WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"01:06:35" NOTE recognizability:0.855

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:03.927 Great, so there's still people coming in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}03.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}06.648$ but we might just make a start and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}06.648 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}00{:}09.143$ good afternoon everyone and welcome to

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:00:09.143 --> 00:00:12.100 grand rounds at the Child Study Center

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:00:12.100 --> 00:00:14.767 and I'd like to start by thanking

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}14.767 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}17.480$ Doctor Linda Mays for kicking off

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:17.480 \longrightarrow 00:00:20.510$ our 2022 lecture series last week.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:20.510 \longrightarrow 00:00:22.286$ And you know, one of the themes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:22.286 \longrightarrow 00:00:23.470$ emerged from Linda's presentation

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:00:23.470 --> 00:00:25.190 was the importance of community,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}25.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}26.940$ so it's so hear tening to see you

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}26.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}29.350$ all on the call today as we continue

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:29.350 \longrightarrow 00:00:30.950$ with our grand rounds series.

00:00:30.950 --> 00:00:32.816 Now just a couple of notices,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:32.820 \longrightarrow 00:00:35.039$ and next week we'll hear from Usha

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:35.039 \longrightarrow 00:00:36.845$ Tummala Narra and from Boston

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:00:36.845 --> 00:00:38.810 College after Russia to molinara,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:38.810 \longrightarrow 00:00:41.540$ they'll be speaking to us about a

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:00:41.540 --> 00:00:43.094 psycho analytical perspective on

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}43.094 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}45.020$ the origins of xenophobia and racism

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:45.020 \longrightarrow 00:00:47.464$ and how such xenophobia and racism

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:47.464 \longrightarrow 00:00:49.814$ contributes in perpetuates suffering and

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:49.814 \longrightarrow 00:00:51.789$ trauma within racial minority immigrants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}51.789 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}54.190$ Here in the United States and now

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:54.255 \longrightarrow 00:00:56.181$ rounding off our speaker series in

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}56.181 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}57.900$ January will be Doctor Jonathan

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:00:57.900 --> 00:00:59.775 Omer Hearty from Kings College.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:00:59.780 --> 00:01:02.034 London will be sharing some new data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:01:02.040 --> 00:01:04.476 From the developing Human Connectome project,

 $00:01:04.480 \longrightarrow 00:01:06.980$ and really emphasizing the importance

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:06.980 \longrightarrow 00:01:09.480$ of studying individual trajectories of

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:09.548 \longrightarrow 00:01:11.618$ brain development from the prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:01:11.618 --> 00:01:14.392 period across early life to better

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:14.392 \longrightarrow 00:01:16.916$ understand braydan behavior associations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:01:16.920 --> 00:01:19.494 Now today it's my distinct privilege

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:19.494 \longrightarrow 00:01:21.755$ and pleasure to introduce Doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}01{:}21.755 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}24.120$ Jenny Tongue from Duke University.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:24.120 \longrightarrow 00:01:25.760$ I'd like to especially thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:25.760 \longrightarrow 00:01:27.400$ Jenny for being so flexible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:27.400 \longrightarrow 00:01:30.368$ We really reschedule this to be a virtual

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}01{:}30.368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}32.827$ format and with very short notice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:01:32.830 --> 00:01:33.871 So thank you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143 00:01:33.871 --> 00:01:34.218 Jennifer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:34.218 \longrightarrow 00:01:37.749$ for being with us today and as you'll hear

00:01:37.749 --> 00:01:40.044 from Doctor Tongues presentation today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}01{:}40.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}42.435$ the Tongue Group seamlessly integrates

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:42.435 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.343$ functional genomics with behavioral

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:44.343 \longrightarrow 00:01:46.691$ ecology to really ask and answer

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:46.691 \longrightarrow 00:01:48.135$ questions of importance regarding

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:01:48.135 --> 00:01:50.257 how the social environment and

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:50.257 \longrightarrow 00:01:51.957$ social stress shapes individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:01:51.957 --> 00:01:54.138 differences in a range of phenotypes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:01:54.138 --> 00:01:56.130 and then how those changes in

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:01:56.197 --> 00:01:58.017 behavior can change the function

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}01{:}58.017 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}00.350$ and the evolution of the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143 00:02:00.350 --> 00:02:00.653 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:02:00.653 --> 00:02:02.168 Doctor Tung's work has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:02:02.168 \longrightarrow 00:02:03.840$ the impact of doctor Tongue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:02:03.840 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.940$ Work has been recognized by a number

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:02:05.940 \longrightarrow 00:02:07.580$ of different funding institutions,

00:02:07.580 --> 00:02:08.873 agencies, and foundations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:02:08.873 --> 00:02:10.597 including the MacArthur Foundation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:02:10.600 \longrightarrow 00:02:12.958$ that named Jenny MacArthur Fellow in

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}02{:}12.960 --> 00{:}02{:}14.992$ 2019 and which I think was the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:02:14.992 \longrightarrow 00:02:17.356$ year that you renamed as a fellow in

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:02:17.356 \longrightarrow 00:02:19.052$ the Canadian Institute for Advanced

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:02:19.052 --> 00:02:21.668 Research Child and Brain Development Program.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}02{:}21.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}23.374$ Now it's at this stage that I really

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:02:23.374 \longrightarrow 00:02:25.245$ wish that I had some canned laugh or

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}02{:}25.245 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}26.720$ some canned applause to like welcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:02:26.720 --> 00:02:28.214 you to the Child Study Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:02:28.220 \longrightarrow 00:02:30.390$ We're getting some virtual applause

NOTE Confidence: 0.91115719285714300:02:30.390 --> 00:02:31.560 in on zoom,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143 00:02:31.560 --> 00:02:32.340 but really, NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:02:32.340 \longrightarrow 00:02:33.985$ it's a pleasure to have you with.

 $00:02:33.990 \longrightarrow 00:02:36.886$ Today and welcome to the CHILD Study Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:02:39.520 \longrightarrow 00:02:40.840$ Thank you so much Karen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:02:40.840 \longrightarrow 00:02:42.528$ Thanks to all of you for for being

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:02:42.528 --> 00:02:44.122 willing to carve out time in your

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:02:44.122 \longrightarrow 00:02:45.670$ day to do another virtual seminar,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}02{:}45.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}48.220$ and especially to Karen and Rosemary

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:02:48.220 \longrightarrow 00:02:50.691$ for being so flexible and making

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:02:50.691 \longrightarrow 00:02:53.106$ this thing work as we go through

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}02{:}53.106 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}55.852$ the sort of whiplash of wave for

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:02:55.852 \longrightarrow 00:02:59.030$ whatever we happen to be on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:02:59.030 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.088$ OK, can you guys see my screen?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:01.090 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.580$ OK, does this look like

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:02.580 \longrightarrow 00:03:04.070$ it's it's supposed to look?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}03{:}04.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}05.720$ This is great alright.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:05.720 \longrightarrow 00:03:07.190$ As Karen mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}03{:}07.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}10.130$ my focal system is largely non

 $00:03:10.222 \longrightarrow 00:03:11.470$ human primates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:11.470 \longrightarrow 00:03:13.388$ I do some work on other social

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:13.388 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.131$ mammals but by and large not

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:03:15.131 --> 00:03:17.133 humans which I suspect is the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:17.199 \longrightarrow 00:03:19.208$ study system of most of you here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:03:19.210 --> 00:03:22.486 So I'm going to just start my

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:03:22.486 --> 00:03:24.334 presentation by introducing you

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:24.334 \longrightarrow 00:03:26.847$ to a few of our study subjects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:26.850 \longrightarrow 00:03:29.580$ The animals in my title slide are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:29.580 \longrightarrow 00:03:30.762$ Two known females.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:03:30.762 --> 00:03:33.126 This is Rwanda on the bottom

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}03{:}33.126 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}35.178$ right and her then a dolescent

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}03{:}35.178 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}37.542$ daughter rodeo up on the top.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}03{:}37.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}39.370$ I'm showing you these particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:39.370 \longrightarrow 00:03:41.675$ individuals because they are the benefits

 $00:03:41.675 \longrightarrow 00:03:43.780$ of substantial amounts of privilege.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:43.780 \longrightarrow 00:03:45.802$ At least what counts is privilege

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:03:45.802 --> 00:03:47.760 in a wild baboon society,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:03:47.760 --> 00:03:49.926 Rwanda was born to a particularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:49.926 \longrightarrow 00:03:51.829$ high status female and because

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:51.829 \longrightarrow 00:03:53.377$ in species like these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:53.380 \longrightarrow 00:03:55.400$ females inherit their social status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:55.400 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.661$ their position on the on the social

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}03{:}57.661 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}00.760$ hierarchy from their mothers, she's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:00.760 \longrightarrow 00:04:03.030$ Tire life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:03.030 \longrightarrow 00:04:05.445$ As either the top ranking female and

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:05.445 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.806$ her social group or just right below

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:07.806 \longrightarrow 00:04:10.215$ that that's had some pretty profound

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}04{:}10.215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}13.010$ effects on on her life history.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:13.010 \longrightarrow 00:04:15.950$ High ranking females in the population

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}04{:}15.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}18.557$ that we study reach maturation

 $00:04:18.557 \longrightarrow 00:04:21.436$ earlier and because of increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:21.436 \longrightarrow 00:04:24.666$ or better access to resources,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:24.670 \longrightarrow 00:04:26.355$ they tend to have shorter

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:26.355 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.040$ inter birth intervals as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:04:28.040 --> 00:04:30.260 So Rwanda has been remarkably

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:30.260 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.036$ successful at producing offspring.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:32.040 \longrightarrow 00:04:33.219$ She's had eight.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:33.219 \longrightarrow 00:04:36.443$ Live birth so far 2 miscarriages and her

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:04:36.443 --> 00:04:39.273 most recent offspring was born in 2020,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}04{:}39.273 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}43.057$ so she was a pandemic baby and Rwanda

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:43.057 \longrightarrow 00:04:45.895$ is still going the the advantages

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}04{:}45.895 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}48.520$ that accrue to her have been passed

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}04{:}48.592 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}50.368$ down in an intergenerational

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:50.368 \longrightarrow 00:04:53.032$ fashion to her daughter Rodeo here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:04:53.040 --> 00:04:54.966 who benefits from having a large

00:04:54.966 --> 00:04:56.878 family including a large number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:56.878 \longrightarrow 00:04:58.852$ sisters who are likely to be her

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:58.852 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.997$ closest social partners throughout life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:01.000 \longrightarrow 00:05:02.421$ And in fact we know from previous

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:02.421 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.350$ work in our study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:03.350 \longrightarrow 00:05:05.240$ Population that females who have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}05{:}05.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}07.204$ lot of close social partners live

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:07.204 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.130$ on average years longer than those

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}05{:}09.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}11.518$ who do not see the top quartile

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:05:11.518 --> 00:05:12.866 versus the bottom quartile.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}05{:}12.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}15.430$ Most socially integrated versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:15.430 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.350$ socially isolated baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:17.350 \longrightarrow 00:05:19.990$ So the circumstances of early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:19.990 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.298$ surrounding the birth of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:05:22.298 --> 00:05:24.178 animals shapes their phenotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:24.178 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.528$ in a long lasting fashion,

 $00:05:26.530 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.380$ parallel in some ways to what

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:29.380 \longrightarrow 00:05:32.040$ has been observed in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:32.040 \longrightarrow 00:05:34.644$ This type of the importance of early

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:05:34.644 --> 00:05:37.098 life effects I'm talking about here

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}05{:}37.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}38.830$ is something that's been observed

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:38.830 \longrightarrow 00:05:40.214$ repeatedly in other species,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:40.220 \longrightarrow 00:05:41.720$ and in fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}05{:}41.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}44.180$ in much more striking fashions that

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:05:44.180 --> 00:05:46.420 I'm even talking about in the baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:46.420 \longrightarrow 00:05:47.340$ So here in the top,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}05{:}47.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}49.612$ I'm showing you spade foot,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:05:49.612 --> 00:05:52.116 toad tadpoles, water fleas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}05{:}52.116 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}55.477$ and to bacco horn worm larvae,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:05:55.477 --> 00:05:57.358 which actually produced

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:57.358 \longrightarrow 00:05:59.239$ entirely different morphs,

 $00:05:59.240 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.670$ carnivore versus omnivore, or morphs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}01.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}04.958$ Of the tadpoles, can you see my cursor?

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:04.960 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.093$ Actually, I can't tell if you can see what.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:06:07.100 --> 00:06:10.254 Yeah, OK. Great, so carnivore and

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:10.254 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.120$ omnivore or more fear is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}12.177 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}13.732$ a carnivore eating an omnivore

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:13.732 \longrightarrow 00:06:15.624$ morph based purely on what early

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:06:15.624 --> 00:06:17.304 life diet looks like in these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}17.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}19.910$ In these in these toads,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:06:19.910 --> 00:06:23.894 this elaborated helmet or long sword

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}23.894 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}26.826$ depending on whether eggs of Daphnia

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}26.826 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}29.010$ are exposed to predator cues or a

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:06:29.083 --> 00:06:31.187 completely different color morph,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:31.190 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.310$ just depending on the temperature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:33.310 \longrightarrow 00:06:34.814$ In early development these

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}34.814 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}37.070$ are pretty far a field from us,

 $00:06:37.070 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.919$ but there are examples of fairly striking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:39.920 \longrightarrow 00:06:42.584$ Early life effects in other mammals as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:42.590 \longrightarrow 00:06:44.645$ We know from experimental evidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:44.645 \longrightarrow 00:06:47.549$ that wild red squirrels who are exposed

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:06:47.549 --> 00:06:49.895 to cues of high density actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}49.895 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}52.269$ accelerate the their offspring growth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:52.270 \longrightarrow 00:06:54.104$ We know that voles who are born

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:54.104 \longrightarrow 00:06:56.280$ in the cold season versus a wet

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:56.280 \longrightarrow 00:06:58.260$ season develop a thicker codes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:58.321 \longrightarrow 00:07:00.223$ from work in the population that

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}00.223 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}02.158$ I'll be telling you about today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}02.158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}04.461$ These baboons we know that diet in

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:07:04.461 --> 00:07:06.796 the first year of life postnatally

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:06.800 \longrightarrow 00:07:08.978$ has effects on the overall lifetime

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:08.978 \longrightarrow 00:07:10.430$ reproductive success of these.

 $00:07:10.430 \longrightarrow 00:07:13.898$ Animals, even years or decades later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:13.900 \longrightarrow 00:07:14.827$ And of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:07:14.827 --> 00:07:16.681 in our own species there's been

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}16.681 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}18.344$ abundant work linking childhood

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:07:18.344 --> 00:07:19.637 adversity in advantage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}19.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}22.035$ including in the adverse childhood

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}22.035 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}23.951$ experiences framework to later

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:23.951 \longrightarrow 00:07:26.594$ life health and mortality rates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}26.594 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}30.520$ So we know that these things exist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:07:30.520 --> 00:07:32.446 We know they're common across species,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:32.450 \longrightarrow 00:07:34.472$ but there are a number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:34.472 \longrightarrow 00:07:35.820$ lingering questions about why,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:35.820 \longrightarrow 00:07:38.420$ how and when these types

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:38.420 \longrightarrow 00:07:39.980$ of relationships arise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:39.980 \longrightarrow 00:07:41.945$ including whether childhood adversity or

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:41.945 \longrightarrow 00:07:44.650$ early life adversity leads to differences.

00:07:44.650 --> 00:07:46.192 In natural lifespan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:46.192 \longrightarrow 00:07:48.762$ in completely natural primate populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:48.762 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.782$ in the way that has been observed

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:07:51.782 --> 00:07:54.040 in humans to get at these questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}54.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}56.476$ I've been lucky enough to Co direct

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:56.476 \longrightarrow 00:07:58.670$ the Amboseli Baboon Research Project,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:58.670 \longrightarrow 00:08:00.777$ which is a launch toodle field study

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}00.777 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}02.768$ of wild primates in southern Kenya.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:02.770 \longrightarrow 00:08:04.370$ That's now been running continuously

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:04.370 \longrightarrow 00:08:05.650$ for over 50 years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:05.650 \longrightarrow 00:08:07.197$ so this is actually the first talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:08:07.197 --> 00:08:08.868 where I get to say over 50 years

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}08.868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}10.830$ and what we mean by that is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:10.830 \longrightarrow 00:08:11.781$ individually recognized animals

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:08:11.781 --> 00:08:13.438 in this population so recognized

 $00:08:13.438 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.378$ on site by trained observers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:15.380 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.198$ Have been watched on a near

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:17.198 \longrightarrow 00:08:19.029$ daily basis for those 50 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:08:19.030 --> 00:08:19.796 Of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:19.796 \longrightarrow 00:08:21.328$ that that constitutes multiple

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:08:21.328 --> 00:08:22.477 generations of baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:22.480 \longrightarrow 00:08:25.240$ We collect data on their social

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:25.240 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.710$ interactions on their reproductive history.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}27.710 \longrightarrow 00{:}08{:}30.132$ On life span and we also complement

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:30.132 \longrightarrow 00:08:32.206$ those data with information on

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}32.206 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}34.616$ their endocrine profiles on their

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:08:34.616 --> 00:08:36.879 genetic relatedness to one another

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}36.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}39.652$ on their microbiome and on their

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}39.652 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}41.500$ gene regulation more recently.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:41.500 \longrightarrow 00:08:42.295$ Like I said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:42.295 \longrightarrow 00:08:44.740$ this has been a 50 year plus project,

 $00:08:44.740 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.708$ so I've had the the ability to work

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}47.708 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}50.618$ on this really singular resource

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:08:50.620 --> 00:08:53.140 through the foresight of Jean Altman,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:53.140 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.280$ who founded the project in 1971

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}55.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}57.380$ with her husband, Stuart Altman.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:08:57.380 --> 00:08:57.914 Susan Alberts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:08:57.914 --> 00:08:59.783 who's also at Duke and Beth Archie

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}59.783 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}01.598$ at the University of Notre Dame.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:09:01.600 \longrightarrow 00:09:05.030$ And together we Co. Direct this project.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}09{:}05.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}07.082$ A large number of our employees

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}09{:}07.082 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}09.489$ on the project our Kenyan and are

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}09{:}09.489 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}11.743$ based in Kenya at the field site

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}09{:}11.811 --> 00{:}09{:}14.051$ or in Nairobi and so all of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:14.051 \longrightarrow 00:09:16.604$ data that I'll be talking to

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:09:16.604 --> 00:09:19.084 you about today were collected.

