## WEBVTT

NOTE duration: "00:58:33.3200000"

NOTE recognizability:0.797

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00{:}00{:}00{:}00{:}00 {\:\raisebox{---}{\text{---}}} > 00{:}00{:}03.288$  Doctor Anani who used to be Doctor Isuzu

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:00:03.288 \longrightarrow 00:00:06.719$  but now she has her taken her married

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:00:06.719 \longrightarrow 00:00:10.392$  name and Annie is a good friend and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:00:10.392 --> 00:00:13.432 really one of our someone we're so proud

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:00:13.432 \longrightarrow 00:00:16.808$  to have as a trainee and now on faculty.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00{:}00{:}16.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}19.561$  Uche went to medical school in her

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:00:19.561 --> 00:00:22.246 native Nigeria, the University of Ibadan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:00:22.246 \longrightarrow 00:00:24.616$  and then in the states.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:00:24.620 --> 00:00:26.756 She's been winding her way up

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:00:26.756 \longrightarrow 00:00:27.824$  the eastern seaboard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00{:}00{:}27.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}34.634$  from Miami to Duke to Johns Hopkins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:00:34.640 \longrightarrow 00:00:36.112$  All of them are a bunch of losers

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:00:36.112 --> 00:00:37.416 because she ended up here with us,

 $00:00:37.420 \longrightarrow 00:00:38.644$  so we're delighted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:00:38.644 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.406$  And Uche has worked with a lot of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:00:42.406 --> 00:00:45.262 people in the Who's who of psychiatry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:00:45.270 --> 00:00:47.076 including I was just looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:00:47.076 \longrightarrow 00:00:49.034$  her CV again with Doctor Charlie

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:00:49.034 \longrightarrow 00:00:51.104$  Nemeroff when he was in Miami.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:00:51.110 --> 00:00:53.886 And it's just remarkable looking at your CV,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:00:53.890 --> 00:00:56.590 which how quickly you've been publishing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:00:56.590 \longrightarrow 00:00:58.885$  getting grants, coming into your

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:00:58.885 --> 00:01:01.180 own right as an investigator,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:01:01.180 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.095$  which is what you're going to show us today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:01:05.100 --> 00:01:07.192 Among her many interests,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:01:07.192 \longrightarrow 00:01:10.330$  Uche has done some really important

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:01:10.415 --> 00:01:13.186 work on race, racism, race relations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:01:13.186 --> 00:01:16.498 including here in our inpatient unit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:01:16.500 --> 00:01:18.866 I was joking that I had the

00:01:18.866 --> 00:01:20.880 privilege of publishing, I think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:01:20.880 --> 00:01:22.880 Doctor Isuzus last paper,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:01:22.880 \longrightarrow 00:01:25.260$  because Doctor Azusa is now Doctor Anani.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:01:25.260 \longrightarrow 00:01:27.084$  But that paper is really important

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:01:27.084 \longrightarrow 00:01:29.020$  with many of our colleagues,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:01:29.020 --> 00:01:31.036 including David Rees and Laurie Cardona,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:01:31.040 --> 00:01:32.640 who's here in Amanda Calhoun,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00{:}01{:}32.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}34.930$  a qualitative study about racism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00{:}01{:}34.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}37.810$  Race relations in an inpatient unit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:01:37.810 \longrightarrow 00:01:41.238$  a pretty brave type of work

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:01:41.238 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.786$  that is much needed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00{:}01{:}42.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}46.164$  And Uche has moved into the digital

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:01:46.164 \longrightarrow 00:01:49.606$  world in a in in a major way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00{:}01{:}49.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}52.770$  She is now part of a number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:01:52.770 \longrightarrow 00:01:55.231$  consortia and grants all together

 $00:01:55.231 \longrightarrow 00:01:57.866$  with the digital team here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00{:}01{:}57.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}00.118$  She is now the associate director of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:02:00.118 \longrightarrow 00:02:02.353$  play to Prevent Group that we're going

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:02:02.353 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.199$  to be hearing about that brings technologies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:02:05.200 \longrightarrow 00:02:07.520$  To clinical needs and

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:02:07.520 --> 00:02:11.000 using all sorts of G Wiz.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:02:11.000 --> 00:02:12.164 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:02:12.164 \longrightarrow 00:02:15.074$  toys towards very important purposes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:02:15.080 \longrightarrow 00:02:17.360$  So it's wonderful to be here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:02:17.360 \longrightarrow 00:02:17.625$  Oh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00{:}02{:}17.625 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}19.480$  the most important thing is that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:02:19.480 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.955$  understand because I saw the list

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

00:02:20.955 --> 00:02:22.293 that her husband is watching you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00{:}02{:}22.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}23.980$  so you better do a good job.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:02:23.980 \longrightarrow 00:02:25.947$  And but the most important thing is

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:02:25.947 \longrightarrow 00:02:28.145$  that that which is also the proud mom

 $00:02:28.145 \longrightarrow 00:02:30.408$  of two beautiful kids who we have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00{:}02{:}30.408 \to 00{:}02{:}32.754$  seeing growing here, Daisy and Damien.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776480074736842

 $00:02:32.754 \longrightarrow 00:02:35.622$  So would you take it away?

NOTE Confidence: 0.904478185

00:02:43.630 --> 00:02:46.318 Thank you for that kind introduction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.06702602

 $00{:}02{:}48.910 --> 00{:}02{:}49.470 \ \mathrm{Umm}.$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.691802335

 $00:02:53.780 \longrightarrow 00:02:55.610$  Ohh sorry. 2nd.

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:03:02.860 \longrightarrow 00:03:06.075$  All right. So I'm excited to talk to

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00{:}03{:}06.075 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}08.624$  you all about my work investigating

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:03:08.624 \longrightarrow 00:03:11.649$  the utility of digital tools,

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:03:11.650 \longrightarrow 00:03:13.080$  not only for risk assessment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:03:13.080 \longrightarrow 00:03:14.886$  which is the focus of this talk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:03:14.890 \longrightarrow 00:03:17.538$  but also for intervention

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00{:}03{:}17.538 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}19.524$  development and delivery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00{:}03{:}19.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}22.070$  specifically focused on addressing

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:03:22.070 \longrightarrow 00:03:24.610$  adults and substance misuse.

 $00:03:24.610 \longrightarrow 00:03:27.130$  And all of this really is framed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00{:}03{:}27.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}30.112$  Under the umbrella of increasing access to

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00{:}03{:}30.112 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}32.540$  care, I think a lot about access to care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:03:32.540 \longrightarrow 00:03:35.012$  I grew up in a country where access

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

00:03:35.012 --> 00:03:37.358 to care was pretty challenging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

00:03:37.360 --> 00:03:40.348 and so I thought a lot about it growing

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:03:40.348 \longrightarrow 00:03:43.560$  up also as a resident and trainee,

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

00:03:43.560 --> 00:03:47.280 I was also really struck by how delaying

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:03:47.280 \longrightarrow 00:03:51.880$  access to care really leads to adolescence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

00:03:51.880 --> 00:03:53.780 presenting very late in disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:03:53.780 \longrightarrow 00:03:56.090$  but also how difficult it is

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:03:56.090 \longrightarrow 00:03:58.360$  to manage when kids present.

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:03:58.360 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.286$  So within that framework is where

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:04:00.286 \longrightarrow 00:04:02.840$  where I where I land and how I

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:04:02.840 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.646$  will be framing the talk today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

00:04:04.650 --> 00:04:06.841 And I have an outline thinking

00:04:06.841 --> 00:04:08.707 together with you all about why,

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333 00:04:08.710 --> 00:04:09.078 when, NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00{:}04{:}09.078 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}11.286$  where and what are the barriers

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:04:11.286 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.830$  with identifying kids early.

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

00:04:12.830 --> 00:04:15.406 And I will focus mainly on 2 digital

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

00:04:15.406 --> 00:04:17.868 tools which have which I'm working on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:04:17.870 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.574$  which is game based and the electric the

NOTE Confidence: 0.678330453333333

 $00:04:19.574 \longrightarrow 00:04:21.419$  use of the electronic health records.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:04:23.560 \longrightarrow 00:04:25.394$  And so when I say substance misuse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:04:25.400 \longrightarrow 00:04:27.020$  I mean unhealthy substance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

00:04:27.020 --> 00:04:30.659 Use of alcohol or drugs to relieve stress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:04:30.660 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.640$  alter reality or bring about pleasure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00{:}04{:}32.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}35.200$  Using any way not prescribed by a doctor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

00:04:35.200 --> 00:04:36.860 Use without one's own prescription,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

00:04:36.860 --> 00:04:38.400 using greater amounts, small often,

 $00:04:38.400 \longrightarrow 00:04:40.560$  or longer than told to take.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:04:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.140$  And this affects 3.7 million adolescents,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:04:43.140 \longrightarrow 00:04:44.617$  as is the national Survey of Drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

00:04:44.617 --> 00:04:46.003 Use and Health, which equates to

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:04:46.003 \longrightarrow 00:04:47.760$  about one to two in \$10 cents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:04:47.760 \longrightarrow 00:04:49.914$  So it's common, although the average

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:04:49.914 \longrightarrow 00:04:52.877$  age of onset is about 15 to 17 years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:04:52.880 \longrightarrow 00:04:53.996$  it can occur earlier.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:04:53.996 \longrightarrow 00:04:56.429$  And we know that younger age of onset

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:04:56.429 \longrightarrow 00:04:58.511$  is associated with a greater likelihood

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00{:}04{:}58.511 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}00.657$  of developing a substance use disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:00.660 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.039$  Outcomes are worse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:03.040 \longrightarrow 00:05:04.200$  The consequences are dire.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:04.200 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.634$  So in the last two years we've seen

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:06.634 \longrightarrow 00:05:08.723$  we're dealing with a crisis, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:08.723 \longrightarrow 00:05:11.238$  And drug overdose rates has

 $00:05:11.238 \longrightarrow 00:05:13.111$  risen by 1 / 100%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:13.111 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.833$  If we look at the media

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:14.833 \longrightarrow 00:05:16.319$  monthly overdose deaths,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:16.320 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.344$  it's associated with overdose,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:17.344 \longrightarrow 00:05:19.140$  which can happen at the first time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:19.140 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.115$  the first time someone misuses a substance

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:22.120 \longrightarrow 00:05:24.140$  associated with comorbid mental disorders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:24.140 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.780$  Both as as increases the

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:26.780 \longrightarrow 00:05:28.892$  risk for substance abuse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:28.900 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.156$  but also as a consequence and

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:31.156 \longrightarrow 00:05:32.660$  of course associated with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00{:}05{:}32.660 \rightarrow 00{:}05{:}35.300$  Or functioning like school dropout

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00{:}05{:}35.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}37.412$  legal problems for relationships.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

00:05:37.420 --> 00:05:38.136 Also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:38.136 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.122$  the time between when disease staff

 $00:05:42.122 \longrightarrow 00:05:45.488$  seems sad and initial treatment seeking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00{:}05{:}45.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}47.920$  Initial treatment seeking is on average.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

00:05:47.920 --> 00:05:49.280 This study done by Tesla,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

00:05:49.280 --> 00:05:52.304 which has reached really fund did they lead?

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:05:52.310 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.790$  The National Comorbidity Survey was 16 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

00:05:56.790 --> 00:06:00.670 And I know you will agree that that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:06:00.670 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.842$  that's unacceptable and it underscores the

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

00:06:03.842 --> 00:06:07.010 importance and need to identify people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00{:}06{:}07.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}08.874$  Adolescence, early substances used

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

00:06:08.874 --> 00:06:11.204 typically occur starts in adolescence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00{:}06{:}11.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}13.639$  which is which is why the focus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:06:13.640 \longrightarrow 00:06:16.090$  Also less than 10% in need of

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:06:16.090 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.672$  treatment receive it in 2021.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:06:17.672 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.232$  The number for adults since

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:06:19.232 \longrightarrow 00:06:22.490$  12 to 17 years was 3.5%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:06:22.490 \longrightarrow 00:06:22.903$  So.

 $00:06:22.903 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.381$  Adolescent substance misuse is a major

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00{:}06{:}25.381 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}28.109$  public health problem problem and most in

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:06:28.109 \longrightarrow 00:06:30.500$  need of treatment are not receiving it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

00:06:30.500 --> 00:06:32.885 If we've got to think about how might we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

00:06:32.890 --> 00:06:35.375 you know, start to solve this problem,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:06:35.380 \longrightarrow 00:06:36.388$  one of the things that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:06:36.388 \longrightarrow 00:06:37.310$  might think about like where,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:06:37.310 \longrightarrow 00:06:37.720$  where,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851397984285714

 $00:06:37.720 \longrightarrow 00:06:38.950$  where are adolescents?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:06:41.400 \longrightarrow 00:06:43.280$  96% are enrolled in schools,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:06:43.280 --> 00:06:44.484 not necessarily attending schools,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:06:44.484 \longrightarrow 00:06:45.989$  but I6I enrolled in school,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:06:45.990 \longrightarrow 00:06:48.230$  so there might be a way to

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:06:48.230 \longrightarrow 00:06:49.610$  like engage contact them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:06:49.610 \longrightarrow 00:06:51.620$  95% have access to a smartphone,

 $00:06:51.620 \longrightarrow 00:06:54.924$  91% are seen in primary care annually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:06:54.930 \dashrightarrow 00:06:58.938$  90% are lined daily and 90% play video games.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:06:58.940 \longrightarrow 00:07:01.332$  So, umm, I think we need a systemic

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:01.332 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.858$  model for addressing substance misuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:03.860 \longrightarrow 00:07:06.620$  And what I mean by systemic model is a model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:06.620 \longrightarrow 00:07:08.264$  a national model that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:08.264 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.497$  screens all adolescents,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:09.500 \longrightarrow 00:07:12.220$  triages them based on their risk of use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:12.220 \longrightarrow 00:07:13.318$  No substance misuse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:13.318 \longrightarrow 00:07:15.880$  and so therefore it needs primary prevention,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:15.880 \longrightarrow 00:07:17.560$  at least substance misuse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:17.560 \longrightarrow 00:07:18.400$  secondary prevention,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}07{:}18.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}22.180$  substance use disorder treatment. Umm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:07:22.180 --> 00:07:27.516 And I think what digital tools can do,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:27.520 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.996$  we'll talk a bit about that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:29.000 \longrightarrow 00:07:30.368$  how they can help with these.

