WEBVTT

- NOTE duration:"00:54:40.2240000"
- NOTE language:en-us
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:00.000 \rightarrow 00:00:05.364$ Here and then Karen take it from there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:05.370 --> 00:00:09.434 So may I call Doctor Tara Thompson Felix.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00{:}00{:}09{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}10{.}484$ Take it away.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:11.878 \longrightarrow 00:00:13.270$ so good afternoon everyone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:15.010 --> 00:00:17.954 Felix I'm one of the first year child

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00:00:17.954 \dashrightarrow 00:00:20.104$ Psychiatry Fellows so I actually met NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:20.104 --> 00:00:22.114 Doctor O'Donnell a few months ago NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:22.188 --> 00:00:24.467 on virtually in one of our breakout NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00{:}00{:}24.467 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}26.681$ sessions and grand rounds and just

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

 $00{:}00{:}26.681 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}28.924$ heard a lot about his research who

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:28.924 --> 00:00:31.006 really got me excited because I've

NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883

00:00:31.006 --> 00:00:33.097 done some research and in utero,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- 00:00:33.100 --> 00:00:35.236 and epigenetics and I really wanted
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- $00{:}00{:}35{.}236 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}37{.}328$ the opportunity to kind of explore
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- $00{:}00{:}37{.}328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}39{.}018$ that more so Doctor O'Donnell
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- $00:00:39.020 \dashrightarrow 00:00:40.830$ has been awesome and discussing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- $00{:}00{:}40.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}42.514$ Potential projects with me.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- $00{:}00{:}42.514 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}45.521$ Since then an I am very excited
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- $00{:}00{:}45{.}521 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}48{.}293$ to announce that I will be a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- $00:00:48.293 \longrightarrow 00:00:50.078$ PhD student in his lab.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- 00:00:50.080 --> 00:00:51.538 Starting in July,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- $00:00:51.538 \longrightarrow 00:00:54.940$ so I'm very excited to pass it
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- 00:00:55.047 --> 00:00:58.287 along to Doctor Karen O'Donnell.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- $00{:}00{:}58.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}59.756$ Thank you.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8208883
- 00:00:59.756 --> 00:01:00.489 But
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- 00:01:00.490 --> 00:01:01.978 congratulations again, Tara Anne.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}01{:}01{.}978 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}04{.}614$ I'm very happy that you got into
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:06.319 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.240$ you'll be working in the lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:08.240 --> 00:01:10.824 and I'll be looking forward to when you NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}01{:}10.824 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}13.158$ were doing Grand Ryans showing some.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:13.160 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:01:14.920 Hopefully you're very interesting data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}01{:}14.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}17.181$ fetal exosomes and how they are shaped NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:17.181 --> 00:01:18.880 by exposure to prenatal adversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:21.581 --> 00:01:23.716 your development and Doctor Martin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:01:23.720 \longrightarrow 00:01:25.946$ Thank you very much for that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}01{:}35{.}502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}38{.}295$ how and where I've come from an end to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:01:40.601 \rightarrow 00:01:42.498$ and as Doctor Martin mentioned, an.

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:44.346 --> 00:01:45.984 the Department of Citrix and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:01:47.280 --> 00:01:49.692 I'm more than happy to be a subject in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}01{:}51{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}54{.}648$ to be acting as a bridge between these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}01{:}54.648 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}56.814$ two Fantastic Department's an so as

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}01{:}58.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}01{.}138$ I'm from the West coast of Ireland.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}02{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}04{.}490$ around 200 people an on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}06{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}09{.}208$ very close to a small town called Belona.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}16{.}204 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}18{.}936$ Atlantic way that has a roadway that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:18.936 \dashrightarrow 00:02:21.324$ hugs the Atlantic coast of Ireland.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}21{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}23{.}661$ And for those of you who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}23.661 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}25.730$ avid cyclists like Doctor Martin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}25{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}27{.}812$ it's 1500 miles and that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:02:27.812 --> 00:02:29.770 can cycle around our lender,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}29{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}32{.}086$ driver and arnensee some fantastic sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}32{.}090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}34{.}250$ Such as the Stone Age settlement

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}34.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}36.580$ that's around 20 minutes from my home,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}36{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}37{.}876$ Amore Dan Patrick head.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

00:02:37.876 --> 00:02:40.624 I can tell you it took a long

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00:02:40.624 \rightarrow 00:02:42.439$ time to take this photograph.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

 $00{:}02{:}42.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}44.075$ This isn't representative of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- 00:02:46.240 --> 00:02:46.573 Ann,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}02{:}46{.}573 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}48{.}571$ but there are some beautiful scenes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}02{:}48.571 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}51.180$ to be had in the West Coast of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:02:51.180 \rightarrow 00:02:53.164$ Ireland and up until very recently
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:02:53.164 \longrightarrow 00:02:55.444$ that would have been the most
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}02{:}55{.}444 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}57{.}532$ famous thing about where I'm from.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}02{:}57{.}532 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}58{.}788$ This wonderful coastline and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:02:58.788 \longrightarrow 00:03:00.380$ this Stone Age settlement.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}03{:}00{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}02{.}900$ And but then Joe Biden got elected.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}03{:}02{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}06{.}156$ And his ancestral home is around 20 minutes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:06.156 \rightarrow 00:03:09.770$ from my home in a small town called Belle.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}03{:}09{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}12{.}794$ And all you can see is distant relatives
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:12.794 \rightarrow 00:03:15.417$ celebrating when the election was announced,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}03{:}15{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}17{.}440$ and mural that remains in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:17.440 \longrightarrow 00:03:19.460$ our small town and were,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789

- $00:03:19.460 \rightarrow 00:03:20.663$ among other works.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:20.663 \rightarrow 00:03:23.910$ So where everyone was very excited by this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:23.910 \longrightarrow 00:03:26.190$ this is actually the 2nd president
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:26.190 \longrightarrow 00:03:28.222$ that belona can lay claim
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- 00:03:28.222 --> 00:03:29.966 to because Mary Robinson,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}03{:}29{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}32{.}388$ the first woman President of Ireland,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:32.390 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.136$ also hails.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- 00:03:33.136 --> 00:03:33.882 From Belona,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}03{:}33{.}882 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}35{.}747$ so a little fun fact,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}03{:}35{.}750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}37{.}510$ but as Doctor Martin mentioned,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- 00:03:37.510 --> 00:03:39.514 I my trading didn't occur in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00{:}03{:}39{.}514 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}42{.}017$ Ireland and I had to travel a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:42.017 \longrightarrow 00:03:44.195$ little bit further East for that,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:44.200 \longrightarrow 00:03:46.531$ and that was to London where I
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:46.531 \rightarrow 00:03:48.284$ completed my undergrad Masters and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:48.284 \rightarrow 00:03:50.354$ eventually my PhD where I worked

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:50.354 \longrightarrow 00:03:52.570$ with Vivek Glover and who's an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:52.570 \rightarrow 00:03:54.390$ expert and perinatal cycle biology
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:54.390 \longrightarrow 00:03:56.300$ and also with Tom O'Connor.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8083789
- $00:03:56.300 \rightarrow 00:03:58.610$ Andthat PhD was actually a little
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:03:58.679 \rightarrow 00:04:01.442$ bit of an experiment at the time as well.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:04:01.450 \longrightarrow 00:04:03.700$ It was in an NIH funded.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:04:03.700 \dashrightarrow 00:04:06.262$ PhD occurring in London using the Avon
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- 00:04:06.262 --> 00:04:08.708 Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00{:}04{:}08{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}10{.}762$ which is along the Tunal perspective
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- 00:04:10.762 --> 00:04:12.611 cohort of around 15,000 pregnancies
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- 00:04:12.611 --> 00:04:14.721 where these children have been
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- 00:04:14.721 --> 00:04:16.409 followed up continuously there,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- 00:04:16.410 --> 00:04:18.330 now approaching their 30s themselves,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- 00:04:18.330 --> 00:04:20.260 having children of their own,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:04:20.260 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.710$ and I'll talk to you a little
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:22.710 \longrightarrow 00:04:24.880$ bit about that cohort today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}04{:}28{.}942 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}31{.}414$ further West than where I'm from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:04:31.420 --> 00:04:33.405 An ended up at McGill

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}04{:}33{.}405 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}35{.}390$ University where I completed it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:04:37.760 \longrightarrow 00:04:40.245$ who many of you will know and

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}04{:}40{.}245 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}42{.}694$ it's really been a pioneer in

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}04{:}42.694 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}44.864$ the field of social epigenetics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}04{:}44{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}47{.}240$ So how the environment can shape

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}04{:}51{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}53{.}320$ I'm talking about chemical marks

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:04:58.090 \rightarrow 00:05:00.515$ the way the genome functions and

 $00:05:00.515 \rightarrow 00:05:02.650$ throughout all of my training.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:02.650 \rightarrow 00:05:06.098$ Really, what's been at the heart of my.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:06.100 \rightarrow 00:05:06.465$ Fascination,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}06{.}465 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}09{.}020$ really with science is the idea that

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}09{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}11.490$ the early environment can shape health

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}13.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}16.590$ Ann and this notion or this idea has

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}16.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}18.737$ been described as the developmental

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}18.737 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}21.824$ origins of health and disease and which

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:05:24.620 --> 00:05:27.259 A SoC adore had society that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}29.682 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}32.100$ from the work of David Barker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:05:36.550 --> 00:05:38.900 Hypothesis that and the fetal

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

00:05:38.900 --> 00:05:40.310 origins of disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}42.656 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}45.285$ types of disease could be traced

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:05:45.285 \dashrightarrow 00:05:47.740$ back to the neutral environment NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}52{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}54{.}586$ where he notice to parallel between

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}54{.}586 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}56{.}857$ high rates of infant mortality

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}05{:}59{.}412 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}01{.}456$ from coronary heart disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}06{:}01{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}04{.}154$ and these were largely in deprived

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}06{:}04{.}154 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}06{.}700$ areas in the United Kingdom.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:06.700 \dashrightarrow 00:06:09.031$ And what you're looking at here is NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:06:11.130 \rightarrow 00:06:13.200$ for death from coronary heart disease
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:06:13.200 \longrightarrow 00:06:15.278$ as a function of birth weight.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- 00:06:15.280 --> 00:06:16.990 I want David Barker noticed,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:06:16.990 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.144$ was that lower birth weight was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00{:}06{:}19{.}144 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}21{.}359$ associated with an elevated or an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00{:}06{:}21.359 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}23.513$ increased risk from death from coronary
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:06:23.513 \rightarrow 00:06:25.567$ heart disease before the age of 65,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:06:25.570 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.074$ and you can see a greater decline in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:06:28.074 \dashrightarrow 00:06:31.047$ risk as we move to larger birth weights.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- 00:06:31.050 00:06:32.422 These are birth weights
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:06:32.422 \rightarrow 00:06:34.137$ expressed in pounds and answers,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00{:}06{:}34{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}37{.}026$ and then may be a slight uptick.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:06:37.030 \longrightarrow 00:06:38.902$ In at disease risk,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00{:}06{:}38{.}902 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}40{.}774$ and as I mentioned,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:06:40.780 \longrightarrow 00:06:43.454$ this is really led to really an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00:06:46.315 \rightarrow 00:06:48.507$ environment can shape vulnerability

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}06{:}54.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}55.874$ But of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}06{:}55{.}874 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}58{.}322$ the question is if the cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}07{:}05{.}090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}08{.}057$ And as we heard from Kartek last

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

 $00{:}07{:}12.985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}14.980$ environment can also shape variation

