WEBVTT

NOTE duration: "00:54:40.2240000"

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:05.364 Here and then Karen take it from there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:05.370 \longrightarrow 00:00:09.434$ So may I call Doctor Tara Thompson Felix.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:09.440 \longrightarrow 00:00:10.484$ Take it away.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:10.484 --> 00:00:11.878 Doctor Thompson feelings, yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:11.878 --> 00:00:13.270 so good afternoon everyone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:13.270 \longrightarrow 00:00:15.010$ My name is Tara Thompson.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00{:}00{:}15.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}17.954$ Felix I'm one of the first year child

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:17.954 --> 00:00:20.104 Psychiatry Fellows so I actually met

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00{:}00{:}20.104 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}22.114$ Doctor O'Donnell a few months ago

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:22.188 \longrightarrow 00:00:24.467$ on virtually in one of our breakout

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:24.467 \longrightarrow 00:00:26.681$ sessions and grand rounds and just

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:26.681 --> 00:00:28.924 heard a lot about his research who

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:28.924 \longrightarrow 00:00:31.006$ really got me excited because I've

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00{:}00{:}31.006 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}33.097$ done some research and in utero,

 $00{:}00{:}33.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}35.236$ and epigenetics and I really wanted

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00{:}00{:}35.236 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}37.328$ the opportunity to kind of explore

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00{:}00{:}37.328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}39.018$ that more so Doctor O'Donnell

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:39.020 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.830$ has been awesome and discussing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:40.830 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.514$ Potential projects with me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:42.514 \longrightarrow 00:00:45.521$ Since then an I am very excited

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:45.521 \longrightarrow 00:00:48.293$ to announce that I will be a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:48.293 --> 00:00:50.078 PhD student in his lab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:50.080 \longrightarrow 00:00:51.538$ Starting in July,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:51.538 \longrightarrow 00:00:54.940$ so I'm very excited to pass it

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:55.047 --> 00:00:58.287 along to Doctor Karen O'Donnell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:58.290 \longrightarrow 00:00:59.756$ Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:59.756 --> 00:01:00.489 But

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}01{:}00.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}01.978$ congratulations again, Tara Anne.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:01.978 --> 00:01:04.614 I'm very happy that you got into

 $00:01:04.614 \longrightarrow 00:01:06.319$ the program and delighted that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:06.319 --> 00:01:08.240 you'll be working in the lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:08.240 \longrightarrow 00:01:10.824$ and I'll be looking forward to when you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:10.824 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.158$ were doing Grand Ryans showing some.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:13.160 --> 00:01:14.920 Hopefully you're very interesting data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:14.920 --> 00:01:17.181 fetal exosomes and how they are shaped

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}01{:}17.181 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}18.880$ by exposure to prenatal adversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:18.880 \longrightarrow 00:01:21.520$ and how they can inform on child in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:21.581 \longrightarrow 00:01:23.716$ your development and Doctor Martin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:23.720 --> 00:01:25.946 Thank you very much for that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}01{:}25.946 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}27.825$ kind introduction for not giving

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:27.825 \longrightarrow 00:01:30.107$ the game away about where I am.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:30.110 --> 00:01:32.726 Chrome I thought I would start by giving

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:32.726 \longrightarrow 00:01:35.502$ you a little bit of a background on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:35.502 \longrightarrow 00:01:38.295$ how and where I've come from an end to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:38.295 \longrightarrow 00:01:40.601$ end up here at the Child study Center

00:01:40.601 --> 00:01:42.498 and as Doctor Martin mentioned, an.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:42.498 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.346$ If this is an experiment between

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:44.346 \longrightarrow 00:01:45.984$ the Department of Citrix and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:45.984 --> 00:01:47.280 the Child Study Center,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:47.280 \longrightarrow 00:01:49.692$ I'm more than happy to be a subject in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:49.692 --> 00:01:51.890 this study because it's such a pleasure

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:51.890 \longrightarrow 00:01:54.648$ to be acting as a bridge between these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:54.648 \longrightarrow 00:01:56.814$ two Fantastic Department's an so as

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:56.820 --> 00:01:58.728 Doctor Martin at knows I actually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}01{:}58.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}01.138$ I'm from the West coast of Ireland.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:02:01.140 --> 00:02:02.480 A very small village,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:02.480 \longrightarrow 00:02:04.490$ around 200 people an on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:02:04.567 --> 00:02:06.279 western coast of Ireland,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:06.280 \dashrightarrow 00:02:09.208$ very close to a small town called Belona.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:09.210 \longrightarrow 00:02:11.418$ It's right on the Atlantic coast.

 $00:02:11.420 \longrightarrow 00:02:13.667$ The red line that you're seeing on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}13.667 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}16.204$ this map is what's called the Wild

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:02:16.204 --> 00:02:18.936 Atlantic way that has a roadway that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:02:18.936 --> 00:02:21.324 hugs the Atlantic coast of Ireland.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:21.330 \longrightarrow 00:02:23.661$ And for those of you who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:02:23.661 --> 00:02:25.730 avid cyclists like Doctor Martin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:25.730 \longrightarrow 00:02:27.812$ it's 1500 miles and that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:27.812 \longrightarrow 00:02:29.770$ can cycle around our lender,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:29.770 \longrightarrow 00:02:32.086$ driver and arnensee some fantastic sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:32.090 \longrightarrow 00:02:34.250$ Such as the Stone Age settlement

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:02:34.250 --> 00:02:36.580 that's around 20 minutes from my home,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:36.580 \longrightarrow 00:02:37.876$ Amore Dan Patrick head.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:37.876 \longrightarrow 00:02:40.624$ I can tell you it took a long

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}40.624 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}42.439$ time to take this photograph.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:42.440 \longrightarrow 00:02:44.075$ This isn't representative of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:44.075 \longrightarrow 00:02:46.240$ weather that we have in Ireland,

 $00:02:46.240 \longrightarrow 00:02:46.573$ Ann,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:02:46.573 --> 00:02:48.571 but there are some beautiful scenes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:48.571 \longrightarrow 00:02:51.180$ to be had in the West Coast of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:02:51.180 --> 00:02:53.164 Ireland and up until very recently

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:53.164 \longrightarrow 00:02:55.444$ that would have been the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:55.444 \longrightarrow 00:02:57.532$ famous thing about where I'm from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:57.532 \longrightarrow 00:02:58.788$ This wonderful coastline and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:58.788 \longrightarrow 00:03:00.380$ this Stone Age settlement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:00.380 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.900$ And but then Joe Biden got elected.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:02.900 \longrightarrow 00:03:06.156$ And his ancestral home is around 20 minutes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:06.156 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.770$ from my home in a small town called Belle.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:09.770 \longrightarrow 00:03:12.794$ And all you can see is distant relatives

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}03{:}12.794 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}15.417$ celebrating when the election was announced,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:15.420 \longrightarrow 00:03:17.440$ and mural that remains in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:17.440 \longrightarrow 00:03:19.460$ our small town and were,

 $00:03:19.460 \longrightarrow 00:03:20.663$ among other works.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:20.663 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.910$ So where everyone was very excited by this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:23.910 \longrightarrow 00:03:26.190$ this is actually the 2nd president

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:26.190 \longrightarrow 00:03:28.222$ that belona can lay claim

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:03:28.222 --> 00:03:29.966 to because Mary Robinson,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:03:29.970 --> 00:03:32.388 the first woman President of Ireland,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:32.390 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.136$ also hails.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:33.136 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.882$ From Belona,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:33.882 \longrightarrow 00:03:35.747$ so a little fun fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:35.750 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.510$ but as Doctor Martin mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}03{:}37.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}39.514$ I my trading didn't occur in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:39.514 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.017$ Ireland and I had to travel a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:03:42.017 --> 00:03:44.195 little bit further East for that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:44.200 \longrightarrow 00:03:46.531$ and that was to London where I

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:46.531 \longrightarrow 00:03:48.284$ completed my undergrad Masters and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:48.284 \longrightarrow 00:03:50.354$ eventually my PhD where I worked

 $00:03:50.354 \longrightarrow 00:03:52.570$ with Vivek Glover and who's an

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:52.570 \longrightarrow 00:03:54.390$ expert and perinatal cycle biology

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:03:54.390 \longrightarrow 00:03:56.300$ and also with Tom O'Connor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:03:56.300 --> 00:03:58.610 Andthat PhD was actually a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}03{:}58.679 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}01.442$ bit of an experiment at the time as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:01.450 \longrightarrow 00:04:03.700$ It was in an NIH funded.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:04:03.700 --> 00:04:06.262 PhD occurring in London using the Avon

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:04:06.262 --> 00:04:08.708 Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:08.710 \longrightarrow 00:04:10.762$ which is along the Tunal perspective

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:10.762 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.611$ cohort of around 15,000 pregnancies

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:12.611 \longrightarrow 00:04:14.721$ where these children have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:14.721 \longrightarrow 00:04:16.409$ followed up continuously there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}04{:}16.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}18.330$ now approaching their 30s themselves,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:04:18.330 --> 00:04:20.260 having children of their own,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:20.260 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.710$ and I'll talk to you a little

00:04:22.710 --> 00:04:24.880 bit about that cohort today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:04:24.880 --> 00:04:26.308 Now following my PhD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:04:26.308 --> 00:04:28.942 I moved back out West but much

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:28.942 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.414$ further West than where I'm from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:31.420 \longrightarrow 00:04:33.405$ An ended up at McGill

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:04:33.405 --> 00:04:35.390 University where I completed it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:04:35.390 --> 00:04:37.760 Post doctoral fellowship with Michael Meaney,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:04:37.760 --> 00:04:40.245 who many of you will know and

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}04{:}40.245 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}42.694$ it's really been a pioneer in

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:42.694 \longrightarrow 00:04:44.864$ the field of social epigenetics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}04{:}44.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}47.240$ So how the environment can shape

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:47.240 \longrightarrow 00:04:48.820$ variation in the epigenome?

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:04:48.820 --> 00:04:51.190 When I talk about the epigenome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:04:51.190 --> 00:04:53.320 I'm talking about chemical marks

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:53.320 \longrightarrow 00:04:55.843$ or modifications that sit on or

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:55.843 \longrightarrow 00:04:58.090$ close to the genome that can change

 $00:04:58.090 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.515$ the way the genome functions and

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:05:00.515 --> 00:05:02.650 throughout all of my training.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:05:02.650 --> 00:05:06.098 Really, what's been at the heart of my.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:05:06.100 --> 00:05:06.465 Fascination,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:06.465 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.020$ really with science is the idea that

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:09.020 \longrightarrow 00:05:11.490$ the early environment can shape health

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:11.490 \longrightarrow 00:05:13.585$ and disease across the lifespan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:13.590 \longrightarrow 00:05:16.590$ Ann and this notion or this idea has

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:16.590 \longrightarrow 00:05:18.737$ been described as the developmental

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:18.737 \longrightarrow 00:05:21.824$ origins of health and disease and which

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:21.899 \longrightarrow 00:05:24.619$ has led to a whole field of research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}24.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}27.259$ A SoC adore had society that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}27.259 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}29.682$ really an largely based on findings

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:05:29.682 --> 00:05:32.100 from the work of David Barker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:32.100 \longrightarrow 00:05:32.844$ In fact,

 $00:05:32.844 \longrightarrow 00:05:36.550$ it used to be referred to as the Barker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}36.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}38.900$ Hypothesis that and the fetal

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:38.900 \longrightarrow 00:05:40.310$ origins of disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:40.310 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.656$ that the origins of many

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:42.656 \longrightarrow 00:05:45.285$ types of disease could be traced

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:45.285 \longrightarrow 00:05:47.740$ back to the neutral environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:47.740 \longrightarrow 00:05:49.848$ and these observations initially

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:05:49.848 --> 00:05:52.060 stemmed from David's work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}52.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}54.586$ where he notice to parallel between

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:54.586 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.857$ high rates of infant mortality

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}56.857 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}59.412$ and subsequent rates of death

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:05:59.412 --> 00:06:01.456 from coronary heart disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:01.460 \longrightarrow 00:06:04.154$ and these were largely in deprived

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:04.154 \longrightarrow 00:06:06.700$ areas in the United Kingdom.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:06.700 \longrightarrow 00:06:09.031$ And what you're looking at here is

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:09.031 \longrightarrow 00:06:11.130$ the relationship of risk from death

 $00:06:11.130 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.200$ for death from coronary heart disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:13.200 \longrightarrow 00:06:15.278$ as a function of birth weight.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:06:15.280 --> 00:06:16.990 I want David Barker noticed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:16.990 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.144$ was that lower birth weight was

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:19.144 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.359$ associated with an elevated or an

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:21.359 \longrightarrow 00:06:23.513$ increased risk from death from coronary

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:23.513 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.567$ heart disease before the age of 65,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}06{:}25.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}28.074$ and you can see a greater decline in

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:28.074 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.047$ risk as we move to larger birth weights.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:31.050 \longrightarrow 00:06:32.422$ These are birth weights

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:06:32.422 --> 00:06:34.137 expressed in pounds and answers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}06{:}34.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}37.026$ and then maybe a slight uptick.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}06{:}37.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}38.902$ In at disease risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}06{:}38.902 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}40.774$ and as I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:40.780 \longrightarrow 00:06:43.454$ this is really led to really an

 $00:06:43.454 \longrightarrow 00:06:46.315$ expansive literature on how the neutral

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:06:46.315 --> 00:06:48.507 environment can shape vulnerability

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:06:48.507 --> 00:06:50.151 for cardiovascular disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:50.160 \longrightarrow 00:06:53.526$ and really a whole host of

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:53.526 \longrightarrow 00:06:54.648$ metabolic phenotypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:06:54.650 --> 00:06:55.874 But of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}06{:}55.874 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}58.322$ the question is if the cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:58.322 \longrightarrow 00:07:01.297$ system is so sensitive to the unusual

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}07{:}01.297 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}03.450$ environment into adversity in usual,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:07:03.450 \longrightarrow 00:07:05.090$ what about the brain?

