WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"01:02:38"

NOTE recognizability:0.940

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:00:05.040 \rightarrow 00:00:06.720$  Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:00:06.720 \longrightarrow 00:00:09.060$  to Grand Ryans and especially to

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

00:00:09.120 --> 00:00:10.800 everyone joining us on Zoom.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}00{:}10{.}800$  -->  $00{:}00{:}12{.}680$  And I'd like to remind you that for the Q&A,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:00:12.680 \rightarrow 00:00:15.184$  please feel free to put on your video

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:00:15.184 \rightarrow 00:00:17.480$  cameras and we'll project you here on

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}00{:}17.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}19.538$  our screens here in the Cohen Auditorium

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:00:19.538 \rightarrow 00:00:21.760$  and we'll hope for a lively discussion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:00:21.760 \longrightarrow 00:00:23.176$  Now as usual, we just want to preview

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}00{:}23.176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}24.596$  a couple of our presentations that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:00:24.596 \rightarrow 00:00:26.280$  coming up over the next couple of weeks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}00{:}26.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}27.580$  And so next Tuesday,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}00{:}27.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}30.090$  we will hear from Doctor Jessica Cardena.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00:00:30.090 \longrightarrow 00:00:32.064$  And this is a very special by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}00{:}32.064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}33.370$ Ola Barnard lecture series.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}00{:}33{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}35{.}674$  And so Doctor Cardeno will be talking to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}00{:}35.674 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}38.175$  us about what we can learn from Latino
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}00{:}38.175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}40.306$  mothers and what Latino mothers can
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}00{:}40{.}306 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}42{.}642$  teach clinicians about trauma and recovery.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00:00:42.642 \longrightarrow 00:00:44.910$  And then a special date for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- 00:00:44.980 --> 00:00:46.448 your diary on Monday.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00:00:46.450 \longrightarrow 00:00:48.244$  And we have Doctor Tracy Bale
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00:00:48.244 \rightarrow 00:00:50.870$  coming to give a seminar in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00:00:50.870 \rightarrow 00:00:52.690$  Division of Reproductive Sciences.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- 00:00:52.690 --> 00:00:54.770 So that's in the department of OB GYN,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00:00:54.770 \longrightarrow 00:00:56.094$  my other home department.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- 00:00:56.094 --> 00:00:58.649 And so on Monday from 12:00 to 1:00,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}00{:}58.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}00.533$  Doctor Bale will be coming to talk
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:01:00.533 \rightarrow 00:01:02.185$  to us about extracellular vesicles

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

00:01:02.185 --> 00:01:04.537 as a novel form of communication

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}01{:}04.537 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}06.609$  between the mother and the fetus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

00:01:06.610 --> 00:01:07.290 And as you'll all know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

00:01:07.290 --> 00:01:09.120 Doctor Bale has done some seminal

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:01:09.120 \dashrightarrow 00:01:11.309$  work trying to uncover the molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:01:11.309 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.137$  mechanisms that underpin the

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:01:13.137 \rightarrow 00:01:14.965$  intergenerational transmission of stress.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

00:01:14.970 --> 00:01:16.965 And now to our speaker for today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:01:16.970 \rightarrow 00:01:19.056$  it is my distinct pleasure to welcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:01:19.056 \rightarrow 00:01:20.736$  Doctor Hennington Meyer to the Child

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

00:01:20.736 --> 00:01:22.444 Study Center for the very first time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}01{:}22.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}22.854$  I'm told.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}01{:}22.854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}24.735$  And we did a little bit of history of

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:01:24.735 \dashrightarrow 00:01:26.487$  the Child Study Center earlier on and a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

