WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"01:06:35"

NOTE recognizability:0.855

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:00.000 \rightarrow 00:00:03.927$  Great, so there's still people coming in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}03{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}06{.}648$  but we might just make a start and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}06{.}648 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}09{.}143$  good afternoon every one and welcome to

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}09{.}143 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}12{.}100$  grand rounds at the Child Study Center

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}12.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}14.767$  and I'd like to start by thanking

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:00:14.767 --> 00:00:17.480 Doctor Linda Mays for kicking off

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}17.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}20.510$  our 2022 lecture series last week.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:00:20.510 --> 00:00:22.286 And you know, one of the themes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}26{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}29{.}350$  all on the call today as we continue

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}29.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}30.950$  with our grand rounds series.

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}35{.}039 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}36{.}845$ Tummala Narra and from Boston

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:41.540 \longrightarrow 00:00:43.094$  psycho analytical perspective on

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:43.094 \rightarrow 00:00:45.020$  the origins of xenophobia and racism

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}45{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}47{.}464$  and how such xenophobia and racism

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}47{.}464 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}49{.}814$  contributes in perpetuates suffering and

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}00{:}56{.}181 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}57{.}900$ January will be Doctor Jonathan

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:00:59.780 \dashrightarrow 00:01:02.034$  London will be sharing some new data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:11.618 \rightarrow 00:01:14.392$  period across early life to better

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}01{:}14.392 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}16.916$  understand braydan behavior associations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:01:21.755 --> 00:01:24.120 Jenny Tongue from Duke University.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:01:25.760 --> 00:01:27.400 Jenny for being so flexible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}01{:}30{.}368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}32{.}827$  form at and with very short notice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:01:33.871 --> 00:01:34.218 Jennifer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}01{:}42{.}435 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}44{.}343$  functional genomics with behavioral

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}01{:}48.135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}50.257$  how the social environment and

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00:01:51.957 \rightarrow 00:01:54.138$  differences in a range of phenotypes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}01{:}54.138 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}56.130$  and then how those changes in

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

 $00{:}01{:}56{.}197 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}58{.}017$  behavior can change the function

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:02:00.350 --> 00:02:00.653 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- $00{:}02{:}07{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}08{.}873$  agencies, and foundations,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- $00:02:08.873 \rightarrow 00:02:10.597$  including the MacArthur Foundation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- $00:02:10.600 \dashrightarrow 00:02:12.958$  that named Jenny MacArthur Fellow in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- $00{:}02{:}12{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}14{.}992$  2019 and which I think was the same
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- $00{:}02{:}14.992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}17.356$  year that you renamed as a fellow in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- $00{:}02{:}17.356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}19.052$  the Canadian Institute for Advanced
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- 00:02:19.052 --> 00:02:21.668 Research Child and Brain Development Program.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- 00:02:21.670 --> 00:02:23.374 Now it's at this stage that I really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- $00{:}02{:}23.374 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}25.245$  wish that I had some canned laugh or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- $00:02:25.245 \longrightarrow 00:02:26.720$  some canned applause to like welcome
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- 00:02:26.720 --> 00:02:28.214 you to the Child Study Center.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- $00:02:28.220 \rightarrow 00:02:30.390$  We're getting some virtual applause
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- 00:02:30.390 --> 00:02:31.560 in on zoom,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- $00{:}02{:}31{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}32{.}340$  but really,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143
- $00{:}02{:}32{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}33{.}985$  it's a pleasure to have you with.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911157192857143

00:02:33.990 --> 00:02:36.886 Today and welcome to the CHILD Study Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:02:39.520 --> 00:02:40.840 Thank you so much Karen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:02:42.528 \dashrightarrow 00:02:44.122$  willing to carve out time in your

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}02{:}53{.}106 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}55{.}852$  the sort of whiplash of wave for

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:02:59.030 --> 00:03:01.088 OK, can you guys see my screen?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:03:02.580 --> 00:03:04.070 it's it's supposed to look?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:04.070 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.720$  This is great alright.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}03{:}05{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}07{.}190$  As Karen mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- 00:03:10.222 --> 00:03:11.470 human primates.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- 00:03:11.470 --> 00:03:13.388 I do some work on other social
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:03:13.388 \rightarrow 00:03:15.131$  mammals but by and large not
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- 00:03:15.131 --> 00:03:17.133 humans which I suspect is the the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00{:}03{:}17.199 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}19.208$  study system of most of you here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:03:19.210 \longrightarrow 00:03:22.486$  So I'm going to just start my
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:03:22.486 \rightarrow 00:03:24.334$  presentation by introducing you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:03:24.334 \rightarrow 00:03:26.847$  to a few of our study subjects.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:03:26.850 \longrightarrow 00:03:29.580$  The animals in my title slide are.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:03:29.580 \longrightarrow 00:03:30.762$  Two known females.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:03:30.762 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.126$  This is Rwanda on the bottom
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00{:}03{:}33{.}126$  -->  $00{:}03{:}35{.}178$  right and her then adolescent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:03:35.178 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.542$  daughter rodeo up on the top.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00{:}03{:}37{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}39{.}370$  I'm showing you these particular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:03:39.370 \dashrightarrow 00:03:41.675$  individuals because they are the benefits
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:03:47.760 \rightarrow 00:03:49.926$  Rwanda was born to a particularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}03{:}49{.}926 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}51{.}829$  high status female and because

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}03{:}55{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}57{.}661$  their position on the on the social

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:04:00.760 --> 00:04:03.030 Tire life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:04:03.030 --> 00:04:05.445 As either the top ranking female and

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:04:05.445 --> 00:04:07.806 her social group or just right below

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:10.215 \longrightarrow 00:04:13.010$  effects on on her life history.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:04:15.950 \longrightarrow 00:04:18.557$  that we study reach maturation

- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- 00:04:18.557 --> 00:04:21.436 earlier and because of increased
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:04:21.436 \longrightarrow 00:04:24.666$  or better access to resources,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00{:}04{:}24.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}26.355$  they tend to have shorter
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:04:26.355 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.040$  inter birth intervals as well.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- 00:04:28.040 --> 00:04:30.260 So Rwanda has been remarkably
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- 00:04:30.260 --> 00:04:32.036 successful at producing offspring.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- 00:04:32.040 --> 00:04:33.219 She's had eight.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00{:}04{:}33{.}219 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}36{.}443$  Live birth so far 2 miscarriages and her
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:04:36.443 \rightarrow 00:04:39.273$  most recent offspring was born in 2020,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00{:}04{:}39{.}273 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}43{.}057$  so she was a pandemic baby and Rwanda
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- 00:04:43.057 > 00:04:45.895 is still going the the advantages
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00{:}04{:}45.895 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}48.520$  that accrue to her have been passed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00:04:48.592 \longrightarrow 00:04:50.368$  down in an intergenerational
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00{:}04{:}50{.}368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}53{.}032$  fashion to her daughter Rodeo here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00{:}04{:}53{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}54{.}966$  who benefits from having a large
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:04:56.878 --> 00:04:58.852 sisters who are likely to be her

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}05{:}03{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}05{.}240$  Population that females who have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}05{:}05{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}07{.}204$  lot of close social partners live

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

00:05:09.130 --> 00:05:11.518 who do not see the top quartile

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:11.518 \longrightarrow 00:05:12.866$  versus the bottom quartile.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}05{:}22.298 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}24.178$  animals shapes their phenotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628
- $00{:}05{:}26{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}29{.}380$  parallel in some ways to what

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:34.644 \rightarrow 00:05:37.098$  life effects I'm talking about here

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:41.720 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.180$  in much more striking fashions that

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:44.180 \dashrightarrow 00:05:46.420$  I'm even talking about in the baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}05{:}47{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}49{.}612$  I'm showing you spadefoot,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:49.612 \longrightarrow 00:05:52.116$  to ad tadpoles, water fleas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00:05:52.116 \rightarrow 00:05:55.477$  and tobacco horn worm larvae,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

 $00{:}05{:}55{.}477 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}57{.}358$  which actually produced

NOTE Confidence: 0.871134628

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:06:01.670 --> 00:06:04.958 Of the tadpoles, can you see my cursor?

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:06:04.960 --> 00:06:07.093 Actually, I can't tell if you can see what.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}10.254 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}12.120$  omnivore or more fear is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:06:12.177 --> 00:06:13.732 a carnivore eating an omnivore

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}15{.}624 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}17{.}304$  life diet looks like in these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}19{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}23{.}894$  this elaborated helmet or long sword

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:06:23.894 --> 00:06:26.826 depending on whether eggs of Daphnia

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:06:26.826 --> 00:06:29.010 are exposed to predator cues or a

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:29.083 \rightarrow 00:06:31.187$  completely different color morph,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:06:33.310 --> 00:06:34.814 In early development these

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:06:34.814 \rightarrow 00:06:37.070$  are pretty far afield from us,

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}44.645 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}47.549$  that wild red squirrels who are exposed

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}47{.}549 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}49{.}895$  to cues of high density actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}52{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}54{.}104$  We know that voles who are born

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}54{.}104 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}56{.}280$  in the cold season versus a wet

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}06{:}56{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}58{.}260$  season develop a thicker codes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:06:58.321 -> 00:07:00.223 from work in the population that

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}00{.}223 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}02{.}158$  I'll be telling you about today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}04.461 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}06.796$  the first year of life postnatally

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}06.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}08.978$  has effects on the overall lifetime

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}08{.}978 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}10{.}430$  reproductive success of these.

00:07:10.430 --> 00:07:13.898 Animals, even years or decades later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:07:13.900 --> 00:07:14.827 And of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:07:16.681 --> 00:07:18.344 abundant work linking childhood

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:18.344 \longrightarrow 00:07:19.637$  adversity in advantage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:30.520 \rightarrow 00:07:32.446$  We know they're common across species,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}32{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}34{.}472$  but there are a number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}38.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}39.980$  of relationships arise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}39{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}41{.}945$  including whether childhood adversity or

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:07:51.782 \rightarrow 00:07:54.040$  in humans to get at these questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:07:56.476 --> 00:07:58.670 the Amboseli Baboon Research Project,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}07{:}58.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}00.777$  which is a launch toodle field study

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}00{.}777 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}02{.}768$  of wild primates in southern Kenya.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}07{.}197 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}08{.}868$  where I get to say over 50 years

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:08:08.868 --> 00:08:10.830 and what we mean by that is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}10.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}11.781$  individually recognized animals

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}11.781 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}13.438$  in this population so recognized

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}15{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}17{.}198$  Have been watched on a near

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}19.796 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}21.328$  that that constitutes multiple

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:21.328 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.477$  generations of baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}22{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}25{.}240$  We collect data on their social

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:08:27.710 $-\!\!>$ 00:08:30.132 On life span and we also complement

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}30{.}132 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}32{.}206$  those data with information on

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:34.616 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.879$  genetic relatedness to one another

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:36.880 \longrightarrow 00:08:39.652$  on their microbiome and on their

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:08:41.500 --> 00:08:42.295 Like I said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00:08:50.620 \dashrightarrow 00:08:53.140$  through the foresight of Jean Altman,

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}55{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}57{.}380$  with her husband, Stuart Altman.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}08{:}57{.}914 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}59{.}783$  who's also at Duke and Beth Archie

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:08:59.783 - > 00:09:01.598 at the University of Notre Dame.

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

00:09:05.030 --> 00:09:07.082 A large number of our employees

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}09{:}07{.}082 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}09{.}489$  on the project our Kenyan and are

NOTE Confidence: 0.65311982

 $00{:}09{:}09{.}489 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}11.743$  based in Kenya at the field site

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}09{:}14.051 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}16.604$  data that I'll be talking to

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:09:16.604 \dashrightarrow 00:09:19.084$  you about today were collected.

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}09{:}29{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}31{.}381$  OK, so I told you we've been

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:09:40.090 --> 00:09:42.860 We're now up to just over 2100

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}09{:}45{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}47{.}912$  and the ones who we followed the

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:09:52.000 - 00:09:53.745 So using this information which

 $00:09:53.745 \longrightarrow 00:09:56.184$  goes across the full life course

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}09{:}59{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}01{.}310$  the consequences of early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:10:01.377 --> 00:10:03.307 experience and early life adversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:05.304 \rightarrow 00:10:06.944$  sort of prospectively intensively

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}06{.}944 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}08{.}994$  monitored setting that is free

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:11.402 \rightarrow 00:10:13.394$  confounding or potentially mediating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:10:13.400 --> 00:10:15.068 Depending on your question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}15{.}068 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}16{.}736$  factors that influence early

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}16.736 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}18.239$  life effects in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}19{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}22{.}952$  as as as scientists trained from an

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:31.389 \rightarrow 00:10:33.360$  adjust their phenotypes in a way that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:34.150 \rightarrow 00:10:36.915$  predicts how they'll deal with later life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}37{.}946 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}41{.}537$  and as many of you may be?

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}41.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}43.654$  We are interested in how these types

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:43.654 \rightarrow 00:10:46.058$  of early life effects may arise.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:10:46.058 \rightarrow 00:10:49.082$  What links and experience that may

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}10{:}52{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}55{.}224$  that we observe with the internal

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}11{:}00{.}362 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}02{.}264$  literature in our population as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00:11:02.264 \rightarrow 00:11:04.469$  well as in nonhuman primates.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- 00:11:04.470 --> 00:11:06.130 Generally, including from your colleague,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- 00:11:06.130 --> 00:11:06.730 Amanda Detmer,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}11{:}06{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}08{.}530$  who I think I saw here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- 00:11:08.530 --> 00:11:09.330 Hi Amanda,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- 00:11:09.330 --> 00:11:11.730 on different sources of early life
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00:11:11.730 \rightarrow 00:11:13.454$  experience and downstream effects
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- 00:11:13.454 --> 00:11:16.004 in the juvenile or adult period,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- 00:11:16.010 --> 00:11:18.160 for example, in Amboseli alone,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00:11:18.160 \rightarrow 00:11:20.085$  we know that early life social status
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- 00:11:20.085 --> 00:11:21.887 has long term predictive relationships
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}11{:}21.887 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}24.641$  with the timing of maturation with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}11{:}24.641 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}25.892$  glucocorticoid Physiology and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}11{:}25{.}892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}27{.}554$  with the ability of animals too.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:11:27.560 --> 00:11:29.900 Resist drought later in life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}11{:}29{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}32{.}318$  We know that mothers are exceptionally

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}11{:}37{.}024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}39{.}929$  periods of nutritional and social

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}11{:}39{.}929 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}41{.}906$  dependency and and individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00{:}11{:}46.525 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}47.752$  themselves to a dulthood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:11:56.630 \rightarrow 00:11:57.815$  Resource competition influences

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

00:11:57.815 --> 00:12:00.185 many of these outcomes as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055

 $00:12:00.190 \longrightarrow 00:12:01.754$  including maturation timing and

- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00:12:01.754 \rightarrow 00:12:03.709$  certain patterns of gene regulation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00:12:03.709 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.209$  and early life drought.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00:12:05.210 \rightarrow 00:12:07.160$  This is a highly variable environment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}12{:}07{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}09{.}854$  has strong effects on female fertility
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}12{:}09{.}854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}12{.}499$  and later life resilience to drought.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}12{:}12{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}15{.}162$  So all of these papers pursued
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- 00:12:15.162 --> 00:12:17.822 individual sources of early life
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}12{:}17.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}19.950$  experience and in connection
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}12{:}20{.}033 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}22{.}577$  with individual outcome variables
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00:12:22.580 \longrightarrow 00:12:24.076$  we became very inspired.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}12{:}24.076 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}27.027$  Actually by work done in humans in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}12{:}27.027 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}28.947$  As us framework to ask what happens
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00{:}12{:}28{.}947 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}31{.}530$  if you look at them in conjunction.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- 00:12:31.530 --> 00:12:32.200 In fact,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.876031055
- $00:12:32.200 \rightarrow 00:12:34.880$  if you do something as simple as counting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:12:44.160 --> 00:12:47.088 in a baboon parallel of an ACE score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:12:47.090 --> 00:12:48.618 early life social status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}12{:}48.618 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}50.910$  So the the dominance rank the

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:12:59.560 \longrightarrow 00:13:00.286$  reproductive maturation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:02.470 \longrightarrow 00:13:04.459$  Testicular enlargement for

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}13{:}09{.}790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}12{.}673$  mother was based on the results I

 $00:13:12.673 \rightarrow 00:13:15.438$  showed you earlier that that type of

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:13:15.438 --> 00:13:17.889 pattern predicts juvenile survival,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}13{:}21.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}24.520$  So inter birth intervals in

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:24.520 \longrightarrow 00:13:26.376$  our population get very short,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}13{:}26{.}376 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}28{.}210$  the lowest quartile is about a year

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}13{:}28{.}263 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}29{.}957$  and a half in her birth interval.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}13{:}29{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}32{.}312$  So we asked whether individuals were

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}13{:}32{.}312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}35{.}126$  faced with a little brother or sister

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}13{:}37{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}40{.}830$  We asked about resource competition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:40.830 \longrightarrow 00:13:42.094$  This experience density so

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:47.064 \rightarrow 00:13:48.260$  immediate competitor?