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- 00:07:18.114 --> 00:07:19.786 at the Dutch hunger,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00:07:19.790 \longrightarrow 00:07:22.400$ winter and the Holocaust have all
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80372703
- $00{:}07{:}22.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}24.140$ been associated with increased
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00{:}07{:}24.213 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}25.368$ risk for adverse.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00{:}07{:}25.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}27.135$ Mental health outcomes in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00{:}07{:}27.135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}29.680$ offspring and in the next generation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:07:29.680 \longrightarrow 00:07:31.540$ and these have largely been
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:07:31.540 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.028$ from retrospective studies where
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00{:}07{:}33.028 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}34.779$ this evidence first emerged.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00{:}07{:}34.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}36.999$ And of course from our own work
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:07:36.999 \rightarrow 00:07:38.525$ with the Avon Longitudinal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- 00:07:38.525 --> 00:07:41.045 Study of Parents and Children.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00{:}07{:}41.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}43.042$ What we found is that maternal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00{:}07{:}43.042 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}44.370$ prenatal anxiety and also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:07:44.430 \dashrightarrow 00:07:46.149$ maternal prenatal depression,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}07{:}47.894 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}50.074$ risk for adverse mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:07:50.074 --> 00:07:52.067 outcomes in the child and what NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:07:55.900 \dashrightarrow 00:07:58.618$ Of a probable mental disorder at NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:07:58.618 \longrightarrow 00:08:01.458$ children from age 4 all the way

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}08{:}01{.}458 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}04{.}562$ up to age 13 an and what we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}08{:}07{.}016 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}09{.}124$ to women that experience high

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:08:09.124 --> 00:08:11.692 levels of anxiety in the prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:11.692 \rightarrow 00:08:13.332$ period have approximately double

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:08:13.332 --> 00:08:16.430 the risk of ending up in the group

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}08{:}16{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}18{.}662$ that is likely to suffer from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:18.662 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.149$ a probable mental disorder,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}08{:}20{.}149 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}22{.}732$ and we see this elevated risk across

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:08:22.732 \rightarrow 00:08:24.950$ childhood and into early adolescence,

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}08{:}33{.}624 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}35{.}582$ Association between high rates of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:08:45.077 \longrightarrow 00:08:46.730$ of socioeconomic status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

00:08:46.730 --> 00:08:49.474 So you may think that this may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}08{:}49{.}474 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}51{.}257$ confounded by maternal education

- $00:08:51.257 \rightarrow 00:08:52.790$ or maternal age,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:08:52.790 \longrightarrow 00:08:54.810$ or indeed taxol crowding or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:08:54.810 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.618$ obstetric outcomes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:08:55.620 \longrightarrow 00:08:56.532$ Birth weight,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:08:56.532 \rightarrow 00:08:57.444$ gestational age.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:08:57.444 \longrightarrow 00:08:59.724$ Because of the large sample
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:08:59.724 \longrightarrow 00:09:01.270$ size of this court,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:01.270 \longrightarrow 00:09:03.465$ we can statistically control for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00{:}09{:}03.465 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}05.660$ the effects of those exposures,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00{:}09{:}05.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}08.564$ and we still see this independent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:08.564 \dashrightarrow 00:09:11.150$ Association with maternal prenatal anxiety.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:11.150 \longrightarrow 00:09:13.831$ So for any of you that have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- 00:09:13.831 00:09:15.720 heard me speak before,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- 00:09:15.720 --> 00:09:18.352 I always talk about 414 and 44 being
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:18.352 \dashrightarrow 00:09:21.717$ one in four women that are likely to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:21.717 \rightarrow 00:09:24.027$ experience or struggle with their

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:24.027 \rightarrow 00:09:26.919$ mental health in and around pregnancy.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:26.920 \longrightarrow 00:09:30.248$ So I say one in four other estimates
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:30.248 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.884$ they went in five, one in six,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- 00:09:32.884 --> 00:09:35.180 and really what I think we're seeing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:35.249 \rightarrow 00:09:37.709$ from these epidemiological analysis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00{:}09{:}37{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}39{.}370$ particularly the more recent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- 00:09:39.370 --> 00:09:40.200 epidemiological analysis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:40.200 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.469$ is increased rates.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:41.469 \longrightarrow 00:09:43.584$ Of perinatal mental health problems.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- 00:09:43.590 --> 00:09:43.980 So,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:43.980 \longrightarrow 00:09:44.760$ for example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00{:}09{:}44.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}47.100$ Louise Howard Publishing in 2018 and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- 00:09:47.100 --> 00:09:49.860 one in four women struggling with their
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:49.860 \rightarrow 00:09:52.630$ mental health in and around pregnancy.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:09:52.630 \rightarrow 00:09:53.474$ Rebecca Pearson,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00:09:53.474 \rightarrow 00:09:55.584$ using the Avon Longitudinal Study NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 $00{:}09{:}55{.}584 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}58{.}234$ of Parents and children using the NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 $00:09:58.234 \rightarrow 00:10:00.424$ second generation from that cohort. NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 $00:10:00.430 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.210$ Showed a generational increase in NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 $00:10:03.210 \longrightarrow 00:10:05.990$ rates of perinatal mental health NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 $00{:}10{:}06{.}083 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}09{.}473$ problems with again one in four NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 $00:10:09.473 \longrightarrow 00:10:11.168$ women experiencing perinatal NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 00:10:11.168 - 00:10:13.170 mental health problems. NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 00:10:13.170 --> 00:10:15.683 So this is a common problem and NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 $00:10:15.683 \rightarrow 00:10:17.644$ what is challenging with this NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 $00:10:17.644 \longrightarrow 00:10:20.056$ problem is that we're still not NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 00:10:20.056 --> 00:10:21.780 screening women effectively, NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 $00{:}10{:}21.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}24.090$ and when we do screen women and NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 $00{:}10{:}24.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}25.805$ they're still not receiving NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 00:10:25.805 --> 00:10:27.109 adequate treatment, NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338 $00:10:27.110 \longrightarrow 00:10:30.008$ so we know that around 25% of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338
- $00:10:30.008 \rightarrow 00:10:32.198$ women who do experience perinatal

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}10{:}34.019 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}36.165$ treatment and less than 5% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}10{:}36.165 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}37.945$ those women achieve remission

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}10{:}37{.}945 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}39{.}725$ or experience receive adequate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}10{:}39.725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}41.814$ treatment to reduce their symptoms

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

 $00{:}10{:}43{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}46{.}100$ So this is a common problem that we are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8285338

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:10:54.729 \rightarrow 00:10:56.934$ perinatal mental health problems is

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}10{:}56{.}934 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}59{.}830$ around 14 billion US dollars per year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:11:07.470 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:11:10.094 What about the in the UK where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}11{:}17{.}072 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}19{.}164$ associated with untreated paradata mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:19.164 \rightarrow 00:11:21.840$ health problems in the United Kingdom,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:24.720 \longrightarrow 00:11:27.184$ we see that 72% almost 3/4 of those NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}11{:}27{.}184 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}29{.}786$ costs are attributed to the adverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}11{:}29.786 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}32.181$ effects of untreated perinatal mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}11{:}32{.}181 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}34{.}579$ health problems on child outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:34.580 \longrightarrow 00:11:36.080$ and you may ask,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:49.483 \longrightarrow 00:11:51.358$ because in the United States,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00:11:51.360 \longrightarrow 00:11:53.230$ costs were only calculated on

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}11{:}55{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}57{.}924$ whereas in the United Kingdom costs

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:12:00.010 --> 00:12:02.890 So I think you can appreciate that if

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}12{:}02{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}05{.}991$ we extend the follow up period in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:12:05.991 --> 00:12:08.288 United States that 40% an proportion

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}12{:}08{.}288 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}10{.}941$ of costs is likely to increase in

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}12{:}10{.}941 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}13{.}508$ addition to the total costs that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}12{:}13.508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}15.940$ been reported from that cost analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

- 00:12:18.640 --> 00:12:19.532 And of course,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00:12:19.532 \rightarrow 00:12:21.708$ you may ask about what is the impact
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00{:}12{:}21.708 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}23.598$ of the post Natal environment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00{:}12{:}23.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}24.431$ And of course,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00{:}12{:}24{.}431 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}26{.}370$ we know that there is an effect
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00{:}12{:}26{.}438 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}28{.}248$ of the post Natal environment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00{:}12{:}28{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}30{.}252$ and in our studies from the Avon
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- 00:12:30.252 --> 00:12:32.279 Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00{:}12{:}32{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}33{.}520$ we see that perhaps,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00:12:33.520 \rightarrow 00:12:34.760$ as you would expect,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00:12:34.760 \longrightarrow 00:12:36.662$ children that are exposed to high
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- 00:12:36.662 --> 00:12:39.173 levels of anxiety in the pre and post
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00{:}12{:}39{.}173 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}41{.}305$ Natal period are the children who do
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00:12:41.305 \rightarrow 00:12:43.141$ worse than children who are exposed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00:12:43.141 \rightarrow 00:12:45.252$ to anxiety at one but not both.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00:12:45.252 \rightarrow 00:12:47.779$ Time points end up somewhere in the middle.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464
- $00:12:47.780 \rightarrow 00:12:50.705$ Now hasten to add, this is not a treatment.

 $00{:}12{:}50{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}53{.}538$ And study this is not an intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

00:12:53.540 --> 00:12:55.958 This is simply an epidemiological analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}12{:}58{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}01{.}457$ principle that if we could pull down

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

 $00{:}13{:}01{.}457 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}04{.}031$ or reduce maternal symptoms of anxiety,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87315464

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:13:10.380 --> 00:13:13.188 So again, just thinking about what are the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}13{:}13{.}188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}15{.}267$ consequences for untreated perinatal mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:15.267 \rightarrow 00:13:17.889$ health problems on the next generation?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}13{:}24{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}26{.}180$ but this is another study

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}13{:}30{.}394 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}33{.}421$ and Children where they looked at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}13{:}33{.}421 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}35{.}803$ rates of prenatal depression in women

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}13{:}35{.}803 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}38{.}606$ that were born to ALS back moms who

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:38.606 \rightarrow 00:13:40.392$ either didn't or did experience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}13{:}41{.}174$ --> $00{:}13{:}45{.}510$ and so when we look at the daughters of women

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}13{:}47{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}50{.}908$ we see that around 16% of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:53.362 \rightarrow 00:13:55.760$ depression in their own pregnancies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}13{:}55{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}58{.}434$ So what about the daughters from women

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:13:58.434 \rightarrow 00:14:00.989$ who did experience prenatal depression?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}04{.}428 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}07{.}530$ prenatal depression in their own pregnancies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00:14:11.290 \rightarrow 00:14:13.732$ Add there can be marked intergenerational

 $00{:}14{:}13.732 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}15.846$ effects of exposure to prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:24.992 \rightarrow 00:14:27.007$ all mental and physical health,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:27.010 \rightarrow 00:14:30.292$ but also to potentially mitigate the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:32.559 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.200$ transmission of risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}34{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}36{.}540$ But there are some unanswered questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:14:36.540 --> 00:14:39.802 and many of you will be looking at and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}39{.}802 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}42{.}185$ some of the slides that I presented

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}44{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}46{.}585$ and thinking about the advances

 $00:14:46.585 \rightarrow 00:14:48.260$ that we've made in characterizing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}50{.}288 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}52{.}178$ isn't this just all confounded

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:52.178 \rightarrow 00:14:53.690$ by underlying genetic propensity

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}53{.}754 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}55{.}454$ for psychiatric disorders and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}55{.}454 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}57{.}542$ there have been many studies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:57.542 \rightarrow 00:14:59.187$ have attempted to address this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:14:59.190 \longrightarrow 00:14:59.918$ perhaps indirectly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}14{:}59{.}918 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}02{.}466$ and perhaps the most well established or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}15{:}04{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}07{.}994$ Was at this study by Hanigan and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:15:07.994 \longrightarrow 00:15:10.476$ colleagues based in the mobile

