WALL STREET UNPLUGGED

AUDIO TRANSCRIPT

Frank Curzio: How's it going out there? It's March 15th. I'm Frank Curzio, host of the Wall Street Unplugged podcast where I break down the headlines and tell you what's really moving these markets. Wanted to say that I hope all my friends and listeners in the Northeast are safe. They got a lot of snow up there. It's freezing. A terrible storm. Hold on one second. My throat was a little dry there. Just needed to take a drink from my piña colada since I'm taping this from my pool in Florida, but I hope all of you are keeping warm from the winter storm Stella. Come on, I have to make fun of Florida ... Actually I always make fun of Florida. I get so many emails making fun of Florida so it's only right I give Florida some love. Nice and warm here, it's pretty cool. In all seriousness I hope all of you are safe, being smart since most of you should be home relaxing, not working, waiting for everything to clear up a bit before getting back to your normal routines.

At least the Fed is working hard as well. I'm taping this on Wednesday around noon. They're expected to announce their decision on interest rates in about two hours, but all 17 officials in that meeting are going to be present. They all made it to Washington, which is kind of weird, given that flights have been canceled across the Northeast for the past two to three days. Even have company in town that was supposed to leave on Monday, are here until Thursday, that's the quickest they get a flight which is tomorrow, but all 17 members made it which is cool. The Fed widely expected to raise rates by 25 basis points or quarter percentage. They're expected to raise rates at least another three times, another three times before year end.

We heard this story before, right? All this type of language coming out of the Fed since 2011. How rates must move higher as the economy starts to get stronger. In 2011, 2012, 13, 14, 15, 16 very little activity. What do we have, one rate hike in 16, last year, December? They're predicting three, maybe four rate hikes this year. Can you take them seriously? I think so. I think this time is going to be different because they have new pro-growth policies by the Trump administration, probably keep a lot of optimism in this market. I don't see a ton of risks or set backs to economic

growth. These are things we saw in the past that forced the Feds to keep rates at historic lows for how many years? Incredible, but if you google 'higher interest rates 2011, 2012' and you just look at what the Fed was saying, "By 2013 we're going to be at 2, 3%, by 2004 ... ", every single year until now.

It seems like a lot more serious this time because those risks which we had during those years, we had oil prices crash, you had Brexit, higher unemployment in 2011, Ebola and that crises in 2014, negative earnings and sales growth, how long has taken place? From 2014 almost through all of 2016 now we're seeing earnings and sales growth about 5% each, a quarter of a quarter. You had China's stock market crash, 2015, huge decline in emerging markets, banking problems in Europe.

All these problems keep coming up and coming up which the forced the Fed to say, "Wait a minute, let's not do anything yet." Forced them to rethink their tightening policy, which is a higher interest rate policy and put everything on hold, but going forward guys, what are we seeing today? Most emerging developed nations are growing, rebounding off the bottom. Their PPI CPI numbers are moving higher. Those are gauges of inflation, the Producer Price Index, the Consumer Price Index. Every country has them just like us, monitored every month.

We have the possibly of tax reform which could add more than $20.00 in total earnings to the S&P 500, and if you did that it would make the index simply based on the tax cuts, Trump signing something, everybody agreeing, Congress agreeing, simply based on that. It would make the S&P 500 trade at more like 15 times earnings instead of 17 and a half times earnings, what it's trading at right now which is people say, "It's the most expensive. It's very, very expensive." That is expensive and it's a big deal when you add those earnings in because the average PE of the S&P 500 since inception is around 15.5. If you add in these earnings from the tax cuts, you're going to see that multiple come down below the average of that median.

I'm not even talking about repatriation or bringing the 2.5 trillion in cash that's overseas back to America which is likely to happen if they're given a lower tax rate of say, 10 to 15% to bring it back in, instead of the 35% which is law right now. I have to tell you, a lot of Democrats support this initiative as well. Their tax rates a little higher than the Republicans, but they want to bring it back as well so this is probably going to happen.

You have the repealing of the Affordable Healthcare Act, which

is taking place right now. Yes, it's not perfect, far from perfect. It's seen as a positive. We all know that costs are going to rise dramatically and are probably going to continue to rise even with these changes. Again, at least we try and do certain things, not give away healthcare for free for 40 million people and have the people who are working pay for it, because that's what's going on right now. You'd think that would be a boon to healthcare companies, but even the insurers are dropping out of the market because they're like, "We can't afford this either. We can't do it anymore. They can't afford, how do you think we feel?"

Not only look at how much healthcare costs have doubled, tripled, whatever, and they're go being higher next year, this year, by 15%, next year 20% if nothing's done. At least we're trying to do certain things. That's a catalyst. There's a possible one trillion infrastructure spending bill on it's way also supported by Democrats. Hillary ran on a 600 billion to a trillion infrastructure spending bill as well. I'm sure they'll come together hopefully on that.

Deregulation, the Dodd Frank which will be a boon to financials, that's why they've been running so higher, so much higher, at least since Trump got elected. It's going to be not only a boon to those companies but to the economies since banks are going to be able to lend more to hopefully qualified individuals. They'll still be monitored guys, don't worry. Doesn't mean we're going to go back to the credit crisis if this happens. As long as these initiatives are on the table, which you need to understand as investors, we're likely going to see a buy the debt mentality on stocks, or money flowing into the market on every single pullback, because there's a lot of catalysts in the market and things are much better on the surface.

What's this all mean? Well, it's likely the Fed is going to raise rates throughout the year. Not going to be persuaded by negative market factors that could cause them to delay this or delay these hikes which we've seen over the past six years, five, six years. Of course we could always have a black swan event. The exchanges get hacked, the big banks get hacked, the terrorists attack on American soil, God forbid. Then again, all bets are off. Who knows what the Fed's going to do. There's just too many positive catalysts for stocks right now.

These guys expect higher interest rates to end 2017, because there's a very high probability that this year, unlike the previous four or five or six years, the Fed is going to do what they say and aggressively raise rates.

I put together a really great report about Trumps policies and what they mean for you as an investor, what they mean for the economy and which stocks in particular and sectors will be the biggest beneficiaries. Spent a few weeks writing this report which is different from the common stories you're going to see on sites like, "How Trump Economy is Going to Impact your Portfolio, So Buy Banks." My report is much more detailed, includes a lot of numbers, a lot of analysis, easy to understand and explains why so many of these policies are going to lead to much higher profits for a select group, sectors and stocks. I break down what a 10% corporate tax, a 10% corporate tax cut, but it's going to be more like a 25% cut or a 10% tax rate would mean to earnings for the entire S&P 500, how these earnings, these companies are going to move sharply higher if this takes place, making the index not so expensive if these cuts become law.

