 | knife [1] 10466/22 | let [3] 10489/13 | 10534/22 10534/ |
| 10488/23 10489/11 | Judicial [1] 10447/13 | knobs [1] 10479/5 | 10491/15 10511/13 | 0535/5 10535 |
| 10489/15 10490/25 | jump [1] 10484/23 | know [387] | let's [23] 10450/15 | 0536/4 10536/ |
| 10491/23 10492/4 | jumps [1] 10482/2 | knows [1] 10507/17 | 10463/17 10466/1 | 5536/12 10537/2 |
| 10493/4 10495/11 | just [119] | ksmurzynski [1] | 10467/23 10470/6 | 0538/4 10538/5 |
| Israel's [16] 10454/7 | JUSTICE [1] 10447/2 | 10448/5 | 10472/11 10476/20 | 538/16 10539/1 |
| 10456/17 10457/5 |  | L |  |  |
| 10459/1 10463/18 | justify [1] 10503/3 | labeled [2] 10493 | 10513/ | 544/16 1054 |
| 10469/19 10470/2 | K | 10493/12 | 514/23 10514/24 | 10547/15 10548 |
| 10474/3 10480/5 |  | language [2] 10502 | 515/17 10519/13 | 10548/15 10552/1 |
| 10487/13 10487/13 | Kansas [4] 10486/7 | 10543/12 | 520/10 10520/22 | likelihood [1] |
| 10488/25 10489/5 | 10486/9 10486/17 | large [2] 10503/22 | 10524/6 10535/12 | 10546/10 |
| 10489/7 | 10486/22 | 10545/3 | 10547/11 10547/20 | likely [2] 10456/2 |
| issue [12] 10462/25 | keep [5] 10452/25 | largely [1] 10462/15 | level [11] 10459/10 | 10528/5 |
| 10471/7 10479/3 | 01/19 10514/12 | larger [1] 10528/1 | 460/12 10460/13 | likes [2] 10515/1 |
| 10479/3 10496/6 | 10524/8 10524/19 | last [31] 10456/3 | 460/14 10512/8 | 517/8 |
| 10496/6 10496/7 | keeps [1] 1054 | 10461/10 10462/18 | 10518/14 10537/7 | limit [1] 10455/10 |
| 10496/10 10510/20 | Kenneth [2] 10447/2 | 10465/13 10467/21 | 10547/7 10547/8 | limitations [1] |


| L | 10487/11 10492/25 | 10468/4 10468/20 | 10520/15 10520/19 | 2/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10496/3 | 10475/17 10501 | 10545/7 10545/8 | 21 10545/7 |
| 494/16 | 10496/4 10501/8 | 10537/1 10538/20 | 10548/23 10553/1 | 0545/14 10548/14 |
| [2] 10490/4 | 10501/9 10502/1 | 10539/5 10539/5 | 10553/2 | 549/21 10551/11 |
| $10496 / 14$ | 10502/6 10505/2 | 10539/9 10543/9 | marketplace [2] | 551/21 10552/13 |
| [8] 10481/21 | 10505/3 10511/8 | 10545/4 10548/20 | 10515/15 10518/2 | 22 |
| 10490/10 10490/14 | 10521/18 10546/25 | managed [1] 10476/6 | markets [4] 10463/1 | meaning [3] 10463/9 |
| 10490/19 10536/10 | lots [3] 10458/4 | manufacturer [7] | 10470/7 10472/11 | 10474/24 10526/25 |
| 10537/15 10548/19 | 10463/8 10543/8 | 10475/3 10512/6 | 10483/16 | means [5] 10468/9 |
| 10551/22 | Iow [7] 10459/20 | 10524/2 10524/3 | marries [1] 10526/ | 10492/6 10511/2 |
| linear [1] 10484/22 | 10460/18 10470/5 | 10524/8 10524/19 | marry [1] 10525/23 | 515/25 10517/10 |
| link [1] 10540/9 | 10473/24 10540/17 | 10525/1 | massive [1] 10505/2 | ant [2] 10529/23 |
| list [1] 10534/16 | 10540/25 10542/2 | manufacturers | match [1] 10491/12 | 10539/12 |
| listed [1] 10538/7 | lower [16] 10456/14 | 10474/22 10474/25 | material [1] 10550/13 | measure [10] 10475 |
| literally [5] 10467/1 | 10456/15 10478/10 | 10479/14 10524/24 | matter [13] 10468/18 | 10487/13 10487/14 |
| 10494/18 10500/16 | 10478/15 10504/18 | manufacturing [1] | 10469/13 10471/1 | 491/25 10492/5 |
| 0508/20 10508/21 | /24 105071 | 10453/17 | 10500/25 10504 | 506/21 10508/3 |
| literature [3] 10501/8 | 10520/15 10520/17 | many [14] 10458/6 | 10504/12 10505/1 | /5 |
| 10527/4 10530/25 | 10 | 10458/6 10461/14 | 10506/4 10507/23 | 10543/17 |
| little [2] 10458/12 | 10536/3 10538/3 | 10461/14 10462/4 | 10515/15 10541/2 | 2] 105 |
| 10482/4 | 10540/25 10542/21 |  |  |  |
| LLC [2] 104 | 10542/24 | 86/1 10517/7 | mattered [1] 10499 | sures [3] 1048 |
| 0450/8 | lowering [1] 10543/23 | 10525/8 10534/25 | matters [2] 10516/6 | 10506/14 10507/1 |
| P [1] | lowers [2] 10452/21 | 10547/14 10547/17 | 10528/14 | measuring [5] 10460/9 |
| locking [1] 10543 | $10543 / 21$ | 10549/22 | may [18] 10451/13 | 10490/11 10492/2 |
| logic [1] 10460/8 | lunch [1] 10553/21 | Maps [1] 10498/16 | 10451/14 10454/16 | 10506/22 10508/ |
| long [2] 10457/18 | M |  |  | mechanical [1] |
|  | Mac [1] | Marissa [1] 10466/22 | 10481/15 10487/24 | mechanism [4] |
| longer [1] 10539/4 | MADA [5] 10540/11 | market [84] 10451/20 | 10507/21 10514/18 | 10478/14 10479/3 |
|  | 10540/12 10541/11 | 10451/21 10452/7 | 10515/12 10516/10 | 10479/7 10479/11 |
|  | 10541/11 10541/13 | 10452/13 10452/13 | 10528/16 10531/10 | media [3] 10489/17 |
| 10490/15 10490/17 | made [7] 10457/23 | 10453/8 10453/2 | 10544/4 10546/2 | 10492/25 10494/20 |
| 10490/18 10508/12 | 10461/4 10461/6 | 10454/21 10455/12 | 105 | meeting [3] 10476/14 |
| 10508/14 10518/13 | 10461/10 10495/11 | 10458/21 10459/18 | maybe [17] 10486/6 | 10476/14 10476/15 |
| 5531/2 10541/3 | 10498/11 10509/10 | 10459/23 10460/10 | 10491/16 10503/11 | EHTA [2] 10446/9 |
| 10542/19 10546/7 | main [2] 10458/3 | 10460/25 10461/8 | 12 | 10450/3 |
| looked [11] 10464 | 10463/18 | 10461/13 10462/9 | 10507/20 10509/4 | memory [1] 10475/4 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { looked [11] } \\ & \text { 10489/10 104 } \end{aligned}$ | Maine [1] 10448/3 | 10463/17 10464/1 | 10512/9 10516/18 | mental [2] 10471/18 |
| 10498/6 10498/12 | maintain [1] 10521/19 | 10464/7 10464/9 | 517/17 10520/11 | 0471/2 |
|  | majority [2] 10497/16 | 10464/11 10464/20 | 10523/10 10525/19 | menu [3] 10532/9 |
| 10532/18 10536/17 | 10547/19 | 10464/23 10465/7 | 10530/9 10534/24 | 10532/12 10533/11 |
| 10532/18 10536/17 | make [36] 10450/21 | 10465/19 10465/20 | 10536/4 10548/16 | merger [3] 10465/18 |
| 10536/17 | 10452/12 10453/1 | 10465/20 10468/1 | Mayer [1] 10466/22 | 10483/1 10483/7 |
| 10459/19 10459/21 | 10453/4 10453/18 | 10468/15 10469/3 | MBAs [2] 10501/6 | Merit [1] 10448/6 |
| 10464/17 10464/18 | 10462/11 10462/20 | 10469/18 10469/19 | 10501/6 | Meta [8] 10489/16 |
| 10471/6 10481/19 | 10466/3 10475/6 | 10470/1 10472/14 | me [28] 10451/8 | 10490/11 10492/8 |
| 10488/1 10489/11 | 10475/25 10476/1 | 10472/14 10472/22 | 10453/23 10461/7 | 10492/18 10492/25 |
| 10492/9 10499/7 | 10478/19 10478/24 | 10472/22 10473/3 | 10464/16 10470/25 | 10494/15 10494/2 |
| 10503/3 10503/8 | 10478/25 10488/8 | 10473/4 10473/5 | 10471/17 10484/14 | 10495/5 |
| 10518/10 10537/6 | 10489/14 10489/23 | 10473/6 10473/7 | 10485/7 10489/13 | Meta's [1] 10492 |
| 10537/21 10553/4 | 10500/11 10500/12 | 10473/8 10473/8 | 10490/8 10490/24 | method [1] 10503/21 |
| looks [2] 10546/25 | 10500/13 10505/21 | 10473/9 10473/12 | 10491/15 10493/18 | Michael [2] 10450/19 |
| 10547/1 | 10507/24 1 | 10473/13 10473/20 | 10499/16 10500/12 | 10451/2 |
| lose [8] 10475/7 | 105 | 10474/2 10474/12 | 500/13 10502/3 | Microsoft [22] |
| 10479/22 1049 | 10528/6 10530/10 | 10474/16 10474/19 | 502/5 10507 | 10457/20 1049 |
| 10506/7 10506/8 | 30/14 10531/1 | 10477 | 10510/20 10511/13 | $049$ |
| 10524/24 10525/10 | 31/12 10539/7 | 10477/7 10477/10 | 210523 | 10499/4 10499/4 |
| 10525/15 | 541/1 10543/7 | 俦/11 10479/17 | 5/24 10535/25 | /15 1051 |
| loser [1] 10505/20 | 543/11 10549/20 | 482/21 10482/23 | 10538/15 10543/7 | 525/19 10528/13 |
| losing [1] 10550/3 | 51/20 | 10483/8 10483/14 | 10547/3 | 528/17 10549/19 |
| lost [3] 10499/20 | 10486/24 10525 | 10483/20 104 |  |  |
| 10501/3 10549/25 | 10538/22 10539/2 |  |  | 10550/13 10551/16 |
| lot [23] 104 | 10541/11 10541/13 | 03/2 10503 |  |  |
|  | making [17] 10453/18 | 10505/9 10506/22 | 10511/22 10512/19 | 10551/22 10551/25 |
| 10474/12 10474/16 | 10456/13 10459/5 | 10514/21 10515/9 | 10513/24 10514/11 | Microsoft's [1] |
| 10475/15 10484/24 | 10459/6 10466/2 | 10519/11 10520/13 | 10529/20 10529/24 | 10499/13 |


 10505/9 10505/13 10505/14 10506/3 10506/4 10506/5 10533/10
Number 2 [1] 10485/24 numbers [14] 10463/9 10497/24 10499/8 10499/12 10499/14 10502/12 10502/19 10503/22 10505/10 10506/16 10508/1 10537/13 10537/14 10537/16
NW [3] 10447/3 10447/7 10448/8