 $00:09:19.090 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.855$ In partnership with them and they are

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}09{:}21.855 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}23.565$ a really extraordinary professional

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:09:23.565 --> 00:09:25.865 and talented group of people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:25.870 \longrightarrow 00:09:29.326$ So I want to acknowledge them and here too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:29.330 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.381$ OK, so I told you we've been

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:31.381 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.910$ watching these animals for 50

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:32.910 \longrightarrow 00:09:34.385$ some years in the background.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:34.390 \longrightarrow 00:09:36.728$ Here is the pedigree for those animals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}09{:}36.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}38.410$ Both maternal lines and yellow

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:38.410 \longrightarrow 00:09:40.090$ and paternal lines in blue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:40.090 \longrightarrow 00:09:42.860$ We're now up to just over 2100

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:42.860 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.910$ known individuals in the population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:45.910 \longrightarrow 00:09:47.912$ and the ones who we followed the

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:47.912 \longrightarrow 00:09:49.696$ longest are from families that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:49.696 \longrightarrow 00:09:52.000$ have up to 9 generations of data for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:52.000 \longrightarrow 00:09:53.745$ So using this information which

 $00{:}09{:}53.745 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}56.184$ goes across the full life course

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:56.184 \longrightarrow 00:09:57.448$ and intergenerationally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:57.450 \longrightarrow 00:09:59.380$ We are interested in understanding

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}09{:}59.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}01.310$ the consequences of early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:01.377 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.307$ experience and early life adversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:03.307 \longrightarrow 00:10:05.237$ for natural mortality in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:10:05.304 --> 00:10:06.944 sort of prospectively intensively

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}06.944 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}08.994$ monitored setting that is free

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:08.994 \longrightarrow 00:10:11.402$ from the types of potentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:10:11.402 --> 00:10:13.394 confounding or potentially mediating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}13.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}15.068$ Depending on your question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:10:15.068 --> 00:10:16.736 factors that influence early

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}16.736 --> 00{:}10{:}18.239$ life effects in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:18.240 \longrightarrow 00:10:19.880$ We're interested, of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:19.880 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.952$ as as as scientists trained from an

00:10:22.952 --> 00:10:24.475 evolutionary biology, tradition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}24.475 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}26.255$ and understanding why these

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}26.255 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}28.960$ effects exist in the first place.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:28.960 \longrightarrow 00:10:31.389$ Is there a reason for animals to

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:10:31.389 --> 00:10:33.360 adjust their phenotypes in a way that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:33.360 \longrightarrow 00:10:34.150$ for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:10:34.150 --> 00:10:36.915 predicts how they'll deal with later life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:10:36.920 --> 00:10:37.946 environmental adversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:37.946 \longrightarrow 00:10:41.537$ and as many of you may be?

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:41.540 \longrightarrow 00:10:43.654$ We are interested in how these types

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}43.654 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}46.058$ of early life effects may arise.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:10:46.058 --> 00:10:49.082 What links and experience that may

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:49.082 \longrightarrow 00:10:52.139$ occur decades prior to the phenotypes

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:52.140 \longrightarrow 00:10:55.224$ that we observe with the internal

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:55.224 \longrightarrow 00:10:58.150$ physiological states that those organisms?

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:58.150 \longrightarrow 00:11:00.362$ So there is quite a bit of

 $00{:}11{:}00.362 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}11{:}02.264$ literature in our population as

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:02.264 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.469$ well as in nonhuman primates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:11:04.470 --> 00:11:06.130 Generally, including from your colleague,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:06.130 \longrightarrow 00:11:06.730$ Amanda Detmer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:06.730 \longrightarrow 00:11:08.530$ who I think I saw here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:11:08.530 --> 00:11:09.330 Hi Amanda,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:09.330 \longrightarrow 00:11:11.730$ on different sources of early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:11.730 \longrightarrow 00:11:13.454$ experience and downstream effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:11:13.454 --> 00:11:16.004 in the juvenile or adult period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:11:16.010 --> 00:11:18.160 for example, in Amboseli alone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:18.160 \longrightarrow 00:11:20.085$ we know that early life social status

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:20.085 \longrightarrow 00:11:21.887$ has long term predictive relationships

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}11{:}21.887 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}24.641$ with the timing of maturation with

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:24.641 \longrightarrow 00:11:25.892$ glucocorticoid Physiology and

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:25.892 \longrightarrow 00:11:27.554$ with the ability of animals too.

 $00:11:27.560 \longrightarrow 00:11:29.900$ Resist drought later in life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}11{:}29.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}32.318$ We know that mothers are exceptionally

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:11:32.318 --> 00:11:34.699 important for baboons because like humans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:11:34.700 --> 00:11:37.024 baboon babies experience long

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:37.024 \longrightarrow 00:11:39.929$ periods of nutritional and social

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}11{:}39.929 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}41.906$ dependency and and individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:41.906 \longrightarrow 00:11:44.000$ who lose their mothers early in

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:11:44.071 --> 00:11:46.525 life are very unlikely to survive

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:46.525 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.752$ themselves to adulthood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:11:47.760 --> 00:11:48.261 Similarly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:48.261 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.766$ animals who have relatively socially

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:50.766 \longrightarrow 00:11:53.688$ isolated mothers are less likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:53.688 \longrightarrow 00:11:56.628$ make it to their own reproductive maturation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:11:56.630 --> 00:11:57.815 Resource competition influences

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:57.815 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.185$ many of these outcomes as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:12:00.190 --> 00:12:01.754 including maturation timing and

 $00{:}12{:}01.754 \longrightarrow 00{:}12{:}03.709$ certain patterns of gene regulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:12:03.709 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.209$ and early life drought.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:12:05.210 --> 00:12:07.160 This is a highly variable environment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:12:07.160 \longrightarrow 00:12:09.854$ has strong effects on female fertility

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}12{:}09.854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}12.499$ and later life resilience to drought.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:12:12.500 \longrightarrow 00:12:15.162$ So all of these papers pursued

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:12:15.162 --> 00:12:17.822 individual sources of early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}12{:}17.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}19.950$ experience and in connection

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:12:20.033 \longrightarrow 00:12:22.577$ with individual outcome variables

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:12:22.580 \longrightarrow 00:12:24.076$ we became very inspired.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}12{:}24.076 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}27.027$ Actually by work done in humans in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:12:27.027 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.947$ As us framework to ask what happens

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}12{:}28.947 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}31.530$ if you look at them in conjunction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:12:31.530 --> 00:12:32.200 In fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:12:32.200 --> 00:12:34.880 if you do something as simple as counting

 $00:12:34.949 \longrightarrow 00:12:37.553$ up the number of sources of advantage

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:12:37.553 \longrightarrow 00:12:39.815$ or adversity that baboon baboons

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:12:39.815 --> 00:12:42.340 can experience early in life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:12:42.340 \longrightarrow 00:12:44.158$ so we considered. Six of them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:12:44.160 \longrightarrow 00:12:47.088$ in a baboon parallel of an ACE score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:12:47.090 \longrightarrow 00:12:48.618$ early life social status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:12:48.618 \longrightarrow 00:12:50.910$ So the the dominance rank the

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:12:50.988 \longrightarrow 00:12:53.238$ position on a linear social hierarchy

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:12:53.238 \longrightarrow 00:12:55.788$ of the mother of a baby baboon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:12:55.790 \longrightarrow 00:12:59.558$ Whether or not that baby reached

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}12{:}59.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}00.286$ reproductive maturation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:00.286 \longrightarrow 00:13:02.464$ So men are key for females.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}13{:}02.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}04.459$ Testicular enlargement for

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:04.459 \longrightarrow 00:13:07.774$ males without losing its mother.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:07.780 \longrightarrow 00:13:09.790$ How isolated or integrated that

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:09.790 \longrightarrow 00:13:12.673$ mother was based on the results I

00:13:12.673 --> 00:13:15.438 showed you earlier that that type of

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:15.438 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.889$ pattern predicts juvenile survival,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}13{:}17.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}19.474$ whether maternal resources were

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:19.474 \longrightarrow 00:13:21.850$ diverted by a competing younger sibling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:21.850 \longrightarrow 00:13:24.520$ So inter birth intervals in

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:13:24.520 --> 00:13:26.376 our population get very short,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:26.376 \longrightarrow 00:13:28.210$ the lowest quartile is about a year

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:28.263 \longrightarrow 00:13:29.957$ and a half in her birth interval.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:29.960 \longrightarrow 00:13:32.312$ So we asked whether individuals were

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}13{:}32.312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}35.126$ faced with a little brother or sister

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:35.126 \longrightarrow 00:13:37.870$ within that very short period of time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}13{:}37.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}40.830$ We asked about resource competition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:13:40.830 --> 00:13:42.094 This experience density so

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:42.094 \longrightarrow 00:13:43.674$ the size of social groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:43.680 \longrightarrow 00:13:44.808$ Who of animals?

 $00:13:44.808 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.064$ Who are a given focal animals

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:13:47.064 --> 00:13:48.260 immediate competitor?

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:48.260 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.717$ And we asked about exposure to environmental

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:13:50.717 --> 00:13:52.750 adversity in the form of drought.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:52.750 \longrightarrow 00:13:54.430$ This is a very dry environment as

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:13:54.430 --> 00:13:56.179 I'll show you a little bit later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:56.180 \longrightarrow 00:14:00.660$ but some years are much wetter than others,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:00.660 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.580$ so our interest here was not

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:02.580 \longrightarrow 00:14:03.540$ what happened immediately.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:03.540 \longrightarrow 00:14:05.505$ It's perhaps unsurprising if an

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}14{:}05.505 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}07.945$ animal loses its mother when it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:07.945 \longrightarrow 00:14:09.545$ so nutritionally dependent that

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:14:09.545 --> 00:14:11.545 it doesn't do very well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:11.550 \longrightarrow 00:14:13.100$ but rather in what happens

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:13.100 \longrightarrow 00:14:15.020$ over a longer stretch of time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:15.020 \longrightarrow 00:14:16.288$ separated from early life.

00:14:16.288 --> 00:14:18.550 So here we're specifically asking me about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:18.550 \longrightarrow 00:14:20.926$ Events that happen early in life

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}14{:}20.926 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}22.996$ exposures that occur early in

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:22.996 \longrightarrow 00:14:25.046$ life and their predictive value

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:25.046 \longrightarrow 00:14:26.686$ for survival in adulthood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:26.690 \longrightarrow 00:14:30.810$ So starting around age 4 for these animals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:30.810 \longrightarrow 00:14:35.466$ Unlike what is typical in aces and humans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:35.470 \longrightarrow 00:14:37.035$ these six sources of adversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:37.035 \longrightarrow 00:14:38.600$ are actually not very closely

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}14{:}38.659 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}40.067$ correlated with each other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:40.070 \longrightarrow 00:14:40.781$ In other words,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}14{:}40.781 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}42.748$ it's not the case that if an animal

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:42.748 \longrightarrow 00:14:44.533$ is born to a low status mother,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:44.540 \longrightarrow 00:14:46.570$ she is more likely to be born

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:46.570 \longrightarrow 00:14:48.560$ to a socially socially isolated

 $00:14:48.560 \longrightarrow 00:14:51.190$ mother or experience higher degrees

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:14:51.190 --> 00:14:52.768 of resource competition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:52.770 \longrightarrow 00:14:54.898$ So we're able to parse those different

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:54.898 \longrightarrow 00:14:57.109$ types of experiences separately from another.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:57.110 \longrightarrow 00:14:58.888$ A little bit more cleanly than is

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:58.888 \longrightarrow 00:15:00.560$ typical in human studies, and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:00.560 \longrightarrow 00:15:02.360$ In the same vein,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:02.360 \longrightarrow 00:15:04.952$ early life environment is not very

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:04.952 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.680$ correlated with environment that

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:06.745 \longrightarrow 00:15:08.805$ experience that animals experience

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}15{:}08.805 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}09.835$ in a dulthood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:09.840 \longrightarrow 00:15:11.820$ So here's the breakdown about 1/5

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:11.820 \longrightarrow 00:15:14.247$ to 1/4 of this is actually females

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:14.247 \longrightarrow 00:15:16.655$ in this case of females in our

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:15:16.727 --> 00:15:18.833 study population are what we think

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}15{:}18.833 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}21.737$ of as our silver spoon babies who

 $00:15:21.737 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.733$ experience no particular sources

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:23.733 \longrightarrow 00:15:26.340$ of major adversity early in life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:15:26.340 --> 00:15:27.840 Another third of them experienced

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:27.840 \longrightarrow 00:15:29.040$ one of these six,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:29.040 \longrightarrow 00:15:31.189$ and then the more unfortunate ones are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:31.190 \longrightarrow 00:15:34.190$ Faced with two or even three or more

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:34.190 \longrightarrow 00:15:36.778$ sources of major early adversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:36.780 \longrightarrow 00:15:39.183$ So I'll cut right to the chase again here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}15{:}39.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}42.095$ The ages on the X axis represent

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:15:42.095 --> 00:15:43.340 adulthood in baboons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:15:43.340 --> 00:15:45.476 and here I'm showing you survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:45.476 \longrightarrow 00:15:47.390$ curves stratified by that baboon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}15{:}47.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}51.166$ Aces score from zero to three or more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:15:51.170 --> 00:15:53.754 This is the kind of result where we

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:15:53.754 \longrightarrow 00:15:56.496$ actually did not expect something so clean,

 $00:15:56.500 \longrightarrow 00:15:57.837$ and when I show it to you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:15:57.840 \longrightarrow 00:15:59.814$ it's you know you almost don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:15:59.814 \longrightarrow 00:16:01.380$ need statistics to see it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:16:01.380 --> 00:16:04.036 but I'll tell you that what we're showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:04.036 \longrightarrow 00:16:06.989$ you is a difference in median survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:16:06.990 --> 00:16:08.830 Highly significant difference in

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:08.830 \longrightarrow 00:16:11.130$ median survival depending on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:16:11.130 --> 00:16:13.129 number of adverse experiences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:13.130 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.580$ a baby baboon faced that leads to

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:16:15.580 --> 00:16:17.486 a difference in lifespan between

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:17.486 \longrightarrow 00:16:19.426$ about 18 or 19 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:19.430 \longrightarrow 00:16:21.698$ Assuming that an animal gets to

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:21.700 \longrightarrow 00:16:23.525$ reproductive maturation to about 9

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:23.525 \longrightarrow 00:16:25.803$ years for those animals who experience

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:16:25.803 --> 00:16:28.125 three or more sources of adversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:28.130 \longrightarrow 00:16:30.244$ it's sometimes useful to put these in,

00:16:30.250 --> 00:16:32.870 you know, coarsely translated terms,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:32.870 \longrightarrow 00:16:35.886$ so this is a decade in real time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}16{:}35.890 \to 00{:}16{:}36.716$ The life span.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:16:36.716 --> 00:16:40.020 And the sort of life history of pace

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:40.103 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.871$ of life of baboons is about 2 1/2

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}16{:}42.871 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}45.719$ to three times faster than humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:45.720 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.673$ So what I'm showing you here is a decade.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:16:47.680 --> 00:16:49.234 If we put that in human terms,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:16:49.240 --> 00:16:51.000 we're talking about differences of

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:51.000 \longrightarrow 00:16:54.283$ 20 to 30 years in a population where

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}16{:}54.283 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}57.175$ everyone has equivalent access to health care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}16{:}57.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}59.340$ Because there is no health care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:59.340 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.060$ There is no smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:01.060 \longrightarrow 00:17:02.780$ There is no alcoholism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:02.780 \longrightarrow 00:17:04.190$ There are no illicit drugs.

 $00:17:04.190 \longrightarrow 00:17:06.596$ There are no motorcycles, etc etc.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}17{:}06.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}08.520$ And yet there's this very pronounced.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:08.520 \longrightarrow 00:17:12.895$ Long lasting effect on adult mortality rates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:17:12.900 --> 00:17:14.340 OK, perhaps interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:17:14.340 --> 00:17:19.159 for any of you who use the Asus framework,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:17:19.160 --> 00:17:21.840 which is proposed in some cases to move

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:21.840 \longrightarrow 00:17:24.860$ through an intermediary of effects on social,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:24.860 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.056$ emotional and cognitive development,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:26.056 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.850$ what we find is that individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:27.901 \longrightarrow 00:17:28.639$ are silver spoon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:28.640 \longrightarrow 00:17:31.256$ Babies end up growing up to be socially

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:31.256 \longrightarrow 00:17:33.193$ more integrated and socially better

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}17{:}33.193 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}35.218$ connected than are individuals who

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:17:35.218 --> 00:17:37.756 experienced a lot of early life adversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:17:37.760 --> 00:17:40.210 which is perhaps one of the mediating

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:40.210 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.008$ factors that may explain this relationship.

 $00:17:43.010 \longrightarrow 00:17:44.862$ Although separate analysis suggest

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:17:44.862 --> 00:17:47.640 it certainly can't explain at all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:17:47.640 --> 00:17:49.720 And for any of you who may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:49.720 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.239$ interested in the evolutionary

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:17:51.239 --> 00:17:53.099 ramifications of this result,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:53.100 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.977$ what we find is that this shortened

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:55.977 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.674$ lifespan not only influences a

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:17:58.674 --> 00:18:02.146 female's own time on time on earth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:02.146 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.906$ but also the likelihood that

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:18:03.906 --> 00:18:06.129 she'll leave many copies of her

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:18:06.129 --> 00:18:07.944 own genome in future generations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}18{:}07.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}10.570$ and Amboseli females produce another

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:18:10.570 --> 00:18:12.500 surviving offspring you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:12.500 \longrightarrow 00:18:14.260$ not quite like clockwork,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:18:14.260 --> 00:18:17.388 but pretty close to it about every 2.1 years.