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:15:13.221 \rightarrow 00:15:15.450$ around 30,000 pregnant women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00:15:19.178 \rightarrow 00:15:22.440$ and sibling children of Twins design.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00:15:22.440 \longrightarrow 00:15:25.116$ Basically it's a twin study that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00:15:25.116 \rightarrow 00:15:27.976$ looks at the offspring and their
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00:15:27.976 \longrightarrow 00:15:30.451$ conclusion was that a genetic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00{:}15{:}30{.}451 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}32{.}600$ factor that explained relatedness
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00{:}15{:}32.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}35.505$ between Twins and siblings was.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00{:}15{:}35{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}38{.}108$ The explanation for the effects of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00:15:38.108 \rightarrow 00:15:40.460$ prenatal depression on child outcome.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00{:}15{:}40.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}42.992$ So they concluded that the entire
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00:15:42.992 \longrightarrow 00:15:44.680$ fetal origins hypothesis was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00{:}15{:}44.755 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}47.175$ confounded by genetic variation using
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00{:}15{:}47.175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}49.595$ an indirect assessment of genetic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00{:}15{:}49{.}665 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}51{.}710$ variation using a twin design.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00{:}15{:}51{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}54{.}608$ So we wanted to revisit this question
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00{:}15{:}54.608 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}57.627$ to really ask and provide a more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:15:57.627 \rightarrow 00:15:59.737$ direct test of this hypothesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}15{:}59{.}737 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}03{.}225$ as to whether or not there was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:16:03.225 --> 00:16:05.209 confounding by underlying genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:16:07.430 --> 00:16:10.205 For adverse mental health outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}16{:}10{.}205 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}13{.}425$ now many of you will have heard from NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}16{:}18{.}396$ --> $00{:}16{:}21{.}152$ to capture common variation that is NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:21.152 \rightarrow 00:16:22.936$ associated with psychiatric disorders NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:22.936 \rightarrow 00:16:26.162$ and the use of these genetic tools

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}16{:}26.162 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}28.886$ has really an been greatly facilitated NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

00:16:28.886 --> 00:16:31.216 by these incredibly large genome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00:16:31.216 \rightarrow 00:16:33.092$ wide Association studies largely

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

 $00{:}16{:}33.092 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}35.431$ conducted by the Psychiatric Genomics

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00:16:37.220 \longrightarrow 00:16:39.788$ 10s or hundreds of thousands of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- 00:16:39.788 --> 00:16:41.914 individuals with a psychiatric disorder
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00:16:41.914 \rightarrow 00:16:44.329$ and where we look at the snips,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00:16:44.330 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.042$ the genetic variants that are associated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589383
- $00:16:47.042 \longrightarrow 00:16:48.850$ with the psychiatric disorder
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}16{:}48{.}916 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}50{.}812$ and that provides us with an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00:16:50.812 \longrightarrow 00:16:52.964$ effect size for that snip and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00:16:52.964 \longrightarrow 00:16:54.600$ risk of psychiatric disorder.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}16{:}54.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}57.624$ Now what we can do is take those
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00:16:57.624 \rightarrow 00:16:59.873$ effect sizes and we can count
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}16{:}59{.}873 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}02{.}533$ up and using our own data using
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- 00:17:02.533 --> 00:17:05.269 genetic data from our own court,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00:17:05.270 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.119$ we can count up the number of.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}17{:}08.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}10.766$ Risk snips that an individual carries,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}17{:}10.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}12.210$ and we can wait.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}14{.}907 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}17{.}571$ effect size that has been derived

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}17{.}571$ --> $00{:}17{:}20{.}504$ from these very large scale genome NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}20{.}504 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}23{.}019$ wide Association studies and what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}26.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}27.576$ that reflects an individual's

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}27{.}576$ --> $00{:}17{:}29{.}567$ genetic vulnerability for adverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}31{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}33{.}310$ whether it be ADHD, schizophrenia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}33{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}34{.}134$ or depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}34{.}134 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}37{.}018$ So the general principle is that once

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}39.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}41.262$ And this polygenic risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}43.693 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}46.048$ cases or individuals that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:17:46.048 --> 00:17:48.403 high risk for psychiatric disorder,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00:17:48.410 \rightarrow 00:17:51.105$ generally have a higher score

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}53.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}55.888$ So we use this methodology and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}55{.}888 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}58{.}254$ we can talk about the limitations

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}17{:}58{.}254 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}00{.}948$ of this methodology and in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:18:11.220 --> 00:18:13.160 We calculated these polygenic risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:18:13.160 --> 00:18:15.100 scores in the Outback children

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}18{:}18{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}20{.}800$ schizophrenia and depression and then

 $00:18:20.800 \rightarrow 00:18:23.210$ we used child mental health symptoms,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:25.470 \longrightarrow 00:18:27.730$ Difficulties questionnaire from age

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:18:27.730 --> 00:18:31.568 4 to 16 years of age and then we use

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}18{:}31{.}568 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}34{.}509$ long to tude ainle model modeling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}18{:}34{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}36{.}434$ Generalized estimating equations to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:18:36.434 --> 00:18:39.320 ask whether or not the prediction

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:18:41.534 --> 00:18:44.214 or maternal prenatal anxiety was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:44.214 \rightarrow 00:18:46.989$ confounded by child genetic risk for ADHD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}18{:}48{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}49{.}030$ And.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}18{:}49{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}52{.}600$ And the take home message from these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:18:52.600 --> 00:18:55.186 analysis was that even when we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:18:55.186 \rightarrow 00:18:58.288$ adjusted for child genetic risk for ADHD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00:18:58.701 \longrightarrow 00:18:59.523$ or depression,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00:18:59.523 \longrightarrow 00:19:01.578$ we still saw a significant
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}19{:}01{.}578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}03{.}221$ independent effect of maternal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}19{:}03.221 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}05.136$ prenatal depression on child outcome.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}19{:}05{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}07{.}660$ And this is just a representative
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- 00:19:07.660 --> 00:19:09.799 figure using the ADHD polygenic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}19{:}09{.}799 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}12{.}791$ risk score and what you can see is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00:19:12.791 \longrightarrow 00:19:15.633$ that children with a high burden of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}19{:}15.633 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}18.469$ genetic risk for ADHD and exposed to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}19{:}18{.}469 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}20{.}947$ high levels of maternal prenatal depression.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00:19:20.950 \longrightarrow 00:19:23.080$ Show increased symptoms relative to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00:19:23.080 \longrightarrow 00:19:25.581$ children with low genetic risk for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- 00:19:25.581 --> 00:19:27.660 ADHD and low and exposure to low
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}19{:}27.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}30.199$ levels of maternal prenatal depression,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00{:}19{:}30{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}32{.}612$ depression and we see this for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:32.612 \longrightarrow 00:19:34.220$ the external Ising subscale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}19{:}34{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}37{.}489$ We see this for the total symptom

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}19{:}37{.}489 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}41{.}029$ scores and we see this at four years

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:41.029 \rightarrow 00:19:45.156$ of age but also at 16 1/2 years of age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:19:45.160 \rightarrow 00:19:45.612$ Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}19{:}45.612 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}47.872$ one of the interesting observations

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:19:47.872 --> 00:19:50.624 from this study was that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}19{:}50{.}624 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}52{.}779$ was no interaction with time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:19:52.780 --> 00:19:55.810 We found a stable prediction from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}19{:}57{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}00{.}180$ Conversely, for both the schizophr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:20:00.180 --> 00:20:02.350 Any other polygenic risk score

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}20{:}04{.}591 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}06{.}985$ risk or we found a significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00{:}20{:}06{.}985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}09{.}154$ interaction with time where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:20:09.154 --> 00:20:11.634 polygenic risk score for schizophrenia

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987
- $00:20:11.634 \rightarrow 00:20:14.038$ or depression strengthened as these

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:20:15.292 \rightarrow 00:20:17.800$ so perhaps in the question period

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

 $00:20:17.867 \rightarrow 00:20:19.872$ we can discuss how developmentally

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

00:20:19.872 --> 00:20:21.877 dynamic symptoms or phenotypes may

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8720987

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}20{:}25{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}28{.}342$ but going back to the question

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}20{:}31.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}34.116$ Effects of the prenatal environment are

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}20{:}36{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}38{.}560$ At least from this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}20{:}38{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}41{.}256$ we can see that our best efforts to

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

 $00:20:45.838 \rightarrow 00:20:48.019$ the Association between maternal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}20{:}49.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}51.890$ prenatal anxiety and child outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}20{:}51.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}55.285$ and we do see an independent significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}20{:}55{.}285 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}57{.}664$ prediction from child genetic risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}20{:}57{.}664 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}00{.}196$ factors with the child ADHD PRS

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:00.196 \rightarrow 00:21:02.689$ being the strongest predictor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:21:05.066 --> 00:21:07.173 time talking about the importance

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:21:08.950 --> 00:21:11.038 but of course maternal mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:21:11.038 --> 00:21:13.137 can be associated with many other

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}15.081 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}16.869$ factors for adverse mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}16.869 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}19.023$ outcomes and one of the other

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00:21:20.890 \rightarrow 00:21:22.765$ interested in assessing and perhaps

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:26.010 \rightarrow 00:21:28.086$ was the role of maternal infection,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}28.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}30.603$ and again with the idea of trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}30.603 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}32.819$ to understand whether or not there

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:37.305 \longrightarrow 00:21:40.370$ and maternal infection to produce

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}40{.}454 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}43{.}681$ an works outcomes for the child and

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:21:43.681 --> 00:21:46.800 what you're looking at here in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:21:46.800 --> 00:21:49.266 slide is symptoms from the social

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}49{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}50{.}788$ communication disorder checklist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}21{:}50{.}788 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}54{.}330$ which can be thought of as essentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:21:54.406 \rightarrow 00:21:57.286$ symptoms related to autism like features,

- $00:21:57.290 \longrightarrow 00:21:58.793$ and we cut,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00{:}21{:}58.793 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}00.797$ characterized or assessed maternal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- 00:22:00.797 --> 00:22:02.300 infection in pregnancy,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00:22:02.300 \longrightarrow 00:22:04.910$ and we particularly focused on.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00:22:04.910 \rightarrow 00:22:07.794$ Infections that may give rise to systemic,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00{:}22{:}07{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}09{.}560$ an inflammation and infection an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00{:}22{:}09{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}12{.}271$ and what we found was that the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00{:}22{:}12{.}271 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}14{.}486$ number of maternal infections was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00{:}22{:}14.486 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}16.470$ associated with increased symptoms.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00{:}22{:}16.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}18.575$ Scores for the social communication
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- 00:22:18.575 --> 00:22:20.680 disorder checklist and the question
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00{:}22{:}20.747 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}22.557$ was whether or not maternal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00{:}22{:}22{.}557 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}24{.}367$ anxiety would have an independent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00:22:24.430 \longrightarrow 00:22:26.390$ effect and multiplicative effect,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00{:}22{:}26{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}28{.}862$ and what we found was indeed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00:22:28.862 \longrightarrow 00:22:30.098$ an additive effect.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00:22:30.100 \longrightarrow 00:22:31.752$ An independent additive effect

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:22:38.580 --> 00:22:41.898 but also for symptoms of 80 HD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:22:41.900 --> 00:22:42.225 So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}22{:}45{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}47{.}016$ I think that what we've documented

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:47.016 \rightarrow 00:22:49.158$ using the OS backward is that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:49.158 \rightarrow 00:22:51.104$ can be a persisting influence of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:22:51.164 \longrightarrow 00:22:53.279$ prenatal environment on child outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}22{:}53{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}56{.}040$ and we don't think that this is completely