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}07{:}05.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}08.057$ And as we heard from Kartek last

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:07:08.057 \longrightarrow 00:07:10.983$ week and from Amanda study as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:07:10.990 \longrightarrow 00:07:12.985$ we know that the prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:07:12.985 --> 00:07:14.980 environment can also shape variation

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:07:15.054 \longrightarrow 00:07:16.858$ in brain related phenotypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:07:16.860 \longrightarrow 00:07:18.114$ So, for example,

 $00{:}07{:}18.114 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}19.786$ at the Dutch hunger,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:07:19.790 \longrightarrow 00:07:22.400$ winter and the Holocaust have all

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:07:22.400 \longrightarrow 00:07:24.140$ been associated with increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:07:24.213 \longrightarrow 00:07:25.368$ risk for adverse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:07:25.370 \longrightarrow 00:07:27.135$ Mental health outcomes in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}07{:}27.135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}29.680$ offspring and in the next generation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:07:29.680 \longrightarrow 00:07:31.540$ and these have largely been

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}07{:}31.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}33.028$ from retrospective studies where

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}07{:}33.028 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}34.779$ this evidence first emerged.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}07{:}34.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}36.999$ And of course from our own work

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:07:36.999 \longrightarrow 00:07:38.525$ with the Avon Longitudinal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}07{:}38.525 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}41.045$ Study of Parents and Children.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:07:41.050 \longrightarrow 00:07:43.042$ What we found is that maternal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:07:43.042 --> 00:07:44.370 prenatal anxiety and also

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:07:44.430 --> 00:07:46.149 maternal prenatal depression,

 $00:07:46.150 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.894$ associate's with an increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:07:47.894 \longrightarrow 00:07:50.074$ risk for adverse mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}07{:}50.074 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}52.067$ outcomes in the child and what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:07:52.067 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.190$ you're looking at here is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:07:54.190 \longrightarrow 00:07:55.897$ predicted population prevalence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:07:55.900 --> 00:07:58.618 Of a probable mental disorder at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:07:58.618 --> 00:08:01.458 children from age 4 all the way

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:01.458 \longrightarrow 00:08:04.562$ up to age 13 an and what we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:08:04.562 --> 00:08:07.016 see is that those children born

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:07.016 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.124$ to women that experience high

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}08{:}09.124 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}11.692$ levels of anxiety in the prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:08:11.692 --> 00:08:13.332 period have approximately double

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:13.332 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.430$ the risk of ending up in the group

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:16.430 \longrightarrow 00:08:18.662$ that is likely to suffer from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:08:18.662 --> 00:08:20.149 a probable mental disorder,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:20.149 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.732$ and we see this elevated risk across

00:08:22.732 --> 00:08:24.950 childhood and into early adolescence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:24.950 \longrightarrow 00:08:25.882$ and indeed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:08:25.882 --> 00:08:27.746 As studies follow up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:27.750 \longrightarrow 00:08:29.362$ studies have been completed

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:29.362 \longrightarrow 00:08:31.377$ now into the early 20s,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:31.380 \longrightarrow 00:08:33.624$ and Sean a similar pattern of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:08:33.624 --> 00:08:35.582 Association between high rates of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:35.582 \longrightarrow 00:08:37.178$ prenatal anxiety and depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:37.178 \longrightarrow 00:08:39.173$ and increase risk for adverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:39.236 \longrightarrow 00:08:40.670$ mental health outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}08{:}40.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}43.254$ And I just want to point out that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}08{:}43.254 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}45.077$ these effects are independent

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}08{:}45.077 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}46.730$ of socioeconomic status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:46.730 \longrightarrow 00:08:49.474$ So you may think that this may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:08:49.474 --> 00:08:51.257 confounded by maternal education

 $00:08:51.257 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.790$ or maternal age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:52.790 \longrightarrow 00:08:54.810$ or indeed taxol crowding or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:54.810 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.618$ obstetric outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:08:55.620 --> 00:08:56.532 Birth weight,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:56.532 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.444$ gestational age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:57.444 \longrightarrow 00:08:59.724$ Because of the large sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:59.724 \longrightarrow 00:09:01.270$ size of this court,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:01.270 \longrightarrow 00:09:03.465$ we can statistically control for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}09{:}03.465 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}05.660$ the effects of those exposures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:05.660 \longrightarrow 00:09:08.564$ and we still see this independent

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}09{:}08.564 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}11.150$ Association with maternal prenatal anxiety.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:11.150 \longrightarrow 00:09:13.831$ So for any of you that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:13.831 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.720$ heard me speak before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:09:15.720 --> 00:09:18.352 I always talk about 414 and 44 being

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:18.352 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.717$ one in four women that are likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}09{:}21.717 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}24.027$ experience or struggle with their

 $00:09:24.027 \longrightarrow 00:09:26.919$ mental health in and around pregnancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:26.920 \longrightarrow 00:09:30.248$ So I say one in four other estimates

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:30.248 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.884$ they went in five, one in six,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:09:32.884 --> 00:09:35.180 and really what I think we're seeing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:35.249 \longrightarrow 00:09:37.709$ from these epidemiological analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:37.710 \longrightarrow 00:09:39.370$ particularly the more recent

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:09:39.370 --> 00:09:40.200 epidemiological analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:40.200 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.469$ is increased rates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:09:41.469 --> 00:09:43.584 Of perinatal mental health problems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:43.590 \longrightarrow 00:09:43.980 \text{ So}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:43.980 \longrightarrow 00:09:44.760$ for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:09:44.760 --> 00:09:47.100 Louise Howard Publishing in 2018 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:47.100 \longrightarrow 00:09:49.860$ one in four women struggling with their

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:49.860 \longrightarrow 00:09:52.630$ mental health in and around pregnancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:09:52.630 --> 00:09:53.474 Rebecca Pearson,

 $00:09:53.474 \longrightarrow 00:09:55.584$ using the Avon Longitudinal Study

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:55.584 \longrightarrow 00:09:58.234$ of Parents and children using the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:58.234 \longrightarrow 00:10:00.424$ second generation from that cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:00.430 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.210$ Showed a generational increase in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:03.210 \longrightarrow 00:10:05.990$ rates of perinatal mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}10{:}06.083 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}09.473$ problems with again one in four

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:09.473 \longrightarrow 00:10:11.168$ women experiencing perinatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:10:11.168 --> 00:10:13.170 mental health problems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}10{:}13.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}15.683$ So this is a common problem and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:10:15.683 --> 00:10:17.644 what is challenging with this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}10{:}17.644 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}20.056$ problem is that we're still not

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:10:20.056 --> 00:10:21.780 screening women effectively,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:21.780 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.090$ and when we do screen women and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}10{:}24.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}25.805$ they're still not receiving

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:25.805 \longrightarrow 00:10:27.109$ adequate treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:27.110 \longrightarrow 00:10:30.008$ so we know that around 25% of

 $00:10:30.008 \longrightarrow 00:10:32.198$ women who do experience perinatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}10{:}32.198 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}33.950$ mental health problems receive

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:34.019 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.165$ treatment and less than 5% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:36.165 \longrightarrow 00:10:37.945$ those women achieve remission

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}10{:}37.945 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}39.725$ or experience receive adequate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:39.725 \longrightarrow 00:10:41.814$ treatment to reduce their symptoms

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:41.814 \longrightarrow 00:10:43.398$ down below clinical levels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:43.400 \longrightarrow 00:10:46.100$ So this is a common problem that we are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:46.100 \longrightarrow 00:10:49.130$ not addressing sufficiently at the moment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:49.130 \longrightarrow 00:10:51.416$ It is also a costly problem,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:10:51.420 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.364$ so we know that the per

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:10:53.364 --> 00:10:54.660 year costs of untreated

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}10{:}54.729 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}56.934$ per inatal mental health problems is

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:10:56.934 --> 00:10:59.830 around 14 billion US dollars per year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:10:59.830 \longrightarrow 00:11:02.511$ with around 40% of those costs attributed

 $00:11:02.511 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.168$ to the adverse effects on the child.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:11:05.170 --> 00:11:07.468 So that's in the United States.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:11:07.470 --> 00:11:10.094 What about the in the UK where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:11:10.094 --> 00:11:12.430 first cost estimate was produced?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:12.430 \longrightarrow 00:11:14.440$ Well, we see that around.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:11:14.440 --> 00:11:17.072 An 8 billion pounds is the cost

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:17.072 \longrightarrow 00:11:19.164$ associated with untreated paradata mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:11:19.164 --> 00:11:21.840 health problems in the United Kingdom,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}11{:}21.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}24.717$ but in contrast to the United States,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:24.720 \longrightarrow 00:11:27.184$ we see that 72% almost 3/4 of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}11{:}27.184 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}29.786$ costs are attributed to the adverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:11:29.786 --> 00:11:32.181 effects of untreated perinatal mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:32.181 \longrightarrow 00:11:34.579$ health problems on child outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:11:34.580 --> 00:11:36.080 and you may ask,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:36.080 \longrightarrow 00:11:38.330$ rightfully So what is the difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:38.403 \longrightarrow 00:11:40.738$ between these two cost estimates?

 $00:11:40.740 \longrightarrow 00:11:44.970$ Why is it 40% in the United States and 72%?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:44.970 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.184$ In the United Kingdom or one

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:47.184 \longrightarrow 00:11:49.483$ of the explanations for that is

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:11:49.483 --> 00:11:51.358 because in the United States,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}11{:}51.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}53.230$ costs were only calculated on

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:11:53.230 --> 00:11:55.500 child outcomes from zero to five,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:55.500 \longrightarrow 00:11:57.924$ whereas in the United Kingdom costs

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:57.924 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.010$ were calculated from zero to 18.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:00.010 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.890$ So I think you can appreciate that if

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:02.890 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.991$ we extend the follow up period in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}12{:}05.991 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}08.288$ United States that 40% an proportion

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:08.288 \longrightarrow 00:12:10.941$ of costs is likely to increase in

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:10.941 \longrightarrow 00:12:13.508$ addition to the total costs that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:13.508 \longrightarrow 00:12:15.940$ been reported from that cost analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:15.940 \longrightarrow 00:12:18.640$ In the United States.

00:12:18.640 --> 00:12:19.532 And of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:19.532 \longrightarrow 00:12:21.708$ you may ask about what is the impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}12{:}21.708 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}23.598$ of the post Natal environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:23.600 \longrightarrow 00:12:24.431$ And of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:24.431 \longrightarrow 00:12:26.370$ we know that there is an effect

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:26.438 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.248$ of the post Natal environment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:28.250 \longrightarrow 00:12:30.252$ and in our studies from the Avon

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:12:30.252 --> 00:12:32.279 Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:32.280 \longrightarrow 00:12:33.520$ we see that perhaps,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:33.520 \longrightarrow 00:12:34.760$ as you would expect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}12{:}34.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}36.662$ children that are exposed to high

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:12:36.662 --> 00:12:39.173 levels of anxiety in the pre and post

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}12{:}39.173 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}41.305$ Natal period are the children who do

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:41.305 \longrightarrow 00:12:43.141$ worse than children who are exposed

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:43.141 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.252$ to anxiety at one but not both.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:45.252 \longrightarrow 00:12:47.779$ Time points end up somewhere in the middle.

 $00:12:47.780 \longrightarrow 00:12:50.705$ Now hasten to add, this is not a treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}12{:}50.710 \longrightarrow 00{:}12{:}53.538$ And study this is not an intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:53.540 \longrightarrow 00:12:55.958$ This is simply an epidemiological analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:12:55.960 --> 00:12:58.550 but I think it provides proof of

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:12:58.550 \longrightarrow 00:13:01.457$ principle that if we could pull down

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:13:01.457 --> 00:13:04.031 or reduce maternal symptoms of anxiety,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:13:04.040 \longrightarrow 00:13:06.060$ ideally at both time points,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:13:06.060 \longrightarrow 00:13:08.080$ we could improve child outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}13{:}10.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}13.188$ So again, just thinking about what are the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:13.188 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.267$ consequences for untreated perinatal mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:13:15.267 --> 00:13:17.889 health problems on the next generation?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:17.890 \longrightarrow 00:13:21.458$ Well, I showed you the effects on child

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:21.458 \longrightarrow 00:13:24.210$ outcomes from 4 to 13 years of age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:24.210 \longrightarrow 00:13:26.180$ but this is another study

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:26.180 \longrightarrow 00:13:27.756$ from the same cohort.