 $00:18:17.388 \longrightarrow 00:18:21.310$ So a difference in lifespan of 10 years

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}18{:}21.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}25.130$ is a dramatic difference in terms of an

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:25.130 \longrightarrow 00:18:28.330$ individual's lifetime reproductive success.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:28.330 \longrightarrow 00:18:31.210$ So a former graduate student working

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:31.210 \longrightarrow 00:18:33.130$ with the project specifically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:33.130 \longrightarrow 00:18:34.466$ and Susan Alberts lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}18{:}34.466 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}36.136$ was interested in whether this

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:36.136 \longrightarrow 00:18:37.749$ also had knock on effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:18:37.750 --> 00:18:39.782 Intergenerationally given the importance

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:39.782 \longrightarrow 00:18:43.710$ of moms to their offspring in particular.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:43.710 \longrightarrow 00:18:46.420$ So what I've been showing you so far is early

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:18:46.480 --> 00:18:49.006 adversity accruing to a particular female,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:49.010 \longrightarrow 00:18:51.089$ and the consequences for her own life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:51.090 \longrightarrow 00:18:54.254$ What he wanted to know is whether.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:54.260 \longrightarrow 00:18:56.864$ Early adversity experienced by the mother

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:18:56.864 \longrightarrow 00:18:59.848$ had cascading effects on her kids survival,

 $00:18:59.850 \longrightarrow 00:19:02.118$ even controlling for that kids own

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:19:02.118 \longrightarrow 00:19:05.148$ exposure to the same sources of adversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:19:05.150 --> 00:19:05.914 Remarkably remarkably,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:19:05.914 \longrightarrow 00:19:08.970$ we see that it does so here again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:19:08.970 --> 00:19:10.866 our survival curves, in this case,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:10.870 \longrightarrow 00:19:12.582$ survival to reproductive maturation

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:12.582 \longrightarrow 00:19:14.722$ for the offspring of mothers

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:14.722 \longrightarrow 00:19:16.859$ who experienced maternal loss.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:16.860 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.702$ You know what could have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:18.702 \longrightarrow 00:19:19.930$ decades earlier in life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:19:19.930 --> 00:19:22.396 or mothers who experienced that competing

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:22.396 \longrightarrow 00:19:24.806$ younger sibling again in what could

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}19{:}24.806 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}26.906$ have been decades earlier in life?

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:26.910 \longrightarrow 00:19:30.582$ So in both cases kids of moms who

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:30.582 \longrightarrow 00:19:32.840$ experienced early adversity were

 $00:19:32.840 \longrightarrow 00:19:35.850$ more likely to to die before they

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:19:35.850 --> 00:19:38.318 hit their own period of independence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:19:38.318 --> 00:19:41.230 We think we know what's mediating this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:41.230 \longrightarrow 00:19:43.963$ at least at a gross level and

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:43.963 \longrightarrow 00:19:46.504$ and that is likely an effect on

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:19:46.504 --> 00:19:48.230 maternal health or viability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:48.230 \longrightarrow 00:19:50.150$ That is, the moms of those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:50.150 \longrightarrow 00:19:51.590$ Those second generation

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:51.590 \longrightarrow 00:19:53.990$ offspring to ask this question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:19:53.990 --> 00:19:55.710 Matthew divided up those

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}19{:}55.710 --> 00{:}19{:}57.860$ first four years of life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:19:57.860 --> 00:20:00.420 From birth to earliest maturation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:00.420 \longrightarrow 00:20:03.846$ he asked what the survival probability

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:03.846 \longrightarrow 00:20:07.329$ was of offspring in the in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:07.329 \longrightarrow 00:20:11.053$ period from age 0 to age 2 as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:11.053 \longrightarrow 00:20:13.728$ function of whether mothers were.

 $00:20:13.730 \longrightarrow 00:20:15.599$ Able to survive or not during the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:15.599 \longrightarrow 00:20:17.442$ period in which that offspring would

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:17.442 \longrightarrow 00:20:20.908$ have been age 2 to 4 sodas later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:20:20.910 --> 00:20:23.662 maternal mortality predict something

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:20:23.662 --> 00:20:25.878 about the survival for offspring

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:25.878 \longrightarrow 00:20:27.981$ earlier in life and for females

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:27.981 \longrightarrow 00:20:29.566$ who either experience maternal loss

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:29.566 \longrightarrow 00:20:31.530$ themselves or competing younger sibling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:31.530 \longrightarrow 00:20:33.054$ That's the case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:33.054 \longrightarrow 00:20:36.550$ So in other words, if you are a baboon,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:36.550 \longrightarrow 00:20:39.322$ is the offspring of an individual who

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:39.322 \longrightarrow 00:20:41.550$ experienced early adversity in its own life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}20{:}41.550 --> 00{:}20{:}43.020$ that individual is likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:43.020 \longrightarrow 00:20:44.196$ be in poor somatic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:44.200 \longrightarrow 00:20:46.234$ Quality in a way that influences

 $00:20:46.234 \longrightarrow 00:20:48.601$ whether or not that kid is able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}20{:}48.601 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}50.976$ make it to age 2 even if its mother

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}20{:}50.976 \rightarrow 00{:}20{:}53.343$ is there the whole time and I'll just

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:53.343 \longrightarrow 00:20:54.658$ tell you that this relationship.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:54.660 \longrightarrow 00:20:56.396$ This difference between offspring

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:56.396 \longrightarrow 00:20:59.000$ survival as a function of later

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:20:59.073 --> 00:21:01.395 maternal death does not exist for

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:21:01.395 --> 00:21:04.448 the offspring of mothers who did not

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:04.448 \longrightarrow 00:21:06.356$ themselves experience early mortality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:06.360 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.530$ So we think that this is explained

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}21{:}08.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}11.159$ by what's going on with the mother's

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:21:11.159 --> 00:21:12.795 condition and doesn't necessarily

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:21:12.795 --> 00:21:14.668 require any sort of complex.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:14.670 \longrightarrow 00:21:15.556$ For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:15.556 \longrightarrow 00:21:17.771$ epigenetic explanations that that go

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:17.771 \longrightarrow 00:21:21.030$ into sort of transgenerational effects.

 $00:21:21.030 \longrightarrow 00:21:23.754$ So in this population we find

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:23.754 \longrightarrow 00:21:25.570$ that as in humans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:21:25.570 --> 00:21:27.873 early life is a critical period for

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:27.873 \longrightarrow 00:21:29.909$ development that affects lifelong survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:29.910 \longrightarrow 00:21:31.849$ Even in a time period that's quite

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:31.849 \longrightarrow 00:21:33.830$ separated from the early life exposures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:33.830 \longrightarrow 00:21:35.270$ It appears to be profoundly

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}21{:}35.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}36.422$ affected by social resources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:21:36.430 --> 00:21:37.128 In particular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:37.128 \longrightarrow 00:21:39.920$ many of the things that pop out to

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:39.992 \longrightarrow 00:21:42.127$ us as individually predictive sources

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:42.127 \longrightarrow 00:21:45.050$ of variance have to do with moms,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}21{:}45.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}47.198$ in particular maternal presence

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:47.198 \longrightarrow 00:21:49.883$ and maternal attention or maternal

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:49.883 \longrightarrow 00:21:50.920$ resources spent.

 $00:21:50.920 \longrightarrow 00:21:53.428$ With that particular offspring.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}21{:}53.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}54.800$ Our data suggests that multiple

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:21:54.800 --> 00:21:56.914 hits compound to influence risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:56.914 \longrightarrow 00:22:00.771$ so the the risk of or of earlier

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:22:00.771 \longrightarrow 00:22:03.576$ death with higher aces exceeds the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}22{:}03.576 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}05.844$ explanatory power of looking at each

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:22:05.844 \longrightarrow 00:22:08.329$ of those individual effects alone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:22:08.330 --> 00:22:11.150 and this has intergenerational consequences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:22:11.150 \longrightarrow 00:22:14.150$ meaning that the viability of an

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:22:14.150 \longrightarrow 00:22:16.239$ animal that we happen to watch at a

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:22:16.239 --> 00:22:18.053 given point in time is affected not

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:22:18.053 \longrightarrow 00:22:20.105$ only by its own experience but by

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:22:20.105 \longrightarrow 00:22:22.000$ the experiences in previous generations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:22:22.000 \longrightarrow 00:22:25.366$ So I already told you that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:22:25.370 \longrightarrow 00:22:27.115$ But this has major consequences

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:22:27.115 \longrightarrow 00:22:28.860$ for the the currency of

00:22:28.927 --> 00:22:31.084 Darwinian fitness, right lifetime,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:22:31.084 --> 00:22:32.098 reproductive success,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:22:32.098 --> 00:22:34.601 how many offspring females leave behind.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:22:34.601 \longrightarrow 00:22:36.563$ So this raises a natural question

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:22:36.563 \longrightarrow 00:22:38.340$ about why these early life effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:22:38.340 \longrightarrow 00:22:40.110$ have evolved in the 1st place.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:22:40.110 \longrightarrow 00:22:42.680$ If this has such costly

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:22:42.680 \longrightarrow 00:22:44.321$ consequences for fitness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:22:44.321 \longrightarrow 00:22:47.603$ then shouldn't over the course of

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:22:47.603 \longrightarrow 00:22:49.990$ evolutionary history we and other

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:22:49.990 --> 00:22:52.185 longer lived primates you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:22:52.190 \longrightarrow 00:22:53.922$ quit paying attention to

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}22{:}53.922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}55.654$ those early life experiences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:22:55.660 --> 00:22:56.908 This was a question that a

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:22:56.908 --> 00:22:58.000 former PhD student of mine,

 $00:22:58.000 \longrightarrow 00:22:58.880$ Amanda Lea,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:22:58.880 --> 00:23:01.080 is now faculty at Vanderbilt

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:01.080 \longrightarrow 00:23:02.700$ was very interested in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:02.700 \longrightarrow 00:23:05.490$ and she attempted to disentangle 2

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:05.490 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.856$ of the predominant hypothesis for

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:07.856 \longrightarrow 00:23:09.976$ why early life effects evolved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}23{:}09.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}12.002$ These are often used to explain

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:12.002 \longrightarrow 00:23:14.119$ early life effects in humans too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:14.120 \longrightarrow 00:23:16.780$ so I think that there is some

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:23:16.780 --> 00:23:19.498 some generalizability here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}23{:}19.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}22.212$ The 1st is a class of of explanations

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:23:22.212 --> 00:23:25.018 I'll refer to as early life programming,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:23:25.020 --> 00:23:25.636 adaptive programming,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:25.636 \longrightarrow 00:23:26.868$ or sometimes you'll see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:23:26.870 --> 00:23:29.366 Adaptive responses which posits

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:29.366 \longrightarrow 00:23:33.538$ that what's going on is that young

 $00:23:33.538 \longrightarrow 00:23:36.106$ animals are taking cues from their

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:36.106 \longrightarrow 00:23:38.204$ environment to adjust their phenotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:38.204 \longrightarrow 00:23:40.436$ in a way that better prepares

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:23:40.436 --> 00:23:42.551 them for a similar environmental

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:23:42.551 --> 00:23:44.706 exposure later in Life OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:23:44.710 --> 00:23:47.338 and so if you use these kind of fitness

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:23:47.338 --> 00:23:50.150 nor sorry reaction norm representations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}23{:}50.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}51.938$ what that means is that individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:51.938 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.298$ who are born in a poor early

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:23:54.298 --> 00:23:55.770 environment actually do better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:55.770 \longrightarrow 00:23:57.216$ If the quality of the environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:57.220 \longrightarrow 00:24:00.060$ Is also poor in adulthood and vice versa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}24{:}00.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}02.526$ Individuals who are born in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}24{:}02.526 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}04.170$ benign environment do better

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:04.243 --> 00:24:06.835 in an environment that are high

 $00:24:06.835 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.052$ quality in a dulthood relative to

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:09.052 \longrightarrow 00:24:11.117$ that other class of individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:11.120 \longrightarrow 00:24:13.058$ A major alternative class of hypothesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:13.058 \longrightarrow 00:24:15.254$ is what is often termed developmental

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:15.254 --> 00:24:17.768 constraints or a silver spoon effect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:17.770 --> 00:24:20.798 which basically posits that good

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:20.798 \longrightarrow 00:24:22.862$ benign early environments are

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:22.862 \longrightarrow 00:24:25.570$ good for you no matter what your

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:25.570 --> 00:24:26.730 adult environment looks like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:26.730 \longrightarrow 00:24:30.090$ and so the consequences of early

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:30.090 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.330$ life adversity are because.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:32.330 --> 00:24:33.610 Individuals have to physiologically

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:33.610 --> 00:24:34.890 adapt to their environment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:34.890 --> 00:24:36.414 and they're basically making

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:36.414 \longrightarrow 00:24:38.700$ the best of a bad job.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:38.700 \longrightarrow 00:24:41.112$ A real challenge with distinguishing these

00:24:41.112 --> 00:24:43.578 between these two hypothesis is that often,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:43.580 \longrightarrow 00:24:46.020$ particularly in human natural experiments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:46.020 \longrightarrow 00:24:48.084$ what we what we have our data from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:48.090 --> 00:24:50.060 Individuals born in poor versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:50.060 --> 00:24:51.636 high quality early environments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:51.640 \longrightarrow 00:24:52.720$ You can think about classical

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:52.720 --> 00:24:53.800 studies like the Dutch hunger,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}24{:}53.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}56.832$ winter or the Great Leap

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:56.832 --> 00:24:58.124 Forward studies in China,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:58.130 \longrightarrow 00:25:00.020$ but they're measured in a dulthood

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:00.020 \longrightarrow 00:25:01.532$ in relatively benign environments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:01.540 \longrightarrow 00:25:02.233$ In other words,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}25{:}02.233 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}03.619$ we're seeing two of these points,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:03.620 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.790$ not four of these points,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:04.790 \longrightarrow 00:25:06.126$ and if you only see two of these

00:25:06.126 --> 00:25:07.299 points on the right hand side,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}25{:}07.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}08.932$ you can't actually distinguish.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:08.932 \longrightarrow 00:25:10.564$ Between that crossing pattern,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:10.570 \longrightarrow 00:25:12.712$ that interaction pattern or a pattern

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:12.712 \longrightarrow 00:25:15.402$ that would be much more consistent

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:15.402 \longrightarrow 00:25:17.199$ with developmental constraints.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:17.200 \longrightarrow 00:25:19.584$ So we think we can do this in

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:25:19.584 --> 00:25:21.783 Amboseli because there is a major

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:21.783 \longrightarrow 00:25:23.315$ source of environmental variation

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:25:23.315 --> 00:25:25.910 that can cause hardship or relative

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}25{:}25.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}27.674$ advantage that is completely

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:27.674 \longrightarrow 00:25:29.568$ exogenous to the fabulous themselves,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:29.568 \longrightarrow 00:25:31.248$ and that's simply defined by

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:25:31.248 --> 00:25:33.060 patterns of rainfall in Amboseli,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:33.060 \longrightarrow 00:25:35.499$ which can be quite dry in some years less

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:35.499 \longrightarrow 00:25:37.899$ than rainfall in Phoenix for comparison.

 $00:25:37.900 \longrightarrow 00:25:39.650$ So desert like these are

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:39.650 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.400$ hydrological years going back into

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:25:41.465 \longrightarrow 00:25:44.688$ the 70s, or they can be relatively high,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:25:44.690 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.920$ not as high as New Haven.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:25:45.920 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.712$ In case you're interested

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:25:46.712 --> 00:25:47.702 in putting this in context,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:25:47.710 \longrightarrow 00:25:49.422$ New Haven get spelled.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:25:49.422 \longrightarrow 00:25:51.990$ 1200 millimeters of precipitation a year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:25:51.990 \longrightarrow 00:25:54.111$ but high enough that we aren't talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:25:54.111 \longrightarrow 00:25:56.110$ about desert like conditions anymore.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:25:56.110 --> 00:25:58.542 OK, and of course this variation again is

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:25:58.542 \longrightarrow 00:26:00.510$ something that the baboon like baboons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}26{:}00.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}03.654$ nor we have any kind of control over.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}26{:}03.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}05.508$ Now in 2009 we had the equivalent

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:26:05.508 --> 00:26:07.773 of a weight of a natural experiment

00:26:07.773 --> 00:26:09.533 in our own natural population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:09.540 \longrightarrow 00:26:11.619$ which was the worst drought ever recorded

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:26:11.619 --> 00:26:13.529 in the history of this ecosystem,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:13.530 \longrightarrow 00:26:15.595$ and it was compounded by the fact

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:15.595 \longrightarrow 00:26:17.554$ that the year before 2008 was

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:26:17.554 --> 00:26:19.426 actually also a low rainfall year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:26:19.430 --> 00:26:20.955 so animals were really suffering

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666666700:26:20.955 --> 00:26:21.870 in the basin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:26:21.870 --> 00:26:23.550 There was large scale die

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:23.550 \longrightarrow 00:26:24.894$ off of large animals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:24.900 \longrightarrow 00:26:28.260$ We did not see a lot of mortality

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:28.260 \longrightarrow 00:26:29.514$ consequences in the baboons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:29.514 \longrightarrow 00:26:32.389$ but we did see a huge drop in fertility.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:32.390 \longrightarrow 00:26:34.058$ So here on the Y axis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:26:34.060 --> 00:26:36.846 I'm showing you rates of conception per

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:36.846 \longrightarrow 00:26:39.798$ adult female by hydrological year and this

 $00:26:39.798 \longrightarrow 00:26:42.610$ is 2009 where it dropped by about 25%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:42.610 \longrightarrow 00:26:44.830$ So the animals are very much

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:44.830 \longrightarrow 00:26:46.780$ feeling these kinds of effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:46.780 \longrightarrow 00:26:49.678$ so this gave us the ability to ask in

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:26:49.678 --> 00:26:53.068 a poor quality adult environment 2009

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:53.068 \longrightarrow 00:26:55.558$ versus good quality adult environments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:26:55.560 \longrightarrow 00:26:58.605$ So the middle 50% of rainfall years

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}26{:}58.605 \to 00{:}27{:}00.500$ were treating in that sort of way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:27:00.500 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.541$ In this analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:27:01.541 --> 00:27:04.360 how did individuals who were born in poor?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:27:04.360 --> 00:27:06.555 Early environments during early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}27{:}06.555 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}09.222$ droughts do compared to individuals born

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}27{:}09.222 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}11.676$ in modern high quality early environments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:27:11.680 \longrightarrow 00:27:14.585$ In terms of their ability to conceive

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:27:14.585 \longrightarrow 00:27:20.460$ offspring and also to resume reproductive.