I'm giving away this report absolutely for free because I'm a nice guy. When I launch my new 'Currency and Research Advisory Newsletter', expected to launch very soon, just putting the finishing touches on everything, I know I said it was going to launch like a week ago, again, I want to make sure everything is 100% tested and working. The last thing you want to do is get a newsletter, you click on something and you want to read the basics of it and the link doesn't work. We've got to make sure everything is absolutely tested and perfect. That's what we do here so we get no complaints.

Again, that handshake for you guys, I know you would deal with it and be like, "All right Frank, this is annoying but we like you, we've been listening to you for 10 years", but for new people who have never heard of me this is very important. That handshake, that introduction to make sure everything is right, they're getting everything that they asked for, everything they need, everything they want, access to customer service, everything. It has to be absolutely perfect before we launch. It'll take an extra week or two here, but it's going to launch. Everyone who subscribes to that newsletter will get this report as well as several other reports I just wrote for free.

As I mentioned last podcast, all of you, the listeners are going to receive a special offer to this newsletter. Than annual rate's going to be easily affordable to everyone that's listening to this podcast right now. Also going to provide a very reasonable lifetime offer for you as well, for those interested in following my work for many, many years which I hope is the case. Sometimes, you know, a six month or nine month period could be bad for an investor, a stock.

I mean, you look at Ackman and what happened to some valiant and stuff, yet everybody's all over him about that particular stock and Herbalife and his short, but yet his track record is still pretty remarkable. If you follow him over the past 15 years. I mean, any nine month period, anyone could outperform the markets, underperform the markets, so long term is the goal. Get as many into my newsletter as long term so they can see my research and follow me for a long period.

That special offer is only going to be available for the very first week of my launch. Again, it's not going to be available to anyone outside of this podcast. Why am I offering this newsletter for such a low price to you? Maybe you've followed my work for years, even decades. Because of your loyalty, you've allowed me to start Curzio research, which I plan to make my company one of the largest providers of financial newsletters in the world. Building a team of superstar analysts. A few of them we're talking to already. I want to make sure that they're the best at what they do and sectors like technology, banking, alternative energy, oil. I want to hire the average guy to give you advice. No, it's not going to happen here.

You're getting the best advice, not only from people who have been in this industry for years, even decades, but who understand the markets. It's important, important guys. You can get an amazing guy in biotech who's been in the industry to years who knows very little about stocks. I've seen it. It happens all the time. They try to write newsletters and they get crushed. Not only do you have to be great in your industry, you have to understand stock markets. What drives stocks and the markets. You have to travel the world to get the best stories. I want you to get those stories first before mainstream media, which we've done a pretty good job on this podcast covering trends well ahead of everyone else out there. That's my long term goal.

To get this offer, all you have to do is be in my free email list. If you're on it, you're probably getting a few emails from Curzio Research notifying you when the latest podcast is up or you're getting my weekly breakdown which highlights the best financial stories of the week. If you're already on my free email list, you don't need to do anything. You're going to receive this offer directly from me. However, if you're not on that free list and what to get the offer, which will be a substantial discount to the retail price ... Again guys, I can't stress this enough. It's only going to be available for the first seven days. We're going to really market this heavy and everywhere after the first week of the launch. If you're not on the list, just go to Curzioresearch.com. There's a little box on the

right hand side that says, "My new product launch is coming soon. Click here." Put your email in the box. You're on my list and you'll definitely get that offer.

Remember, you're not committed to anything. I'm not going to spam you a million times. I just want to make sure you receive that special offer for Curzio Research Advisory which is going to be launching, again, in just a few weeks. Once you get the offer, it's up to you to decide if you want to subscribe or not. If you do, you get access to a lot of the free reports which is the one on Trump that I explained his policies will have significant impact on stocks. For me, that report alone would be worth the price of a lifetime subscription because I spent a ton of time writing it, analyzing the numbers.

Guys, please, it's not political. I don't care if you're a Democrat, Republican, or Independent, T-party, or if you just hate everyone in the world, especially in politics. If you are an investor, if you own stocks, these policies are going to have a major impact on your portfolio over the next four years and possibly eight if he gets reelected. I know Democrats are like, "No way." Whatever. It could happen. This report is going to explain exactly the sectors and stocks that are going to benefit. Again, I'm giving it away for free to anyone who subscribes to my newsletter. If you're interested in receiving that report and my special offer to my new Curzio Research Advisory news list, it's going to be my flagship product, just be sure you're on my free email list, guys. To do that, again, just go to my website curzioresearch.com.

Now, I have an amazing interview for you. The CEO of a small cap company. Before I go any further, you know my rules for bringing on CEOs. I don't like having these guys come on when their stock is run up tremendously unless I believe the stock still has enormous upside potential. I try to have these guys on early before the Street is talking to them. Before they're on CNBC, Fox Business, Bloomberg, being mentioned every week in the Wall Street Journal. The company they're going to talk about today has no Wall Street coverage. When I say bringing on these guys before, I'm talking about guys like Jordan Trimble from Skyharbour. I brought him on in November. Uranium company. The stock rose over 200% in a few months. Keith Neumeyer from First Majestic Silver that rose 300%.

Look at Jonathan Awde is another one, from Gold Standard Ventures. Stock was at $0.35, it's now at $2.60. That company just went to the GDXJ index. That's the leading junior gold and mining index. What an accomplishment for Jonathan. A young guy that I

thought was amazing. Door to door ... Knocking door to door. The Carlin trend and that fourth window. Again, a lot of you know this story. If not, you should take a look at it. Gold Standard Ventures. Some of the biggest elephant mines have been built there. 20 million ounce plus. A big area that was just so fragmented. He went door to door, signing deals with everybody to basically cash in on one of the biggest landholdings in the Carlin trend. Now look at him. Look how much he's benefiting. I've been telling that story for five or six years now. Amazing to see where that stock is and I still think it's going higher as long as gold cooperates, which we know it's been down the past few days, past few weeks. A terrible trend.

Anyway, I'm picky when it comes to having CEOs on my podcast because I want them to give you the best advice and have these guys on at the right time. It's very, very important. This interview is with Panna Sharma who is the president and CEO of Cancer Genetics. The symbol is CGIX. There at a $2.00 stock. The cancer diagnostic industry, a genetic testing for cancer industry. Amazing technology which I'll let Panna explain since he's a top name in the industry. He has a history of doing some amazing M&A deals. Over 70 during his career within the healthcare industry. He also has an amazing, amazing team which includes the director of the Mayo Clinic that actually sits on his board of directors. They also have tons of partnerships. I'll let him describe that. Even with Pfizer Merck. Amazing because it's a small company. It's going to be a great interview.

Full disclosure, I don't own shares. I don't own the stock personally, at least, not yet so I'm going to learn just as much from this interview as you. Then you can make your decision or we can make our decision on whether to buy Cancer Genetics or not. A great interview coming up. Almost like an exclusive since I don't see Panna doing lots of interviews outside of some of the major healthcare conferences. It's going to be some really good stuff.