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:50.717 \rightarrow 00:13:52.750$  adversity in the form of drought.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}13{:}52{.}750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}54{.}430$  This is a very dry environment as

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:13:54.430 \longrightarrow 00:13:56.179$  I'll show you a little bit later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}14{:}05{.}505 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}07{.}945$  animal loses its mother when it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:14:09.545 \longrightarrow 00:14:11.545$  it doesn't do very well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00:14:16.288 \rightarrow 00:14:18.550$  So here we're specifically asking me about.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00:14:18.550 \rightarrow 00:14:20.926$  Events that happen early in life
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00:14:20.926 \longrightarrow 00:14:22.996$  exposures that occur early in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00:14:22.996 \longrightarrow 00:14:25.046$  life and their predictive value
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00:14:25.046 \longrightarrow 00:14:26.686$  for survival in adulthood.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00{:}14{:}26.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}30.810$  So starting around age 4 for these animals.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00:14:30.810 \rightarrow 00:14:35.466$  Unlike what is typical in aces and humans,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00:14:35.470 \longrightarrow 00:14:37.035$  these six sources of adversity
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- 00:14:37.035 --> 00:14:38.600 are actually not very closely
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00:14:38.659 \longrightarrow 00:14:40.067$  correlated with each other.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00:14:40.070 \longrightarrow 00:14:40.781$  In other words,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00{:}14{:}40{.}781 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}42{.}748$  it's not the case that if an animal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00{:}14{:}42{.}748 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}44{.}533$  is born to a low status mother,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00:14:44.540 \longrightarrow 00:14:46.570$  she is more likely to be born
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211
- $00:14:46.570 \longrightarrow 00:14:48.560$  to a socially socially isolated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}14{:}51{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}52{.}768$  of resource competition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}15{:}04.952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}06.680$  correlated with environment that

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:08.805 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.835$  in adulthood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:16.727 \rightarrow 00:15:18.833$  study population are what we think

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:18.833 \rightarrow 00:15:21.737$  of as our silver spoon babies who

00:15:21.737 --> 00:15:23.733 experience no particular sources

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:26.340 \rightarrow 00:15:27.840$  Another third of them experienced

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}15{:}29{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}31{.}189$  and then the more unfortunate ones are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:15:31.190 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:15:34.190 Faced with two or even three or more

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

00:15:34.190 --> 00:15:36.778 sources of major early adversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00:15:43.340 \rightarrow 00:15:45.476$  and here I'm showing you survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}15{:}45{.}476 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}47{.}390$  curves stratified by that baboon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.908250413684211

 $00{:}15{:}47{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}51{.}166$  Aces score from zero to three or more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}15{:}51{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}53{.}754$  This is the kind of result where we

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}15{:}53.754 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}56.496$  actually did not expect something so clean,

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:15:57.840 --> 00:15:59.814 it's you know you almost don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:15:59.814 --> 00:16:01.380 need statistics to see it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:01.380 \rightarrow 00:16:04.036$  but I'll tell you that what we're showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:06.990 \rightarrow 00:16:08.830$  Highly significant difference in

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:11.130 \rightarrow 00:16:13.129$  number of adverse experiences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}16{:}15{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}17{.}486$  a difference in lifespan between

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}16{:}19{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}21{.}698$  Assuming that an animal gets to

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:16:25.803 \rightarrow 00:16:28.125$  three or more sources of adversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- 00:16:30.250 --> 00:16:32.870 you know, coarsely translated terms,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:16:32.870 \longrightarrow 00:16:35.886$  so this is a decade in real time.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00{:}16{:}35{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}36{.}716$  The lifespan.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:16:36.716 \rightarrow 00:16:40.020$  And the sort of life history of pace
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:16:40.103 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.871$  of life of baboons is about 2 1/2
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00{:}16{:}42.871 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}45.719$  to three times faster than humans.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:16:45.720 \rightarrow 00:16:47.673$  So what I'm showing you here is a decade.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:16:47.680 \longrightarrow 00:16:49.234$  If we put that in human terms,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:16:49.240 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.000$  we're talking about differences of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- 00:16:51.000 00:16:54.283 20 to 30 years in a population where
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:16:54.283 \rightarrow 00:16:57.175$  everyone has equivalent access to healthcare.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00{:}16{:}57{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}59{.}340$  Because there is no health care.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:16:59.340 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.060$  There is no smoking.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00{:}17{:}01.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}02.780$  There is no alcoholism.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00{:}17{:}02.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}04.190$  There are no illicit drugs.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}17{:}06{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}08{.}520$  And yet there's this very pronounced.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:17:08.520 --> 00:17:12.895 Long lasting effect on adult mortality rates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:19.160 \longrightarrow 00:17:21.840$  which is proposed in some cases to move

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:17:21.840 --> 00:17:24.860 through an intermediary of effects on social,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}17{:}33{.}193 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}35{.}218$  connected than are individuals who

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:35.218 \rightarrow 00:17:37.756$  experienced a lot of early life adversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00:17:37.760 \longrightarrow 00:17:40.210$  which is perhaps one of the mediating

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:17:43.010 \rightarrow 00:17:44.862$  Although separate analysis suggest
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:17:44.862 \rightarrow 00:17:47.640$  it certainly can't explain at all.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:17:47.640 \longrightarrow 00:17:49.720$  And for any of you who may be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00{:}17{:}49.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}51.239$  interested in the evolutionary
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00{:}17{:}51.239 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}53.099$  ramifications of this result,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00{:}17{:}53{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}55{.}977$  what we find is that this shortened
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- 00:17:55.977 --> 00:17:58.674 lifespan not only influences a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- 00:17:58.674 --> 00:18:02.146 female's own time on time on earth,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00{:}18{:}02{.}146 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}03{.}906$  but also the likelihood that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- 00:18:03.906 --> 00:18:06.129 she'll leave many copies of her
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:18:06.129 \rightarrow 00:18:07.944$  own genome in future generations,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00{:}18{:}07{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}10{.}570$  and Amboseli females produce another
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- 00:18:10.570 --> 00:18:12.500 surviving offspring you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- 00:18:12.500 --> 00:18:14.260 not quite like clockwork,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00{:}18{:}14.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}17.388$  but pretty close to it about every 2.1 years.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:18:17.388 --> 00:18:21.310 So a difference in lifespan of 10 years

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}18{:}21{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}25{.}130$  is a dramatic difference in terms of an

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:18:25.130 --> 00:18:28.330 individual's lifetime reproductive success.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}18{:}34{.}466 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}36{.}136$  was interested in whether this

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

 $00{:}18{:}49.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}51.089$  and the consequences for her own life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

00:18:51.090 - 00:18:54.254 What he wanted to know is whether.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:18:59.850 \rightarrow 00:19:02.118$  even controlling for that kids own
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:19:02.118 \longrightarrow 00:19:05.148$  exposure to the same sources of adversity.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- 00:19:05.150 --> 00:19:05.914 Remarkably remarkably,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905359847333333
- $00:19:05.914 \rightarrow 00:19:08.970$  we see that it does so here again,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:19:08.970 --> 00:19:10.866 our survival curves, in this case,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00{:}19{:}10.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}12.582$  survival to reproductive maturation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:19:12.582 --> 00:19:14.722 for the offspring of mothers
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:19:14.722 \rightarrow 00:19:16.859$  who experienced maternal loss.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:19:16.860 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.702$  You know what could have been
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:19:18.702 --> 00:19:19.930 decades earlier in life,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:19:19.930 \rightarrow 00:19:22.396$  or mothers who experienced that competing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:19:22.396 --> 00:19:24.806 younger sibling again in what could
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00{:}19{:}24.806 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}26.906$  have been decades earlier in life?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:19:26.910 --> 00:19:30.582 So in both cases kids of moms who
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:19:30.582 \rightarrow 00:19:32.840$  experienced early adversity were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:35.850 \rightarrow 00:19:38.318$  hit their own period of independence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:38.318 \rightarrow 00:19:41.230$  We think we know what's mediating this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:46.504 \rightarrow 00:19:48.230$  maternal health or viability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}19{:}51{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}53{.}990$  offspring to ask this question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:53.990 \longrightarrow 00:19:55.710$  Matthew divided up those

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:19:55.710 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.860$  first four years of life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:20:11.053 \rightarrow 00:20:13.728$  function of whether mothers were.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:20:13.730 \longrightarrow 00:20:15.599$  Able to survive or not during the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:20:15.599 \rightarrow 00:20:17.442$  period in which that offspring would
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:20:17.442 \longrightarrow 00:20:20.908$  have been age 2 to 4 sodas later,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:20:20.910 --> 00:20:23.662 maternal mortality predict something
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00{:}20{:}23.662 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}25.878$  about the survival for offspring
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:20:25.878 --> 00:20:27.981 earlier in life and for females
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00{:}20{:}27{.}981 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}29{.}566$  who either experience maternal loss
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:20:29.566 --> 00:20:31.530 themselves or competing younger sibling.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:20:31.530 \longrightarrow 00:20:33.054$  That's the case.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:20:33.054 --> 00:20:36.550 So in other words, if you are a baboon,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:20:36.550 \rightarrow 00:20:39.322$  is the offspring of an individual who
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:20:39.322 --> 00:20:41.550 experienced early adversity in its own life,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:20:41.550 \longrightarrow 00:20:43.020$  that individual is likely to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:20:43.020 \longrightarrow 00:20:44.196$  be in poor somatic.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00{:}20{:}44{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}46{.}234$  Quality in a way that influences
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}20{:}50{.}976 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}53{.}343$  is there the whole time and I'll just

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}20{:}54.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}56.396$  This difference between offspring

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}20{:}56{.}396 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}59{.}000$  survival as a function of later

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}20{:}59{.}073 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}01{.}395$  maternal death does not exist for

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:01.395 \rightarrow 00:21:04.448$  the offspring of mothers who did not

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}21{:}06{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}08{.}530$  So we think that this is explained

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}21{:}08{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}11{.}159$  by what's going on with the mother's

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:21:12.795 \longrightarrow 00:21:14.668$  require any sort of complex.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}21{:}15{.}556 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}17{.}771$  epigenetic explanations that that go

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}21{:}17.771 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}21.030$  into sort of transgenerational effects.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:21:21.030 \longrightarrow 00:21:23.754$  So in this population we find
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:21:23.754 \longrightarrow 00:21:25.570$  that as in humans,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:21:25.570 --> 00:21:27.873 early life is a critical period for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:21:27.873 \rightarrow 00:21:29.909$  development that affects lifelong survival.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00{:}21{:}29{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}31{.}849$  Even in a time period that's quite
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:21:31.849 \rightarrow 00:21:33.830$  separated from the early life exposures.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:21:33.830 --> 00:21:35.270 It appears to be profoundly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:21:35.270 \longrightarrow 00:21:36.422$  affected by social resources.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:21:36.430 --> 00:21:37.128 In particular,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- 00:21:37.128 --> 00:21:39.920 many of the things that pop out to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:21:39.992 \rightarrow 00:21:42.127$  us as individually predictive sources
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:21:42.127 \longrightarrow 00:21:45.050$  of variance have to do with moms,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00{:}21{:}45.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}47.198$  in particular maternal presence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00{:}21{:}47.198 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}49.883$  and maternal attention or maternal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333
- $00:21:49.883 \longrightarrow 00:21:50.920$  resources spent.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:21:53.430 --> 00:21:54.800 Our data suggests that multiple

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}22{:}00{.}771 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}03{.}576$  death with higher aces exceeds the

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

00:22:05.844 --> 00:22:08.329 of those individual effects alone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00:22:08.330 \rightarrow 00:22:11.150$  and this has intergenerational consequences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}22{:}16.239 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}18.053$  given point in time is affected not

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}22{:}20.105 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}22.000$  the experiences in previous generations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

 $00{:}22{:}25{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}27{.}115$  But this has major consequences

NOTE Confidence: 0.912698818333333

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:22:32.098 \rightarrow 00:22:34.601$  how many offspring females leave behind.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}22{:}34.601 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}36.563$  So this raises a natural question

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}22{:}53{.}922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}55{.}654$  those early life experiences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}22{:}55{.}660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}56{.}908$  This was a question that a

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

00:22:58.000 --> 00:22:58.880 Amanda Lea,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:23:01.080 --> 00:23:02.700 was very interested in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}23{:}05{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}07{.}856$  of the predominant hypothesis for

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}23{:}07{.}856 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}09{.}976$  why early life effects evolved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}23{:}09{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}12{.}002$  These are often used to explain

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:23:12.002 --> 00:23:14.119 early life effects in humans too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}23{:}14.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}16.780$  so I think that there is some

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:16.780 \longrightarrow 00:23:19.498$  some generalizability here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:23:22.212 \rightarrow 00:23:25.018$  I'll refer to as early life programming,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}23{:}26.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}29.366$  Adaptive responses which posits

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00:23:33.538 \rightarrow 00:23:36.106$  animals are taking cues from their
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00:23:36.106 \longrightarrow 00:23:38.204$  environment to adjust their phenotype
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00:23:38.204 \rightarrow 00:23:40.436$  in a way that better prepares
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00:23:40.436 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.551$  them for a similar environmental
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- 00:23:42.551 --> 00:23:44.706 exposure later in Life OK,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00{:}23{:}44.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}47.338$  and so if you use these kind of fitness
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00:23:47.338 \rightarrow 00:23:50.150$  nor sorry reaction norm representations,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00{:}23{:}50{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}51{.}938$  what that means is that individuals
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00:23:51.938 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.298$  who are born in a poor early
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00:23:54.298 \rightarrow 00:23:55.770$  environment actually do better.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00:23:55.770 \rightarrow 00:23:57.216$  If the quality of the environment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00:23:57.220 \rightarrow 00:24:00.060$  Is also poor in adulthood and vice versa.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00:24:00.060 \longrightarrow 00:24:02.526$  Individuals who are born in a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- 00:24:02.526 --> 00:24:04.170 benign environment do better
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00:24:04.243 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.835$  in an environment that are high
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:11.120 --> 00:24:13.058 A major alternative class of hypothesis

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}24{:}17.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}20.798$  which basically posits that good

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}24{:}26.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}30.090$  and so the consequences of early

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:32.330 \longrightarrow 00:24:33.610$  Individuals have to physiologically

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}24{:}33.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}34.890$  adapt to their environment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}24{:}34{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}36{.}414$  and they're basically making

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

 $00:24:41.112 \rightarrow 00:24:43.578$  between these two hypothesis is that often,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:24:43.580 --> 00:24:46.020 particularly in human natural experiments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}24{:}51.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}52.720$  You can think about classical

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:24:53.800 \longrightarrow 00:24:56.832$  winter or the Great Leap

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}25{:}01{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}02{.}233$  In other words,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}25{:}03.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}04.790$  not four of these points,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}25{:}04.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}06.126$  and if you only see two of these

 $00:25:06.126 \longrightarrow 00:25:07.299$  points on the right hand side,

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

00:25:07.300 --> 00:25:08.932 you can't actually distinguish.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}25{:}12.712 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}15.402$  that would be much more consistent

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}25{:}15{.}402 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}17{.}199$  with developmental constraints.