 $00:27:20.460 \longrightarrow 00:27:24.030$ Cycling after a period of postpartum minaria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:27:24.030 \longrightarrow 00:27:24.558$ OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:27:24.558 \longrightarrow 00:27:27.726$ so that's what we'll focus on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:27:27.730 \longrightarrow 00:27:29.118$ These fertility related outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:27:29.118 --> 00:27:31.790 And here's what we get as a result.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:27:31.790 \longrightarrow 00:27:34.436$ What we find is that for females who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:27:34.436 --> 00:27:37.027 born in relatively benign environments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:27:37.030 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.282$ there's actually very little

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}27{:}39.282 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}41.814$ difference in their probability of

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:27:41.814 \longrightarrow 00:27:43.686$ conceiving or resuming cycling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}27{:}43.690 --> 00{:}27{:}45.350$ This is conception data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}27{:}45.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}48.790$ Here in moderate years versus in the drought.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:27:48.790 --> 00:27:49.894 They're relatively buffered,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}27{:}49.894 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}53.259$ although you see a little bit of a decrement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:27:53.260 --> 00:27:55.450 This is actually a comparison within

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:27:55.450 \longrightarrow 00:27:57.637$ individuals for for females who conceived

00:27:57.637 --> 00:27:59.982 in both of those types of environments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}27{:}59.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}01.940$ so these comparisons are going

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:28:01.940 \longrightarrow 00:28:03.890$ to be centered around 0,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:28:03.890 \longrightarrow 00:28:05.440$ whereas for females who were

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:28:05.440 --> 00:28:06.370 born during droughts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:28:06.370 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.547$ they took a much larger hit in

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:28:08.547 \longrightarrow 00:28:10.406$ comparison to their own reproductive

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}28{:}10.406 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}12.974$ performance and mop in moderate years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:28:12.980 \longrightarrow 00:28:13.820$ In other words,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}28{:}13.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}15.780$ there is a difference between how well

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:28:15.837 --> 00:28:17.832 females who were born and droughts and

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:28:17.832 --> 00:28:19.940 females who were born in good years did,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}28{:}19.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}21.956$ but is in the opposite direction

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}28{:}21.956 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}23.939$ as predicted by the predictive

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:28:23.939 \longrightarrow 00:28:25.637$ adaptive response model.

 $00:28:25.640 \longrightarrow 00:28:27.090$ We actually also see some,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}28{:}27.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}29.085$ some some preliminary evidence for

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00{:}28{:}29.085 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}31.080$ social buffering in this situation

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:28:31.147 --> 00:28:33.323 for females who were both born in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:28:33.323 \longrightarrow 00:28:35.464$ drought and lived as reproductive adults

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

00:28:35.464 --> 00:28:37.896 through that very severe 2009 drought,

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:28:37.896 \longrightarrow 00:28:41.480$ we find that females were able to maintain

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:28:41.567 \longrightarrow 00:28:44.710$ their ability to conceive if they were

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:28:44.710 \longrightarrow 00:28:46.990$ born to high status mothers versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.859227986666667

 $00:28:46.990 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.375$ females who were born to low status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00{:}28{:}49.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}52.008$ Mothers were less able to buffer

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

00:28:52.008 --> 00:28:54.210 her against these multiple hits.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:28:54.210 \longrightarrow 00:28:55.754$ And so you know, Amanda came to me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:28:55.760 \longrightarrow 00:28:57.470$ And she found this result.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

00:28:57.470 --> 00:28:59.045 She said, well, I think all we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:28:59.045 \longrightarrow 00:29:00.799$ saying is that if you were born in

 $00{:}29{:}00.799 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}02.336$ a terrible year and then you had

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:02.336 \longrightarrow 00:29:03.704$ the bad luck of living through,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:03.710 \longrightarrow 00:29:05.456$ you know one of the worst years on record.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:05.460 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.670$ And you know you are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00{:}29{:}08.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}09.735$ Experiencing social disadvantage

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:09.735 \longrightarrow 00:29:12.580$ is the result of being low on a

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:12.580 \longrightarrow 00:29:14.350$ social hierarchy than that is bad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:14.350 \longrightarrow 00:29:15.154$ And that's true.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

00:29:15.154 --> 00:29:17.070 I mean, maybe that's not very surprising,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:17.070 \longrightarrow 00:29:19.761$ but the fact is it is counter to one

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:19.761 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.629$ of the dominant predictions in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:22.629 \longrightarrow 00:29:25.740$ literature about why these things happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

00:29:25.740 --> 00:29:26.150 So

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

 $00:29:26.740 \longrightarrow 00:29:27.540$ you're going on to that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

00:29:27.540 --> 00:29:28.856 There's just a little bit of ********

 $00:29:28.860 \longrightarrow 00:29:30.396$ that we're hearing from the audio.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

 $00:29:30.400 \longrightarrow 00:29:32.242$ I'm wondering if there's anything with

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

00:29:32.242 --> 00:29:34.025 your microphone or something on your

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

00:29:34.025 --> 00:29:35.537 microphone that we could try moving,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

 $00:29:35.540 \longrightarrow 00:29:37.756$ and it's not. It's not too too bad,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

 $00:29:37.760 \longrightarrow 00:29:39.804$ it's just a little bit of ********.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802217362857143

00:29:40.320 --> 00:29:42.432 OK, I can probably switch my

NOTE Confidence: 0.802217362857143

 $00:29:42.432 \longrightarrow 00:29:43.708$ microphone. This may switch.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7869168025

 $00{:}29{:}46.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}47.400$ This may switch the image

NOTE Confidence: 0.7869168025

 $00:29:47.400 \longrightarrow 00:29:49.088$ for a SEK, so bear with me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809811013333333

00:29:50.120 --> 00:29:51.380 Sorry to interrupt you. I just

NOTE Confidence: 0.859348397777778

 $00:29:51.410 \longrightarrow 00:29:53.732$ Oh no, no problem. It's better

NOTE Confidence: 0.859348397777778

 $00:29:53.732 \longrightarrow 00:29:55.928$ to to actually be able to hear

NOTE Confidence: 0.770058035714286

 $00:29:56.120 \longrightarrow 00:29:58.282$ we can. We can hear you fine. It's just

NOTE Confidence: 0.770058035714286

 $00:29:58.282 \longrightarrow 00:30:00.090$ a little bit of of of of ********.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822665881666667

 $00:30:00.580 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.302$ OK yeah I'm going to switch

 $00:30:02.302 \longrightarrow 00:30:04.330$ mikes in just a second once.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91811237875

 $00{:}30{:}05.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}07.154$ Just as you did your shadow to Amanda,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91811237875

 $00{:}30{:}07.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}08.220$ I thought that was a knife, nice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8292339

00:30:09.740 --> 00:30:12.350 Correct, OK? Are you seeing a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8292339

 $00:30:12.350 \longrightarrow 00:30:15.370$ presenter view now or are you seeing

NOTE Confidence: 0.607020261666667

00:30:15.880 --> 00:30:17.620 no? We're seeing a blank screen?

NOTE Confidence: 0.607020261666667

00:30:17.620 --> 00:30:20.007 Well, just seeing a square of white

NOTE Confidence: 0.827297339090909

 $00:30:20.520 \longrightarrow 00:30:22.235$ square of white, that's not

NOTE Confidence: 0.827297339090909

00:30:22.235 --> 00:30:24.740 what I want to show you, OK?

NOTE Confidence: 0.727680142857143

 $00:30:26.420 \longrightarrow 00:30:27.420$ Yeah, the baboon pictures

NOTE Confidence: 0.727680142857143

 $00:30:27.420 \longrightarrow 00:30:28.770$ are far more preferable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.939946548888889

 $00:30:30.140 \longrightarrow 00:30:31.607$ Let me let me try and work on that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608122807142857

 $00{:}30{:}31.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}33.249$ I can probably go. We've got him.

NOTE Confidence: 0.608122807142857

 $00:30:33.250 \longrightarrow 00:30:37.820$ Now we can see your slides, but just OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438150775

 $00:30:37.820 \longrightarrow 00:30:40.956$ And then let me go back to zoom.

 $00:30:40.960 \longrightarrow 00:30:42.864$ I'm gonna stop share for just a second.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438150775

 $00{:}30{:}42.870 --> 00{:}30{:}44.670$ I just fix this problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438150775

 $00:30:44.670 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.070$ Sorry about that Dani.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438150775

 $00:30:46.070 \longrightarrow 00:30:47.070$ No no, no that's OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438150775

 $00:30:47.070 \longrightarrow 00:30:48.070$ Thank you for telling me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40966004 00:30:50.950 --> 00:30:51.210 OK. NOTE Confidence: 0.90149472625

00:30:55.130 --> 00:30:56.970 OK, I've just switched.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90149472625

 $00:30:56.970 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.810$ Microphones is that better?

NOTE Confidence: 0.787057286

 $00:30:59.220 \longrightarrow 00:31:00.370$ We don't hear any ********

NOTE Confidence: 0.787057286

 $00:31:00.370 \longrightarrow 00:31:01.010$ at the moment then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6000819475

 $00{:}31{:}01.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}03.398$ OK, great and then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68643683

 $00{:}31{:}05.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}09.030$ Go back to the screen share, oops.

NOTE Confidence: 0.948924313333333

00:31:18.020 --> 00:31:20.108 OK, are you seeing my slides?

NOTE Confidence: 0.623313266666667

 $00:31:20.280 \longrightarrow 00:31:23.238$ We can see your Internet actually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.623313266666667

 $00:31:23.240 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.626$ Yeah now we can see your slides

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:25.500 \longrightarrow 00:31:27.229$ and it looks like the way it's

 $00:31:27.229 \longrightarrow 00:31:29.000$ supposed to and not not presented.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:29.000 \longrightarrow 00:31:30.020$ It looks great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:31:30.020 --> 00:31:32.738 OK perfect, thanks so much no problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:32.738 \longrightarrow 00:31:35.873$ So I think the evidence that we have is

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:35.873 \longrightarrow 00:31:38.459$ against the idea of adaptive programming,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:38.460 \longrightarrow 00:31:41.624$ but much more easily explained

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:31:41.624 --> 00:31:42.920 by contingently experience,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}31{:}42.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}45.130$ developmental constraints in other words.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:45.130 \longrightarrow 00:31:47.236$ Females who are born in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}31{:}47.236 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}48.289$ disadvantageous environment do

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:31:48.289 --> 00:31:50.394 worse even in that same type of dis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}31{:}50.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}52.184$ and fit advantageous environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:52.184 \longrightarrow 00:31:53.968$ when they grow up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:53.970 \longrightarrow 00:31:56.394$ We actually don't see those effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:56.394 \longrightarrow 00:31:58.859$ in moderate years and for females

00:31:58.859 --> 00:32:01.193 who were born in moderate years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:01.200 \dashrightarrow 00:32:03.993$ The effect is is much attenuated relative

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:03.993 \longrightarrow 00:32:08.662$ to females who were born in in dry years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81611120384615400:32:08.662 --> 00:32:09.350 Additionally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:09.350 \longrightarrow 00:32:11.060$ there are other sources of relative

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:11.060 \longrightarrow 00:32:12.466$ advantage in diversity that can

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:12.466 \longrightarrow 00:32:13.744$ have the same kind of effect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:13.750 \longrightarrow 00:32:16.930$ including being born to a relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}32{:}16.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}19.590$ socially privileged family.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:19.590 \longrightarrow 00:32:22.134$ OK, and I'll just note that this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:22.134 \longrightarrow 00:32:24.360$ fairly consistent with the pattern that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:32:24.360 --> 00:32:26.790 think is emerging from long lived species,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:26.790 \longrightarrow 00:32:28.974$ including humans that because

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:28.974 \longrightarrow 00:32:31.704$ of our very long lives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:32:31.710 --> 00:32:34.244 setting a strong, making a strong bet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}32{:}34.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}36.320$ making a strong prediction from

 $00:32:36.320 \longrightarrow 00:32:38.390$ an experience in in utero,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:38.390 \longrightarrow 00:32:41.449$ or in the first years of life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:32:41.450 --> 00:32:44.594 is probably not wise for animals that live,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:44.600 \longrightarrow 00:32:45.710$ you know, decades,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:45.710 \longrightarrow 00:32:47.930$ whereas it may be very wise

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:47.930 \longrightarrow 00:32:49.723$ for a water free or.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:49.723 \longrightarrow 00:32:51.988$ Or for a tobacco hornworms?

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:51.990 \longrightarrow 00:32:52.499$ OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:32:52.499 --> 00:32:56.571 So finally I think one of the biggest

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}32{:}56.571 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}58.835$ puzzles that is of shared interest

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:58.835 \longrightarrow 00:33:00.665$ to people interested in early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:00.665 --> 00:33:02.324 effects is of course this very

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}33{:}02.324 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}04.247$ general question of how where we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:04.247 \longrightarrow 00:33:05.957$ be talking about multiple types of

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:05.957 \longrightarrow 00:33:07.835$ different types of mechanisms from

 $00:33:07.835 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.575$ social and behavioral mechanisms

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:09.575 --> 00:33:11.595 to biological mechanisms that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}33{:}11.595 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}13.551$ adjusted based on the early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:13.551 --> 00:33:15.486 environment and one of the puzzling

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:15.486 --> 00:33:17.555 things about relating early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:17.555 --> 00:33:19.495 adversity to phenotypic outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:19.495 --> 00:33:22.491 later in life is that they don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:22.491 --> 00:33:24.425 affect you know single types of

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:24.425 \longrightarrow 00:33:25.990$ outcomes with very clear ideology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:25.990 \longrightarrow 00:33:28.503$ But rather tend to have very general

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:28.503 \longrightarrow 00:33:31.064$ effects on a lot of different

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:31.064 \longrightarrow 00:33:33.878$ outcomes that have lots of different

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:33.878 \longrightarrow 00:33:35.230$ underlying mechanisms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:35.230 \longrightarrow 00:33:37.967$ So I think a common and influential

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:37.967 \longrightarrow 00:33:41.721$ idea about how this works is through a

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:41.721 \longrightarrow 00:33:44.221$ general process of biological embedding.

 $00:33:44.230 \longrightarrow 00:33:46.474$ And here I'm using the criteria

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:46.474 \longrightarrow 00:33:47.596$ defined by herzman,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:47.600 \longrightarrow 00:33:50.666$ where the environment somehow you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:50.670 --> 00:33:52.565 influences what's going on under

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}33{:}52.565 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}55.114$ the skin is at the physiological

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:55.114 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.969$ and molecular level to influence

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:57.970 \longrightarrow 00:34:00.462$ biological and developmental processes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:00.462 \longrightarrow 00:34:02.954$ meaning that systematic differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:02.954 \longrightarrow 00:34:05.389$ in experience like being born.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}05.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}07.538$ Two in a low resource environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}07.538 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}09.526$ and an environment that produces

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}09.526 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}11.486$ material deprivation or social

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}11.486 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}13.936$ deprivation can lead to systematically

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}14.003 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}15.719$ different types of biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:15.719 \longrightarrow 00:34:18.812$ states that remain stable overtime.