 $00:07:30.370 \longrightarrow 00:07:32.134$  But one of the questions that come up is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:32.140 \longrightarrow 00:07:33.834$  well we already have a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:33.834 \longrightarrow 00:07:35.760$  kids who are struggling and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:35.760 \longrightarrow 00:07:37.276$  don't have enough providers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}07{:}37.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}39.992$  So this is only going to increase the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:07:39.992 --> 00:07:42.024 number of kids who who were identifying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:07:42.024 --> 00:07:44.375 But I I would say that I think that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:44.375 \longrightarrow 00:07:46.007$  the fact that we're not identifying

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}07{:}46.007 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}47.719$  them early is contributing to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:07:47.719 --> 00:07:49.450 number of kids that we're seeing

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:49.450 \longrightarrow 00:07:52.170$  who are really ill and at that time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:52.170 \longrightarrow 00:07:55.000$  It's really difficult to address symptoms

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:55.000 \longrightarrow 00:07:57.880$  as opposed to like if you catch them early.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:07:57.880 \longrightarrow 00:08:00.400$  One of the systematic reviews we did earlier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:00.400 \longrightarrow 00:08:01.891$  some years ago,

 $00:08:01.891 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.879$  showed that interventions digitally

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}08{:}03.879 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}05.882$  delivered interventions that deliver

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:05.882 \longrightarrow 00:08:08.117$  universal or targeted interventions were

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:08:08.117 --> 00:08:10.780 actually more likely to be effective,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:10.780 \longrightarrow 00:08:13.270$  which I think speaks to other

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}08{:}13.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}15.503$  findings from other studies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:15.503 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.507$  data interventions can adequately

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:17.507 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.142$  target adolescents who have present

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}08{:}20.142 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}23.030$  with mild to moderate symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}08{:}23.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}25.370$  As opposed to like severe disorders

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:08:25.370 --> 00:08:27.926 which need which you you need more than,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:27.930 \longrightarrow 00:08:31.870$  you know, standalone digital intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:08:31.870 --> 00:08:33.398 And so, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:33.398 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.240$  the car as opposed to sustained model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:36.240 \longrightarrow 00:08:37.800$  what we do, what we have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:37.800 \longrightarrow 00:08:39.879$  where the model that we have is

00:08:39.879 --> 00:08:41.240 routine recommendation by Samsung,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}08{:}41.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}43.235$  the American Academy of Pediatrics

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:43.235 \longrightarrow 00:08:45.230$  to screen routinely at annual

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:08:45.301 --> 00:08:46.549 primary care visits.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:46.550 \longrightarrow 00:08:48.965$  And the way this happens is you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:48.970 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.355$  you know through the expert

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:50.355 \longrightarrow 00:08:51.463$  model where you screen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:51.470 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.565$  you have a proof intervention

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}08{:}52.565 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}54.140$  and then you refer to treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:54.140 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.750$  All of this is required.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}08{:}55.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}57.586$  The primary care provider does this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:08:57.590 \longrightarrow 00:08:59.360$  Some systems do differently where there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}08{:}59.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}01.169$  some one in there who can deliver.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:09:01.170 --> 00:09:02.066 Of intervention, but many,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:09:02.066 \longrightarrow 00:09:03.726$  many times it falls on the shoulders

 $00:09:03.726 \longrightarrow 00:09:05.096$  of the primary care provider.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}09{:}05.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}07.165$  There are no universal screening in schools.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:09:07.170 --> 00:09:08.490 Schools do schools once,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:09:08.490 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.470$  but they do whatever they can.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:09:10.470 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.760$  It's not systemic at all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:09:12.760 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.340$  So what are the barriers?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:09:15.340 --> 00:09:16.990 Many providers are not screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:09:16.990 \longrightarrow 00:09:17.980$  for substance misuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}09{:}17.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}19.520$  There are time constraints,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:09:19.520 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.060$  there's lack of reimbursement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}09{:}21.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}23.125$  It seems that every time we want

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:09:23.125 \longrightarrow 00:09:25.206$  to do something else that is

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:09:25.206 --> 00:09:26.714 prevention or preventive wise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}09{:}26.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}28.890$  we add some one more thing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:09:28.890 \longrightarrow 00:09:30.508$  primary care providers have to do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}09{:}30.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}32.340$  And so primary care providers have

 $00{:}09{:}32.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}34.281$  to triage and decide what they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00{:}09{:}34.281 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}36.273$  going to prioritize in their visit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:09:36.280 \longrightarrow 00:09:39.035$  which might be appropriately informed

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

 $00:09:39.035 \longrightarrow 00:09:42.104$  by the presenting complaint and so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:09:42.104 --> 00:09:44.264 Provide us some providers have

NOTE Confidence: 0.87053272

00:09:44.264 --> 00:09:45.560 reported lacking knowledge

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

00:09:45.629 --> 00:09:48.086 about what screens to use the system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

00:09:48.090 --> 00:09:49.878 The workflow is in there to

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:09:49.878 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.070$  actually make this happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:09:51.070 \longrightarrow 00:09:52.446$  What are the resources?

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

00:09:52.446 --> 00:09:54.510 I don't have resources of identifying

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:09:54.572 \longrightarrow 00:09:56.210$  how to figure out what to do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00{:}09{:}56.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}58.541$  Occurrence not always aware of of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:09:58.541 \longrightarrow 00:10:00.620$  substance misuse among their adolescence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:00.620 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.270$  Adolescence are worried about disclosing

 $00:10:02.270 \longrightarrow 00:10:04.661$  this for the first time with their

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00{:}10{:}04.661 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}06.707$  parents being present so they're not

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:06.707 \longrightarrow 00:10:08.320$  always forthcoming for many reasons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:08.320 \longrightarrow 00:10:11.968$  The stigma there's no privacy in the clinics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:11.970 \longrightarrow 00:10:14.161$  Umm, and so I'm saying I'm suggesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

00:10:14.161 --> 00:10:16.158 that you talk to us, mere Canadians,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:16.158 \longrightarrow 00:10:17.728$  why some of these barriers?

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:17.730 \longrightarrow 00:10:19.134$  There's wide reach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:19.134 \longrightarrow 00:10:21.006$  You can automate this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:21.010 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.720$  You can alleviate provider burden.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:22.720 \longrightarrow 00:10:25.618$  This can happen at any time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:25.620 \longrightarrow 00:10:27.657$  The study by night at all showed

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00{:}10{:}27.657 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}29.385$  that adolescents are more honest

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

00:10:29.385 --> 00:10:31.365 about the substance misuse when

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:31.365 \longrightarrow 00:10:32.989$  completing digital screeners and

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00{:}10{:}32.989 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}34.869$  paper screens compared to interviews,

 $00:10:34.870 \longrightarrow 00:10:37.200$  and there's potential for electronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:37.200 \longrightarrow 00:10:38.598$  health record integration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:38.600 \longrightarrow 00:10:40.660$  We could potentially build an

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:40.660 \longrightarrow 00:10:42.308$  automated system that identifies

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:42.308 \longrightarrow 00:10:44.018$  risk as it as it emerges,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:44.020 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.764$  which would be ideal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

00:10:45.764 --> 00:10:46.636 Funnel appropriately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00{:}10{:}46.640 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}10{:}48.270$  deliver an intervention if it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:48.270 \longrightarrow 00:10:49.900$  a standalone for multi moderate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:49.900 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.396$  figure out a way to deliver or funnel

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:53.396 \longrightarrow 00:10:55.628$  to to treatment for those who need.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:10:55.630 \longrightarrow 00:10:59.470$  Specific treatment by a trained personnel.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00{:}10{:}59.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}02.116$  So what might an ideal digital

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

00:11:02.116 --> 00:11:03.439 Screener look like?

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:03.440 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.120$  I would suggest that it would be up,

00:11:05.120 --> 00:11:05.666 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00{:}11{:}05.666 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}07.304$  objective as opposed to self report

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

00:11:07.304 --> 00:11:08.966 will be effective at identifying

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:08.966 \longrightarrow 00:11:10.736$  what you're trying to measure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:10.740 \longrightarrow 00:11:12.246$  So substance misuse in this case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:12.250 \longrightarrow 00:11:14.840$  It will be scalable and it will

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:14.840 \longrightarrow 00:11:17.213$  be accessible at all times by

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00{:}11{:}17.213 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}19.577$  whoever needs needs to access it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

00:11:19.580 --> 00:11:24.539 So my my proposition is that games may

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:24.540 \longrightarrow 00:11:26.988$  offer an objective and effective method

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00{:}11{:}26.988 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}29.470$  for identifying at risk adolescents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:29.470 \longrightarrow 00:11:31.766$  And this is based on the premise

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

00:11:31.766 --> 00:11:34.198 of of metrics which experts call

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:34.198 \longrightarrow 00:11:36.940$  digital biomarkers that are that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:36.940 \longrightarrow 00:11:39.468$  captured by the by the game software.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00{:}11{:}39.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}41.675$  And I like this definition of game

00:11:41.675 --> 00:11:43.430 digital biomarkers which is which

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:43.430 \longrightarrow 00:11:45.300$  defines it as consumer generated

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:45.300 \longrightarrow 00:11:46.888$  physiological and behavioral measures

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:46.888 \longrightarrow 00:11:48.512$  collected through connected digital

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:48.512 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.542$  tools that explain influence or

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:50.550 \longrightarrow 00:11:53.218$  predict health related outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:53.220 \longrightarrow 00:11:55.780$  So one example that has been used now

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:55.780 \longrightarrow 00:11:58.159$  is being used is motor performance

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

 $00:11:58.159 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.244$  in games and the identification

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

00:12:00.244 --> 00:12:02.410 of Ellie Parkinson's. Umm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831023641764706

00:12:02.410 --> 00:12:05.350 And so could we do something similar?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}12{:}07.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}09.306$  Games collect a lot of metrics and

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:09.306 \dashrightarrow 00:12:11.087$  we'll talk a little more about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:11.087 \longrightarrow 00:12:12.950$  work that I've been doing around this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:12.950 \longrightarrow 00:12:15.344$  But games collect a lot of metrics,

 $00:12:15.350 \longrightarrow 00:12:16.995$  and some of the metrics for example

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:12:16.995 --> 00:12:18.668 are like time to complete a task,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:18.670 \longrightarrow 00:12:20.320$  accuracy of choices.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:20.320 \longrightarrow 00:12:23.620$  Those task may be informed by

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:23.620 \longrightarrow 00:12:26.020$  cognitive processes such as maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:12:26.020 --> 00:12:27.570 working memory or inhibitory control,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:27.570 \longrightarrow 00:12:31.448$  which we know are implicated in development

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}12{:}31.448 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}35.031$  of substance misuse and are also in

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:12:35.031 --> 00:12:37.773 in impacted by misuse of substances.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:12:37.780 --> 00:12:40.354 And so if we're going to use games to

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:40.354 \longrightarrow 00:12:42.110$  measure cognitive function or identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:12:42.110 --> 00:12:45.359 kids who are at risk for substance misuse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:45.360 \longrightarrow 00:12:46.146$  are they valid?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:46.146 \longrightarrow 00:12:48.373$  So we did a systematic review and meta

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:48.373 \longrightarrow 00:12:50.697$  analysis to assess the validity of game

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:50.697 \longrightarrow 00:12:52.599$  based assessments of cognitive function.

 $00:12:52.600 \longrightarrow 00:12:54.865$  This has been accepted in

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:54.865 \longrightarrow 00:12:56.677$  progress in brain research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:56.680 \longrightarrow 00:12:59.422$  We looked at studies examining game

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:12:59.422 \longrightarrow 00:13:01.250$  based assessments among children

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:01.326 \longrightarrow 00:13:03.475$  and adults and zero to 17 years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:03.480 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.004$  but four major questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:13:05.004 --> 00:13:06.147 general game characteristics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:06.150 \longrightarrow 00:13:08.600$  cognitive functions that were measured,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:08.600 \longrightarrow 00:13:09.780$  how, what was the validity

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:09.780 \longrightarrow 00:13:10.960$  and how did they compare.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:10.960 \longrightarrow 00:13:13.207$  They used in the studies used pairwise

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}13{:}13.207 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}15.179$  correlations and we're looking at factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:15.179 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.075$  that may influence the validity of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}13{:}17.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}19.740$  Game just assessments would define

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:13:19.740 --> 00:13:21.868 validity by criterion validity.

 $00:13:21.870 \longrightarrow 00:13:24.621$  So how well does a new measure

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:13:24.621 --> 00:13:27.499 compared to an to a previously

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:13:27.499 --> 00:13:30.174 validated measure using you know?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:13:30.180 --> 00:13:31.624 Here using pairwise correlation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:31.624 \longrightarrow 00:13:33.429$  so pairwise correlations between games

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:13:33.429 --> 00:13:35.186 that measured specific cognitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:35.186 \longrightarrow 00:13:36.978$  functions and traditional assessments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:13:36.980 --> 00:13:39.290 We did a meta analysis of specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}13{:}39.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}41.429$  to these games had many tasks and

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:41.429 \longrightarrow 00:13:44.025$  so we only did a meta analysis of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}13{:}44.025 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}46.290$  games that measured specific tasks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:46.290 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.336$  So an impact task for working

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:48.336 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.604$  memory to a traditional and back

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}13{:}50.604 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}52.276$  task measuring working memory.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:52.280 \longrightarrow 00:13:54.513$  We're also interested in things that would

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:54.513 \longrightarrow 00:13:56.385$  affect validity and we organized this

 $00:13:56.385 \longrightarrow 00:13:58.660$  around things at the person level like age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619 00:13:58.660 --> 00:13:59.482 sex, race, NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:13:59.482 \longrightarrow 00:14:01.537$  how the game was delete,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:01.540 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.680$  where the game was delivered,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:14:02.680 --> 00:14:03.994 home school clinic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:03.994 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.060$  and how the how the game itself.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:14:07.060 --> 00:14:09.188 Operated one of the things I'll talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:14:09.188 --> 00:14:11.149 about the scarring analytical method.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}14{:}11.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}13.047$  So you could you could you could

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}14{:}13.047 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}15.032$  do a task and basically measure

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:15.032 \longrightarrow 00:14:17.240$  for the impact test for example

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:17.240 \longrightarrow 00:14:19.545$  how many errors or go no go task,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}14{:}19.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}21.140$  how many errors were made when

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}14{:}21.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}22.709$  this person was doing the test.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:14:22.710 --> 00:14:24.960 As opposed to like using collecting

 $00:14:24.960 \longrightarrow 00:14:27.829$  all the metrics in a game and

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}14{:}27.829 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}29.984$  using an analytic machine learning

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:29.984 \longrightarrow 00:14:32.379$  predictive model to predict cognitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:32.379 \longrightarrow 00:14:33.840$  function for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:33.840 \longrightarrow 00:14:35.660$  So we extracted all of these metrics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:14:35.660 --> 00:14:38.138 type of game, duration of gameplay,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:38.140 \longrightarrow 00:14:38.998$  narrative, storyline.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:14:38.998 --> 00:14:42.430 So one ways in which people are trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:42.505 \longrightarrow 00:14:44.690$  to make screen assessments more

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:44.690 \longrightarrow 00:14:46.930$  palatable is to gamify, for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}14{:}46.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}48.890$  And one way in which they gamify it

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:14:48.942 --> 00:14:50.778 is to include a narrative storyline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:50.780 \longrightarrow 00:14:51.380$  follow Mr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:51.380 \longrightarrow 00:14:53.480 \text{ X}$  as it goes on a plane,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:14:53.480 \longrightarrow 00:14:55.502$  and then while that is happening

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}14{:}55.502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}57.240$  you have different cognitive tests.