00:01:26.490 --> 00:01:28.863 Tour So Doctor Timmeyer is joining us

- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- 00:01:28.863 --> 00:01:31.447 from the Harvard School of Public Health,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00:01:31.450 \longrightarrow 00:01:33.445$  where he is the Professor of Social
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}01{:}33{.}445 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}34{.}922$  and Behavioral Science and holds
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- 00:01:34.922 --> 00:01:36.347 the Sumner and Esther Feldberg
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- 00:01:36.347 --> 00:01:38.088 Chair of Maternal and Child Health,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}01{:}38.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}40.016$  where he also directs the Maternal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}01{:}40.016 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}42.130$  and Child Center for Excellence at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- 00:01:42.130 --> 00:01:44.050 Harvard School of Public Health.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}01{:}44.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}44.902$  And, of course, Dr.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}01{:}44{.}902 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}47{.}070$  Timmeyer also holds a professorship at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- 00:01:47.070 --> 00:01:49.770 the Erasmus University in Rotterdam,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}01{:}49{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}51{.}366$  where, as many of you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00:01:51.370 \rightarrow 00:01:54.450$  he set up the Generation Rotterdam cohort,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- 00:01:54.450 --> 00:01:55.806 the Gen. R cohort.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333
- $00{:}01{:}55{.}806$  -->  $00{:}01{:}57{.}501$  Which has made a tremendous
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:01:57.501 \rightarrow 00:01:59.583$  contribution to our understanding of

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}01{:}59{.}583 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}01{.}683$  how the environment shapes individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:02:01.683 \longrightarrow 00:02:03.370$  differences in child development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:02:03.370 \longrightarrow 00:02:04.434$  And I hope we'll hear a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:02:04.434 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.130$  bit about that today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}02{:}05{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}07{.}244$  as well as many of the other

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}02{:}07{.}244 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}08{.}882$  initiatives that Doctor Tiamar is

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:02:08.882 \rightarrow 00:02:10.886$  involved in since moving to Harvard.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}02{:}10.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}11.997$  And of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:02:11.997 \rightarrow 00:02:14.211$  he has published prolifically and is

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00:02:14.211 \rightarrow 00:02:16.018$  regarded as a ISI highly cited researcher.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

00:02:16.018 --> 00:02:17.710 So please join me in giving

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

 $00{:}02{:}17.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}18.730$  a warm child study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

00:02:18.730 --> 00:02:19.722 Welcome to Doctor Tiameyer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950987893333333

00:02:19.722 --> 00:02:19.970 Thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:02:23.810 \longrightarrow 00:02:26.812$  you. Thank you very much.

 $00{:}02{:}26.812 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}29.174$  Let me put on my mic and thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}02{:}29{.}174 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}31{.}471$  you very much for the kind,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:02:31.471 \rightarrow 00:02:33.526$  very kind and warm introduction

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:02:33.526 \longrightarrow 00:02:35.939$  and the invitation to come here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}02{:}35{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}38{.}138$  Indeed, I'm quite proud to talk here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}02{:}38.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}41.390$  I should say that because just teach

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:02:41.390 \longrightarrow 00:02:44.180$  currently again the the course child

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}02{:}44.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}46.514$  Psychiatric EPI at Harvard and on

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

00:02:46.514 --> 00:02:49.337 my third slide there I show the Yale

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

00:02:49.337 --> 00:02:51.976 Study Center and the work of gazelle,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}02{:}51{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}55{.}826$  which I think shaped longitudinal studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}02{:}55{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}58{.}674$  More than many others or any body

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}02{:}58.674 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}00{.}170$  else was that introduction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}03{:}00{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}02{.}550$  For those that are also interested in

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}03{:}02{.}611 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}04{.}787$  more recent work I'm doing or more other

 $00:03:04.787 \rightarrow 00:03:07.146$  work on the maternal child space space,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

00:03:07.150 --> 00:03:09.726 I must disappoint you or focus on

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:03:09.726 \dashrightarrow 00:03:11.748$  generation R still doing much of my work. NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:03:11.750 \longrightarrow 00:03:17.950$  What I did is I okay is I selected work

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}03{:}17{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}21{.}590$  from ongoing studies or older studies even

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:03:21.590 \dashrightarrow 00:03:23.788$  because I do much population or imaging. NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:03:23.790 \longrightarrow 00:03:25.029$  I'll show you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:03:25.029 \dashrightarrow 00:03:27.796$  And the theme I thought was answering

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}03{:}27.796$  -->  $00{:}03{:}29.512$  an all discussion saying this work

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}03{:}29{.}512 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}31{.}392$  should do now that you're at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}03{:}31{.}392 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}33{.}176$  School of public health is not really