00:34:18.812 --> 00:34:21.524 And crucially, to actually mediate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:21.524 \longrightarrow 00:34:25.169$ you know this sort of bubble on the left.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:25.170 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.730$ At the relationship with bubble on

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:26.730 \longrightarrow 00:34:28.848$ the left and the bubble on the right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:28.850 \longrightarrow 00:34:29.676$ these differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:29.676 \longrightarrow 00:34:31.741$ whatever changes at that molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:31.741 \longrightarrow 00:34:32.980$ and physiological level,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:32.980 \longrightarrow 00:34:35.638$ must have the capacity to influence

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:35.638 \longrightarrow 00:34:38.370$ trait variation over the life course.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:38.370 \longrightarrow 00:34:43.458$ For those interested in social epigenetics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}43.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}45.724$ much of this much of the attention to

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:45.724 \longrightarrow 00:34:47.569$ a potential mechanism has therefore

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:34:47.569 --> 00:34:49.916 focused on the epigenome, and for both,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:34:49.916 --> 00:34:51.126 I think reasons of measurement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:34:51.130 \longrightarrow 00:34:55.316$ and because DNA methylation is a relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:34:55.316 \longrightarrow 00:34:58.750$ stable epigenetic mark to the epigenetic

00:34:58.750 --> 00:35:00.850 marker of DNA methylation, in particular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:00.850 \longrightarrow 00:35:04.846$ that is the addition or removal of a methyl

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:35:04.846 --> 00:35:07.674 group to invertebrates, typically cytisine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:07.674 \longrightarrow 00:35:09.162$ Nucleotides where they're followed

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:09.162 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.070$ by Queens in the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:11.070 \longrightarrow 00:35:13.894$ So there are potentially about 20 million or

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:13.894 \longrightarrow 00:35:18.110$ so of these CPG sites in in a human genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:18.110 \longrightarrow 00:35:20.182$ So this is thought to be a plausible

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}20.182 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}22.255$ mechanism in part because DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:22.255 \longrightarrow 00:35:24.505$ is known to be environmentally responsive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:35:24.510 --> 00:35:26.708 It's part of the gene regulatory machinery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:35:26.710 --> 00:35:28.929 and our genome must be able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}28.929 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}31.011$ flexibly respond to its immediate

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:35:31.011 --> 00:35:32.610 environment throughout life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:35:32.610 --> 00:35:35.031 In fact, this is happening even as we speak

 $00:35:35.031 \longrightarrow 00:35:37.735$ as a consequence of what we might have

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:37.735 \longrightarrow 00:35:39.868$ eaten before circadian rhythms and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:39.870 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.705$ Depending on where in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:35:41.705 --> 00:35:43.173 genome you're talking about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:43.180 \longrightarrow 00:35:46.060$ Again, DNA methylation has relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:35:46.060 --> 00:35:48.940 remarkable fidelity across cell division,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:48.940 \longrightarrow 00:35:51.856$ and so has the potential to

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}51.856 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}54.377$ remain stable over time even from

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}54.377 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}57.257$ early life into into later years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:35:57.260 --> 00:35:59.381 Evidence that this may in fact be

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}59.381 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}01.212$ a plausible pathway comes from

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:01.212 \longrightarrow 00:36:02.928$ correlative studies that link

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:02.928 \longrightarrow 00:36:04.644$ early life environmental exposures

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:04.709 \longrightarrow 00:36:06.822$ with epigenetic change in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:36:06.822 --> 00:36:08.100 But of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:08.100 \longrightarrow 00:36:10.030$ suffer from the potential confounding

 $00:36:10.030 \longrightarrow 00:36:11.960$ of early environments that affect

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:12.020 \longrightarrow 00:36:14.030$ adult environments that are actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:14.030 \longrightarrow 00:36:16.040$ immediately responsible for the types

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:16.103 \longrightarrow 00:36:18.287$ of epigenetic patterns that have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:18.287 \longrightarrow 00:36:21.820$ documented in many population studies so far.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923 00:36:21.820 --> 00:36:22.151 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:36:22.151 --> 00:36:24.137 I think of a potentially bigger

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}36{:}24.137 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}26.384$ problem is that although we know

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:26.384 \longrightarrow 00:36:28.364$ that DNA methylation can influence

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:28.364 \longrightarrow 00:36:30.198$ gene regulation and therefore change

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:30.198 \longrightarrow 00:36:32.473$ the Nixon expression in a way that

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:36:32.480 --> 00:36:34.560 it could be phenotypically relevant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}36{:}34.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}36.700$ it doesn't always do so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:36.700 \longrightarrow 00:36:39.100$ And we know this from experimental studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:39.100 \longrightarrow 00:36:41.896$ for example that if used epigenomic

00:36:41.896 --> 00:36:43.760 editing technologies to specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:36:43.826 --> 00:36:46.610 change DNA methylation at individual sites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:46.610 \longrightarrow 00:36:50.331$ so these are four data from another lab

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:36:50.331 --> 00:36:53.013 that focused on changing DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:53.020 \longrightarrow 00:36:54.570$ and a very specific manner.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:54.570 \longrightarrow 00:36:58.202$ By 4 CPG sites at 1 gene in

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:58.202 \longrightarrow 00:37:00.210$ the genome and looked at it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:37:00.210 --> 00:37:01.585 Effects on expression and only

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:01.585 \longrightarrow 00:37:03.532$ one of these sites is sensitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:03.532 \longrightarrow 00:37:04.824$ to DNA methylation lawyers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:04.830 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.298$ The other changes are effectively silent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:08.300 \longrightarrow 00:37:10.820$ We don't know whether the the cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:10.820 \longrightarrow 00:37:13.049$ where early environment has even been

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:13.049 \longrightarrow 00:37:14.849$ correlated with DNA methylation later

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:14.849 \longrightarrow 00:37:17.289$ in life are in that class of silent

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:17.290 \longrightarrow 00:37:20.430$ changes or in the class of things that

 $00:37:20.430 \longrightarrow 00:37:21.870$ might have physiological consequences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:21.870 \longrightarrow 00:37:22.926$ which are the things that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:22.926 \longrightarrow 00:37:23.630$ have to care about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:23.630 \longrightarrow 00:37:25.100$ If we believe this is mediating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:25.100 \longrightarrow 00:37:28.537$ Early life effects on health and mortality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:28.540 \longrightarrow 00:37:30.472$ So we have the opportunity to

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:30.472 \longrightarrow 00:37:32.320$ study this in Amboseli as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}37{:}32.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}34.147$ where we can again divorce some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}37{:}34.147 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}35.723$ these early and a dult environmental

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:35.723 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.573$ processes and separate out different

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:37.573 \longrightarrow 00:37:39.419$ types of early life effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:39.420 \longrightarrow 00:37:40.680$ We can do this because,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}37{:}40.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}42.436$ although most of the research we

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:42.436 \longrightarrow 00:37:44.800$ do on the baboons is non invasive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:44.800 \longrightarrow 00:37:46.590$ occasionally we have reason to

 $00:37:46.590 \longrightarrow 00:37:48.380$ want to take biological samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:37:48.380 --> 00:37:50.468 collect morphometric data and so on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:50.470 \longrightarrow 00:37:54.394$ and so we periodically engage in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:54.394 \longrightarrow 00:37:56.518$ brief and estimations darting in order

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:56.518 \longrightarrow 00:37:58.688$ to collect those sorts of samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:58.690 \longrightarrow 00:38:00.972$ So this is our very talented field

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:38:00.972 \dashrightarrow 00:38:02.649$ assistant Kenya Larry Terry here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:38:02.650 --> 00:38:04.228 You probably can barely see it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:04.230 \longrightarrow 00:38:05.958$ but he's holding about a metre

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:38:05.958 --> 00:38:08.022 long metal tube in his right arm

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:08.022 \longrightarrow 00:38:09.714$ and trying to look as innocuous

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:09.714 \longrightarrow 00:38:11.827$ as possible around these baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:11.830 \longrightarrow 00:38:13.886$ We wait for a period in which nobody

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:13.886 \longrightarrow 00:38:15.812$ is looking and then very rapidly

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:15.812 \longrightarrow 00:38:17.168$ deliver an anesthetic containing

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:38:17.168 --> 00:38:19.402 dart at our animals in order to

 $00:38:19.402 \longrightarrow 00:38:20.902$ collect these types of samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:20.910 \longrightarrow 00:38:22.387$ And over time we've been able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:22.387 \longrightarrow 00:38:23.630$ collect hundreds of these samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:23.630 \longrightarrow 00:38:25.772$ including from individuals where we know

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:25.772 \longrightarrow 00:38:28.500$ a lot about both their early life and

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:28.500 \longrightarrow 00:38:31.040$ what's going on with them in adulthood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:31.040 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.309$ We've used a sequencing based method to

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:34.309 \longrightarrow 00:38:36.808$ generate genome scale DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:36.808 \longrightarrow 00:38:38.572$ data for several 100 individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:38:38.572 --> 00:38:40.903 including a number of of whom we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:38:40.903 --> 00:38:42.499 actually had repeated sampling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:42.500 \longrightarrow 00:38:45.338$ overtime and post quality filtering are

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:45.338 \dashrightarrow 00:38:49.358$ able to assess DNA methylation in a dulthood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:49.360 \longrightarrow 00:38:50.533$ In this period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:50.533 \longrightarrow 00:38:52.488$ in blue for these baboons,

 $00:38:52.490 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.975$ this is years of life for about

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:54.975 \longrightarrow 00:38:57.657$ half a million sites in the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:57.660 \longrightarrow 00:38:59.535$ We asked how individual sources

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:59.535 \longrightarrow 00:39:01.963$ of early adversity as well as

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:39:01.963 --> 00:39:03.418 cumulative early adversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:03.420 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.510$ that sort of Aces score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:04.510 \longrightarrow 00:39:06.595$ I talked to you about earlier adding

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}39{:}06.595 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}08.720$ up these individual exposures in

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:08.720 \longrightarrow 00:39:12.193$ the first few years of life or at

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:39:12.193 --> 00:39:13.893 birth influenced DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}39{:}13.893 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}16.039$ collected in this blue period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:16.040 \longrightarrow 00:39:17.948$ We also paid attention to whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:17.948 \longrightarrow 00:39:20.500$ animals were born in a relatively high

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:20.500 \longrightarrow 00:39:22.530$ habitat quality environment versus a

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:22.530 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.059$ relatively low habitat quality environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:25.060 \longrightarrow 00:39:26.922$ We had again a sort of natural

 $00:39:26.922 \longrightarrow 00:39:28.390$ experiment in our population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:28.390 \longrightarrow 00:39:30.298$ Where our animals made a fairly

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:39:30.298 --> 00:39:32.334 dramatic shift as the quality of

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:32.334 \longrightarrow 00:39:34.074$ their initial habitat declined to

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:34.074 \longrightarrow 00:39:36.329$ a much higher quality environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:36.330 \longrightarrow 00:39:39.960$ outside the original area of study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333 00:39:39.960 --> 00:39:40.386 Finally, NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:40.386 \longrightarrow 00:39:42.942$ we included a measure of their

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}39{:}42.942 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}44.661$ adult social circumstance based

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:44.661 \longrightarrow 00:39:46.863$ on dominance rank or the position

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:46.863 \longrightarrow 00:39:49.129$ in the hierarchy for both females

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}39{:}49.129 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}51.313$ and males based on prior evidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}39{:}51.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}55.928$ from my student Jordan's work that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:39:55.930 --> 00:39:57.976 That dominance rank is a major

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:57.976 \longrightarrow 00:39:59.807$ predictor of differences in gene

00:39:59.807 --> 00:40:01.407 expression in our population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:01.410 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.999$ So all of this work was really

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:02.999 \longrightarrow 00:40:05.281$ led by Jordan and we're in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:40:05.281 --> 00:40:07.050 process of putting it together now

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:07.050 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.108$ again to just skip to the results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:09.110 \longrightarrow 00:40:11.408$ What we find is that early

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:40:11.408 --> 00:40:12.940 life effects do persist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:12.940 \longrightarrow 00:40:15.230$ Do leave a signature in

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:40:15.230 --> 00:40:16.604 DNA methylation profiles,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:16.610 \longrightarrow 00:40:18.824$ but that this is really most

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}40{:}18.824 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}20.300$ apparent for those individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:20.372 \longrightarrow 00:40:22.214$ born in that low quality habitat

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:22.214 \longrightarrow 00:40:24.509$ and not the high quality habitat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:24.510 \longrightarrow 00:40:26.406$ So what I'm showing you here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:26.410 \longrightarrow 00:40:29.522$ On the X axis are the effect sizes

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:29.522 \longrightarrow 00:40:32.627$ of cumulative early adversity on DNA

 $00:40:32.627 \longrightarrow 00:40:34.867$ methylation levels multi measured

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:34.867 \longrightarrow 00:40:37.302$ in adulthood for about 470,000.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:37.302 \longrightarrow 00:40:39.310$ Sites in the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:40:39.310 --> 00:40:41.039 They're quite close to 0 for animals

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:40:41.039 --> 00:40:43.238 born in a resource rich environment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:43.240 \longrightarrow 00:40:45.025$ but they move quite further

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:45.025 \longrightarrow 00:40:46.810$ away from zero on average.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:46.810 \longrightarrow 00:40:49.180$ For those born in low quality

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:49.180 \longrightarrow 00:40:51.715$ habitats and we can see a

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:40:51.715 --> 00:40:53.850 very similar type of quality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:53.850 \longrightarrow 00:40:56.450$ For each of the individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:56.450 \longrightarrow 00:40:59.050$ sources of building per city.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}40{:}59.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}01.860$ Investigated separately.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:41:01.860 \longrightarrow 00:41:04.875$ So this is what it looks like genome wide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:41:04.880 \longrightarrow 00:41:07.028$ These are the effect sizes in

 $00:41:07.028 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.460$ the high quality environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:41:08.460 \longrightarrow 00:41:10.140$ Individuals born in high quality environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:41:10.140 \longrightarrow 00:41:11.710$ These are effect sizes for

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:41:11.710 \longrightarrow 00:41:13.280$ for individuals born in low

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:41:13.340 --> 00:41:14.760 quality environment for exactly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:14.760 \longrightarrow 00:41:16.890$ the same sites in the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:41:16.890 --> 00:41:19.837 And again, you can see that replicated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:41:19.837 --> 00:41:21.602 in individual at individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:21.602 \longrightarrow 00:41:23.446$ sites for individual exposures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:41:23.450 --> 00:41:24.944 Basically, individuals who

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:24.944 \longrightarrow 00:41:27.434$ are born during a drought.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:27.440 \longrightarrow 00:41:29.096$ You can see a market effect of drought

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:29.096 \longrightarrow 00:41:30.959$ if they were born in that low quality

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}41{:}30.959 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}32.928$ habit at that's in that sort of pinkish color.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:41:32.930 --> 00:41:34.988 But a much more attenuated effect for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:34.988 \longrightarrow 00:41:37.200$ those born in high quality habitats.

 $00:41:37.200 \longrightarrow 00:41:39.727$ So it looks like we're looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:39.727 \longrightarrow 00:41:42.099$ compounding effects of resource limitation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:42.100 \longrightarrow 00:41:44.896$ that the whole population is exposed

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:44.896 \longrightarrow 00:41:47.770$ to and individual level exposure to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:47.770 \longrightarrow 00:41:50.029$ Early life adversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:50.030 \longrightarrow 00:41:51.398$ So to give you a sense of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:41:51.398 --> 00:41:52.388 relative magnitude of these effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:52.390 \longrightarrow 00:41:53.862$ these are significantly associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:53.862 \longrightarrow 00:41:56.070$ CP G sites in the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}41{:}56.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}58.718$ Simply, the number of them of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:58.718 \longrightarrow 00:42:00.670$ that we tested based on each of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:00.732 \longrightarrow 00:42:02.772$ predictor variables and the major effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}42{:}02.772 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}04.990$ other than large scale effects of age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}42{:}04.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}07.234$ which are expected based on our

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:07.234 \longrightarrow 00:42:09.110$ and other people's previous work,

 $00:42:09.110 \longrightarrow 00:42:10.740$ are those habitat quality effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}42{:}10.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}12.510$ The difference between being born

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:12.510 \longrightarrow 00:42:14.610$ in an environment looks like this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:14.610 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.256$ or exactly the same place in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:17.256 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.939$ ecosystem that's been denuded of the major.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:19.940 \longrightarrow 00:42:21.780$ Dietary resources for baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:21.780 \longrightarrow 00:42:24.080$ The individual sources of early

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:24.080 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.890$ adversity that matter are are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}42{:}25.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}28.174$ particularly those also associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:28.174 \longrightarrow 00:42:29.887$ with resource deprivation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}42{:}29.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}30.215 \ \mathrm{Drought},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:30.215 \longrightarrow 00:42:32.490$ loss of a mother early in life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:32.490 \longrightarrow 00:42:35.680$ and high levels of resource competition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:35.680 \longrightarrow 00:42:38.760$ If the group is is, is dense.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:42:38.760 --> 00:42:40.657 This by itself doesn't answer the question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:40.660 \longrightarrow 00:42:42.802$ though about whether those types of

 $00:42:42.802 \longrightarrow 00:42:44.750$ epigenetic changes are effectively silenced.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:42:44.750 --> 00:42:46.094 Maybe they're simply passive

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:42:46.094 --> 00:42:47.774 biomarkers or early life exposure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:47.780 \longrightarrow 00:42:51.372$ or whether they have any potential to mediate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:51.372 \longrightarrow 00:42:53.957$ downstream effects on health and survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:53.960 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.820$ Part of that question can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:42:55.820 --> 00:42:57.060 answered at least circumstantially,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:57.060 \longrightarrow 00:42:58.698$ by asking where in the genome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:58.700 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.572$ differentially expressed early

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:00.572 \longrightarrow 00:43:02.444$ adversity associated differentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:02.444 \longrightarrow 00:43:04.940$ methylated sorry sites fall.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:04.940 \longrightarrow 00:43:07.264$ The genome is a diverse place in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}43{:}07.264 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}09.582$ different parts of your DNA sequence

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:09.582 \longrightarrow 00:43:12.096$ have different roles in gene regulation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:12.100 \longrightarrow 00:43:14.593$ and so a simple question to ask is whether

 $00:43:14.593 \longrightarrow 00:43:16.183$ those differentially methylated sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:16.183 \longrightarrow 00:43:18.679$ tend to fall in regulatory elements

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}43{:}18.679 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}20.780$ like gene promoters or enhancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:20.780 \longrightarrow 00:43:23.167$ These elements that tend to loop around

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:23.167 \longrightarrow 00:43:24.929$ physically interact with the promoters

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:43:24.929 --> 00:43:26.969 of genes to modulate gene expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}43{:}26.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}29.906$ Or whether they fall in kind of deserts

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:29.906 \longrightarrow 00:43:32.330$ of genes or regulatory elements

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:32.330 \longrightarrow 00:43:35.292$ unannotated regions of the genome and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:43:35.292 --> 00:43:37.548 what we've revealed what we found we think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:37.550 \longrightarrow 00:43:40.678$ is a fairly bimodal pattern,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:40.678 \longrightarrow 00:43:43.282$ where if you look at age

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:43.282 \longrightarrow 00:43:44.620$ differentially expressed sorry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:44.620 \longrightarrow 00:43:45.898$ differentially methylated sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:45.898 \longrightarrow 00:43:46.750$ For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:46.750 \longrightarrow 00:43:48.535$ we find that they are enriched in

 $00{:}43{:}48.535 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}49.913$ this pinkish color in Unannotated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:49.913 \longrightarrow 00:43:51.025$ region of the unit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:51.030 \longrightarrow 00:43:51.948$ We find a lot of them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:51.950 \longrightarrow 00:43:53.763$ but they don't tend to fall in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:43:53.763 --> 00:43:55.435 places where we believe they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:55.435 \longrightarrow 00:43:57.525$ likely to influence gene regulation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:43:57.530 --> 00:43:59.595 Habitat quality is fairly neutrally

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:59.595 \longrightarrow 00:44:01.247$ spread across the genome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:44:01.250 \longrightarrow 00:44:03.161$ with a little bit of tendency towards

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}44{:}03.161 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}04.981$ more enrichment in these sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}44{:}04.981 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}06.249$ functionally important regions of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:44:06.249 \longrightarrow 00:44:08.030$ the genome versus the unannotated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:44:08.030 \longrightarrow 00:44:09.490$ but it's not very striking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:44:09.490 \longrightarrow 00:44:11.555$ whereas we if we look at drought

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:44:11.555 \longrightarrow 00:44:13.455$ effects or the effects of a social

00:44:13.455 --> 00:44:15.105 environment at the time of sampling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:15.110 \longrightarrow 00:44:17.371$ like male rank, we see a pattern

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:17.371 \longrightarrow 00:44:20.494$ that is opposite to that of age where

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}44{:}20.494 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}21.742$ those differentially methylated

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:21.742 \longrightarrow 00:44:24.030$ sites tend to fall non randomly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:44:24.030 --> 00:44:26.170 In enhancers and gene bodies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:26.170 \longrightarrow 00:44:27.640$ that is, regions of the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:27.640 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.356$ That we believe may be important

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:44:29.356 --> 00:44:31.260 to the Physiology of the Organism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:31.260 \longrightarrow 00:44:33.990$ and then they tend to be depleted

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:33.990 \longrightarrow 00:44:35.820$ in those unannotated regions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:35.820 \longrightarrow 00:44:38.250$ Another way to look at this is to use

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:38.250 \longrightarrow 00:44:40.498$ the chromatin states annotated by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:40.498 \longrightarrow 00:44:43.200$ road map of the Genomics Consortium.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:43.200 \longrightarrow 00:44:44.976$ This was done for humans that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:44.976 \longrightarrow 00:44:46.817$ pull over these annotation to baboons.