 $00:13:27.760 \longrightarrow 00:13:30.394$ the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}13{:}30.394 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}33.421$ and Children where they looked at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:33.421 \longrightarrow 00:13:35.803$ rates of prenatal depression in women

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:13:35.803 --> 00:13:38.606 that were born to ALS back moms who

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:13:38.606 --> 00:13:40.392 either didn't or did experience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:13:40.392 --> 00:13:41.174 Prenatal depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:41.174 \longrightarrow 00:13:45.510$ and so when we look at the daughters of women

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:13:45.510 --> 00:13:47.905 who didn't experience prenatal depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:47.910 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.908$ we see that around 16% of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:50.908 \longrightarrow 00:13:53.362$ women who want to experience prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}13{:}53.362 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}55.760$ depression in their own pregnancies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:55.760 \longrightarrow 00:13:58.434$ So what about the daughters from women

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:13:58.434 --> 00:14:00.989 who did experience prenatal depression?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:14:00.990 --> 00:14:04.428 Or 54% of those women went on to experience

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:04.428 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.530$ prenatal depression in their own pregnancies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}07.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}11.290$ So I think you can begin to appreciate.

 $00:14:11.290 \longrightarrow 00:14:13.732$ Add there can be marked intergenerational

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:13.732 \longrightarrow 00:14:15.846$ effects of exposure to prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:15.846 \longrightarrow 00:14:18.366$ depression and this makes it critically

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:18.366 \longrightarrow 00:14:20.796$ important that we try to support

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:20.796 \longrightarrow 00:14:22.641$ pregnant women and their mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:14:22.641 --> 00:14:24.992 health both for the pregnant woman's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:14:24.992 --> 00:14:27.007 all mental and physical health,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:14:27.010 --> 00:14:30.292 but also to potentially mitigate the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:30.292 \longrightarrow 00:14:32.480$ effects of this intergenerational

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:14:32.559 --> 00:14:34.200 transmission of risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}34.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}36.540$ But there are some unanswered questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:36.540 \longrightarrow 00:14:39.802$ and many of you will be looking at and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}39.802 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}42.185$ some of the slides that I presented

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}42.185 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}44.905$ in some of the data that I presented

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:14:44.910 --> 00:14:46.585 and thinking about the advances

00:14:46.585 --> 00:14:48.260 that we've made in characterizing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:14:48.312 --> 00:14:49.908 genetic variation and thinking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:49.910 \longrightarrow 00:14:50.288$ well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:50.288 \longrightarrow 00:14:52.178$ isn't this just all confounded

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:14:52.178 --> 00:14:53.690 by underlying genetic propensity

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:53.754 \longrightarrow 00:14:55.454$ for psychiatric disorders and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}55.454 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}57.542$ there have been many studies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:14:57.542 --> 00:14:59.187 have attempted to address this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:14:59.190 --> 00:14:59.918 perhaps indirectly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:59.918 \longrightarrow 00:15:02.466$ and perhaps the most well established or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}15{:}02.466 \to 00{:}15{:}04.970$ well known paper to address this question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:15:04.970 --> 00:15:07.994 Was at this study by Hanigan and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:15:07.994 --> 00:15:10.476 colleagues based in the mobile

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:15:10.476 \longrightarrow 00:15:13.221$ quarter large Norwegian study of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:15:13.221 --> 00:15:15.450 around 30,000 pregnant women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:15:15.450 \longrightarrow 00:15:19.178$ Ann and they used a children of children

 $00:15:19.178 \longrightarrow 00:15:22.440$ and sibling children of Twins design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:15:22.440 --> 00:15:25.116 Basically it's a twin study that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:15:25.116 \longrightarrow 00:15:27.976$ looks at the offspring and their

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:15:27.976 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.451$ conclusion was that a genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}15{:}30.451 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}32.600$ factor that explained relatedness

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:15:32.600 --> 00:15:35.505 between Twins and siblings was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:15:35.510 \longrightarrow 00:15:38.108$ The explanation for the effects of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:15:38.108 \longrightarrow 00:15:40.460$ prenatal depression on child outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}15{:}40.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}42.992$ So they concluded that the entire

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}15{:}42.992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}44.680$ fetal origins hypothesis was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:15:44.755 \longrightarrow 00:15:47.175$ confounded by genetic variation using

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:15:47.175 \longrightarrow 00:15:49.595$ an indirect assessment of genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}15{:}49.665 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}51.710$ variation using a twin design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}15{:}51.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}54.608$ So we wanted to revisit this question

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:15:54.608 --> 00:15:57.627 to really ask and provide a more

00:15:57.627 --> 00:15:59.737 direct test of this hypothesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:15:59.737 \longrightarrow 00:16:03.225$ as to whether or not there was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:03.225 \longrightarrow 00:16:05.209$ confounding by underlying genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:05.210 \longrightarrow 00:16:07.430$ propensity or genetic vulnerability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:07.430 \longrightarrow 00:16:10.205$ For adverse mental health outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:16:10.205 --> 00:16:13.425 now many of you will have heard from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:13.425 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.720$ our recent ground round sessions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:16:15.720 --> 00:16:18.396 The use of polygenic risk scores

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}16{:}18.396 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}21.152$ to capture common variation that is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:21.152 \longrightarrow 00:16:22.936$ associated with psychiatric disorders

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}16{:}22.936 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}26.162$ and the use of these genetic tools

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:26.162 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.886$ has really an been greatly facilitated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:28.886 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.216$ by these incredibly large genome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:16:31.216 --> 00:16:33.092 wide Association studies largely

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:33.092 \longrightarrow 00:16:35.431$ conducted by the Psychiatric Genomics

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:35.431 \longrightarrow 00:16:37.215$ Consortium where we have.

 $00:16:37.220 \longrightarrow 00:16:39.788$ 10s or hundreds of thousands of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}16{:}39.788 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}41.914$ individuals with a psychiatric disorder

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:41.914 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.329$ and where we look at the snips,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:44.330 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.042$ the genetic variants that are associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:47.042 \longrightarrow 00:16:48.850$ with the psychiatric disorder

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:16:48.916 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.812$ and that provides us with an

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:16:50.812 --> 00:16:52.964 effect size for that snip and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:16:52.964 \longrightarrow 00:16:54.600$ risk of psychiatric disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:16:54.600 \longrightarrow 00:16:57.624$ Now what we can do is take those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}16{:}57.624 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}59.873$ effect sizes and we can count

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}16{:}59.873 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}02.533$ up and using our own data using

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:17:02.533 --> 00:17:05.269 genetic data from our own court,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:05.270 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.119$ we can count up the number of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:17:08.120 --> 00:17:10.766 Risk snips that an individual carries,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:10.770 \longrightarrow 00:17:12.210$ and we can wait.

 $00:17:12.210 \longrightarrow 00:17:14.907$ Each one of those snips by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}14.907 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}17.571$ effect size that has been derived

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:17.571 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.504$ from these very large scale genome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:20.504 \longrightarrow 00:17:23.019$ wide Association studies and what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:17:23.019 --> 00:17:26.000 you get is a simple summary score

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:26.000 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.576$ that reflects an individual's

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:27.576 \longrightarrow 00:17:29.567$ genetic vulnerability for adverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:17:29.567 --> 00:17:31.100 mental health outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}31.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}33.310$ whether it be ADHD, schizophrenia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:33.310 \longrightarrow 00:17:34.134$ or depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}34.134 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}37.018$ So the general principle is that once

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:17:37.018 --> 00:17:39.689 we calculate this summary score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:39.690 \longrightarrow 00:17:41.262$ And this polygenic risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:41.262 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.620$ or you will generally see that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:43.693 \longrightarrow 00:17:46.048$ cases or individuals that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}46.048 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}17{:}48.403$ high risk for psychiatric disorder,

 $00:17:48.410 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.105$ generally have a higher score

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:51.105 \longrightarrow 00:17:53.800$ than non cases or controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:53.800 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.888$ So we use this methodology and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:17:55.888 --> 00:17:58.254 we can talk about the limitations

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:17:58.254 \longrightarrow 00:18:00.948$ of this methodology and in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:00.948 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.319$ question period and but we use

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:03.319 \longrightarrow 00:18:05.407$ this methodology as what we think

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:05.410 \longrightarrow 00:18:07.622$ of as the best approach at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}18{:}07.622 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}09.675$ moment to capture genetic risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:18:09.675 --> 00:18:11.220 for psychiatric disorders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}18{:}11.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}13.160$ We calculated these polygenic risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}18{:}13.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}15.100$ scores in the Outback children

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:15.166 \longrightarrow 00:18:17.016$ around just over 5000 children.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:17.020 \longrightarrow 00:18:18.960$ We calculated them for ADHD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:18.960 \longrightarrow 00:18:20.800$ schizophrenia and depression and then

00:18:20.800 --> 00:18:23.210 we used child mental health symptoms,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:23.210 \longrightarrow 00:18:25.470$ derives from the strength.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:25.470 \longrightarrow 00:18:27.730$ Difficulties question naire from age

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:27.730 \longrightarrow 00:18:31.568$ 4 to 16 years of age and then we use

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:18:31.568 --> 00:18:34.509 long to tude ainle model modeling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:18:34.510 --> 00:18:36.434 Generalized estimating equations to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}18{:}36.434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}39.320$ ask whether or not the prediction

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:39.390 \longrightarrow 00:18:41.534$ from maternal prenatal depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}18{:}41.534 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}44.214$ or maternal prenatal anxiety was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:18:44.214 --> 00:18:46.989 confounded by child genetic risk for ADHD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:46.990 \longrightarrow 00:18:48.520$ schizophrenia, or depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:48.520 \longrightarrow 00:18:49.030$ And.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:49.030 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.600$ And the take home message from these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:52.600 \longrightarrow 00:18:55.186$ analysis was that even when we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:18:55.186 --> 00:18:58.288 adjusted for child genetic risk for ADHD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:58.290 \longrightarrow 00:18:58.701$ schizophrenia,

00:18:58.701 --> 00:18:59.523 or depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:59.523 \longrightarrow 00:19:01.578$ we still saw a significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:19:01.578 --> 00:19:03.221 independent effect of maternal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}19{:}03.221 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}05.136$ prenatal depression on child outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:19:05.140 --> 00:19:07.660 And this is just a representative

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:07.660 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.799$ figure using the ADHD polygenic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:09.799 \longrightarrow 00:19:12.791$ risk score and what you can see is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:12.791 \longrightarrow 00:19:15.633$ that children with a high burden of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:15.633 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.469$ genetic risk for ADHD and exposed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:18.469 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.947$ high levels of maternal prenatal depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:20.950 \longrightarrow 00:19:23.080$ Show increased symptoms relative to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:23.080 \longrightarrow 00:19:25.581$ children with low genetic risk for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:19:25.581 --> 00:19:27.660 ADHD and low and exposure to low

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:27.660 \longrightarrow 00:19:30.199$ levels of maternal prenatal depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:30.200 \longrightarrow 00:19:32.612$ depression and we see this for

00:19:32.612 --> 00:19:34.220 the external Ising subscale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:34.220 \dashrightarrow 00:19:37.489$ We see this for the total symptom

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:37.489 \longrightarrow 00:19:41.029$ scores and we see this at four years

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:41.029 \longrightarrow 00:19:45.156$ of age but also at $16 \frac{1}{2}$ years of age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:19:45.160 --> 00:19:45.612 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:45.612 \longrightarrow 00:19:47.872$ one of the interesting observations

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}19{:}47.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}50.624$ from this study was that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}19{:}50.624 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}52.779$ was no interaction with time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}19{:}52.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}55.810$ We found a stable prediction from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:55.810 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.830$ maternal prenatal depression overtime.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}19{:}57.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}00.180$ Conversely, for both the schizophr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:20:00.180 \longrightarrow 00:20:02.350$ Any other polygenic risk score

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:20:02.350 \longrightarrow 00:20:04.520$ and for the depression polygenic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}20{:}04.591 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}06.985$ risk or we found a significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:20:06.985 \longrightarrow 00:20:09.154$ interaction with time where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:20:09.154 \longrightarrow 00:20:11.634$ polygenic risk score for schizophrenia

 $00:20:11.634 \longrightarrow 00:20:14.038$ or depression strengthened as these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:20:14.038 \longrightarrow 00:20:15.292$ children approached adolescence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:20:15.292 --> 00:20:17.800 so perhaps in the question period

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:20:17.867 --> 00:20:19.872 we can discuss how developmentally

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:20:19.872 \longrightarrow 00:20:21.877$ dynamic symptoms or phenotypes may

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:20:21.939 \longrightarrow 00:20:23.559$ require developmentally informed

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:20:23.559 --> 00:20:25.719 genome wide Association studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}20{:}25.720 \longrightarrow 00{:}20{:}28.342$ but going back to the question

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:20:28.342 \longrightarrow 00:20:31.678$ at hand as to whether or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:20:31.680 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.116$ Effects of the prenatal environment are

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:20:34.116 \longrightarrow 00:20:36.410$ confounded by child genetic variation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:20:36.410 --> 00:20:38.560 At least from this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:20:38.560 \longrightarrow 00:20:41.256$ we can see that our best efforts to

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:20:41.256 \longrightarrow 00:20:43.443$ assess genetic risk for psychiatric

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:20:43.443 --> 00:20:45.838 disorders doesn't seem to confound

00:20:45.838 --> 00:20:48.019 the Association between maternal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}20{:}48.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}49.740$ prenatal depression or maternal