 $00{:}14{:}57.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}00.502$  And so I was interested in whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}15{:}00.502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}03.340$  this influenced the validity of game.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

00:15:03.340 --> 00:15:05.320 Especially since I'll talk about my

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:15:05.320 \longrightarrow 00:15:07.461$  study which actually uses a narrative

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00:15:07.461 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.442$  based game and we extracted this

NOTE Confidence: 0.86210449047619

 $00{:}15{:}09.442 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}11.350$  current method like I talked about

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:11.416 \longrightarrow 00:15:13.761$  the study side mode of delivery and

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00{:}15{:}13.761 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}15.514$  this year's traditional validated tests

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

00:15:15.514 --> 00:15:18.980 like the West, Kaufmanns, Baileys.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:18.980 \longrightarrow 00:15:20.315$  There were eighteen games across

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

00:15:20.315 --> 00:15:21.879 20 studies, 17 serious games,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:21.879 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.937$  which means that they were specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:23.937 \longrightarrow 00:15:25.898$  designed to measure cognitive function,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:25.900 \longrightarrow 00:15:27.680$  and one commercially available game,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

00:15:27.680 --> 00:15:29.906 Minecraft, which was assessed for its

 $00:15:29.906 \longrightarrow 00:15:31.940$  utility in assessing cognitive function.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:31.940 \longrightarrow 00:15:34.440$  And compared with traditional assessments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

00:15:34.440 --> 00:15:36.760 The duration of Gameplay varied,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:36.760 \longrightarrow 00:15:38.968$  So we can do much, much more with that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:38.968 \longrightarrow 00:15:40.971$  There were five games to use narrative

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

00:15:40.971 --> 00:15:43.155 story Line 6 studies of 20 studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:43.160 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.120$  which is the predictive model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

00:15:45.120 --> 00:15:47.336 You can see the wide range of sites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:47.340 \longrightarrow 00:15:49.104$  the delivery mods. Words.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

00:15:49.104 --> 00:15:51.750 Most of them were through computers

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:51.830 \longrightarrow 00:15:54.314$  and we extracted shout out to Megan

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:54.314 \longrightarrow 00:15:56.618$  and ISA for helping with extracting

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:56.618 \longrightarrow 00:15:59.229$  all of this coral correlations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:15:59.230 \longrightarrow 00:16:02.068$  But we extracted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00:16:02.070 \longrightarrow 00:16:04.425$  375 pairwise correlations across the

NOTE Confidence: 0.71839253736

 $00{:}16{:}04.425 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}06.780$  street difference through 20 studies.

 $00:16:06.780 \longrightarrow 00:16:08.170 75\%$  of these were significant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:16:10.300 \longrightarrow 00:16:13.150$  Working memory was the most common

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00{:}16{:}13.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}14.575$  cognitive function measured,

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:16:14.580 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.972$  followed by attention,

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:16:15.972 \longrightarrow 00:16:18.756$  inhibitory control and visual spatial skills.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:16:18.760 \longrightarrow 00:16:21.560$  The meta analysis just quickly

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

00:16:21.560 --> 00:16:23.408 while on the low to medium range,

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00{:}16{:}23.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}25.190$  which you might say compares

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:16:25.190 \longrightarrow 00:16:26.614$  to other validation studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

00:16:26.620 --> 00:16:28.240 But for attention it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8140612911111111

 $00{:}16{:}28.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}31.517 \ 0.3 \ inhibitory \ control \ 0.3,$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:16:31.517 \longrightarrow 00:16:36.270$  my working memory at the best at 0.4.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

00:16:36.270 --> 00:16:39.594 We did very basic frequency high

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:16:39.594 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.405$  square frequency comparisons by by

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:16:42.405 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.413$  correlations by these different

00:16:44.413 --> 00:16:47.970 factors and we found no differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:16:47.970 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.130$  by sites and format of delivery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:16:50.130 \longrightarrow 00:16:52.377$  But we found that adolescents tended to

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:16:52.377 \longrightarrow 00:16:54.430$  play older adolescents tend to play better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:16:54.430 \longrightarrow 00:16:55.470$  As you would expect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

00:16:55.470 --> 00:16:56.510 As you grow older,

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

00:16:56.510 --> 00:16:57.945 you would you your cognitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

00:16:57.945 --> 00:16:59.678 process will get better and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8140612911111111

00:16:59.678 --> 00:17:01.130 will play better in the game.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

00:17:01.130 --> 00:17:02.648 And also as you would expect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8140612911111111

 $00{:}17{:}02.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}04.904$  a producer of a prediction model was

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:04.904 \longrightarrow 00:17:06.574$  more likely to yield significant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:06.574 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.334$  Solutions as you would expect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8140612911111111

 $00:17:08.340 \longrightarrow 00:17:10.232$  since they were specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

00:17:10.232 --> 00:17:12.810 identifying metrics, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:12.810 \longrightarrow 00:17:14.679$  But also the inclusion of a narrative

 $00:17:14.679 \longrightarrow 00:17:16.914$  story lines seem to be more associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00{:}17{:}16.914 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}18.298$  with non significant correlations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:18.300 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.855$  So I wonder about whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:20.855 \longrightarrow 00:17:22.388$  that was distracting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:22.390 \longrightarrow 00:17:24.638$  All this to say in general is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:24.638 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.678$  that that there are factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:26.678 \longrightarrow 00:17:28.790$  that influence the how valid

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00{:}17{:}28.854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}31.116$  game based games are for assessing

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:31.116 \longrightarrow 00:17:34.290$  cognitive function is is the takeover.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:34.290 \longrightarrow 00:17:36.774$  We were interested in assisting for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8140612911111111

 $00:17:36.774 \longrightarrow 00:17:40.706$  race and none of the studies did

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:40.710 \longrightarrow 00:17:45.390$  reviewed reported on race and ethnicity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00{:}17{:}45.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}47.721$  Most studies as you can see here

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00{:}17{:}47.721 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}49.250$  found effect differences for age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:49.250 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.885$  Gender was really around spatial

00:17:51.885 --> 00:17:53.466 reasoning and ability,

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:53.470 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.588$  which I think relates to that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

00:17:55.590 --> 00:17:57.942 Boys are more exposed to buy their

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:17:57.942 \longrightarrow 00:18:00.119$  toys special task as opposed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:18:00.119 \longrightarrow 00:18:01.959$  like a biological difference and

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:18:01.959 \dashrightarrow 00:18:03.989$  then prior exposure to gaming.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:18:03.990 \longrightarrow 00:18:05.882$  Technology also influence which

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:18:05.882 \longrightarrow 00:18:07.774$  we'll talk about also.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111 00:18:07.780 --> 00:18:08.536 So if.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

00:18:08.536 --> 00:18:11.182 If you can learn from the game,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8140612911111111

 $00:18:11.190 \longrightarrow 00:18:12.930$  is it is it still?

NOTE Confidence: 0.814061291111111

 $00:18:12.930 \longrightarrow 00:18:15.432$  Can it still be useful as a screening tool?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:18:17.570 \longrightarrow 00:18:20.174$  And so I talked about this unexplored

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:18:20.174 --> 00:18:22.841 factors which we we need to be thinking

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:18:22.841 \longrightarrow 00:18:25.656$  about and we need to be assessing for

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}18{:}25.656 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}27.836$  for widespread we're talking about

 $00:18:27.836 \longrightarrow 00:18:30.380$  scalable and scalability of this tools.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}18{:}30.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}32.780$  So in summary, many adults and such risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:18:32.780 \longrightarrow 00:18:34.880$  for substance misuse are not identified.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:18:34.880 \longrightarrow 00:18:36.745$  The use of digital tools

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:18:36.745 --> 00:18:38.237 can alleviate some barriers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}18{:}38.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}40.228$  Cognitive dysfunction is associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:18:40.228 \longrightarrow 00:18:41.719$  with substance misuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:18:41.720 \longrightarrow 00:18:44.828$  Video games can measure cognitive function.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:18:44.830 \longrightarrow 00:18:46.982$  So it may be a potential tool for

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:18:46.982 --> 00:18:48.496 identifying adult center to risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:18:48.496 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.332$  for substance misuse via measure of

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:18:50.332 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.132$  indices that correlates with cognitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}18{:}52.132 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}53.927$  functions that are also implicated

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:18:53.927 \longrightarrow 00:18:57.130$  in development of substance misuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:18:57.130 \longrightarrow 00:18:59.020$  So this is one of the basis for our

00:18:59.020 --> 00:19:00.908 proof of concept study and the central

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:00.908 \dashrightarrow 00:19:02.715$  question is can data collected during

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:19:02.715 --> 00:19:04.713 gameplay be used to identify adult

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:19:04.713 --> 00:19:08.116 centered risk for substance misuse?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:19:08.116 --> 00:19:09.028 Umm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:09.030 \longrightarrow 00:19:10.680$  Central hypothesis is that adolescence

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:10.680 \longrightarrow 00:19:12.675$  with higher risk of substance misuse

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:12.675 \longrightarrow 00:19:14.684$  will perform worse on the video game

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}19{:}14.684 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}15.939$  and demonstrate poorer cognitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:15.939 \longrightarrow 00:19:17.519$  function compared to adolescence at

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}19{:}17.519 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}19.895$  a lower risk for substance misuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:19.895 \longrightarrow 00:19:21.795$  We've already established that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:21.795 \longrightarrow 00:19:23.857$  cognitive function influences how you

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}19{:}23.857 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}25.880$  perform in a game and also influences

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:25.880 \longrightarrow 00:19:27.738$  your risk for substance misuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}19{:}27.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}29.342$  So we're using play forward game

 $00:19:29.342 \longrightarrow 00:19:31.359$  developed in the play to Prevent Lab

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}19{:}31.359 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}32.844$  in narrative based game initially

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:32.844 \longrightarrow 00:19:35.063$  designed to target HIV and high risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:35.063 \longrightarrow 00:19:36.319$  behaviors like substance misuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:19:36.320 --> 00:19:38.840 It has 12 levels and five mini games

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:38.840 \longrightarrow 00:19:40.820$  here shown at the bottom here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:40.820 \longrightarrow 00:19:42.746$  Each mini game has 10 levels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:42.750 \longrightarrow 00:19:44.871$  We'll talk a little bit about that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}19{:}44.871 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}47.199$  and players and stars and points has

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:47.199 \longrightarrow 00:19:49.233$  been previously tested where we had

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:19:49.240 --> 00:19:52.800 160 where they were \$166 cents each,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:52.800 \longrightarrow 00:19:55.460$  11 to 14 who played play forward.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:55.460 \longrightarrow 00:19:58.260$  There were 43% black adolescents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:19:58.260 \dashrightarrow 00:20:02.856$ 15% fifty 6% Hispanics, Hispanic adolescents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:02.860 \longrightarrow 00:20:05.245$  So in the I will try and walk through

00:20:05.245 --> 00:20:07.549 the point to show how perhaps some

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}20{:}07.549 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}09.502$  of these metrics may correlate

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:09.502 \longrightarrow 00:20:11.197$  with cognitive processes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:11.200 \longrightarrow 00:20:13.704$  And so in the no sense mini game

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:20:13.704 --> 00:20:15.847 an adolescent has a challenge and

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}20{:}15.847 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}18.013$  they have to decide the statement

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}20{:}18.084 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}20.166$  presented to them about drug use

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:20.166 \longrightarrow 00:20:22.484$  or drug misuse and they have to

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:22.484 \longrightarrow 00:20:24.332$  decide if this statement is true

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:24.332 \longrightarrow 00:20:26.599$  false and or an opinion and so you

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:26.599 \longrightarrow 00:20:28.613$  can imagine that they have some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:20:28.613 --> 00:20:30.740 it is influenced of course by their

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:30.740 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.840$  their prior existing knowledge but.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:32.840 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.720$  How quickly can they retrieve

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:34.720 \longrightarrow 00:20:36.224$  the information they know?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:36.230 \longrightarrow 00:20:38.030$  Are they going to do that or are

00:20:38.030 --> 00:20:39.848 they going to just choose an option?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:20:39.850 --> 00:20:40.778 Impulsivity, perhaps,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:20:40.778 --> 00:20:44.026 and how does that influence how well

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:20:44.026 --> 00:20:47.449 they perform as they're playing in the game?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:47.450 \longrightarrow 00:20:48.269$  They have feedback,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:20:48.269 --> 00:20:49.088 they get feedback.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:20:49.090 --> 00:20:51.330 And so you can imagine that if that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:51.330 \longrightarrow 00:20:53.148$  people will do better over time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}20{:}53.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}54.560$  unless they don't really don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}20{:}54.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}56.379$  care whether to do better or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:20:56.380 \longrightarrow 00:20:59.936$  And can we seize those differences apart?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:20:59.940 --> 00:21:00.320 Umm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00{:}21{:}00.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}02.980$  in the People's Sense mini game this

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:21:02.980 \longrightarrow 00:21:05.782$  this player has to decide where to

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:21:05.782 \longrightarrow 00:21:07.752$  place their friend on friendship

00:21:07.827 --> 00:21:10.886 circles and how they decide that ideally

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:21:10.886 \longrightarrow 00:21:13.253$  should be influenced by people's skills,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

 $00:21:13.253 \longrightarrow 00:21:15.008$  which may reflect whether they

NOTE Confidence: 0.87810072

00:21:15.008 --> 00:21:16.870 are low risk or high risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:21:16.870 --> 00:21:18.746 So for example, how do you observe

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:21:18.746 --> 00:21:20.141 people's skills while Jaden is

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:21:20.141 --> 00:21:21.476 always hanging out with Dante,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:21:21.480 \longrightarrow 00:21:22.980$  but Dante happens to be so

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00{:}21{:}22.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}24.639$  wasted at the party last night.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:21:24.640 \longrightarrow 00:21:27.154$  Is he someone you wants and

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:21:27.154 --> 00:21:28.830 you're very close circle?

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:21:28.830 --> 00:21:30.594 So when you decide that's the play,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:21:30.600 \longrightarrow 00:21:32.532$  it gets more complex as you

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:21:32.532 --> 00:21:33.703 go through higher levels,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:21:33.703 \longrightarrow 00:21:35.670$  but you can imagine that a player

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:21:35.723 \longrightarrow 00:21:37.178$  has to keep that information.

 $00:21:37.180 \longrightarrow 00:21:39.076$  You can say they can always go back

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:21:39.076 \longrightarrow 00:21:40.720$  and click and look at the risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:21:40.720 --> 00:21:43.121 but how quickly you advance in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:21:43.121 --> 00:21:45.559 game depends also on how much of

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:21:45.559 \longrightarrow 00:21:47.575$  that information you can keep within.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:21:47.580 --> 00:21:49.435 And when they finish placing

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:21:49.435 \longrightarrow 00:21:50.919$  friends in their circle,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:21:50.920 \longrightarrow 00:21:53.320$  they then have invites that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00{:}21{:}53.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}56.079$  get and the invites that they get.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:21:56.080 \longrightarrow 00:21:57.460$  They have to decide whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:21:57.460 \longrightarrow 00:21:58.840$  this is a good invite.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:21:58.840 \longrightarrow 00:22:00.525$  Very risky invites and depending

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00{:}22{:}00.525 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}02.670$  on whether they decline or accept,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:22:02.670 \longrightarrow 00:22:03.549$  they get stars.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:22:03.549 \longrightarrow 00:22:05.014$  So if you accept like

00:22:05.014 --> 00:22:06.550 invites that are very risky,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:22:06.550 \longrightarrow 00:22:10.590$  you can have three strikes in your house.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:22:10.590 --> 00:22:14.500 And so I'm we myself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:22:14.500 --> 00:22:18.160 Megan Isabella played the game and

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:22:18.160 \longrightarrow 00:22:20.638$  page by page of the game reviewed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00{:}22{:}20.640 \longrightarrow 00{:}22{:}23.624$  What are specific metrics in the game that

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:22:23.624 \longrightarrow 00:22:27.038$  may be influenced by cognitive processes?