 $00:44:46.820 \longrightarrow 00:44:48.857$ They recognize a number of different sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}44{:}48.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}50.792$ You can just think about painting

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:50.792 \longrightarrow 00:44:52.427$ the genome different colors depending

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:52.427 \longrightarrow 00:44:54.149$ on what part of that genome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:54.150 \longrightarrow 00:44:55.218$ what that part of the genome

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:55.218 \longrightarrow 00:44:56.220$ is likely to be doing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:56.220 \longrightarrow 00:44:57.780$ which is defined in turn by

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:57.780 \longrightarrow 00:44:59.160$ different types of histone marks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:59.160 \longrightarrow 00:45:02.442$ As well as the DNA configuration

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:02.442 \longrightarrow 00:45:03.536$ DNA methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:03.540 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.812$ Where the ones on the top of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:45:05.812 --> 00:45:08.137 list tend to be linked with active

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}45{:}08.137 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}10.476$ regulation and the ones on the bottom

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:10.476 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.070$ of the list tend to be associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:13.070 \longrightarrow 00:45:14.790$ with repression or silencing.

 $00:45:14.790 \longrightarrow 00:45:15.540$ If we look at age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:45:15.540 --> 00:45:18.290 associated State state sites again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:45:18.290 --> 00:45:20.996 we see under enrichment or depletion

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:20.996 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.270$ in those actively regulated regions

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:23.270 \longrightarrow 00:45:26.078$ of the genome and enrichment in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:26.078 \longrightarrow 00:45:29.214$ repressed or quiescent parts of the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:29.220 \longrightarrow 00:45:31.662$ If we look at socio ecologically

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:31.662 \longrightarrow 00:45:33.704$ associated sites, on the other hand,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}45{:}33.704 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}35.540$ here are things like habitat quality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:35.540 \longrightarrow 00:45:38.420$ drought, or male social status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:38.420 \longrightarrow 00:45:40.124$ We see the opposite effect on

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:40.124 \longrightarrow 00:45:41.260$ this left hand side.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:41.260 \longrightarrow 00:45:43.150$ There's enrichment in regions of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:43.150 \longrightarrow 00:45:45.078$ genome that are associated with active

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:45.078 \longrightarrow 00:45:46.908$ regulation in blood cells as opposed

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:46.908 \longrightarrow 00:45:49.076$ to depletion in those age associated sites.

 $00:45:49.080 \longrightarrow 00:45:52.306$ We see the same kind of pattern as

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:52.306 \longrightarrow 00:45:54.904$ age or even more neutral pattern

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:54.904 \longrightarrow 00:45:57.860$ for just technical batch effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:57.860 \longrightarrow 00:45:59.799$ Now finally I want to say that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:59.800 \longrightarrow 00:46:01.556$ This is. Still circumstantial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:01.556 \longrightarrow 00:46:04.190$ What we're saying is that there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:04.262 \longrightarrow 00:46:06.217$ an association between a which

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:46:06.217 --> 00:46:08.380 is early life exposure and B,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:08.380 \longrightarrow 00:46:10.300$ which is DNA methylation and adulthood,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}46{:}10.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}11.935$ and those associations tend to

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:11.935 \longrightarrow 00:46:13.570$ fall in particular regions of

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:13.627 \longrightarrow 00:46:15.553$ the genome that are probably more

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}46{:}15.553 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}17.500$ interesting than just the background.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:46:17.500 --> 00:46:19.175 They don't provide any direct

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:46:19.175 --> 00:46:20.515 causal evidence is which,

00:46:20.520 --> 00:46:22.360 which is what you really want to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:22.360 \longrightarrow 00:46:24.551$ if you want to argue for epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:24.551 \longrightarrow 00:46:26.226$ mediation that an epigenetic change

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:46:26.280 --> 00:46:28.060 directly influences the phenotype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:28.060 \longrightarrow 00:46:31.204$ or at least gene expression as

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:46:31.204 --> 00:46:32.776 approximate molecular phenotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:32.780 \longrightarrow 00:46:35.740$ So we ended up going after this too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:35.740 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.288$ Inspired by some work done by Alexander

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}46{:}38.288 \operatorname{--}{>} 00{:}46{:}41.158$ Stark Lab in Vienna on using massively

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:46:41.158 --> 00:46:43.720 parallel reporter assays to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}46{:}43.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}46.352$ causal effects of DNA sequence on

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}46{:}46.352 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}48.502$ the capacity for regulatory activity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:48.502 \longrightarrow 00:46:51.154$ There assay is called star seep

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:46:51.154 --> 00:46:53.863 and it basically works by randomly

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:53.863 \longrightarrow 00:46:56.467$ shearing or amplifying lots and lots

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:56.467 \longrightarrow 00:46:59.776$ of fragments of the genome and cloning

 $00:46:59.776 \longrightarrow 00:47:02.270$ them into little episomal plasmids like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:47:02.270 \longrightarrow 00:47:04.790$ This in a structure so that if the

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:47:04.858 \longrightarrow 00:47:07.378$ piece you cloned in this little olive

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:47:07.378 --> 00:47:09.875 piece actually has the potential to

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:47:09.875 \longrightarrow 00:47:11.675$ drive differential gene regulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:47:11.675 \longrightarrow 00:47:14.026$ when you transfect this little circle

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:47:14.026 --> 00:47:16.350 DNA into your cell type of interest,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:47:16.350 \longrightarrow 00:47:18.975$ then it will cause its own its

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:47:18.975 \longrightarrow 00:47:20.100$ own sequence to

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:20.186 \longrightarrow 00:47:21.815$ be transcribed. Basically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:47:21.815 --> 00:47:23.840 this green sequence loops around,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:23.840 \longrightarrow 00:47:25.172$ interacts with the promoter,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}47{:}25.172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}27.531$ and drives its own expression in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:47:27.531 --> 00:47:29.666 way that we can track using high

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:47:29.666 --> 00:47:30.940 throughput sequencing technology.

 $00:47:30.940 \longrightarrow 00:47:32.870$ So regions where you end up with a lot of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}47{:}32.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}34.970$ Seeds when you sequence libraries

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:34.970 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.579$ from this type of assay point

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:37.579 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.147$ to regions of the genome that

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:47:40.147 --> 00:47:42.170 have active regulatory capacity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:42.170 \longrightarrow 00:47:44.546$ So we thought, well, this is really cool.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:44.550 \longrightarrow 00:47:46.503$ Can we modify this to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:46.503 \longrightarrow 00:47:48.259$ changes in DNA methylation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:48.259 \longrightarrow 00:47:50.389$ how those changes in isolation?

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:47:50.390 --> 00:47:52.695 Just changing DNA methylation influences

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}47{:}52.695 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}55.830$ or fails to influence gene expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:55.830 \longrightarrow 00:47:59.401$ So we ended up tweaking the assay

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:59.401 \longrightarrow 00:48:02.263$ and and producing a separate plasmid

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:02.263 \longrightarrow 00:48:05.365$ PM star seek one which you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:05.365 \longrightarrow 00:48:07.570$ actually order yourself from addgene

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:07.570 \longrightarrow 00:48:09.795$ if you're interested and producing

 $00:48:09.795 \longrightarrow 00:48:12.343$ the same kind of assay idea, but.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}48{:}12.343 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}14.821$ But leaving sites targets of DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:14.821 \longrightarrow 00:48:16.701$ methylation vertebrates only in those

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:16.701 \longrightarrow 00:48:19.005$ regions that we clone in in olive and

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:19.068 \longrightarrow 00:48:21.320$ either experimentally methylating them

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:21.320 \longrightarrow 00:48:24.135$ or leaving them experimentally methylated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:48:24.140 --> 00:48:25.876 That means we can compare the regulatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}48{:}25.876 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}27.560$ activity of the exact same sequence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:27.560 \longrightarrow 00:48:29.423$ and we can do this for hundreds of thousands

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:29.423 \longrightarrow 00:48:31.088$ of fragments in the genome at once,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:31.090 \longrightarrow 00:48:32.950$ where the only difference between two

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:32.950 \longrightarrow 00:48:35.188$ fragments of the same location is whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}48{:}35.188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}37.078$ those sites are methylated or not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:37.080 \longrightarrow 00:48:38.862$ and the results of that assay

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:38.862 \longrightarrow 00:48:41.201$ for like 1 region of the genome

 $00:48:41.201 \longrightarrow 00:48:42.645$ looks something like this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:42.650 \longrightarrow 00:48:45.770$ This happens to be data from the human

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:48:45.770 --> 00:48:48.664 genome in and around the gene NF Kappa BIA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:48.670 \longrightarrow 00:48:51.154$ where if you see higher levels

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:48:51.154 --> 00:48:53.910 of RNA produced at that region,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:53.910 \longrightarrow 00:48:55.938$ higher levels of expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:55.938 \longrightarrow 00:48:58.473$ relative to the input DNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:48:58.480 --> 00:49:01.036 Then that points to regulatory activity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:01.040 \longrightarrow 00:49:02.816$ and in this case that happens

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:02.816 \longrightarrow 00:49:04.000$ in the methylated condition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:04.000 \longrightarrow 00:49:05.600$ This is an active enhancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:05.600 \longrightarrow 00:49:07.436$ but not when the exact same

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:07.436 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.354$ sequence is methylated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:08.360 \longrightarrow 00:49:10.285$ so this was work that was pioneered.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:49:10.290 --> 00:49:12.768 This protocol was led by Amanda Lea,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:12.770 \longrightarrow 00:49:13.740$ the same person who took,

00:49:13.740 --> 00:49:16.320 but I'm predictive adaptive response stuff,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:16.320 \longrightarrow 00:49:18.860$ and we generated data for

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:49:18.860 --> 00:49:20.936 bedroom specifically in work led

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:20.936 \longrightarrow 00:49:22.696$ by my postdoc Dana Lynn.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:22.700 \longrightarrow 00:49:24.434$ So basically we cross referenced that

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:24.434 \longrightarrow 00:49:26.909$ with all the regions in the genome that

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:26.909 \longrightarrow 00:49:28.489$ we know are differentially methylated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}49{:}28.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}30.470$ An association with early life drought,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667 00:49:30.470 --> 00:49:31.238 for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:31.238 \longrightarrow 00:49:32.390$ or with aging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:32.390 \longrightarrow 00:49:34.868$ and what we find is the following

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:34.868 \longrightarrow 00:49:36.362$ of about 200,000 windows.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}49{:}36.362 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}37.926$ We tested genome wide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:37.930 \longrightarrow 00:49:40.700$ I just want to point out that really only a

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:49:40.773 --> 00:49:43.765 minority of them in a particular cell type

00:49:43.765 --> 00:49:46.068 have regulatory capacity to begin with,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667 00:49:46.070 --> 00:49:46.275 right? NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}49{:}46.275 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}48.530$ Most of CP G sites and most of the genome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:48.530 \longrightarrow 00:49:49.850$ whether they're methylated or not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:49:49.850 --> 00:49:52.020 don't do much of anything,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:52.020 \longrightarrow 00:49:54.564$ but if they are drought associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:54.564 \longrightarrow 00:49:57.649$ sites or male ranked associated sites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:57.650 \longrightarrow 00:49:58.346$ they're significantly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:58.346 \longrightarrow 00:50:01.130$ More likely to fall in one of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:50:01.195 --> 00:50:02.955 active regulatory regions than

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}50{:}02.955 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}05.155$ expected just by background chance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:50:05.160 \longrightarrow 00:50:06.840$ where again if we use age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:50:06.840 \longrightarrow 00:50:08.496$ differentially methylated sites as a control,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:50:08.500 \longrightarrow 00:50:11.804$ you see no such signal of active

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:50:11.804 \longrightarrow 00:50:13.220$ participation in regulation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}50{:}13.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}15.436$ And so now we were able to start

 $00:50:15.436 \longrightarrow 00:50:16.996$ putting together our results like

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}50{:}16.996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}18.892$ this where for a very particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:50:18.892 --> 00:50:20.767 region of the genome that contains

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}50{:}20.767 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}22.262$ specific set of CPG sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:22.270 \longrightarrow 00:50:24.850$ we see. Increases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:50:24.850 --> 00:50:27.700 In RNA relative to DNA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:50:27.700 --> 00:50:29.674 if that region fragment is not methylated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}50{:}29.680 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}50{:}32.260$ so zero methylation means that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:32.260 \longrightarrow 00:50:34.480$ see regulatory activity he there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:34.480 \longrightarrow 00:50:36.862$ whereas if that exact same sequence

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}50{:}36.862 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}39.615$ is methylated then we see complete

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:50:39.615 --> 00:50:41.799 repression of regulatory activity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:41.800 \longrightarrow 00:50:44.089$ so pointing this is a way of

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:44.089 \longrightarrow 00:50:45.070$ identifying methylation dependent

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:45.131 \longrightarrow 00:50:47.136$ regulatory activity across the genome.