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}03{:}33{.}176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}34{.}868$  relevant to public health at all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

00:03:34.870 --> 00:03:37.786 And after 20 years or 30 years of imaging

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}03{:}37.786 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}40.790$  research, it's still not relevant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}03{:}40.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}42.870$  And that doesn't insult me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:03:42.870 \longrightarrow 00:03:44.148$  I think it's a fair critique,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- 00:03:44.150 --> 00:03:45.398 but at least I have to live with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00{:}03{:}45{.}398 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}46{.}190$  it and address it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00:03:46.190 \dashrightarrow 00:03:47.226$  And that's what I'm trying to do
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00:03:47.226 \dashrightarrow 00:03:48.970$  with you today. Discuss it with you.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00:03:48.970 \longrightarrow 00:03:50.270$  Could it be relevant?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00{:}03{:}50{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}53{.}330$  It's not so obvious.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00:03:53.330 \longrightarrow 00:03:53.872$  So yes,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00:03:53.872 \rightarrow 00:03:55.769$  they asked me to do learning objectives.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00{:}03{:}55{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}56{.}766$  So here you are a bit,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00:03:56.770 \longrightarrow 00:03:58.604$  it's a bit about the prenet exposures,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00{:}03{:}58{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}00{.}686$  which I'll Kieran is working on.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00{:}04{:}00{.}690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}02{.}330$  So I'll focus on that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00:04:02.330 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.410$  And the question really is,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00{:}04{:}04{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}05{.}220$  is it identified?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- 00:04:05.220 --> 00:04:06.570 I don't think that's the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

00:04:06.570 --> 00:04:07.728 learning objective to be honest.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}04{:}07{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}10{.}479$  It would be discussed with me how

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}04{:}10.479 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}13.024$  child imaging might possibly in

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:04:13.024 \rightarrow 00:04:16.450$  theory a bit impact public health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:04:16.450 \longrightarrow 00:04:17.850$  What am I talking about?

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:04:17.850 \rightarrow 00:04:19.776$  I see Euroscience population of science

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:04:19.776 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.820$  not as broad as somebody like Thomas Powells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

00:04:22.820 --> 00:04:24.060 Thomas Powers, I would see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00{:}04{:}24.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}26.420$  It's really the intersection of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

00:04:26.420 --> 00:04:27.566 if you wish,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:04:27.566 \rightarrow 00:04:29.094$  population research or etymology

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:04:29.100 \longrightarrow 00:04:29.740$  and neuroscience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

00:04:29.740 --> 00:04:31.660 Essentially that's what happened in genetics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:04:31.660 \rightarrow 00:04:34.708$  that genetics has been now 1520 years really

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:04:34.708 \dashrightarrow 00:04:37.900$  infused with genetics as we just talked,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015

 $00:04:37.900 \longrightarrow 00:04:38.411$  epidemiology,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00{:}04{:}38{.}411 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}40{.}455$  but now also influences
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00:04:40.455 \rightarrow 00:04:42.499$  epidemiology with new methods.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00{:}04{:}42.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}45.097$  And then I'll focus on prenatal exposures,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00:04:45.100 \longrightarrow 00:04:46.279$  psychosocial or chemicals.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- 00:04:46.279 --> 00:04:48.244 I've got one more chemical
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00{:}04{:}48{.}244 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}51{.}315$  exposure pull that up after I met.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- 00:04:51.315 --> 00:04:53.130 Somebody yesterday night,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93019015
- $00:04:53.130 \longrightarrow 00:04:54.048$  I thought that's a good one,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504
- $00:04:56.850 \longrightarrow 00:04:59.250$  how that impacts child development.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504
- $00{:}04{:}59{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}00{.}702$  I'll start with what I think
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504
- $00:05:00.702 \longrightarrow 00:05:02.170$  is not public health relevant.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504
- $00{:}05{:}02{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}03{.}784$  So I thought I'll start with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504
- $00:05:03.784 \dashrightarrow 00:05:05.330$  something where I think it's not
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00{:}05{:}07{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}09{.}472$  what imaging research is not and I
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00:05:09.472 \dashrightarrow 00:05:11.410$  start with not other people's work.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

 $00:05:11.410 \longrightarrow 00:05:12.402$  That's not very cool.