Later on, we're going to have the most important educational segment of the year, which so many of you requested. It will be my analysis of the NCAA tournament. My Final Four picks and sleeper picks that could run all the way to the Final Four. If you're not a college basketball fan, that's okay. You don't have to listen. You could skip it. It's something I do every year. Played basketball all my life. One thing I know just as good as stocks is college basketball. If you're a betting person, you may want to listen. There's at least two great teams that people are picking in the Final Four that I do not think are going to make the Final Four. You're

probably going to lose your bracket.

It is Wednesday. If you didn't fill out your NCAA tournament bracket yet, you're in luck. Guys, I'm sure you made money on my Super Bowl prediction, right? You all know what happened there. Just bet the opposite of me. It's not the same in college, but hopefully I'll make you some money on the NCAA tournament as well which is going to be really cool this year because there's not one dominant team. If you're about to fill out your bracket tonight since the tournament starts tomorrow, at least the real tournament not the playing games, definitely give a listen to my Final Four prediction, this educational segment which is coming up in a few. First, let's get to my interview. Cancer Genetics president and CEO, Panna Sharma.

Panna Sharma, thanks so much for coming on my podcast. I really appreciate it. I know how busy you are. I'm really excited and looking forward to this interview. Thanks so much for coming on.

Panna Sharma: Yeah. Thank you Frank. I really appreciate being here and talking about what we're doing in precision medicine.

Frank Curzio: This is what we're going to get to right now. Talk about your company which is Cancer Genetics. On the NASDAQ as CGIX. Tell everybody a little bit more about your company.

Panna Sharma: Absolutely. We're publicly listed at Ticker CGIX on NASDAQ. The company was founded, really, by some leading scientists from Sloan Kettering back in '99, 2000 to help understand the genomic networks that drove cancer and what kind of genomic changes happened to drive these drive cancers, and how we could understand them, and more importantly, how we can target them to better manage cancer patients. I joined the company in 2010. We took it public and we've grown.

Today the company is serving the needs of biotech and pharma companies, using our technology to help them improve their drug design, monitor patients during clinical trials, and most importantly, develop companion diagnostics or tests that really help understand if a patient needs a drug, will respond to a drug, and more importantly, pinpoint what is the type of cancer, the hundreds of types that are out there, that they have.

The other portion of our business which is about a third of our business is actually helping hundreds of cancer centers, hospitals, and laboratories out there better diagnose patients. Everyday, thousands of samples are coming to our labs in either the East

Coast or the West Coast where we diagnose the patients and the types of cancer they have. That's about a third of our business. The other two thirds is in biotech and pharma, helping them with either discovering new drugs or helping them manage and test their clinical trials.

Frank Curzio: Talk about the testing for a minute because my audience of sophisticated great investors, they're always looking for new ideas. Maybe they would think that is, is this like a 23 or me thing or something, and it's a lot more advanced than that. Explain those differences and even how the tests are taken. Is it a biopsy, is it blood, is it urine, because learning more about this is going to get people more familiar with your stock, I believe, at least my audience.

Panna Sharma: Absolutely. Samples do come into our lab. Unlike 23 and Me or just a Foundation Medicine, we believe and I think most of the industry believes that cancer is not a one trick pony. The genomics alone or just using an aluminum box or an iron torn box will give you the answer. I think any business that relies on just one platform to understand the complexity of cancer is ultimately pretty doomed.

What we use is a technology agnostic approach. What we do is we really understand what are the biomarkers, whether they be genomic or proteomic or immunohistochemistry or immune markers like in immuno-oncology. You're not looking at genes, you're looking at proteins to understand immuno-oncology. Our technology is really bringing together different technologies that interrogate the biomarkers and then put together an analysis using all these different biomarkers. Our understanding really, our platform is really understanding the biology of these specific cancers.

For example in leukemia and lymphoma there are nearly 100 different subtypes of leukemia and lymphoma, and the genomic and biomarker signatures vary tremendously. You have to really understand the biology of these disease. What we do and why eight out of the top ten pharmas work with us is because of our focus on each of the different types of cancer and bringing together different technologies to really provide a comprehensive picture.

What we're now also doing is taking that same comprehensive picture that takes multiple inputs and providing that for the clinical community. A lot of people might understand a simple marker like Her Too. Her Too is very involved in breast cancer but it's also involved in many other cancers, such as gastric cancers, it can be

involved in lung cancers, it can be involved in other cancers. That Her Too marker, just because you find it, it depends on what side of the exon it is in the genome, the dosing for different drugs can be very different. And where it's found to the the site of origin.

Again, in a world where biomarkers matter, it only also matters specifically what is the tumor system and what are the details of the biomarkers involved. That's what our company does extraordinarily well. We deeply appreciate the complex biology behind these different cancers and come up with panels that bring together genomic, proteomics immune markers and provide a comprehensive answer.

Our company is doing about, as I mentioned, about seven million a quarter more or less in revenue. We've grown that tremendously over the last few quarters. We continue to grow. We're on a 28 to 30 million runway today and growing about between anywhere between 30 and 60% a year. A lot of that is driven because of our comprehensive understanding of the biology of these diseases and then our ability to rapidly put together tests that can help solve these complex answers.

Again, the key thing in these tests is the tests also constantly change. What we knew about cancer 3 years ago or even 18 months ago to what we're learning today is constantly evolving. We've put together a pretty remarkable system internally where we can take the knowledge and constantly improve our knowledge base and constantly improve the tests. I think we really are creating a real durable advantage in this race to be the cancer partner out there for both the clinical and the biotech community.

Frank Curzio: This is pretty remarkable too, because again, I'm learning just like everyone else who is learning who is listing to this. Someone may look at this and say even about your test, because when I was doing research and I've done a tone of research in immunotherapy, generics, genetics, ... For example, there's tests to find the, and correct me if I'm wrong, the BRCA gene for breast cancer. If you have that gene, it means that your chances of getting breast cancer rise significantly. If you detect early, there's things you could do to prevent it, or a signature gene that detects ALS or is common and found in ALS.

You have companies like, say, Myriad, Genomic Health, Thermo Fisher, companies like that, and you may say, "But these guys have tests for these type of cancer already", but like you said, there are over 100 forms of cancer even 100 subtypes of lymphoma, which you just said, where each patient can be treated differently,

depending on say, what strand they have. Could you explain this a little further?

Panna Sharma: We don't have today hundreds of different types of drugs, but we do have the insight to manage patients differently. For example, in one of our tests which is for chronic lymphocytic leukemia, is one of the very, very early tests that we did that we brought into market. I'll give you a couple examples to make it more clear for the audience.