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:22:27.040 --> 00:22:28.188 And so, for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:22:28.188 \longrightarrow 00:22:29.623$  in the deciding your friends,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471 00:22:29.630 --> 00:22:30.098 for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:22:30.098 --> 00:22:30.800 in people's sense,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:22:30.800 \longrightarrow 00:22:33.902$  checking out like this time spent

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00{:}22{:}33.902 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}35.768$  checking PS characteristics and

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:22:35.768 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.616$  there's you have to correctly set

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:22:37.616 --> 00:22:39.459 peers into right social circles,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00{:}22{:}39.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}41.916$  and we're hypothesizing that

 $00:22:41.916 \longrightarrow 00:22:44.372$  these domains are probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:22:44.372 \longrightarrow 00:22:46.530$  influencing those processes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:22:46.530 \longrightarrow 00:22:50.202$  And also when you are accepting and rejecting

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

00:22:50.202 --> 00:22:52.878 invites correctly accepting or declining.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471 00:22:52.880 --> 00:22:53.343 Um,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:22:53.343 \longrightarrow 00:22:54.732$  that these processes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:22:54.732 \longrightarrow 00:22:57.047$  this cognitive processes and domains

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00{:}22{:}57.047 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}59.828$  are influencing how well adolescence

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00{:}22{:}59.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}02.798$  perform in this tasks in the game.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00{:}23{:}02.800 \to 00{:}23{:}05.000$  You can also see that there are constructs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:23:05.000 \longrightarrow 00:23:06.660$  so there's a time construct,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00{:}23{:}06.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}08.724$  and there's also an accuracy conduct

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00{:}23{:}08.724 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}10.578$  time constructing yellow and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.782601811176471

 $00:23:10.578 \longrightarrow 00:23:11.847$  accuracy constructing green.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:23:14.260 \longrightarrow 00:23:18.120$  And so. The the first game from

 $00:23:18.120 \longrightarrow 00:23:20.020$  this study be butanol, that is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00{:}23{:}20.020 \to 00{:}23{:}22.435$  can we identify them metrics in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:23:22.435 \longrightarrow 00:23:24.868$  game that are predictive of substance

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:23:24.868 \longrightarrow 00:23:27.960$  misuse and can we derive a prediction

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

00:23:27.960 --> 00:23:30.480 model using those identified metrics?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:23:30.480 \longrightarrow 00:23:31.768$  We used 166 participants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

00:23:31.768 --> 00:23:33.056 Like I talked about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:23:33.060 \longrightarrow 00:23:34.648$  We had two outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

00:23:34.648 --> 00:23:36.236 substance misuse and self

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:23:36.236 \longrightarrow 00:23:38.000$  efficacy to refuse drugs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:23:38.000 \longrightarrow 00:23:39.878$  Sometimes it's used was already measured

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

00:23:39.878 --> 00:23:42.009 using the youth Risk Behavior Survey.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00{:}23{:}42.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}43.625$  There were twenty questions related

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:23:43.625 \longrightarrow 00:23:45.852$  to alcohol and drug use and we'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:23:45.852 \longrightarrow 00:23:47.496$  talk a little more about this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:23:47.500 \longrightarrow 00:23:49.018$  but some of those questions included

00:23:49.018 --> 00:23:50.799 if I tried using the cigarettes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:23:50.800 \longrightarrow 00:23:53.020$  which I think contributed to this

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

00:23:53.020 --> 00:23:55.496 being overall a low risk group in

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

00:23:55.496 --> 00:23:58.000 terms of like if you used once you

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:23:58.000 \longrightarrow 00:24:00.450$  were you were considered high risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:24:00.450 \longrightarrow 00:24:02.460$  Um, based on just how many?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:24:02.460 \longrightarrow 00:24:05.972$  The variance in the sample and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

00:24:05.972 --> 00:24:08.018 self efficacy to refuse drugs was

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00{:}24{:}08.018 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}10.201$  measured using the door scale and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88460253

 $00:24:10.201 \longrightarrow 00:24:11.996$  we dichotomized these two outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:14.240 \longrightarrow 00:24:15.865$  We use the the variance

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:15.865 \longrightarrow 00:24:17.490$  threshold metal method to drop

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00{:}24{:}17.559 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}19.429$  all metrics with zero variance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:19.430 \longrightarrow 00:24:21.398$  So if they have no variance then they

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

00:24:21.398 --> 00:24:23.141 are likely to differentiate the two

 $00:24:23.141 \longrightarrow 00:24:24.929$  groups between low and high risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:24.930 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.090$  And we also dropped some variables

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:27.090 \longrightarrow 00:24:29.760$  that had very high multicollinearity

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:29.760 \longrightarrow 00:24:31.685$  and used this machine learning

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:31.685 \longrightarrow 00:24:33.225$  technique called cross validation

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00{:}24{:}33.225 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}35.315$  which splits the data and then splits

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00{:}24{:}35.315 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}37.229$  the data even more and and checks

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:37.229 \longrightarrow 00:24:39.000$  to make sure that how the model

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:39.000 \longrightarrow 00:24:41.168$  performs in one set of data is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:41.168 \longrightarrow 00:24:43.298$  same across multiple sets of the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:43.300 \longrightarrow 00:24:45.204$  It's a very small sample for people

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:45.204 \longrightarrow 00:24:47.053$  who do machine learning statistics as

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:47.053 \longrightarrow 00:24:49.335$  one single is like very small sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00{:}24{:}49.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}51.920$  Usually you want to be using

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:51.920 \longrightarrow 00:24:53.192$  samples 600 and above.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:24:53.192 \longrightarrow 00:24:56.188$  And so we were limited in the amount of

00:24:56.188 --> 00:24:58.554 like can we examine race for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00{:}24{:}58.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}00.084$  which is something that I wanted

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00{:}25{:}00.084 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}01.480$  to examine other other models,

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:25:01.480 \longrightarrow 00:25:03.280$  the same between black and

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:25:03.280 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.720$  white adolescents for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:25:04.720 \longrightarrow 00:25:07.596$  And then we tested these six different

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:25:07.596 \longrightarrow 00:25:09.836$  models and computer AUC values.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00{:}25{:}09.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}11.778$  AUC value tells you how well

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

00:25:11.778 --> 00:25:13.070 your model is doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:25:13.070 \longrightarrow 00:25:15.600$  And 0.5 usually means that

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00:25:15.600 \longrightarrow 00:25:17.624$  it's not doing anything,

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

00:25:17.630 --> 00:25:20.269 0.6 means that it's performing moderately OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

 $00{:}25{:}20.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}21.735$  and 0.7 usually means this

NOTE Confidence: 0.814705158

00:25:21.735 --> 00:25:23.200 is a pretty good model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:25:25.480 \longrightarrow 00:25:30.448$  So we excluded 6 um log files that were

 $00:25:30.448 \longrightarrow 00:25:32.533$  corrupted or were from adolescence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:25:32.540 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.222$  We had there were mostly mostly corrupted

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:25:36.222 \longrightarrow 00:25:39.270$  or were incomplete and based on the final

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:25:39.270 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.349$  sample one in three adolescents had high

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:25:41.349 \longrightarrow 00:25:43.565$  risk or causing the high risk of substance

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:25:43.627 --> 00:25:45.553 misuse and wanting about wanting to

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:25:45.553 \longrightarrow 00:25:48.355$  have poor self efficacy to refuse drugs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:25:48.355 \longrightarrow 00:25:51.012$  We ultimately had 285 in

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}25{:}51.012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}53.296$  game metrics after cleaning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:25:53.300 --> 00:25:55.004 So our first outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:25:55.004 --> 00:25:57.134 a model was not good.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:25:57.140 \longrightarrow 00:26:00.570$  So the model didn't predict what didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:00.570 \longrightarrow 00:26:03.499$  predict substance misuse among adolescents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:03.500 \longrightarrow 00:26:07.910$  Umm. And but the second outcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:07.910 \longrightarrow 00:26:10.010$  self efficacy to refuse drugs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}26{:}10.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}12.425$  The logistic regression model seem

00:26:12.425 --> 00:26:14.840 to perform relatively well across

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}26{:}14.919 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}17.307$  multiple and was stable across multiple

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:17.307 \longrightarrow 00:26:21.980$  cuts of the data with an AUC of 0.6.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:21.980 \longrightarrow 00:26:23.798$  When we looked at the model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:26:23.800 --> 00:26:26.215 when we looked at what was contributing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:26.220 \longrightarrow 00:26:28.180$  what metrics were contributing

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:28.180 \longrightarrow 00:26:29.650$  to this prediction?

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}26{:}29.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}31.930$  What I take from here is that most

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:31.930 \longrightarrow 00:26:33.891$  of them happened at the beginning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:33.891 \longrightarrow 00:26:35.808$  So zero level 0, there were ten levels,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:35.808 \longrightarrow 00:26:37.981$  zero level 0 to 9 and most of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:26:37.981 --> 00:26:39.291 were happening at the beginning

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:39.291 \longrightarrow 00:26:40.479$  of the of the game.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:40.480 \longrightarrow 00:26:42.864$  Which again speaks to like can these be

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:42.864 \longrightarrow 00:26:45.702$  used as a can just really be used as a

00:26:45.702 --> 00:26:47.837 screening if it identifies if it can,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}26{:}47.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}49.562$  if your performance can change over

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}26{:}49.562 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}51.597$  time and is if your performance

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:26:51.597 --> 00:26:52.836 changing over time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:26:52.840 \longrightarrow 00:26:54.802$  Is that reflective of an improvement

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}26{:}54.802 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}56.533$  in function that actually influences

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:26:56.533 --> 00:26:58.009 substance misuse or not?

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:26:58.010 --> 00:27:00.550 Many questions are raised right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:27:00.550 --> 00:27:02.482 So in summary I think there

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:02.482 \longrightarrow 00:27:03.448$  are outstanding questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:27:03.450 --> 00:27:05.564 I think we found certain game metrics

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:05.564 \longrightarrow 00:27:07.797$  were predicted of self efficacy to refuse

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:07.797 \longrightarrow 00:27:09.930$  drugs among adolescents aged 11 to 14,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:09.930 \longrightarrow 00:27:11.258$  but not drug misuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:11.258 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.250$  I think this was an overall

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:13.326 \longrightarrow 00:27:14.990$  overall low risk sample.

 $00:27:14.990 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.742$  Game based features may be more

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}27{:}16.742 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}27{:}17.910$  useful as monitoring metrics

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:27:17.964 --> 00:27:19.669 during an intervention for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:19.670 \longrightarrow 00:27:21.875$  like if you embed them as opposed

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:27:21.875 --> 00:27:23.806 to screening, but if you embed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}27{:}23.806 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}25.750$  Them into an intervention and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:25.819 \longrightarrow 00:27:28.035$  use machine learning algorithms

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:27:28.035 --> 00:27:29.697 to personalize interventions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}27{:}29.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}31.630$  and you've documented at baseline

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:31.630 \longrightarrow 00:27:33.174$  where people have deficits.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:33.180 \longrightarrow 00:27:35.292$  Could you then use that as a monitoring

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:35.292 \longrightarrow 00:27:36.899$  over time of the improvement?

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:36.900 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.238$  But then you also have to show

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:39.238 \longrightarrow 00:27:41.773$  that the improvement is related

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:27:41.773 --> 00:27:45.628 to actual improvement in risk.

00:27:45.630 --> 00:27:48.185 And then we probably need better game

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}27{:}48.185 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}50.327$  behavior that is more reflective

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:50.327 \longrightarrow 00:27:51.788$  of substance misuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:51.790 \longrightarrow 00:27:54.205$  Some of the work that people are

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:27:54.205 --> 00:27:56.310 beginning to think about is like

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:27:56.310 --> 00:27:58.634 are there can you embed cues within

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:27:58.702 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.406$  a game and and can you use more

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:28:01.406 \longrightarrow 00:28:03.149$  biometric measures and would that

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}28{:}03.149 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}05.267$  be more reflective as opposed to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:28:05.270 --> 00:28:05.892 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}28{:}05.892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}08.069$  how people are performing in a game,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:28:08.070 \longrightarrow 00:28:11.227$  for example. So there's definitely more work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}28{:}11.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}12.795$  I think further investigation is

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}28{:}12.795 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}15.038$  needed at this algorithm is going to be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:28:15.040 --> 00:28:15.371 Finally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:28:15.371 --> 00:28:17.026 valid whether the hypothesis may

 $00:28:17.026 \longrightarrow 00:28:19.829$  be at play that account for these

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}28{:}19.829 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}21.242$  predictions algorithms performing

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

00:28:21.242 --> 00:28:23.126 similarly between among black

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:28:23.189 \longrightarrow 00:28:25.745$  adolescents as opposed to white adolescents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816 00:28:25.750 --> 00:28:27.520 Umm. NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:28:27.520 \longrightarrow 00:28:29.095$  One of the things we're going to do so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00:28:29.100 \longrightarrow 00:28:31.036$  so far we've we've looked at a precise

NOTE Confidence: 0.731522816

 $00{:}28{:}31.036 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}32.350$  prediction for substance misuse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00{:}28{:}32.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}34.548$  right. But we're our hypothesis is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:28:34.548 \longrightarrow 00:28:36.800$  this is influenced by cognitive processes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:28:36.800 \longrightarrow 00:28:38.068$  But we haven't tested

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:28:38.068 \longrightarrow 00:28:39.019$  for cognitive processes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00{:}28{:}39.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}41.449$  So we're going to embark on a

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:28:41.449 \longrightarrow 00:28:44.399$  pilot to see if those same mackers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:28:44.400 \longrightarrow 00:28:46.892$  we can compute the score using the

 $00:28:46.892 \longrightarrow 00:28:49.310$  logistic regression model and if those

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:28:49.310 \longrightarrow 00:28:51.450$  are actually associated with executive

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:28:51.450 \longrightarrow 00:28:53.221$  functioning measured by actual tasks

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:28:53.221 \longrightarrow 00:28:55.216$  like the impact test and the go,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:28:55.220 \longrightarrow 00:28:56.780$  no GO task among.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:28:56.780 \longrightarrow 00:28:58.730$  14 to 15 years old.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462 00:28:58.730 --> 00:29:00.236 So we'll see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:00.236 \longrightarrow 00:29:03.750$  We'll see what that data tells us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:03.750 \longrightarrow 00:29:06.630$  So in addition to games,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:06.630 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.670$  we talked a lot about games.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00{:}29{:}08.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}10.246$  I think I think I got you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:29:10.250 --> 00:29:12.658 I presented the slide where I say let's

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:12.658 \longrightarrow 00:29:14.289$  meet adolescence wherever they are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:14.290 \longrightarrow 00:29:16.586$  how they are engaging with the world.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:29:16.590 --> 00:29:18.921 And so you know the games I one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00{:}29{:}18.921 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}20.888$  the areas that I've been thinking

 $00:29:20.888 \longrightarrow 00:29:23.903$  about is how do we use the electronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00{:}29{:}23.903 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}26.078$  medical record to identify risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:29:26.080 --> 00:29:29.391 Umm, and our rush risk of substance

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:29:29.391 --> 00:29:32.449 misuse rationale is that the you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:32.450 \longrightarrow 00:29:34.358$  the HR is already in use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:34.360 \longrightarrow 00:29:36.565$  It has vast amounts of data and

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:36.565 \longrightarrow 00:29:38.959$  these that are routinely collected.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00{:}29{:}38.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}40.448$  We don't need a different process

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:40.448 \longrightarrow 00:29:41.440$  for collecting this data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:29:41.440 --> 00:29:44.200 It's already happening.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:44.200 \longrightarrow 00:29:45.664$  There are two types of data

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:45.664 \longrightarrow 00:29:46.910$  that occur that you can.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00{:}29{:}46.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}47.926$  I mean there's it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:29:47.926 --> 00:29:49.196 There's a large debate about

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:49.196 \longrightarrow 00:29:50.697$  the kinds of data in the HR,