## 0

objection [2] 10531/18 10531/25
obligated [1] 10530/16
obtain [1] 10496/23
obvious [1] 10512/10
obviously [1] 10457/18
October [1] 10551/9
off [4] 10462/20
10493/22 10497/5 10516/12
offer [8] 10462/24
10524/16 10526/21
10530/1 10530/7 10531/12 10532/11 10540/24
offered [3] 10500/16 10527/2 10541/6
offering [8] 10466/14
10466/15 10510/13 10510/17 10526/5 10531/8 10531/9 10540/15
offers [5] 10472/2 10524/13 10527/1 10530/2 10530/4
Official [1] 10448/7
oh [9] 10458/15 10462/5 10469/14 10471/2 10478/11 10490/15 10491/9 10500/25 10537/16 oil [2] 10457/12 10457/14
okay [50] 10451/12 10451/16 10454/18 10455/2 10456/21 10460/1 10460/10 10460/20 10467/23 10472/3 10472/24 10474/20 10477/13 10488/21 10489/22 10490/16 10490/18 10499/13 10500/19 10501/6 10502/5 10503/17 10504/2 10510/1 10511/14 10513/3 10513/21 10513/25 10515/10 10517/1 10517/7

10518/14 10519/17 10520/13 10522/6 10523/6 10524/11 10535/20 10537/8 10537/12 10540/17 10542/3 10544/11 10546/5 10547/1 10547/2 10547/9 10551/6 10553/16 10553/19 once [3] 10476/5 10509/25 10533/2 one [85] 10452/19 10457/12 10458/1 10459/16 10463/7 10463/18 10464/2 10465/15 10466/1 10466/19 10466/21 10466/22 10468/2 10468/11 10468/17 10470/13 10470/16 10470/21 10471/15 10471/15 10471/17 10474/16 10474/18 10477/22 10479/5 10481/5 10485/5 10485/16 10486/1 10488/8 10489/13 10490/3 10490/6 10490/6 10491/23 10494/10 10495/22 10497/13 10498/23 10499/17 10500/14 10500/20 10501/8 10501/16 10501/25 10503/12 10504/2 10504/9 10505/9 10505/13 10510/16 10511/14 10512/5 10518/19 10521/5 10521/7 10523/14 10523/16 10524/3 10524/10 10525/1 10525/6 10528/3 10529/13 10530/1 10531/2 10531/5 10532/17 10532/17 10533/6 10533/21 10534/3 10538/8 10540/1 10541/20 10541/20 10541/22 10542/15 10545/9 10545/20 10545/20 10546/4 10546/12 10546/19 10551/3 one-stop [8] 10465/15 10466/1 10466/19 10468/11 10470/13 10470/16 10470/21 10495/22
one-stop-shop [1] 10471/15 ones [1] 10476/2 only [10] 10462/1 10462/14 10467/25 10496/23 10502/11 10519/10 10524/16 10526/16 10537/5

10550/2
operates [1] 10452/10 opinion [8] 10455/23 10457/10 10457/22 10473/15 10473/18 10495/17 10510/13 10541/10
opinions [4] 10467/6 10504/23 10509/7 10549/17
opportunities [1] 10494/16 opportunity [1] 10518/13
opposed [1] 10534/13
opposite [1] 10516/20 option [2] 10462/2 10545/15 options [1] 10480/7 order [5] 10454/11 10487/1 10500/18 10521/10 10534/4 ordinary [3] 10453/16 10493/7 10502/22 other [34] 10457/7 10462/17 10462/20 10471/14 10471/14 10472/6 10472/7 10480/22 10483/21 10483/22 10484/10 10487/4 10489/17 10491/10 10491/23 10491/23 10497/14 10499/14 10503/7 10503/21 10505/6 10515/23 10521/6 10523/8 10524/12 10524/14 10525/24 10528/17 10529/19 10540/16 10541/25 10542/16 10545/12 10547/11
others [1] 10515/15 otherwise [2]
10452/24 10520/11 ought [1] 10532/11 our [6] 10478/15 10479/23 10513/6 10526/4 10537/18 10542/5
ourselves [1] 10528/19
out [23] 10461/18
10462/12 10464/4
10475/24 10483/25
10491/6 10498/22
10499/8 10499/21
10499/21 10499/22
10510/7 10511/20
10511/22 10515/7
10515/8 10524/9
10524/20 10526/7
10539/23 10547/25
10548/7 10550/17
outbid [1] 10521/12 outcomes [2]
10502/24 10503/2
output [33] 10452/2 10452/9 10452/10

| $10453 / 5$ | $10453 / 15$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $10453 / 22$ | $10453 / 25$ |
| $10454 / 11$ | $10454 / 15$ |
| $10454 / 17$ | $10454 / 23$ |
| $10455 / 11$ | $10455 / 18$ |
| $10455 / 25$ | $10457 / 1$ |
| $10457 / 2$ | $10457 / 7$ |
| $10457 / 10$ | $10457 / 13$ |
| $10457 / 18$ | $10457 / 22$ |
| $10458 / 4$ | $10458 / 7$ |
| $10458 / 8$ | $10458 / 13$ |
| $10459 / 1$ | $10459 / 4$ |
| $10459 / 7$ | $10459 / 18$ |
| $10460 / 5$ | $10460 / 10$ |
| $10460 / 13$ | $10460 / 15$ |
| outside $[2]$ | $10501 / 2$ |
| $10534 / 18$ |  |

outweigh [1] 10527/17 over [15] 10456/19 10457/6 10457/19 10463/12 10473/16 10476/17 10482/4 10500/17 10505/12 10505/12 10505/12 10528/12 10536/8 10547/19 10551/8 overall [3] 10459/18 10494/4 10520/18 overlap [5] 10485/23 10486/25 10487/3 10487/14 10488/13 overlapping [1] 10485/17
overly [1] 10454/9 overrule [1] 10531/24 overtime [1] 10473/19 own [3] 10470/5 10491/17 10518/24

## $\mathbf{P}$

P. [1] 10450/3
p.m [2] 10553/24

10553/24
page [4] 10489/14 10493/5 10523/20 10533/10
paid [2] 10464/10 10534/5
par [1] 10462/19 paraphrasing [1] 10504/12
parents [1] 10507/18
part [9] 10452/11
10456/25 10459/23
10478/24 10500/24
10522/15 10522/24
10546/13 10546/15
participants [1]
10505/10
particular [4] 10463/8 10512/3 10536/22 10538/19
parties [7] 10502/13 10503/1 10503/8 10503/8 10504/8 10512/16 10519/19
parties' [1] 10501/21
partner [1] 10537/25
parts [1] 10465/23 party [1] 10534/23 Pass [1] 10553/18 passed [1] 10536/2 passthrough [2] 10535/23 10535/25 past [3] 10456/19 10476/13 10551/17 pause [4] 10493/11 10493/12 10493/16 10494/13
pay [25] 10455/15 10462/7 10462/7 10501/1 10501/9 10505/19 10506/1 10506/5 10516/21 10517/20 10521/4 10521/21 10524/13 10528/15 10528/20 10530/19 10531/1 10531/7 10531/12 10532/14 10533/5 10533/22 10534/1 10535/1 10537/17 paying [11] 10505/20 10521/18 10531/1 10532/20 10533/25 10535/4 10535/6 10535/7 10538/2 10540/23 10541/16 payment [2] 10529/21 10535/6
payments [13]
10527/21 10527/25 10529/18 10530/24 10531/8 10531/10 10531/14 10531/21 10532/12 10534/21 10535/13 10535/17 10536/2
payoff [1] 10501/12 pays [1] 10534/2 PC [1] 10497/15 PCs [7] 10457/21 10497/10 10497/10 10497/13 10497/17 10525/19 10551/24
PCTR [1] 10479/1
Penado [17] 10451/18 10476/22 10480/2 10482/13 10485/8 10489/2 10495/13 10496/19 10504/20 10508/5 10509/6 10513/4 10519/13 10521/23 10527/13 10550/6 10552/4 penny [1] 10476/19 people [33] 10453/4 10456/16 10466/16 10466/18 10470/13 10471/20 10471/24 10484/23 10486/17 10486/17 10486/18 10486/21 10486/22 10487/17 10487/20 10488/11 10488/12 10488/18 10488/19

## $\mathbf{P}$

people... [14] 10502/25 10507/13 10507/16 10507/20 10507/21 10507/22 10507/25 10514/15 10523/18 10524/20 10546/5 10547/14 10547/15 10547/17
people's [1] 10507/11 per [1] 10512/12 perceives [2] 10456/10 10459/10
percent [28] 10481/12
10493/16 10493/17 10493/18 10493/25 10493/25 10494/3 10494/3 10494/15 10495/4 10495/4 10496/24 10497/9 10505/18 10506/15 10507/6 10507/6 10507/12 10507/25 10534/3 10544/13 10547/19 10548/1 10548/5 10548/5 10548/6 10548/7 10548/12
percentage [2] 10462/1 10503/23 percentages [1] 10499/17
perfectly [4] 10455/13 10468/8 10486/18 10530/14
perform [1] 10491/17
performed [1]
10480/17
period [11] 10475/17 10489/19 10489/24 10490/13 10490/15 10490/23 10492/19 10493/13 10550/23 10551/9 10551/13
permissible [2] 10529/9 10529/10
perspective [1] 10508/10
perspectives [1] 10479/23
phone [7] 10538/20 10538/21 10538/23 10541/2 10541/8 10541/9 10541/21 phones [9] 10505/18 10537/18 10538/4 10539/7 10539/8 10539/10 10539/11 10540/17 10540/25
Pichai [4] 10461/20 10485/4 10501/25 10540/1
picking [1] 10499/8 pie [4] 10493/11 10493/24 10494/8 10503/20
piece [7] 10455/20 10459/13 10459/16

## 10518/23 10545/9 10545/12 10549/6 pieces [1] 10509/19 Pinterest [4] 10492/25 10493/15 10493/19 10494/17 <br> placards [2] 10457/25 10457/25

place [10] 10504/3 10508/13 10509/21 10509/23 10524/22 10544/20 10544/22 10545/11 10548/9 10548/11
placed [1] 10533/16
placement [4] 10540/23 10541/15 10541/16 10541/23
places [1] 10504/7
Plaintiff [2] 10447/10 10450/10
PLAINTIFF's [2]
10449/5 10449/10 Plaintiffs [3] 10446/4 10447/2 10451/2 Plaintiffs' [1] 10553/17 platforms [1] 10466/14 plausible [1] 10507/24 play [6] 10462/20 10510/7 10540/15 10541/18 10541/19 10541/21
player [1] 10521/18 playing [4] 10518/14 10547/7 10547/8 10549/9
please [5] 10450/4 10482/13 10485/8 10513/18 10550/6 plotted [1] 10491/22 plotting [1] 10457/21 plus [1] 10505/18 point [31] 10452/5 10458/3 10458/12 10463/7 10466/21 10466/23 10467/22 10471/18 10476/19 10478/23 10485/5 10494/11 10512/1 10513/6 10513/23 10514/7 10516/18 10517/22 10519/5 10519/11 10519/12 10520/2 10522/7 10530/5 10530/13 10539/22 10543/15 10544/6 10546/9 10548/19 10551/15 pointed [3] 10491/5 10536/5 10536/15 pointing [1] 10478/5 points [9] 10463/18 10488/8 10505/9 10506/10 10511/24 10512/4 10513/1 10520/1 10543/24 position [12] 10458/25 10459/2 10461/13