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}25{:}17{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}19{.}584$  So we think we can do this in

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:19.584 \rightarrow 00:25:21.783$  Amboseli because there is a major

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00{:}25{:}21.783 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}23.315$  source of environmental variation

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:23.315 \rightarrow 00:25:25.910$  that can cause hardship or relative

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

 $00:25:25.910 \longrightarrow 00:25:27.674$  advantage that is completely

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00{:}25{:}37{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}39{.}650$  So desert like these are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827512293333333
- $00:25:39.650 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.400$  hydrological years going back into
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- 00:25:41.465 00:25:44.688 the 70s, or they can be relatively high,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:25:44.690 \rightarrow 00:25:45.920$  not as high as New Haven.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:25:45.920 \longrightarrow 00:25:46.712$  In case you're interested
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:25:46.712 \longrightarrow 00:25:47.702$  in putting this in context,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:25:47.710 \longrightarrow 00:25:49.422$  New Haven get spelled.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- 00:25:49.422 --> 00:25:51.990 1200 millimeters of precipitation a year,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00{:}25{:}51{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}54{.}111$  but high enough that we aren't talking
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:25:54.111 \longrightarrow 00:25:56.110$  about desert like conditions anymore.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00{:}25{:}56{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}58{.}542$  OK, and of course this variation again is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00{:}25{:}58{.}542 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}00{.}510$  something that the baboon like baboons,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00{:}26{:}00{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}03{.}654$  nor we have any kind of control over.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00{:}26{:}03.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}05.508$  Now in 2009 we had the equivalent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00{:}26{:}05{.}508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}07{.}773$  of a weight of a natural experiment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00:26:11.619 \rightarrow 00:26:13.529$  in the history of this ecosystem,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00:26:17.554 \rightarrow 00:26:19.426$  actually also a low rainfall year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00:26:19.430 \rightarrow 00:26:20.955$  so animals were really suffering

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00:26:20.955 \longrightarrow 00:26:21.870$  in the basin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00{:}26{:}34.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}36.846$  I'm showing you rates of conception per

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:26:39.798 \longrightarrow 00:26:42.610$  is 2009 where it dropped by about 25%.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:26:42.610 \longrightarrow 00:26:44.830$  So the animals are very much
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:26:44.830 \rightarrow 00:26:46.780$  feeling these kinds of effects,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:26:46.780 \longrightarrow 00:26:49.678$  so this gave us the ability to ask in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:26:49.678 \longrightarrow 00:26:53.068$  a poor quality adult environment 2009
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:26:53.068 \rightarrow 00:26:55.558$  versus good quality adult environments.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:26:55.560 \longrightarrow 00:26:58.605$  So the middle 50% of rainfall years
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- 00:26:58.605 --> 00:27:00.500 were treating in that sort of way.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:27:00.500 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.541$  In this analysis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:27:01.541 \rightarrow 00:27:04.360$  how did individuals who were born in poor?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- 00:27:04.360 --> 00:27:06.555 Early environments during early life
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- 00:27:06.555 --> 00:27:09.222 droughts do compared to individuals born
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00{:}27{:}09{.}222 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}11.676$  in modern high quality early environments.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00{:}27{:}11.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}14.585$  In terms of their ability to conceive
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00{:}27{:}14.585 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}20.460$  offspring and also to resume reproductive.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

00:27:20.460 --> 00:27:24.030 Cycling after a period of postpartum minaria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

00:27:24.030 --> 00:27:24.558 OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00{:}27{:}29{.}118 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}31{.}790$  And here's what we get as a result.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00:27:34.436 \rightarrow 00:27:37.027$  born in relatively benign environments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

00:27:37.030 --> 00:27:39.282 there's actually very little

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00{:}27{:}39{.}282 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}41{.}814$  difference in their probability of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00{:}27{:}43.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}45.350$  This is conception data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00{:}27{:}45{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}48{.}790$  Here in moderate years versus in the drought.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00{:}27{:}49{.}894 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}53{.}259$  although you see a little bit of a decrement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00{:}27{:}53.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}55.450$  This is actually a comparison within

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:27:57.637 \rightarrow 00:27:59.982$  in both of those types of environments,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- 00:27:59.990 00:28:01.940 so these comparisons are going
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:28:01.940 \longrightarrow 00:28:03.890$  to be centered around 0,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:28:03.890 \longrightarrow 00:28:05.440$  whereas for females who were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- 00:28:05.440 --> 00:28:06.370 born during droughts,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:28:06.370 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.547$  they took a much larger hit in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:28:08.547 \rightarrow 00:28:10.406$  comparison to their own reproductive
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:28:10.406 \rightarrow 00:28:12.974$  performance and mop in moderate years.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:28:12.980 \longrightarrow 00:28:13.820$  In other words,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:28:13.820 \longrightarrow 00:28:15.780$  there is a difference between how well
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:28:15.837 \rightarrow 00:28:17.832$  females who were born and droughts and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- 00:28:17.832 --> 00:28:19.940 females who were born in good years did,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00{:}28{:}19{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}21{.}956$  but is in the opposite direction
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00{:}28{:}21{.}956 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}23{.}939$  as predicted by the predictive
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667
- $00:28:23.939 \rightarrow 00:28:25.637$  adaptive response model.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00:28:29.085 \longrightarrow 00:28:31.080$  social buffering in this situation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00:28:35.464 \rightarrow 00:28:37.896$  through that very severe 2009 drought,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00{:}28{:}37.896 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}41.480$  we find that females were able to maintain

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

00:28:41.567 -> 00:28:44.710 their ability to conceive if they were

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8592279866666667

 $00{:}28{:}46{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}49{.}375$  females who were born to low status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00{:}28{:}49{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}52{.}008$  Mothers were less able to buffer

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00{:}28{:}52.008 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}54.210$  her against these multiple hits.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00{:}28{:}54{.}210$  -->  $00{:}28{:}55{.}754$  And so you know, Amanda came to me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:28:55.760 \longrightarrow 00:28:57.470$  And she found this result.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00{:}28{:}57{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}59{.}045$  She said, well, I think all we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:28:59.045 \rightarrow 00:29:00.799$  saying is that if you were born in

 $00{:}29{:}00{.}799 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}02{.}336$  a terrible year and then you had

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:02.336 \longrightarrow 00:29:03.704$  the bad luck of living through,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:03.710 \longrightarrow 00:29:05.456$  you know one of the worst years on record.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:05.460 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.670$  And you know you are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:08.670 \longrightarrow 00:29:09.735$  Experiencing social disadvantage

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00{:}29{:}09{.}735 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}12{.}580$  is the result of being low on a

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:12.580 \longrightarrow 00:29:14.350$  social hierarchy than that is bad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00:29:14.350 \longrightarrow 00:29:15.154$  And that's true.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

00:29:15.154 --> 00:29:17.070 I mean, maybe that's not very surprising,

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00{:}29{:}17.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}19.761$  but the fact is it is counter to one

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00{:}29{:}19.761 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}22.629$  of the dominant predictions in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

 $00{:}29{:}22.629 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}25.740$  literature about why these things happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.826622907272727

00:29:25.740 --> 00:29:26.150 So

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

 $00{:}29{:}26.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}27.540$  you're going on to that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

00:29:27.540 --> 00:29:28.856 There's just a little bit of \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

 $00:29:28.860 \rightarrow 00:29:30.396$  that we're hearing from the audio.

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

 $00{:}29{:}30{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}32{.}242$  I'm wondering if there's anything with

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

 $00{:}29{:}32{.}242 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}34{.}025$  your microphone or something on your NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

 $00:29:34.025 \rightarrow 00:29:35.537$  microphone that we could try moving,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

00:29:35.540 --> 00:29:37.756 and it's not. It's not too bad,

NOTE Confidence: 0.591490706

00:29:37.760 --> 00:29:39.804 it's just a little bit of \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802217362857143

00:29:40.320 --> 00:29:42.432 OK, I can probably switch my

NOTE Confidence: 0.802217362857143

 $00:29:42.432 \rightarrow 00:29:43.708$  microphone. This may switch.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7869168025

00:29:46.000 --> 00:29:47.400 This may switch the image

NOTE Confidence: 0.7869168025

 $00:29:47.400 \longrightarrow 00:29:49.088$  for a SEK, so bear with me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809811013333333

00:29:50.120 --> 00:29:51.380 Sorry to interrupt you. I just

NOTE Confidence: 0.859348397777778

00:29:51.410 --> 00:29:53.732 Oh no, no problem. It's better

NOTE Confidence: 0.859348397777778

 $00:29:53.732 \longrightarrow 00:29:55.928$  to to actually be able to hear

NOTE Confidence: 0.770058035714286

00:29:56.120 --> 00:29:58.282 we can. We can hear you fine. It's just

NOTE Confidence: 0.770058035714286

00:29:58.282 --> 00:30:00.090 a little bit of of of \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*.

NOTE Confidence: 0.822665881666667

00:30:00.580 --> 00:30:02.302 OK yeah I'm going to switch

- NOTE Confidence: 0.822665881666667
- $00{:}30{:}02{.}302 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}04{.}330$  mikes in just a second once.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91811237875
- $00{:}30{:}05{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}07{.}154$  Just as you did your shadow to Amanda,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91811237875
- $00{:}30{:}07{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}08{.}220$  I thought that was a knife, nice.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8292339
- 00:30:09.740 --> 00:30:12.350 Correct, OK? Are you seeing a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8292339
- $00{:}30{:}12.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}15.370$  presenter view now or are you seeing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6070202616666667
- 00:30:15.880 --> 00:30:17.620 no? We're seeing a blank screen?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6070202616666667
- 00:30:17.620 --> 00:30:20.007 Well, just seeing a square of white
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827297339090909
- $00:30:20.520 \longrightarrow 00:30:22.235$  square of white, that's not
- NOTE Confidence: 0.827297339090909
- 00:30:22.235 --> 00:30:24.740 what I want to show you, OK?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.727680142857143
- $00:30:26.420 \longrightarrow 00:30:27.420$  Yeah, the baboon pictures
- NOTE Confidence: 0.727680142857143
- $00:30:27.420 \longrightarrow 00:30:28.770$  are far more preferable.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.939946548888889
- $00:30:30.140 \longrightarrow 00:30:31.607$  Let me let me try and work on that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.608122807142857
- 00:30:31.660 00:30:33.249 I can probably go. We've got him.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.608122807142857
- $00:30:33.250 \rightarrow 00:30:37.820$  Now we can see your slides, but just OK.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8438150775
- $00:30:37.820 \longrightarrow 00:30:40.956$  And then let me go back to zoom.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8438150775

 $00:30:40.960 \rightarrow 00:30:42.864$  I'm gonna stop share for just a second.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438150775

 $00{:}30{:}42.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}44.670$  I just fix this problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438150775

 $00:30:44.670 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.070$  Sorry about that Dani.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438150775

 $00:30:46.070 \longrightarrow 00:30:47.070$  No no, no that's OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8438150775

 $00:30:47.070 \longrightarrow 00:30:48.070$  Thank you for telling me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40966004

 $00:30:50.950 \longrightarrow 00:30:51.210$  OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90149472625

 $00{:}30{:}55{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}56{.}970$  OK, I've just switched.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90149472625

 $00:30:56.970 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.810$  Microphones is that better?

NOTE Confidence: 0.787057286

00:30:59.220 --> 00:31:00.370 We don't hear any \*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

NOTE Confidence: 0.787057286

 $00{:}31{:}00{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}01{.}010$  at the moment then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6000819475

 $00{:}31{:}01{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}03{.}398$  OK, great and then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68643683

 $00{:}31{:}05{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}09{.}030$  Go back to the screen share, oops.

NOTE Confidence: 0.948924313333333

00:31:18.020 --> 00:31:20.108 OK, are you seeing my slides?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6233132666666667

 $00:31:20.280 \dashrightarrow 00:31:23.238$  We can see your Internet actually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6233132666666667

 $00{:}31{:}23{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}24{.}626$  Yeah now we can see your slides

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:25.500 \rightarrow 00:31:27.229$  and it looks like the way it's

 $00:31:27.229 \rightarrow 00:31:29.000$  supposed to and not not presented.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:29.000 \longrightarrow 00:31:30.020$  It looks great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:31:30.020 --> 00:31:32.738 OK perfect, thanks so much no problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:32.738 \dashrightarrow 00:31:35.873$  So I think the evidence that we have is

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:31:35.873 --> 00:31:38.459 against the idea of adaptive programming,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:38.460 \rightarrow 00:31:41.624$  but much more easily explained

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:41.624 \rightarrow 00:31:42.920$  by contingently experience,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:42.920 \rightarrow 00:31:45.130$  developmental constraints in other words.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}31{:}45{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}47{.}236$  Females who are born in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:31:47.236 --> 00:31:48.289 disadvantageous environment do

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:31:48.289 \rightarrow 00:31:50.394$  worse even in that same type of dis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}31{:}50{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}52{.}184$  and fit advantageous environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}31{:}52{.}184 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}53{.}968$  when they grow up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}31{:}53.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}56.394$  We actually don't see those effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}31{:}56{.}394 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}58{.}859$  in moderate years and for females

 $00:31:58.859 \rightarrow 00:32:01.193$  who were born in moderate years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}32{:}01{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}03{.}993$  The effect is is much attenuated relative

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:03.993 \rightarrow 00:32:08.662$  to females who were born in in dry years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:08.662 \rightarrow 00:32:09.350$  Additionally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}32{:}09{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}11.060$  there are other sources of relative

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:32:11.060 -> 00:32:12.466 advantage in diversity that can

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:12.466 \longrightarrow 00:32:13.744$  have the same kind of effect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:13.750 \rightarrow 00:32:16.930$  including being born to a relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}32{:}16{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}19{.}590$  socially privileged family.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:32:19.590 --> 00:32:22.134 OK, and I'll just note that this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}32{:}22{.}134 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}24{.}360$  fairly consistent with the pattern that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:24.360 \rightarrow 00:32:26.790$  think is emerging from long lived species,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:26.790 \longrightarrow 00:32:28.974$  including humans that because

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:32:28.974 --> 00:32:31.704 of our very long lives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:31.710 \longrightarrow 00:32:34.244$  setting a strong, making a strong bet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:32:34.250 \rightarrow 00:32:36.320$  making a strong prediction from

- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- 00:32:36.320 --> 00:32:38.390 an experience in in utero,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- $00:32:38.390 \longrightarrow 00:32:41.449$  or in the first years of life,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- $00:32:41.450 \rightarrow 00:32:44.594$  is probably not wise for animals that live,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- 00:32:44.600 --> 00:32:45.710 you know, decades,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- $00:32:45.710 \longrightarrow 00:32:47.930$  whereas it may be very wise
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- $00{:}32{:}47{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}49{.}723$  for a water free or.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- $00:32:49.723 \longrightarrow 00:32:51.988$  Or for a tobacco hornworms?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- 00:32:51.990 --> 00:32:52.499 OK.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- $00:32:52.499 \dashrightarrow 00:32:56.571$  So finally I think one of the biggest
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- $00{:}32{:}56{.}571 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}58{.}835$  puzzles that is of shared interest
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- $00:32:58.835 \rightarrow 00:33:00.665$  to people interested in early life
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- $00{:}33{:}00{.}665 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}02{.}324$  effects is of course this very
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- $00:33:02.324 \dashrightarrow 00:33:04.247$  general question of how where we can
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- $00{:}33{:}04{.}247 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}05{.}957$  be talking about multiple types of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154
- $00:33:05.957 \rightarrow 00:33:07.835$  different types of mechanisms from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}33{:}07{.}835 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}09{.}575$  social and behavioral mechanisms

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:09.575 \dashrightarrow 00:33:11.595$  to biological mechanisms that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:11.595 - 00:33:13.551 adjusted based on the early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:13.551 \rightarrow 00:33:15.486$  environment and one of the puzzling

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:15.486 \rightarrow 00:33:17.555$  things about relating early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:17.555 --> 00:33:19.495 adversity to phenotypic outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:19.495 \longrightarrow 00:33:22.491$  later in life is that they don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:22.491 \dashrightarrow 00:33:24.425$  affect you know single types of

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}33{:}24{.}425 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}25{.}990$  outcomes with very clear ideology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:25.990 \rightarrow 00:33:28.503$  But rather tend to have very general

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:28.503 \longrightarrow 00:33:31.064$  effects on a lot of different

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}33{:}31{.}064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}33{.}878$  outcomes that have lots of different

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:33.878 --> 00:33:35.230 underlying mechanisms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}33{:}35{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}37{.}967$  So I think a common and influential

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}33{:}37{.}967 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}41{.}721$  idea about how this works is through a

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:41.721 --> 00:33:44.221 general process of biological embedding.