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:20:49.740 --> 00:20:51.890 prenatal anxiety and child outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:20:51.890 \longrightarrow 00:20:55.285$ and we do see an independent significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:20:55.285 \longrightarrow 00:20:57.664$ prediction from child genetic risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:20:57.664 --> 00:21:00.196 factors with the child ADHD PRS

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}00.196 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}02.689$ being the strongest predictor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:02.690 \longrightarrow 00:21:05.066$ Now for many years we spend a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}05.066 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}07.173$ time talking about the importance

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:07.173 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.945$ of maternal mental health,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}08.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}11.038$ but of course maternal mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}11.038 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}13.137$ can be associated with many other

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:13.137 \longrightarrow 00:21:15.081$ phenotypes that are also at risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:21:15.081 --> 00:21:16.869 factors for adverse mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:16.869 \longrightarrow 00:21:19.023$ outcomes and one of the other

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:19.023 \longrightarrow 00:21:20.890$ exposures that we were particularly

 $00:21:20.890 \longrightarrow 00:21:22.765$ interested in assessing and perhaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}22.765 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}24.443$ especially relevant in the context

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:21:24.443 --> 00:21:26.003 of an ongoing global pandemic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:21:26.010 --> 00:21:28.086 was the role of maternal infection,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:28.090 \longrightarrow 00:21:30.603$ and again with the idea of trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:30.603 \longrightarrow 00:21:32.819$ to understand whether or not there

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:32.819 \longrightarrow 00:21:34.239$ could be synergy between.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:34.240 \longrightarrow 00:21:37.305$ Maternal prenatal anxiety or depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:21:37.305 --> 00:21:40.370 and maternal infection to produce

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}40.454 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}43.681$ an works outcomes for the child and

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:43.681 \longrightarrow 00:21:46.800$ what you're looking at here in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:46.800 \longrightarrow 00:21:49.266$ slide is symptoms from the social

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:21:49.270 --> 00:21:50.788 communication disorder checklist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:21:50.788 --> 00:21:54.330 which can be thought of as essentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:21:54.406 --> 00:21:57.286 symptoms related to autism like features,

 $00:21:57.290 \longrightarrow 00:21:58.793$ and we cut,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}58.793 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}00.797$ characterized or assessed maternal

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:00.797 \longrightarrow 00:22:02.300$ infection in pregnancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:02.300 \longrightarrow 00:22:04.910$ and we particularly focused on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:04.910 \longrightarrow 00:22:07.794$ Infections that may give rise to systemic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:07.800 \longrightarrow 00:22:09.560$ an inflammation and infection an

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:09.560 \longrightarrow 00:22:12.271$ and what we found was that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:22:12.271 --> 00:22:14.486 number of maternal infections was

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}22{:}14.486 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}16.470$ associated with increased symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:16.470 \longrightarrow 00:22:18.575$ Scores for the social communication

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}22{:}18.575 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}20.680$ disorder checklist and the question

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:20.747 \longrightarrow 00:22:22.557$ was whether or not maternal

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:22.557 \longrightarrow 00:22:24.367$ anxiety would have an independent

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:22:24.430 --> 00:22:26.390 effect and multiplicative effect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:26.390 \longrightarrow 00:22:28.862$ and what we found was indeed

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:28.862 \longrightarrow 00:22:30.098$ an additive effect.

00:22:30.100 --> 00:22:31.752 An independent additive effect

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:22:31.752 --> 00:22:33.404 of maternal prenatal anxiety,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:33.410 \longrightarrow 00:22:35.580$ and infection on child symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:35.580 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.455$ We saw this first social

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:22:37.455 --> 00:22:38.580 communication disorder checklist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:38.580 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.898$ but also for symptoms of 80 HD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:41.900 \longrightarrow 00:22:42.225 \text{ So}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:42.225 \longrightarrow 00:22:45.150$ just to summarize this first part of my talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:22:45.150 --> 00:22:47.016 I think that what we've documented

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}22{:}47.016 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}49.158$ using the OS backward is that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:22:49.158 --> 00:22:51.104 can be a persisting influence of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:22:51.164 --> 00:22:53.279 prenatal environment on child outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:22:53.280 --> 00:22:56.040 and we don't think that this is completely

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:56.040 \longrightarrow 00:22:58.459$ confounded by child genetic risk factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:58.460 \longrightarrow 00:23:00.645$ Could it be amplified by

 $00:23:00.645 \longrightarrow 00:23:02.830$ genetic variation in the child?

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}23{:}02.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}06.113$ That's an open question and we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:23:06.113 \longrightarrow 00:23:08.129$ published papers previously showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:23:08.129 \longrightarrow 00:23:10.774$ evidence of gene environment interactions

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:23:10.774 \longrightarrow 00:23:14.009$ and the prediction of child outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}23{:}14.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}16.584$ Really highlights is that there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:23:16.584 \longrightarrow 00:23:18.731$ multiple opportunities to intervene to

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:23:18.731 --> 00:23:20.909 try and improve maternal mental health,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}23{:}20.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}23.472$ ideally as early as possible in

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:23:23.472 --> 00:23:25.180 pregnancy and certainly early

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}23{:}25.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}27.000$ in the post Natal period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:23:27.000 --> 00:23:27.614 Of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}23{:}27.614 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}30.070$ I think our data also speak to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}23{:}30.148 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}32.064$ importance of considering maternal

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:23:32.064 \longrightarrow 00:23:34.938$ physical health as another point of

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}23{:}35.006 \to 00{:}23{:}37.508$ intervention to ensure that we can

00:23:37.508 --> 00:23:40.408 bolster both maternal well being but

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}23{:}40.408 \to 00{:}23{:}43.478$ also potentially improve child outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:23:43.480 \longrightarrow 00:23:45.315$ Now one of the characteristics

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:23:45.315 \longrightarrow 00:23:46.783$ of this research area,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:23:46.790 --> 00:23:47.894 the developmental origins

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:23:47.894 \longrightarrow 00:23:49.366$ of health and disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:23:49.370 \longrightarrow 00:23:51.422$ is that there can be marked

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:23:51.422 \longrightarrow 00:23:52.790$ variation or marked individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:23:52.851 --> 00:23:55.077 differences in the effects of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:23:55.077 \longrightarrow 00:23:56.561$ prenatal environment on child

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:23:56.628 \longrightarrow 00:23:58.684$ outcome, and the question is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}23{:}58.684 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}01.060$ how can we better identify children

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:01.136 \longrightarrow 00:24:03.826$ that are at risk and to try and get at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:03.898 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.658$ this question or address this question?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:06.660 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.000$ And I moved to Montreal to

 $00:24:09.000 \longrightarrow 00:24:10.560$ study social epigenetics with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:10.631 \longrightarrow 00:24:12.926$ Michael Meaney and that's really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:24:12.930 --> 00:24:14.995 Features heavily in my current

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:24:14.995 --> 00:24:16.647 research program because epigenetics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:16.650 \longrightarrow 00:24:18.710$ really, while it's heavily involved

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:18.710 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.946$ in cellular differentiation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}19.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}21.960$ there was a paradigm shift in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:21.960 \longrightarrow 00:24:24.560$ the early 2000s where we began to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}24.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}26.535$ appreciate that the environment could

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:26.535 \longrightarrow 00:24:29.039$ also shape epigenetic modifications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:29.040 \longrightarrow 00:24:31.518$ But before we get into that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:31.520 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.680$ I think it's helpful to start with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:34.680 \longrightarrow 00:24:37.381$ definition of epigenetics and I like

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:37.381 \longrightarrow 00:24:40.129$ add this definition that comes from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:40.211 \longrightarrow 00:24:43.443$ the road map project and which is really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}43.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}45.315$ Markable initiative that sought to

00:24:45.315 --> 00:24:48.864 act as a parallel to the Human Genome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}48.864 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}51.544$ Project and to characterize different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}51.544 \to 00{:}24{:}53.506$ epigenetic modifications across the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:53.506 \longrightarrow 00:24:55.541$ genome and across different cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:55.541 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.572$ and tissues and integrate those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:57.572 \longrightarrow 00:24:59.978$ data to provide a richer perspective

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:59.978 \longrightarrow 00:25:02.788$ and a deeper understanding of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:25:02.788 \longrightarrow 00:25:05.208$ epigenome across cells and tissues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:25:05.210 \longrightarrow 00:25:05.635$ Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:25:05.635 \longrightarrow 00:25:08.610$ what many of you on the call

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}08.610 \longrightarrow 00{:}25{:}11.860$ will probably be aware of is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:25:11.860 --> 00:25:13.708 very controversial area of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}13.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}14.994$ Transgenerational epigenetic inheritance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:25:14.994 \longrightarrow 00:25:16.706$ which posits that epigenetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:25:16.706 --> 00:25:18.953 states can be transmitted across

00:25:18.953 --> 00:25:20.765 multiple generations with Fidelity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:25:20.770 \longrightarrow 00:25:23.416$ and the evidence for that in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:25:23.416 --> 00:25:25.180 humans is lacking an.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:25:25.180 --> 00:25:26.503 As I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:25:26.503 --> 00:25:29.149 it is a very controversial subject,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:25:29.150 \longrightarrow 00:25:32.090$ and there is an excellent review by

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:25:32.090 \longrightarrow 00:25:35.497$ Edith Heard for any of you that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:25:35.497 --> 00:25:38.136 interested in getting a having a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}38.136 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}40.606$ deeper dive into this controversy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:25:40.610 \longrightarrow 00:25:43.795$ but also the evidence we can see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}43.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}45.120$ Evidence for transgenerational

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}45.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}46.880$ epigenetic inheritance in C.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:25:46.880 \longrightarrow 00:25:47.282$ Elegans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:25:47.282 --> 00:25:48.488 In certain plants,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}48.488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}51.351$ an Indra Sofala fruit flies and but

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:25:51.351 \longrightarrow 00:25:53.637$ again trying to establish that evidence

 $00:25:53.637 \longrightarrow 00:25:56.560$ in humans is particularly challenging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}56.560 {\:{\text{--}}}{>}\ 00{:}25{:}59.640$ It doesn't rule out the possibility an,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}59.640 \longrightarrow 00{:}26{:}02.657$ but there is no clear evidence for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:02.657 \longrightarrow 00:26:05.800$ that in humans at the current time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:05.800 \longrightarrow 00:26:08.836$ But when I think about epigenetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:08.836 \longrightarrow 00:26:11.322$ and really the definition that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:11.322 \longrightarrow 00:26:13.905$ I use in my work is different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:26:13.910 --> 00:26:15.935 The genetic states or epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:15.935 \longrightarrow 00:26:17.960$ modifications that can alter the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:26:18.025 --> 00:26:20.270 transcriptional potential of a cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:26:20.270 --> 00:26:23.393 or indeed a system and what I mean by

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:23.393 \longrightarrow 00:26:27.047$ that is directly related to gene expression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:27.050 \longrightarrow 00:26:29.170$ so epigenetic modifications have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:26:29.170 --> 00:26:31.290 potential to alter gene expression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:26:33.635$ and that's one of the reasons that

 $00:26:33.635 \longrightarrow 00:26:36.160$ people are so interested in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:36.160 \longrightarrow 00:26:38.570$ epigenome trying to understand how

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}38.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}40.496$ these epigenetic modifications can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:40.496 \longrightarrow 00:26:43.166$ alter the function of the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:43.170 \longrightarrow 00:26:44.080$ And as.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:26:44.080 --> 00:26:46.355 Doctor Martin very kindly pointed

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:46.355 \longrightarrow 00:26:49.046$ out we've written a review on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:49.046 \longrightarrow 00:26:51.542$ the evidence for and against the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:51.542 \longrightarrow 00:26:53.658$ epigenome underlying the biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:26:53.658 --> 00:26:56.353 embedding of experience and what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:56.353 \longrightarrow 00:26:58.820$ we conclude from this review is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:58.820 \longrightarrow 00:27:02.495$ that there is quite a lot of a good

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:02.495 \longrightarrow 00:27:04.016$ correlational evidence suggesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}27{:}04.016 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}07.350$ that the epigenome may underlie the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:07.350 \longrightarrow 00:27:09.806$ biological embedding of experience,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:27:09.810 --> 00:27:12.225 but trying to establish causality

00:27:12.225 --> 00:27:14.157 does require model or.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}27{:}14.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}15.720$ Organisms and I think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:15.720 \longrightarrow 00:27:18.060$ will be greatly facilitated by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:27:18.137 --> 00:27:20.879 advent of EPI genome editing technology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:20.880 \longrightarrow 00:27:22.615$ where we can actually directly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:22.615 \longrightarrow 00:27:24.350$ manipulate in a site specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:24.409 \longrightarrow 00:27:26.281$ manner and different epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:26.281 \longrightarrow 00:27:28.153$ States and establish functional

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:28.153 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.030$ associations with gene expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:30.030 \longrightarrow 00:27:32.220$ and different brain based phenotypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:32.220 \longrightarrow 00:27:33.836$ Now the modification that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:33.836 \longrightarrow 00:27:36.260$ I'm going to spend most of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}27{:}36.342 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}38.477$ my time talking about today

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:27:38.477 --> 00:27:40.612 is that of DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:27:40.620 \longrightarrow 00:27:43.206$ which is the addition of a

00:27:43.206 --> 00:27:44.930 methyl group are represented.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:27:44.930 \longrightarrow 00:27:47.240$ Here in red to a cytisine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:27:47.240 \longrightarrow 00:27:49.935$ that's a C in the genetic code,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:27:49.940 --> 00:27:52.364 Anne Anne, but I also want to point

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:27:52.364 \longrightarrow 00:27:54.367$ out from this figure from this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:27:54.367 \longrightarrow 00:27:57.111$ review that this is one of many

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:27:57.111 \longrightarrow 00:27:59.178$ different epigenetic modifications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:27:59.180 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.400$ In fact, some people call them

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}28{:}01.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}03.344$ epigenetic systems that work in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:03.344 \longrightarrow 00:28:04.948$ conjunction with one another,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}28{:}04.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}07.386$ and as we make progress in our

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:28:07.386 --> 00:28:09.190 understanding of the epigenome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:09.190 \longrightarrow 00:28:10.734$ and indeed, social epigenomics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:10.734 \longrightarrow 00:28:12.664$ we're beginning to realize the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:12.664 \longrightarrow 00:28:14.258$ importance of integrating different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}28{:}14.258 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}16.173$ layers and levels of information.