10462/13 10463/14
10463/15 10476/25
10479/10 10501/14 10501/15 10521/19 10534/16
possibility [2] 10530/1 10530/4
postings [1] 10488/1 potato [9] 10523/24 10523/24 10524/1 10524/2 10524/5 10524/6 10524/6 10524/17 10525/1 potential [1] 10505/5 potentially [3] 10453/8 10478/9 10528/14 pouring [1] 10550/24 power [29] 10451/21 10453/6 10455/24 10456/23 10458/9 10458/21 10460/25 10461/8 10462/9 10462/22 10464/21 10472/14 10472/23 10473/3 10473/4
10473/6 10473/9
10473/12 10473/20 10474/2 10474/12 10474/17 10477/10 10479/17 10496/11 10497/3 10497/22 10504/4 10546/3
powerful [1] 10468/18 precise [1] 10500/9 precision [2] 10551/1 10551/10
prediction [1] 10545/4 preference [3]
10468/11 10468/20 10495/22
preferences [2]
10468/6 10468/15
prepare [1] 10451/9
present [1] 10535/21 presentation [3] 10493/5 10513/23 10552/7
presented [6]
10469/17 10472/21
10485/11 10488/23
10504/23 10527/15
presents [1] 10489/12 preserving [1]
10515/22
presiding [1] 10450/3
pressure [4] 10456/5 10528/8 10528/9
10528/11
pressures [1]
10525/21
pretty [4] 10490/19
10499/12 10499/14 10520/12
Prettyman [1] 10448/8 prevent [7] 10464/19 10482/12 10512/24
10519/24 10521/2 10521/9 10521/22
previous [2] 10500/22 10501/23
previously [7] 10451/3 10452/19 10467/24 10496/11 10499/23 10536/20 10537/2
price [29] 10452/7
10452/11 10452/11
10452/14 10453/10
10453/18 10454/11
10454/16 10454/17
10454/20 10454/21
10455/7 10455/10
10474/10 10474/14
10476/19 10477/11
10477/25 10479/24
10480/1 10482/11
10486/20 10492/8
10494/23 10495/4
10495/9 10516/11
10533/7 10533/8
priced [2] 10540/17
10540/25
prices [28] 10454/22
10455/8 10455/15
10473/20 10474/7
10474/21 10476/1
10476/16 10477/7
10477/8 10477/16
10478/8 10478/10
10478/14 10479/9
10480/18 10481/9
10481/11 10481/18
10481/25 10482/9
10516/24 10520/18
10536/3 10536/8
10538/3 10541/5
10541/9
pricing [8] 10464/13
10472/13 10472/22
10473/16 10473/19
10476/5 10476/7
10477/25
primary [1] 10453/15
principal [2] 10473/15
10473/18
principle [10]
10482/16 10482/18 10482/20 10483/3
10483/5 10483/9 10483/10 10483/15 10483/17 10484/3
principles [1] 10553/5
privacy [4] 10522/25
10525/18 10525/23 10526/9
private [1] 10530/9
pro [2] 10552/19
10553/11
pro-competitive [2]
10552/19 10553/11
Probably [1] 10455/2
problem [7] 10496/1
10511/11 10512/18 10517/15 10519/1
10552/2 10553/10
problems [2] 10505/4 10536/9
proceedings [3] 10446/9 10448/10 10554/4
process [3] 10464/11 10464/12 10471/23
procompetitive [2]
10527/14 10527/17
produced [1] 10448/11 product [5] 10465/22
10465/23 10472/2
10486/9 10486/10
production [1] 10453/16
products [8] 10484/9 10484/13 10486/13 10486/19 10488/14 10489/17 10490/12 10495/5
Professor [89]
10450/16 10450/19 10450/22 10451/7
10451/17 10453/13 10455/23 10456/17 10458/13 10458/19 10460/22 10462/24 10463/3 10467/7 10468/25 10469/1 10470/6 10470/9 10470/9 10485/13 10485/15 10487/3 10495/10 10495/12 10495/16 10496/4 10496/13 10496/16 10496/22 10497/7 10500/7 10502/14 10503/12 10504/2 10504/16 10504/22 10504/23 10505/10 10506/12 10507/17 10508/3 10508/19 10509/7 10509/10 10510/10 10511/1 10511/4 10513/7 10513/22 10518/7 10519/3 10521/11 10525/7 10527/15 10527/16 10527/20 10529/22 10530/18 10531/6 10531/25 10535/11 10535/13 10535/21 10536/1 10536/11 10538/5 10538/6 10538/9 10539/22 10540/12 10540/14 10541/10 10542/4 10542/6 10542/23 10543/6 10543/24 10546/8 10546/14 10546/24 10549/2 10549/17 10550/9 10550/11 10550/12 10552/8 10552/20 10552/23 10553/15
Professor Murphy [38]
10458/13 10462/24 10463/3 10495/12 10495/16 10496/13

|  | 10507/13 | 10505/5 10505/5 | 0529/24 | 04 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professor Murphy... | proportional [2] | 10536 | Rangel [1] 10 | 10501/13 10512/14 |
| 2] 10497/7 10500/7 | 10492/3 10494/4 | 10543/ | ranked [2] 10533/ | 521/7 10546/13 |
| 10503/12 10504/2 | 10492/21 | 10543/19 10544/8 | rare [1] 10456/4 | leasons [9] 10456/14 |
| 10504/16 10504/23 | proportions [2] | 10544/17 10544/19 | rate [1] 10477/5 | 10458/4 10470/20 |
| 10505/10 10507/17 | 10492/12 10492/15 | 10544/23 10546/10 | rates [1] 10478/7 | 10471/14 10471/15 |
| 10508/3 10508/19 | protecting [1] 10521/5 | 10546/11 10549/14 | rather [2] 10478/20 | 10484/11 10495/21 |
| 10509/10 10511/4 | Protection [1] | 10550/14 10550/20 | 10518/11 | 10500/13 10547/16 |
| 10529/22 10531/6 | 10447/12 | 10550/20 10550/2 | rational [2] 10479 | rebuttal [6] 1045 |
| 10531/25 10535/13 | protects [1] 10520/7 | 10551/14 | 10479/18 | 10491/5 10505/3 |
| 10535/21 10536/11 | provided [2] 10480/15 | qualm [1] 10552/ | reach [6] 10485/1 | 10532/3 10551 |
| 10538/9 10540/14 | 10552/21 | quantify [1] 10460/4 | 10486/12 10486/2 | 10551/3 |
| 10542/6 10542/23 | providers [1] 10533/2 | quarter [1] 10533/2 | 488/3 10512/ | call [1] 10542/6 |
| 10543/24 10546/8 | provides [1] 10531/22 | queries [15] 10453 | 10519/21 | ceived [1] 10553 |
| 10546/14 10546/24 | public [9] 10457/9 | 10457/5 10458/4 | reached [1] 10517/25 | recent [1] 10456/8 |
| 10549/17 10550/11 | 10506/3 10514/11 | 10464/24 10465/8 | reaches [2] 10486/9 | recess [4] 10513/ |
| 10550/12 10552/8 | 10514/11 10514/16 | 10496/24 10497/16 |  | 10513/15 |
| Professor Murphy's [9] | 10519/1 10 | 10547/23 10548 | react [2] 10480/7 | recognition |
| 10450/22 10496/4 | pull [1] 10450/15 | 10548/5 10548/6 | 10482/3 | 10469/23 |
| 10496/16 10525/7 <br> 10538/6 10539/22 | purchase [1] 10484/22 | 10548/10 10548/13 | reacting [1] 10482/5 | cognizes [1] |
| 10540/12 10543/6 | purchased [1] 10538/4 | query [2] 10456/18 | reaction [2] 10461/1 | 104 |
| 52/23 | push [5] 10458/12 | 10466/10 | 10470/18 | ecord [8] |
| Professor Murray |  | question [23] 10452/2 | reactions [5] 10480 | 10460/7 1046 |
| 10527/16 | 10538/11 10539/7 | 10453/23 10456/25 | 10480/6 10480/13 | 10460/19 10461/12 |
| Professor Rangel [1] |  | 10456/25 10460/2 |  |  |
| 10469/1 | 10487/23 10489/2 | 10465/3 10467/22 | 10461/22 10463/3 | ed |
| Professo | 10491/10 10491/10 | 10472/18 10478/22 | 10523/18 | recovery [2] 10 |
| [11] 10450/16 1045 | 10491/16 10496/19 | 10503/11 10506/14 | ready [1] 10450/13 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { recovery } \\ 10535 / 1 \end{gathered}\right.$ |
| 10451/17 10455/23 | 10499/24 1050 | 10512/5 10512 | real [3] 10517/15 | RECROSS [1] 10449/4 |
| 10470/9 10506/12 | 10505/15 | 10512/23 10514 | 10531/15 10531/2 | red [2] 10490/24 |
| 10513/7 10513/22 | 10509/4 1051 | 10523/9 10527/2 | real-world [1] | 20 |
| 10542/4 | 4/22 10526/19 | 10538/15 10539/16 |  | redacted [3] 10480/25 |
| Professo |  | 10543/5 10550/ | e |  |
| [2] 10467/7 10553/15 |  | questions [7] |  | did [1] 10491/2 |
| profit [11] 10455/9 | 10546/12 105 | 10451/22 104 | 10481/4 | DIRECT [1] 1044 |
| 10461/10 10462/12 | 10552/9 | $\begin{aligned} & 10552 / 910552 / 11 \\ & 10552 / 1310552 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | 10458/17 10459/9 | 10452/18 10452/2 |
| 10462/16 10462/16 | puts [3] 10459/11 | 10552/22 | 10461/25 10466/5 | 10453/3 10453 |
| 463/ | 10528/8 10528/11 | quickly [1] 1048 | 10468/18 10469/12 | 0454/11 10454/15 |
| 10536/21 10537/6 | putting [1] 10466/25 | quite [3] | 10470/24 10471/17 | 10454/17 10454/23 |
| pros | Q | 10506/20 10537/11 | 10472/8 10474/21 | 05515/25 10517/20 |
| 10536 | qual | 10481/4 10501/25 | 485/20 | reduced [1] 10517/19 |
| $10482 / 910482 / 12$ | 10523/13 |  | 10487/6 10488/ | reduces [1] 10517/21 |
| 10550/2 | qualities [1] | R | 491/12 10492 | reducing [6] 10452/20 |
| profits [19] 10452/12 | quality [60] 10452/16 | raise [17] 10452/11 | 10492/24 10492/24 | 10453/2 10453/2 |
| 10453/1 10453/19 | 10452/18 10452/21 | 10453/1 10454/11 | 10493/17 10494/ | 10453/7 10453/7 |
| 10458/20 10460/22 | 10452/22 10452/23 | 10454/16 10454/17 | 10494/11 10500/ | 10453/16 |
| 10460/24 10461/6 | 10453/2 10453 | 10476/1 10476/1 | 10501/16 10501/1 | reduction [4] 1045 |
| 10478/15 10515/2 | 10453/7 10456/6 | 10477/9 10477/16 | 10502/8 10504/11 | 10460/5 10460/5 |
| 10519/16 10520/6 | 14 | 10478/14 10478 | 10506/10 10508/9 | 10460/9 |
| 10520/15 10520/18 | 10459/5 10459/6 | 10479/7 10479 | 509/20 10511/1 | refer [1] 10514/10 |
| 10520/23 10521/3 | 10459/12 10459/13 | 10481/9 10482/8 | 511/22 10511/2 | referred [2] 10485/5 |
| 10537/3 10537/3 |  | 10542/24 10543/12 | 10518/21 10520/22 | 10497/23 |
| 10537/6 10537/19 | 10460/16 10460/17 | rais | 10521/20 10524/3 | s [1] 10485/ |
| prohibited [2] |  |  | 10539/1 10539/2 | 1] 10477/19 |
| 10510/14 10510/1 | 10474/23 10474/24 | 10473/20 10481/8 | 10539/7 | reflecting [1] 10521/20 reflection [1] 10494/21 |
| projections [1] 10536/22 | 10475/1 10475/17 | 10481/11 10481/18 | 540/7 10543/15 | reflective [1] 10474/1 |
|  | 10477/2 10477/4 | 10528/19 | 544/17 10546 | flects [1] 10484/1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { promote [5] 10518/3 } \\ & 10519 / 7 \text { 10538/10 } \end{aligned}$ | 10477/4 10477/9 | Ralph [1] 10447/13 | 553/2 10553/ | regarded [1] 10529/1 |
| 10538/17 10538/24 | 10477/17 10477/24 | randomized [1] | 0553/7 10553/7 | regarding [1] 10473/15 |
| prompted [1] 10453/23 <br> proper [1] 10464/24 | 10478/7 10478/12 <br> 10478/16 10479/12 <br> 10479/18 10479/21 | range [4] 10506/14 10507/3 10507/5 | Realtime [1] 10448/7 reason [10] 10473/2 10474/9 10474/11 | Registered [1] 10448/6 regression [2] <br> 10491/20 10544/15 |