 $00:33:44.230 \longrightarrow 00:33:46.474$  And here I'm using the criteria

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:46.474 \longrightarrow 00:33:47.596$  defined by herzman,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:47.600 \rightarrow 00:33:50.666$  where the environment somehow you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:33:50.670 - 00:33:52.565 influences what's going on under

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}33{:}52{.}565 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}55{.}114$  the skin is at the physiological

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:55.114 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.969$  and molecular level to influence

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:33:57.970 \rightarrow 00:34:00.462$  biological and developmental processes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:00.462 \rightarrow 00:34:02.954$  meaning that systematic differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:02.954 \longrightarrow 00:34:05.389$  in experience like being born.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}05{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}07{.}538$  Two in a low resource environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}07{.}538 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}09{.}526$  and an environment that produces

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:09.526 \longrightarrow 00:34:11.486$  material deprivation or social

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:11.486 \rightarrow 00:34:13.936$  deprivation can lead to systematically

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}14.003 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}15.719$  different types of biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}15.719 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}18.812$  states that remain stable overtime.

00:34:18.812 --> 00:34:21.524 And crucially, to actually mediate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:21.524 \dashrightarrow 00:34:25.169$  you know this sort of bubble on the left.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}25{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}26{.}730$  At the relationship with bubble on

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:26.730 \rightarrow 00:34:28.848$  the left and the bubble on the right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}28.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}29.676$  these differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}29.676 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}31.741$  whatever changes at that molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:34:31.741 - 00:34:32.980 and physiological level,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:32.980 \rightarrow 00:34:35.638$  must have the capacity to influence

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}35{.}638 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}38{.}370$  trait variation over the life course.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:38.370 \rightarrow 00:34:43.458$  For those interested in social epigenetics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}43{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}45{.}724$  much of this much of the attention to

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00{:}34{:}45{.}724 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}47{.}569$  a potential mechanism has therefore

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

 $00:34:47.569 \dashrightarrow 00:34:49.916$  focused on the epigenome, and for both,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816111203846154

00:34:49.916 - 00:34:51.126 I think reasons of measurement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:34:51.130 \rightarrow 00:34:55.316$  and because DNA methylation is a relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:34:55.316 \rightarrow 00:34:58.750$  stable epigenetic mark to the epigenetic

00:34:58.750 --> 00:35:00.850 marker of DNA methylation, in particular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}00{.}850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}04{.}846$  that is the addition or removal of a methyl

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:04.846 \rightarrow 00:35:07.674$  group to invertebrates, typically cytisine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:07.674 \rightarrow 00:35:09.162$  Nucleotides where they're followed

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:09.162 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.070$  by Queens in the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}11.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}13.894$  So there are potentially about 20 million or

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:13.894 \rightarrow 00:35:18.110$  so of these CPG sites in in a human genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:18.110 \longrightarrow 00:35:20.182$  So this is thought to be a plausible

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}20.182 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}22.255$  mechanism in part because DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:22.255 \rightarrow 00:35:24.505$  is known to be environmentally responsive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:24.510 \rightarrow 00:35:26.708$  It's part of the gene regulatory machinery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}26{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}28{.}929$  and our genome must be able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:28.929 \rightarrow 00:35:31.011$  flexibly respond to its immediate

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:31.011 \dashrightarrow 00:35:32.610$  environment throughout life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}32{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}35{.}031$  In fact, this is happening even as we speak

 $00:35:35.031 \rightarrow 00:35:37.735$  as a consequence of what we might have

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:37.735 \dashrightarrow 00:35:39.868$  eaten before circadian rhythms and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:39.870 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.705$  Depending on where in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:35:41.705 --> 00:35:43.173 genome you're talking about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:43.180 \rightarrow 00:35:46.060$  Again, DNA methylation has relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:46.060 \rightarrow 00:35:48.940$  remarkable fidelity across cell division,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:48.940 \longrightarrow 00:35:51.856$  and so has the potential to

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}51{.}856 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}54{.}377$  remain stable overtime even from

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}54{.}377 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}57{.}257$  early life into into later years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}35{:}57{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}59{.}381$  Evidence that this may in fact be

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:35:59.381 \dashrightarrow 00:36:01.212$  a plausible pathway comes from

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}36{:}01{.}212 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}02{.}928$  correlative studies that link

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:02.928 \longrightarrow 00:36:04.644$  early life environmental exposures

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:04.709 \rightarrow 00:36:06.822$  with epigenetic change in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:06.822 \rightarrow 00:36:08.100$  But of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:08.100 \rightarrow 00:36:10.030$  suffer from the potential confounding

- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:36:10.030 \rightarrow 00:36:11.960$  of early environments that affect
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:36:12.020 \rightarrow 00:36:14.030$  adult environments that are actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:36:14.030 \rightarrow 00:36:16.040$  immediately responsible for the types
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:36:16.103 \rightarrow 00:36:18.287$  of epigenetic patterns that have been
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:36:18.287 \rightarrow 00:36:21.820$  documented in many population studies so far.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- 00:36:21.820 --> 00:36:22.151 However,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- 00:36:22.151 --> 00:36:24.137 I think of a potentially bigger
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:36:24.137 \rightarrow 00:36:26.384$  problem is that although we know
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:36:26.384 \longrightarrow 00:36:28.364$  that DNA methylation can influence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:36:28.364 \rightarrow 00:36:30.198$  gene regulation and therefore change
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:36:30.198 \rightarrow 00:36:32.473$  the Nixon expression in a way that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:36:32.480 \longrightarrow 00:36:34.560$  it could be phenotypically relevant,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- 00:36:34.560 --> 00:36:36.700 it doesn't always do so.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00{:}36{:}36{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}39{.}100$  And we know this from experimental studies,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00{:}36{:}39{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}41{.}896$  for example that if used epigenomic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:41.896 \rightarrow 00:36:43.760$  editing technologies to specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:36:43.826 --> 00:36:46.610 change DNA methylation at individual sites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}36{:}46{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}50{.}331$  so these are four data from another lab

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:50.331 \rightarrow 00:36:53.013$  that focused on changing DNA methylation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}36{:}53.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}54.570$  and a very specific manner.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}36{:}54{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}58{.}202$  By 4 CPG sites at 1 gene in

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:36:58.202 \longrightarrow 00:37:00.210$  the genome and looked at it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:00.210 \longrightarrow 00:37:01.585$  Effects on expression and only

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}37{:}01.585 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}03.532$  one of these sites is sensitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:03.532 \rightarrow 00:37:04.824$  to DNA methylation lawyers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:04.830 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.298$  The other changes are effectively silent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}37{:}08{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}10{.}820$  We don't know whether the the cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}37{:}10.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}13.049$  where early environment has even been

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}37{:}13.049 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}14.849$  correlated with DNA methylation later

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:14.849 \longrightarrow 00:37:17.289$  in life are in that class of silent

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:17.290 \rightarrow 00:37:20.430$  changes or in the class of things that

- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- 00:37:20.430 --> 00:37:21.870 might have physiological consequences,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:37:21.870 \longrightarrow 00:37:22.926$  which are the things that we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:37:22.926 \longrightarrow 00:37:23.630$  have to care about.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:37:23.630 \longrightarrow 00:37:25.100$  If we believe this is mediating.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:37:25.100 \rightarrow 00:37:28.537$  Early life effects on health and mortality.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00{:}37{:}28{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}30{.}472$  So we have the opportunity to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:37:30.472 \rightarrow 00:37:32.320$  study this in Amboseli as well,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00{:}37{:}32{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}34{.}147$  where we can again divorce some of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00{:}37{:}34.147 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}35.723$  these early and a dult environmental
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:37:35.723 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.573$  processes and separate out different
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:37:37.573 \rightarrow 00:37:39.419$  types of early life effects.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00{:}37{:}39{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}40{.}680$  We can do this because,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00{:}37{:}40.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}42.436$  although most of the research we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00{:}37{:}42.436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}44.800$  do on the baboons is non invasive,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923
- $00:37:44.800 \longrightarrow 00:37:46.590$  occasionally we have reason to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

00:37:46.590 - 00:37:48.380 want to take biological samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:48.380 \rightarrow 00:37:50.468$  collect morphometric data and so on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:50.470 \longrightarrow 00:37:54.394$  and so we periodically engage in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:54.394 \rightarrow 00:37:56.518$  brief and estimations darting in order

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:56.518 \dashrightarrow 00:37:58.688$  to collect those sorts of samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00:37:58.690 \dashrightarrow 00:38:00.972$  So this is our very talented field

NOTE Confidence: 0.853549673076923

 $00{:}38{:}00{.}972 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}02{.}649$ assistant Kenya Larry Terry here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:38:02.650 --> 00:38:04.228 You probably can barely see it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}38{:}04{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}05{.}958$  but he's holding about a metre

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}38{:}05{.}958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}08{.}022$  long metal tube in his right arm

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:38:08.022 --> 00:38:09.714 and trying to look as innocuous

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:09.714 \rightarrow 00:38:11.827$  as possible around these baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:38:11.830 --> 00:38:13.886 We wait for a period in which nobody

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:13.886 \rightarrow 00:38:15.812$  is looking and then very rapidly

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}38{:}15{.}812 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}17{.}168$  deliver an anesthetic containing

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:17.168 \longrightarrow 00:38:19.402$  dart at our animals in order to

 $00:38:19.402 \longrightarrow 00:38:20.902$  collect these types of samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}38{:}20{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}22{.}387$  And over time we've been able to

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}38{:}22{.}387 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}23{.}630$  collect hundreds of these samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:23.630 \rightarrow 00:38:25.772$  including from individuals where we know

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}38{:}25{.}772 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}28{.}500$  a lot about both their early life and

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:28.500 \rightarrow 00:38:31.040$  what's going on with them in adulthood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:31.040 \rightarrow 00:38:34.309$  We've used a sequencing based method to

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:34.309 \rightarrow 00:38:36.808$  generate genome scale DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:38:36.808 --> 00:38:38.572 data for several 100 individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:38:38.572 --> 00:38:40.903 including a number of of whom we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:38:40.903 --> 00:38:42.499 actually had repeated sampling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}38{:}42.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}45.338$  overtime and post quality filtering are

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:45.338 \rightarrow 00:38:49.358$  able to assess DNA methylation in adulthood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}38{:}49{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}50{.}533$  In this period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:50.533 \rightarrow 00:38:52.488$  in blue for these baboons,

 $00:38:52.490 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.975$  this is years of life for about

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:38:54.975 \rightarrow 00:38:57.657$  half a million sites in the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}38{:}57.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}59.535$  We asked how individual sources

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:38:59.535 - 00:39:01.963 of early adversity as well as

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:39:01.963 --> 00:39:03.418 cumulative early adversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}39{:}03{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}04{.}510$  that sort of Aces score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:04.510 \longrightarrow 00:39:06.595$  I talked to you about earlier adding

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}39{:}06{.}595 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}08{.}720$  up these individual exposures in

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:08.720 \longrightarrow 00:39:12.193$  the first few years of life or at

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:12.193 \rightarrow 00:39:13.893$  birth influenced DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:13.893 \longrightarrow 00:39:16.039$  collected in this blue period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}39{:}16{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}17{.}948$  We also paid attention to whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:17.948 \longrightarrow 00:39:20.500$  animals were born in a relatively high

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:20.500 \longrightarrow 00:39:22.530$  habitat quality environment versus a

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:22.530 \rightarrow 00:39:25.059$  relatively low habitat quality environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:39:25.060 \rightarrow 00:39:26.922$  We had again a sort of natural

- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:39:26.922 \longrightarrow 00:39:28.390$  experiment in our population.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- 00:39:28.390 00:39:30.298 Where our animals made a fairly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:39:30.298 \rightarrow 00:39:32.334$  dramatic shift as the quality of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:39:32.334 \longrightarrow 00:39:34.074$  their initial habitat declined to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:39:34.074 \longrightarrow 00:39:36.329$  a much higher quality environment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:39:36.330 \rightarrow 00:39:39.960$  outside the original area of study.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- 00:39:39.960 --> 00:39:40.386 Finally,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:39:40.386 \longrightarrow 00:39:42.942$  we included a measure of their
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00{:}39{:}42{.}942 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}44{.}661$  adult social circumstance based
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:39:44.661 \rightarrow 00:39:46.863$  on dominance rank or the position
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- 00:39:46.863 00:39:49.129 in the hierarchy for both females
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:39:49.129 \dashrightarrow 00:39:51.313$  and males based on prior evidence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:39:51.320 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.928$  from my student Jordan's work that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00{:}39{:}55{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}57{.}976$  That dominance rank is a major
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:39:57.976 \rightarrow 00:39:59.807$  predictor of differences in gene
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:39:59.807 - 00:40:01.407 expression in our population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}40{:}01{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}02{.}999$  So all of this work was really

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:02.999 \longrightarrow 00:40:05.281$  led by by Jordan and we're in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:05.281 \rightarrow 00:40:07.050$  process of putting it together now

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:07.050 \rightarrow 00:40:09.108$  again to just skip to the results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:09.110 \longrightarrow 00:40:11.408$  What we find is that early

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:11.408 \longrightarrow 00:40:12.940$  life effects do persist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:12.940 \longrightarrow 00:40:15.230$  Do leave a signature in