 $00:28:16.180 \longrightarrow 00:28:17.800$ About the epigynum.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}28{:}17.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}20.500$ To fully understand its impact

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:20.500 \longrightarrow 00:28:22.480$ on genome function.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:22.480 \longrightarrow 00:28:24.355$ So let's think about this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:24.355 \longrightarrow 00:28:25.855$ in more simple terms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:25.860 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.866$ I think it can be very helpful to think

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:28.866 \longrightarrow 00:28:31.877$ about the epigenome in terms of metaphor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:31.880 \longrightarrow 00:28:34.162$ And so some great metaphors exist to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:34.162 \longrightarrow 00:28:36.768$ try and add describe the epigenome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:28:36.770 --> 00:28:38.798 I particularly like the idea of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:38.798 \longrightarrow 00:28:40.900$ the epigenome as a conductor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}28{:}40.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}43.908$ so as sheet music and as a conductor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:43.910 \longrightarrow 00:28:46.465$ So we think about genes being the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:46.465 \longrightarrow 00:28:48.420$ individual and instruments or musicians.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:28:48.420 --> 00:28:49.138 And really,

00:28:49.138 --> 00:28:52.640 if we want to create a Symphony to create.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}28{:}52.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}54.600$ A phenotype that makes sense.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:54.600 \longrightarrow 00:28:56.808$ It's important that all of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:56.808 \longrightarrow 00:28:58.774$ different units and work together

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:58.774 \longrightarrow 00:29:00.478$ in a coordinated manner,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:00.480 \longrightarrow 00:29:02.692$ and one of the ways that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:02.692 \longrightarrow 00:29:05.565$ do so is by following the signs

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:05.565 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.313$ of the signals of the conductor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}08.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}10.637$ One of the other metaphors that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:10.637 \longrightarrow 00:29:13.477$ love to use to describe how the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}13.477 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}15.245$ epigenome influences the function

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:15.245 \longrightarrow 00:29:18.119$ of the genome is that of grammar,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:18.120 \longrightarrow 00:29:21.288$ and so you can have all of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:21.288 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.950$ correct letters and text.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:29:22.950 --> 00:29:26.874 In a book, but if you don't have punctuation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:26.880 \longrightarrow 00:29:29.070$ if you don't have grammar,

 $00:29:29.070 \longrightarrow 00:29:31.910$ then you lose all meaning and we all

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}31.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}34.745$ know that grammar can be critically

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:34.745 \longrightarrow 00:29:37.805$ important for our understanding of text,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:37.810 \longrightarrow 00:29:39.990$ and similarly with the epigenome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:39.990 \longrightarrow 00:29:41.870$ Epigenetic modifications are critically

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}41.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}44.220$ important for placing emphasis on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:29:44.220 --> 00:29:46.550 certain genes or silencing other genes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}46.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}50.108$ so really playing a functional role.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:29:50.110 --> 00:29:50.443 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:29:50.443 --> 00:29:51.442 historically we've thought

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}51.442 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}53.107$ about DNA methylation as being

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:29:53.107 --> 00:29:54.749 a repressive modification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:54.750 \longrightarrow 00:29:57.846$ People have likened it to a light switch,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:57.850 \longrightarrow 00:30:00.250$ so turning a gene on turning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:00.250 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.614$ Aging off and the evidence really

00:30:02.614 --> 00:30:04.190 to support DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}04.256 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{\:{\mbox{-}}} 00{:}30{:}06.160$ as a repressive modification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:06.160 \longrightarrow 00:30:08.848$ Cones from X inactivation where DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:08.848 \longrightarrow 00:30:11.492$ methylation plays a role in silencing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:11.492 \longrightarrow 00:30:14.596$ one of the X chromosomes an in females,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:14.600 \longrightarrow 00:30:17.522$ but also from an imprinting where

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:17.522 \longrightarrow 00:30:20.553$ there can be silencing of 1 copy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:20.553 \longrightarrow 00:30:22.863$ of a gene for ad that occurs

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}22.958 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}30{:}25.568$ in a parent of origin fashion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:30:25.570 --> 00:30:27.859 But we've begun to realize that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:27.859 \longrightarrow 00:30:30.789$ as we add more deeply characterized

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:30.789 \longrightarrow 00:30:32.037$ DNA methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:32.040 \longrightarrow 00:30:34.170$ Is that it's Association with gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:34.170 \longrightarrow 00:30:36.150$ expression can be more nuanced.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}36.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}39.516$ In some cases it can act like a dimmer

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:39.516 \dashrightarrow 00:30:41.390$ switch, turning gene expression up,

 $00:30:41.390 \longrightarrow 00:30:42.140$ or Dan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:42.140 \longrightarrow 00:30:43.540$ Indeed in other situations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:43.540 \longrightarrow 00:30:44.940$ demethylation is not associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:44.940 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.250$ with gene expression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}46.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}48.666$ and in other cases still we can find

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:48.666 \longrightarrow 00:30:51.024$ the DNA methylation at certain sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:51.024 \longrightarrow 00:30:53.538$ within a gene can actually alter

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:53.615 \longrightarrow 00:30:55.925$ the product or the splice variant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:30:55.925 --> 00:30:58.118 that's produced from a given gene.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}58.118 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}00.710$ I think the take home message is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:00.784 \longrightarrow 00:31:03.169$ the context is critically important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:03.170 \longrightarrow 00:31:05.215$ Another cool curring epigenetic modifications

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}31{:}05.215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}08.066$ can also have an impact on whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:08.066 \longrightarrow 00:31:10.304$ or not DNA methylation is negatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:10.304 \longrightarrow 00:31:12.491$ associated with gene expression or

00:31:12.491 --> 00:31:14.786 positively associated with gene expression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:14.790 \longrightarrow 00:31:17.054$ or indeed not associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:17.054 \longrightarrow 00:31:19.884$ with gene expression at all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}31{:}19.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}22.458$ Now, one thing to consider when we look

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:22.458 \longrightarrow 00:31:25.201$ at DNA methylation across the genome is

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:31:25.201 --> 00:31:28.209 that DNA methylation is a binary event,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:28.210 \longrightarrow 00:31:30.466$ it's either on or it's off.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:30.470 \longrightarrow 00:31:33.134$ But throughout my talk you'll hear me talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:31:33.134 --> 00:31:35.390 perhaps about percentage DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:31:35.390 --> 00:31:37.658 90% DNA methylation, 60% DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}31{:}37.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}40.145$ or 10% DNA methylation, and that is

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:31:40.145 --> 00:31:42.947 because when we look at DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:31:42.950 --> 00:31:44.414 particularly in clinical studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:44.414 \longrightarrow 00:31:46.610$ we're looking at an average across

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:46.671 \longrightarrow 00:31:49.850$ multiple cells, and so when we look within.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:49.850 \longrightarrow 00:31:53.306$ Multiple cells we can see that there may

00:31:53.306 --> 00:31:56.455 be methylation at a given site in one cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:56.460 \longrightarrow 00:31:57.824$ but not in another,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:31:57.824 --> 00:32:01.130 and so when we report back DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:01.130 \longrightarrow 00:32:03.070$ an results were talking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:03.070 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.622$ it as percentage metalation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:32:04.630 --> 00:32:05.020 Essentially,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:05.020 \longrightarrow 00:32:07.360$ the number of metalation marks within

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}32{:}07.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}10.078$ the cells of your tissue of interest.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:32:10.080 --> 00:32:12.870 And that brings me to one of the issues

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:12.870 \dashrightarrow 00:32:15.519$ with epigenetics in clinical studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:15.520 \longrightarrow 00:32:17.860$ and that is the rule of

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:17.860 \longrightarrow 00:32:18.640$ cellular heterogeneity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:18.640 \longrightarrow 00:32:20.625$ So one of the principle

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:20.625 \longrightarrow 00:32:22.213$ rules of the epigenome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:22.220 \longrightarrow 00:32:25.041$ Is to ensure that there is cellular

 $00:32:25.041 \longrightarrow 00:32:26.879$ differentiation and the maintenance

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:26.879 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.119$ of those cellular phenotypes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:29.120 \longrightarrow 00:32:31.941$ and in fact where you have disorders

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:32:31.941 --> 00:32:34.180 related to DNA methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:34.180 \longrightarrow 00:32:35.686$ Another epigenetic modifications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}32{:}35.686 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}32{:}38.196$ You can require pluripotency increase

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:38.196 \longrightarrow 00:32:40.160$ the stemness of these cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:40.160 \longrightarrow 00:32:42.830$ giving rise to disorders and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:42.830 \longrightarrow 00:32:44.966$ diseases such as cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:44.970 \longrightarrow 00:32:47.580$ But one of the other interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}32{:}47.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}50.500$ features of the epigenome and one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:50.500 \longrightarrow 00:32:53.069$ the functions that is emerging for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:53.152 \longrightarrow 00:32:56.225$ epigenome is the idea of genomic priming.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:56.230 \longrightarrow 00:32:58.894$ So this is the idea that there can

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:58.894 \longrightarrow 00:33:02.294$ be an exposure that gives rise to a

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}02.294 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}05.149$ change in an epigenetic state such

00:33:05.149 --> 00:33:07.847 as DNA methylation, and that am,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:07.847 \longrightarrow 00:33:08.246$ instills,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:08.246 \longrightarrow 00:33:10.640$ or instantiates the capacity to then

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:10.710 \longrightarrow 00:33:13.314$ have an even greater response to an

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:13.314 \longrightarrow 00:33:15.919$ exposure subject to subsequent exposures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:15.920 \longrightarrow 00:33:18.398$ That an individual or sell may

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:18.398 \longrightarrow 00:33:19.637$ experience as subsequently,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}19.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}21.872$ and this is really nicely articulated

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:21.872 \longrightarrow 00:33:24.423$ in this paper from my colleague

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:33:24.423 --> 00:33:25.419 Nadine Provincal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:33:25.420 --> 00:33:27.355 working with Elizabeth ***** where

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}27.355 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}28.903$ they treated hippocampal stem

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}28.903 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}30.380$ cells with dexame thasone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}30.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}32.440$ which is a synthetic glucocorticoid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:32.440 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.331$ And you can think of it like

 $00:33:35.331 \longrightarrow 00:33:36.570$ a synthetic cortisol,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:36.570 \longrightarrow 00:33:38.615$ an that produced widespread changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}38.615 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}41.146$ in DNA methylation and what was

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:41.146 \longrightarrow 00:33:43.226$ interesting about this particular study

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:43.226 \longrightarrow 00:33:46.188$ was that the changes in DNA methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:33:46.190 --> 00:33:48.908 Didn't always correlate with the gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:48.908 \longrightarrow 00:33:50.720$ expression response to dexamethasone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:50.720 \longrightarrow 00:33:53.096$ but the DNA methylation changes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:33:53.096 --> 00:33:55.768 did occur did predict the magnitude

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:55.768 \longrightarrow 00:33:58.308$ of response to subsequent exposures

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:58.308 \longrightarrow 00:33:59.324$ to dexamethasone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:33:59.330 --> 00:34:02.048 supporting this notion of genomic priming,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:02.050 \longrightarrow 00:34:04.310$ and you may be asking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:34:04.310 --> 00:34:06.580 well, how could that occur?

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:06.580 \longrightarrow 00:34:09.286$ What would be the molecular mechanism?

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:09.290 \longrightarrow 00:34:09.720$ Well,

 $00:34:09.720 \longrightarrow 00:34:12.730$ one of the reasons that we're interested

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:12.730 \longrightarrow 00:34:15.639$ in steroid hormones such as cortisol,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:15.640 \longrightarrow 00:34:16.554$ progesterone, estradiol,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:34:16.554 --> 00:34:17.011 testosterone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:17.011 \longrightarrow 00:34:19.296$ Is because they are there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:19.300 \longrightarrow 00:34:21.510$ Their receptors are nuclear receptors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:21.510 \longrightarrow 00:34:24.394$ So when you have high levels of

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}34{:}24.394 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}26.380$ glucocorticoids such as cortisol,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:26.380 \longrightarrow 00:34:29.056$ they can bind to the glucocorticoid

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:34:29.056 --> 00:34:31.260 receptor highlighted here in Gray,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:31.260 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.450$ and the binding of that receptor

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:33.450 \longrightarrow 00:34:34.910$ to the DNA can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}34{:}34.988 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}37.784$ result in DNA demethylation or changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}34{:}37.784 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}41.222$ in DNA methylation at the site that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:34:41.222 \longrightarrow 00:34:43.218$ the transcription factor binds.