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}22{:}56{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}58{.}459$ confounded by child genetic risk factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

 $00:23:00.645 \rightarrow 00:23:02.830$ genetic variation in the child? NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00{:}23{:}02{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}06{.}113$ That's an open question and we have NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00:23:06.113 \rightarrow 00:23:08.129$ published papers previously showing NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00:23:08.129 \rightarrow 00:23:10.774$ evidence of gene environment interactions NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00:23:10.774 \rightarrow 00:23:14.009$ and the prediction of child outcome. NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00{:}23{:}14.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}16.584$ Really highlights is that there are NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00:23:16.584 \rightarrow 00:23:18.731$ multiple opportunities to intervene to NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00:23:18.731 \rightarrow 00:23:20.909$ try and improve maternal mental health, NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00{:}23{:}20{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}23{.}472$ ideally as early as possible in NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00:23:23.472 \rightarrow 00:23:25.180$ pregnancy and certainly early NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00:23:25.250 \longrightarrow 00:23:27.000$ in the post Natal period. NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 00:23:27.000 --> 00:23:27.614 Of course, NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00:23:27.614 \rightarrow 00:23:30.070$ I think our data also speak to the NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 00:23:30.148 --> 00:23:32.064 importance of considering maternal NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00:23:32.064 \rightarrow 00:23:34.938$ physical health as another point of NOTE Confidence: 0.831203 $00:23:35.006 \rightarrow 00:23:37.508$ intervention to ensure that we can

- NOTE Confidence: 0.831203
- $00:23:37.508 \rightarrow 00:23:40.408$ bolster both maternal well being but

 $00{:}23{:}40{.}408 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}43{.}478$ also potentially improve child outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}23{:}43{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}45{.}315$ Now one of the characteristics

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00:23:46.790 \longrightarrow 00:23:47.894$ the developmental origins

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

 $00{:}23{:}52{.}851 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}55{.}077$ differences in the effects of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.831203

00:23:55.077 --> 00:23:56.561 prenatal environment on child

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:23:58.684 --> 00:24:01.060 how can we better identify children

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}01{.}136 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}03{.}826$ that are at risk and to try and get at NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}06.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}09.000$ And I moved to Montreal to

00:24:09.000 --> 00:24:10.560 study social epigenetics with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}10.631 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}12.926$ Michael Meaney and that's really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:12.930 \longrightarrow 00:24:14.995$ Features heavily in my current

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:24:16.650 --> 00:24:18.710 really, while it's heavily involved

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:19.950 \longrightarrow 00:24:21.960$ there was a paradigm shift in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}24{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}26{.}535$ appreciate that the environment could

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}26.535 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}29.039$ also shape epigenetic modifications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}31{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}34{.}680$ I think it's helpful to start with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}34{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}37{.}381$ definition of epigenetics and I like

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}37{.}381 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}40{.}129$ add this definition that comes from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:24:43.450 \rightarrow 00:24:45.315$ Markable initiative that sought to

 $00:24:45.315 \rightarrow 00:24:48.864$ act as a parallel to the Human Genome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}51{.}544 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}53{.}506$ epigenetic modifications across the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}53.506 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}55.541$ genome and across different cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}55{.}541 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}57{.}572$ and tissues and integrate those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}57{.}572 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}59{.}978$ data to provide a richer perspective

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}24{:}59{.}978 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}02{.}788$ and a deeper understanding of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:25:05.210 --> 00:25:05.635 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}11.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}13.708$ very controversial area of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:25:13.710 --> 00:25:14.994 Transgenerational epigenetic inheritance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}14.994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}16.706$ which posits that epigenetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}16.706 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}18.953$ states can be transmitted across

 $00:25:18.953 \rightarrow 00:25:20.765$ multiple generations with Fidelity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}20{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}23{.}416$ and the evidence for that in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}23.416 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}25.180$ humans is lacking an.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:25:25.180 \longrightarrow 00:25:26.503$ As I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}26{.}503 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}29{.}149$ it is a very controversial subject,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:25:29.150 --> 00:25:32.090 and there is an excellent review by

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}32.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}35.497$ Edith Heard for any of you that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}35{.}497 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}38{.}136$ interested in getting a having a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:25:38.136 --> 00:25:40.606 deeper dive into this controversy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}40.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}43.795$ but also the evidence we can see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}45{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}46{.}880$ epigenetic inheritance in C.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}46.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}47.282$ Elegans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:25:47.282 \rightarrow 00:25:48.488$ In certain plants,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}48{.}488{\:}{-}{-}{>}00{:}25{:}51{.}351$ an Indra Sofala fruit flies and but

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}56{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}59{.}640$ It doesn't rule out the possibility an,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}25{:}59{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}02{.}657$ but there is no clear evidence for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}02{.}657 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}05{.}800$ that in humans at the current time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}05{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}08{.}836$ But when I think about epigenetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}08{.}836 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}11{.}322$ and really the definition that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:13.910 \rightarrow 00:26:15.935$ The genetic states or epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}15{.}935 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}17{.}960$ modifications that can alter the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:18.025 \rightarrow 00:26:20.270$ transcriptional potential of a cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:20.270 \longrightarrow 00:26:23.393$ or indeed a system and what I mean by

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}23{.}393 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}27{.}047$ that is directly related to gene expression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}27.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}29.170$ so epigenetic modifications have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:29.170 \longrightarrow 00:26:31.290$ potential to alter gene expression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}31.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}33.635$ and that's one of the reasons that

00:26:33.635 - 00:26:36.160 people are so interested in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:26:38.570 \longrightarrow 00:26:40.496$ these epigenetic modifications can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}46.355 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}49.046$ out we've written a review on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}49.046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}51.542$ the evidence for and against the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}51{.}542 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}53{.}658$ epigenome underlying the biological NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}53.658 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}56.353$ embedding of experience and what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}56{.}353 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}58{.}820$ we conclude from this review is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}26{:}58{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}02{.}495$ that there is quite a lot of a good

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}27{:}02.495 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}04.016$ correlational evidence suggesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:27:04.016 --> 00:27:07.350 that the epigenome may underlie the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}27{:}07{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}09{.}806$ biological embedding of experience,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:09.810 \longrightarrow 00:27:12.225$ but trying to establish causality

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012
- $00{:}27{:}12.225 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}14.157$ does require model or.

00:27:14.160 --> 00:27:15.720 Organisms and I think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00:27:18.137 \rightarrow 00:27:20.879$ advent of EPI genome editing technology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}27{:}20.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}22.615$ where we can actually directly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}27{:}22.615 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}24.350$ manipulate in a site specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}27{:}24.409 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}26.281$ manner and different epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}27{:}26.281 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}28.153$ States and establish functional

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}27{:}28.153 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}30.030$ associations with gene expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

 $00{:}27{:}32{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}33{.}836$ Now the modification that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8619012

00:27:33.836 --> 00:27:36.260 I'm going to spend most of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}27{:}36{.}342 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}38{.}477$ my time talking about today

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}27{:}38{.}477 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}40{.}612$ is that of DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:27:40.620 --> 00:27:43.206 which is the addition of a

 $00:27:43.206 \longrightarrow 00:27:44.930$ methyl group are represented.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:27:54.367 --> 00:27:57.111 review that this is one of many

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:28:01.400 --> 00:28:03.344 epigenetic systems that work in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}28{:}04{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}07{.}386$ and as we make progress in our

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:28:09.190 --> 00:28:10.734 and indeed, social epigenomics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:14.258 \rightarrow 00:28:16.173$ layers and levels of information.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767
- $00:28:16.180 \longrightarrow 00:28:17.800$ About the epigynum.

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}28{:}22{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}24{.}355$ So let's think about this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:28:25.860 - 00:28:28.866 I think it can be very helpful to think

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}28{:}31{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}34{.}162$ And so some great metaphors exist to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}28{:}40{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}43{.}908$ so as sheet music and as a conductor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:28:48.420 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.138$ And really,

 $00:28:49.138 \rightarrow 00:28:52.640$ if we want to create a Symphony to create.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}28{:}52{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}54{.}600$ A phenotype that makes sense.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}28{:}56{.}808 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}58{.}774$ different units and work together

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:28:58.774 --> 00:29:00.478 in a coordinated manner,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:29:05.565 --> 00:29:08.313 of the signals of the conductor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:29:08.320 --> 00:29:10.637 One of the other metaphors that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}10.637 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}13.477$ love to use to describe how the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:29:15.245 --> 00:29:18.119 of the genome is that of grammar,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}21.288 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}22.950$ correct letters and text.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}22{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}26{.}874$ In a book, but if you don't have punctuation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:29:26.880 --> 00:29:29.070 if you don't have grammar,

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}31{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}34{.}745$ know that grammar can be critically

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}34.745 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}37.805$ important for our understanding of text,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:29:39.990 --> 00:29:41.870 Epigenetic modifications are critically

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:44.220 \rightarrow 00:29:46.550$ certain genes or silencing other genes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:29:50.443 \longrightarrow 00:29:51.442$ historically we've thought

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}51{.}442 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}53{.}107$ about DNA methylation as being

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:29:53.107 --> 00:29:54.749 a repressive modification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}54.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}57.846$ People have likened it to a light switch,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}29{:}57{.}850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}00{.}250$ so turning a gene on turning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}00{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}02{.}614$ Aging off and the evidence really

 $00:30:02.614 \rightarrow 00:30:04.190$ to support DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}04{.}256 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}06{.}160$ as a repressive modification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}06{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}08{.}848$ Cones from X inactivation where DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:08.848 \rightarrow 00:30:11.492$ methylation plays a role in silencing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}11.492 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}14.596$ one of the X chromosomes an in females,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}14.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}17.522$ but also from an imprinting where

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:17.522 \longrightarrow 00:30:20.553$ there can be silencing of 1 copy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:20.553 \longrightarrow 00:30:22.863$ of a gene for ad that occurs

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}22{.}958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}25{.}568$ in a parent of origin fashion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}25{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}27{.}859$ But we've begun to realize that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}27.859 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}30.789$ as we add more deeply characterized

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:30.789 \longrightarrow 00:30:32.037$ DNA methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}32{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}34{.}170$ Is that it's Association with gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00:30:34.170 \dashrightarrow 00:30:36.150$ expression can be more nuanced.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

 $00{:}30{:}36{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}39{.}516$ In some cases it can act like a dimmer

NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767

00:30:39.516 --> 00:30:41.390 switch, turning gene expression up,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767
- $00{:}30{:}41{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}42{.}140$ or Dan.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767
- $00:30:42.140 \longrightarrow 00:30:43.540$ Indeed in other situations,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767
- $00:30:43.540 \longrightarrow 00:30:44.940$ demethylation is not associated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767
- $00:30:44.940 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.250$ with gene expression,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767
- $00{:}30{:}46.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}48.666$ and in other cases still we can find
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767
- $00{:}30{:}48.666 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}51.024$ the DNA methylation at certain sites
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767
- $00{:}30{:}51{.}024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}53{.}538$ within a gene can actually alter
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767
- 00:30:53.615 00:30:55.925 the product or the splice variant
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767
- $00{:}30{:}55{.}925 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}58{.}118$ that's produced from a given gene.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8554767
- $00{:}30{:}58{.}118 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}00{.}710$ I think the take home message is that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00:31:00.784 \rightarrow 00:31:03.169$ the context is critically important.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- 00:31:03.170 --> 00:31:05.215 Another cool curring epigenetic modifications
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00{:}31{:}05{.}215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}08{.}066$ can also have an impact on whether
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00{:}31{:}08.066 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}10.304$ or not DNA methylation is negatively
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00{:}31{:}10{.}304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}12{.}491$ associated with gene expression or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:12.491 \rightarrow 00:31:14.786$ positively associated with gene expression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:14.790 \longrightarrow 00:31:17.054$ or indeed not associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:17.054 \rightarrow 00:31:19.884$ with gene expression at all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}31{:}19.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}22.458$ Now, one thing to consider when we look