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

00:40:15.230 --> 00:40:16.604 DNA methylation profiles,

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:16.610 \longrightarrow 00:40:18.824$  but that this is really most

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}40{:}18.824 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}20.300$  apparent for those individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:20.372 \longrightarrow 00:40:22.214$  born in that low quality habitat

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:22.214 \rightarrow 00:40:24.509$  and not the high quality habitat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:24.510 \longrightarrow 00:40:26.406$  So what I'm showing you here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00{:}40{:}26{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}29{.}522$  On the X axis are the effect sizes

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:40:29.522 \rightarrow 00:40:32.627$  of cumulative early adversity on DNA
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:40:32.627 \rightarrow 00:40:34.867$  methylation levels multi measured
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:40:34.867 \longrightarrow 00:40:37.302$  in adulthood for about 470,000.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:40:37.302 \longrightarrow 00:40:39.310$  Sites in the genome.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:40:39.310 \longrightarrow 00:40:41.039$  They're quite close to 0 for animals
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:40:41.039 \rightarrow 00:40:43.238$  born in a resource rich environment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:40:43.240 \longrightarrow 00:40:45.025$  but they move quite further
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:40:45.025 \rightarrow 00:40:46.810$  away from zero on average.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:40:46.810 \longrightarrow 00:40:49.180$  For those born in low quality
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- 00:40:49.180 --> 00:40:51.715 habitats and we can see a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- 00:40:51.715 --> 00:40:53.850 very similar type of quality.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:40:53.850 \longrightarrow 00:40:56.450$  For each of the individual
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00:40:56.450 \longrightarrow 00:40:59.050$  sources of building per city.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- 00:40:59.050 --> 00:41:01.860 Investigated separately.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00{:}41{:}01{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}04{.}875$  So this is what it looks like genome wide.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333
- $00{:}41{:}04.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}07.028$  These are the effect sizes in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:41:07.028 \rightarrow 00:41:08.460$  the high quality environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:41:08.460 \rightarrow 00:41:10.140$  Individuals born in high quality environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:41:10.140 \longrightarrow 00:41:11.710$  These are effect sizes for

NOTE Confidence: 0.914546908333333

 $00:41:11.710 \longrightarrow 00:41:13.280$  for individuals born in low

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:41:13.340 --> 00:41:14.760 quality environment for exactly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:14.760 \longrightarrow 00:41:16.890$  the same sites in the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:41:16.890 --> 00:41:19.837 And again, you can see that replicated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:19.837 \longrightarrow 00:41:21.602$  in individual at individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}41{:}21.602 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}23.446$  sites for individual exposures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:41:23.450 --> 00:41:24.944 Basically, individuals who

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:24.944 \longrightarrow 00:41:27.434$  are born during a drought.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:41:27.440 --> 00:41:29.096 You can see a market effect of drought

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:41:29.096 --> 00:41:30.959 if they were born in that low quality

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}41{:}30{.}959 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}32{.}928$  habit at that's in that sort of pinkish color.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}41{:}32{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}34{.}988$  But a much more attenuated effect for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:41:34.988 \rightarrow 00:41:37.200$  those born in high quality habitats.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:41:37.200 \longrightarrow 00:41:39.727$  So it looks like we're looking at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:41:39.727 \longrightarrow 00:41:42.099$  compounding effects of resource limitation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:41:42.100 \longrightarrow 00:41:44.896$  that the whole population is exposed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}41{:}44{.}896 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}47{.}770$  to and individual level exposure to.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:41:47.770 \longrightarrow 00:41:50.029$  Early life adversity.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:41:50.030 \longrightarrow 00:41:51.398$  So to give you a sense of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:41:51.398 \rightarrow 00:41:52.388$  relative magnitude of these effects,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:41:52.390 \rightarrow 00:41:53.862$  these are significantly associated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- 00:41:53.862 --> 00:41:56.070 CP G sites in the genome.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- 00:41:56.070 --> 00:41:58.718 Simply, the number of them of those
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}41{:}58{.}718 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}00{.}670$  that we tested based on each of these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}42{:}00{.}732 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}02{.}772$  predictor variables and the major effects
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:42:02.772 \rightarrow 00:42:04.990$  other than large scale effects of age,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}42{:}04{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}07{.}234$  which are expected based on our
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}42{:}07{.}234 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}09{.}110$  and other people's previous work,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:09.110 \longrightarrow 00:42:10.740$  are those habitat quality effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}42{:}10.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}12.510$  The difference between being born

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:42:12.510 --> 00:42:14.610 in an environment looks like this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:14.610 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.256$  or exactly the same place in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:17.256 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.939$  ecosystem that's been denuded of the major.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}42{:}19{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}21{.}780$  Dietary resources for baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:42:21.780 --> 00:42:24.080 The individual sources of early

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:24.080 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.890$  adversity that matter are are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}42{:}25.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}28.174$  particularly those also associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:28.174 \rightarrow 00:42:29.887$  with resource deprivation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:29.890 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.215$  Drought,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:30.215 \longrightarrow 00:42:32.490$  loss of a mother early in life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:32.490 \rightarrow 00:42:35.680$  and high levels of resource competition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:35.680 \longrightarrow 00:42:38.760$  If the group is is, is dense.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}42{:}38.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}40.657$  This by itself doesn't answer the question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:42:40.660 \rightarrow 00:42:42.802$  though about whether those types of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:42:42.802 \rightarrow 00:42:44.750$  epigenetic changes are effectively silenced.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}42{:}44.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}46.094$  Maybe they're simply passive
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- 00:42:46.094 --> 00:42:47.774 biomarkers or early life exposure,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:42:47.780 \longrightarrow 00:42:51.372$  or whether they have any potential to mediate
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}42{:}51{.}372 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}53{.}957$  downstream effects on health and survival.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:42:53.960 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.820$  Part of that question can be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:42:55.820 \rightarrow 00:42:57.060$  answered at least circumstantially,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:42:57.060 \rightarrow 00:42:58.698$  by asking where in the genome,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:42:58.700 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.572$  differentially expressed early
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:43:00.572 \rightarrow 00:43:02.444$  adversity associated differentially
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:43:02.444 \longrightarrow 00:43:04.940$  methylated sorry sites fall.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- 00:43:04.940 --> 00:43:07.264 The genome is a diverse place in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}43{:}07{.}264 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}09{.}582$  different parts of your DNA sequence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}43{:}09{.}582 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}12{.}096$  have different roles in gene regulation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- 00:43:12.100 --> 00:43:14.593 and so a simple question to ask is whether
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:14.593 \rightarrow 00:43:16.183$  those differentially methylated sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:16.183 \rightarrow 00:43:18.679$  tend to fall in regulatory elements

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}43{:}18.679 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}20.780$  like gene promoters or enhancers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}43{:}20.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}23.167$  These elements that tend to loop around

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}43{:}23.167 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}24.929$  physically interact with the promoters

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}43{:}24{.}929 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}26{.}969$  of genes to modulate gene expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}43{:}26{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}29{.}906$  Or whether they fall in kind of deserts

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:43:29.906 --> 00:43:32.330 of genes or regulatory elements

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}43{:}32{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}35{.}292$  unannotated regions of the genome and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:35.292 \rightarrow 00:43:37.548$  what we've revealed what we found we think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:43:37.550 --> 00:43:40.678 is a fairly bimodal pattern,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00{:}43{:}40.678 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}43.282$  where if you look at age

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:43:43.282 --> 00:43:44.620 differentially expressed sorry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:44.620 \rightarrow 00:43:45.898$  differentially methylated sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

00:43:45.898 --> 00:43:46.750 For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:43:46.750 \longrightarrow 00:43:48.535$  we find that they are enriched in

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:43:48.535 \rightarrow 00:43:49.913$  this pinkish color in Unannotated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:43:49.913 \rightarrow 00:43:51.025$  region of the unit.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:43:51.030 \longrightarrow 00:43:51.948$  We find a lot of them,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:43:51.950 \longrightarrow 00:43:53.763$  but they don't tend to fall in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}43{:}53.763 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}55.435$  places where we believe they're
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:43:55.435 \rightarrow 00:43:57.525$  likely to influence gene regulation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- 00:43:57.530 --> 00:43:59.595 Habitat quality is fairly neutrally
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:43:59.595 \longrightarrow 00:44:01.247$  spread across the genome,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}44{:}01{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}03{.}161$  with a little bit of tendency towards
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}44{:}03.161 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}04.981$  more enrichment in these sort of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}44{:}04{.}981 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}06{.}249$  functionally important regions of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00:44:06.249 \rightarrow 00:44:08.030$  the genome versus the unannotated,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- 00:44:08.030 --> 00:44:09.490 but it's not very striking,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}44{:}09{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}11{.}555$  whereas we if we look at drought
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895
- $00{:}44{:}11.555 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}13.455$  effects or the effects of a social
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8826710895

 $00:44:13.455 \rightarrow 00:44:15.105$  environment at the time of sampling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:15.110 \longrightarrow 00:44:17.371$  like male rank, we see a pattern

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}44{:}17{.}371 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}20{.}494$  that is opposite to that of age where

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}44{:}20{.}494 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}21{.}742$  those differentially methylated

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:21.742 \longrightarrow 00:44:24.030$  sites tend to fall non randomly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:44:24.030 --> 00:44:26.170 In enhancers and gene bodies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:26.170 \longrightarrow 00:44:27.640$  that is, regions of the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:44:27.640 - 00:44:29.356 That we believe may be important

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:44:29.356 --> 00:44:31.260 to the Physiology of the Organism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:31.260 \rightarrow 00:44:33.990$  and then they tend to be depleted

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:33.990 \longrightarrow 00:44:35.820$  in those unannotated regions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}44{:}35{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}38{.}250$  Another way to look at this is to use

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:38.250 \dashrightarrow 00:44:40.498$  the chromatin states annotated by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:44:40.498 --> 00:44:43.200 road map of the Genomics Consortium.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}44{:}43.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}44.976$  This was done for humans that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:44:44.976 \longrightarrow 00:44:46.817$  pull over these annotation to baboons.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:44:46.820 \rightarrow 00:44:48.857$  They recognize a number of different sites.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- 00:44:48.860 --> 00:44:50.792 You can just think about painting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:44:50.792 \rightarrow 00:44:52.427$  the genome different colors depending
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:44:52.427 \rightarrow 00:44:54.149$  on what part of that genome,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:44:54.150 \longrightarrow 00:44:55.218$  what that part of the genome
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:44:55.218 \longrightarrow 00:44:56.220$  is likely to be doing,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:44:56.220 \longrightarrow 00:44:57.780$  which is defined in turn by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:44:57.780 \rightarrow 00:44:59.160$  different types of histone marks.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}44{:}59{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}02{.}442$  As well as the DNA configuration
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- 00:45:02.442 --> 00:45:03.536 DNA methylation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}45{:}03{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}05{.}812$  Where the ones on the top of this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}45{:}05{.}812 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}08{.}137$  list tend to be linked with active
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}45{:}08{.}137 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}10{.}476$  regulation and the ones on the bottom
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}45{:}10.476 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}13.070$  of the list tend to be associated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}45{:}13.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}14.790$  with repression or silencing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:14.790 \longrightarrow 00:45:15.540$  If we look at age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:45:15.540 --> 00:45:18.290 associated State state sites again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:18.290 \rightarrow 00:45:20.996$  we see under enrichment or depletion

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:20.996 \rightarrow 00:45:23.270$  in those actively regulated regions

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}45{:}23.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}26.078$  of the genome and enrichment in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}45{:}26.078$  -->  $00{:}45{:}29.214$  repressed or quiescent parts of the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:29.220 \longrightarrow 00:45:31.662$  If we look at socio ecologically

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:45:31.662 - 00:45:33.704 associated sites, on the other hand,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:33.704 \rightarrow 00:45:35.540$  here are things like habitat quality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:35.540 \longrightarrow 00:45:38.420$  drought, or male social status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:38.420 \longrightarrow 00:45:40.124$  We see the opposite effect on

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}45{:}40{.}124 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}41{.}260$  this left hand side.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}45{:}41{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}43{.}150$  There's enrichment in regions of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}45{:}43.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}45.078$  genome that are associated with active

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}45{:}45{.}078 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}46{.}908$  regulation in blood cells as opposed

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:45:46.908 \rightarrow 00:45:49.076$  to depletion in those age associated sites.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}45{:}49{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}52{.}306$  We see the same kind of pattern as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}45{:}52{.}306 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}54{.}904$  age or even more neutral pattern
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}45{:}54{.}904 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}57{.}860$  for just technical batch effects.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:45:57.860 \longrightarrow 00:45:59.799$  Now finally I want to say that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:45:59.800 \longrightarrow 00:46:01.556$  This is. Still circumstantial.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:46:01.556 \rightarrow 00:46:04.190$  What we're saying is that there's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}46{:}04.262 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}06.217$  an association between a which
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- 00:46:06.217 --> 00:46:08.380 is early life exposure and B,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}46{:}08{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}10{.}300$  which is DNA methylation and a dulthood,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}46{:}10.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}11.935$  and those associations tend to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- 00:46:11.935 --> 00:46:13.570 fall in particular regions of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}46{:}13.627 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}15.553$  the genome that are probably more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:46:15.553 \rightarrow 00:46:17.500$  interesting than just the background.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:46:17.500 \longrightarrow 00:46:19.175$  They don't provide any direct
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:46:19.175 \longrightarrow 00:46:20.515$  causal evidence is which,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}46{:}20.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}22.360$  which is what you really want to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:22.360 \rightarrow 00:46:24.551$  if you want to argue for epigenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:24.551 \rightarrow 00:46:26.226$  mediation that an epigenetic change

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:26.280 \rightarrow 00:46:28.060$  directly influences the phenotype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}46{:}28.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}31.204$  or at least gene expression as

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:31.204 \rightarrow 00:46:32.776$  approximate molecular phenotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:32.780 \longrightarrow 00:46:35.740$  So we ended up going after this too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:35.740 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.288$  Inspired by some work done by Alexander

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:46:38.288 --> 00:46:41.158 Stark Lab in Vienna on using massively

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}46{:}41.158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}43.720$  parallel reporter as says to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}46{:}43.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}46.352$  causal effects of DNA sequence on

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}46{:}46{.}352 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}48{.}502$  the capacity for regulatory activity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:48.502 \longrightarrow 00:46:51.154$  There assay is called star seep

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

00:46:51.154 --> 00:46:53.863 and it basically works by randomly

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00{:}46{:}53{.}863 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}56{.}467$  shearing or amplifying lots and lots

NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667

 $00:46:56.467 \rightarrow 00:46:59.776$  of fragments of the genome and cloning

- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:46:59.776 \longrightarrow 00:47:02.270$  them into little episomal plasmids like.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}47{:}02.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}04.790$  This in a structure so that if the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:47:04.858 \longrightarrow 00:47:07.378$  piece you cloned in this little olive
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}47{:}07{.}378 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}09{.}875$  piece actually has the potential to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}47{:}09{.}875 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}11.675$  drive differential gene regulation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}47{:}11.675 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}14.026$  when you transfect this little circle
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- 00:47:14.026 --> 00:47:16.350 DNA into your cell type of interest,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00:47:16.350 \longrightarrow 00:47:18.975$  then it will cause its own its
- NOTE Confidence: 0.880606502916667
- $00{:}47{:}18.975 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}20.100$  own sequence to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667
- 00:47:20.186 --> 00:47:21.815 be transcribed. Basically,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667
- $00:47:21.815 \rightarrow 00:47:23.840$  this green sequence loops around,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667
- $00:47:23.840 \longrightarrow 00:47:25.172$  interacts with the promoter,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667
- $00{:}47{:}25{.}172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}27{.}531$  and drives its own expression in a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667
- $00{:}47{:}27{.}531 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}29{.}666$  way that we can track using high
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667
- $00{:}47{:}29.666 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}30.940$  throughput sequencing technology.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:30.940 \rightarrow 00:47:32.870$  So regions where you end up with a lot of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}47{:}32.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}34.970$  Seeds when you sequence libraries

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:34.970 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.579$  from this type of assay point

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:37.579 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.147$  to regions of the genome that

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:47:40.147 --> 00:47:42.170 have active regulatory capacity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:42.170 \longrightarrow 00:47:44.546$  So we thought, well, this is really cool.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:44.550 \longrightarrow 00:47:46.503$  Can we modify this to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:47:46.503 --> 00:47:48.259 changes in DNA methylation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:48.259 \longrightarrow 00:47:50.389$  how those changes in isolation?