 $00:34:43.220 \longrightarrow 00:34:45.932$ So here you can see before

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}34{:}45.932 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}47.288$ exposure to glucocorticoids.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}34{:}47.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}49.922$ You have higher levels of DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:34:49.922 \longrightarrow 00:34:52.568$ at this particular site or glucocorticoid

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:34:52.568 \longrightarrow 00:34:54.983$ response element then you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:34:54.983 --> 00:34:57.018 glucocorticoids binding to its receptor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:34:57.020 \longrightarrow 00:34:59.120$ resulting in changes in DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:34:59.120 \longrightarrow 00:35:01.698$ and then when you have subsequent

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}01.698 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}35{:}03.360$ exposures to glucocorticoids,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:03.360 \longrightarrow 00:35:05.475$ you then have enhanced response

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}05.475 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}06.744$ to that exposure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:06.750 \longrightarrow 00:35:09.865$ And I think this is a particularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:09.865 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.704$ interesting hypothesis and model

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:11.704 \longrightarrow 00:35:14.284$ when we think about the effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:35:14.284 --> 00:35:16.403 of prenatal adversity or early

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:16.403 \longrightarrow 00:35:18.278$ adversity and how that may.

 $00:35:18.280 \longrightarrow 00:35:22.788$ Confer or prime the genome for subsequent

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:22.788 \longrightarrow 00:35:26.740$ exposures or responses to those exposures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:26.740 \longrightarrow 00:35:29.547$ So how do we analyze DNA methylation?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:29.550 \longrightarrow 00:35:29.952$ Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:29.952 \longrightarrow 00:35:33.168$ there are many approaches that we can use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:33.170 \longrightarrow 00:35:35.486$ We can use an epigenome wide

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:35.486 \longrightarrow 00:35:37.030$ Association study or metalation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:37.100 \longrightarrow 00:35:39.711$ wide Association study an if we use

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:39.711 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.610$ whole genome bisulfite sequencing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}41.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}44.452$ we can assess roughly around 24 million

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:44.452 \longrightarrow 00:35:46.840$ CPG's more commonly because of cost.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:46.840 \longrightarrow 00:35:49.186$ We're using an microarray based technology

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}49.186 \to 00{:}35{:}51.660$ where we assess around $850{,}000$ sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:51.660 \longrightarrow 00:35:54.228$ Now, what you can quickly appreciate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:54.228 \longrightarrow 00:35:57.000$ is that you're going to need very.

 $00:35:57.000 \longrightarrow 00:35:59.682$ Large courts to to adjust for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:59.682 \dashrightarrow 00:36:01.956$ multiple comparisons with so many

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:01.956 \longrightarrow 00:36:04.362$ sites and so what's promising in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:04.362 \longrightarrow 00:36:07.188$ this regard is the PACE consortium,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:36:07.190 --> 00:36:09.788 which is a consortium that's combining

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}36{:}09.788 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}11.520$ multiple different studies to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:11.591 \longrightarrow 00:36:13.821$ perform meta analysis of prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:13.821 \longrightarrow 00:36:15.605$ exposures on DNA methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:15.610 \longrightarrow 00:36:18.627$ So they have performed a meta analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:36:18.627 --> 00:36:20.894 of maternal prenatal smoking and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}36{:}20.894 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}23.139$ DNA methylation and cord blood,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:23.140 \longrightarrow 00:36:26.008$ and found over 2000 sites that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:36:26.008 --> 00:36:27.442 survived genome wide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:27.450 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.886$ Adjustment and then the figure that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:29.886 \longrightarrow 00:36:32.487$ you're looking at here on the right

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:32.487 \longrightarrow 00:36:34.594$ is showing all of the sites in

 $00:36:34.666 \longrightarrow 00:36:37.102$ blue and red across the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:37.102 \longrightarrow 00:36:39.146$ chromosomes in the human genome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:39.146 \longrightarrow 00:36:41.226$ that were associated with infant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:36:41.226 --> 00:36:43.888 birth weight in cord blood and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:43.888 \longrightarrow 00:36:45.736$ from around 9000 participants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:36:45.740 --> 00:36:46.136 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:36:46.136 --> 00:36:49.304 one of the challenges with this approach is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:49.310 \longrightarrow 00:36:52.883$ as I said, you need very large sample sizes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:52.890 \longrightarrow 00:36:54.875$ but you also ideally would

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}36{:}54.875 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}56.860$ need to have longitudinal data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}36{:}56.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}59.422$ So for example in the birth weight

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:59.422 \longrightarrow 00:37:02.018$ study that I'm talking about here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}02.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}04.438$ they identified around 900 CPG's that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:04.438 \longrightarrow 00:37:06.498$ were associated with birth weight

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:06.498 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.766$ for a subset of those participants.

 $00:37:08.770 \longrightarrow 00:37:11.248$ They then had longitudinal data and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:11.248 \longrightarrow 00:37:14.077$ what they found was that of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:14.077 \longrightarrow 00:37:16.856$ 900 sites only around 10% of them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:16.856 \longrightarrow 00:37:18.748$ We're still associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:37:18.748 --> 00:37:21.868 birth weight at 7 years of age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}21.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}24.810$ and this highlights a complexity with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:24.810 \longrightarrow 00:37:27.588$ epigenetic analysis that you don't have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}27.588 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}30.185$ as it's not as strong a confounder

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:30.185 \longrightarrow 00:37:33.009$ with genome wide Association studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:33.010 \longrightarrow 00:37:35.038$ This idea that there can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}35.038 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}37.227$ dynamic change in DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:37.227 \longrightarrow 00:37:39.507$ requiring longitudinal sampling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:39.510 \longrightarrow 00:37:41.830$ So what approaches can we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:41.830 \longrightarrow 00:37:44.150$ take to overcome these issues?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:44.150 \longrightarrow 00:37:44.626$ Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:44.626 \dashrightarrow 00:37:47.958$ one approach that has I've used extensively.

 $00:37:47.960 \longrightarrow 00:37:50.280$ Is that of an biomarkers?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:50.280 \longrightarrow 00:37:52.164$ Epigenetic biomarkers that distill

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:52.164 \longrightarrow 00:37:54.990$ down and genome wide data into

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:55.065 \longrightarrow 00:37:57.240$ a single unit of measurements,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:37:57.240 --> 00:37:59.560 and perhaps the most well

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:59.560 \longrightarrow 00:38:01.416$ established of these biomarkers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:38:01.420 \longrightarrow 00:38:03.740$ is that of epigenetic age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:38:03.740 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.060$ initially developed by Steve Horvath,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:38:06.060 --> 00:38:07.664 an at UCLA Ann,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:38:07.664 \longrightarrow 00:38:10.070$ and the idea with these epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}38{:}10.152 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}13.038$ biomarkers is that we can identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:38:13.038 \longrightarrow 00:38:14.962$ sites that are predictive

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:15.045 \longrightarrow 00:38:16.728$ of chronological age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:16.730 \longrightarrow 00:38:18.302$ and we can create.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:38:18.302 --> 00:38:19.874 A measure of epigenetic

 $00:38:19.874 \longrightarrow 00:38:21.849$ age for an individual.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:21.850 \longrightarrow 00:38:23.830$ These clocks now exist with

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:23.830 \longrightarrow 00:38:25.018$ multi tissue predictors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:25.020 \longrightarrow 00:38:27.246$ so you can take any biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:27.246 \longrightarrow 00:38:29.916$ sample from anyone and you can then

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}38{:}29.916 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}31.771$ measure their epigenetic age and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:31.771 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.322$ what we notice in population levels

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:34.322 \longrightarrow 00:38:36.926$ is that there are some individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}38{:}36.930 \to 00{:}38{:}38.920$ that you'll hire epigenetic age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:38.920 \longrightarrow 00:38:40.428$ relative chronological age and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}38{:}40.428 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}42.313$ others that show lower epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:42.313 \longrightarrow 00:38:44.218$ age relative to their chronological

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:44.218 \longrightarrow 00:38:46.048$ age and what's interesting is

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:46.048 \longrightarrow 00:38:48.317$ that those individuals with higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:38:48.317 --> 00:38:49.697 epigenetic age acceleration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:49.700 \longrightarrow 00:38:55.130$ Show increase risk for age related?

00:38:55.130 --> 00:38:57.682 Disorders including cardiovascular disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:57.682 \longrightarrow 00:39:00.872$ but also all cause mortality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:00.880 \longrightarrow 00:39:03.124$ Now, one of the challenges with

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:03.124 \longrightarrow 00:39:05.066$ this epigenetic Clock from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}39{:}05.066 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}06.562$ multi tissue epigenetic Clock

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:06.562 \longrightarrow 00:39:08.877$ is that it was developed using

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:39:08.877 --> 00:39:10.747 primarily samples from adults and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:10.747 \longrightarrow 00:39:13.622$ they ranged in age from zero to 100,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:39:13.622 --> 00:39:15.680 but it was primarily samples from

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:15.748 \dashrightarrow 00:39:18.046$ adult participants and the error in

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39{:}18.046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}20.047$ the prediction of the epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:20.047 \longrightarrow 00:39:22.423$ Clock is around 3.6 years and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:22.423 \longrightarrow 00:39:24.757$ which obviously is a very long

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:24.757 \longrightarrow 00:39:27.410$ time in the life of a child.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:27.410 \longrightarrow 00:39:29.726$ So we set about creating a

 $00:39:29.726 \longrightarrow 00:39:30.884$ novel pediatric specific.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:39:30.890 --> 00:39:31.680 Epigenetic Clock,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}39{:}31.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}33.655$ which was published last year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:33.660 \longrightarrow 00:39:35.645$ We used approximately 2000 DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:35.645 \longrightarrow 00:39:38.106$ methylome's and we simply asked what

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:39:38.106 --> 00:39:40.530 were the sites that were associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:40.530 \longrightarrow 00:39:42.768$ with chronological age in this cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:42.770 \longrightarrow 00:39:44.690$ This is data from longitudinal cohort

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}39{:}44.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}47.055$ where we use the original epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}39{:}47.055 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}49.107$ Clock with longitudinal samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:49.110 \longrightarrow 00:39:52.206$ and what you can appreciate from this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:52.206 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.436$ that the slopes are all over the place.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:55.440 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.330$ An long digital samples that

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:57.330 \longrightarrow 00:39:58.842$ should be epigenetically older

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:58.842 \longrightarrow 00:40:00.550$ are appearing epigenetic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:00.550 \longrightarrow 00:40:03.310$ Younger and you can see this again here,

 $00:40:03.310 \longrightarrow 00:40:05.368$ and this simply reflects the error

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}40{:}05.368 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}40{:}07.110$ in the conventional epigenetic Clock.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:07.110 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.476$ When we plot these data using the

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:09.476 --> 00:40:10.900 new pediatric epigenetic Clock,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}40{:}10.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}13.189$ I think you can appreciate that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:13.189 --> 00:40:15.390 slopes become a lot more positive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:15.390 \longrightarrow 00:40:18.158$ so we brought the error in prediction of

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:18.158 \longrightarrow 00:40:20.556$ epigenetic age down to around six months,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:20.560 --> 00:40:22.975 and many of you may be thinking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:22.980 \longrightarrow 00:40:24.700$ well, you know, that's great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}40{:}24.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}26.450$ You can just calculate someones

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:26.450 \longrightarrow 00:40:28.839$ age based on their date of birth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:28.840 \longrightarrow 00:40:31.156$ What is what value is this?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:31.160 --> 00:40:33.806 An and so in this particular study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:33.810 \longrightarrow 00:40:35.748$ what we found was that children

00:40:35.748 --> 00:40:37.583 of the autism spectrum disorder

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}40{:}37.583 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}39.499$ had accelerated epigenetic age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}40{:}39.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}42.132$ an Association that we saw with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:42.132 --> 00:40:43.670 pediatric specific epigenetic Clock,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:43.670 \longrightarrow 00:40:46.960$ but not with the conventional Horvath Clock.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:46.960 --> 00:40:47.992 But of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:47.992 --> 00:40:51.140 bringing us back to the topic of interest,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:51.140 --> 00:40:53.800 the fetal origins of health and disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:53.800 \longrightarrow 00:40:56.271$ we wanted to ask whether or not

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:56.271 --> 00:40:57.811 maternal prenatal anxiety would

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:57.811 \longrightarrow 00:40:59.876$ be associated with epigenetic age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:59.880 \longrightarrow 00:41:00.207$ acceleration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:41:00.207 --> 00:41:02.823 and to do that we made use of

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:41:02.823 --> 00:41:04.819 two longitudinal at courts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:41:04.820 \longrightarrow 00:41:06.340$ one from the Netherlands.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:41:06.340 --> 00:41:07.860 That's primarily Caucasian one

00:41:07.860 --> 00:41:08.620 from Singapore,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:41:08.620 \longrightarrow 00:41:11.042$ that's multi ethnic and what we found

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:41:11.042 --> 00:41:13.034 was that maternal prenatal anxiety

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}41{:}13.034 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}14.798$ was associated with accelerated