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}31{:}22{.}458 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}25{.}201$ at DNA methylation across the genome is

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:25.201 \rightarrow 00:31:28.209$ that DNA methylation is a binary event,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:28.210 \longrightarrow 00:31:30.466$ it's either on or it's off.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:30.470 \rightarrow 00:31:33.134$ But throughout my talk you'll hear me talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:31:33.134 --> 00:31:35.390 perhaps about percentage DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:31:35.390 --> 00:31:37.658 90% DNA methylation, 60% DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}31{:}37{.}660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}40{.}145$ or 10% DNA methylation, and that is

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:40.145 \rightarrow 00:31:42.947$ because when we look at DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:42.950 \rightarrow 00:31:44.414$ particularly in clinical studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:44.414 \rightarrow 00:31:46.610$ we're looking at an average across

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:46.671 \rightarrow 00:31:49.850$ multiple cells, and so when we look within.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:31:49.850 \longrightarrow 00:31:53.306$ Multiple cells we can see that there may

- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00:31:53.306 \rightarrow 00:31:56.455$ be methylation at a given site in one cell,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00:31:56.460 \longrightarrow 00:31:57.824$ but not in another,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00:31:57.824 \rightarrow 00:32:01.130$ and so when we report back DNA methylation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00{:}32{:}01{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}03{.}070$ an results were talking about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00{:}32{:}03{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}04{.}622$ it as percentage metalation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- 00:32:04.630 --> 00:32:05.020 Essentially,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00{:}32{:}05{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}07{.}360$ the number of metalation marks within
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00:32:07.360 \dashrightarrow 00:32:10.078$ the cells of your tissue of interest.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00{:}32{:}10.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}12.870$ And that brings me to one of the issues
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00:32:12.870 \rightarrow 00:32:15.519$ with epigenetics in clinical studies,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00:32:15.520 \longrightarrow 00:32:17.860$ and that is the rule of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00:32:17.860 \longrightarrow 00:32:18.640$ cellular heterogeneity.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00{:}32{:}18.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}20.625$ So one of the principle
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00{:}32{:}20.625 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}22.213$ rules of the epigenome.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00{:}32{:}22{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}25{.}041$ Is to ensure that there is cellular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}32{:}25{.}041 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}26{.}879$ differentiation and the maintenance

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:32:26.879 --> 00:32:29.119 of those cellular phenotypes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}32{:}29{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}31{.}941$ and in fact where you have disorders

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:32:31.941 - > 00:32:34.180 related to DNA methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:34.180 \dashrightarrow 00:32:35.686$ Another epigenetic modifications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}32{:}35{.}686 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}38{.}196$ You can require pluripotency increase

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:38.196 \longrightarrow 00:32:40.160$ the stemness of these cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:32:40.160 --> 00:32:42.830 giving rise to disorders and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}32{:}42.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}44.966$ diseases such as cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}32{:}44{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}47{.}580$ But one of the other interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:47.580 \longrightarrow 00:32:50.500$ features of the epigenome and one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}32{:}50{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}53{.}069$ the functions that is emerging for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:53.152 \rightarrow 00:32:56.225$ epigenome is the idea of genomic priming.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}32{:}56{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}58{.}894$ So this is the idea that there can

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:32:58.894 \rightarrow 00:33:02.294$ be an exposure that gives rise to a

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:02.294 \rightarrow 00:33:05.149$ change in an epigenetic state such

- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00:33:05.149 \rightarrow 00:33:07.847$ as DNA methylation, and that am,

00:33:07.847 --> 00:33:08.246 instills,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:08.246 \rightarrow 00:33:10.640$ or instantiates the capacity to then

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:10.710 \rightarrow 00:33:13.314$ have an even greater response to an

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:33:13.314 --> 00:33:15.919 exposure subject to subsequent exposures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:15.920 \longrightarrow 00:33:18.398$ That an individual or sell may

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:18.398 \rightarrow 00:33:19.637$ experience as subsequently,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:19.640 \longrightarrow 00:33:21.872$ and this is really nicely articulated

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}21.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}24.423$ in this paper from my colleague

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:33:24.423 --> 00:33:25.419 Nadine Provincal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:33:25.420 --> 00:33:27.355 working with Elizabeth ****** where

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}27{.}355 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}28{.}903$ they treated hippocampal stem

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}28{.}903 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}30{.}380$ cells with dexame thasone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}30{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}32{.}440$ which is a synthetic glucocorticoid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}32{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}35{.}331$ And you can think of it like

 $00:33:35.331 \rightarrow 00:33:36.570$ a synthetic cortisol,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:36.570 \rightarrow 00:33:38.615$ an that produced widespread changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:33:38.615 --> 00:33:41.146 in DNA methylation and what was

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:41.146 \rightarrow 00:33:43.226$ interesting about this particular study

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}43.226 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}46.188$ was that the changes in DNA methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}46{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}48{.}908$ Didn't always correlate with the gene NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:48.908 \rightarrow 00:33:50.720$ expression response to dexame thas one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}50{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}53{.}096$ but the DNA methylation changes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}33{:}53.096 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}55.768$ did occur did predict the magnitude

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:55.768 \rightarrow 00:33:58.308$ of response to subsequent exposures

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:58.308 \longrightarrow 00:33:59.324$ to dexame thas one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:33:59.330 \rightarrow 00:34:02.048$ supporting this notion of genomic priming,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}34{:}02{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}04{.}310$ and you may be asking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:04.310 \longrightarrow 00:34:06.580$ well, how could that occur?

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:06.580 \dashrightarrow 00:34:09.286$ What would be the molecular mechanism?

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:09.290 \rightarrow 00:34:09.720$ Well,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723
- $00:34:09.720 \longrightarrow 00:34:12.730$ one of the reasons that we're interested

 $00:34:12.730 \rightarrow 00:34:15.639$ in steroid hormones such as cortisol,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:34:15.640 --> 00:34:16.554 progesterone, estradiol,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}34{:}16{.}554 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}17{.}011$ test osterone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:17.011 \longrightarrow 00:34:19.296$ Is because they are there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}34{:}19{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}21{.}510$ Their receptors are nuclear receptors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:21.510 \longrightarrow 00:34:24.394$ So when you have high levels of

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:34:24.394 --> 00:34:26.380 glucocorticoids such as cortisol,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00{:}34{:}26{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}29{.}056$ they can bind to the glucocorticoid

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:34:29.056 --> 00:34:31.260 receptor highlighted here in Gray,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

 $00:34:31.260 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.450$ and the binding of that receptor

NOTE Confidence: 0.84403723

00:34:33.450 --> 00:34:34.910 to the DNA can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:34:34.988 \rightarrow 00:34:37.784$ result in DNA demethylation or changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}34{:}37{.}784 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}41{.}222$ in DNA methylation at the site that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}34{:}41.222 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}43.218$ the transcription factor binds.

 $00:34:43.220 \longrightarrow 00:34:45.932$ So here you can see before

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:34:45.932 --> 00:34:47.288 exposure to glucocorticoids.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}34{:}47{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}49{.}922$ You have higher levels of DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}34{:}49{.}922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}52{.}568$ at this particular site or glucocorticoid

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}34{:}52{.}568 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}54{.}983$ response element then you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}34{:}54{.}983 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}57{.}018$ glucocorticoids binding to its receptor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:34:57.020 \rightarrow 00:34:59.120$ resulting in changes in DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}34{:}59{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}01{.}698$ and then when you have subsequent

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}01.698 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}03.360$ exposures to glucocorticoids,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}03{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}05{.}475$ you then have enhanced response

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}05{.}475 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}06{.}744$ to that exposure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}06{.}750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}09{.}865$ And I think this is a particularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}09{.}865 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}11{.}704$ interesting hypothesis and model

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:11.704 \longrightarrow 00:35:14.284$ when we think about the effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:14.284 \longrightarrow 00:35:16.403$ of prenatal adversity or early

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:16.403 \rightarrow 00:35:18.278$ adversity and how that may.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138
- $00:35:18.280 \rightarrow 00:35:22.788$ Confer or prime the genome for subsequent

 $00:35:22.788 \longrightarrow 00:35:26.740$ exposures or responses to those exposures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:26.740 \rightarrow 00:35:29.547$ So how do we analyze DNA methylation?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:35:29.550 --> 00:35:29.952 Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:29.952 \rightarrow 00:35:33.168$ there are many approaches that we can use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:35:33.170 - 00:35:35.486 We can use an epigenome wide

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}35{.}486 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}37{.}030$ Association study or metalation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:37.100 \dashrightarrow 00:35:39.711$ wide Association study an if we use

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:39.711 \rightarrow 00:35:41.610$ whole genome bisulfite sequencing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}41.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}44.452$ we can assess roughly around 24 million

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:44.452 \rightarrow 00:35:46.840$ CPG's more commonly because of cost.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}46{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}49{.}186$ We're using an microarray based technology

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}49{.}186 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}51{.}660$ where we assess around 850,000 sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}35{:}51.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}54.228$ Now, what you can quickly appreciate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:35:54.228 \rightarrow 00:35:57.000$ is that you're going to need very.

00:35:57.000 - 00:35:59.682 Large courts to to adjust for NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 $00{:}35{:}59{.}682 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}01{.}956$ multiple comparisons with so many NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 $00:36:01.956 \rightarrow 00:36:04.362$ sites and so what's promising in NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 $00:36:04.362 \rightarrow 00:36:07.188$ this regard is the PACE consortium, NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 $00:36:07.190 \rightarrow 00:36:09.788$ which is a consortium that's combining NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 $00{:}36{:}09{.}788 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}11{.}520$ multiple different studies to NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 $00:36:11.591 \rightarrow 00:36:13.821$ perform meta analysis of prenatal NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 00:36:13.821 - > 00:36:15.605 exposures on DNA methylation. NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 $00:36:15.610 \rightarrow 00:36:18.627$ So they have performed a meta analysis NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 $00:36:18.627 \rightarrow 00:36:20.894$ of maternal prenatal smoking and NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 00:36:20.894 --> 00:36:23.139 DNA methylation and cord blood, NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 $00:36:23.140 \rightarrow 00:36:26.008$ and found over 2000 sites that NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 00:36:26.008 --> 00:36:27.442 survived genome wide. NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 $00:36:27.450 \rightarrow 00:36:29.886$ Adjustment and then the figure that NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 $00:36:29.886 \rightarrow 00:36:32.487$ you're looking at here on the right NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138 $00:36:32.487 \longrightarrow 00:36:34.594$ is showing all of the sites in

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138
- $00:36:34.666 \longrightarrow 00:36:37.102$ blue and red across the different

 $00{:}36{:}37.102 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}39.146$ chromosomes in the human genome

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}36{:}39{.}146 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}41{.}226$ that were associated with infant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:41.226 \longrightarrow 00:36:43.888$ birth weight in cord blood and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:36:43.888 --> 00:36:45.736 from around 9000 participants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:45.740 \longrightarrow 00:36:46.136$ Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:36:46.136 \rightarrow 00:36:49.304$ one of the challenges with this approach is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:36:49.310 --> 00:36:52.883 as I said, you need very large sample sizes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}36{:}52{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}54{.}875$ but you also ideally would

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:36:54.875 -> 00:36:56.860 need to have longitudinal data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}36{:}56{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}59{.}422$ So for example in the birth weight

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}36{:}59{.}422 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}02{.}018$ study that I'm talking about here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:02.020 \longrightarrow 00:37:04.438$ they identified around 900 CPG's that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}04{.}438 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}06{.}498$ were associated with birth weight

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}06{.}498 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}08{.}766$ for a subset of those participants.