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:47:50.390 --> 00:47:52.695 Just changing DNA methylation influences

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}47{:}52.695 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}55.830$  or fails to influence gene expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:47:55.830 - 00:47:59.401 So we ended up tweaking the assay

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:47:59.401 \longrightarrow 00:48:02.263$  and and producing a separate plasmid

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:02.263 \longrightarrow 00:48:05.365$  PM star seek one which you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:05.365 \rightarrow 00:48:07.570$  actually order yourself from addgene

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:48:07.570 --> 00:48:09.795 if you're interested and producing

 $00:48:09.795 \rightarrow 00:48:12.343$  the same kind of assay idea, but.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:48:12.343 --> 00:48:14.821 But leaving sites targets of DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:14.821 \rightarrow 00:48:16.701$  methylation vertebrates only in those

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:48:16.701 -> 00:48:19.005 regions that we clone in in olive and

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:48:19.068 --> 00:48:21.320 either experimentally methylating them

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:21.320 \rightarrow 00:48:24.135$  or leaving them experimentally methylated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:24.140 \rightarrow 00:48:25.876$  That means we can compare the regulatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:25.876 \rightarrow 00:48:27.560$  activity of the exact same sequence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}48{:}27{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}29{.}423$  and we can do this for hundreds of thousands

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:29.423 \rightarrow 00:48:31.088$  of fragments in the genome at once,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:31.090 \longrightarrow 00:48:32.950$  where the only difference between two

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:32.950 \rightarrow 00:48:35.188$  fragments of the same location is whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:48:35.188 --> 00:48:37.078 those sites are methylated or not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:37.080 \longrightarrow 00:48:38.862$  and the results of that assay

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}48{:}38{.}862 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}41{.}201$  for like 1 region of the genome

 $00:48:41.201 \rightarrow 00:48:42.645$  looks something like this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}48{:}42.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}45.770$  This happens to be data from the human

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:48:45.770 --> 00:48:48.664 genome in and around the gene NF Kappa BIA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:48.670 \rightarrow 00:48:51.154$  where if you see higher levels

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:48:51.154 --> 00:48:53.910 of RNA produced at that region,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:53.910 \longrightarrow 00:48:55.938$  higher levels of expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:55.938 \rightarrow 00:48:58.473$  relative to the input DNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:48:58.480 \rightarrow 00:49:01.036$  Then that points to regulatory activity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:01.040 \longrightarrow 00:49:02.816$  and in this case that happens

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:02.816 \longrightarrow 00:49:04.000$  in the methylated condition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:04.000 \rightarrow 00:49:05.600$  This is an active enhancer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}49{:}05{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}07{.}436$  but not when the exact same

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:07.436 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.354$  sequence is methylated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:08.360 \rightarrow 00:49:10.285$  so this was work that was pioneered.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}49{:}10.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}12.768$  This protocol was led by Amanda Lea,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:12.770 \longrightarrow 00:49:13.740$  the same person who took,

00:49:13.740 --> 00:49:16.320 but I'm predictive adaptive response stuff,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:16.320 \longrightarrow 00:49:18.860$  and we generated data for

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:49:18.860 --> 00:49:20.936 bedroom specifically in work led

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:20.936 \longrightarrow 00:49:22.696$  by my postdoc Dana Lynn.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}49{:}22.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}24.434$  So basically we cross referenced that

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}49{:}24{.}434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}26{.}909$  with all the regions in the genome that

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:26.909 \rightarrow 00:49:28.489$  we know are differentially methylated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:28.490 \rightarrow 00:49:30.470$  An association with early life drought,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:30.470 \longrightarrow 00:49:31.238$  for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:31.238 \longrightarrow 00:49:32.390$  or with aging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:32.390 \longrightarrow 00:49:34.868$  and what we find is the following

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:34.868 \longrightarrow 00:49:36.362$  of about 200,000 windows.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}49{:}36{.}362 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}37{.}926$  We tested genome wide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}49{:}37{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}40{.}700$  I just want to point out that really only a

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}49{:}40.773 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}43.765$  minority of them in a particular cell type

 $00{:}49{:}43.765 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}46.068$  have regulatory capacity to begin with,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:46.070 \longrightarrow 00:49:46.275$  right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:49:46.275 --> 00:49:48.530 Most of CP G sites and most of the genome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:48.530 \rightarrow 00:49:49.850$  whether they're methylated or not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:49.850 \longrightarrow 00:49:52.020$  don't do much of anything,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}49{:}52.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}54.564$  but if they are drought associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:54.564 \rightarrow 00:49:57.649$  sites or male ranked associated sites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:49:57.650 \rightarrow 00:49:58.346$  they're significantly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}49{:}58{.}346 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}01{.}130$  More likely to fall in one of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}50{:}01{.}195 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}02{.}955$  active regulatory regions than

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00{:}50{:}02{.}955 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}05{.}155$  expected just by background chance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:50:05.160 \rightarrow 00:50:06.840$  where again if we use age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:50:06.840 --> 00:50:08.496 differentially methylated sites as a control,

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

00:50:08.500 --> 00:50:11.804 you see no such signal of active

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:50:11.804 \rightarrow 00:50:13.220$  participation in regulation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667

 $00:50:13.220 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.436$  And so now we were able to start

- NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667
- $00:50:15.436 \rightarrow 00:50:16.996$  putting together our results like
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667
- $00{:}50{:}16.996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}18.892$  this where for a very particular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667
- $00:50:18.892 \longrightarrow 00:50:20.767$  region of the genome that contains
- NOTE Confidence: 0.932665579166667
- $00{:}50{:}20.767 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}22.262$  specific set of CPG sites
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}50{:}22{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}24{.}850$  we see. Increases.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- 00:50:24.850 --> 00:50:27.700 In RNA relative to DNA,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:50:27.700 \rightarrow 00:50:29.674$  if that region fragment is not methylated,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}50{:}29{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}32{.}260$  so zero methylation means that you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:50:32.260 \longrightarrow 00:50:34.480$  see regulatory activity he there,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:50:34.480 \longrightarrow 00:50:36.862$  whereas if that exact same sequence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}50{:}36.862 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}39.615$  is methylated then we see complete
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- 00:50:39.615 --> 00:50:41.799 repression of regulatory activity,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:50:41.800 \longrightarrow 00:50:44.089$  so pointing this is a way of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:50:44.089 \rightarrow 00:50:45.070$  identifying methylation dependent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:50:45.131 \rightarrow 00:50:47.136$  regulatory activity across the genome.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:47.140 \longrightarrow 00:50:48.710$  This particular example gives us

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:50:48.710 --> 00:50:50.659 causal evidence in an in vitro

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}50{:}50{.}659 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}52{.}279$  framework that those sites have

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:52.279 \rightarrow 00:50:54.019$  the capacity to drive differential

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}50{:}54{.}019 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}55{.}919$  expression and the particular sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:55.919 \rightarrow 00:50:58.622$  I'm showing you here happen to be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:50:58.622 \rightarrow 00:50:59.410$  Forked sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}50{:}59{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}00{.}132$  That's it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:51:00.132 --> 00:51:02.298 Just upstream of a gene that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}51{:}02{.}298 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}05{.}290$  important to T cell receptor activation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}51{:}05{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}07{.}466$  We can then couple that with the observation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}51{:}07{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}09{.}150$  ULL data from the animals themselves

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:09.150 \longrightarrow 00:51:11.237$  in vivo in a completely unmanipulated

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:11.237 \rightarrow 00:51:13.487$  environment where we see that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:13.490 \longrightarrow 00:51:14.442$  for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}51{:}14.442 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}17.298$  male social status is also associated

- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- 00:51:17.298 --> 00:51:19.788 with levels of DNA methylation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:51:19.790 \longrightarrow 00:51:21.618$  and independently with levels
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:51:21.618 \longrightarrow 00:51:22.989$  of gene expression.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}51{:}22{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}24{.}680$  So the correlation is consistent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}51{:}24.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}27.170$  with the causal of the correlation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}51{:}27{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}29{.}790$  Evidence in vivo is consistent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}51{:}29{.}790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}33{.}050$  with the causal evidence in vitro.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:51:33.050 \longrightarrow 00:51:34.378$  So to sum up,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:51:34.378 \longrightarrow 00:51:36.038$  we have this hypothesis about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:51:36.038 \rightarrow 00:51:38.520$  this pathway that connects early
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}51{:}38{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}40{.}596$  environment to a dult phenotypes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:51:40.600 \rightarrow 00:51:42.410$  Our data suggests that early
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- 00:51:42.410 --> 00:51:43.858 environments also predict DNA
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}51{:}43.858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}44.949$  methylation in a dulthood.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:51:44.950 \longrightarrow 00:51:46.450$  In this natural environment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:46.450 \longrightarrow 00:51:47.950$  where there's absolutely no

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}51{:}47{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}49{.}472$  correlation between drought in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:49.472 \longrightarrow 00:51:50.918$  first year of life and rainfall

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:50.918 \longrightarrow 00:51:52.400$  at the time of measurement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:52.400 \longrightarrow 00:51:55.053$  but that those types of patterns are

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:55.053 \rightarrow 00:51:57.569$  compounded by further resource limitation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:57.570 \longrightarrow 00:51:58.326$  In other words,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:51:58.326 \rightarrow 00:51:59.586$  we're really only seeing this

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}51{:}59{.}586 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}01{.}126$  when the animals are exposed

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:01.126 \longrightarrow 00:52:02.434$  to fairly severe deprivation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}52{:}02{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}05{.}659$  Material deprivation linked to both

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:05.659 \rightarrow 00:52:07.570$  a low quality environment as a whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}52{:}07{.}623 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}09{.}261$  and then further knock on effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:09.261 \longrightarrow 00:52:11.530$  of other types of individual adversity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}52{:}11{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}13{.}195$  And that leads to substantial

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:13.195 \longrightarrow 00:52:14.194$  heterogeneity across different

- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- 00:52:14.194 --> 00:52:15.970 forms of early life experience.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- 00:52:15.970 --> 00:52:16.450 Where,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- 00:52:16.450 --> 00:52:17.410 grossly speaking,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:52:17.410 \longrightarrow 00:52:20.770$  I would say our data are consistent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}52{:}20.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}22.950$  with effects of deprivation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:52:22.950 \rightarrow 00:52:25.196$  related early life experiences
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:52:25.196 \dashrightarrow 00:52:28.526$  rather than social threat related.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- 00:52:28.530 --> 00:52:30.570 Early life experience like being
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:52:30.570 \longrightarrow 00:52:33.230$  born to a low status mother.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- 00:52:33.230 --> 00:52:33.711 Additionally,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}52{:}33{.}711 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}36{.}116$  our data suggests that DNA
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}52{:}36{.}116 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}38{.}040$  methylation associated with the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:52:38.108 \longrightarrow 00:52:39.924$  social or ecological environment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}52{:}39{.}924 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}42{.}648$  and including sources of early life
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:52:42.719 \longrightarrow 00:52:45.485$  adversity are more likely to be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:45.485 \rightarrow 00:52:47.329$  functionally relevant than background

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:47.330 \longrightarrow 00:52:48.840$  sites identified in the genome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}52{:}48{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}50{.}340$  including those that we can detect

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}52{:}50{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}52{.}193$  in the exact same data set in

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:52.193 \rightarrow 00:52:54.022$  association with age, for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:52:54.022 --> 00:52:55.922 So that's promising, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:55.922 \rightarrow 00:52:56.274$  It?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:52:56.274 \rightarrow 00:52:58.738$  It speaks to the potential for this

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}52{:}58{.}738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}00{.}729$  mediating pathway to really matter,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}53{:}00{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}02{.}550$  but I think that our results also

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:02.550 \longrightarrow 00:53:04.350$  suggest that care is still warranted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:04.350 \rightarrow 00:53:06.050$  Warranted we see this enrichment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}53{:}06{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}07{.}850$  but there's lots of individual sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00:53:07.850 \rightarrow 00:53:09.969$  that are early life associated that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

 $00{:}53{:}09{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}11{.}867$  as far as we can tell from

NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835

00:53:11.867 - 00:53:13.110 the data available to us,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- 00:53:13.110 --> 00:53:14.618 don't particularly do anything,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:53:14.618 \rightarrow 00:53:17.470$  and if they don't particularly do anything,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:53:17.470 \longrightarrow 00:53:19.690$  then they are very unlikely to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:53:19.690 \rightarrow 00:53:22.452$  rely on a causal pathway between
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:53:22.452 \rightarrow 00:53:24.692$  early life environment and,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:53:24.692 \longrightarrow 00:53:25.576$  for example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- 00:53:25.576 --> 00:53:27.344 compromised health or earlier
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:53:27.344 \longrightarrow 00:53:28.670$  mortality in adulthood.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:53:28.670 \dashrightarrow 00:53:30.734$  And I think that the lesson for us
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:53:30.734 \longrightarrow 00:53:32.628$  is that those correlations that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00:53:32.628 \rightarrow 00:53:34.818$  we observe in population studies.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}53{:}34{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}37{.}046$  So far are really the first step
- NOTE Confidence: 0.871907835
- $00{:}53{:}37{.}046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}38{.}000$  and the second
- NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588
- $00{:}53{:}38.076 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}40.206$  step that we should increasingly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588
- $00{:}53{:}40.206 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}43.012$  think about embedding into studies of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:53:43.012 \rightarrow 00:53:44.964$  environmental or social epigenetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:53:44.964 \rightarrow 00:53:47.168$  in general are causal tests,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}53{:}47{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}49{.}840$  especially experimental tests where possible

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}53{:}49{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}53{.}060$  of whether those differences even matter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:53:53.060 \longrightarrow 00:53:56.219$  So in some we see effects of early life

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}53{:}56{.}219$  -->  $00{:}53{:}58{.}564$  environment on later life phenotype that NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:53:58.564 --> 00:54:00.994 are in many ways strikingly parallel

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:00.994 \rightarrow 00:54:03.586$  to what's been described in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}54{:}03{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}04{.}948$  And in fact some of the measurement

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:04.948 \rightarrow 00:54:05.939$  constructs that we've been using.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:05.940 \rightarrow 00:54:07.805$  The baboons are directly borrowed

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}54{:}07{.}805 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}09{.}670$  from the literature in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:09.670 \rightarrow 00:54:12.664$  These suggest that early life effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:12.664 \rightarrow 00:54:16.379$  on later life health are not something

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:16.379 \rightarrow 00:54:19.631$  that humans invented and not purely

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:19.631 \rightarrow 00:54:22.486$  explained by the types of highly developed.