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:41:14.798 \longrightarrow 00:41:17.449$ epigenetic age at six years of age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:41:17.450 \longrightarrow 00:41:20.447$ In the 10 years of age in the Bible

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:41:20.447 \longrightarrow 00:41:22.631$ course and again we replicated

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:41:22.631 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.836$ this in the coastal court,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:41:24.840 \longrightarrow 00:41:26.452$ finding that maternal prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:41:26.452 --> 00:41:28.064 anxiety was associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:41:28.064 --> 00:41:29.120 accelerated epigenetic age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:41:29.120 \longrightarrow 00:41:31.850$ an effect that strengthens overtime

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}41{:}31.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}34.580$ is particularly pronounced at 48

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:41:34.665 \longrightarrow 00:41:37.345$ months of age. Now, one of the questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:41:37.345 \longrightarrow 00:41:39.513$ that again I'm very interested in is

 $00:41:39.513 \longrightarrow 00:41:41.452$ is trying to understand whether or not

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:41:41.452 --> 00:41:43.858 there are features or aspects of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:41:43.858 \longrightarrow 00:41:45.738$ Pulcinella environment that may be able

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:41:45.738 --> 00:41:47.730 to buffer or moderate the effects of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:41:47.787 \longrightarrow 00:41:49.967$ prenatal environment on epigenetic states.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:41:49.970 --> 00:41:51.570 Because of course it's very

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:41:51.570 \longrightarrow 00:41:54.058$ depressing to to give a talk and say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:41:54.060 --> 00:41:55.950 well, it's all over at birth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}41{:}55.950 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>}\ 00{:}41{:}57.959$ and of course it's much more optimistic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:41:57.959 \longrightarrow 00:42:00.208$ and positive to say that there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}00.208 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}01.878$ potential interventions that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:01.878 \longrightarrow 00:42:03.879$ implement that may buffer or mitigate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:03.879 \longrightarrow 00:42:05.494$ the effects of prenatal adversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:05.500 \longrightarrow 00:42:08.340$ This is a paper from my PhD mentors

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:08.340 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.130$ showing that an infant attachment style,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:11.130 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.310$ so each child's perception of

 $00:42:13.310 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.490$ the predictability an index of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:15.562 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.956$ the quality of care in the pools.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:42:17.960 --> 00:42:19.504 Naval environment moderates the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:42:19.504 --> 00:42:21.048 Association between prenatal cortisol

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:21.048 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.188$ exposure and child cognitive development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:23.190 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.200$ Of course, other examples exist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:25.200 \longrightarrow 00:42:27.606$ This is from the Boukris Early

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:42:27.606 --> 00:42:28.408 Intervention Project,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:28.410 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.780$ showing that secure an infant attachment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}30.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}33.748$ can buffer or moderate the effects of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:42:33.748 --> 00:42:35.943 early adversity on child psychopathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:42:35.950 --> 00:42:36.844 So of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}36.844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}38.930$ the question we wanted to ask with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:38.993 \longrightarrow 00:42:41.597$ this study was whether or not infant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:41.597 \longrightarrow 00:42:43.916$ attachment would buffer or moderate the

 $00:42:43.916 \longrightarrow 00:42:45.806$ effects of maternal prenatal anxiety

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:45.806 \longrightarrow 00:42:47.629$ on child epigenetic age acceleration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:47.629 \longrightarrow 00:42:49.394$ And this is unpublished data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:49.400 \longrightarrow 00:42:51.677$ But what we find is that yes indeed in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:51.677 \longrightarrow 00:42:53.368$ children that have secure attachment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:53.368 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.438$ we see a positive but nonsignificant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:55.492 \longrightarrow 00:42:57.300$ Association between maternal prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}57.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}59.560$ anxiety and child epigenetic age

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:59.560 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.012$ acceleration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:00.020 \longrightarrow 00:43:01.946$ but the effects of maternal prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}01.946 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}03.695$ anxiety on child epigenetic age

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:03.695 \longrightarrow 00:43:04.922$ acceleration are particularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:04.922 \longrightarrow 00:43:06.149$ pronounced in children.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:06.150 \longrightarrow 00:43:08.590$ With an insecure attachment style.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:43:08.590 --> 00:43:11.985 Again supporting this idea of a potential,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:11.990 \longrightarrow 00:43:15.770$ pools Natal moderation of infant attachment.

 $00:43:15.770 \longrightarrow 00:43:18.598$ Now of course there are other M

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}18.598 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}20.503$ epigenetic biomarkers that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:20.503 \longrightarrow 00:43:22.652$ use to try and probe our describe

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:22.652 \longrightarrow 00:43:24.914$ the effects of the environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:24.914 \longrightarrow 00:43:26.798$ on health related outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:26.800 \longrightarrow 00:43:29.164$ This is one that we're starting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:29.164 \longrightarrow 00:43:30.740$ to make use of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:30.740 \longrightarrow 00:43:32.636$ It's a second generation after genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:32.636 \longrightarrow 00:43:34.834$ Clock and what is different about

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:34.834 \longrightarrow 00:43:37.444$ this epigenetic biomarker is that it

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}37.444 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}39.211$ incorporates information about plasma

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:39.211 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.301$ proteins that are associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:41.301 \longrightarrow 00:43:43.396$ cardiovascular disease risk as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:43.396 \longrightarrow 00:43:45.904$ as sites that are associated with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:45.910 \longrightarrow 00:43:47.854$ Aging and we wanted to determine

 $00:43:47.854 \longrightarrow 00:43:50.421$ whether or not there was any Association

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:43:50.421 --> 00:43:52.839 between an early adversity and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:52.839 \longrightarrow 00:43:54.524$ epigenetic biomarker making use

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:43:54.524 --> 00:43:56.549 of the Nurse Family Partnership,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:56.550 \longrightarrow 00:43:58.755$ which many of you will know is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:58.755 \longrightarrow 00:44:00.639$ a randomized control trial of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:00.639 \longrightarrow 00:44:02.391$ the perinatal intervention that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:02.391 --> 00:44:04.143 targets vulnerable low income.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:04.150 \longrightarrow 00:44:06.280$ First time moms and it provides

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:06.280 \longrightarrow 00:44:08.525$ nurse visitations have been shown to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}44{:}08.525 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}10.420$ reduce child maltreatment an improve

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:10.420 \longrightarrow 00:44:12.890$ outcomes for both mothers and children.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:12.890 \longrightarrow 00:44:14.850$ We published the first epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:14.850 \longrightarrow 00:44:16.418$ analysis in this cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:16.420 --> 00:44:18.874 A collaboration with Jim Lechman and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}44{:}18.874 \longrightarrow 00{:}44{:}21.202$ Elena Grigorenko when she was based

 $00:44:21.202 \longrightarrow 00:44:23.682$ here and we found that there was some

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}44{:}23.753 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}25.917$ preliminary Association between nurse

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:25.917 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.163$ Visitation and variation in DNA methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:29.170 \longrightarrow 00:44:31.676$ But really the take home message was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:31.676 \longrightarrow 00:44:34.788$ that there was a profound effect of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:34.788 --> 00:44:37.243 childhood maltreatment on DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:37.250 --> 00:44:39.370 but we couldn't distinguish the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:39.370 --> 00:44:41.066 effects of maltreatment from,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:41.070 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.345$ say, for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:42.345 \longrightarrow 00:44:44.045$ the effects of associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:44.045 \longrightarrow 00:44:45.320$ confounders like smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:45.320 \longrightarrow 00:44:46.685$ So what about?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:46.685 --> 00:44:48.960 This measure of epigenetic age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:44:48.960 \longrightarrow 00:44:51.704$ acceleration in the context of the Nurse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:44:51.710 --> 00:44:52.376 Family, Partnership,

 $00:44:52.376 \longrightarrow 00:44:55.040$ or what we see is that children with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}44{:}55.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}57.656$ a documented or substantiated case of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}44{:}57.656 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}59.360$ child maltreatment show accelerated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:44:59.426 \longrightarrow 00:45:01.526$ epigenetic aging using this disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:01.530 \longrightarrow 00:45:02.943$ Relevant epigenetic biomarker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:02.943 \longrightarrow 00:45:06.240$ But what about when we break this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:06.320 \longrightarrow 00:45:08.438$ down by an intervention group or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:08.438 \longrightarrow 00:45:11.286$ what we find is that in the nurse

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}11.286 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}13.712$ visit a group in purple here and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:13.712 \longrightarrow 00:45:16.064$ the yellow is the control group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}16.070 --> 00{:}45{:}18.150$ We find no difference in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}18.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}19.398$ epigenetic age acceleration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:19.400 \longrightarrow 00:45:21.640$ As a function in those individuals that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:21.640 \longrightarrow 00:45:24.517$ don't have a history of child maltreatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:45:24.520 --> 00:45:27.337 But when we look in the group that does

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:45:27.337 --> 00:45:30.008 have a history of child maltreatment,

 $00:45:30.010 \longrightarrow 00:45:31.478$ we see significantly increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:31.478 \longrightarrow 00:45:32.579$ an epigenetic age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:32.580 \longrightarrow 00:45:34.410$ acceleration and those individuals that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:45:34.410 --> 00:45:36.657 have a history of child maltreatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:45:36.657 --> 00:45:38.799 that are in the control group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:38.800 \longrightarrow 00:45:40.714$ But it seems that exposure to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:40.714 \longrightarrow 00:45:42.409$ nurse Visitation to that early

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:45:42.409 --> 00:45:44.209 intervention seems to be buffering

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:44.209 \longrightarrow 00:45:46.480$ the effects of child maltreatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}46.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}48.044$ An epigenetic age acceleration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}48.044 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}49.608$ Now we can discuss.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:49.610 \longrightarrow 00:45:51.234$ Potential explanations for this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}51.234 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}53.264$ one possibility is that perhaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:53.264 \longrightarrow 00:45:55.661$ the severity of abuse was less in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:55.661 \longrightarrow 00:45:57.790$ the nurse visited group that there

00:45:57.790 --> 00:45:59.740 was greater surveillance of abuse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}59.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}01.990$ and the nurse visited group an.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:01.990 \longrightarrow 00:46:03.775$ An alternative hypothesis is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:03.775 \longrightarrow 00:46:05.560$ the early intervention is providing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:46:05.617 --> 00:46:06.859 some buffering capacity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:46:06.860 --> 00:46:09.860 so even in the face of child maltreatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:09.860 \longrightarrow 00:46:12.242$ there's less of an impact on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:12.242 \longrightarrow 00:46:13.830$ epigenetic age acceleration just

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}46{:}13.903 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}15.859$ in the last couple of minutes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:46:15.860 --> 00:46:18.758 I just like to tell you about one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:18.758 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.987$ the biomarker that we're making use of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:21.990 \longrightarrow 00:46:24.180$ Which is a measure that relates

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:24.180 \longrightarrow 00:46:26.650$ to this paper I highlighted,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:26.650 \longrightarrow 00:46:28.350$ previously speaking to this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:28.350 \longrightarrow 00:46:30.050$ idea of genomic priming,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:30.050 \longrightarrow 00:46:32.874$ and in this paper they created an epigenetic

00:46:32.874 --> 00:46:35.129 biomarker of glucocorticoid exposure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}46{:}35.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}37.601$ and so this essentially we can create

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:37.601 \longrightarrow 00:46:40.908$ a an index or a proxy measure for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:40.908 \longrightarrow 00:46:42.644$ glucocorticoid exposure based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:42.644 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.732$ DNA methylation, and so we created.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:45.732 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.424$ We use this array.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:47.430 \longrightarrow 00:46:49.614$ Tested this out in a court

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:49.614 \longrightarrow 00:46:52.170$ where we had DNA methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}46{:}52.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}54.860$ Data upper than at one year of age in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:46:54.935 --> 00:46:57.767 cohort from the University of California,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:46:57.770 --> 00:46:58.112 Irvine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:58.112 \longrightarrow 00:47:00.506$ and we also had structural imaging in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}00.506 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}02.660$ this cohort and what we simply asked

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:02.660 \longrightarrow 00:47:04.958$ was whether or not the sites that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:04.958 \longrightarrow 00:47:07.028$ were associated DNA methylation sites

 $00:47:07.028 \longrightarrow 00:47:08.998$ that were associated with maternal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}08.998 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}10.818$ prenatal depression did they overlap

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:10.818 \longrightarrow 00:47:13.064$ with the sites that were identified

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:13.064 \longrightarrow 00:47:14.884$ to be glucocorticoid sensitive sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:14.884 \longrightarrow 00:47:17.019$ in that paper that I showed you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:47:17.020 --> 00:47:17.790 And indeed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:47:17.790 --> 00:47:19.330 we found significant enrichment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:19.330 \longrightarrow 00:47:20.870$ of glucocorticoid sensitive sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:20.926 \longrightarrow 00:47:23.026$ in the sites that were associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:23.026 \longrightarrow 00:47:24.076$ maternal prenatal depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}24.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}26.504$ And when we created this Google

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:47:26.504 --> 00:47:27.716 Corticoid exposure score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:27.720 \longrightarrow 00:47:30.120$ we saw a significant negative Association

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:30.120 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.720$ between maternal prenatal depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:31.777 \longrightarrow 00:47:33.777$ and this glucocorticoid exposure score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:33.780 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.902$ And interesting Lee,

 $00:47:34.902 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.520$ what we found was that this glucocorticoid