 $00:50:47.140 \longrightarrow 00:50:48.710$ This particular example gives us

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}50{:}48.710 \longrightarrow 00{:}50{:}50.659$ causal evidence in an in vitro

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:50:50.659 --> 00:50:52.279 framework that those sites have

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:52.279 \longrightarrow 00:50:54.019$ the capacity to drive differential

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:54.019 \longrightarrow 00:50:55.919$ expression and the particular sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:50:55.919 --> 00:50:58.622 I'm showing you here happen to be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:58.622 \longrightarrow 00:50:59.410$ Forked sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:59.410 \longrightarrow 00:51:00.132$ That's it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}51{:}00.132 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}02.298$ Just upstream of a gene that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:02.298 \longrightarrow 00:51:05.290$ important to T cell receptor activation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:05.290 \longrightarrow 00:51:07.466$ We can then couple that with the observation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:07.470 \longrightarrow 00:51:09.150$ ULL data from the animals themselves

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:09.150 \longrightarrow 00:51:11.237$ in vivo in a completely unmanipulated

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:11.237 \longrightarrow 00:51:13.487$ environment where we see that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:51:13.490 --> 00:51:14.442 for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:14.442 \longrightarrow 00:51:17.298$ male social status is also associated

00:51:17.298 --> 00:51:19.788 with levels of DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:19.790 \longrightarrow 00:51:21.618$ and independently with levels

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:21.618 \longrightarrow 00:51:22.989$ of gene expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:22.990 \longrightarrow 00:51:24.680$ So the correlation is consistent

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:24.680 \longrightarrow 00:51:27.170$ with the causal of the correlation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:27.170 \longrightarrow 00:51:29.790$ Evidence in vivo is consistent

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:29.790 \longrightarrow 00:51:33.050$ with the causal evidence in vitro.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:33.050 \longrightarrow 00:51:34.378$ So to sum up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:34.378 \longrightarrow 00:51:36.038$ we have this hypothesis about

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:36.038 \longrightarrow 00:51:38.520$ this pathway that connects early

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:38.520 \longrightarrow 00:51:40.596$ environment to a dult phenotypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:51:40.600 --> 00:51:42.410 Our data suggests that early

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}51{:}42.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}43.858$ environments also predict DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}51{:}43.858 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}51{:}44.949$ methylation in a dulthood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:44.950 \longrightarrow 00:51:46.450$ In this natural environment,

 $00:51:46.450 \longrightarrow 00:51:47.950$ where there's absolutely no

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:47.950 \longrightarrow 00:51:49.472$ correlation between drought in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:49.472 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.918$ first year of life and rainfall

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:50.918 \longrightarrow 00:51:52.400$ at the time of measurement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:52.400 \longrightarrow 00:51:55.053$ but that those types of patterns are

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:55.053 \longrightarrow 00:51:57.569$ compounded by further resource limitation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:57.570 \longrightarrow 00:51:58.326$ In other words,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:58.326 \longrightarrow 00:51:59.586$ we're really only seeing this

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}51{:}59.586 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}01.126$ when the animals are exposed

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:01.126 \longrightarrow 00:52:02.434$ to fairly severe deprivation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:02.440 \longrightarrow 00:52:05.659$ Material deprivation linked to both

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:52:05.659 --> 00:52:07.570 a low quality environment as a whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:07.623 \longrightarrow 00:52:09.261$ and then further knock on effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:09.261 \longrightarrow 00:52:11.530$ of other types of individual adversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:11.530 \longrightarrow 00:52:13.195$ And that leads to substantial

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:13.195 \longrightarrow 00:52:14.194$ heterogeneity across different

 $00:52:14.194 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.970$ forms of early life experience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:15.970 \longrightarrow 00:52:16.450$ Where,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:52:16.450 --> 00:52:17.410 grossly speaking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:52:17.410 --> 00:52:20.770 I would say our data are consistent

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:20.850 \longrightarrow 00:52:22.950$ with effects of deprivation

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:22.950 \longrightarrow 00:52:25.196$ related early life experiences

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:25.196 \longrightarrow 00:52:28.526$ rather than social threat related.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:52:28.530 --> 00:52:30.570 Early life experience like being

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:30.570 \longrightarrow 00:52:33.230$ born to a low status mother.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:52:33.230 --> 00:52:33.711 Additionally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}52{:}33.711 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}36.116$ our data suggests that DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:36.116 \longrightarrow 00:52:38.040$ methylation associated with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}52{:}38.108 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}\:} > 00{:}52{:}39.924$ social or ecological environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:39.924 \longrightarrow 00:52:42.648$ and including sources of early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:52:42.719 --> 00:52:45.485 adversity are more likely to be

 $00:52:45.485 \longrightarrow 00:52:47.329$ functionally relevant than background

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:47.330 \longrightarrow 00:52:48.840$ sites identified in the genome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:48.840 \longrightarrow 00:52:50.340$ including those that we can detect

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:50.340 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.193$ in the exact same data set in

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:52.193 \longrightarrow 00:52:54.022$ association with age, for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:52:54.022 --> 00:52:55.922 So that's promising, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835 00:52:55.922 --> 00:52:56.274 It? NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:56.274 \longrightarrow 00:52:58.738$ It speaks to the potential for this

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}52{:}58.738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}00.729$ mediating pathway to really matter,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}53{:}00.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}02.550$ but I think that our results also

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}53{:}02.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}04.350$ suggest that care is still warranted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:53:04.350 --> 00:53:06.050 Warranted we see this enrichment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}53{:}06.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}07.850$ but there's lots of individual sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}53{:}07.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}09.969$ that are early life associated that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:09.970 \longrightarrow 00:53:11.867$ as far as we can tell from

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:11.867 \longrightarrow 00:53:13.110$ the data available to us,

00:53:13.110 --> 00:53:14.618 don't particularly do anything,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:53:14.618 --> 00:53:17.470 and if they don't particularly do anything,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:17.470 \longrightarrow 00:53:19.690$ then they are very unlikely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:53:19.690 --> 00:53:22.452 rely on a causal pathway between

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:22.452 \longrightarrow 00:53:24.692$ early life environment and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:24.692 \longrightarrow 00:53:25.576$ for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:53:25.576 --> 00:53:27.344 compromised health or earlier

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:27.344 \longrightarrow 00:53:28.670$ mortality in adulthood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:28.670 \longrightarrow 00:53:30.734$ And I think that the lesson for us

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}53{:}30.734 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}32.628$ is that those correlations that

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:32.628 \longrightarrow 00:53:34.818$ we observe in population studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:34.820 \longrightarrow 00:53:37.046$ So far are really the first step

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:37.046 \longrightarrow 00:53:38.000$ and the second

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:53:38.076 --> 00:53:40.206 step that we should increasingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:53:40.206 \longrightarrow 00:53:43.012$ think about embedding into studies of

 $00:53:43.012 \longrightarrow 00:53:44.964$ environmental or social epigenetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:53:44.964 \longrightarrow 00:53:47.168$ in general are causal tests,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:53:47.170 \longrightarrow 00:53:49.840$ especially experimental tests where possible

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:53:49.840 \longrightarrow 00:53:53.060$ of whether those differences even matter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:53:53.060 \longrightarrow 00:53:56.219$ So in some we see effects of early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:53:56.219 \longrightarrow 00:53:58.564$ environment on later life phenotype that

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:53:58.564 \longrightarrow 00:54:00.994$ are in many ways strikingly parallel

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:00.994 \longrightarrow 00:54:03.586$ to what's been described in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:03.590 \longrightarrow 00:54:04.948$ And in fact some of the measurement

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:04.948 \longrightarrow 00:54:05.939$ constructs that we've been using.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:05.940 \longrightarrow 00:54:07.805$ The baboons are directly borrowed

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:07.805 \longrightarrow 00:54:09.670$ from the literature in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:09.670 \longrightarrow 00:54:12.664$ These suggest that early life effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:54:12.664 --> 00:54:16.379 on later life health are not something

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:54:16.379 --> 00:54:19.631 that humans invented and not purely

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:19.631 \longrightarrow 00:54:22.486$ explained by the types of highly developed.

 $00:54:22.486 \longrightarrow 00:54:24.338$ Urban environments that many

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:24.338 \longrightarrow 00:54:26.740$ of us live in today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:54:26.740 --> 00:54:30.674 Rather, they're part of the fabric of

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:30.680 \longrightarrow 00:54:33.480$ the societies of primates and other long

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:33.480 \longrightarrow 00:54:35.976$ lived social mammals that have probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:35.976 \longrightarrow 00:54:38.825$ predated our species for millions of years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:54:38.830 --> 00:54:40.162 However, because these species,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}54{:}40.162 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}42.730$ like the baboons live in a relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:42.730 \longrightarrow 00:54:45.270$ simplified environment compared to humans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:54:45.270 --> 00:54:46.805 studying them gives an ability

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:46.805 \longrightarrow 00:54:48.776$ to ask questions about the types

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:48.776 \longrightarrow 00:54:49.907$ of early environments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}54{:}49.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}51.920$ the way they split between

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:54:51.920 --> 00:54:53.464 different types of exposure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:53.464 \longrightarrow 00:54:55.394$ And the relationship between early

 $00:54:55.394 \longrightarrow 00:54:57.519$ life and adulthood that are sometimes

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:57.519 \longrightarrow 00:55:00.109$ difficult to come to grips with in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:00.110 \longrightarrow 00:55:04.060$ And so with that I just want to thank the

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:04.157 \dashrightarrow 00:55:06.828$ people who have led a lot of this work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:55:06.830 --> 00:55:07.634 Susan, Albert Smith,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:55:07.634 --> 00:55:08.706 Archie and Jean Altman,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:08.710 \longrightarrow 00:55:10.910$ who are my fellow travelers on all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:10.910 \longrightarrow 00:55:13.067$ the research that has to do with baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:55:13.070 --> 00:55:14.780 Matthew Schippel, Susan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:14.780 \longrightarrow 00:55:17.630$ former student who led the

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:17.630 \longrightarrow 00:55:19.210$ intergenerational adversity work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:55:19.210 --> 00:55:20.341 My own lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:55:20.341 --> 00:55:21.849 and particularly Amanda Lea,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:55:21.850 --> 00:55:23.510 Jordan Anderson and Dana Lynn,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:23.510 \longrightarrow 00:55:25.606$ who were the trainees who produced some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:25.606 \longrightarrow 00:55:27.884$ the work that I talked to you about today.

00:55:27.890 --> 00:55:29.878 And if there's time I'd be happy

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:29.878 \longrightarrow 00:55:31.440$ to take any questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

00:55:33.640 --> 00:55:35.901 Fantastic thank you so much Jenny and

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

 $00:55:35.901 \longrightarrow 00:55:38.726$ and you do indeed have we do indeed

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

 $00:55:38.726 \longrightarrow 00:55:41.521$ have some time for questions despite me

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

 $00:55:41.521 \longrightarrow 00:55:43.876$ interrupting you mid mid presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

00:55:43.880 --> 00:55:46.496 You know just what. So first of all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

 $00:55:46.500 \longrightarrow 00:55:48.138$ ask anyone that wants to raise

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

00:55:48.138 --> 00:55:49.975 their hand and they can mute

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

 $00{:}55{:}49.975 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}51.355$ themselves and ask questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

00:55:51.360 --> 00:55:53.901 Or feel free to put your question

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

 $00:55:53.901 \longrightarrow 00:55:55.850$ into the chat for Jenny.

NOTE Confidence: 0.930652434

 $00{:}55{:}58.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}00.340$ Hi I have a question. My name

NOTE Confidence: 0.517075307666667

 $00:56:00.350 \longrightarrow 00:56:03.636$ is Tara Vaccarino. Are the trust

NOTE Confidence: 0.517075307666667

 $00:56:03.636 \longrightarrow 00:56:05.708$ a decent? Are wonderful seminar

 $00{:}56{:}06.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}09.568$ I can you hear me I wanted yeah I

NOTE Confidence: 0.951936377142857

 $00{:}56{:}09.568 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}13.080$ wanted to ask you to what extent

NOTE Confidence: 0.951936377142857

 $00:56:13.080 \longrightarrow 00:56:15.868$ this you think that this early effect

NOTE Confidence: 0.845759544

 $00:56:15.880 \longrightarrow 00:56:17.415$ of the environment are actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.845759544

 $00:56:17.415 \longrightarrow 00:56:18.950$ acting on the prenatal stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.88519188

 $00:56:18.960 \longrightarrow 00:56:20.240$ rather than early postnatal?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88519188

 $00:56:20.240 \longrightarrow 00:56:22.705$ I think in principle there is no

NOTE Confidence: 0.88519188

 $00:56:22.705 \longrightarrow 00:56:25.406$ proof that drastic conditions like

NOTE Confidence: 0.88519188

00:56:25.406 --> 00:56:27.770 what you're studying like drought

NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572

 $00:56:27.780 \longrightarrow 00:56:30.250$ for example, or even dominance

NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572

 $00:56:30.250 \longrightarrow 00:56:31.673$ amongst these primates

NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572

 $00:56:31.673 \longrightarrow 00:56:33.370$ could actually not affect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572

00:56:33.370 --> 00:56:36.329 Much earlier phases of development,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572

 $00:56:36.329 \longrightarrow 00:56:37.748$ including the brain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572

 $00:56:37.750 \longrightarrow 00:56:39.290$ not just the blood,

NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572

00:56:39.290 --> 00:56:42.328 which is what you can study postnatally.

 $00:56:42.330 \longrightarrow 00:56:44.079$ So what would

NOTE Confidence: 0.771023164285714

 $00:56:44.090 \longrightarrow 00:56:47.128$ be a potential Ave to study earlier

NOTE Confidence: 0.771023164285714

 $00:56:47.130 \longrightarrow 00:56:49.578$ effect and to what extent do you think

NOTE Confidence: 0.771023164285714

00:56:49.580 --> 00:56:52.168 they're possible or even likely? Thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333

00:56:52.180 --> 00:56:55.936 you. I think they're entirely possible,

NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333

 $00:56:55.940 \longrightarrow 00:56:57.620$ and it sort of depends on our

NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333

 $00:56:57.620 \longrightarrow 00:56:59.330$ ability to get at that question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333

 $00:56:59.330 \longrightarrow 00:57:01.240$ Depends on the source of

NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333

 $00{:}57{:}01.240 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}57{:}02.768$ early adversity in question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333

 $00{:}57{:}02.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}05.731$ so for some of the things we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333

 $00:57:05.731 \longrightarrow 00:57:07.480$ considering like early life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:09.810 \longrightarrow 00:57:12.030$ Social status, maternal social status

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00{:}57{:}12.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}13.806$ or maternal social integration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:13.810 \longrightarrow 00:57:16.490$ Those don't change a whole lot in our

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

00:57:16.490 --> 00:57:18.478 study system prenatally to postnatally

 $00:57:18.478 \longrightarrow 00:57:20.980$ within a short period of time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00{:}57{:}20.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}24.072$ and so we really can't disentangle

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:24.072 \longrightarrow 00:57:26.832$ whether the crucial point there

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:26.832 \longrightarrow 00:57:30.469$ is in utero or or post Natal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:30.470 \longrightarrow 00:57:32.606$ We can do a little bit actually with

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:32.606 \longrightarrow 00:57:34.556$ the drought effects because we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:34.556 \longrightarrow 00:57:36.251$ such seasonality in our population

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:36.251 \longrightarrow 00:57:38.378$ in year to year variation differs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:38.380 \longrightarrow 00:57:40.438$ So for example, when we were looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:40.438 \longrightarrow 00:57:42.069$ at drought effects on fertility,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

00:57:42.070 --> 00:57:43.750 we used the first year of life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:43.750 \longrightarrow 00:57:46.306$ but we also did some comparisons

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:46.306 \longrightarrow 00:57:48.010$ with the prenatal period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8347356144444444

 $00:57:48.010 \longrightarrow 00:57:50.314$ So if you just take birth

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:50.314 \longrightarrow 00:57:51.850$ minus a year instead,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:51.850 \longrightarrow 00:57:53.660$ which would cover conception as

 $00:57:53.660 \longrightarrow 00:57:56.024$ well in these animals and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:56.024 \longrightarrow 00:57:58.309$ get similar kinds of patterns,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:57:58.310 \longrightarrow 00:58:00.354$ but they're weaker, which.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444 00:58:00.354 --> 00:58:01.376 You know, NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:58:01.380 \longrightarrow 00:58:02.295$ obviously I think you would

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:58:02.295 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.539$ take that with a grain of salt,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:58:03.540 \longrightarrow 00:58:05.430$ but they would suggest to us by

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00{:}58{:}05.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}06.990$ themselves that for that particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

00:58:06.990 --> 00:58:09.060 exposure the post Natal period maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:58:09.060 \longrightarrow 00:58:10.762$ more important potentially because

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

00:58:10.762 -> 00:58:12.586 mothers are actually buffering

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:58:12.586 \longrightarrow 00:58:17.010$ their offspring against against.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

00:58:17.010 --> 00:58:18.025 The challenges posed by a

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00{:}58{:}18.025 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}19.653$ drought and they can do so more

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:58:19.653 \longrightarrow 00:58:20.785$ effectively when they're neutral.

00:58:20.790 --> 00:58:22.686 But here I'm I'm speculating a little bit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:58:22.690 \longrightarrow 00:58:23.770$ so sometimes we can get it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:58:23.770 \longrightarrow 00:58:24.990$ and sometimes we can't,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:58:24.990 \longrightarrow 00:58:26.210$ because those correlations can

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:58:26.210 \longrightarrow 00:58:27.512$ be quite tight across that

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

 $00:58:27.512 \longrightarrow 00:58:29.200$ about a year and a half or so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00{:}58{:}30.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}33.628$ And I think Karthik had a question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00{:}58{:}33.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}35.286$ Great talk is really cool stuff.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00{:}58{:}35.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}36.610$ My question is kind of similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

00:58:36.610 --> 00:58:37.795 to Doctor Vaccarino's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00{:}58{:}37.795 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}39.090$ but one of the interesting things

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00.58:39.090 \longrightarrow 00.58:41.310$ was just the reduced like fertility,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00:58:41.310 \longrightarrow 00:58:43.206$ like or like having less children.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00:58:43.210 \longrightarrow 00:58:44.418$ And I mean I could think of

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00:58:44.418 \longrightarrow 00:58:45.606$ a lot of causes for that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00{:}58{:}45.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}47.160$ Like you know their eggs are less

 $00:58:47.160 \longrightarrow 00:58:48.870$ viable or they change their behavior

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00{:}58{:}48.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}50.730$ so they're like having less like

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00:58:50.730 \longrightarrow 00:58:52.210$ intercourse or the fact that like

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

00:58:52.210 --> 00:58:53.806 just 'cause of their like hierarchy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

00:58:53.806 --> 00:58:55.566 they just have less opportunity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00:58:55.570 \longrightarrow 00:58:56.562$ Have you looked at?

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00:58:56.562 \longrightarrow 00:58:57.802$ Like what is the actual

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00:58:57.802 \longrightarrow 00:58:58.978$ like granular cause of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9062175325

00:58:58.990 --> 00:59:00.298 this change in like?

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00:59:01.900 \longrightarrow 00:59:05.236$ Yeah, so in in that severe drought they

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

00:59:05.236 --> 00:59:08.044 just stopped cycling and I think the

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00:59:08.044 \longrightarrow 00:59:10.615$ the rationale for that is very similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00{:}59{:}10.615 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}13.140$ to reproductive biology in humans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00{:}59{:}13.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}16.458$ which is when you know energy

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00:59:16.458 \longrightarrow 00:59:18.670$ expenditures exceed energy intake.

00:59:18.670 --> 00:59:20.470 We stop cycling. I mean you see that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

00:59:20.470 --> 00:59:21.898 for example in athletes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

00:59:21.898 --> 00:59:25.637 but you also see it in in Syria in

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00:59:25.637 \longrightarrow 00:59:28.157$ situations of severe caloric deprivation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00:59:28.160 \longrightarrow 00:59:29.798$ Baboons have actually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00.59.29.798 \longrightarrow 00.59.31.436$ In many ways,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

00:59:31.440 --> 00:59:32.432 very similar reproductive biology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00:59:32.432 \longrightarrow 00:59:33.920$ so I think that's what's happened.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00{:}59{:}33.920 \to 00{:}59{:}35.755$ They're not getting pregnant because

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

00:59:35.755 --> 00:59:37.590 they're they're they're not ovulating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

NOTE Confidence: 0.89972785

 $00:59:37.590 \longrightarrow 00:59:37.810$ But

 $00:59:37.820 \longrightarrow 00:59:39.270$ that would be like 'cause

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00:59:39.280 \longrightarrow 00:59:40.930$ there was differences between like the

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

00:59:40.930 --> 00:59:43.150 higher status versus the lower status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00:59:43.150 \longrightarrow 00:59:44.560$ like the higher status it would

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00:59:44.560 \longrightarrow 00:59:45.732$ affect both of them, right?