 $00{:}37{:}08{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}11{.}248$ They then had longitudinal data and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}11{.}248 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}14.077$ what they found was that of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}14.077 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}16.856$ 900 sites only around 10% of them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}16.856 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}18.748$ We're still associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:18.748 \longrightarrow 00:37:21.868$ birth weight at 7 years of age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:37:21.870 --> 00:37:24.810 and this highlights a complexity with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:37:24.810 --> 00:37:27.588 epigenetic analysis that you don't have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}27{.}588 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}30{.}185$ as it's not as strong a confounder

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}30.185 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}33.009$ with genome wide Association studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}33{.}010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}35{.}038$ This idea that there can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:37:35.038 --> 00:37:37.227 dynamic change in DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:37.227 \rightarrow 00:37:39.507$ requiring longitudinal sampling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:37:39.510 --> 00:37:41.830 So what approaches can we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:41.830 \longrightarrow 00:37:44.150$ take to overcome these issues?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:37:44.150 --> 00:37:44.626 Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}37{:}44.626 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}47.958$ one approach that has I've used extensively.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138
- $00:37:47.960 \longrightarrow 00:37:50.280$ Is that of an biomarkers?

 $00:37:50.280 \rightarrow 00:37:52.164$ Epigenetic biomarkers that distill

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:52.164 \rightarrow 00:37:54.990$ down and genome wide data into

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:37:55.065 - 00:37:57.240 a single unit of measurements,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:57.240 \longrightarrow 00:37:59.560$ and perhaps the most well

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:37:59.560 \longrightarrow 00:38:01.416$ established of these biomarkers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:38:01.420 \rightarrow 00:38:03.740$ is that of epigenetic age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:38:03.740 \rightarrow 00:38:06.060$ initially developed by Steve Horvath,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

00:38:06.060 --> 00:38:07.664 an at UCLA Ann,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00:38:07.664 \rightarrow 00:38:10.070$ and the idea with these epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}38{:}10.152 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}13.038$ biomarkers is that we can identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.8489138

 $00{:}38{:}13.038 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}14.962$ sites that are predictive

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:15.045 \rightarrow 00:38:16.728$ of chronological age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}38{:}16{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}18{.}302$ and we can create.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:18.302 \longrightarrow 00:38:19.874$ A measure of epigenetic

 $00:38:19.874 \longrightarrow 00:38:21.849$ age for an individual.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:38:21.850 --> 00:38:23.830 These clocks now exist with

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:38:23.830 --> 00:38:25.018 multi tissue predictors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:25.020 \longrightarrow 00:38:27.246$ so you can take any biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}38{:}27{.}246 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}29{.}916$ sample from any one and you can then

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:38:29.916 --> 00:38:31.771 measure their epigenetic age and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}38{:}31{.}771 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}34{.}322$ what we notice in population levels

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}38{:}34{.}322 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}36{.}926$ is that there are some individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}38{:}36{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}38{.}920$ that you'll hire epigenetic age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}38{:}38{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}40{.}428$ relative chronological age and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:38:40.428 --> 00:38:42.313 others that show lower epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:38:42.313 \rightarrow 00:38:44.218$ age relative to their chronological

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}38{:}44{.}218 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}46{.}048$ age and what's interesting is

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}38{:}46{.}048 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}48{.}317$ that those individuals with higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:38:48.317 --> 00:38:49.697 epigenetic age acceleration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:38:49.700 - > 00:38:55.130 Show increase risk for age related?

00:38:55.130 --> 00:38:57.682 Disorders including cardiovascular disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}38{:}57{.}682 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}00{.}872$ but also all cause mortality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:00.880 \dashrightarrow 00:39:03.124$ Now, one of the challenges with

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:03.124 \longrightarrow 00:39:05.066$ this epigenetic Clock from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:39:05.066 --> 00:39:06.562 multi tissue epigenetic Clock

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:06.562 \longrightarrow 00:39:08.877$ is that it was developed using

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}39{:}08{.}877 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}10{.}747$ primarily samples from a dults and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:10.747 \rightarrow 00:39:13.622$ they ranged in age from zero to 100,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:39:13.622 --> 00:39:15.680 but it was primarily samples from

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:39:15.748 --> 00:39:18.046 adult participants and the error in

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}39{:}18.046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}20.047$ the prediction of the epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:39:20.047 --> 00:39:22.423 Clock is around 3.6 years and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:22.423 \longrightarrow 00:39:24.757$ which obviously is a very long

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}39{:}24.757 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}27.410$ time in the life of a child.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}39{:}27{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}29{.}726$ So we set about creating a

 $00:39:29.726 \longrightarrow 00:39:30.884$ novel pediatric specific.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:39:30.890 --> 00:39:31.680 Epigenetic Clock,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:31.680 \longrightarrow 00:39:33.655$ which was published last year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:39:33.660 --> 00:39:35.645 We used approximately 2000 DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}39{:}35{.}645 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}38{.}106$ methylome's and we simply asked what

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:39:38.106 --> 00:39:40.530 were the sites that were associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:40.530 \dashrightarrow 00:39:42.768$ with chronological age in this cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}39{:}42.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}44.690$ This is data from longitudinal cohort

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:39:44.690 --> 00:39:47.055 where we use the original epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}39{:}47.055 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}49.107$ Clock with longitudinal samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:49.110 \rightarrow 00:39:52.206$ and what you can appreciate from this is NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:52.206 \rightarrow 00:39:55.436$ that the slopes are all over the place.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:55.440 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.330$ An long digital samples that

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:39:57.330 \longrightarrow 00:39:58.842$ should be epigenetically older

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}39{:}58.842 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}00.550$ are appearing epigenetic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:00.550 \rightarrow 00:40:03.310$ Younger and you can see this again here,

 $00:40:03.310 \rightarrow 00:40:05.368$ and this simply reflects the error

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}40{:}05{.}368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}07{.}110$ in the conventional epigenetic Clock.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:07.110 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.476$ When we plot these data using the

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:09.476 --> 00:40:10.900 new pediatric epigenetic Clock,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}40{:}10.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}13.189$ I think you can appreciate that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:13.189 \rightarrow 00:40:15.390$ slopes become a lot more positive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:15.390 \longrightarrow 00:40:18.158$ so we brought the error in prediction of

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:18.158 \rightarrow 00:40:20.556$ epigenetic age down to around six months,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:20.560 --> 00:40:22.975 and many of you may be thinking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:22.980 --> 00:40:24.700 well, you know, that's great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:24.700 --> 00:40:26.450 You can just calculate someones

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:26.450 \longrightarrow 00:40:28.839$ age based on their date of birth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:28.840 \longrightarrow 00:40:31.156$ What is what value is this?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}40{:}31.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}33.806$ An and so in this particular study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:33.810 \longrightarrow 00:40:35.748$ what we found was that children

 $00{:}40{:}35.748 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}37.583$ of the autism spectrum disorder

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:37.583 --> 00:40:39.499 had accelerated epigenetic age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}40{:}39{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}42{.}132$ an Association that we saw with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:42.132 --> 00:40:43.670 pediatric specific epigenetic Clock,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}40{:}43.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}46.960$ but not with the conventional Horvath Clock.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:40:46.960 --> 00:40:47.992 But of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:47.992 \rightarrow 00:40:51.140$ bringing us back to the topic of interest,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:51.140 \rightarrow 00:40:53.800$ the fetal origins of health and disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}40{:}53.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}56.271$ we wanted to ask whether or not

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:56.271 \rightarrow 00:40:57.811$ maternal prenatal anxiety would

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}40{:}57.811 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}59.876$ be associated with epigenetic age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:40:59.880 \longrightarrow 00:41:00.207$ acceleration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00:41:00.207 \longrightarrow 00:41:02.823$ and to do that we made use of

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:41:02.823 --> 00:41:04.819 two longitudinal at courts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

 $00{:}41{:}04{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}06{.}340$ one from the Netherlands.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704

00:41:06.340 --> 00:41:07.860 That's primarily Caucasian one

- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00{:}41{:}07{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}08{.}620$ from Singapore,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00{:}41{:}08.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}11.042$ that's multi ethnic and what we found
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00:41:11.042 \rightarrow 00:41:13.034$ was that maternal prenatal anxiety
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00{:}41{:}13.034 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}14.798$ was associated with accelerated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00{:}41{:}14.798 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}17.449$ epigenetic age at six years of age.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00:41:17.450 \longrightarrow 00:41:20.447$ In the 10 years of age in the Bible
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00{:}41{:}20{.}447 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}22{.}631$ course and again we replicated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00:41:22.631 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.836$ this in the coastal court,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00:41:24.840 \longrightarrow 00:41:26.452$ finding that maternal prenatal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00:41:26.452 \longrightarrow 00:41:28.064$ anxiety was associated with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00:41:28.064 \longrightarrow 00:41:29.120$ accelerated epigenetic age,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00:41:29.120 \longrightarrow 00:41:31.850$ an effect that strengthens overtime
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79934704
- $00:41:31.850 \longrightarrow 00:41:34.580$ is particularly pronounced at 48
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952
- $00{:}41{:}34.665 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}37.345$ months of age. Now, one of the questions
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952
- $00{:}41{:}37{.}345 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}39{.}513$ that again I'm very interested in is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:41:39.513 \rightarrow 00:41:41.452$ is trying to understand whether or not

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}41{:}41{.}452 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}43.858$ there are features or a spects of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}41{:}43.858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}45.738$ Pulcinella environment that may be able NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}41{:}45{.}738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}47{.}730$ to buffer or moderate the effects of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}41{:}47.787 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}49.967$ prenatal environment on epigenetic states.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:41:49.970 --> 00:41:51.570 Because of course it's very

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:41:51.570 -> 00:41:54.058 depressing to to give a talk and say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:41:54.060 \rightarrow 00:41:55.950$ well, it's all over at birth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}41{:}55{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}57{.}959$ and of course it's much more optimistic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}41{:}57{.}959 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}00{.}208$ and positive to say that there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}00{.}208 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}01{.}878$ potential interventions that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:42:01.878 --> 00:42:03.879 implement that may buffer or mitigate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}03{.}879 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}05{.}494$ the effects of prenatal adversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:42:05.500 --> 00:42:08.340 This is a paper from my PhD mentors

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:08.340 \rightarrow 00:42:11.130$ showing that an infant attachment style,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:11.130 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.310$ so each child's perception of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952
- $00:42:13.310 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.490$ the predictability an index of

 $00:42:15.562 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.956$ the quality of care in the pools.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}17.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}19.504$ Naval environment moderates the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:19.504 \rightarrow 00:42:21.048$ Association between prenatal cortisol

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:21.048 \rightarrow 00:42:23.188$ exposure and child cognitive development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:23.190 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.200$ Of course, other examples exist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:25.200 \longrightarrow 00:42:27.606$ This is from the Boukris Early

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:42:27.606 --> 00:42:28.408 Intervention Project,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}28.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}30.780$ showing that secure an infant attachment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}30{.}780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}33{.}748$ can buffer or moderate the effects of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:42:33.748 --> 00:42:35.943 early adversity on child psychopathology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:42:35.950 --> 00:42:36.844 So of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}36{.}844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}38{.}930$ the question we wanted to ask with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}38{.}993 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}41{.}597$ this study was whether or not infant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}41.597 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}43.916$ attachment would buffer or moderate the