There are companies out there that can detect whether you have chronic lymphocytic leukemia. It's a very challenging leukemia, not necessarily to diagnose, but to really understand what to do. Once you diagnose it, and there are a lot of stories I hear about misdiagnosing the disease, people thought it was Lyme disease or they thought it was an infection and took several months, and that's just unbelievable to me today.

In fact I had ... Just a backstory, a few months after we first went public, I was talking with people in the capital markets. There was a guy at one of the firms and he took kind of a personal interest and he said that he had chronic lymphocytic leukemia and he lives with it today and he's on maintenance therapy. He talked to me about how when he first got he lived in Long Island, that it took nearly six, seven months for him to be diagnosed. They initially thought it was Lyme Disease, then they thought it was some kind of skin rash, then they thought it was something else. He said he finally was recommended to five or six different doctors. He said he had bills that probably amounted to like 70 or $80,000.00 including nine different rounds of blood work and testing to look for this cancer, look for this Lyme Disease.

I just thought it's amazing, here we live in an era where a guy who has means, this is 2014, late 2014, and here we are, we know cancer is a genomic disease and yet it took seven months for a guy with means and insurance and everything else, which to me today is remarkable. We've known cancer is a genetic disease for almost 50 years. Today, the challenge isn't necessarily the science, because the science is maturing so rapidly, it's how do we make people in the scientific community understand that there's no one answer, and more importantly get of the dogma of, "Okay, I have a test that solves everything." There is no such thing. This is such a rapidly evolving space that any company that comes out there and says, "We have the perfect test for A or B or C", you have to be suspicious because the science changes and it changes so rapidly.

The issue isn't the science, the issue is now getting the knowledge that these tests are available into the hands of clinicians and to patients and to know where to use them.

In CLL, we have a test that looks at the genomic network that's involved in that kind of specific B cell malignancy which is CLL. We can tell you, does this patient have a high risk, meaning that they might not have a very good chance of survival in the next two to three years, that this patient is medium risk, that probably five to ten year survival or very low risk, meaning that their CLL is a very low stage and it's called smoldering. The chance of survival is very high, it could be 10, 15, 20 years.

That whole disease, someone who dies in 2 and someone who lives to 20, it's amazing but that's all called CLL, but really it's very different diseases. The outcomes are very different. The response to chemo, the response to Rituximab plus chemo is very different, and yet today we still call it one disease. We're not going to necessarily change the disease calling paradigm, because that already exists, but what we can do is when someone has it, they can apply our test and know whether someone is high, medium or low risk and based on that, decide on therapy options.

This is exactly what we've done for a number of different clinical trials for biotech and pharma so that they can really stratify the patients that are medium and high risk and incorporate them into a trial. It's not only better for the patient, but it's better for the healthcare system because it lowers costs for not treating patients who shouldn't be treated that are low risk, over over treating them, but for clinical trials it's very efficient because now we're getting the population of patients that are going to best respond to the new targeted drugs and more importantly we're going to have higher response rates. It increases the pharma or the biotech's company of having a cleaner approval and faster approval and potentially a breakthrough approval.

Higher response rates through better targeting, better outcomes by using funds more efficiently. Actually, the real issue ... Today, if you look at our business model, what's different about it is I don't believe in the dogma that any one test solves everything. I don't believe in any one technology, but more important, the business itself in cancer today, you have to have a company that has a foot in the clinical setting that's inpatient care to understand the patient dynamics, the patient needs, what's happening in the actual clinical environment.

At the same time, you have to have deep signs to go back and to

understand what are technologies, the biomarkers, the algorithms, the signatures that need to be advanced into a clinical trial with the pharma customers? All these new great drugs are coming out but unless you can understand and map to the right patient for the right trial, that's challenging. The business model needs to be one foot firmly in, what I call, the biotech and pharma development world and one foot firmly in the clinical and patient world because the changes are happening so rapidly today that in order to properly commercialize, you have to do both.

I think there's going to be a new era of clinically oriented oncology companies out there, like Cancer Genetics, that are driven by information, have a deep appreciation of biology, and have multiple technologies to solve the problem. That's what we're building at Cancer Genetics. I think it's not a standard one test kind of company or one test story, but I also think that era has passed in molecular diagnostics. I think today, to really build a great company, you really have to have a durable and probably more multi-tiered strategy and that's what we've gone about building.

Frank Curzio: We're talking to Panna Sharma who is the president and CEO of Cancer Genetics. Panna, cancer touches so many of us which I know that you know. My dad past away from lung cancer. Talk about how far we've come when it comes to this disease where the past hundred years the main treatments have really not changed other than take away the past five or ten years where it's chemo or radiation to treat it. How optimistic are you? What are you seeing within the industry? I know you have amazing connections within this industry. Are you saying you're optimistic on what's coming down the pipeline because it seems like you're making big strides here, but I just wanted to hear from someone who's really in this field.

Panna Sharma: Yeah, absolutely. We do a lot of work in lung cancer. In fact, that's one of the big areas. Our big area is probably our lung cancer first, and second in lymphomas and leukemias. In lung cancers specifically, today, outcomes are improving quite a bit and they're improving not only for people who are smokers and symptomatic with non-small cell lung cancer, but they're also improving dramatically for younger people who are not smokers who come down with lung cancer. Typically, those have been traditionally very hopeless type pathways for those patients.

Today, we're really changing the face of lung cancer because of a number of reasons. One is amino oncology which everyone has heard about. Amino oncology is where you harness the power of the patient's own immune system to go fight against the disease.

A lot of patients have very, very good prognosis because they have an immune system that can fight that sub-type of cancer. Having drugs that stimulate that immune system, stimulate that immune response is really important. There have been a lot of breakthroughs by companies such as Bristol-Myers Squibb, by Merck. In fact, from Merck, we're a national reference lab partner with their amino oncology drug. That's been one of the fastest growing tests in our clinical lab.

Also, what's happened is that there are newer and newer appreciation of all the different lung cancer mutations and pathways, and so in an era where it used to be surgery plus chemotherapy, maybe some targeted drugs for some subset of the population that were ALK positive or EGF positive, these are biomarkers, now it's becoming more complex. You have ALK. You have EGFR. You have TD 70 M. You have combinations of those. You have PD-L1 or PD-1 positive. Folks that are also N-Track and so you have a complexity of biomarkers. What a lot of clinicians about as alphabet soup. Clinicians don't need to necessarily know all the details, but what you really need to do is work with a company that understands how to get the right testing on that sample and then more importantly, monitor the patient.