 $00:29:50.700 \longrightarrow 00:29:52.044$  but largely there's two

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:52.044 \longrightarrow 00:29:54.060$  kinds of data in the EHR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:54.060 \longrightarrow 00:29:56.000$  structured data and unstructured data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:56.000 \longrightarrow 00:29:59.416$  Structured data you might say like things

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:29:59.416 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.460$  that someone selects from pre populated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:02.460 \longrightarrow 00:30:03.740$  it's already in the system

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:03.740 \longrightarrow 00:30:04.764$  and you select all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:30:04.770 --> 00:30:06.510 This person has an alcohol use

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:30:06.510 --> 00:30:08.532 disorder you selected as opposed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:08.532 \longrightarrow 00:30:11.220$  like a structure where a provider is

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00{:}30{:}11.297 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}14.120$  imputing what they think and data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:30:14.120 --> 00:30:17.550 The type of data is important from

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:17.550 \longrightarrow 00:30:20.110$  a from a from the point of trust.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:30:20.110 --> 00:30:22.549 And we talk a little bit about about trust,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:22.550 \longrightarrow 00:30:25.448$  like what data can we trust?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:25.450 \longrightarrow 00:30:26.236$  Is the problem,

 $00:30:26.236 \longrightarrow 00:30:27.808$  can we trust the problem list?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:27.810 \longrightarrow 00:30:31.960$  Is it always complete 80%?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87120319153846200:30:31.960 --> 00:30:34.168 There is not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:34.170 \longrightarrow 00:30:38.699$  And is it nice thing to load?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:38.700 \longrightarrow 00:30:39.654$  Um, can we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:39.654 \longrightarrow 00:30:42.456$  you know or or do we trust the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:42.456 \longrightarrow 00:30:45.396$  clinical notes at the clinical notes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:45.400 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.585$  what kind of information we

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:46.585 \longrightarrow 00:30:47.533$  get from the clinical?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:47.540 \longrightarrow 00:30:49.036$  Are they more predictive?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:49.036 \longrightarrow 00:30:51.628$  The consensus is that we should be

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:30:51.628 \longrightarrow 00:30:53.602$  using both all kinds of data that

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00{:}30{:}53.602 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}56.571$  we can get from the EHR as long as

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00{:}30{:}56.571 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}58.510$  we're intentional about why we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:30:58.510 --> 00:31:01.300 using them and also intentional and

00:31:01.300 --> 00:31:03.657 thoughtful about what we find from,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:31:03.660 \longrightarrow 00:31:05.940$  you know, whatever models that we find from,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:31:05.940 \longrightarrow 00:31:08.466$  from the use of this data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:31:08.470 \longrightarrow 00:31:10.325$  Prior studies have shown that

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:31:10.325 --> 00:31:13.111 we can use EHR data to predict

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:31:13.111 --> 00:31:15.241 mental health outcomes as you

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:31:15.241 --> 00:31:17.098 side health services research,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:31:17.098 --> 00:31:18.410 suicide prediction, depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:31:18.410 \longrightarrow 00:31:19.490$  anxiety and alcohol.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:31:19.490 \longrightarrow 00:31:22.011$  And these are findings from two different

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:31:22.011 --> 00:31:24.693 studies on the left here as one study here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:31:24.700 \longrightarrow 00:31:26.635$  which was among young adults

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00{:}31{:}26.635 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}28.570$  and this was among adolescents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:31:28.570 --> 00:31:31.804 And the models were pretty pretty good.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

00:31:31.810 --> 00:31:33.630 Good enough, I would say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00{:}31{:}33.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}36.214$  in identifying these disorders

00:31:36.214 --> 00:31:37.506 among adolescents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:31:37.510 \longrightarrow 00:31:39.670$  So it can be used.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:31:39.670 \longrightarrow 00:31:40.960$  I think there are limited

NOTE Confidence: 0.871203191538462

 $00:31:40.960 \longrightarrow 00:31:42.250$  studies among the adults and

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182 00:31:42.303 --> 00:31:42.830 population, NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00:31:42.830 \longrightarrow 00:31:44.790$  particularly using unstructured data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00:31:44.790 \longrightarrow 00:31:48.140$  Most of the studies use structured data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00{:}31{:}48.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}51.478$  And I'm, I'm very interested, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00:31:51.478 \longrightarrow 00:31:54.341$  I showed this slide about the median

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00{:}31{:}54.341 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}57.639$  time between onset of symptoms and

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00:31:57.639 \longrightarrow 00:31:59.883$  actual initial treatment contact.

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00:31:59.890 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.622$  Is it possible to derive a model

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00{:}32{:}04.622 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}08.568$  that identifies risk as the mergers

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00:32:08.570 \longrightarrow 00:32:11.695$  and then funnel an adolescent

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

00:32:11.695 --> 00:32:13.570 appropriately to intervention?

 $00:32:13.570 \longrightarrow 00:32:16.410$  It would mean that you have a way

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00:32:16.410 \longrightarrow 00:32:19.395$  to to to determine time to event or

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00:32:19.395 \longrightarrow 00:32:22.071$  time between the onset of symptoms

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00:32:22.071 \longrightarrow 00:32:24.521$  and when has recurrently defined

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

00:32:24.521 --> 00:32:27.030 substance use disorder, for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00:32:27.030 \longrightarrow 00:32:29.690$  So I'm I would like to explore

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00:32:29.690 \longrightarrow 00:32:32.135$  that and investigate that and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

00:32:32.135 --> 00:32:35.281 think there's a lack of focus on

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00:32:35.281 \longrightarrow 00:32:37.445$  disparities and why disparities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

00:32:37.450 --> 00:32:38.125 Um.

NOTE Confidence: 0.749348361818182

 $00{:}32{:}38.125 --> 00{:}32{:}38.800~\mathrm{Umm}.$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:32:42.060 --> 00:32:44.508 Lack of focus on disparities can

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:32:44.508 \dashrightarrow 00:32:46.176$  cause harm and machine learning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7561747022222222

00:32:46.176 --> 00:32:47.920 You know, a few years ago we said

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:32:47.972 \longrightarrow 00:32:49.127$  we thought machine learning was

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:32:49.127 \dashrightarrow 00:32:50.720$  going to solve all our problems.

 $00:32:50.720 \longrightarrow 00:32:53.240$  There was truth in it and we would be

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:32:53.240 \longrightarrow 00:32:55.999$  able to identify every insoluble problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:32:56.000 --> 00:32:57.848 And now we're finding that machine

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:32:57.848 \longrightarrow 00:32:59.440$  learning algorithms are inherently biased.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:32:59.440 \longrightarrow 00:33:03.444$  And some are. Some are racist and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7561747022222222

 $00:33:03.450 \longrightarrow 00:33:04.140$  And so on the left,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:33:04.140 --> 00:33:06.108 here we have Google apologizing for

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:33:06.108 \longrightarrow 00:33:08.347$  having an algorithm that then gets a bug,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7561747022222222

 $00{:}33{:}08.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}11.841$  but then this bug uses for some reason.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00{:}33{:}11.841 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}14.339$  However it does this, it's able to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7561747022222222

 $00:33:14.339 \longrightarrow 00:33:16.254$  It's now identified that now

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:33:16.254 --> 00:33:18.207 identifies black people, wrongly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7561747022222222 00:33:18.207 --> 00:33:19.521 as guerrillas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:33:19.521 \longrightarrow 00:33:23.462$  And on the right is this famous people

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:33:23.462 --> 00:33:27.164 might have known about this study by Obama.

00:33:27.164 --> 00:33:28.898 Yeah, which?

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:33:28.900 \longrightarrow 00:33:32.536$  Was looking at the models used in a program,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:33:32.540 \longrightarrow 00:33:36.740$  where the program was designed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00{:}33{:}36.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}39.080$  automatically funnel adults into

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:33:39.080 \longrightarrow 00:33:41.900$  a program that helped them manage

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:33:41.900 --> 00:33:43.750 comorbid chronic conditions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:33:43.750 \longrightarrow 00:33:47.040$  And so the algorithm computer the score

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:33:47.040 \longrightarrow 00:33:50.987$  and the risk score was at 97 percentile,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7561747022222222

 $00{:}33{:}50.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}52.572$  and if you reach that based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:33:52.572 --> 00:33:54.290 the number of chronic conditions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7561747022222222

 $00{:}33{:}54.290 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}33{:}56.298$  you were automatically funneled

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:33:56.298 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.804$  into this program.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:33:57.810 \longrightarrow 00:34:00.645$  And so you can see that the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7561747022222222

 $00:34:00.645 \longrightarrow 00:34:03.161$  couple line is for blacks and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:03.161 \longrightarrow 00:34:06.032$  orange line or white is for the yellows

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:06.032 \longrightarrow 00:34:09.016$  for whites that whites at a lower level,

00:34:09.016 --> 00:34:11.281 lower number of active chronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:11.281 \longrightarrow 00:34:13.628$  conditions were being funneled into

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:13.628 \longrightarrow 00:34:15.918$  the program earlier than blacks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:34:15.920 --> 00:34:17.105 And so, umm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:17.105 \longrightarrow 00:34:19.080$  when they when they risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:19.080 \longrightarrow 00:34:20.240$  wasn't accounted for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:34:20.240 --> 00:34:23.068 Race is not exactly a very good

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00{:}34{:}23.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}25.247$  because we're learning it's not a very

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:34:25.247 --> 00:34:26.928 good metric for assessing racism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:34:26.928 --> 00:34:30.496 But I think it's a, it's a good start,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:30.496 \longrightarrow 00:34:32.352$  especially if you're intentional

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:32.352 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.632$  about examining disparities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00{:}34{:}33.632 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}36.474$  But they didn't account for that here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:36.480 \longrightarrow 00:34:38.050$  They simply just deployed an

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:38.050 \longrightarrow 00:34:40.120$  algorithm based on data that existed.

00:34:40.120 --> 00:34:42.540 But when they examined,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:42.540 \longrightarrow 00:34:46.410$  they realized they realized that the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:46.410 \longrightarrow 00:34:47.850$  Metric, which is why I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222 00:34:47.850 --> 00:34:48.576 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:34:48.576 --> 00:34:50.391 examined the metric like what

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:34:50.391 --> 00:34:51.995 metrics are actually contributing

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:34:51.995 --> 00:34:53.787 to our prediction model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:53.790 \longrightarrow 00:34:55.813$  So when they examine the metrics that

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:55.813 \longrightarrow 00:34:57.269$  we're contributing to this model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:34:57.270 \longrightarrow 00:35:00.598$  they found that the one of the largest

NOTE Confidence: 0.7561747022222222

 $00{:}35{:}00.598 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}03.108$  contributor of the model was cost

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:03.108 \longrightarrow 00:35:05.930$  and that whites were more likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:05.930 \longrightarrow 00:35:09.730$  spend more per chronic condition than blacks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222 00:35:09.730 --> 00:35:10.050 Why? NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:10.050 \longrightarrow 00:35:12.290$  Some of the things that like there

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:12.290 \longrightarrow 00:35:14.410$  are many competing priorities,

 $00:35:14.410 \longrightarrow 00:35:16.740$  Blacks may not be able to take time off work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:16.740 \longrightarrow 00:35:19.350$  To go and see their doctor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:19.350 \longrightarrow 00:35:22.689$  whites were more likely to have procedures

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:22.689 \longrightarrow 00:35:24.610$  and inpatients appointment large.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:24.610 \longrightarrow 00:35:27.424$  This is to say that if if

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:27.424 \longrightarrow 00:35:29.150$  we're not intentional like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:35:29.150 --> 00:35:31.950 Algorithms can do a lot of good,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00{:}35{:}31.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}33.594$  but they can also cost ham

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:33.594 \longrightarrow 00:35:35.570$  and we need to be thinking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:35.570 \longrightarrow 00:35:36.474$  Or at least I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:36.474 \longrightarrow 00:35:38.214$  as someone who is doing a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:35:38.214 --> 00:35:39.716 of machine learning research,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00{:}35{:}39.716 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}42.630$  needs to be thinking about how

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:42.630 \longrightarrow 00:35:44.030$  how these models are used.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:44.030 \longrightarrow 00:35:46.074$  What informs these models and can we,

 $00:35:46.080 \longrightarrow 00:35:48.262$  before we deploy them for, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

00:35:48.262 --> 00:35:50.417 deploy them for prime time?

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:50.420 \longrightarrow 00:35:53.076$  And so the question that we're asking is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:53.080 \longrightarrow 00:35:54.776$  can data collected routinely

NOTE Confidence: 0.756174702222222

 $00:35:54.776 \longrightarrow 00:35:56.896$  in the electronic health record

NOTE Confidence: 0.78245094

 $00:35:56.900 \longrightarrow 00:35:58.910$  be used to identify adolescents

NOTE Confidence: 0.78245094

00:35:58.910 --> 00:36:00.920 at risk for substance misuse?

NOTE Confidence: 0.78245094

 $00:36:00.920 \longrightarrow 00:36:02.645$  And now they are algorithmic

NOTE Confidence: 0.78245094

00:36:02.645 --> 00:36:04.370 differences by racial ethnic groups?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:06.830 \longrightarrow 00:36:08.850$  We will identify electronic health

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00{:}36{:}08.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}10.870$  record data features that predict

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:10.933 \longrightarrow 00:36:13.069$  substance use disorder will derive a

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00{:}36{:}13.069 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}14.962$  model will determine if electronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:14.962 \longrightarrow 00:36:16.494$  health record features predictive

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:16.494 \longrightarrow 00:36:18.129$  of substance misuse disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:18.130 \longrightarrow 00:36:20.410$  So use this sort of default by racial

 $00:36:20.410 \longrightarrow 00:36:22.449$  ethnic groups and then we'll try to derive

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00{:}36{:}22.449 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}24.853$  a lot of time so these features

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:24.853 \longrightarrow 00:36:26.965$  are collected at different time points.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:26.970 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.314$  When do at what point do you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:29.314 \longrightarrow 00:36:31.156$  enough features in the model that

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:31.156 \longrightarrow 00:36:32.950$  you can actually see this person

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:32.950 \longrightarrow 00:36:36.400$  should be further assessed and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:36.400 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.304$  What is the length of time between

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:38.304 \longrightarrow 00:36:40.558$  when those at documented and the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00{:}36{:}40.558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}42.628$  determination of substance use is so

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00{:}36{:}42.692 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}44.988$  that they exist right now and also

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00{:}36{:}44.988 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}46.646$  referral for behavioral health services

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00{:}36{:}46.646 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}48.977$  and also determine if that length of

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:48.977 \longrightarrow 00:36:51.088$  time there any racial ethnic differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:51.088 \longrightarrow 00:36:53.339$  in those in that length of time?