 $00:42:43.916 \rightarrow 00:42:45.806$ effects of maternal prenatal anxiety

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:45.806 \rightarrow 00:42:47.629$ on child epigenetic age acceleration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:47.629 \longrightarrow 00:42:49.394$ And this is unpublished data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}49{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}51{.}677$ But what we find is that yes indeed in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}51.677 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}53.368$ children that have secure attachment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}53{.}368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}55{.}438$ we see a positive but nonsignificant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:55.492 \longrightarrow 00:42:57.300$ Association between maternal prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:42:57.300 \longrightarrow 00:42:59.560$ anxiety and child epigenetic age

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}42{:}59{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}00{.}012$ acceleration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:00.020 \rightarrow 00:43:01.946$ but the effects of maternal prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}01{.}946 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}03{.}695$ anxiety on child epigenetic age

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:43:03.695 --> 00:43:04.922 acceleration are particularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}04{.}922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}06{.}149$ pronounced in children.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}06{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}08{.}590$ With an insecure attachment style.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:08.590 \rightarrow 00:43:11.985$ Again supporting this idea of a potential,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:11.990 \rightarrow 00:43:15.770$ pools Natal moderation of infant attachment.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952
- $00{:}43{:}15.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}18.598$ Now of course there are other M

00:43:18.598 --> 00:43:20.503 epigenetic biomarkers that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:20.503 \rightarrow 00:43:22.652$ use to try and probe our describe

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}22.652 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}24.914$ the effects of the environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}24{.}914 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}26{.}798$ on health related outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:26.800 \rightarrow 00:43:29.164$ This is one that we're starting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:29.164 \longrightarrow 00:43:30.740$ to make use of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:30.740 \longrightarrow 00:43:32.636$ It's a second generation after genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}32{.}636 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}34{.}834$ Clock and what is different about

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:34.834 \longrightarrow 00:43:37.444$ this epigenetic biomarker is that it

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:43:37.444 --> 00:43:39.211 incorporates information about plasma

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}39{.}211 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}41{.}301$ proteins that are associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:43:41.301 --> 00:43:43.396 cardiova
scular disease risk as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}43{.}396 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}45{.}904$ as sites that are associated with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}45{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}47{.}854$ Aging and we wanted to determine

 $00{:}43{:}47{.}854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}50{.}421$ whether or not there was any Association

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:50.421 \rightarrow 00:43:52.839$ between an early adversity and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}52{.}839 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}54{.}524$ epigenetic biomarker making use

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:43:54.524 --> 00:43:56.549 of the Nurse Family Partnership,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:43:56.550 \longrightarrow 00:43:58.755$ which many of you will know is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}43{:}58.755 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}00.639$ a randomized control trial of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}44{:}00{.}639 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}02{.}391$ the perinatal intervention that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:02.391 \rightarrow 00:44:04.143$ targets vulnerable low income.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}44{:}04{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}06{.}280$ First time moms and it provides

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}44{:}06{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}08{.}525$ nurse visitations have been shown to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:08.525 --> 00:44:10.420 reduce child maltreatment an improve

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}44{:}10{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}12{.}890$ outcomes for both mothers and children.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}44{:}12.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}14.850$ We published the first epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}44{:}14.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}16.418$ analysis in this cohort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:16.420 --> 00:44:18.874 A collaboration with Jim Lechman and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}44{:}18.874 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}21.202$ Elena Grigorenko when she was based

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952
- $00{:}44{:}21.202 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}23.682$ here and we found that there was some

00:44:23.753 --> 00:44:25.917 preliminary Association between nurse

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:25.917 --> 00:44:29.163 Visitation and variation in DNA methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:29.170 \longrightarrow 00:44:31.676$ But really the take home message was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}44{:}31.676 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}34.788$ that there was a profound effect of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:34.788 --> 00:44:37.243 childhood maltreatment on DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:37.250 \longrightarrow 00:44:39.370$ but we couldn't distinguish the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:39.370 --> 00:44:41.066 effects of maltreatment from,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:41.070 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.345$ say, for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00{:}44{:}42{.}345 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}44{.}045$ the effects of associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:44.045 --> 00:44:45.320 confounders like smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

 $00:44:45.320 \longrightarrow 00:44:46.685$ So what about?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8114952

00:44:46.685 --> 00:44:48.960 This measure of epigenetic age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}44{:}48{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}51{.}704$ acceleration in the context of the Nurse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:44:51.710 --> 00:44:52.376 Family, Partnership,

 $00{:}44{:}52{.}376 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}55{.}040$ or what we see is that children with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}44{:}55{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}57{.}656$ a documented or substantiated case of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}44{:}57.656$ --> $00{:}44{:}59.360$ child maltreatment show accelerated NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:44:59.426 \rightarrow 00:45:01.526$ epigenetic aging using this disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}01{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}02{.}943$ Relevant epigenetic biomarker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}02{.}943 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}06{.}240$ But what about when we break this NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:06.320 \longrightarrow 00:45:08.438$ down by an intervention group or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}08{.}438 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}11{.}286$ what we find is that in the nurse

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:45:11.286 --> 00:45:13.712 visit a group in purple here and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:13.712 \longrightarrow 00:45:16.064$ the yellow is the control group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}16.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}18.150$ We find no difference in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:45:18.150 --> 00:45:19.398 epigenetic age acceleration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}19{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}21{.}640$ As a function in those individuals that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:21.640 \rightarrow 00:45:24.517$ don't have a history of child maltreatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}24{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}27{.}337$ But when we look in the group that does

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:27.337 \rightarrow 00:45:30.008$ have a history of child maltreatment,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00:45:30.010 \rightarrow 00:45:31.478$ we see significantly increased
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00:45:31.478 \longrightarrow 00:45:32.579$ an epigenetic age,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00{:}45{:}32{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}34{.}410$ acceleration and those individuals that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00:45:34.410 \longrightarrow 00:45:36.657$ have a history of child maltreatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00:45:36.657 \rightarrow 00:45:38.799$ that are in the control group.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00{:}45{:}38{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}40{.}714$ But it seems that exposure to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00:45:40.714 \longrightarrow 00:45:42.409$ nurse Visitation to that early
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00:45:42.409 \rightarrow 00:45:44.209$ intervention seems to be buffering
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00{:}45{:}44{.}209 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}46{.}480$ the effects of child maltreatment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00{:}45{:}46{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}48{.}044$ An epigenetic age acceleration.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00:45:48.044 \rightarrow 00:45:49.608$ Now we can discuss.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00{:}45{:}49{.}610$ --> $00{:}45{:}51{.}234$ Potential explanations for this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00:45:51.234 \rightarrow 00:45:53.264$ one possibility is that perhaps
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00{:}45{:}53{.}264 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}55{.}661$ the severity of abuse was less in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00{:}45{:}55{.}661 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}57{.}790$ the nurse visited group that there
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:45:57.790 \rightarrow 00:45:59.740$ was greater surveillance of abuse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}45{:}59{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}01{.}990$ and the nurse visited group an.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}46{:}01{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}03{.}775$ An alternative hypothesis is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:03.775 \rightarrow 00:46:05.560$ the early intervention is providing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:46:05.617 --> 00:46:06.859 some buffering capacity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:06.860 \rightarrow 00:46:09.860$ so even in the face of child maltreatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}46{:}09{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}12{.}242$ there's less of an impact on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:12.242 \rightarrow 00:46:13.830$ epigenetic age acceleration just

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}46{:}13.903 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}15.859$ in the last couple of minutes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}46{:}15.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}18.758$ I just like to tell you about one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}46{:}18.758 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}21.987$ the biomarker that we're making use of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}46{:}21.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}24.180$ Which is a measure that relates

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:24.180 \longrightarrow 00:46:26.650$ to this paper I highlighted,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:26.650 \longrightarrow 00:46:28.350$ previously speaking to this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:46:28.350 --> 00:46:30.050 idea of genomic priming,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:30.050 \rightarrow 00:46:32.874$ and in this paper they created an epigenetic

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- 00:46:32.874 --> 00:46:35.129 biomarker of glucocorticoid exposure,

 $00{:}46{:}35{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}37{.}601$ and so this essentially we can create

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:46:37.601 --> 00:46:40.908 a an index or a proxy measure for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:40.908 \rightarrow 00:46:42.644$ glucocorticoid exposure based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:42.644 \dashrightarrow 00:46:45.732$ DNA methylation, and so we created.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:45.732 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.424$ We use this array.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:47.430 \longrightarrow 00:46:49.614$ Tested this out in a court

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:49.614 \rightarrow 00:46:52.170$ where we had DNA methylation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}46{:}52.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}54.860$ Data upper than at one year of age in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:46:54.935 \rightarrow 00:46:57.767$ cohort from the University of California,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:46:57.770 --> 00:46:58.112 Irvine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}46{:}58.112 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}00.506$ and we also had structural imaging in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}00{.}506$ --> $00{:}47{:}02{.}660$ this cohort and what we simply asked NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:47:02.660 --> 00:47:04.958 was whether or not the sites that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}04{.}958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}07{.}028$ were associated DNA methylation sites

 $00{:}47{:}07{.}028 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}08{.}998$ that were associated with maternal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:47:08.998 --> 00:47:10.818 prenatal depression did they overlap

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}10.818 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}13.064$ with the sites that were identified

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}13.064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}14.884$ to be glucocorticoid sensitive sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:14.884 \longrightarrow 00:47:17.019$ in that paper that I showed you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:47:17.020 --> 00:47:17.790 And indeed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}17.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}19.330$ we found significant enrichment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}19{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}20{.}870$ of glucocorticoid sensitive sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}20{.}926 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}23{.}026$ in the sites that were associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}23.026$ --> $00{:}47{:}24.076$ maternal prenatal depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}24.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}26.504$ And when we created this Google

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:47:26.504 --> 00:47:27.716 Corticoid exposure score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}27{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}30{.}120$ we saw a significant negative Association

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:30.120 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.720$ between maternal prenatal depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}31.777$ --> $00{:}47{:}33.777$ and this glucocorticoid exposure score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:33.780 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.902$ And interesting Lee,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794
- $00:47:34.902 \rightarrow 00:47:37.520$ what we found was that this glucocorticoid

 $00:47:37.585 \rightarrow 00:47:39.730$ exposure score at birth predicted

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:47:39.730 --> 00:47:41.446 lower hippocampal volume birth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:41.450 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.994$ and as you'll appreciate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:42.994 \longrightarrow 00:47:44.538$ the hippocampus is enriched

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:44.538 \rightarrow 00:47:45.900$ for glucocorticoid receptors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00:47:45.900 \longrightarrow 00:47:48.280$ So we find that the direction of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}48.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}49.844$ this Association is consistent

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}49{.}844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}52{.}199$ with a higher maternal prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}52.199 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}54.550$ liberation predicting a lower score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}54{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}57{.}550$ And a lower score predicting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}47{:}57{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}59{.}350$ lower hippocampal volume.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

00:47:59.350 --> 00:48:00.558 So, just to summarize,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}48{:}00{.}558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}02{.}821$ I think that with some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8456794

 $00{:}48{:}02{.}821 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}04{.}741$ studies that I've tried to

00:48:04.741 --> 00:48:06.277 highlight perhaps very quickly

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}06{.}342 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}08{.}694$ today, we can see that variation in

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:48:08.694 --> 00:48:10.447 DNA methylation is associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:10.447 \longrightarrow 00:48:12.337$ variation in the early environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}12{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}14{.}564$ I think as we move towards trying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:14.564 \rightarrow 00:48:16.899$ make these findings clinically relevant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:16.900 \rightarrow 00:48:18.993$ we need to move towards more integrative