 $00:54:22.486 \longrightarrow 00:54:24.338$  Urban environments that many

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}54{:}24{.}338 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}26{.}740$  of us live in today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:26.740 \rightarrow 00:54:30.674$  Rather, they're part of the fabric of

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:30.680 \rightarrow 00:54:33.480$  the societies of primates and other long

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:33.480 \rightarrow 00:54:35.976$  lived social mammals that have probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}54{:}35{.}976$  -->  $00{:}54{:}38{.}825$  predated our species for millions of years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:54:38.830 --> 00:54:40.162 However, because these species,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:40.162 \longrightarrow 00:54:42.730$  like the baboons live in a relatively

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}54{:}42{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}45{.}270$  simplified environment compared to humans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:45.270 \longrightarrow 00:54:46.805$  studying them gives an ability

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:54:46.805 -> 00:54:48.776 to ask questions about the types

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:54:48.776 --> 00:54:49.907 of early environments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}54{:}49{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}51{.}920$  the way they split between

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:51.920 \longrightarrow 00:54:53.464$  different types of exposure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:53.464 \rightarrow 00:54:55.394$  And the relationship between early

 $00{:}54{:}55{.}394 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}57{.}519$  life and a dulthood that are sometimes

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:54:57.519 \rightarrow 00:55:00.109$  difficult to come to grips with in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}55{:}00{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}04{.}060$  And so with that I just want to thank the

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}55{:}04{.}157 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}06{.}828$  people who have led a lot of this work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:55:06.830 --> 00:55:07.634 Susan, Albert Smith,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}55{:}07.634 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}08.706$  Archie and Jean Altman,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:08.710 \longrightarrow 00:55:10.910$  who are my fellow travelers on all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:10.910 \rightarrow 00:55:13.067$  the research that has to do with baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:55:13.070 --> 00:55:14.780 Matthew Schippel, Susan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:14.780 \longrightarrow 00:55:17.630$  former student who led the

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:17.630 \rightarrow 00:55:19.210$  intergenerational adversity work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

00:55:19.210 --> 00:55:20.341 My own lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}55{:}20{.}341 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}21{.}849$  and particularly Amanda Lea,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}55{:}21.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}23.510$ Jordan Anderson and Dana Lynn,

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}55{:}23.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}25.606$  who were the trainees who produced some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00{:}55{:}25{.}606 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}27{.}884$  the work that I talked to you about today.

00:55:27.890 --> 00:55:29.878 And if there's time I'd be happy

NOTE Confidence: 0.877331316470588

 $00:55:29.878 \longrightarrow 00:55:31.440$  to take any questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

 $00:55:33.640 \rightarrow 00:55:35.901$  Fantastic thank you so much Jenny and

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

00:55:35.901 --> 00:55:38.726 and you do indeed have we do indeed

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

00:55:38.726 --> 00:55:41.521 have some time for questions despite me

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

 $00{:}55{:}41{.}521 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}43{.}876$  interrupting you mid mid presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

00:55:43.880 --> 00:55:46.496 You know just what. So first of all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

00:55:46.500 - 00:55:48.138 ask anyone that wants to raise

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

 $00:55:48.138 \longrightarrow 00:55:49.975$  their hand and they can mute

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

 $00:55:49.975 \rightarrow 00:55:51.355$  themselves and ask questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

00:55:51.360 --> 00:55:53.901 Or feel free to put your question

NOTE Confidence: 0.901443506296296

 $00{:}55{:}53{.}901 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}55{.}850$  into the chat for Jenny.

NOTE Confidence: 0.930652434

 $00{:}55{:}58{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}00{.}340$  Hi I have a question. My name

NOTE Confidence: 0.517075307666667

 $00{:}56{:}00{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}03{.}636$  is Tara Vaccarino. Are the trust

NOTE Confidence: 0.517075307666667

 $00{:}56{:}03.636 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}05.708$  a decent? Are wonderful seminar

00:56:06.180 --> 00:56:09.568 I can you hear me I wanted yeah I NOTE Confidence: 0.951936377142857  $00{:}56{:}09{.}568 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}13.080$  wanted to ask you to what extent NOTE Confidence: 0.951936377142857  $00:56:13.080 \rightarrow 00:56:15.868$  this you think that this early effect NOTE Confidence: 0.845759544  $00:56:15.880 \longrightarrow 00:56:17.415$  of the environment are actually NOTE Confidence: 0.845759544  $00:56:17.415 \longrightarrow 00:56:18.950$  acting on the prenatal stage NOTE Confidence: 0.88519188  $00:56:18.960 \rightarrow 00:56:20.240$  rather than early postnatal? NOTE Confidence: 0.88519188  $00:56:20.240 \longrightarrow 00:56:22.705$  I think in principle there is no NOTE Confidence: 0.88519188  $00:56:22.705 \rightarrow 00:56:25.406$  proof that drastic conditions like NOTE Confidence: 0.88519188 00:56:25.406 --> 00:56:27.770 what you're studying like drought NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572  $00:56:27.780 \rightarrow 00:56:30.250$  for example, or even dominance NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572  $00:56:30.250 \longrightarrow 00:56:31.673$  amongst these primates NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572  $00:56:31.673 \rightarrow 00:56:33.370$  could actually not affect. NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572 00:56:33.370 --> 00:56:36.329 Much earlier phases of development, NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572  $00:56:36.329 \rightarrow 00:56:37.748$  including the brain, NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572  $00:56:37.750 \rightarrow 00:56:39.290$  not just the blood, NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572  $00:56:39.290 \rightarrow 00:56:42.328$  which is what you can study postnatally.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.868411351428572
- $00:56:42.330 \longrightarrow 00:56:44.079$  So what would
- NOTE Confidence: 0.771023164285714
- $00{:}56{:}44.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}47.128$  be a potential Ave to study earlier
- NOTE Confidence: 0.771023164285714
- $00{:}56{:}47{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}49{.}578$  effect and to what extent do you think
- NOTE Confidence: 0.771023164285714
- $00:56:49.580 \rightarrow 00:56:52.168$  they're possible or even likely? Thank
- NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333
- $00:56:52.180 \rightarrow 00:56:55.936$  you. I think they're entirely possible,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333
- $00:56:55.940 \longrightarrow 00:56:57.620$  and it sort of depends on our
- NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333
- $00:56:57.620 \longrightarrow 00:56:59.330$  ability to get at that question.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333
- $00:56:59.330 \longrightarrow 00:57:01.240$  Depends on the source of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333
- $00:57:01.240 \longrightarrow 00:57:02.768$  early adversity in question,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333
- $00:57:02.770 \longrightarrow 00:57:05.731$  so for some of the things we're
- NOTE Confidence: 0.913404643333333
- 00:57:05.731 00:57:07.480 considering like early life.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444
- 00:57:09.810 --> 00:57:12.030 Social status, maternal social status
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444
- $00{:}57{:}12.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}13.806$  or maternal social integration.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444
- 00:57:13.810 --> 00:57:16.490 Those don't change a whole lot in our
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444
- $00:57:16.490 \longrightarrow 00:57:18.478$  study system prenatally to postnatally
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:57:18.478 \longrightarrow 00:57:20.980$  within a short period of time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00{:}57{:}20{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}24{.}072$  and so we really can't disentangle

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

00:57:24.072 -> 00:57:26.832 whether the crucial point there

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:57:26.832 \rightarrow 00:57:30.469$  is in utero or or post Natal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00{:}57{:}30{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}32{.}606$  We can do a little bit actually with

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00{:}57{:}32.606$  -->  $00{:}57{:}34.556$  the drought effects because we have NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:57:34.556 \rightarrow 00:57:36.251$  such seasonality in our population

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:57:36.251 \rightarrow 00:57:38.378$  in year to year variation differs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:57:38.380 \rightarrow 00:57:40.438$  So for example, when we were looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:57:40.438 \longrightarrow 00:57:42.069$  at drought effects on fertility,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:57:42.070 \longrightarrow 00:57:43.750$  we used the first year of life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00{:}57{:}43.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}46.306$  but we also did some comparisons

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:57:46.306 \longrightarrow 00:57:48.010$  with the prenatal period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834735614444444

00:57:48.010 --> 00:57:50.314 So if you just take birth

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00{:}57{:}50{.}314 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}51{.}850$  minus a year instead,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:57:51.850 \rightarrow 00:57:53.660$  which would cover conception as

 $00:57:53.660 \rightarrow 00:57:56.024$  well in these animals and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

00:57:56.024 --> 00:57:58.309 get similar kinds of patterns,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:57:58.310 \rightarrow 00:58:00.354$  but they're weaker, which.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

00:58:00.354 --> 00:58:01.376 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

00:58:01.380 --> 00:58:02.295 obviously I think you would

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:58:02.295 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.539$  take that with a grain of salt,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:58:03.540 \rightarrow 00:58:05.430$  but they would suggest to us by

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00{:}58{:}05{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}06{.}990$  themselves that for that particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:58:06.990 \rightarrow 00:58:09.060$  exposure the post Natal period maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:58:09.060 \rightarrow 00:58:10.762$  more important potentially because

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:58:10.762 \rightarrow 00:58:12.586$  mothers are actually buffering

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:58:12.586 \rightarrow 00:58:17.010$  their offspring against against.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00{:}58{:}17.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}18.025$  The challenges posed by a

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

00:58:18.025 --> 00:58:19.653 drought and they can do so more

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00{:}58{:}19.653 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}20.785$  effectively when they're neutral.

00:58:20.790 --> 00:58:22.686 But here I'm I'm speculating a little bit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00{:}58{:}22.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}23.770$  so sometimes we can get it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:58:23.770 \longrightarrow 00:58:24.990$  and sometimes we can't,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00{:}58{:}24{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}26{.}210$  because those correlations can

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00{:}58{:}26{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}27{.}512$  be quite tight across that

NOTE Confidence: 0.83473561444444

 $00:58:27.512 \longrightarrow 00:58:29.200$  about a year and a half or so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00{:}58{:}30{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}33{.}628$  And I think Karthik had a question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00:58:33.630 \longrightarrow 00:58:35.286$  Great talk is really cool stuff.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00{:}58{:}35{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}36{.}610$  My question is kind of similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

00:58:36.610 --> 00:58:37.795 to Doctor Vaccarino's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00:58:37.795 \rightarrow 00:58:39.090$  but one of the interesting things

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

00:58:39.090 --> 00:58:41.310 was just the reduced like fertility,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

00:58:41.310 --> 00:58:43.206 like or like having less children.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00{:}58{:}43{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}44{.}418$  And I mean I could think of

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

 $00{:}58{:}44{.}418 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}45{.}606$  a lot of causes for that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857

00:58:45.610 --> 00:58:47.160 Like you know their eggs are less

- NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857
- $00:58:47.160 \rightarrow 00:58:48.870$  viable or they change their behavior
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857
- $00:58:48.870 \longrightarrow 00:58:50.730$  so they're like having less like
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857
- $00{:}58{:}50{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}52{.}210$  intercourse or the fact that like
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857
- $00{:}58{:}52{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}53{.}806$  just 'cause of their like hierarchy,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857
- $00{:}58{:}53{.}806 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}55{.}566$  they just have less opportunity.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857
- $00:58:55.570 \longrightarrow 00:58:56.562$  Have you looked at?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857
- $00:58:56.562 \longrightarrow 00:58:57.802$  Like what is the actual
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857807277142857
- 00:58:57.802 --> 00:58:58.978 like granular cause of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9062175325
- $00:58:58.990 \longrightarrow 00:59:00.298$  this change in like?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091
- $00{:}59{:}01{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}05{.}236$  Yeah, so in in that severe drought they
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091
- $00:59:05.236 \rightarrow 00:59:08.044$  just stopped cycling and I think the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091
- 00:59:08.044 --> 00:59:10.615 the rationale for that is very similar
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091
- $00:59:10.615 \rightarrow 00:59:13.140$  to reproductive biology in humans,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091
- 00:59:13.140 --> 00:59:16.458 which is when you know energy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091
- $00:59:16.458 \rightarrow 00:59:18.670$  expenditures exceed energy intake.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

00:59:18.670 -> 00:59:20.470 We stop cycling. I mean you see that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00{:}59{:}20{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}21{.}898$  for example in athletes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00{:}59{:}21.898 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}25.637$  but you also see it in in Syria in

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00:59:25.637 \rightarrow 00:59:28.157$  situations of severe caloric deprivation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00:59:28.160 \longrightarrow 00:59:29.798$  Baboons have actually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

00:59:29.798 --> 00:59:31.436 In many ways,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00:59:31.440 \rightarrow 00:59:32.432$  very similar reproductive biology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00:59:32.432 \rightarrow 00:59:33.920$  so I think that's what's happened.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00{:}59{:}33{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}35{.}755$  They're not getting pregnant because

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

 $00:59:35.755 \rightarrow 00:59:37.590$  they're they're they're not ovulating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.841069970909091

00:59:37.590 --> 00:59:37.810 But

NOTE Confidence: 0.89972785

 $00{:}59{:}37{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}39{.}270$  that would be like 'cause

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00{:}59{:}39{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}40{.}930$  there was differences between like the

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00:59:40.930 \dashrightarrow 00:59:43.150$  higher status versus the lower status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00:59:43.150 \longrightarrow 00:59:44.560$  like the higher status it would

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00:59:44.560 \rightarrow 00:59:45.732$  affect both of them, right?
$00:59:45.732 \rightarrow 00:59:46.660$  'cause they're both starving,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00{:}59{:}46.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}48.060$  but it seemed like it wasn't as effective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00{:}59{:}48.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}49.803$  So what would be like the mechanism

NOTE Confidence: 0.845422974545455

 $00:59:49.803 \rightarrow 00:59:51.208$  where effects one at the other?

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $00{:}59{:}51{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}54{.}764$  Yeah, so that I can tell you with

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $00{:}59{:}54{.}764 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}56{.}865$  less certainty, but one of the reasons

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $00{:}59{:}56.865 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}58.872$  that being a high status female baboon

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $00:59:58.872 \rightarrow 01:00:00.902$  is probably a nice thing to be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

01:00:00.910 --> 01:00:04.260 Is a nice thing to be is not only because

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01{:}00{:}04{.}341 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}06{.}828$  they suffer reduced much less targeting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:06.828 \rightarrow 01:00:09.174$  social targeting by other animals, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01{:}00{:}09{.}174 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}11{.}008$  There's a lot of reinforcement

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:11.008 \rightarrow 01:00:12.680$  of hierarchies in baboons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01{:}00{:}12.680 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}14.752$  so there's a lot of psychosocial stress

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:14.752 \rightarrow 01:00:17.110$  as well, but because you know it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:17.110 \longrightarrow 01:00:19.110$  it it actually increases their

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:19.110 \longrightarrow 01:00:20.310$  access to resources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:20.310 \rightarrow 01:00:22.632$  They have the ability to displace

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01{:}00{:}22.632 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}24.639$  other animals from areas where

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

01:00:24.639 --> 01:00:26.187 food might still exist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01{:}00{:}26.190 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}28.388$  and so I suspect that in energetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

01:00:28.388 --> 01:00:30.468 rationale has a big role to play.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:30.470 \longrightarrow 01:00:31.114$  That's certainly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:31.114 \longrightarrow 01:00:32.080$  That's for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:32.080 \rightarrow 01:00:34.208$  the reason why we think females who

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01{:}00{:}34{.}208 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}36{.}358$  are higher status have shorter inter

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01{:}00{:}36.358 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}37.980$  birth intervals than females who

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01{:}00{:}37{.}980 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}39{.}660$  are low status in our population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

01:00:39.660 --> 01:00:42.330 They just come back to reproductive

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:42.330 \longrightarrow 01:00:43.220$  condition faster.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678

 $01:00:43.220 \rightarrow 01:00:45.200$  It's shorter postpartum area,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.91379678
- 01:00:45.200 --> 01:00:46.910 interesting, cool, thanks sure.