 $00:36:53.340 \longrightarrow 00:36:55.510$  We're going to use data from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:55.510 \longrightarrow 00:36:56.440$  Fairhaven Community Healthcare.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:56.440 \longrightarrow 00:36:59.212$  They have about 100 / 100,000

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:36:59.212 \longrightarrow 00:37:01.550$  records and we're going to use that

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:37:01.620 \longrightarrow 00:37:03.870$  training model for predicting SD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:37:03.870 \longrightarrow 00:37:06.048$  We will validate that model among

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:37:06.048 \longrightarrow 00:37:09.310$  adolescents 12 to 17 years and we'll use

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:37:09.310 \dashrightarrow 00:37:11.480$  both structured and unstructured data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

00:37:11.480 --> 00:37:13.888 So right now we have IRB approval and

NOTE Confidence: 0.871253395882353

 $00:37:13.888 \longrightarrow 00:37:16.207$  we're working through data use agreements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

00:37:18.660 --> 00:37:21.229 So hope, hope, hopeful to have some

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:21.229 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.201$  of this data and stats get into the

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:24.201 \longrightarrow 00:37:26.840$  nitty gritty nephew in a few weeks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:26.840 \longrightarrow 00:37:30.984$  So, in conclusion, a dozen substance

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:30.984 \longrightarrow 00:37:33.560$  misuse is a major public health problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:33.560 \longrightarrow 00:37:36.170$  There are myriad of barriers that

 $00:37:36.170 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.475$  preclude early identification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:37.480 \longrightarrow 00:37:39.340$  We need to identify adolescents

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:39.340 \longrightarrow 00:37:43.808$  wherever they are and as risk emerges.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:43.810 \longrightarrow 00:37:45.610$  Talked specifically about video games.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:45.610 \longrightarrow 00:37:49.306$  I'm interested in all things digital tools.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:49.310 \longrightarrow 00:37:52.278$  Phones and a lot of there's a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:52.278 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.940$  of work on ER and that's ecological

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:55.940 \longrightarrow 00:37:58.882$  momentary assessment MMA and so that

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:37:58.882 \longrightarrow 00:38:00.928$  there's there's a wide variety of

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00{:}38{:}00.928 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}03.662$  how we can use digital tools mid

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:03.662 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.072$  adolescence where they are social

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

00:38:06.072 --> 00:38:08.828 media for example I was I was I was

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

00:38:08.828 --> 00:38:10.447 trying this I was looking yesterday

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:10.447 \dashrightarrow 00:38:13.183$  as I was preparing and Googling on on

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:13.251 \longrightarrow 00:38:15.339$  Google like self harm and immediately

 $00:38:15.339 \longrightarrow 00:38:17.622$  I Google self harm like the 1st

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

00:38:17.622 --> 00:38:19.680 988 if you you know like there's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

00:38:19.680 --> 00:38:20.584 Regarding working,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:20.584 \longrightarrow 00:38:24.364$  that is trying to like identify risk and

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:24.364 \longrightarrow 00:38:27.556$  trying to like deliver an intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

00:38:27.560 --> 00:38:28.576 And so I think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:28.576 \longrightarrow 00:38:31.085$  you know we need to be thinking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:31.085 \longrightarrow 00:38:33.781$  all of these different strategies have

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:33.781 \longrightarrow 00:38:36.588$  I think ideally have a systemic model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81357863863636400:38:36.590 --> 00:38:37.718 And umm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00{:}38{:}37.718 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}41.666$  and refine the ones like there's some.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:41.670 \longrightarrow 00:38:43.866$  I think there's a lot of work to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:43.866 \longrightarrow 00:38:46.106$  to refine the use of video games,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:46.110 \longrightarrow 00:38:48.660$  refine the use of the electronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:48.660 \longrightarrow 00:38:49.510$  health record.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:49.510 \longrightarrow 00:38:51.466$  So there's more research to be

 $00:38:51.466 \longrightarrow 00:38:53.210$  done in refining these tools.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:53.210 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.334$  And ultimately we want,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:54.334 \longrightarrow 00:38:55.739$  we want the adolescents to

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:55.739 \longrightarrow 00:38:56.790$  live healthy lives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:56.790 \longrightarrow 00:38:58.790$  We want them to live highly functional lives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364 00:38:58.790 --> 00:38:59.640 And yeah, NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:38:59.640 \longrightarrow 00:39:03.930$  whatever we can do to make that a reality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364

 $00:39:03.930 \longrightarrow 00:39:07.250$  So is all about. So thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813578638636364 00:39:07.250 --> 00:39:08.490 I will. NOTE Confidence: 0.748868325714286

00:39:12.130 --> 00:39:13.645 My family patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.748868325714286

00:39:13.645 --> 00:39:15.665 study participants by mentors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.748868325714286

 $00:39:15.670 \longrightarrow 00:39:16.612$  collaborators, funders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.748868325714286

 $00:39:16.612 \dashrightarrow 00:39:19.909$  members of the play to prevent lab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.748868325714286

 $00{:}39{:}19.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}22.857$  Shout out to Jenny and Fiza who

NOTE Confidence: 0.748868325714286

00:39:22.857 --> 00:39:25.649 keep the wheels running and yes,

 $00:39:25.650 \longrightarrow 00:39:26.748$  I'll take questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91373885

00:39:32.810 --> 00:39:33.300 Yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.28818858

 $00:39:35.540 \longrightarrow 00:39:35.890$  Stolen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795834826

 $00:39:45.920 \longrightarrow 00:39:47.580$  Richard, thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.795834826

 $00:39:47.580 \longrightarrow 00:39:50.170$  So as a CL psychologist, I'm absolutely

NOTE Confidence: 0.896082448666667

 $00:39:50.180 \longrightarrow 00:39:51.900$  thrilled by this study where

NOTE Confidence: 0.896082448666667

 $00:39:51.900 \longrightarrow 00:39:53.620$  you're looking at the electronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.896082448666667

00:39:53.678 --> 00:39:57.160 health record in primary care. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.8848735

 $00{:}39{:}57.160 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}40{:}00.820$  that is an overwhelmingly rich

NOTE Confidence: 0.8848735

00:40:00.820 --> 00:40:02.770 source of data, everything from,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8848735

 $00{:}40{:}02.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}04.936$ you know, social workers notes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8848735

 $00:40:04.936 \longrightarrow 00:40:06.680$  to the standardized instruments

NOTE Confidence: 0.8848735

 $00{:}40{:}06.680 \rightarrow 00{:}40{:}09.660$  that are being used at Fairhaven.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8848735

 $00:40:09.660 \longrightarrow 00:40:12.495$  Do you have a sense of in that vast

NOTE Confidence: 0.8848735

00:40:12.495 --> 00:40:15.649 data set which initially are going to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.94945115

 $00:40:15.660 \longrightarrow 00:40:17.570$  part of your first pass

 $00:40:17.900 \longrightarrow 00:40:19.907$  because we know that at Fair Haven they are

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

00:40:19.907 --> 00:40:21.798 using standardized measures of depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

00:40:21.800 --> 00:40:25.160 anxiety, suicide risk, social work notes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

00:40:25.160 --> 00:40:27.824 So I'm wondering how you're prioritizing

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:40:27.824 \longrightarrow 00:40:31.528$  that vast data in terms of your first pass.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:40:31.530 \longrightarrow 00:40:33.746$  Are you using your kind of clinical intuition

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

00:40:33.746 --> 00:40:35.710 of what's because you're a clinician,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

00:40:35.710 --> 00:40:37.358 you're amazing clinician of

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:40:37.358 \longrightarrow 00:40:39.418$  what's most likely to result?

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:40:39.420 \longrightarrow 00:40:41.730$  In that higher yield, right, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

00:40:41.730 --> 00:40:44.130 I do, yes, we're using the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:40:44.130 \longrightarrow 00:40:46.530$  we're using the scales validated skills.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00{:}40{:}46.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}50.110$  So they use craft to identify, to identify,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:40:50.110 \longrightarrow 00:40:52.380$  to identify the outcome as you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:40:52.380 \longrightarrow 00:40:53.670$  as an outcome for prediction,

00:40:53.670 --> 00:40:56.530 like who is misusing substances.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00{:}40{:}56.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}58.721$  But we're also going to use like

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

00:40:58.721 --> 00:41:00.738 all primary care notes, I find.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

00:41:00.738 --> 00:41:02.936 I think the notes are more something

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:02.936 \longrightarrow 00:41:05.659$  I find like the notes are more

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:05.659 \longrightarrow 00:41:07.091$  informative about presenting complaints.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:07.091 \longrightarrow 00:41:09.520$  Sometimes you don't use the problem lists.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455 00:41:09.520 --> 00:41:09.830 Umm. NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:09.830 \longrightarrow 00:41:12.310$  But we're also going to use the problem

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:12.310 \longrightarrow 00:41:14.938$  lists and then we're going to use similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00{:}41{:}14.938 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}17.532$  things that have been used in different

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:17.532 \longrightarrow 00:41:19.872$  studies like vital signs and encounters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

00:41:19.880 --> 00:41:22.856 I mean encounters they had in a year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00{:}41{:}22.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}24.150$  did they go to the Ed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:24.150 \longrightarrow 00:41:26.016$  what did they go to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

00:41:26.016 --> 00:41:27.230 Ed for inpatient visits.

00:41:27.230 --> 00:41:29.969 So we're going to be using all of those

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:29.969 \longrightarrow 00:41:32.160$  and those are going to definitely be

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:32.160 \longrightarrow 00:41:34.178$  informed by our clinical knowledge.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:34.180 \longrightarrow 00:41:36.567$  But also you know the I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:36.567 \longrightarrow 00:41:38.780$  the the thing about that is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:38.780 \longrightarrow 00:41:41.090$  Useful about machine learning is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

00:41:41.090 --> 00:41:44.020 it's at its nature is exploratory and

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:44.020 \longrightarrow 00:41:46.660$  hypothesis generating and so informed by

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:46.660 \longrightarrow 00:41:49.475$  that you also want to like get all that

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00{:}41{:}49.475 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}55.298$ you can get because you can learn you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00{:}41{:}55.300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}58.072$  On the one hand you can your your clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:41:58.072 \longrightarrow 00:42:00.106$  knowledge informs hypothesis which are

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00{:}42{:}00.106 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}02.596$  already existing and you're testing them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:42:02.600 \longrightarrow 00:42:04.413$  But also there may be things that

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:42:04.413 \longrightarrow 00:42:05.826$  you haven't thought about that

00:42:05.826 --> 00:42:07.271 the machine learning helps you

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:42:07.271 \longrightarrow 00:42:08.729$  generate or think about them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455 00:42:08.730 --> 00:42:09.870 Um, that we.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:42:09.870 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.010$  So we're balancing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:42:11.010 \longrightarrow 00:42:12.990$  we're balancing those and we'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:42:12.990 \longrightarrow 00:42:14.970$  be collecting as much information

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455

 $00:42:15.038 \longrightarrow 00:42:16.318$  as we have access to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857170174545455 00:42:16.320 --> 00:42:16.670 Yeah. NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:42:23.290 \longrightarrow 00:42:26.510$  That was great Bouche and and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:42:26.510 \longrightarrow 00:42:28.750$  know it's such a huge problem that

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00{:}42{:}28.750 \longrightarrow 00{:}42{:}31.010$  that we really wish you success

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:42:31.010 \longrightarrow 00:42:32.950$  because it's it's so important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:42:32.950 \longrightarrow 00:42:35.239$  So I was wondering what you thought

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:42:35.239 \longrightarrow 00:42:37.820$  about kind of what the factors are

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:42:37.820 \longrightarrow 00:42:40.106$  the skills are that help adolescents

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00{:}42{:}40.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}42.171$ you know say no to drugs or or or

 $00:42:42.171 \longrightarrow 00:42:44.386$  or lessen their use and and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:42:44.386 \longrightarrow 00:42:46.430$  know that fear doesn't work right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:42:46.430 \longrightarrow 00:42:47.702$  That's been tested forever

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:42:47.702 \longrightarrow 00:42:48.974$  that that doesn't work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00{:}42{:}48.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}51.581$  But is it I'm stuck with this is it

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:42:51.581 \longrightarrow 00:42:54.520$  like learning things or is it just

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

00:42:54.520 --> 00:42:57.445 peer group influence and and you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:42:57.445 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.406$  are there really things we could teach

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00{:}43{:}00.406 \longrightarrow 00{:}43{:}03.133$  that get kids to you know that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:43:03.133 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.498$  could teach on a game or is it the

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

00:43:05.498 --> 00:43:07.248 way we get them to think differently

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:43:07.248 \longrightarrow 00:43:09.308$  after they're playing the game?

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00{:}43{:}09.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}11.294$  I'm, I'm I'm just interested in what you

NOTE Confidence: 0.742048941666667

 $00:43:11.294 \longrightarrow 00:43:13.219$  what you think you're going to find.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00{:}43{:}14.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}17.392$  So I think that based on based on

 $00:43:17.392 \longrightarrow 00:43:19.457$  other studies that have been done,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00{:}43{:}19.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}21.679$  I think that you can one, you can model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:43:21.679 --> 00:43:23.940 you can model behavior in like the

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:43:24.006 --> 00:43:26.548 same ways that you expect, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:43:26.548 --> 00:43:28.618 adults, parents to model behavior.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:43:28.620 --> 00:43:30.566 You can model those behaviors in game,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:43:30.570 \longrightarrow 00:43:33.506$  in games. You can also teach within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:43:33.506 \longrightarrow 00:43:36.436$  game because they like in the mining games,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:43:36.440 \longrightarrow 00:43:38.320$  they are practicing skills like

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:43:38.320 --> 00:43:40.700 they're practicing how do you refuse?

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:43:40.700 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.351$  Someone says, oh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:43:41.351 --> 00:43:43.260 let's go to like how do you say no,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:43:43.260 \longrightarrow 00:43:45.270$  what things can you say?

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:43:45.270 \longrightarrow 00:43:48.160$  Um to to circumvent this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:43:48.160 --> 00:43:49.550 Um, sometimes you may not

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00{:}43{:}49.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}51.440$  succeed and if you don't succeed,

 $00:43:51.440 \longrightarrow 00:43:52.852$  what are the consequences?

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:43:52.852 \longrightarrow 00:43:56.019$  And the idea is that if you're if

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:43:56.019 --> 00:43:57.967 you're engaging your cognitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:43:57.967 \longrightarrow 00:44:00.374$  processes in practicing this in

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:00.374 \longrightarrow 00:44:01.898$  within the veteran environment

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:01.898 \longrightarrow 00:44:04.350$  that you may be able to translate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:04.350 \longrightarrow 00:44:06.240$  depending you may be able to translate

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:06.240 \longrightarrow 00:44:08.409$  that you will translate this into real life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:08.410 \longrightarrow 00:44:09.940$  But I think also there's the

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:44:09.940 --> 00:44:10.705 part about habit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00{:}44{:}10.710 --> 00{:}44{:}12.348$  like the dose like how much,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:44:12.350 --> 00:44:15.620 how much practice are they getting?

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00{:}44{:}15.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}17.559$  Similarly to how I might learn math,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:17.560 \longrightarrow 00:44:17.988$  for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:17.988 \longrightarrow 00:44:20.038$  Like if I if I did more of the

 $00:44:20.038 \longrightarrow 00:44:21.138$  work of problem sets,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:21.140 \longrightarrow 00:44:22.869$  then the likelihood that I would know

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:22.869 \longrightarrow 00:44:25.023$  what to do if I'm presented with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:44:25.023 --> 00:44:26.700 different problem set will be high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:44:26.700 --> 00:44:29.036 So how much? How much dose is enough?

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:29.040 \longrightarrow 00:44:30.180$  How much dose translates to

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:44:30.180 --> 00:44:31.092 a lowering your risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:31.100 \longrightarrow 00:44:33.332$  how much of that then translates to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:33.332 \longrightarrow 00:44:35.918$  idea to the fact that these adults and

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:44:35.918 --> 00:44:38.240 might then practice this in in real life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:38.240 \longrightarrow 00:44:39.788$  But also there's also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:39.788 \longrightarrow 00:44:43.221$  I think he also alludes to a a big

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:43.221 \longrightarrow 00:44:45.273$  the issue of like this culture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

00:44:45.280 --> 00:44:47.695 Because there's a huge influence of culture,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:47.700 \longrightarrow 00:44:49.730$  so you may learn all of this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:49.730 \longrightarrow 00:44:53.447$  but like the stigma that's peer like.