| R | 10549/13 10550/24 | 10535/5 10535/6 | 10543/10 10543/22 | 10453/7 10453/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| relate [2] 10472/13 | [3] | 10535/6 10535/ | 544/12 10544/1 | 10453/20 10454/4 |
| 10472/22 | 10456/7 10456/9 | 10535/7 10536/2 | 10545/19 10545/25 | 10458/15 10459 |
| related [1] 10454/5 | 10551/13 | 10537/7 10537/9 | 10546/4 10546/10 | 10459/25 10460/ |
| relates [1] 10550/9 | response [7] 10455/17 | 10537/11 10537/17 | 10547/12 10547/16 | 10464/13 10475/2 |
| relating [1] 10509/7 | 10456/11 10538/ | 10537/21 10537/22 | 10547/23 10548/4 | 10480/6 104 |
| relationship [1] | 2410539 | 10537/23 10537/2 | 549/9 10549/13 | 83/7 104881 |
| 10546/20 | 0540/12 10540/18 | 105 | als' [3] 10542/7 | 10490/1 10490/17 |
| relative [3] 10468/23 | [1] | review [2] 10480 | 543/9 10549/8 |  |
| 10485/1 10508/6 | sponsive [2] |  | RMR [2] |  |
| relatively [1] 10488/11 | 10454/15 10482/11 | re |  |  |
| relevant [13] 10463/19 | ness [8] | right [36] | robust [1] 10513/7 |  |
| 10464/6 10464/11 | 10454/12 10455/7 | 10 | 1] $10529 / 8$ | 511/13 |
| 10468/5 10473/5 | 599/20 10460/ | 10453/19 10454/1 | n [2] 10516/1 | 516/2 1051 |
| 10473/6 10473/7 | 10460/17 10470/4 | 10454/3 10454/13 | 517/11 | 5523/2 10524 |
| 10473/13 10482/21 | 10473/24 10492/1 | 10457/3 10457/4 | rooms [5] 10486/15 | 10524/12 1052 |
| 10482/23 10483/8 | restate [1] 10472/18 | 10457/16 10459/7 | 10486/17 10486/23 | 10525/13 10527/2 |
| 10498/7 10553/5 | restrict [3] 10452/1 | 10460/6 10464 | 10488/18 10488/ | 10527/25 1052 |
| reliable [4] 10491/14 | 10453/15 10453/25 | 10466/1 10470/6 | Roszak [1] 10499/2 | 10531/9 10531/13 |
| 10535/21 10536/6 |  | 10471/10 10476/17 | S | 10532/17 10534/24 |
| 10536/14 | restriction [2] | 10487/2 10488/15 | Safari [2] 10526/7 | 10540/6 10543 |
| relied [12] 10467/11 | 10453/22 10455/18 | 10488/21 10489/11 | 10530/9 | 10544/14 10548/6 |
| 10467/13 10467/16 | restrictions [4] | 10489/20 10489/22 | said [26] 10456/14 | 10548/9 10548/12 |
| 10497/2 10497/21 | 10540/24 10541/14 | 10490/9 10494/7 | 10462/18 10463/6 | 10553/3 |
| 10497/25 10498/16 | 10541/15 10541/23 | 10516/22 10526/2 | 10463/25 10477/17 | saying [29] 10455/17 |
| 10505/10 10505/11 | restrictive [6] 10528/1 | 10531/24 10535/4 | 10478/22 10479/15 | 10458/15 10461/6 |
| 10505/13 | 10528/4 10529/1 | 10535/11 10543/16 | 10480/11 10483/14 | 10462/6 10463/8 |
| rely [1] 1049 | 10529/12 10540/19 | 10547/24 10548/6 | 10484/15 10486/2 | 10467/10 1046 |
| relying [2] 10497/7 | 10553/12 | 10552/3 | 487/6 10491/9 | 10476/18 10478/ |
| 10497/9 | result [8] 10458/15 | right-hand [1] | 10491/20 10491/21 | 10479/6 1048 |
| ber [9] | 10458/16 10459/6 | 10489/20 | 0/14 | 10488/5 10494/13 |
| 10454/24 10467/22 | 10491/8 10491/8 | ring [1] 10483/23 | 10526/14 10530/24 | 10494/18 10496/2 |
| $10481 / 1 \text { 10481/23 }$ | 10520/20 10523/2 | rise [5] 10450/2 | 10532/10 10535/20 | 10499/9 10503/2 |
| 10490/6 10533/19 | 10527/5 | 10478/8 10513/13 | 10536/24 10539/13 | 10505/11 10509/1 |
| 10534/9 10534/14 | resulted [1] 10455/2 | 10513/16 10553/22 | 10542/13 10542/18 | 10509/2 10516/11 |
| 10538/14 | results [8] 10481/5 | risk [2] 10501/20 | 10547/10 | 105 |
| remembering [2] | 10491/2 10491/21 | 10501/21 | Sallet [2] 10447/11 | 05 |
| 10485/3 10534/16 | 10493/6 10527/9 | rival [28] 1048 | 10450/10 | 10536/11 10538/1 |
| remind [7] 10473/15 | 10533/10 10539/3 | 10496/22 10499/21 | salt [6] 10524 | 10538/1 1 |
| 10481/7 10482/17 | 10543/24 | 10500/2 10501/18 | 524/6 10524/8 | [9] |
| 10490/10 10497/2 | resume [2] 10513/9 | 10520/9 1052 | 524/19 10524/2 | 10482/18 10490/15 |
| 10506/16 10529/5 | 10553/21 | 520/12 10520/20 | 10524/24 | 10492/5 10492/5 |
| repeat [2] 10465/3 | RESUMED [1] | 10520/23 10520/24 | salt-free [6] 10524 | 508/6 10524/1 |
| 10472/25 | rev [2] 10526/5 | 10521/9 10522/21 | 10 | 10537/8 10540 |
| reply [2] 10551/5 | 10526/5 | 10522/23 | 10 | ale [5] 10494/16 |
| 10551/7 | rev share [2] 10526/5 | 10531/11 10532/11 | $\begin{array}{\|c} 10524 / 24 \\ \text { same [20] } \end{array}$ | 8/21 10520/13 |
| report [6] 10491/5 |  |  | $10477 / 16104$ | dtlein [2] |
| 10505/3 10531/21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { revealing } \\ & 10460 / 25 \end{aligned}$ | 10544/22 10544/24 | 10478/4 10478/5 | Schmidtlein [2] $10448 / 2 \text { 10450/11 }$ |
| 10550/2 10551/5 | revenue [50] 10453/1 | 10547/4 10548/1 | 10478/6 10486/12 | score [2] 10550/20 |
| 10551/7 ${ }^{\text {Reporter [4] 10448/6 }}$ | 10462/1 10481/20 | 10548/9 10548/12 | 10487/11 10487/18 | 10551/10 |
| Reporter [4] 10448/6 10448/6 10448/7 | 10482/1 10482/6 | 10548/20 | 10487/21 10487/2 | scores [1] 1055 |
|  | 10505/19 10505/24 | rivals [43] 10462/18 | 10488/16 10489/14 | screen [31] 10469/24 |
|  | 10516/17 10525/14 | 10463/16 10474/23 | 10501/25 10513/10 | 10529/16 10529/17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { reports [7] 1046 } \\ & 10467 / 510505 / 3 \end{aligned}$ | 10526/6 10526/6 | 10479/19 10479/21 | 10521/20 10536/24 | 5531/4 10531/7 |
| 10531/20 1053 | 10527/1 10527/2 | 10483/21 10504/13 | 10540/20 10544/23 | 10532/17 10532/19 |
| 10536/9 1055 | 10527/10 10528/12 | 10507/4 10507/23 | 10549/14 | 10532/20 10532/24 |
| represent [3] 10499/17 | 10528/22 10528/25 | 10507/24 10509/12 | sang [1] 10467/3 | 10533/1 10533/11 |
| 10506/17 10507/9 | 10529/18 10529/20 | 10509/24 10512/13 | sat [1] 10536/11 | 05 |
|  | 10530/2 10530/4 | 10512/19 10512/24 | satisfies [1] | 10543/25 10544/5 |
| 10512/4 | 10530/10 10530/24 | 10518/22 10519/23 | satisfy [3] 10483/ |  |
| represents [1] 10507/ | 10531/8 105 | 1/8 1052 | 10484/3 10484/3 | 544/13 105 |
| resources [1] | 10531/14 10531/15 | 526/17 10526/21 | save [1] 10452/24 | 545/18105 |
| 10550/24 | 10531/21 105 | 26/21 1052 | saw [5] 10453/22 | 546/5 1054 |
| respect [2] 10459/1 | 10532/2 10532/7 | 7/7 1052 | 0480/19 10528/13 | /1 |
| 10513/11 | 10532/11 10532/14 | 28/21 10531/8 | 10544/11 10551/22 | 47/8 1054 |
| responded [3] 10456/4 | 10534/19 10534/21 | 10531/9 10543/9 | say [50] 10452/22 | 10547/13 10548/11 |


se [1] $10512 / 12$
search [75] 10452/1 10453/3 10453/4 10456/15 10456/16 10456/18 10457/5 10460/17 10464/13 10464/17 10464/22 10464/23 10465/7 10465/14 10465/24 10466/3 10466/8 10466/25 10467/25 10468/1 10468/12 10468/20 10468/23 10469/18 10469/23 10470/20 10472/13 10472/22 10473/5 10473/9 10477/3 10477/7 10477/11 10483/21 10483/22 10484/6 10484/6 10484/14 10484/18 10484/20 10487/8 10487/10 10487/23 10490/15 10490/21 10490/22 10492/10 10492/20 10494/2 10495/8 10495/16 10495/17 10496/14 10496/23 10503/19 10503/20 10510/14 10516/7 10518/14 10518/16 10520/18 10521/18 10525/17 10525/19 10530/5 10530/9 10533/2 10533/2 10533/3 10533/10 10533/12 10534/18 10535/8 10539/3 10539/3
search-results [1] 10533/10
searches [5] 10459/14 10470/15 10471/1 10538/23 10539/5
searching [3] 10471/3 10471/4 10471/4
seated [2] 10450/5 10513/18
second [22] 10454/19 10455/20 10456/25 10459/13 10468/19 10494/11 10504/10 10509/25 10512/17 10528/23 10532/15 10532/17 10532/25 10533/7 10533/8 10533/23 10533/23 10539/22 10540/6 10549/6 10552/18 10553/3
second-price [1] 10533/8
secondary [1]
10522/12
Section [3] 10447/12