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:47:37.585 --> 00:47:39.730 exposure score at birth predicted

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:47:39.730 --> 00:47:41.446 lower hippocampal volume birth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:41.450 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.994$ and as you'll appreciate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}42.994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}44.538$ the hippocampus is enriched

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:44.538 \longrightarrow 00:47:45.900$ for glucocorticoid receptors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:45.900 \longrightarrow 00:47:48.280$ So we find that the direction of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:48.280 \longrightarrow 00:47:49.844$ this Association is consistent

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:49.844 \longrightarrow 00:47:52.199$ with a higher maternal prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:52.199 \longrightarrow 00:47:54.550$ liberation predicting a lower score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}54.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}57.550$ And a lower score predicting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}57.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}59.350$ lower hippocampal volume.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:59.350 \longrightarrow 00:48:00.558$ So, just to summarize,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:48:00.558 \longrightarrow 00:48:02.821$ I think that with some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:48:02.821 \longrightarrow 00:48:04.741$ studies that I've tried to

00:48:04.741 --> 00:48:06.277 highlight perhaps very quickly

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}06.342 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}08.694$ today, we can see that variation in

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:08.694 \longrightarrow 00:48:10.447$ DNA methylation is associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:10.447 \longrightarrow 00:48:12.337$ variation in the early environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:12.340 \longrightarrow 00:48:14.564$ I think as we move towards trying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:48:14.564 --> 00:48:16.899 make these findings clinically relevant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:16.900 \longrightarrow 00:48:18.993$ we need to move towards more integrative

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:18.993 \longrightarrow 00:48:20.386$ models where we're incorporating

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}20.386 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}22.170$ measures of genetic variation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:22.170 \longrightarrow 00:48:23.925$ and we're incorporating an greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}23.925 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}25.680$ measures of the social environment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:25.680 \longrightarrow 00:48:28.144$ and I think one way that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:28.144 \longrightarrow 00:48:30.000$ can really begin to probe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:30.000 \longrightarrow 00:48:32.105$ Causal associations between the social

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:48:32.105 --> 00:48:33.789 environment and epigenetic states

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:33.789 \longrightarrow 00:48:36.117$ is through the use of interventions,

 $00:48:36.120 \longrightarrow 00:48:39.081$ and this is an area that I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:48:39.081 --> 00:48:41.830 particularly keen to do more work in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:41.830 \longrightarrow 00:48:43.852$ and one collaboration that I'm very

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:48:43.852 --> 00:48:46.163 excited about is a cluster randomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:46.163 \longrightarrow 00:48:48.408$ control trial of parental intervention

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:48:48.408 --> 00:48:51.095 that begins in early pregnancy that

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:48:51.095 --> 00:48:53.215 seeks to reduce prenatal anxiety

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}53.215 \rightarrow 00{:}48{:}55.698$ and depression but also provide an

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:55.698 \longrightarrow 00:48:57.733$ information about nutrition and sleep,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:57.740 \longrightarrow 00:49:00.143$ trying to reduce domestic violence, an.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}00.143 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}01.958$ An increase female empowerment and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}01.958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}04.285$ we're doing this in rural Vietnam

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:04.285 --> 00:49:06.300 with my colleague James Fisher,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:06.300 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.382$ where one in three women can

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:08.382 --> 00:49:10.254 experience or struggle with their

 $00:49:10.254 \longrightarrow 00:49:11.938$ mental health and pregnancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}11.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}14.220$ We're just coordinating to receive

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:14.220 \longrightarrow 00:49:16.500$ samples from approximately 1200 mothers

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:16.563 --> 00:49:18.288 and their infants with biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:18.288 \longrightarrow 00:49:21.332$ samples at birth at 12 months and a 24

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:21.332 \longrightarrow 00:49:23.216$ months MA which have been collected

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:23.220 \longrightarrow 00:49:24.720$ in parallel with standardized

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:24.720 \longrightarrow 00:49:26.595$ measures of child newer development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:26.600 \longrightarrow 00:49:29.240$ And really the goal with these

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:29.240 \longrightarrow 00:49:32.149$ kind of studies and the goal of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:32.150 \longrightarrow 00:49:33.946$ Understanding epigenetic States and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:33.946 \longrightarrow 00:49:35.742$ modifications and implementing them

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:35.742 \longrightarrow 00:49:37.780$ in clinical studies is really to

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}37.780 \to 00{:}49{:}39.869$ try and understand how we can make

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:39.869 --> 00:49:41.899 interventions work from war individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}41.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}44.511$ so I'll leave it there with may be

 $00:49:44.511 \longrightarrow 00:49:47.150$ just one kind of call to action.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}47.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}49.398$ I was very pleased to be invited to

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:49.398 --> 00:49:51.961 take part in the Scientific Council

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:51.961 --> 00:49:53.897 of Postpartum Support International,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:53.900 \longrightarrow 00:49:56.301$ and this is a plug for their

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:56.301 --> 00:49:58.695 national strategy on how we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:58.695 \longrightarrow 00:50:00.415$ improve perinatal mental health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:50:00.420 \dashrightarrow 00:50:03.201$ And so I think this is a societal problem

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}50{:}03.201 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}05.538$ that requires a societal response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}50{:}05.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}07.490$ and I think we're all responsible

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:50:07.490 \dashrightarrow 00:50:09.654$ for playing our part and trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:50:09.654 \longrightarrow 00:50:11.644$ to support perinatal mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}50{:}11.644 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}13.624$ and recognizing that there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:50:13.624 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.072$ structural and societal factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:50:15.072 \longrightarrow 00:50:17.984$ that we can target and to try and

00:50:17.984 --> 00:50:19.448 improve perinatal mental health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:50:19.450 \longrightarrow 00:50:22.117$ And this isn't just all pregnant mothers

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:50:22.117 \longrightarrow 00:50:24.938$ and have another thing to worry about an,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:50:24.940 \longrightarrow 00:50:27.828$ so I'll leave it with that and just

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:50:27.828 \longrightarrow 00:50:31.206$ thank you all for your attention and take.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:50:31.210 --> 00:50:31.930 Any questions?

NOTE Confidence: 0.899965584615385

 $00{:}50{:}41.340 \to 00{:}50{:}43.026$ Fantastic. Questions please.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899965584615385

 $00:50:43.026 \longrightarrow 00:50:48.339$ Just go for it or put it in the text.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

00:50:50.790 --> 00:50:54.137 Hi, this is Flora. Do you hear me?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

00:50:54.137 --> 00:50:56.641 Yes yes Laura hi sorry hi,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

00:50:56.641 --> 00:50:58.976 how are you really? Nice talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00{:}50{:}58.976 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}02.182$ I had a question um so so as you

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:02.182 \longrightarrow 00:51:04.447$ know epigenetics are very much

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:04.447 \longrightarrow 00:51:07.263$ self type an organ specific so

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

00:51:07.263 --> 00:51:10.017 perhaps you can clarify for us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00{:}51{:}10.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}12.904$ I mean of course studies in humans

 $00:51:12.904 \longrightarrow 00:51:15.634$ cannot be done in brain whereas

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00{:}51{:}15.634 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}18.454$ studies in animals can and I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:18.454 \longrightarrow 00:51:20.946$ assuming some of those that you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:20.950 \longrightarrow 00:51:23.355$ Elucidated or talked about where

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

00:51:23.355 --> 00:51:26.995 done in mouse or rat brains, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:26.995 \longrightarrow 00:51:28.005$ So perhaps,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:28.005 \longrightarrow 00:51:30.530$ given the course profound difficulties,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

00:51:30.530 --> 00:51:31.914 you know?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:31.914 \longrightarrow 00:51:35.374$ Same brain samples from humans

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:35.374 \longrightarrow 00:51:36.758$ living individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

00:51:36.760 --> 00:51:41.224 Is it been any study in animals that has?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00{:}51{:}41.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}43.480$ Um illuminated this concept to

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00{:}51{:}43.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}45.280$ what extent peripheral samples

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

00:51:45.280 --> 00:51:48.056 like blood can inform us on what's

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

00:51:48.056 --> 00:51:50.330 actually happening in the brain or

 $00:51:50.330 \longrightarrow 00:51:52.430$ the individuals as they grow up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:52.430 \longrightarrow 00:51:54.030$ and an and develop.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:51:55.020 \longrightarrow 00:51:56.925$ Yeah floor this is such

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:51:56.925 \longrightarrow 00:51:58.449$ a great great question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:51:58.450 \longrightarrow 00:52:01.879$ And as as you've shown with your own work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:01.880 \longrightarrow 00:52:03.424$ talking about somatic mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:03.424 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.172$ and we know that even genetic variants

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:06.172 --> 00:52:08.338 may not be shared across different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:08.338 \longrightarrow 00:52:10.639$ tissues and so there have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:10.639 \longrightarrow 00:52:12.549$ attempts to address this problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:12.550 \longrightarrow 00:52:14.034$ And so for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:14.034 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.889$ there's a tool called Pecan

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:15.889 --> 00:52:17.498 developed by Michael Horror,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:17.500 --> 00:52:19.080 Gustavo Tracking Michael Meaney,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:19.080 \longrightarrow 00:52:21.862$ which actually does a paired comparison of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:21.862 \longrightarrow 00:52:23.980$ DNA methylation in multiple brain regions,

00:52:23.980 --> 00:52:25.640 and unfortunately is just

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:25.640 \longrightarrow 00:52:26.885$ in peripheral blood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:26.890 \longrightarrow 00:52:29.235$ At the moment and looks at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:29.235 --> 00:52:31.097 correspondence between DNA methylation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:31.097 \longrightarrow 00:52:33.479$ in blood with different brain regions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:33.480 --> 00:52:35.727 and they identify CPG's that show a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:35.727 \longrightarrow 00:52:38.238$ higher degree of concordance than others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:38.240 --> 00:52:40.795 I think your point is well taken,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:40.800 \longrightarrow 00:52:43.472$ this is the idea that we can take

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:43.472 \dashrightarrow 00:52:45.582$ a peripheral sample like blood and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}45.582 \longrightarrow 00{:}52{:}48.115$ say that this is going to predict

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:48.115 \longrightarrow 00:52:50.964$ DNA methylation state in a neuron in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}50.964 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}53.244$ the dentate gyrus of the hippocampus

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:53.244 \longrightarrow 00:52:55.440$ I think would is a stretch.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:55.440 \longrightarrow 00:52:57.708$ I think that it's going to.

00:52:57.710 --> 00:52:59.918 Be very challenging to identify and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}59.918 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}02.728$ sites where there is a high degree

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}53{:}02.728 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}04.833$ of correspondence in specific brain

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:53:04.833 --> 00:53:06.799 nuclei between brain and blood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:53:06.800 --> 00:53:09.304 Where I think we can begin to get

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:53:09.304 --> 00:53:11.367 a better understanding of pathways

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:11.367 \longrightarrow 00:53:14.545$ that are likely to be shared across

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:53:14.625 --> 00:53:17.841 brain and periphery is if we focus on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}53{:}17.841 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}20.110$ specific regions in the genome where

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:20.110 \longrightarrow 00:53:22.300$ there may be snips that influence

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}53{:}22.373 \to 00{:}53{:}24.809$ DNA methylation in the periphery that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:24.809 \longrightarrow 00:53:27.818$ also are shared snips that influence DNS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}53{:}27.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}30.088$ Relation in central and we can use

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:30.088 \longrightarrow 00:53:31.743$ the peripheral tissue essentially as

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:53:31.743 --> 00:53:33.927 a model Organism to say look this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:33.927 \longrightarrow 00:53:36.383$ proof of principle that this exposure

 $00:53:36.383 \longrightarrow 00:53:38.463$ influences DNA methylation or inclusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:38.470 \longrightarrow 00:53:40.210$ Influences the relationship between the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:40.210 \longrightarrow 00:53:42.729$ snip and DNA methylation in the periphery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:42.730 \longrightarrow 00:53:44.505$ And perhaps this could be

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:44.505 \longrightarrow 00:53:45.925$ occurring in the brain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:45.930 \longrightarrow 00:53:48.054$ But then we would need to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:48.054 \longrightarrow 00:53:49.116$ document that experimentally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:49.120 \longrightarrow 00:53:51.250$ either in cell culture in ipsc's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82129586

 $00:54:03.860 \longrightarrow 00:54:06.808$ Any other questions anyone?

NOTE Confidence: 0.84825686666667

 $00:54:11.510 \longrightarrow 00:54:14.066$ Well, it's. It is 2:00 o'clock,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84825686666667

 $00:54:14.070 \longrightarrow 00:54:15.580$ Kieran saved by the Bell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84825686666667

 $00:54:15.580 \longrightarrow 00:54:17.892$ But thank you so much that was really

NOTE Confidence: 0.848256866666667

 $00{:}54{:}17.892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}19.827$ a marvelous presentation and we learn

NOTE Confidence: 0.84825686666667

00:54:19.827 --> 00:54:22.113 so much and wonderful to have you

NOTE Confidence: 0.84825686666667

 $00:54:22.113 \longrightarrow 00:54:24.329$ here and we look forward to all that

 $00{:}54{:}24.329 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}26.110$ you'll teach us another ideal do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848256866666667

 $00{:}54{:}26.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}28.217$ So thank you here and thank you

NOTE Confidence: 0.817174

00:54:28.220 --> 00:54:29.730 very much. Thank you everyone.