 $00:44:53.450 \longrightarrow 00:44:56.124$  I might confident enough that I can

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:56.124 \longrightarrow 00:44:58.727$  do that within all of the scenarios

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:44:58.727 \longrightarrow 00:45:02.181$  and we in view and raise the level of

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:45:02.181 \longrightarrow 00:45:04.514$  confidence within the games to then

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:45:04.514 \longrightarrow 00:45:06.266$  ensure that they can also translate

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:45:06.266 \longrightarrow 00:45:08.129$  this when there's high pressure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00:45:08.130 \longrightarrow 00:45:09.585$  That's something that's I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00{:}45{:}09.585 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}11.290$  that's something we need to test

NOTE Confidence: 0.911626022142857

 $00{:}45{:}11.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}14.040$  because indeed it is complex, I agree.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:45:16.370 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.610$  Hi, nice talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}45{:}18.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}20.596$  I had a couple clarifying questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:45:20.596 \longrightarrow 00:45:24.530$  about the study about the game, so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}45{:}24.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}27.326$  Can you explain again how you

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:45:27.326 \longrightarrow 00:45:29.190$  classified whether they were

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

00:45:29.190 --> 00:45:30.598 classified as using substances?

00:45:30.598 --> 00:45:33.186 Did you say it was one time

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:45:33.186 \longrightarrow 00:45:35.160$  using one cigarette? No, no, no.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:45:35.160 \longrightarrow 00:45:36.410$  I there were many questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:45:36.410 \longrightarrow 00:45:38.460$  There were twenty questions one

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:45:38.460 \longrightarrow 00:45:40.510$  and and it included cigarettes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:45:40.510 \longrightarrow 00:45:43.821$  alcohol and drugs and it included ever

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:45:43.821 \longrightarrow 00:45:47.146$  used and also past 30 days of use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:45:47.150 \longrightarrow 00:45:49.058$  OK. Yeah. And all of those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}45{:}49.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}51.492$  So the, it was such a low risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:45:51.492 \longrightarrow 00:45:52.964$  sample that all the all those

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}45{:}52.964 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}54.908$  who said no for all of them were

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

00:45:54.908 --> 00:45:56.660 essentially in the low risk group

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

00:45:56.660 --> 00:45:58.347 and anyone who endorsed any of

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}45{:}58.347 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}00.194$  that went into the high risk group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:00.194 \longrightarrow 00:46:01.898$  which yeah which is why we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:01.898 \longrightarrow 00:46:04.169$  going to do it more with the pilot.

 $00:46:04.170 \longrightarrow 00:46:06.154$  We're going to have a more high risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:06.154 \longrightarrow 00:46:08.058$  sample like everyone will be misusing

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:08.058 \longrightarrow 00:46:10.080$  substances at some degree of frequency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

00:46:10.080 --> 00:46:12.060 And are you thinking of because

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:12.060 \longrightarrow 00:46:13.994$  I also was thinking about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:13.994 \longrightarrow 00:46:15.905$  age range from 11 to 14 but.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:15.910 \longrightarrow 00:46:17.314$  Yes there are some kids that

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:17.314 \longrightarrow 00:46:18.834$  are starting to use that young

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}46{:}18.834 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}20.418$  unfortunately more all the time but

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:20.418 \longrightarrow 00:46:22.241$  I think that they'll start you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:22.241 \longrightarrow 00:46:24.062$  there are a whole group of kids

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:24.062 \longrightarrow 00:46:25.778$  that don't start until they get

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}46{:}25.778 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}27.718$  to high school and that's really

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:27.718 \longrightarrow 00:46:29.434$  when it when there's more risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

00:46:29.434 --> 00:46:31.341 So I just wondered if you're thinking

00:46:31.341 --> 00:46:33.133 of going up a little little higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:33.133 \longrightarrow 00:46:34.988$  in the age range we are so the

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:34.988 \longrightarrow 00:46:36.642$  pilots is going to be between 14

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:36.642 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.801$  to 15 year olds and we wanted to

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:38.801 \longrightarrow 00:46:40.481$  be careful not to you know we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:40.481 \longrightarrow 00:46:43.048$  I I showed how age can in the age

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:43.048 \longrightarrow 00:46:44.655$  can influence how they perform in

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:44.655 \longrightarrow 00:46:46.370$  the game and such that if it's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

00:46:46.370 --> 00:46:47.300 If you're using older kids,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:47.300 \longrightarrow 00:46:49.099$  gonna be so easy that you're really

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}46{:}49.099 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}50.650$  not getting at the processes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:50.650 \longrightarrow 00:46:52.754$  And so we're we're looking at 14 to

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:52.754 \longrightarrow 00:46:54.614$  15 also because of the feasibility

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}46{:}54.614 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}56.838$ like you can at least get all

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:46:56.838 \longrightarrow 00:46:58.356$  of them in a high school,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}46{:}58.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}00.196$  but they would be high school

 $00:47:00.196 \longrightarrow 00:47:02.239$  students who are 14 to 15 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:02.240 \longrightarrow 00:47:03.233$  Last question, sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:03.233 \longrightarrow 00:47:05.550$  I just thought too about the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

00:47:05.612 --> 00:47:07.880 reasons that kids start to use right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:07.880 \longrightarrow 00:47:08.786$  so that we've talked a lot,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:08.790 \longrightarrow 00:47:10.080$  it sounds like we're talking a

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

00:47:10.080 --> 00:47:11.234 lot about the pressures, right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:11.234 \longrightarrow 00:47:12.998$  of other in the peer situations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:13.000 \longrightarrow 00:47:15.352$  but there are kids that that's not

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}47{:}15.352 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}17.379$  necessarily how or why they start.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}47{:}17.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}19.452$  And so I just wonder if that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

00:47:19.452 --> 00:47:20.671 something you've thought about

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

00:47:20.671 --> 00:47:22.285 in terms of how to integrate?

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}47{:}22.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}24.185$  Those sorts of risk questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

00:47:24.185 --> 00:47:25.701 related to coping strategies

00:47:25.701 --> 00:47:27.766 or stress levels or you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

00:47:27.770 --> 00:47:29.114 reasons that kids start,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:29.114 \longrightarrow 00:47:29.786$  you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:29.790 \longrightarrow 00:47:30.830$  nipping out of their parents

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:30.830 \longrightarrow 00:47:32.310$  cabinet at home or stuff like that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00{:}47{:}32.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}34.228$  that doesn't have anything to do with

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:34.228 \longrightarrow 00:47:36.715$  them being at a party or being with friends.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:36.720 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.068$  Right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:37.068 \longrightarrow 00:47:39.852$  I think the interventions do all like address

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:39.852 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.647$  a lot of the different risk situations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:42.650 \longrightarrow 00:47:43.192$  We just,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:43.192 \longrightarrow 00:47:43.463$  yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:43.463 \longrightarrow 00:47:45.089$  this was just a sample of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:45.090 \longrightarrow 00:47:46.320$  but intervention interventions

NOTE Confidence: 0.44069797

 $00:47:46.320 \longrightarrow 00:47:49.190$  usually address a wide range of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.785438077222222

 $00:47:49.254 \longrightarrow 00:47:50.989$  risk and influence by like

 $00:47:50.989 \longrightarrow 00:47:52.381$  focus groups that make.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785438077222222

 $00{:}47{:}52.381 --> 00{:}47{:}54.136$  The game story lines more

NOTE Confidence: 0.785438077222222

 $00:47:54.136 \longrightarrow 00:47:55.540$  reflective of their own

NOTE Confidence: 0.785438077222222

00:47:55.612 --> 00:47:57.688 experiences, but yes, agreed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

 $00:48:00.680 \longrightarrow 00:48:04.703$  Sort of PBA on two of the previous questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

00:48:04.710 --> 00:48:08.122 This is a very important initiative for

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

 $00:48:08.122 \longrightarrow 00:48:11.016$  us to be hearing about those of us who

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

 $00:48:11.016 \longrightarrow 00:48:12.744$  have been around and been struggling

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

 $00:48:12.744 \longrightarrow 00:48:14.910$  with this issue for 50 years or more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

00:48:14.910 --> 00:48:17.994 It's easy to get very habituated

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

00:48:17.994 --> 00:48:20.572 to the discouraging components of

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

 $00:48:20.572 \longrightarrow 00:48:23.178$  how we have failed repeatedly this

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

 $00{:}48{:}23.178 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}25.746$  population no matter what we've tried.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

00:48:25.750 --> 00:48:28.487 So the the fresh creativity that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

 $00:48:28.487 \longrightarrow 00:48:31.464$  bring to this is extremely welcome and

 $00:48:31.464 \longrightarrow 00:48:34.600$  don't let anybody talk you out of it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

 $00:48:34.600 \longrightarrow 00:48:36.766$  And one of the questions that

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

 $00:48:36.766 \longrightarrow 00:48:39.320$  I'm raised in my mind is that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767302736666667

 $00:48:39.320 \longrightarrow 00:48:41.288$  I think some of the best.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885127934615384

 $00:48:43.650 \longrightarrow 00:48:46.205$  Diagnostic work about substance abuse

NOTE Confidence: 0.885127934615384

 $00:48:46.205 \longrightarrow 00:48:50.088$  in this age group is done by peers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.885127934615384

 $00:48:50.090 \longrightarrow 00:48:52.138$  They're often extraordinarily accurate

NOTE Confidence: 0.885127934615384

00:48:52.138 --> 00:48:55.210 talking about their friends and talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.885127934615384

 $00:48:55.279 \longrightarrow 00:48:57.708$  about what they see in their friends,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885127934615384

 $00:48:57.710 \longrightarrow 00:49:00.422$  and I wondered if you have a multiplayer

NOTE Confidence: 0.885127934615384

 $00:49:00.422 \longrightarrow 00:49:03.335$  game in your future where you could expose

NOTE Confidence: 0.885127934615384

 $00:49:03.335 \longrightarrow 00:49:06.620$  this to a larger group of problem solvers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796521581666667

 $00:49:07.980 \longrightarrow 00:49:10.596$  Love to I would love to. Yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796521581666667

00:49:10.596 --> 00:49:13.026 Um, multiplayer family based games.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796521581666667

 $00{:}49{:}13.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}15.739$  Yes. Yes I think I I think we should

NOTE Confidence: 0.796521581666667

 $00:49:15.739 \longrightarrow 00:49:18.828$  be meeting adolescence where they are.

00:49:18.830 --> 00:49:20.114 We should, it should be informed

NOTE Confidence: 0.796521581666667

 $00:49:20.114 \longrightarrow 00:49:21.509$  by what we know about risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796521581666667

 $00:49:21.510 \longrightarrow 00:49:23.729$  I think we should use multi modality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796521581666667

 $00:49:23.730 \longrightarrow 00:49:26.398$  And yes, absolutely curious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862064633333333

 $00:49:28.420 \longrightarrow 00:49:33.044$  We have a. Sure. Kim,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862064633333333

 $00:49:33.044 \longrightarrow 00:49:34.968$  can you hear us? Can you unmute?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:49:37.570 --> 00:49:43.714 Hi, uchi. I have a question for you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:49:43.720 \longrightarrow 00:49:45.275$  I was really interested what

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:49:45.275 --> 00:49:47.060 you were saying about like uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:49:47.060 \longrightarrow 00:49:48.494$  it was really fascinating that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:49:48.494 \longrightarrow 00:49:50.126$  were able to pick about apart a

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:49:50.126 --> 00:49:51.575 lot of this by kind of thinking

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00{:}49{:}51.627 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}53.272$  through how kids need to adjust to

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:49:53.272 \longrightarrow 00:49:55.240$  game play before they, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:49:55.240 --> 00:49:57.340 thinking about how those biomarkers

00:49:57.340 --> 00:50:00.035 might be relevant to kind of address

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:50:00.035 \longrightarrow 00:50:02.800$  you know or identify at risk players.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:50:02.800 \longrightarrow 00:50:04.738$  So I'm curious your thoughts when

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:50:04.738 --> 00:50:07.602 you have like if you have a brief

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00{:}50{:}07.602 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}09.885$  intervention like a brief one or

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00{:}50{:}09.885 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}11.790$  two hour game based intervention,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:50:11.790 --> 00:50:14.464 how you might get over that barrier?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:50:14.470 --> 00:50:16.318 Um, do you in terms of like collecting

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00{:}50{:}16.318 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}18.434$  data to try to kind of gather that

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:50:18.434 --> 00:50:19.860 information around at risk youth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:50:19.860 \longrightarrow 00:50:20.860$  are you suggesting that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00{:}50{:}20.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}23.182$  It may not be a good idea to look

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:50:23.182 \longrightarrow 00:50:24.967$  at that early game play and maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00{:}50{:}25.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}26.698$  looking like at the full game

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:50:26.698 \longrightarrow 00:50:28.022$  plays to change over time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:50:28.022 --> 00:50:29.506 Or are you or are you thinking

00:50:29.506 --> 00:50:31.284 it may be more valuable to look

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00{:}50{:}31.284 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}32.931$  after somebody kind of salad and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:50:32.931 \longrightarrow 00:50:34.671$  learn the ropes and gotten through

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:50:34.671 \longrightarrow 00:50:37.479$  several levels later in the game?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00{:}50{:}37.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}39.232$  I I think we should look at all

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:50:39.232 \longrightarrow 00:50:41.100$  of it because I I think that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:50:41.100 --> 00:50:43.599 So one of the questions I'm I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:50:43.599 --> 00:50:46.093 wondering about is that is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:50:46.093 --> 00:50:48.343 difficulty of overcoming that initial

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:50:48.343 \longrightarrow 00:50:50.598$  difficulty is that influenced by

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:50:50.600 --> 00:50:52.688 difficult you know difficulties

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:50:52.688 \longrightarrow 00:50:54.992$  and cognitive processing or is it

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00{:}50{:}54.992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}56.700$  just that we're just trying to get.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:50:56.700 \dashrightarrow 00:50:59.760$  I'm just trying to learn how this game works.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:50:59.760 \longrightarrow 00:51:02.224$  We haven't really tested if if there's

00:51:02.224 --> 00:51:05.768 a difference with that and if they settle,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:51:05.768 \longrightarrow 00:51:07.394$  if they settle.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:51:07.400 \longrightarrow 00:51:08.771$  Like is that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:51:08.771 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.148$  The rate of settling, is that also

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:51:12.148 \longrightarrow 00:51:14.504$  influenced by baseline cognitive function?