10457/8 10457/17 Section 2 [2] 10457/8 10457/17 security [1] 10540/4 see [59] 10455/18 10456/2 10456/9 10456/17 10457/2 10457/13 10460/8 10460/10 10460/12 10460/13 10460/15 10460/16 10460/17 10460/17 10461/21 10462/21 10471/8 10472/1 10473/12 10473/25 10473/25 10474/16 10476/9 10478/23 10480/6 10480/10 10480/13 10482/1 10485/24 10487/8 10487/10 10487/17 10490/12 10492/4 10492/15 10493/14 10495/6 10495/7 10495/8 10497/8 10497/20 10497/25 10508/7 10508/23 10509/13 10511/16 10517/1 10517/25 10521/11 10535/24 10537/9 10537/14 10540/9 10546/2 10551/11 10553/1 10553/6 10553/11 10553/21 seem [1] 10471/11 seems [4] 10490/18 10490/21 10525/24 10530/25
seen [6] 10475/9 10493/10 10518/2 10537/21 10549/12 10551/19
sees [1] 10537/3 segue [1] 10527/12 selected [1] 10516/8 sell [2] 10486/16 10537/18 sense [26] 10453/16 10456/2 10459/14 10461/4 10462/11 10462/14 10465/22 10466/12 10488/9 10488/13 10500/12 10500/13 10505/21 10509/3 10509/19 10510/16 10511/9 10511/25 10514/16 10516/4 10516/19 10518/25 10526/9 10528/19 10535/9 10543/7
sensible [1] 10509/4 separate [5] 10466/10 10469/8 10503/6 10504/1 10541/24
separately [3] 10466/9 10469/12 10511/15 seriously [5] 10499/3

10499/4 10499/6
10506/11 10523/21
SERP [1] 10533/9
services [12] 10452/1 10464/17 10464/22 10464/24 10465/7 10465/14 10465/24 10468/1 10469/18 10473/5 10473/9 10520/18
serving [1] 10539/3 session [4] 10446/7 10450/3 10487/21 10513/17
sessions [3] 10470/10 10470/10 10487/19 set [3] 10454/20 10474/7 10541/5
sets [1] 10452/6
setting [5] 10452/15 10452/17 10453/21 10525/4 10527/9 settled [1] 10457/17 settlement [1] 10457/11
Severt [3] 10447/6 10450/18 10523/12 Severt's [1] 10478/22 shape [1] 10454/25 share [50] 10462/1 10462/7 10462/8 10474/7 10474/14 10475/4 10478/19 10479/17 10497/11 10497/23 10499/24 10506/22 10507/6 10507/9 10508/2 10516/18 10521/19 10526/5 10526/5 10527/1 10527/2 10528/12 10529/18 10529/21 10530/2 10530/4 10530/10 10530/24 10531/8 10531/9 10531/14 10531/15 10531/21 10532/2 10532/7 10532/12 10532/14 10534/21 10535/1 10535/5 10535/6 10535/7 10536/2 10537/7 10537/9 10537/11 10537/17 10537/24 10538/2 10548/23
share-shift [1] 10508/2 shares [10] 10503/20 10505/19 10505/24 10525/14 10527/10 10528/22 10528/25 10531/23 10534/19 10537/22
sharing [1] 10474/9
sharp [1] 10481/24 she [2] 10467/2 10467/3
she's [1] 10466/24
sheds [1] 10462/25
shelf [4] 10524/11 10524/14 10524/22 10525/15
shift [5] 10495/7 10495/8 10499/19 10504/3 10508/2 shifted [3] 10492/9 10492/10 10504/9
shifting [1] 10511/8 shifts [1] 10497/23
shipments [1] 10457/21
shoes [1] 10471/5 shop [8] 10465/15 10466/19 10468/11 10470/14 10470/16 10470/21 10471/15 10495/22
shops [1] 10466/1 short [1] 10515/13 shorthand [2] 10479/2 10517/18
should [20] 10453/7 10458/8 10458/10 10460/10 10460/11 10464/11 10466/9 10467/6 10471/21 10479/1 10482/23 10490/1 10498/20 10499/21 10509/4 10510/13 10523/2 10533/16 10544/14 10553/3
shouldn't [1] 10529/15 show [2] 10470/5 10481/2
showed [13] 10478/13 10478/13 10491/6 10493/4 10493/24 10494/1 10501/24 10503/19 10503/22 10504/16 10532/18 10536/6 10536/19 showing [11] 10469/1 10470/13 10481/5 10481/20 10488/4 10492/13 10494/4 10494/5 10498/9 10502/23 10544/6
shown [1] 10483/20
shows [1] 10518/25
shrunk [1] 10494/14
side [12] 10452/14
10453/10 10455/12
10456/12 10462/17
10464/18 10464/18 10468/3 10468/3 10542/16 10543/1 10547/11
sign [3] 10457/2
10512/21 10514/6
significant [6] 10472/1
10473/12 10473/19 10540/2 10546/13 10546/15
significantly [1] 10492/23
silos [1] 10467/2
similar [5] 10463/6 10476/9 10494/1
10499/12 10499/15
simple [1] 10486/4 simplist [1] 10454/9 since [1] 10467/8 single [5] 10452/6 10454/20 10466/17 10469/10 10471/19 sites [1] 10494/20 sitting [2] 10475/3 10534/9
situation [10]
10462/22 10465/21 10499/1 10527/6 10545/24 10546/1 10546/2 10547/21 10547/22 10549/4
situations [2]
10524/10 10548/15 six [2] 10481/13 10481/17
six-month [1] 10481/17
size [1] 10519/3 ski [1] 10487/25 slide [75] 10450/22 10451/9 10451/18 10457/3 10457/23 10461/16 10461/17 10461/18 10461/19 10463/2 10475/13 10475/13 10476/9 10476/11 10476/23 10477/19 10480/3 10480/10 10480/24 10480/24 10481/2 10482/14 10485/9 10485/11 10489/3 10489/5 10491/17 10492/4 10492/14 10493/5 10494/9 10495/14 10496/20 10497/6 10497/7 10497/20 10500/23 10500/23 10501/23 10502/6 10504/21 10505/1 10505/16 10505/22 10506/7 10506/17 10506/19 10507/8 10508/5 10508/21 10509/6 10511/24 10513/3 10513/22 10518/6 10519/13 10521/15 10521/15 10521/24 10527/13 10536/18 10536/19 10536/24 10537/1 10537/14 10538/7 10542/4 10550/7 10550/9 10550/12 10550/18 10551/4 10552/5 10552/8 10552/10
Slide 10 [1] 10480/24
Slide 11 [1] 10482/14
Slide 12 [1] 10485/9
Slide 13 [1] 10489/3

Slide 14 [2] 10491/17 10492/14
Slide 17 [1] 10495/14 Slide 18 [2] 10496/20 10497/7
Slide 19 [1] 10497/20
Slide 2 [1] 10451/18
Slide 20 [2] 10504/21
10505/16
Slide 22 [1] 10506/19
Slide 24 [1] 10509/6
Slide 29 [1] 10521/15
Slide 30 [1] 10521/24
Slide 34 [1] 10542/4
Slide 35 [2] 10550/7
10550/9
Slide 4 [3] 10461/17
10461/18 10461/19
Slide 7 [2] 10476/9 10476/11
Slide 8 [1] 10476/23
slides [2] 10454/5 10504/14
slots [3] 10533/9 10533/9 10533/10
small [4] 10481/22 10493/18 10518/23 10518/23
smaller [2] 10495/8 10524/8
Snapchat [3] 10493/15 10493/19 10494/17
so [285]
so Ithink [2] 10478/3 10485/6
so it's [10] 10462/15 10473/1 10488/16 10494/23 10502/12 10518/6 10521/20 10523/20 10540/9 10550/4
So that's [1] 10500/20 So this combination
[1] 10517/10
So this comes [1] 10482/25
so this externality [1] 10519/11
social [5] 10489/17 10492/25 10494/13 10494/20 10517/6 softening [1] 10523/7 sold [1] 10538/21 solve [3] 10511/11 10512/18 10553/10
some [41] 10451/25 10454/14 10454/16 10456/15 10459/14 10460/17 10460/18 10462/11 10462/14 10464/5 10464/5 10465/22 10466/12 10476/25 10479/3 10480/25 10482/4 10482/5 10490/5 10490/21 10503/21 10504/17 10507/16

10507/20 10509/19 10511/21 10511/25 10515/11 10518/25 10520/13 10522/24 10524/20 10524/22 10528/19 10529/1 10531/25 10538/5 10541/25 10547/14 10547/15 10553/9
somebody [2] 10453/16 10507/17 someone [2] 10466/18 10538/15
something [19] 10463/25 10467/10 10475/14 10477/21 10482/6 10484/18 10486/7 10491/22 10512/9 10512/10 10514/14 10514/16 10516/12 10517/20 10522/25 10523/1 10523/10 10534/24 10536/7
sometimes [4] 10474/7 10481/11 10484/23 10497/23
somewhat [2] 10499/13 10518/22 somewhere [2] 10495/1 10495/2 sorry [30] 10450/21 10453/11 10455/2 10458/22 10460/11 10461/18 10465/3 10467/15 10470/9 10472/17 10476/24 10482/22 10488/7 10492/8 10499/16 10499/18 10503/10 10518/9 10530/6 10532/13 10532/23 10533/12 10535/15 10539/16 10539/18 10539/21 10544/4 10548/2 10548/6 10551/6
sort [9] 10458/12 10467/11 10469/6 10483/1 10504/1 10509/18 10509/19 10517/23 10545/18 sought [1] 10475/24 Sounds [1] 10513/6 source [1] 10457/9 sources [1] 10468/24 space [3] 10524/11 10524/14 10525/15 speaking [1] 10532/1 special [2] 10524/19 10525/16 specialized [2] 10466/13 10483/22 specifically [3] 10467/14 10467/17 10538/7
specifics [2] 10517/2 10517/4
spend [4] 10475/15 10494/3 10505/8 10531/25
spending [3] 10490/14 10490/22 10493/16 spends [1] 10456/6 split [1] 10537/24 squiggly [1] 10481/21 stake [1] 10498/3 stand [2] 10451/3 10518/10
standard [3] 10457/12 10457/14 10480/21
stands [2] 10513/13
10553/22
start [5] 10451/20
10451/22 10454/8
10482/5 10547/11
started [5] 10458/13
10467/8 10475/18 10482/7 10529/6 starting [8] 10452/5 10464/22 10506/13 10514/7 10538/8 10551/13 10551/14 10553/20
starts [3] 10462/3
10462/3 10520/17
State [1] 10447/11 statement [4]
10480/12 10485/18
10502/21 10518/12
STATES [7] 10446/1
10446/3 10446/10 10450/7 10450/10
10450/18 10450/19
steep [3] 10455/4
10455/4 10455/6
stenography [1] 10448/10
step [3] 10460/11 10509/20 10509/25
stepping [1] 10517/4
steps [1] 10460/8
stick [2] 10499/25 10523/24
stickage [1] 10481/4
sticking [1] 10500/3 still [4] 10484/23 10519/10 10519/12 10522/25
stop [9] 10465/15 10466/1 10466/19 10468/11 10470/13 10470/16 10470/21 10471/15 10495/22
store [12] 10523/9 10524/9 10524/13 10524/15 10524/17 10524/20 10524/21 10525/2 10540/16 10541/18 10541/19 10541/21
story [2] 10452/8 10454/19
strategy [1] 10501/7 Street [2] 10447/3 10447/7
strengths [1] 10485/1 striking [1] 10457/25 strong [5] 10463/14 10463/15 10501/14 10507/3 10545/25 stronger [10] 10461/14 10463/4 10491/2 10528/7 10528/8 10528/21 10544/12 10547/5 10547/18 10549/9
studies [1] 10459/18
study [1] 10493/7
substantial [1] 10518/21
substitutable [2]
10486/18 10488/14
substitute [3]
10482/21 10482/22 10482/24
substitutes [9]
10484/5 10484/9
10484/10 10485/16
10486/11 10486/20
10487/1 10488/10
10488/19
substitution [3]
10484/2 10484/12
10487/5
successful [1] 10550/5
such [5] 10459/23
10512/21 10514/6
10517/23 10519/24
sufficiently [1]
10517/14
suggest [4] 10504/17
10516/2 10530/25
10550/12
suggested [3]
10502/14 10503/12 10527/20
suggesting [1]
10483/2
suggests [1] 10511/1
Suite [2] 10447/8
10447/14
sum [1] 10465/22
summarized [1] 10506/17
summer [1] 10489/20
Super [1] 10548/2
supplier [2] 10529/14 10531/5
support [1] 10519/4
supports [1] 10468/1
suppose [2] 10512/17 10531/9
supposedly [1]
10491/11
sure [20] 10450/22 10458/24 10465/4 10472/20 10473/17 10476/1 10482/19 10489/14 10489/23 10497/4 10506/18 10520/7 10529/23 10532/8 10534/3
10534/8 10534/20