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:18.993 \rightarrow 00:48:20.386$ models where we're incorporating

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:20.386 \longrightarrow 00:48:22.170$ measures of genetic variation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}22.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}23.925$ and we're incorporating an greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}23.925 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}25.680$ measures of the social environment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:25.680 \longrightarrow 00:48:28.144$ and I think one way that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:28.144 \rightarrow 00:48:30.000$ can really begin to probe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}30{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}32{.}105$ Causal associations between the social

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}32.105 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}33.789$ environment and epigenetic states

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:48:33.789 \rightarrow 00:48:36.117$ is through the use of interventions,

 $00{:}48{:}36{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}39{.}081$ and this is an area that I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:48:39.081 --> 00:48:41.830 particularly keen to do more work in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}41.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}43.852$ and one collaboration that I'm very

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}43.852 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}46.163$ excited about is a cluster randomized NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}46{.}163 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}48{.}408$ control trial of parental intervention

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:48:48.408 --> 00:48:51.095 that begins in early pregnancy that

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}51.095 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}53.215$ seeks to reduce prenatal anxiety

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}53.215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}55.698$ and depression but also provide an

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:48:55.698 --> 00:48:57.733 information about nutrition and sleep,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}48{:}57{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}00{.}143$ trying to reduce domestic violence, an.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:00.143 --> 00:49:01.958 An increase female empowerment and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:01.958 --> 00:49:04.285 we're doing this in rural Vietnam

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}04{.}285 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}06{.}300$ with my colleague James Fisher,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}06{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}08{.}382$ where one in three women can

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:08.382 --> 00:49:10.254 experience or struggle with their

 $00:49:10.254 \longrightarrow 00:49:11.938$ mental health and pregnancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}11{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}14{.}220$ We're just coordinating to receive

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}14.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}16.500$ samples from approximately 1200 mothers

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:16.563 \rightarrow 00:49:18.288$ and their infants with biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:18.288 --> 00:49:21.332 samples at birth at 12 months and a 24

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}21.332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}23.216$ months MA which have been collected NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:23.220 --> 00:49:24.720 in parallel with standardized

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:24.720 \rightarrow 00:49:26.595$ measures of child newer development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}26.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}29.240$ And really the goal with these

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:29.240 \longrightarrow 00:49:32.149$ kind of studies and the goal of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:32.150 --> 00:49:33.946 Understanding epigenetic States and

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:33.946 --> 00:49:35.742 modifications and implementing them

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:35.742 \longrightarrow 00:49:37.780$ in clinical studies is really to

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}37.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}39.869$ try and understand how we can make

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:39.869 \rightarrow 00:49:41.899$ interventions work from war individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:41.900 \longrightarrow 00:49:44.511$ so I'll leave it there with maybe

 $00:49:44.511 \longrightarrow 00:49:47.150$ just one kind of call to action.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:47.150 --> 00:49:49.398 I was very pleased to be invited to

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:49.398 --> 00:49:51.961 take part in the Scientific Council

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:49:51.961 --> 00:49:53.897 of Postpartum Support International,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}53{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}56{.}301$ and this is a plug for their

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}49{:}56{.}301 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}58{.}695$ national strategy on how we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:49:58.695 \rightarrow 00:50:00.415$ improve perinatal mental health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:50:00.420 \rightarrow 00:50:03.201$ And so I think this is a societal problem

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}50{:}03.201 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}05.538$ that requires a societal response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}50{:}05{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}07{.}490$ and I think we're all responsible

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}50{:}07{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}09{.}654$ for playing our part and trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}50{:}09{.}654$ --> $00{:}50{:}11{.}644$ to support perinatal mental health

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}50{:}11.644 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}13.624$ and recognizing that there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}50{:}13.624 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}15.072$ structural and societal factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}50{:}15{.}072 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}17{.}984$ that we can target and to try and

 $00:50:17.984 \rightarrow 00:50:19.448$ improve perinatal mental health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:50:19.450 \longrightarrow 00:50:22.117$ And this isn't just all pregnant mothers

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}50{:}22.117 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}24.938$ and have another thing to worry about an,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00{:}50{:}24{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}27{.}828$ so I'll leave it with that and just

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

 $00:50:27.828 \rightarrow 00:50:31.206$ thank you all for your attention and take.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84173185

00:50:31.210 --> 00:50:31.930 Any questions?

NOTE Confidence: 0.899965584615385

 $00:50:41.340 \longrightarrow 00:50:43.026$ Fantastic. Questions please.

NOTE Confidence: 0.899965584615385

 $00:50:43.026 \rightarrow 00:50:48.339$ Just go for it or put it in the text.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00{:}50{:}50{.}790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}54{.}137$ Hi, this is Flora. Do you hear me?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

00:50:54.137 - 00:50:56.641 Yes yes Laura hi sorry hi,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:50:56.641 \rightarrow 00:50:58.976$ how are you really? Nice talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00{:}50{:}58{.}976 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}02{.}182$ I had a question um so so as you

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:02.182 \rightarrow 00:51:04.447$ know epigenetics are very much

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:04.447 \longrightarrow 00:51:07.263$ self type an organ specific so

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00{:}51{:}07{.}263 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}10{.}017$ perhaps you can clarify for us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:10.020 \dashrightarrow 00:51:12.904$ I mean of course studies in humans

- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- $00:51:12.904 \rightarrow 00:51:15.634$ cannot be done in brain whereas
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- $00{:}51{:}15{.}634 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}18{.}454$ studies in animals can and I'm
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- $00{:}51{:}18{.}454 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}20{.}946$ assuming some of those that you.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- $00{:}51{:}20{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}23{.}355$ Elucidated or talked about where
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- 00:51:23.355 --> 00:51:26.995 done in mouse or rat brains, right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- $00:51:26.995 \longrightarrow 00:51:28.005$ So perhaps,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- $00:51:28.005 \rightarrow 00:51:30.530$ given the course profound difficulties,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- 00:51:30.530 --> 00:51:31.914 you know?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- $00{:}51{:}31{.}914 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}35{.}374$ Same brain samples from humans
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- 00:51:35.374 --> 00:51:36.758 living individuals.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- $00:51:36.760 \longrightarrow 00:51:41.224$ Is it been any study in animals that has?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- $00{:}51{:}41{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}43{.}480$ Um illuminated this concept to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- $00{:}51{:}43{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}45{.}280$ what extent peripheral samples
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- 00:51:45.280 --> 00:51:48.056 like blood can inform us on what's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225
- $00{:}51{:}48.056 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}50.330$ actually happening in the brain or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00:51:50.330 \rightarrow 00:51:52.430$ the individuals as they grow up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79708225

 $00{:}51{:}52{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}54{.}030$ and an and develop.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}51{:}55{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}56{.}925$ Yeah floor this is such

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:51:56.925 \longrightarrow 00:51:58.449$ a great great question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}51{:}58{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}01{.}879$ And as as you've shown with your own work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}01{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}03{.}424$ talking about somatic mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:03.424 \rightarrow 00:52:06.172$ and we know that even genetic variants

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:06.172 \rightarrow 00:52:08.338$ may not be shared across different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}08{.}338 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}10{.}639$ tissues and so there have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}10.639 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}12.549$ attempts to address this problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:12.550 \longrightarrow 00:52:14.034$ And so for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}14.034 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}15.889$ there's a tool called Pecan

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:15.889 --> 00:52:17.498 developed by Michael Horror,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:17.500 --> 00:52:19.080 Gustavo Tracking Michael Meaney,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}19{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}21{.}862$ which actually does a paired comparison of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:21.862 --> 00:52:23.980 DNA methylation in multiple brain regions,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601
- $00:52:23.980 \longrightarrow 00:52:25.640$ and unfortunately is just

 $00:52:25.640 \longrightarrow 00:52:26.885$ in peripheral blood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}26.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}29.235$ At the moment and looks at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:29.235 --> 00:52:31.097 correspondence between DNA methylation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:31.097 \rightarrow 00:52:33.479$ in blood with different brain regions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}33{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}35{.}727$ and they identify CPG's that show a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:35.727 \rightarrow 00:52:38.238$ higher degree of concordance than others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:38.240 --> 00:52:40.795 I think your point is well taken,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}40{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}43{.}472$ this is the idea that we can take

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}43{.}472 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}45{.}582$ a peripheral sample like blood and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}45{.}582 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}48{.}115$ say that this is going to predict

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:48.115 --> 00:52:50.964 DNA methylation state in a neuron in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:52:50.964 \rightarrow 00:52:53.244$ the dentate gyrus of the hippocampus

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}53{.}244 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}55{.}440$ I think would is a stretch.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}52{:}55{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}57{.}708$ I think that it's going to.

 $00{:}52{:}57{.}710$ --> $00{:}52{:}59{.}918$ Be very challenging to identify and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:52:59.918 --> 00:53:02.728 sites where there is a high degree

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}53{:}02{.}728 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}04{.}833$ of correspondence in specific brain NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:04.833 \dashrightarrow 00:53:06.799$ nuclei between brain and blood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:53:06.800 --> 00:53:09.304 Where I think we can begin to get

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}53{:}09{.}304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}11{.}367$ a better understanding of pathways NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}53{:}11{.}367 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}14{.}545$ that are likely to be shared across

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}53{:}14.625 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}17.841$ brain and periphery is if we focus on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}53{:}17.841$ --> $00{:}53{:}20.110$ specific regions in the genome where NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:53:20.110 - > 00:53:22.300 there may be snips that influence

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}53{:}22{.}373 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}24{.}809$ DNA methylation in the periphery that NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:24.809 \rightarrow 00:53:27.818$ also are shared snips that influence DNS. NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:53:27.820 --> 00:53:30.088 Relation in central and we can use

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}53{:}30{.}088 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}31{.}743$ the peripheral tissue essentially as

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

00:53:31.743 - 00:53:33.927 a model Organism to say look this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00{:}53{:}33{.}927 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}36{.}383$ proof of principle that this exposure

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601
- $00:53:36.383 \rightarrow 00:53:38.463$ influences DNA methylation or inclusion.

 $00{:}53{:}38{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}40{.}210$ Influences the relationship between the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:40.210 \rightarrow 00:53:42.729$ snip and DNA methylation in the periphery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:42.730 \longrightarrow 00:53:44.505$ And perhaps this could be

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:44.505 \longrightarrow 00:53:45.925$ occurring in the brain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:45.930 \longrightarrow 00:53:48.054$ But then we would need to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:48.054 \rightarrow 00:53:49.116$ document that experimentally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8073601

 $00:53:49.120 \longrightarrow 00:53:51.250$ either in cell culture in ipsc's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82129586

 $00:54:03.860 \longrightarrow 00:54:06.808$ Any other questions anyone?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8482568666666667

00:54:11.510 --> 00:54:14.066 Well, it's. It is 2:00 o'clock,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8482568666666667

00:54:14.070 - 00:54:15.580 Kieran saved by the Bell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8482568666666667

 $00{:}54{:}15{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}17{.}892$ But thank you so much that was really

NOTE Confidence: 0.8482568666666667

 $00{:}54{:}17{.}892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}19{.}827$ a marvelous presentation and we learn

NOTE Confidence: 0.8482568666666667

 $00{:}54{:}19{.}827 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}22{.}113$ so much and wonderful to have you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8482568666666667

 $00{:}54{:}22.113 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}24.329$ here and we look forward to all that

00:54:24.329 --> 00:54:26.110 you'll teach us another ideal do. NOTE Confidence: 0.848256866666667 00:54:26.110 --> 00:54:28.217 So thank you here and thank you NOTE Confidence: 0.817174 00:54:28.220 --> 00:54:29.730 very much. Thank you everyone.