The other breakthrough that's continuing to happen to improve outcomes is the era of what's called 'liquid biopsy'. Often time lung cancer patients don't die because of the cancer that's discovered and treated through chemo or a combination regiment, but it's because they have other cancers also at the same time and it's a secondary cancer that comes up and goes unnoticed for a long time, and either metastasizes or spreads again in the lungs and you have an unfortunate outcome. Today, there are two really amazing things happening to better detect the reoccurrence of cancers, especially in lung. In lung, it's not necessarily always the first cancer, but it's often times a recurrence which is far more deadly. Now we're able to monitor these things from blood.

Traditionally, after you go through chemo or a surgery, there's not a lot of ... The health condition of the patient can suffer, so you don't always want to do biopsies and take lung samples. Today, there's technology coming out and we're in the forefront of this. We have a liquid lung cancer test coming out where we can monitor from blood all the important 14, 16 biomarkers that will give you an early indication whether the cancer's coming back. There are a number of companies working in this. Imagine now, instead of an expensive biopsy, you can take a blood draw and from a few milliliters of blood tell you what's going on with your

lung cancer patient. That's amazing. Monitoring from blood for existing cancer patients is going to change outcome and change the survival curve.

The other thing that is happening ... We're working on this with Mayo Clinic. We have a joint venture with Mayo Clinic. We're probably one of the only genomic companies that has a molecular diagnostic venture focused in oncology with Mayo where we're developing a new test. We're expecting it to be out later this year. If someone does have potential multiple lesions in their lung, or what they call multiple tumors or multiple sites, we can take those and tell you, is it one cancer or is it different types of cancer. Again, those are breakthrough technologies. We've been working on this now with Mayo for the last year and a half, two years. We're now ready to start commercializing. We've got some amazing results. Now early on, you can determine, the clinician and the patient, what cancers are we going after? Are we treating one? Are we treating two or more?

The management of cancer is changing because of our appreciation of the biomarkers but, more importantly, the advancement in the technology to understand it. To answer your earlier question, yeah we're changing the face of lung cancer because of improved methodologies, improved understanding of biology, and then ultimately, I think clinicians are increasingly accepting that they have to really use these tests to better manage patients and to get them to the drugs faster.

Frank Curzio: Yeah. That's great stuff. I love everything that you said there. Very optimistic it seems. One of the things that you just talked about, it's a few things, but I want to get to your stock now too because for me, as a small cap analyst for over 20 years, there's just different variables, different things I like to see. One is high insider ownership which you guys have. Another thing, especially when it comes to biotech is partnerships. When you see smaller companies have partnerships and you have unbelievable partnerships. You mentioned a few.

When it comes to the Mayo Clinic and Merck with its signature immunotherapy drug. I believe it's Keytruda. Also Sloan Kettering, Cleveland Clinic, Columbia, Alabama, Iowa Universities. Talk about these partnerships and what it means for your company. For me, from an analyst, when I see partnerships from bigger guys, it means that your technology's good. It makes me want to look at your company even more because there's so many people that are trying to partner up with you at this early stage.

Panna Sharma: We've been very ... The company itself operation, we've been very privileged to have some great partnerships. I think it started with the fact that we were founded by some great scientists such as Dr. Shigante and others from Sloan Kettering early on so they had a real ... The company always just had one foot firmly in innovation. In fact, it's one of our core values in the company, innovation. When I got to Cancer Genetics, I really expanded that philosophy beyond Sloan Kettering to say as a small company, we have to be open to innovation through outside partnerships and accept it. We can't have a non-inventive syndrome and also very importantly, the inventions are happening at these major sites so how do we partner with them and give them upside and give them access to a fast-moving commercial company that wants to see these technologies get into the mainstream.

We have an open innovation type approach. Maybe not as aggressive as like a P&G or other retail companies, but open innovation is a big part of what we do so that's why we're looking for partnerships. We're looking for collaborators that want to make a difference in the face of cancer, not just publish papers. That philosophy has allowed us to work with some of the biggest, brightest names out there. In fact, many of these partnerships, for us it's, like you said as an analyst, it gets other people's attention. The partnership that we did with Columbia with Dr. Raza and Dr. [inaudible] in myeloid cancer helped us get attention of some major pharma companies that wanted to do work with us in myeloid cancer.

The work that we did with Hunstman and Dr. Agarwal, and with City of Hope with kidney cancer, and Cleveland Clinic and kidney cancer got the attention of a major biotech. They are funding a big trial, early stage trial in kidney cancer because of it. These collaborations are part of our open innovation strategy and philosophy to bring in great content from the outside because you can't innovate alone, but then more importantly that innovation attracts revenue, it attracts commercial traction and it attracts people wanting to do new things, which to me means greater market share. That has been a key part of the company in terms of opening up our walls and being that magnet for open innovation and collaboration.

On the other side, we've had some great biotech and pharma customers, companies like Gilead, companies like GSK, H3 Bio, Baygene, some of the ... Like I said we're working with eight out of the top ten big biotech and pharma. I think biotech and pharma

really appreciate our technology agnostic biology driven approach because they understand that assays change, technologies change and there is no one panel that solves all the answers. That approach I think is really appreciated.

They also appreciate the fact that we aren't just a biotech and pharma focused company, that we actually are seeing real patients, thousands of patient samples, so that our judgment and our knowledge is based on not only what is scientifically relevant but what is commercially feasible. Those are often times, as you know, at odds. That balance between execution in the commercial and innovation in the scientific setting is totally essential for these pharma drugs to work because you can great new breakthrough therapy, but if it doesn't reach patients and no one knows how to test for it, it's going to sit on the shelf.

For pharmas we're a great bridge. Develop the assay in the lab, help them manage their clinical trials to get into market and then ultimately make sure the patients are tested correctly and drive the therapy. That's kind of been our model. Again, it starts with that open innovation framework at the outset, but then for every great new test or technology, if we have 20, 30% success rate through the pipeline, that's ultimately thousands of lives that we can potentially impact. That's kind of our philosophy. We continue to look at new partnerships. I think it's part of any grown company is to have partnerships. We're looking now for more partnerships globally so that's also a very exciting time. We're getting a lot of attention from companies and collaborators outside the U.S. today.

Frank Curzio: That's great stuff. A couple more questions here because I want to talk about your financials. In 2012, you did just 4 million in sales, in 2014 did 10 million sales. For a full year, you mentioned earlier I think, over 30 million in sales, yet your stock is lower today, it's around $2.20, compared to, I think it was over $15.00 in 2014.

When it comes to certain companies, say like Netflix, the street or the market wants to see subscriber growth. For other companies it's earnings growth. For retailers it's strong sustained sales and store growth. What does the street or the market want to see from your company, because it seems like you guys are doing the necessary steps but your stock has come down. Are you looking for more revenue growth, or faster, a signature test that's better than the rest of the industry, or profitability which seems is right around the corner for you guys, right?