10543/3 10546/21 10546/22
surplus [3] 10455/9
10473/21 10473/22
surprising [1]
10544/16
surprisingly [1]
10547/16
suspended [2] 10489/16 10489/25
SW [1] 10448/3
Swiss [1] 10466/22 switch [2] 10486/21 10532/14
switched [1] 10476/6
SWORN [1] 10451/3
T
take [19] 10458/8
10458/8 10458/10
10458/17 10462/6
10474/18 10481/15
10490/4 10493/22
10498/24 10500/15
10503/25 10506/11
10513/5 10513/8
10515/16 10520/22
10522/25 10530/23
taken [1] 10499/6
takes [1] 10522/10
taking [5] 10470/22
10470/23 10471/13
10517/12 10517/14
talk [17] 10463/17
10466/1 10472/3
10475/9 10478/3
10479/25 10499/3
10499/4 10504/6
10512/3 10514/4 10522/8 10525/12 10527/14 10536/9 10550/1 10551/17
talked [53] 10456/3 10461/9 10461/9 10464/1 10466/2 10467/12 10469/14 10470/20 10472/12 10473/2 10475/19 10476/12 10477/21 10477/22 10478/17 10478/22 10479/5 10479/24 10481/3 10484/8 10485/25 10486/6 10486/8 10495/21 10498/18 10498/22 10500/23 10501/8 10502/6 10502/19 10504/10 10505/23 10506/20 10507/15 10508/1 10519/18 10523/13 10525/13 10528/3 10528/23 10529/4 10529/19 10536/7 10537/1 10543/16 10545/9 10545/17 10545/24 10546/25 10549/7 10550/10
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talked... [2] 10550/11 10550/22
talking [18] 10451/20 10454/8 10458/13 10466/24 10470/24 10474/13 10475/3 10477/24 10478/3 10489/15 10495/10 10500/24 10512/11 10536/20 10541/11 10546/14 10550/18 10551/16
targeting [1] 10484/20
teach [1] 10501/6
teaching [1] 10501/7
team [1] 10478/7
tell [3] 10468/15
10469/3 10499/16
telling [2] 10473/13 10525/7
tells [3] 10461/7 10501/20 10547/12
temporal [2] 10471/8 10472/8
tempting [1] 10531/10
ten [2] 10456/19 10493/21
tend [2] 10453/4 10528/21
tension [1] 10476/25
term [2] 10530/17 10548/3
terms [6] 10484/2 10484/21 10485/1 10491/24 10499/10 10510/19
testified [18] 10451/4 10459/20 10465/13 10467/24 10469/1 10470/19 10474/6 10477/15 10490/25 10496/11 10506/12 10507/17 10518/16 10530/18 10536/1 10542/23 10549/15 10551/25
testify [2] 10496/13 10542/6
testifying [1] 10467/8 testimony [29] 10451/10 10451/24 10456/18 10461/1 10461/23 10462/24 10463/6 10474/3 10480/5 10482/17 10484/24 10485/12 10488/25 10493/4 10495/12 10496/4 10500/11 10500/24 10509/13 10513/11 10518/8 10521/16 10525/7 10531/19 10532/3 10549/20 10551/21 10552/21 10553/15
text [2] 10472/13 10472/22
textbook [1] 10452/6 than [28] 10456/19 10461/14 10465/22 10478/20 10482/7 10484/6 10492/16 10493/2 10494/14 10495/7 10495/8 10499/14 10504/18 10518/11 10519/8 10520/21 10526/17 10527/2 10527/10 10528/18 10529/15 10531/1 10533/22 10544/12 10547/2 10548/3 10548/12 10552/23
thank [5] 10472/24 10472/24 10493/21 10513/12 10513/18 thank you [4]
10472/24 10472/24 10493/21 10513/12 Thanks [2] 10451/8 10493/21
Thanksgiving [1] 10523/19
that [606]
that's [71] 10453/4 10454/20 10455/16 10459/18 10459/24 10460/19 10465/23 10466/17 10467/9 10469/16 10473/13 10477/6 10477/11 10478/21 10479/22 10480/17 10481/21 10484/1 10484/17 10484/18 10493/5 10493/13 10494/11 10494/25 10500/4 10500/20 10501/4 10501/10 10501/22 10503/9 10504/4 10504/9 10504/14 10506/22 10507/8 10507/25 10509/22 10509/24 10510/3 10511/14 10512/8 10512/10 10512/10 10516/12 10517/15 10517/17 10517/22 10520/19 10523/25 10525/6 10525/18 10526/9 10527/12 10528/6 10531/12 10535/19 10537/7 10537/18 10537/24 10539/9 10539/12 10540/8 10542/1 10542/25 10544/24 10545/10 10545/25 10546/6 10546/17 10548/14 10552/2 their [27] 10470/14 10471/22 10474/21 10474/21 10474/23 10475/7 10479/9 10479/21 10480/7

10487/9 10487/24 10487/25 10488/1 10493/16 10498/7 10498/15 10501/2 10505/6 10507/13 10516/18 10518/24 10520/17 10520/18 10521/4 10543/10 10543/23 10550/19 them [22] 10453/1 10458/1 10462/20 10468/20 10482/12 10497/14 10500/9 10510/3 10511/21 10516/6 10521/5 10523/15 10523/16 10528/6 10534/1 10546/4 10546/11 10547/14 10547/17 10547/24 10548/7 10553/13
then [25] 10453/1 10460/13 10471/3 10476/5 10476/6 10481/14 10481/16 10481/24 10482/4 10484/19 10491/2 10491/9 10493/4 10498/20 10508/24 10523/4 10525/15 10526/7 10530/15 10532/14 10537/9 10539/6 10541/10 10544/14 10553/21
theory [1] 10545/5 there [69] 10453/5 10453/9 10455/7 10456/12 10457/24 10458/4 10458/7 10458/9 10459/4 10460/3 10462/4 10464/5 10470/14 10470/23 10471/13 10472/6 10475/3 10476/7 10476/25 10477/7 10477/8 10478/11 10481/4 10484/10 10484/25 10488/13 10491/9 10494/8 10494/19 10495/5 10496/4 10503/13 10503/18 10505/2 10505/3 10511/2 10511/3 10511/4 10511/13 10511/15 10511/24 10512/12 10512/14 10512/17 10514/19 10515/6 10518/15 10518/17 10519/12 10521/1 10522/4 10523/10 10525/17 10525/17 10525/20 10528/4 10528/14 10529/2 10529/24 10532/16 10533/8 10533/9 10533/10 10536/16 10540/2

10540/19 10552/18 10553/9 10553/12 there's [33] 10459/25 10463/8 10464/3 10471/15 10479/11 10482/4 10483/1 10484/11 10484/24 10487/11 10490/21 10504/1 10507/3 10511/20 10514/22 10515/14 10515/20 10516/1 10516/24 10517/9 10517/10 10521/1 10524/1 10524/2 10524/20 10527/4 10527/7 10533/20 10536/14 10538/1 10543/8 10543/25 10544/8 therefore [1] 10471/11 these [77] 10457/12 10458/2 10461/6 10461/11 10461/24 10462/16 10467/1 10468/14 10469/15 10471/14 10471/14 10475/1 10475/17 10476/15 10477/24 10477/25 10478/12 10478/15 10480/20 10481/3 10481/5 10481/6 10481/8 10481/10 10491/7 10494/3 10499/17 10499/19 10500/7 10500/8 10500/14 10500/17 10502/12 10502/13 10503/1 10503/7 10504/7 10504/8 10504/22 10505/10 10507/24 10507/25 10508/2 10509/18 10510/9 10510/11 10510/24 10510/24 10511/2 10511/8 10511/10 10511/16 10511/17 10512/4 10512/18 10514/2 10514/24 10517/23 10521/9 10528/11 10528/24 10530/19 10532/11 10536/21 10537/15 10537/21 10538/1 10538/17 10541/23 10543/18 10544/21 10545/1 10547/6 10552/11 10552/15 10552/22 10553/9 they [108] 10461/25 10463/9 10463/10 10463/11 10463/12 10463/14 10463/14 10463/15 10464/4 10464/14 10466/3 10466/17 10471/21 10474/23 10476/4 10476/5 10476/6

10476/6 10476/15 10478/20 10479/8 10480/17 10480/18 10480/18 10480/21 10481/3 10481/3 10481/8 10481/8 10481/10 10481/13 10481/14 10481/15 10481/16 10481/16 10481/17 10481/24 10485/2 10485/16 10487/9 10487/23 10487/23 10487/24 10488/3 10488/10 10489/19 10493/8 10495/21 10495/22 10495/24 10498/1 10498/2 10498/6 10498/7 10498/8 10498/16 10498/17 10498/21 10498/22 10498/23 10499/7 10499/8 10499/8 10499/25 10500/25 10501/1 10501/3 10501/3 10502/19 10502/23 10503/2 10503/4 10503/9 10503/9 10504/9 10504/24 10505/11 10506/25 10507/4 10509/21 10509/23 10509/23 10511/9 10516/8 10516/18 10516/23 10516/24 10517/14 10518/20 10518/22 10518/24 10531/16 10533/4 10533/5 10533/13 10533/15 10533/21 10533/25 10534/1 10534/25 10535/1 10535/4 10539/9 10540/5 10541/4 10543/18 10545/16 10549/22
they'd [2] 10475/7 10539/9
they'Il [2] 10538/2 10538/3
they're [25] 10464/7 10470/14 10473/11 10481/21 10487/22 10488/5 10488/6 10488/19 10494/18 10495/23 10495/24 10496/7 10500/2 10500/3 10505/20 10507/23 10508/13 10516/17 10518/20 10518/22 10520/11 10524/24 10524/25 10535/3 10547/23
thing [56] 10454/19 10455/3 10462/10 10465/12 10471/12 10474/16 10474/18 10476/21 10477/6
thing... [47] 10479/7 10479/8 10480/15 10481/22 10484/14 10485/20 10488/23 10490/17 10491/23 10492/14 10492/24 10493/12 10494/2 10494/10 10494/22 10496/2 10497/5 10497/6 10501/8 10501/16 10501/19 10502/13 10504/10 10508/14 10511/12 10512/17 10514/3 10514/9 10518/12 10520/14 10522/8 10522/15 10523/5
10524/21 10526/21
10528/23 10529/19
10530/12 10531/2
10534/3 10535/3
10535/4 10540/6 10540/20 10544/3 10544/5 10546/18 things [44] 10454/5 10458/6 10463/7 10464/3 10464/5 10464/10 10464/19 10465/21 10467/1
10469/15 10471/25 10472/6 10472/7 10475/21 10477/22 10478/15 10478/17
10480/21 10480/22
10480/25 10483/10
10483/23 10484/12
10486/11 10487/1
10491/24 10498/24
10501/25 10502/23
10503/7 10503/12 10503/25 10504/1
10512/3 10514/18
10515/6 10515/15
10518/19 10525/6
10526/23 10528/2
10528/24 10529/25 10543/11
think [157]
thinking [30] 10452/4
10462/9 10464/11
10464/12 10466/9
10469/10 10471/19 10481/9 10495/3
10495/23 10499/9
10502/1 10502/10
10502/10 10502/25 10503/3 10509/16
10510/4 10510/6
10514/23 10518/10
10525/22 10529/6
10537/16 10546/18
10546/23 10547/3
10547/4 10548/14 10548/15
thinks [3] 10537/22 10544/24 10548/17
thinned [1] 10478/9
thinning [1] 10479/4 third [6] 10499/12 10522/2 10533/24 10540/11 10548/7 10548/10
this [209]
This is [1] 10450/7
those [31] 10454/2 10460/24 10463/9
10464/10 10464/12
10464/19 10468/22
10475/20 10485/6
10486/11 10486/18
10486/19 10488/13
10494/20 10497/11
10497/13 10502/19 10505/4 10505/6
10506/10 10506/16
10507/21 10507/22
10512/13 10512/16
10517/2 10522/14
10538/7 10543/11
10548/13 10548/15
though [2] 10458/3 10500/1
thought [8] 10453/21
10463/9 10488/8
10498/7 10498/13
10500/17 10529/4
10548/9
threat [4] 10456/10 10456/11 10456/13 10549/10
threatened [1] 10550/23
three [7] 10457/7
10457/8 10463/18
10481/15 10511/24
10512/4 10514/2
three-month [1]
10481/15
through [15] 10455/16
10477/10 10478/7
10486/12 10492/1
10497/17 10499/23
10500/22 10503/19
10503/23 10504/7
10505/8 10512/2
10536/3 10548/17
thus [1] 10541/22
tie [1] 10507/4
tied [2] 10506/22 10543/20
TikTok [1] 10483/23
time [62] 10452/8
10452/10 10456/3
10457/6 10457/19
10461/10 10462/18
10465/13 10466/3
10466/8 10466/17
10469/10 10471/1
10471/19 10472/12
10473/16 10475/15
10477/15 10477/16
10481/2 10481/4
10481/15 10481/17
10482/4 10484/15
10489/24 10490/19