01:00:49.950 --> 01:00:52.020 I'm very did you have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.77533422

 $01:00:52.020 \longrightarrow 01:00:53.761$  question there or Preston?

NOTE Confidence: 0.77533422

 $01:00:53.761 \longrightarrow 01:00:57.266$  Yes, Preston has a question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77533422

 $01{:}00{:}57{.}270 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}59{.}048$  Question do you want to unmute there?

NOTE Confidence: 0.77533422

01:00:59.050 --> 01:01:00.480 Yep, I'm Preston hi.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9269801

 $01{:}01{:}03.780 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}05.784$  This was this was fascinating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9269801

01:01:05.784 --> 01:01:08.430 I I was really intrigued by.

NOTE Confidence: 0.757721614444444

 $01:01:08.430 \longrightarrow 01:01:10.315$  I was just wondering with

NOTE Confidence: 0.75772161444444

 $01:01:10.315 \longrightarrow 01:01:11.823$  the causes of death.

NOTE Confidence: 0.75772161444444

01:01:11.830 --> 01:01:13.342 I don't know if if you knew

NOTE Confidence: 0.75772161444444

 $01{:}01{:}13.342 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}14.759$  any difference in the causes of

NOTE Confidence: 0.757721614444444

01:01:14.759 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:01:16.199 death with those who have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.75772161444444

01:01:16.199 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:01:17.569 social hits versus those who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.757721614444444

01:01:17.569 --> 01:01:19.222 able to live a long happy life

NOTE Confidence: 0.75772161444444

 $01:01:19.222 \rightarrow 01:01:20.938$  and had that privilege kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.75772161444444

01:01:20.938 --> 01:01:22.258 lifestyle you're talking on it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.75772161444444

01:01:22.260 --> 01:01:23.316 I don't know if there's anything

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01{:}01{:}23.450 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}27.090$  on that. We have limited information on

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

01:01:27.090 --> 01:01:30.090 cause of death because we can't do you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:30.090 \rightarrow 01:01:32.328$  full clinical workups of dead baboons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01{:}01{:}32{.}330 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}34{.}245$  And honestly we barely recovered

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01{:}01{:}34{.}245 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}36{.}862$  their bodies in a state where we

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:36.862 \longrightarrow 01:01:39.110$  would be able to do that, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:39.110 \longrightarrow 01:01:41.140$  'cause so so I'll say the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01{:}01{:}41{.}140 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}43{.}003$  proximate cause of death for most of

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01{:}01{:}43.003 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}44.959$  our animals is they got eaten by by.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:44.960 \rightarrow 01:01:47.726$  Leopard or a lion or something like that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

01:01:47.730 --> 01:01:50.043 You know we do see pathologies and we record

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01:01:50.043 \rightarrow 01:01:52.279$  wounds and pathologies over the lifespan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672

 $01{:}01{:}52{.}280 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}54{.}912$  But they're pretty crude and so the

- NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672
- $01:01:54.912 \rightarrow 01:01:58.040$  short answer is, we really wish we knew.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672
- 01:01:58.040 --> 01:02:00.744 But everything I showed you today is an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672
- $01:02:00.744 \longrightarrow 01:02:02.877$  all 'cause mortality sort of situation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672
- $01{:}02{:}02{.}877 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}04.690$  We could parse some of the individuals
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672
- $01:02:04.744 \longrightarrow 01:02:06.016$  who we have better data for,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.853631672
- $01:02:06.020 \dashrightarrow 01:02:07.757$  but that just drops our sample size a lot.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- 01:02:10.010 --> 01:02:11.612 Thank you I. I imagine that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- 01:02:11.612 --> 01:02:12.680 being depressed probably makes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- $01:02:12.729 \longrightarrow 01:02:14.680$  you more likely to be eaten,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- $01:02:14.680 \longrightarrow 01:02:16.340$  so I I think that's.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- 01:02:16.340 --> 01:02:18.200 It make probably makes you slower,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- $01:02:18.200 \longrightarrow 01:02:20.252$  probably makes you less liked by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- 01:02:20.252 --> 01:02:22.518 your your social peers if you're
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- $01{:}02{:}22.518 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}24.178$  causing them difficulties too,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- $01{:}02{:}24.180 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}25.236$  so I think it makes sense.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308

- $01:02:25.240 \longrightarrow 01:02:28.246$  I just thank you this is this is great.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- 01:02:28.250 --> 01:02:29.562 Thanks, I know we've run
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- $01:02:29.562 \longrightarrow 01:02:30.302$  a little bit over time,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- $01:02:30.310 \dashrightarrow 01:02:31.808$  but Amanda does have her hand raised,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- 01:02:31.810 --> 01:02:32.144 so Amanda,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- $01:02:32.144 \rightarrow 01:02:33.313$  would you like to ask a question?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909937617692308
- 01:02:34.110 --> 01:02:34.540 Thank
- NOTE Confidence: 0.634611006
- $01:02:34.550 \longrightarrow 01:02:36.460$  you. Jenny is great talk.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.634611006
- 01:02:36.460 --> 01:02:37.490 I always love hearing a research
- NOTE Confidence: 0.634611006
- $01{:}02{:}37{.}490 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}39{.}400$  and as a treat to hear about baboons
- NOTE Confidence: 0.769422722857143
- $01:02:40.150 \longrightarrow 01:02:41.570$  in a world where consumed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.769422722857143
- $01:02:41.570 \longrightarrow 01:02:46.620$  by my cats. So but related.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.60834654
- $01:02:46.620 \longrightarrow 01:02:47.968$  I was struck by an image near
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:02:47.980 \longrightarrow 01:02:50.044$  the end of your talk where a baboon
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:02:50.044 \rightarrow 01:02:53.238$  mother and infant appeared to be engaging
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:02:53.238 \rightarrow 01:02:55.660$  in some face to face mutual gazing,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:02:55.660 \longrightarrow 01:02:57.718$  and this led me to wonder.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- 01:02:57.720 --> 01:02:59.592 Are you guys looking at or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:02:59.592 \rightarrow 01:03:01.560$  thinking of looking at?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:03:01.560 \rightarrow 01:03:03.056$  You know mother infant interactions
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:03:03.056 \longrightarrow 01:03:05.728$  in the middle period and how this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:03:05.728 \rightarrow 01:03:08.215$  might be influencing infant outcomes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- 01:03:08.215 --> 01:03:09.480 Yeah, absolutely.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:03:09.480 \longrightarrow 01:03:11.940$  So that was the last part
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:03:11.940 \longrightarrow 01:03:13.770$  of Matthew Zippel thesis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:03:13.770 \longrightarrow 01:03:15.562$  so he was the the former PhD
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:03:15.562 \rightarrow 01:03:17.786$  student who did the work on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:03:17.786 \longrightarrow 01:03:18.988$  intergenerational adversity, right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01{:}03{:}18{.}988 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}21{.}864$  And so where we are there is that we think
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- 01:03:21.864 --> 01:03:24.264 OK moms who experience early adversity.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:03:24.270 \longrightarrow 01:03:27.826$  They grow up and then they have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:27.826 \rightarrow 01:03:30.436$  more difficulty keeping their kids

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01{:}03{:}30{.}436$  -->  $01{:}03{:}32{.}346$  alive and that's the phenomenon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:32.346 \longrightarrow 01:03:34.470$  But it's not the explanation right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:34.470 \longrightarrow 01:03:36.036$  And we think that they're having

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:36.036 \rightarrow 01:03:37.080$  more difficulty because they

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01{:}03{:}37{.}126 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}38{.}536$  themselves are in poor condition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:38.540 --> 01:03:38.756 Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:38.756 \rightarrow 01:03:40.700$  in order for that to translate to the kid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:40.700 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:03:42.002 I mean there are a few different

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:42.002 \rightarrow 01:03:42.880$  ways that could happen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:42.880 \longrightarrow 01:03:45.724$  but one is certainly in their

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

01:03:45.724 --> 01:03:47.620 interaction and caretaking style,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:47.620 \rightarrow 01:03:50.110$  and so he's been aggregating very

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01{:}03{:}50{.}110 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}52{.}787$  very granular data on mother infant

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:52.787 \longrightarrow 01:03:55.595$  pairs to try and understand what

NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

 $01:03:55.595 \rightarrow 01:03:57.819$  the differences in sort of very,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:03:57.820 \longrightarrow 01:04:00.226$  very granular levels of experience are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01{:}04{:}00{.}226 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}03{.}400$  for the kids of moms who have those.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:04:03.400 \rightarrow 01:04:05.048$  Those adverse early experiences
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:04:05.048 \longrightarrow 01:04:06.696$  versus those that don't,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:04:06.700 \rightarrow 01:04:08.590$  and they certainly appear to be different.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01{:}04{:}08{.}590 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}10{.}585$  Although not in ways that we completely
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- 01:04:10.585 --> 01:04:12.160 have our fingers on yet right,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:04:12.160 \rightarrow 01:04:13.924$  they spend more time with adult males.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:04:13.930 \longrightarrow 01:04:14.954$  For instance,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- 01:04:14.954 --> 01:04:18.538 they spend more time away from Mom.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:04:18.540 \longrightarrow 01:04:20.952$  Who is driving that behavior
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- 01:04:20.952 --> 01:04:23.392 is not entirely clear yet,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:04:23.400 \longrightarrow 01:04:25.680$  but hopefully we'll get a little
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- 01:04:25.680 --> 01:04:28.268 bit more more of an understanding
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387
- $01:04:28.268 \longrightarrow 01:04:30.553$  as as that analysis proceeds.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.783544387

- $01:04:30.560 \longrightarrow 01:04:31.550$  I want to see thank you.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.68817834
- 01:04:33.390 --> 01:04:34.950 I know we are, we're time,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.68817834
- $01:04:34.950 \longrightarrow 01:04:36.840$  but I if there are any trainees

 $01:04:36.840 \longrightarrow 01:04:38.833$  that are still on the line that

NOTE Confidence: 0.68817834

 $01{:}04{:}38{.}833 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}40{.}519$  would like to ask any questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.68817834

 $01:04:40.584 \rightarrow 01:04:42.576$  please do now is your opportunity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68817834

 $01:04:42.580 \rightarrow 01:04:44.458$  Any other questions from the audience?

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

01:04:48.480 --> 01:04:49.656 And you know, I just when I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}04{:}49.660 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}51.516$  when you're presenting your

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}04{:}51{.}516$  -->  $01{:}04{:}52{.}908$  developmental constraints versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}04{:}52{.}910 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}54{.}422$  the predictive adaptive response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:04:54.422 \longrightarrow 01:04:55.934$  really resonated with me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

01:04:55.940 --> 01:04:56.420 Because obviously,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}04{:}56{.}420 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}58{.}736$  with the kind of work I do with exposure

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}04{:}58.736 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}00.456$  to prenatal anxiety or depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:00.460 \longrightarrow 01:05:02.115$  you know the clinical implications

 $01:05:02.115 \rightarrow 01:05:03.770$  of saying the predictive adaptive

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:03.822 \longrightarrow 01:05:05.037$  response is the best fit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:05.040 \rightarrow 01:05:07.180$  Model is actually really appalling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:07.180 \longrightarrow 01:05:09.484$  because it suggests that you shouldn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}05{:}09{.}484 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}10{.}743$  treat anxiety or depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

01:05:10.743 --> 01:05:12.780 Pregnancy obviously makes no sense at all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:12.780 \longrightarrow 01:05:14.292$  so I can't really subscribe to

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:14.292 \rightarrow 01:05:15.300$  the predictive adaptive response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:15.300 \longrightarrow 01:05:16.950$  And in the context, so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:16.950 \rightarrow 01:05:18.335$  Mental anxiety and depression or

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01:05:18.335 \rightarrow 01:05:19.443$  perinatal anxiety and depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}05{:}19{.}450 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}20{.}346$  So the developmental constraint

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}05{:}20{.}346 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}21{.}927$  model really seems to fit a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}05{:}21{.}927 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}23{.}285$  bit better with the data that I've

NOTE Confidence: 0.733530794285714

 $01{:}05{:}23.285 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}24.738$  seen from my my own research as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

01:05:25.210 --> 01:05:27.387 you know, Karen, as you probably have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01{:}05{:}27{.}390 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}29{.}364$  I've seen a couple of papers that

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:29.364 \rightarrow 01:05:31.148$  actually do go down that path.

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:31.150 \longrightarrow 01:05:34.430$  Yeah, well, we shouldn't try to

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:34.430 \longrightarrow 01:05:36.270$  address this because you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:36.270 \dashrightarrow 01:05:38.910$  the phenotype is meant to be matched.

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

01:05:38.910 --> 01:05:42.278 And I, I think I think that's problematic

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:42.278 \rightarrow 01:05:45.319$  from a variety of perspectives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:45.320 \rightarrow 01:05:48.694$  And beyond, whether or not one hypothesis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01{:}05{:}48{.}700 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}50{.}408$  one class of models is a better

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01{:}05{:}50{.}408 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}51{.}460$  explanation versus the other,

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:51.460 \longrightarrow 01:05:55.080$  it also seriously conflates what

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:55.080 \rightarrow 01:05:57.446$  evolution may have produced with what we

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:05:57.446 \rightarrow 01:05:59.937$  might want our societies to look like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01{:}05{:}59{.}940 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}02{.}136$  And those are not not always

NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857

 $01:06:02.136 \longrightarrow 01:06:03.665$  the same thing, right?

- NOTE Confidence: 0.704986357142857
- 01:06:03.665 --> 01:06:04.090 So
- NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909
- 01:06:04.820 --> 01:06:06.905 exactly. Yeah, well, we've got
- NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909
- $01:06:06.905 \rightarrow 01:06:09.390$  messages coming and saying great talk.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909
- $01:06:09.390 \longrightarrow 01:06:10.548$  I'd just like to reiterate that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909
- 01:06:10.548 --> 01:06:11.829 and thank you once again Jenny,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909
- $01{:}06{:}11.830 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}13.886$  you have an open invitation to New Haven.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909
- $01:06:13.890 \longrightarrow 01:06:14.730$  We will get you here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909
- $01:06:14.730 \longrightarrow 01:06:17.106$  We will make that pizza comparison
- NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909
- $01:06:17.106 \longrightarrow 01:06:18.690$  happen that we promised.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909
- $01{:}06{:}18.690 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}20.922$  But please join me once again in thanking Dr.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.782804899090909
- $01:06:20.930 \rightarrow 01:06:22.460$  Chung for a wonderful presentation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.792568132
- $01:06:22.950 \longrightarrow 01:06:24.676$  Thanks to all of you. I really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.792568132
- $01:06:24.676 \rightarrow 01:06:25.691$  appreciate the opportunity to do
- NOTE Confidence: 0.792568132
- 01:06:25.691 --> 01:06:27.060 this and I'm sorry I couldn't be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.780239430909091
- $01:06:27.070 \rightarrow 01:06:28.498$  with you in person.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.780239430909091

01:06:28.498 --> 01:06:31.320 Oh my God will make it happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780239430909091

 $01:06:31.320 \longrightarrow 01:06:32.370$  Wonderful, I think we'll stop

NOTE Confidence: 0.780239430909091

 $01:06:32.370 \longrightarrow 01:06:33.420$  the recording that by bye.

NOTE Confidence: 0.780239430909091

 $01:06:33.420 \longrightarrow 01:06:34.998$  Jennie thanks by e.