Panna Sharma: I think they want all of those things. I think there's no fundamental

answer. I think if you ask different players or different analysts, there's probably different views. I think you create a great business on the fundamental merits of the business, but I do think that revenue growth is a key driver for appreciation in the stock, but as you said, we've grown revenues from when we went public we were doing less than 7 million, I think we did 6.3 that year. Analysts expect us to 2016 for the full year to do about 27 million which we're comfortable with, and they expect us to grow to 35 plus this year which we're also comfortable with.

I think we've shown outstanding growth, especially as you benchmark it against other emerging companies in our peer group, some of which have very little revenue or no revenue. I don't think that alone is enough. I think the other challenge has been capitalization. I think if you look at some of the bigger companies, they're really well capitalized. There's no fear of not having enough runway. I think we've been addressing that. We did some fundraising last year. I think we really got put in the penalty box as a result of that because they had a warrant overhang, which we've been working to clean up because the financings are done with a 50% warrant coverage on it. That was pretty standard for deals getting done last year in the nanocap biotech space.

Frank Curzio: Just to go on your point here. It was difficult. The biotech has been really terrible in the past couple years. I'm sure it was difficult to raise money in that type of environment anyway, right?

Panna Sharma: Very challenging. Very challenging but we had some good investors believe in us, but as you know, in that kind of environment, investors do take their pound of flesh, but I think underneath the mechanics of the stock, we've got a great company that's probably undervalued at least three or four X. Even as an analyst in my former career, I just have never seen ... Our market cap today is about 40 or so million, 42 million, which is at a tremendous discount where diagnostic and genomically driven diagnostic companies have traded at, which has traditionally been at about, low end three and a half X of revenue, high end, six, seven X of revenue. Yeah, I think it's a tremendous buying opportunity today.

Frank Curzio: Last thing here, talk about some of the catalysts, because it's very important for me too, before I recommend stocks, where I want to see short term catalysts or medium term catalysts where if your stock is just sitting there, you're almost market dependent where if things go bad or Trump comes out with a tweet about biotech pricing or whatever, the whole market comes down, you're going to be part of that unless there's certain catalysts. I think in today's market, it's probably a lot different, which you probably agree

with where people want to know what's going on, what's going to happen with the company next three to six months and don't really look long term, and sometimes that could impact your stock.

My question to you is: What are some of the catalysts in 2017?

Panna Sharma: A lot of people think six months is long term today.

Frank Curzio: Yeah, I know.

Panna Sharma: I remember walking into a meeting and a guy goes, "I'm a real long term holder. Sometimes I'll probably be in a stock like five, six months at a time." I'm like, "Oh, okay. Sounds exciting."

Frank Curzio: Yeah, right.

Panna Sharma: I think people's perception of long term is different also today.

We have catalysts at three levels. One are new product launches. We launched our hereditary product earlier this year. We'll be making improvements and extensions to that product. The second beyond product launch is customer and wins both in the pharma industry as well as the clinical industry, and we'll be making those. Then third, which is very important, are ongoing partnerships to expand our capabilities. If you think about what's changing the face of oncology and clinical medicine today, there are things like artificial intelligence and big data, they're making a big impact, there are new emerging technologies such as the constant change that's going on in immuno oncology. I think we'll continually have announcements about partnerships that'll expand our footprint, new products that'll expand our total available and addressable market and then very importantly customer wins that are concrete evidence of our fundamental underlying growth of our revenue base and our overall bookings.

Today, as I mentioned, two thirds of our business is pharma and biotech. A lot of those are long term contracts, Frank, where we're contracted over a year, two years, three years, to do the testing for long term phase two B, phase three trials. Today our, what I call our bookings, or really our contracted revenue with the biotech and pharma that we expect to earn in the future, that number is over 40 million dollars in signed contracts that we expect to recognize as revenue going forward. That number is growing so I think that should also give comfort. We report out that number in terms of contracted revenue with the biotech and pharma community.

Frank Curzio: That's great stuff. Now I've got to ask you, this last question is by far the most important. I'm going to take a stab here because I know that when we talked yesterday, you were in Raleigh, North Carolina, which is home to the biggest rivalry in sports which is North Carolina and Duke. I'm not sure if you follow basketball, I'm going take a stab here, but do you have these guys going to the Final Four, winning a national championship, since the tournament starts tomorrow.

Panna Sharma: Yeah. We have a big pool of proceeds go to charity at CGI, but yeah we have our labs, we have people competing against one another. I think both N.C. and Duke will probably go to the Final Four. In my own home we're split. We have some Duke fans and we have N.C. fans so I try to ... I'm not going to take the side here on this call but I think they'll go all the way. I think you have some great teams out there. I think my picks are UCLA, N.C, Duke, maybe Gonzaga, I think. I think it's going to be great. It's very exciting actually, the Final Four at CGI because we've got a lot of people who are passionate about it and we have a pool and the proceeds go to charity, so that'll be very exciting the next couple weeks.

Frank Curzio: That is great. I'm glad you didn't pick a team, either Duke or North Carolina because that may result in people not buying your stock or not, that's how [crosstalk 00:50:46]

Panna Sharma: Definite the ticket on this call, Frank.

Frank Curzio: Listen Panna, thanks so much for joining us. Really exciting stuff. I love your company. Now that I love your company, I love your stock at this price. It seems like you guys are doing lots of great things, higher insider ownership with great partnerships, great catalysts coming up. I really appreciate you taking the time to come on the podcast and educating my listeners.

Panna Sharma: Oh great. Frank, thank you. Most importantly I think we're building a great business model with some great people. Ultimately great companies are built on the backs and minds of great people, which I think we've got some of the best colleagues in the industry. I'd love to give your viewers an update after we report or sometime in the future, so thanks a lot for hearing our story.

Frank Curzio: That sounds great. Thanks so much for coming on.

Hey guys, great stuff from Panna. Full disclosure here, I do not own any shares of the stock, at least not yet, but one thing, actually two that put this stock on the radar for me. There are several hedge funds, three, that just took large stakes in the company, bought

about 15% of the shares outstanding I believe, again, all new positions. Plus one of the top biotech analysts I know who was responsible for helping me out on many of my biotech winners when I was the editor of the Phase One Newsletter at my previous company. He helped me out a lot on the research, always pointed me in the right directions and people to talk to stuff and always said, "You know you don't have to mention me.", or whatever. I always felt guilty. He's a very, very smart guy. Also alerted me to this stock as well.

Not only is it a great company, it's a feel good story right? We all want to make money on the stock, but you could see the enthusiasm. Hopefully they succeed. You're seeing the breakthroughs in cancer which is pretty amazing and here's a way to play it through this stock, but be sure to do your homework. I'm going to have some follow up questions, Panna later on. They're reporting earnings I believe next week, so he couldn't talk too much about the financials obviously. That's why he said he'll report back maybe in a month or so with updates and see what's going on, but going forward, most of these special interviews with small cap CEOs will be reserved for my paid subscribers only.