00:59:45.732 --> 00:59:46.660 'cause they're both starving,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00:59:46.660 \longrightarrow 00:59:48.060$ but it seemed like it wasn't as effective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00:59:48.060 \longrightarrow 00:59:49.803$ So what would be like the mechanism

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00:59:49.803 \longrightarrow 00:59:51.208$ where effects one at the other?

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $00:59:51.820 \longrightarrow 00:59:54.764$ Yeah, so that I can tell you with

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $00:59:54.764 \longrightarrow 00:59:56.865$ less certainty, but one of the reasons

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $00:59:56.865 \longrightarrow 00:59:58.872$ that being a high status female baboon

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $00:59:58.872 \longrightarrow 01:00:00.902$ is probably a nice thing to be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01{:}00{:}00.910 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}04.260$ Is a nice thing to be is not only because

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

01:00:04.341 --> 01:00:06.828 they suffer reduced much less targeting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

01:00:06.828 --> 01:00:09.174 social targeting by other animals, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01\text{:}00\text{:}09.174 \dashrightarrow 01\text{:}00\text{:}11.008$ There's a lot of reinforcement

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

01:00:11.008 --> 01:00:12.680 of hierarchies in baboons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01{:}00{:}12.680 \rightarrow 01{:}00{:}14.752$ so there's a lot of psychosocial stress

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:14.752 \longrightarrow 01:00:17.110$ as well, but because you know it,

 $01:00:17.110 \longrightarrow 01:00:19.110$ it it actually increases their

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:19.110 \longrightarrow 01:00:20.310$ access to resources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:20.310 \longrightarrow 01:00:22.632$ They have the ability to displace

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:22.632 \longrightarrow 01:00:24.639$ other animals from areas where

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

01:00:24.639 --> 01:00:26.187 food might still exist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

01:00:26.190 --> 01:00:28.388 and so I suspect that in energetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:28.388 \longrightarrow 01:00:30.468$ rationale has a big role to play.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:30.470 \longrightarrow 01:00:31.114$ That's certainly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

01:00:31.114 --> 01:00:32.080 That's for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:32.080 \longrightarrow 01:00:34.208$ the reason why we think females who

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01{:}00{:}34.208 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}36.358$ are higher status have shorter inter

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:36.358 \longrightarrow 01:00:37.980$ birth intervals than females who

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:37.980 \longrightarrow 01:00:39.660$ are low status in our population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

01:00:39.660 --> 01:00:42.330 They just come back to reproductive

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:42.330 \longrightarrow 01:00:43.220$ condition faster.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

01:00:43.220 --> 01:00:45.200 It's shorter postpartum area,

 $01:00:45.200 \longrightarrow 01:00:46.910$ interesting, cool, thanks sure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77533422

 $01:00:49.950 \longrightarrow 01:00:52.020$ I'm very did you have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.77533422

 $01:00:52.020 \longrightarrow 01:00:53.761$ question there or Preston?

NOTE Confidence: 0.77533422

 $01:00:53.761 \longrightarrow 01:00:57.266$ Yes, Preston has a question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77533422

 $01:00:57.270 \longrightarrow 01:00:59.048$ Question do you want to unmute there?

NOTE Confidence: 0.77533422

01:00:59.050 --> 01:01:00.480 Yep, I'm Preston hi.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9269801

 $01:01:03.780 \longrightarrow 01:01:05.784$ This was this was fascinating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9269801

 $01:01:05.784 \longrightarrow 01:01:08.430 \text{ I I}$ was really intrigued by.

NOTE Confidence: 0.757721614444444

 $01:01:08.430 \longrightarrow 01:01:10.315$ I was just wondering with

NOTE Confidence: 0.757721614444444

 $01:01:10.315 \longrightarrow 01:01:11.823$ the causes of death.

NOTE Confidence: 0.757721614444444

01:01:11.830 --> 01:01:13.342 I don't know if if you knew

NOTE Confidence: 0.757721614444444

 $01:01:13.342 \longrightarrow 01:01:14.759$ any difference in the causes of

NOTE Confidence: 0.757721614444444

01:01:14.759 --> 01:01:16.199 death with those who have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7577216144444444

 $01:01:16.199 \longrightarrow 01:01:17.569$ social hits versus those who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.757721614444444

 $01:01:17.569 \longrightarrow 01:01:19.222$ able to live a long happy life

 $01:01:19.222 \longrightarrow 01:01:20.938$ and had that privilege kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.757721614444444

 $01{:}01{:}20.938 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}22.258$ lifestyle you're talking on it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.757721614444444

01:01:22.260 --> 01:01:23.316 I don't know if there's anything

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:23.450 \longrightarrow 01:01:27.090$ on that. We have limited information on

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

01:01:27.090 --> 01:01:30.090 cause of death because we can't do you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:30.090 \longrightarrow 01:01:32.328$ full clinical workups of dead baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:32.330 \longrightarrow 01:01:34.245$ And honestly we barely recovered

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:34.245 \longrightarrow 01:01:36.862$ their bodies in a state where we

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:36.862 \longrightarrow 01:01:39.110$ would be able to do that, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:39.110 \longrightarrow 01:01:41.140$ 'cause so so I'll say the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:41.140 \longrightarrow 01:01:43.003$ proximate cause of death for most of

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01{:}01{:}43.003 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}44.959$ our animals is they got eaten by by.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

01:01:44.960 --> 01:01:47.726 Leopard or a lion or something like that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

01:01:47.730 --> 01:01:50.043 You know we do see pathologies and we record

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:50.043 \longrightarrow 01:01:52.279$ wounds and pathologies over the the lifespan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:52.280 \longrightarrow 01:01:54.912$ But they're pretty crude and so the

 $01:01:54.912 \longrightarrow 01:01:58.040$ short answer is, we really wish we knew.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

01:01:58.040 --> 01:02:00.744 But everything I showed you today is an

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:02:00.744 \longrightarrow 01:02:02.877$ all 'cause mortality sort of situation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:02:02.877 \longrightarrow 01:02:04.690$ We could parse some of the individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:02:04.744 \longrightarrow 01:02:06.016$ who we have better data for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:02:06.020 \longrightarrow 01:02:07.757$ but that just drops our sample size a lot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

01:02:10.010 --> 01:02:11.612 Thank you I. I imagine that

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

 $01:02:11.612 \longrightarrow 01:02:12.680$ being depressed probably makes

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

 $01:02:12.729 \longrightarrow 01:02:14.680$ you more likely to be eaten,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

 $01:02:14.680 \longrightarrow 01:02:16.340$ so I I think that's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

01:02:16.340 --> 01:02:18.200 It make probably makes you slower,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

 $01:02:18.200 \longrightarrow 01:02:20.252$ probably makes you less liked by

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

 $01{:}02{:}20.252 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}22.518$ your your social peers if you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

01:02:22.518 --> 01:02:24.178 causing them difficulties too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

 $01:02:24.180 \longrightarrow 01:02:25.236$ so I think it makes sense.

 $01{:}02{:}25.240 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}28.246$ I just thank you this is this is great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

01:02:28.250 --> 01:02:29.562 Thanks, I know we've run

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

 $01:02:29.562 \longrightarrow 01:02:30.302$ a little bit over time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

01:02:30.310 --> 01:02:31.808 but Amanda does have her hand raised,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308 01:02:31.810 --> 01:02:32.144 so Amanda,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

01:02:32.144 --> 01:02:33.313 would you like to ask a question?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90993761769230801:02:34.110 --> 01:02:34.540 Thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.634611006

 $01:02:34.550 \longrightarrow 01:02:36.460$ you. Jenny is great talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.634611006

01:02:36.460 --> 01:02:37.490 I always love hearing a research

NOTE Confidence: 0.634611006

 $01:02:37.490 \longrightarrow 01:02:39.400$ and as a treat to hear about baboons

NOTE Confidence: 0.769422722857143

 $01:02:40.150 \longrightarrow 01:02:41.570$ in a world where consumed

NOTE Confidence: 0.769422722857143

 $01:02:41.570 \longrightarrow 01:02:46.620$ by my cats. So but related.

NOTE Confidence: 0.60834654

01:02:46.620 --> 01:02:47.968 I was struck by an image near

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:02:47.980 \longrightarrow 01:02:50.044$ the end of your talk where a baboon

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:02:50.044 \longrightarrow 01:02:53.238$ mother and infant appeared to be engaging

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:02:53.238 --> 01:02:55.660 in some face to face mutual gazing,

 $01:02:55.660 \longrightarrow 01:02:57.718$ and this led me to wonder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:02:57.720 --> 01:02:59.592 Are you guys looking at or

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:02:59.592 --> 01:03:01.560 thinking of looking at?

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:01.560 --> 01:03:03.056 You know mother infant interactions

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:03.056 \longrightarrow 01:03:05.728$ in the middle period and how this

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:05.728 \longrightarrow 01:03:08.215$ might be influencing infant outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:08.215 --> 01:03:09.480 Yeah, absolutely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:09.480 \longrightarrow 01:03:11.940$ So that was the last part

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:11.940 --> 01:03:13.770 of Matthew Zippel thesis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:13.770 \longrightarrow 01:03:15.562$ so he was the the former PhD

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:15.562 \longrightarrow 01:03:17.786$ student who did the work on

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:17.786 --> 01:03:18.988 intergenerational adversity, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:18.988 \longrightarrow 01:03:21.864$ And so where we are there is that we think

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:21.864 \longrightarrow 01:03:24.264$ OK moms who experience early adversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:24.270 \longrightarrow 01:03:27.826$ They grow up and then they have

 $01:03:27.826 \longrightarrow 01:03:30.436$ more difficulty keeping their kids

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01{:}03{:}30.436 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}32.346$ alive and that's the phenomenon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:32.346 --> 01:03:34.470 But it's not the explanation right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:34.470 \longrightarrow 01:03:36.036$ And we think that they're having

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:36.036 \longrightarrow 01:03:37.080$ more difficulty because they

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01{:}03{:}37.126 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}38.536$ themselves are in poor condition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:38.540 --> 01:03:38.756 Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:38.756 --> 01:03:40.700 in order for that to translate to the kid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:40.700 \longrightarrow 01:03:42.002$ I mean there are a few different

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:42.002 \longrightarrow 01:03:42.880$ ways that could happen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:42.880 \longrightarrow 01:03:45.724$ but one is certainly in their

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:45.724 --> 01:03:47.620 interaction and caretaking style,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:47.620 --> 01:03:50.110 and so he's been aggregating very

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01{:}03{:}50.110 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}52.787$ very granular data on mother in fant

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:52.787 --> 01:03:55.595 pairs to try and understand what

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:55.595 --> 01:03:57.819 the differences in sort of very,

 $01:03:57.820 \longrightarrow 01:04:00.226$ very granular levels of experience are

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:04:00.226 \longrightarrow 01:04:03.400$ for the kids of moms who have those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:04:03.400 --> 01:04:05.048 Those adverse early experiences

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:04:05.048 \longrightarrow 01:04:06.696$ versus those that don't,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:04:06.700 \longrightarrow 01:04:08.590$ and they certainly appear to be different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01{:}04{:}08.590 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}10.585$ Although not in ways that we completely

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:04:10.585 --> 01:04:12.160 have our fingers on yet right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:04:12.160 --> 01:04:13.924 they spend more time with adult males.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:04:13.930 --> 01:04:14.954 For instance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:04:14.954 \longrightarrow 01:04:18.538$ they spend more time away from Mom.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:04:18.540 \longrightarrow 01:04:20.952$ Who is driving that behavior

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:04:20.952 \longrightarrow 01:04:23.392$ is not entirely clear yet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:04:23.400 \longrightarrow 01:04:25.680$ but hopefully we'll get a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:04:25.680 \longrightarrow 01:04:28.268$ bit more more of an understanding

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:04:28.268 \longrightarrow 01:04:30.553$ as as that analysis proceeds.

 $01:04:30.560 \longrightarrow 01:04:31.550$ I want to see thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68817834

 $01:04:33.390 \longrightarrow 01:04:34.950$ I know we are, we're time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68817834

 $01:04:34.950 \longrightarrow 01:04:36.840$ but I if there are any trainees

NOTE Confidence: 0.68817834

 $01:04:36.840 \longrightarrow 01:04:38.833$ that are still on the line that

NOTE Confidence: 0.68817834

 $01:04:38.833 \longrightarrow 01:04:40.519$ would like to ask any questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.68817834

01:04:40.584 --> 01:04:42.576 please do now is your opportunity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68817834

 $01:04:42.580 \longrightarrow 01:04:44.458$ Any other questions from the audience?

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

01:04:48.480 --> 01:04:49.656 And you know, I just when I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}04{:}49.660 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}51.516$ when you're presenting your

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:04:51.516 \longrightarrow 01:04:52.908$ developmental constraints versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}04{:}52.910 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}54.422$ the predictive adaptive response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:04:54.422 \longrightarrow 01:04:55.934$ really resonated with me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

01:04:55.940 --> 01:04:56.420 Because obviously,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:04:56.420 \longrightarrow 01:04:58.736$ with the kind of work I do with exposure

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:04:58.736 \longrightarrow 01:05:00.456$ to prenatal anxiety or depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:00.460 \longrightarrow 01:05:02.115$ you know the clinical implications

 $01:05:02.115 \longrightarrow 01:05:03.770$ of saying the predictive adaptive

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:03.822 \longrightarrow 01:05:05.037$ response is the best fit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

01:05:05.040 --> 01:05:07.180 Model is actually really appalling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

01:05:07.180 --> 01:05:09.484 because it suggests that you shouldn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

01:05:09.484 --> 01:05:10.743 treat anxiety or depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:10.743 \longrightarrow 01:05:12.780$ Pregnancy obviously makes no sense at all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:12.780 \longrightarrow 01:05:14.292$ so I can't really subscribe to

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}05{:}14.292 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}15.300$ the predictive adaptive response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:15.300 \longrightarrow 01:05:16.950$ And in the context, so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:16.950 \longrightarrow 01:05:18.335$ Mental anxiety and depression or

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}05{:}18.335 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}19.443$ perinatal anxiety and depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}05{:}19.450 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}20.346$ So the developmental constraint

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}05{:}20.346 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}21.927$ model really seems to fit a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:21.927 \longrightarrow 01:05:23.285$ bit better with the data that I've

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:23.285 \longrightarrow 01:05:24.738$ seen from my my own research as well,

01:05:25.210 --> 01:05:27.387 you know, Karen, as you probably have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:27.390 \longrightarrow 01:05:29.364$ I've seen a couple of papers that

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:29.364 \longrightarrow 01:05:31.148$ actually do go down that path.

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:31.150 \longrightarrow 01:05:34.430$ Yeah, well, we shouldn't try to

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

01:05:34.430 --> 01:05:36.270 address this because you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:36.270 \longrightarrow 01:05:38.910$ the phenotype is meant to be matched.

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

01:05:38.910 --> 01:05:42.278 And I, I think I think that's problematic

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:42.278 \longrightarrow 01:05:45.319$ from a variety of perspectives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

01:05:45.320 --> 01:05:48.694 And beyond, whether or not one hypothesis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:48.700 \longrightarrow 01:05:50.408$ one class of models is a better

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01{:}05{:}50.408 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}51.460$ explanation versus the other,

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:51.460 \longrightarrow 01:05:55.080$ it also seriously conflates what

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:55.080 \longrightarrow 01:05:57.446$ evolution may have produced with what we

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

01:05:57.446 --> 01:05:59.937 might want our societies to look like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:59.940 \longrightarrow 01:06:02.136$ And those are not not always

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:06:02.136 \longrightarrow 01:06:03.665$ the same thing, right?

 $01:06:03.665 \longrightarrow 01:06:04.090$ So

NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909

01:06:04.820 --> 01:06:06.905 exactly. Yeah, well, we've got

NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909

01:06:06.905 --> 01:06:09.390 messages coming and saying great talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909

 $01:06:09.390 \longrightarrow 01:06:10.548$ I'd just like to reiterate that

NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909

01:06:10.548 --> 01:06:11.829 and thank you once again Jenny,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909

01:06:11.830 --> 01:06:13.886 you have an open invitation to New Haven.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909

 $01:06:13.890 \longrightarrow 01:06:14.730$ We will get you here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909

 $01{:}06{:}14.730 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}17.106$ We will make that pizza comparison

NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909

01:06:17.106 --> 01:06:18.690 happen that we promised.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909

 $01:06:18.690 \longrightarrow 01:06:20.922$ But please join me once again in thanking Dr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909

 $01:06:20.930 \longrightarrow 01:06:22.460$ Chung for a wonderful presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.792568132

 $01:06:22.950 \longrightarrow 01:06:24.676$ Thanks to all of you. I really

NOTE Confidence: 0.792568132

 $01{:}06{:}24.676 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}25.691$ appreciate the opportunity to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.792568132

01:06:25.691 --> 01:06:27.060 this and I'm sorry I couldn't be

NOTE Confidence: 0.780239430909091

 $01:06:27.070 \longrightarrow 01:06:28.498$ with you in person.

 $01{:}06{:}28.498 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}31.320$ Oh my God will make it happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780239430909091

 $01{:}06{:}31.320 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}32.370$ Wonderful, I think we'll stop

NOTE Confidence: 0.780239430909091

 $01:06:32.370 \longrightarrow 01:06:33.420$ the recording that bye bye.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780239430909091

 $01:06:33.420 \longrightarrow 01:06:34.998$ Jennie thanks by e.