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:51:14.504 --> 00:51:15.710 I don't know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:51:15.710 \longrightarrow 00:51:17.586$  I think that those are all questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:51:17.586 --> 00:51:19.453 that need to be, need to be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:51:19.453 \longrightarrow 00:51:21.420$  and need to be answered for us

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:51:21.493 \longrightarrow 00:51:22.699$  to determine when.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:51:22.700 --> 00:51:24.764 I do think, though,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:51:24.764 \longrightarrow 00:51:26.828$  that if learning occurs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:51:26.830 --> 00:51:29.146 If learning from the game occurs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:51:29.150 --> 00:51:32.468 and it doesn't influence risk like that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

00:51:32.470 --> 00:51:34.854 that that risk doesn't get better as you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00:51:34.854 \longrightarrow 00:51:36.766$  learning like it's the couple from it,

 $00:51:36.770 \longrightarrow 00:51:39.346$  then it's not a good metric for

NOTE Confidence: 0.79006787875

 $00{:}51{:}39.346 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}41.780$  measuring risk for substance misuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82051761826087

00:51:46.250 --> 00:51:48.329 Thank you, Kim and thank you for

NOTE Confidence: 0.82051761826087

00:51:48.329 --> 00:51:50.190 helping being such a good mentor

NOTE Confidence: 0.82051761826087

 $00:51:50.190 \longrightarrow 00:51:52.008$  to which we have another question

NOTE Confidence: 0.82051761826087

 $00:51:52.008 \longrightarrow 00:51:53.769$  from Doctor Christine Emmons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82051761826087

 $00:51:53.770 \longrightarrow 00:51:55.780$  Christine and if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.709781158181818

 $00{:}51{:}56.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}57.898$  do you have plans to develop

NOTE Confidence: 0.709781158181818

 $00{:}51{:}57.898 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}59.530$  games that tag your treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709781158181818

 $00:51:59.530 \longrightarrow 00:52:00.244$  Oh, sorry about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.709781158181818

 $00:52:00.244 \longrightarrow 00:52:01.084$  Christine do you want to

NOTE Confidence: 0.821663515

 $00:52:01.130 \longrightarrow 00:52:03.266$  ask your question and if you if you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844032288

 $00{:}52{:}04.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}07.432$  Yes. So my question is do you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.844032288

 $00{:}52{:}07.432 \longrightarrow 00{:}52{:}09.710$  any plans to to create games at

NOTE Confidence: 0.848973975

 $00:52:09.720 \longrightarrow 00:52:12.588$  Target treatment or integrated

 $00:52:12.590 \longrightarrow 00:52:14.450$  diagnostics with treatment?

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

00:52:15.750 --> 00:52:19.017 Um. I mean, ideally we would have a model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00.52:19.020 \longrightarrow 00.52:21.912$  we'll have. Personally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:52:21.912 \longrightarrow 00:52:25.042$  I think about prevention. I do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:52:25.042 \longrightarrow 00:52:26.589$  But but if we think about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

00:52:26.589 --> 00:52:27.898 problem of substance misuse,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00{:}52{:}27.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}29.724$  we should all be thinking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:52:29.724 \longrightarrow 00:52:31.620$  how we also target treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:52:31.620 \longrightarrow 00:52:34.840$  and so I think that those are

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:52:34.840 \longrightarrow 00:52:35.776$  possibilities, especially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:52:35.776 \longrightarrow 00:52:39.108$  If we can, if there's a model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

00:52:39.110 --> 00:52:40.878 you know my mind,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:52:40.878 \longrightarrow 00:52:43.088$  there's a model that funnels

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00{:}52{:}43.088 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}45.302$  appropriately and but we also need

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:52:45.302 \longrightarrow 00:52:48.057$  you know I also mentioned how self

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:52:48.057 \longrightarrow 00:52:50.029$  standalone digital interventions may

 $00:52:50.029 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.804$  not be very effective for treatments,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00{:}52{:}52.804 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}55.186$  you know, for a severe substance

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:52:55.186 \longrightarrow 00:52:57.030$  use disorder and treatments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:52:57.030 \longrightarrow 00:52:58.968$  So I think we need more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:52:58.970 \longrightarrow 00:53:00.242$  Most of the studies that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:53:00.242 \longrightarrow 00:53:01.953$  been done so far are showing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:53:01.953 \longrightarrow 00:53:03.308$  they are useful as adjunctive,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:53:03.310 \longrightarrow 00:53:05.245$  especially if you're having like

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00{:}53{:}05.245 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}07.180$ a maybe zoom televideo treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:53:07.180 \longrightarrow 00:53:09.672$  And then you have these as perhaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00{:}53{:}09.672 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}11.588$  as signments at John Adjunctive that

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:53:11.588 \longrightarrow 00:53:14.311$  help a person practice some of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00{:}53{:}14.311 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}16.418$  skills that we're talking about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

00:53:16.420 --> 00:53:17.580 So as an adjunctive treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:53:17.580 \longrightarrow 00:53:18.640$  I think those are,

 $00:53:18.640 \longrightarrow 00:53:20.661$  those are areas where due to interventions

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

00:53:20.661 --> 00:53:25.248 can be really high yield, I think, yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:53:25.250 \longrightarrow 00:53:26.530$  But of course I'm open.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81279898

 $00:53:26.530 \longrightarrow 00:53:28.100$  I'm open to a possibility.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:53:29.950 \longrightarrow 00:53:31.749$  So maybe building on some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

00:53:31.749 --> 00:53:33.550 comments earlier on and you talked

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:53:33.550 \longrightarrow 00:53:35.180$  about possibly using other digital

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:53:35.180 \longrightarrow 00:53:36.607$  technologies and integrating them

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00{:}53{:}36.607 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}38.407$  into your future research program.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

00:53:38.410 --> 00:53:40.846 I was very taken by reaching recent

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

00:53:40.846 --> 00:53:43.240 nature I think biotechnology paper that

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:53:43.240 \longrightarrow 00:53:46.215$  looked at Fitbit data in the context

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00{:}53{:}46.288 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}48.880$  of COVID and predicted infection like

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:53:48.880 \longrightarrow 00:53:51.456$  many days before symptom onset and that

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:53:51.456 \longrightarrow 00:53:53.430$  was in a relatively small sample size,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:53:53.430 \longrightarrow 00:53:55.488$  I think it was around 64 participants.

00:53:55.490 --> 00:53:58.234 And then the all of US initiative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

00:53:58.240 --> 00:53:59.984 you know they're recruiting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

00:53:59.984 --> 00:54:00.856 Million people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:54:00.860 \longrightarrow 00:54:02.620$  but their approach is just to say well

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:54:02.620 \longrightarrow 00:54:04.373$  if you have a Fitbit you know will

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:54:04.373 \longrightarrow 00:54:06.098$  you allow us to access your data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

00:54:06.100 --> 00:54:07.696 So they're not even providing Fitbits,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:54:07.700 \longrightarrow 00:54:09.380$  but they receive the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:54:09.380 \longrightarrow 00:54:11.324$  I just wondered if anyone is

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00{:}54{:}11.324 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}12.975$  integrating we arable tech like Fitbit

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:54:12.975 \longrightarrow 00:54:14.721$  data in substance use in adults

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00:54:14.721 \longrightarrow 00:54:16.977$  and whether or not that might be of

NOTE Confidence: 0.82877275777778

 $00{:}54{:}16.977 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}18.730$  value in in this population as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:54:19.000 \longrightarrow 00:54:20.080$  I think I think they're doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:54:20.080 \longrightarrow 00:54:23.377$  I think there's actually some research from.

00:54:23.380 --> 00:54:26.190 Integrating Fitbit or at least

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00{:}54{:}26.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}29.368$  we arable technology, I would love to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:54:29.368 \longrightarrow 00:54:33.750$  I would love to integrate that especially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

00:54:33.750 --> 00:54:35.136 Because you know, one of the ways

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

00:54:35.136 --> 00:54:36.665 I think about it is that if, if,

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:54:36.665 \longrightarrow 00:54:39.025$  if there are areas where I think that

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:54:39.025 \longrightarrow 00:54:41.467$  where they've used them before in adult

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:54:41.467 \longrightarrow 00:54:43.858$  studies is that there are areas that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:54:43.860 \longrightarrow 00:54:45.190$  For example, if you're close to a

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

00:54:45.190 --> 00:54:46.636 shop where you can buy a vape right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00{:}54{:}46.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}49.560$  like and then something will,

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:54:49.560 \longrightarrow 00:54:50.934$  you will get a notification that

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:54:50.934 \longrightarrow 00:54:52.619$  you're in a place where you might

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:54:52.619 \longrightarrow 00:54:54.053$  engage in a high risk behavior.

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

00:54:54.060 --> 00:54:55.648 What might you do?

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:54:55.648 \longrightarrow 00:54:57.914$  What resources do you have that

 $00:54:57.914 \longrightarrow 00:54:59.558$  you can employ in this moment?

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:54:59.560 \longrightarrow 00:55:02.472$  So I would I would love to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:55:02.472 \longrightarrow 00:55:05.659$  able to integrate the wearable

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:55:05.659 \longrightarrow 00:55:08.020$  technology in monitoring.

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:55:08.020 \longrightarrow 00:55:09.562$  Kids who are high risk and

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:55:09.562 \longrightarrow 00:55:10.970$  thinking about how we might,

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:55:10.970 \longrightarrow 00:55:13.142$  how we might measure those, how,

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

00:55:13.142 --> 00:55:17.006 how and what will be most useful

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:55:17.010 \longrightarrow 00:55:19.214$  as measures for identifying

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:55:19.214 \longrightarrow 00:55:21.211$  who might be struggling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:55:21.211 \longrightarrow 00:55:23.257$  who is struggling at the moment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.627673088333333

 $00:55:23.260 \longrightarrow 00:55:25.204$  who would be a risk for substance misuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.62767308833333300:55:25.210 --> 00:55:25.510 Yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77186675555556

 $00:55:25.610 \longrightarrow 00:55:26.877$  and if the kids are bringing their

NOTE Confidence: 0.77186675555556

00:55:26.877 --> 00:55:29.124 own Fitbit, it would be quite

 $00:55:29.124 \longrightarrow 00:55:31.438$  cost effective. Question from you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90848117

00:55:36.720 --> 00:55:37.870 Thank you very much. That

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

 $00:55:37.880 \longrightarrow 00:55:39.395$  was terrific presentation

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

 $00:55:39.395 \longrightarrow 00:55:41.920$  of of your amazing work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

00:55:41.920 --> 00:55:44.020 I had a weird idea that that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

00:55:44.020 --> 00:55:45.839 don't it's not terribly well formed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

 $00.55.45.840 \longrightarrow 00.55.47.100$  so I apologize for that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

00:55:47.100 --> 00:55:50.516 But on my mind is the recent CDC

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

 $00{:}55{:}50.516 \to 00{:}55{:}53.180$  report about the prevalence of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

00:55:53.180 --> 00:55:55.145 Of anxiety and depression in

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

00:55:55.145 --> 00:55:57.110 youth in the United States,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

 $00:55:57.110 \longrightarrow 00:55:58.504$  especially amongst.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

00:55:58.504 --> 00:56:02.686 Girls and young women and but

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

00:56:02.690 --> 00:56:04.688 across the board I think really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

 $00:56:04.690 \longrightarrow 00:56:08.590$  and what occurred to me is that probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

 $00:56:08.590 \longrightarrow 00:56:11.482$  there's a connection between those

00:56:11.482 --> 00:56:14.322 dysphoric experiences and substance use,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

 $00:56:14.330 \longrightarrow 00:56:15.690$  I mean, at least broadly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

00:56:15.690 --> 00:56:18.470 And I just wondered whether.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

00:56:18.470 --> 00:56:18.850 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

00:56:18.850 --> 00:56:20.370 you may not have an answer right now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

 $00:56:20.370 \longrightarrow 00:56:23.009$  but whether in the data you collect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

00:56:23.010 --> 00:56:25.524 is there some way of collecting

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

 $00:56:25.524 \longrightarrow 00:56:28.959$  data about about those dysphoric

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

 $00{:}56{:}28.959 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}31.230$  experiences at the same time you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

 $00:56:31.230 \longrightarrow 00:56:32.810$  collecting things that might lead

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125

00:56:32.870 --> 00:56:34.480 to directly to substance use?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88376175125 00:56:35.370 --> 00:56:37.210 Right. NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:56:37.210 \longrightarrow 00:56:39.010$  So with the electronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00{:}56{:}39.010 --> 00{:}56{:}40.810$  health record data data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:56:40.810 \longrightarrow 00:56:43.225$  we're also going to be looking at

00:56:43.230 --> 00:56:47.910 predictions for depression and ID.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

00:56:47.910 --> 00:56:49.728 So we, we would look at,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:56:49.730 \longrightarrow 00:56:51.599$  we would look at any relationships and

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:56:51.599 \longrightarrow 00:56:53.968$  see if those features are also predictive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:56:53.970 \longrightarrow 00:56:55.998$  If the features that are predictive

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

00:56:55.998 --> 00:56:57.707 of substance misuse disorder are

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

00:56:57.707 --> 00:56:59.513 also the feature same features that

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:56:59.513 \longrightarrow 00:57:01.369$  are predictive of major depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00{:}57{:}01.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}03.254$  there's major depression occur

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:57:03.254 \longrightarrow 00:57:05.138$  before substance use disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:57:05.140 \longrightarrow 00:57:07.480$  Could we use that as a way to also screen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:57:07.480 \longrightarrow 00:57:11.536$  you know, for for substance misuse?

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

00:57:11.540 --> 00:57:13.822 I do think that there in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00{:}57{:}13.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}16.359$  of games or digital technology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:57:16.360 \longrightarrow 00:57:19.867$  there are ways in which you can.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:57:19.870 \longrightarrow 00:57:23.111$  Measure like the ways in which behavior

00:57:23.111 --> 00:57:27.239 in a game can be reflective of affect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:57:27.240 \longrightarrow 00:57:34.210$  And so if, if, if, we can.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:57:34.210 \longrightarrow 00:57:36.650$  If we can embed some of those as

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:57:36.650 \longrightarrow 00:57:39.008$  we develop games and we use that

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00{:}57{:}39.008 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}41.708$  as monitoring for like if if we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

00:57:41.708 --> 00:57:43.622 monitor a change in your effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:57:43.622 \longrightarrow 00:57:45.960$  is that also improving your risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:57:45.960 \longrightarrow 00:57:47.568$  or lowering your risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:57:47.570 \longrightarrow 00:57:49.146$  So I do think I mean and these

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00{:}57{:}49.146 \to 00{:}57{:}50.654$  are highly commoditized like the

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

00:57:50.654 --> 00:57:52.074 depression anxiety increase you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

00:57:52.074 --> 00:57:53.819 repeating as they increase your

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00{:}57{:}53.819 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}55.067$  risk of substance misuse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:57:55.070 \longrightarrow 00:57:58.126$  So we do need to be addressing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

00:57:58.126 --> 00:58:00.214 both but also yes I agree thinking

 $00:58:00.214 \longrightarrow 00:58:02.769$  about how we how we use what we

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00{:}58{:}02.769 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}04.125$  know about the physiological.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:58:04.130 \longrightarrow 00:58:04.821$  Presentations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:58:04.821 \longrightarrow 00:58:06.894$  physiological manifestations of

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:58:06.894 \longrightarrow 00:58:08.276$  this disorders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:58:08.280 \longrightarrow 00:58:10.709$  how do we embed those in games

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:58:10.709 \longrightarrow 00:58:12.785$  that measure and monitor over time

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:58:12.785 \longrightarrow 00:58:15.520$  and how do we use that to monitor

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:58:15.520 \longrightarrow 00:58:18.118$  improvements as we as we address,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85604288625

 $00:58:18.120 \longrightarrow 00:58:20.196$  as we address this underlying disorders?

NOTE Confidence: 0.820860143

 $00:58:21.860 \longrightarrow 00:58:22.950$  Which I think that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.820860143

 $00:58:22.950 \longrightarrow 00:58:24.040$  would be many more questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.820860143

 $00:58:24.040 \longrightarrow 00:58:25.600$  but we're going to finish here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.820860143

 $00:58:25.600 \longrightarrow 00:58:27.070$  But thank you so much.