There's a lot of research. This is pretty cool. That's why I am doing a discount courtesy of Research Advisory significantly for you to the point where it's more affordable than filling up your gas tank on monthly basis. It's going to be incredibly cheap, but a lot of those interviews you're going to see with that type of research and that type of hands on. You're going to see that mostly in my newsletters. Of course I'll have some CEOs on and stuff like that on the free podcast, but a lot of that's going to over to the paid versions and you're going to see exactly how I do this research, if I did, say, recommend Cancer Genetics, again that's simple, I think it's CGIX, but if I recommended that stock, I would probably go see them in person, try to see the lab, learn more about the technology then take pictures of it and show you more of exactly what they're doing and learn as much as I can about it before I recommend.

That's how you have to do research. Seriously, you can't just sit behind your desk and do things and talk to people. It's about going out there, being in the room especially when these deals are going on, looking more into their partnerships and everything, but a lot of that is going to be in my newsletter, especially courtesy of Research Advisory. For those of you subscribed to Curzio Venture Opportunities, you're getting all that stuff right now, which is pretty cool so just to let you know.

I thought that it was a cool interview. It was a podcast about you, not me. Let me know what you thought. Frank@curzioresearch.com, you can email me at Frank@curzioresearch.com

Now, let's move on to my educational segment where I will educate you on who will make the Final Four. It's always difficult to predict these things. Not too difficult. You always have these crazy ... Thursday and Friday are nuts. You'll see a couple of teams have these crazy upset and then the next round they usually get blown out, maybe it'll take two rounds, but usually when it comes down to the final, you're going to see the big teams, the main teams. A lot of times these are the guys that make it. Outside of Connecticut that one year and maybe Kansas when they won the championship, we're talking about long, long time ago, not the recent one in 2008 with Danny Manning, where you see like a seven, eight seed or a ten seed even win the championship. Doesn't happen often. However, there's a lot of stuff, lot of things to talk about so let's get right into it.

We have Villanova, Gonzaga, Kansas, which is my favorite team in the world you guys know, and North Carolina as the top seeds in the bracket. However, the favorites to make the Final Four not necessarily the top seeds. If you pick the favorites, it's usually called chalk, you're picking all the favorites to win. The favorites, the chalk, would be Duke, Arizona, Kansas and North Carolina, where Duke and Arizona are two seeds, Kansas, North Carolina are one seeds. That's what the betting people are doing. Those are the favorites to meet in Phoenix on April 1st in the Final Four.

A few things you should know. Again, I'm the biggest Kansas fan in the world, haven't missed one game probably in the last three years of watching it, always tape them if I'm out of town. Have a great team this year but I don't think they're going to make the Final Four. Hopefully this is the contrarian in me and they win the championship, which I'm rooting for. They did win the Big 12 again, which is a record 12 straight times tying UCLA, but a lot of those wins guys, which is what I saw, were very close against decent teams, not great ones within the division.

In other words, they could have lost another five games pretty easily if you just changed one possession, someone who watched the games. Plus, Kansas has trouble defending the three pointer and high scoring teams and in their bracket, 6 of the top 20 three point shooting teams are in their bracket. If you're picking Kansas, be very careful. If they have to play Iowa State, who is in the Big 12, in the third round, they're going to be in big trouble, since it's a team that smoked Kansas, at Kansas, late in the year, not long ago.

They also one the Big 12 tournament pretty easily. They could be in trouble. Iowa State is iffy. I'm going to tell you why in a minute.

I also like Purdue, who is very underrated in this bracket nobody is talking about. Villanova has one of the toughest regions along with North Carolina. Gonzaga has the easiest path for a number one seed.

Let's start with the south bracket. I have North Carolina, definitely the best team, tough bracket though, but most of the better teams on the other half of that south bracket. That's where the trouble starts. They're going to have to play one of those great teams, who is going to come out of that there, which is going to be Kentucky Wichita State, who is an awesome team. They were ranked in the top 10 I believe this year, yet they're a 10 seed, which is insane. UCLA and Cinci. Again, all those guys are on one side of that south bracket, then you have North Carolina, but North Carolina will have trouble with one team and that's Butler. If Butler wins the first two games, North Carolina wins the first two games, they're going to play each other.

It's going to be awesome because Butler is a really, really, really good team. They defeated 10 teams in the RPI top 50. RPI won't get ... That's just basically the top teams that are ranked. 10 teams they beat this year. They beat Villanova twice which is the best team in the nation. They're ranked number one this year. They beat them twice. They also have a great D. If you're looking at sleepers, Butler is legit. Again, they're in the south bracket with UNC, Kentucky, UCLA. I think Cinci also could make some noise, underrated. I think UCLA is terribly overrated. One of the worst defensive teams in the nation and finished third in their conference although some suggest they're powerful enough to be an overall number one seed.

If you're looking at a cool stat guys, pay attention here because after I say this, you're going to be changing your bracket before tomorrow. This is the most important stat you need to know. There is no team that has won the NCAA tournament with a defensive ranking of less than 21 since 2002. What does that mean? That's the defensive efficiency rankings as they rank the teams. If you're worst than 21 out of all the teams that are ranked, whatever, 100 and something, if you're worst than 21, chances are you're not going to win the NCAA tournament. Defensive teams, you have be decent defensively in order to win. You have to be ranked 21 or better.

Now, Virginia is ranked number one, Villanova number two,

Kentucky number nine, so you're okay there. But listen to this, North Carolina is ranked 25, Kansas is ranked 30, that scares me. Arizona is ranked 28. Duke is ranked 39 and UCLA is ranked the 78th best defensive team based on defensive efficiency rankings. They just take everything into account, just like a pure number. Just something to think about if you have North Carolina, Kansas, Duke or Arizona winning the NCAA Championship, which I bet more than 60, probably 70% of the people have since North Carolina, Duke and KU are the betting favorites in Vegas right now. Be very, very careful. If you're looking at defensive efficiency rankings, they're all under 21 and a lot of them are well ... Arizona 28, Duke 39, Kansas 30, UCLA 78. Again, a lot of people have those teams winning. I don't know if they can win. They don't have the defense.

I do like North Carolina, definitely. They're ranked 25 but not too bad, not too far off. I do like them to win the South and make the Final Four. I think it's a safe bet because the other side of the South bracket is just so loaded. I don't think Kentucky, UCLA are in the same class as UNC, at least during the year.

Now, let's keep going here. Real quick. In the Midwest, Kansas is a safe bet in an overall weak bracket since Louisville wasn't that dominant for me this year. They're the number two in the region. The number three team is Oregon. They lost some of their best ... Not, some. They lost their best shot blocker, key to their team, two weeks ago who's out for the year. Then you have number four is Purdue, which is actually a good team. If Kansas and Purdue play their best, I think Kansas is a much better team in my opinion.