10491/6 10491/7
10491/10 10495/23
10496/5 10498/19
10505/8 10505/23
10506/13 10506/20
10507/2 10507/5
10525/13 10528/4
10529/4 10530/15
10531/11 10531/25
10533/5 10533/25
10534/1 10534/22
10536/8 10538/14
10538/16 10539/12
10542/14 10542/18
10543/17 10545/23
10546/20 10549/7
10550/22 10550/23
10553/14
times [6] 10458/14
10464/1 10465/13
10477/23 10493/2
10525/8
tiny [1] 10518/20
titled [1] 10554/4
today [5] 10451/10
10529/3 10542/5
10551/18 10551/20
together [2] 10467/1
10468/22
told [1] 10547/25
tons [2] 10550/3
10550/3
too [2] 10462/25
10472/25
took [2] 10499/3
10499/4
top [2] 10457/16
10476/19
topic [2] 10474/4
10542/5
total [5] 10456/18
10457/5 10460/9
10482/1 10537/22
totally [2] 10484/22 10488/5
touched [3] 10452/19
10526/12 10527/24
tracking [1] 10475/18
traffic [19] 10497/15
10499/22 10499/22
10504/3 10509/23
10509/24 10511/9
10522/24 10526/9
10526/20 10528/6
10530/2 10530/5
10543/18 10543/20
10543/21 10544/24
10548/18 10552/1
trajectory [1] 10459/1
transcript [3] 10446/9
10448/10 10554/3
transcription [1]
10448/11
transcripts [1]
10461/23
transitioning [1]
10513/7
treated [1] 10529/15
trend [2] 10490/21 10491/7
TRIAL [1] 10446/9 tried [3] 10471/7 10500/21 10549/22 trip [1] 10487/25 trouble [1] 10500/19 true [4] 10483/6 10502/16 10519/6 10537/20
try [10] 10473/21
10475/6 10476/20
10477/9 10478/19
10486/21 10494/25
10500/18 10507/24 10512/1
trying [18] 10471/18 10479/20 10479/20 10481/22 10483/6 10488/20 10495/1 10495/5 10511/16 10512/13 10518/2 10520/17 10524/10 10533/18 10534/6 10534/10 10547/3 10550/24
turn [20] 10451/18 10470/6 10472/11 10480/23 10482/13 10485/8 10495/11 10495/13 10509/6 10513/3 10513/22 10519/13 10519/22 10521/23 10531/11 10538/5 10542/4 10542/5 10543/22 10552/4
turner [1] 10523/20
turning [3] 10460/22 10522/2 10540/11
Twitter [3] 10493/15 10493/19 10494/17
two [33] 10458/2
10464/1 10465/13 10468/17 10468/22 10477/22 10485/15 10486/19 10487/6 10503/25 10504/1 10505/9 10505/14 10506/10 10509/19 10512/3 10512/16 10513/1 10515/6 10519/18 10519/19 10520/1 10522/15 10524/9 10528/2
10529/4 10533/20 10542/14 10548/15 10551/3 10552/9 10552/11 10552/15
twofold [1] 10539/25 tying [2] 10508/13 10542/1

## U

U.S [6] 10447/2

10507/6 10507/10 10525/19 10544/14 10548/6

Uh [1] 10500/5
Uh-huh [1] 10500/5
unable [1] 10543/9
unbundled [1] 10541/4 uncertainty [1] 10502/7
unconditional [17]
10525/14 10527/2
10527/10 10529/18
10529/20 10529/22
10530/24 10531/2
10531/9 10531/14
10531/20 10531/23
10532/2 10532/7
10534/19 10534/21 10535/5
under [5] 10528/1
10529/2 10535/12 10537/7 10537/8
undermines [1] 10538/24
understand [8] 10458/25 10459/3 10472/17 10508/14 10517/23 10534/10 10543/2 10543/6
understanding [3] 10468/5 10487/5 10542/1
understood [3] 10453/13 10453/20 10543/5
unimaginably [1] 10548/2
uninformative [1] 10488/5
Unit [1] 10447/12
UNITED [6] 10446/1
10446/3 10446/10 10450/7 10450/18 10450/19
United States [1] 10450/19
United States of [1] 10450/7
universal [1] 10466/25
up [88] 10453/10
10453/12 10453/18 10457/3 10457/6 10457/10 10457/17 10457/21 10458/5 10458/7 10458/9 10458/23 10461/16 10461/19 10463/2 10464/6 10466/8 10471/21 10474/21 10474/24 10475/14 10475/23 10476/11 10478/1 10478/2 10480/2 10480/23 10482/2 10484/23 10486/21 10489/2 10489/13 10490/16 10490/19 10491/17 10492/20 10492/23 10492/24 10493/1 10493/17 10493/23 10493/24 10496/19
$\qquad$
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| U [45] 10497/3 | 10522/22 <br> using [3] 10490/9 <br> 10498/2 10529/3 <br> usually [1] 10491/25 <br> $\mathbf{V}$ | violate [1] 10483/16 violates [1] 10483/15 volume [1] 10456/18 vs [1] 10446/5 | /15 | weekend [1] 10487/25 weeks [1] 10481/13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 10458/8 10458/10 |  |
| 10497/8 10497/21 |  |  | 10462/6 10462/7 | welcome [1] $10451 /$ |
| 10498/15 10503/9 |  |  | 10467/1 | [1] |
| 504/20 10505/1 | V | W |  |  |
| 505/15 10506/19 | vacation [1] | waffled [1] 10458 | 10478/16 10479/7 | 10455/11 10456/12 |
| 10506/22 10507/4 | valid [1] 10483/8 | walking [1] 1045 | 10481/9 10482/8 | 457/1 10462/3 |
| 10508/5 10508/13 | valuable [2] 10512/15 | want [30] 10451/20 | 10483/13 10483/24 | 0462/23 10463/24 |
| 10511/23 10516/11 | 10541/19 | 10451/22 10466/17 | 10486/8 10490/2 | 10466/15 10467/20 |
| 516/24 10518/7 | value [17] 10466/1 | 10467/25 10468/10 | 10491/16 10494/15 | 4699/6 10471/8 |
| 521/15 10523/7 | 10474/6 10474/8 | 10468/11 10469/15 | 10494/18 10495/10 | 0472/7 10473/10 |
| 9 10523/19 | 10474/9 10474/15 | 10475/12 10475/14 | 10495/13 10496/19 | 0474/11 10475/3 |
|  | 10475/5 10475/10 | 10478/24 10478/25 | 10497/5 10497/23 | 0475/19 10478/13 |
|  | 10475/20 10475/21 | 10483/2 10483/5 | 10499/9 10500/23 | 1410 |
| 10528/20 10528/22 | 10476/7 10476/21 | 10485/13 10489/23 | 10501/23 10504/4 | /25 10486/8 |
| 10528/25 10536/2 | 10477/1 10478/19 | 10495/22 10501/16 | 10504/20 10507/19 | 10487/6 10490/18 |
| 105286/25 10536/2 | 10478/19 10479/18 | 10509/1 10510/21 | 10508/7 10509/6 | 10499/9 10502/9 |
| 10536/184 10536/ | 10490/11 10500/17 | 10512/1 10512/3 | 10510/21 10511/7 | 10504/10 10507 |
| 10539/8 10543/9 | value-based [1] | 10514/4 10519/22 | 10511/16 10511/17 | 10508/23 10509/21 |
| 10543/18 10543/18 | 10476/7 | 10519/25 10524/16 | 10513/3 10513/5 | 10512/23 10515/19 |
| 10543/20 10543/22 | values [1] 10491 | 10524/21 10527/14 | 10513/8 10513/9 | 0518/13 10519/6 |
| 10549/23 10550/7 | variable [1] 10452/15 | 10551/17 10552/16 | 10514/9 10514/11 | 0520/5 10521/17 |
| 10551/4 10551/11 | variants [1] 10469/25 | 10552/18 | 10514/16 10518/5 | 526/14 105 |
| updates [1] 10540/4 | varied [1] 10480/18 | wanted [7] 10450/21 | 10519/23 10521/23 | 528/17 10530 |
| UPDX106 [1] 10451/19 | variety [1] 10484/10 | 10462/8 10502/8 | 10528/3 10530/7 | 10531/4 1053 |
| [5] 10467/11 | various [4] 10465/21 | 10518/15 10522/8 | 10530/8 10531/6 | 10533/15 10533/16 |
| 467/13 10467/16 | 10470/20 10505/4 | 10541/5 10541/6 | 10537/17 10542/4 | 10536/11 10538/1 |
| , | 10547/15 | wanting [2] 10525 | 10543/16 10544/11 | 10540/16 10544/3 |
|  | vast [1] 10547 |  | 10544/18 10550/21 | 10544/25 10547/4 |
| [2] 10 | version [2] 10451 | wants [8] 10486/16 | 10552/9 10552/16 | 547/10 10549/15 |
| 53/17 | 532/25 | 10486/22 10515/4 | 10552/18 10553/ | 549/21 10550/17 |
| 53/7 | versus [5] 10 | 10517/19 10524 | 10553/20 10553/21 | 0551/14 10551 |
| [2] | 10498/10 10503/2 | 10526/19 10530/15 | we will [2] 10513/9 | 10553 |
|  | 10530/13 10 | 10 | 10553/21 | went [6] 10490/16 |
|  | vertical [1] 10466/14 | was [156] | we'll [8] 104 | 10491/8 10491/9 |
| 30/9 10530 | very [39] 10454/15 | Washington [5] | 10482/9 10513/1 | 491/21 1049 |
| /13 10532 | 10454/15 10455/4 | 10446/5 10447/3 | 10525/12 10530/10 | 10537/15 |
| 12 | 10455/11 10456/1 | 10447/8 10448/3 | 10532/14 10547/8 | were [49] 10462/4 |
| [1] | 10457/8 10457/14 | 10448/9 | 10553/16 | 0462/6 1046 |
|  | 10461/13 10462/4 | wasn't [8] 10462/21 | we're [24] 10455/20 | 463/10 10463/12 |
| usdoj.gov [2] 10447/9 | 10463/25 10468/9 | 10467/5 10473/6 | 10466/15 10469/8 | 0470/11 10471/13 |
|  | 10468/18 10478/6 | 10491/14 10523/3 | 10475/5 10475/6 | 472/6 10475/21 |
| 476/15 1048 | 10481/7 10481/7 | 10529/23 10540/22 | 10475/25 10475/25 | 10475/21 10475/23 |
| 10485/21 | 10485/6 10490/3 | 10540/22 | 10475/25 10476/2 | 10476/15 10481/9 |
|  | 10494/21 10497/18 | way [34] 10452/10 | 10478/3 10478/5 | 10481/14 10481/16 |
| 500 | 10499/6 10503/1 | 10452/14 10452/25 | 10478/14 10481/14 | 10482/11 10484/10 |
| 520 | 10503/1 10508/14 | 10453/15 10455/16 | 10489/14 10492/9 | 10491/2 10494/19 |
|  | 10521/6 10523/18 | 10462/5 10470/15 | 10506/13 10512/1 | 10494/19 10495/3 |
| used [10] 10466/22 | 10526/8 10535/9 | 10479/15 10482/6 | 10514/1 10531/6 | 10495/5 1049 |
|  | 10537/2 10540/8 | 10483/19 10487/11 | 10531/7 10532/12 | 10498/2 10498 |
| $531 / 151053$ | 10545/25 10547/1 | 10487/14 10487/14 | 10535/18 10541/10 | 10498/3 10498/13 |
| 534/22 105 | 10547/13 10547/13 | 10490/16 10491/25 | 10542/19 | 10499/7 10499 |
| 550/12 | 10547/16 10547/18 | 10499/24 10502/11 | we've [11] 10461/9 | 10500/14 10500/ |
| ful [2] | 10552/1 10552/13 | 10508/18 10517/17 | 10479/24 10495/21 | 10503/2 10503/2 |
| 508/14 | 0552/23 | 10517/18 10518/21 | 10507/15 10516/4 | 5503/8 10504/8 |
|  | viable [2] 10462/ | 523/1 | 10516/4 10519/18 | 10504/18 10505/19 |
| $+68 / 3105$ | 10541/21 | 10525/20 10526/17 | 10528/18 10528/18 | 0529/18 10532/16 |
| 516/6 10516/10 | video [5] 10466/23 | 10526/19 10526/20 | 10549/12 10551/16 | 0532/19 10533/1 |
| 10516/14 | 10467/2 10467/13 | 10539/1 10539/8 | weak [6] 10545/19 | 5533/4 1053 |
| users [11] 10452/25 | 10467/16 10472/4 | 10540/7 10541/6 | 10545/25 10546/4 | 533/8 1053 |
| 10462/14 10468/10 | view [8] 10466/7 | 10541/25 10546/1 | 10547/12 10547/23 | 533/25 |
| 10468/11 10470/11 | 70/15 10483/19 | 10547/2 | 10548/16 | 0541/8 |
| 10515/3 10515/4 | 10484/110503/18 | ways [2] 10484/9 | weaker [2] 10500/2 | weren't [2] |
| 10515/14 1051 | 10515/18 10545/21 | 10505/4 | 10548/20 | 10499/8 |
| 10539/4 10539/6 users' [1] 10468/6 uses [2] 10508/1 | viewed [2] 10505/24 10506/21 | 10448/5 <br> we [67] 10450/13 | week [2] 10493/11 $10493 / 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { what [204] } \\ & \text { what's [17] } 10463 / 11 \\ & 10470 / 18 \text { 10476/18 } \end{aligned}$ |