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

00:05:12.402 --> 00:05:13.890 I start with my own work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

 $00{:}05{:}13.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}15.710$  so I'll show you my.

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

 $00:05:15.710 \dashrightarrow 00:05:17.025$  Were my best publication last

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

 $00:05:17.025 \longrightarrow 00:05:18.790$  year or one of my nicest,

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

00:05:18.790 --> 00:05:21.142 but I don't think it is any

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

 $00{:}05{:}21.142 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}22.150$  public health relevance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

00:05:22.150 --> 00:05:25.542 It's answering the question child psychiatry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

 $00{:}05{:}25{.}542 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}27{.}438$  Really it's giving you an example

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

 $00:05:27.438 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.300$  of that because much of my work

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

 $00{:}05{:}29{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}31{.}544$  or all of my work was funded under

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

 $00{:}05{:}31{.}544 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}34{.}030$  the premise that it will inform in

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

 $00:05:34.030 \rightarrow 00:05:35.830$  the prediction and the causality

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

 $00:05:35.830 \dashrightarrow 00:05:37.270$  of child psychiatric disorders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

00:05:37.270 --> 00:05:40.588 And now 20, not 15 years later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539

 $00:05:40.590 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.754$  what have we delivered?

- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00:05:42.754 \longrightarrow 00:05:45.459$  It's this type of work.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00:05:45.460 \longrightarrow 00:05:47.460$  Can we really predict adolescent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- 00:05:47.460 --> 00:05:48.660 hallucinations with imaging?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00:05:48.660 \rightarrow 00:05:50.196$  Does it add anything?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00{:}05{:}50{.}196 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}53{.}190$  So last year we published work on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00:05:53.190 \dashrightarrow 00:05:55.140$  this question, Public Health Relevant.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- 00:05:55.140 --> 00:05:56.220 You ask yourself,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00:05:56.220 \rightarrow 00:05:57.920$  can we predict adolescent hallucinations
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00:05:57.920 \rightarrow 00:05:59.942$  would be very, very important.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00{:}05{:}59{.}942 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}02{.}447$  We measured that in Generation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00{:}06{:}02{.}447 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}05{.}258$  R at 10 and 14 years.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00{:}06{:}05{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}06{.}976$  It's actually quite easy to measure.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00{:}06{:}06{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}08{.}696$  You can ask the adolescents themselves,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00{:}06{:}08{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}11{.}500$  You can ask them to hear voices.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.944124138461539
- $00:06:11.500 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.700$  You have strange thoughts.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

00:06:14.710 --> 00:06:17.032 I don't know if any<br/>body here has an idea

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00{:}06{:}17.032 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}19.586$  how prevalent that is at age 10, At 14,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

00:06:19.586 --> 00:06:21.970 Any idea if it's a fringe thing happening NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:06:22.039 \rightarrow 00:06:25.283$  at 2% of the population or 10 or 15%?

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:06:25.283 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.654$  But actually if you ask them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

00:06:28.654 --> 00:06:31.738 do you hear voices, it's 25% easily.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:06:31.738 \longrightarrow 00:06:34.734$  And that is not just waking up

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

00:06:34.734 --> 00:06:38.716 after dreaming, it is really work of

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00{:}06{:}38.716$  -->  $00{:}06{:}41.614$  Keleha and Mary Cannon in Ireland.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00{:}06{:}41.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}43.696$  Has shown it's somewhat less frequent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00{:}06{:}43.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}46.477$  so it goes down to 15% if you wish.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00{:}06{:}46{.}477 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}49{.}780$  If you really get them bothered by voices,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00{:}06{:}49{.}780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}52{.}220$  29 is really what you get with these

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:06:52.220 \rightarrow 00:06:53.976$  population assessments if you do it crudely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:06:53.980 \longrightarrow 00:06:56.722$  But trust me, it is easily 15% at