Look out for Michigan who won the Big Ten. Played crappy for most of the year but won the Big Ten tournament and they're playing really great right now. They're underrated. The winner of this bracket is Iowa state. However, they have to get out of the first round since they're playing Nevada, who's a very, very good team. Iowa state, one of the best offenses in the league this year and about a month ago, they figured out how to play defense and have been crushing teams including Kansas at Kansas. Easily won the Big 12 tournament, blowing out just about everyone including West Virginia who was ranked at a top five this year. I have Iowa State coming out of the Midwest but it's risky because Nevada is a very, very good team.

Looking in the East, Villanova is going to play Wisconsin who is very underrated. It's a scary game for them. In the second round. Virginia's also a scary team that held North Carolina for like 50 points a few weeks ago. Wisconsin underperformed this year but they may have one of the best defenses in college basketball.

Again, there's never been a team below the top 20 ranked defensively that has won the NCAA championship. Looking at Florida who I don't think is that good. I saw them play. SMU has been making noise. I feel like they're overrated.

Then you have Duke which the entire world loves now, right? They were ranked, what is it, fifth into the tournament? Sixth? Whatever they were ranked in the AFC. They happened to win the tournament. Played great. Beat North Carolina twice in the past few weeks. They won the AFC championship. I like Duke. They're healthy now, but if they play Villanova guys, which will be the last game to get to the Final Four in the East region, I think Villanova's going to win that game by more than 10, likely by more than 15 points. They're just a very tough match up for Duke since they're faster, better offensively, better defensively. I'd take them in a heartbeat against Duke. If you have Duke going to the Final Four, better make sure Villanova loses, but I don't think they will and I have Villanova as the winner in the East.

Finally, let's go to the West, which includes Gonzaga as a number one. Arizona as a number two. The whole world is picking Arizona. I think they have the best draw in the tournament. The expectations are sky high. They were actually my sleeper five weeks ago since UCLA and Oregon were ranked higher than them in the conference, but UCLA is just not a good team defensively, even though Ball is amazing. It's got to be a top three pick I believe. Oregon also lost a key player in that division. Watch out for VCU. It could be a tough match up for Arizona in the second round. They're my sleeper in the West.

Northwestern made the tournament. First time in history, congratulations. Here's what I want you to do. My advice, sell everything you own. Sell your house, your kids, everything, and put it on Vanderbilt, who they're playing, because I think they're going to destroy Northwestern. The spread is actually even money. I can't believe it. Wisconsin just played Northwestern, their last game, and they beat them by 30. Northwestern beat Rutgers and Maryland before that, which are both terrible teams ... I think Maryland significantly underperformed this year. Vanderbilt beat Florida twice in the past month and they also lost to Kentucky at Kentucky by only six points. They're a very, very good team especially as of late. They also beat Iowa State, which I just told you how great they were, so they've been playing great the last ten games before losing to Arkansas SC semifinal. Northwestern is in the Big Ten. The weakest division in the major conference of college basketball by a mile, but if you take the last 12 games

of Northwestern, they're five and seven. They beat Michigan and Maryland, good wins, but got crushed by Illinois, Wisconsin, and Purdue. I'm going past Northwestern. I just think they're going to get destroyed.

On the other side of the West bracket, you have Gonzaga. Pivotal match up against West Virginia or Notre Dame in the third round and maybe Arizona in the fourth to get to the Final Four. I like West Virginia a lot. I watched them crush Kansas this year at West Virginia and should have beat them at Kansas having a 14 point lead with just two minutes to go and they just ... They lost the game. Kansas didn't win it. They just lost. Choked. They've been playing terrible lately. They certainly have the ability to reach the Final Four. They're a great team that plays great D. Great guards and can shoot. I think they're a top five team this year, just the past few games they haven't been playing that well.

I have Gonzaga winning this division. I know they've been the favorite to reach the Final Four in the past, fell on their face. This team, from what I see, is legit. Very easy schedule, I know. Great defense. You're going to get a great price if you bet them for a number one seed, betting them to win the whole tournament because they play such a weak schedule which is not their fault. I like Gonzaga, who did nothing wrong this year, except what, lose one game? Then basically destroy every other team that they played.

My Final Four is Villanova, Gonzaga, North Carolina, and Iowa State. I have Villanova beating Gonzaga in a very close game in the first semi and then North Carolina beating Iowa State. Again, which could turn out to be a terrible pick because Nevada, they have in the first round, they have one of the best players in college basketball. He's definitely going to the NBA. Marcus Marshall. See that game? Pay attention to that game. They also have a guy, Cameron Oliver, who's awesome. Very awesome. Big man for Nevada. The rest of the team, unfortunately, is not that good.

If Iowa State gets past that game, I'm not worried, but they're going to eventually lose to North Carolina in that other semifinal. That leaves us a rematch of last year. North Carolina and Villanova, and I think Villanova is going to win it again. They're going to win two in a row. They're just a complete basketball team where all five guys can score 20 or more on any given night. I think they're like the fifth, sixth favorite to win which is amazing since they won it last year. They have Kansas ranked ahead of them in terms of the odds, North Carolina, Duke ahead of them now. It's pretty amazing when I see that. I think Villanova is the complete team. Again, great

D. They take care of the ball and have an awesome, awesome defense.

The tournament, which starts tomorrow, hopefully all you guys are watching and if you're not a college basketball fan, my apologies for this educational segment. A little bit long, but it's a tradition that I do on Wall Street Unplugged and I always get tons of emails telling me to keep doing this at least once a year before the tournament. Hopefully those picks work out for you and you make a lot, a lot of money and more importantly, win your tournaments. This way you can brag at your job.

Okay guys, if you have any comments, questions about today's podcast, send me an email at frank@curzioresearch.com. It's frank@curzioresearch.com. Also, check out my website at curzioresearch.com where you can find all my podcasts, including transcripts, ticker symbols of all the companies I'm mentioning in each show, and all the detail information about the interviews, especially the one I just had with Panna which was amazing. I also am launching Curzio Research Advisory very soon guys. Again, putting the finishing touches on a few things.

I will provide an amazing offer for you, my podcast listeners only, to receive that offer when we launch. Just make sure you're on my free list. To do that, go to my website at www.curzioresearch.com. There's going to be a box on the right hand side that says, "My new product is launching soon. Click here." That's the easiest way. Don't send me anymore emails. I'm getting tons of emails and I want to make sure I have all of you guys on the list. That's the easiest way to do it and that way you'll get that special price to my newsletter, which will only be available for just the first week and only to my podcast listeners.

That's it for me. Thank you so much for listening. Enjoy the NCAA tournament. It starts tomorrow. I'm excited. I'll see you in seven days. Take care.