what's... [14] 10479/16
10483/20 10484/1
10488/2 10501/11
10502/24 10508/8
10515/3 10515/18
10517/5 10539/24
10540/12 10546/18 10548/16
whatever [8] 10500/1
10500/1 10506/3 10515/5 10516/7 10526/6 10530/9 10547/15
when [97] 10452/22 10453/3 10455/6 10455/7 10456/5 10456/9 10456/12 10458/13 10461/22 10463/24 10464/1 10464/6 10464/17 10464/18 10470/19 10474/16 10475/14 10476/12 10477/15 10477/23 10477/24 10478/16 10479/17 10481/1 10481/8 10481/24 10484/8 10485/25 10487/17 10487/20 10487/23 10488/3 10489/10 10489/24 10490/17 10490/20 10492/7 10492/8 10492/12 10493/17 10498/2 10501/7 10501/19 10502/7 10502/10 10506/20 10506/24 10508/13 10508/15 10509/17 10510/5 10512/20 10515/19 10516/23 10516/24 10517/8 10517/24 10518/8 10518/9 10518/19 10520/3 10522/4 10522/10 10522/20 10523/12 10526/15 10527/1 10527/2 10527/6 10527/10 10529/6 10535/8 10536/20 10537/20 10538/20 10538/20 10539/12 10540/1 10541/4 10543/16 10544/7 10544/8 10544/9 10544/24 10545/1 10545/23 10546/6 10547/5 10548/14 10548/17 10549/15 10549/16 10549/19 10551/23 10551/24 10552/1 10552/24
whenever [5] 10511/18 10530/7 10530/8 10530/10 10537/20
where [45] 10454/8 10454/23 10457/9

10457/17 10457/20 10463/7 10465/21 10466/9 10466/23 10466/24 10467/3 10469/11 10471/19 10471/21 10471/25 10473/8 10476/16 10480/6 10480/13 10480/17 10482/5 10485/2 10489/16 10498/21 10500/24 10503/9 10503/20 10507/10 10507/25 10509/15 10510/3 10512/1 10521/17 10524/10 10524/12 10524/14 10524/23 10527/6 10529/14 10533/13 10536/17 10538/20 10547/6 10547/21 10547/22 whether [19] 10451/25 10455/24 10456/7 10483/8 10483/9 10483/15 10484/22 10486/16 10488/18 10496/7 10496/10 10510/20 10534/4 10534/7 10538/14 10540/4 10550/4 10552/16 10552/18 which [36] 10452/6 10453/22 10454/10 10457/16 10460/2 10462/6 10470/4 10470/11 10470/24 10473/24 10477/5 10478/2 10479/4 10479/10 10479/12 10484/2 10484/9 10487/8 10491/22 10492/12 10494/22 10497/10 10498/3 10505/4 10506/21 10509/20 10522/12 10523/21 10525/14 10526/9 10529/2 10537/11 10541/9 10545/14 10546/8 10549/23
while [3] 10455/1 10488/5 10541/10 Whinston [18] 10450/16 10450/20 10451/2 10451/7 10451/17 10455/23 10456/17 10460/22 10468/25 10470/6 10470/9 10485/13 10504/22 10506/12 10513/7 10513/22 10535/11 10542/4 Whinston's [2] 10467/7 10553/15 who [17] 10452/6 10455/14 10476/2 10488/11 10488/12 10488/18 10488/19

10499/21 10507/13 10507/20 10512/13 10515/21 10517/18 10524/20 10538/15 10547/13 10548/9
who's [6] 10453/16 10517/4 10517/5 10520/10 10547/18 10547/18
whole [4] 10454/20 10488/6 10536/12 10546/9
whose [1] 10507/17 why [57] 10458/4 10459/25 10462/6 10463/13 10463/14 10463/23 10465/11 10465/23 10466/15 10469/15 10470/20 10471/15 10471/15 10482/10 10484/4 10484/11 10486/5 10494/16 10496/5 10504/25 10506/11 10511/6 10512/6 10512/14 10512/20 10512/20 10512/24 10513/2 10513/5 10513/8 10514/4 10516/2 10516/2 10517/23 10518/11 10518/13 10519/2 10519/19 10520/1 10521/7 10521/8 10522/4 10522/16 10527/24 10527/25 10530/22 10531/13 10534/11 10542/12 10542/25 10544/2 10546/13 10546/15 10546/20 10550/16 10553/19 10553/20 widget [2] 10540/23 10541/17
widgets [2] 10453/17 10453/17 will [20] 10453/8 10453/9 10478/15 10486/21 10510/7 10513/9 10515/16 10517/19 10520/20 10520/21 10520/24 10521/1 10521/21 10522/15 10527/22 10528/21 10535/12 10538/3 10545/16 10553/21
William [3] 10448/6 10554/2 10554/8
WILLIAMS [1] 10448/2 willing [6] 10486/20 10533/5 10551/20 10551/23 10551/24 10552/1
willingness [1]
10521/4
willingnesses [1] 10455/15
win [11] 10500/18 10507/24 10511/2 10511/16 10520/10 10521/10 10525/8 10525/9 10525/10 10525/15 10526/19 Windows [2] 10497/9 10497/10
wins [3] 10519/16 10520/7 10520/12
withdraw [1] 10539/21 within [4] 10473/4 10473/10 10473/11 10494/17
without [2] 10491/13 10541/21
witness [3] 10449/2 10451/2 10553/18 WITNESSES [1] 10449/4
won't [2] 10480/24 10507/13
word [3] 10485/21 10525/8 10544/4
words [4] 10463/19 10505/25 10525/24 10531/20
work [4] 10510/4 10539/15 10539/19 10539/20
working [1] 10466/21
works [4] 10455/16 10502/24 10512/2 10553/1
world [15] 10469/13
10471/20 10508/7 10508/21 10508/22 10508/24 10508/24 10510/6 10531/15 10531/22 10546/14 10546/15 10546/24 10547/6 10549/3 worlds [2] 10508/16 10529/6
worried [2] 10481/14 10481/16
worse [2] 10516/12 10529/15
worth [2] 10494/20 10512/11
worthwhile [8]
10512/7 10512/21 10514/5 10517/19 10519/20 10521/21 10544/25 10545/1 would [83] 10452/1 10452/2 10452/24 10453/24 10459/7 10459/24 10460/19 10462/19 10463/10 10463/12 10464/19 10466/13 10469/15 10470/2 10470/15 10471/7 10472/16 10473/9 10474/19 10477/5 10478/8 10479/14 10484/2 10488/10 10492/11
T

10494/18 10495/5 10495/6 10496/23 10499/20 10501/2 10501/17 10501/18 10502/9 10503/23 10505/19 10505/20 10505/21 10506/8 10510/4 10510/12 10512/6 10514/4 10514/13 10515/12 10515/25 10516/3 10516/6 10517/18 10518/15 10518/18 10520/23 10523/4 10523/5 10523/18 10526/8 10529/2 10529/8 10529/8 10529/9 10531/1 10531/2 10532/15 10533/3 10533/4 10533/12 10533/13 10533/21 10533/21 10533/22 10534/1 10534/15 10535/14 10535/17 10535/22 10537/6 10539/8 10539/9 10541/25 10548/4 10548/9 10548/12 10548/17 wouldn't [3] 10466/12 10469/12 10530/19 write [2] 10502/4 10519/20
writes [1] 10485/15 written [1] 10523/17 wrong [6] 10500/19 10501/5 10501/5 10542/25 10544/2 10544/4
wrote [1] 10523/14
Y
Yahoo [5] 10518/11 10518/13 10549/22
$10550 / 1010550 / 13$ 10518/13 10549/22 yeah [14] 10451/8 10455/4 10455/5 10456/1 10459/8 10456/1 10459/8
10462/11 10463/11 $10469 / 5$ 10473/1
$10494 / 1010500 / 12$ 10469/5 10473/1
10494/10 10500/12 10518/17 10545/14 10552/13
yearly [1] 10550/2 years [2] 10456/19 10474/20
yellow [2] 10490/14 10490/19
yes [12] 10452/3 10462/5 10476/10 10478/1 10484/7 10503/5 10504/6 10516/9 10535/20 10540/5 10540/5 10552/16
yesterday [2] 10467/12 10532/1
yet [1] 10514/23
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Y [1] 10523/14



[^0]:    $\qquad$