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:06:56.722 \rightarrow 00:06:58.851$  age 10 and then it drops to 12%.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- 00:06:58.851 --> 00:07:00.699 And again, if you do it more carefully,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- $00:07:00.700 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.412$  it would probably be six, 7% at age 14.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- $00:07:03.412 \longrightarrow 00:07:04.576$  That hear voices,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- $00:07:04.580 \longrightarrow 00:07:06.620$  which is huge, don't forget.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- $00:07:06.620 \rightarrow 00:07:08.820$  Don't confuse that with schizophrenia.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- $00:07:08.820 \rightarrow 00:07:10.484$  That's nowhere near schizophrenia.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- 00:07:10.484 --> 00:07:12.180 Actually, if you know their work,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- 00:07:12.180 --> 00:07:14.880 it predicts depression, anxiety,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- $00:07:14.880 \rightarrow 00:07:18.255$  borderline much more than schizophrenia.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- 00:07:18.260 --> 00:07:19.070 And we did,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- $00:07:19.070 \longrightarrow 00:07:20.420$  so that's the special thing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- $00{:}07{:}20{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}23{.}741$  We did repeated imaging at age 10 and age
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- $00{:}07{:}23.741 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}26.500$  14 so we can show does the brain change.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- $00:07:26.500 \longrightarrow 00:07:29.900$  We can also say, can we predict it?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825
- $00:07:29.900 \longrightarrow 00:07:31.635$  In the paper in Biological
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

00:07:31.635 --> 00:07:33.370 Psychiatry last year we showed

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:07:33.432 \rightarrow 00:07:37.316$  something after all lots of studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

00:07:37.316 --> 00:07:38.260 different approaches,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:07:38.260 \dashrightarrow 00:07:39.620$  different work with the brains.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:07:39.620 \rightarrow 00:07:44.460$  What we found really is if you hire voices,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:07:44.460 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.060$  then the typical decline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:07:47.060 \longrightarrow 00:07:48.060$  this is sort of exaggerated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00{:}07{:}48.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}48.860$  This is a bad curve.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00{:}07{:}48.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}50.204$  It should be much more than sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:07:50.204 \rightarrow 00:07:50.780$  of trajectory curve.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00{:}07{:}50.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}53.104$  But for give me for that that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:07:53.104 \longrightarrow 00:07:55.070$  decline in Gray matter which.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00:07:55.070 \rightarrow 00:07:57.345$  Originates probably much earlier than age 10,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

00:07:57.350 - > 00:08:00.332 probably age 6 onwards is a tiny

NOTE Confidence: 0.936479825

 $00{:}08{:}00{.}332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}04{.}990$  bit far faster in those that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:08:08.710 \longrightarrow 00:08:12.830$  new onset hallucinations at age 14.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:08:15.470 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.550$  I'm showing this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00{:}08{:}16.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}17.990$  It is an association.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:08:17.990 \longrightarrow 00:08:21.368$  It has a tiny effect size.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:08:21.370 \longrightarrow 00:08:25.038$  You need a few thousands 2000s to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:08:25.038 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.570$  find it as a tiny effect size.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:08:27.570 \longrightarrow 00:08:29.558$  It is a specific,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- 00:08:29.558 --> 00:08:32.672 it is much of your Gray matter,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:08:32.672 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.538$  and actually it also maps on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00{:}08{:}34{.}538$  -->  $00{:}08{:}35{.}690$  other psychiatric problems,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:08:35.690 \longrightarrow 00:08:38.602$  so it would not be that very
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:08:38.602 \rightarrow 00:08:39.850$  specific for hallucinations.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00{:}08{:}39{.}850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}42{.}226$  You can also zoom in and find other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:08:42.226 \rightarrow 00:08:43.370$  structures, of course we did that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00{:}08{:}43{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}45{.}506$  And the hippocampus,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- 00:08:45.506 --> 00:08:47.721 that's what the small A says
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:08:47.721 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.547$  it's The effect is again small.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

00:08:50.550 --> 00:08:51.930 It survives multiple testing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:08:51.930 \dashrightarrow 00:08:53.310$  correction for other structures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:08:53.310 \longrightarrow 00:08:54.462$  It's a tiny effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:08:54.462 \longrightarrow 00:08:56.385$  Again, it is unspecific.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

00:08:56.385 --> 00:08:59.110 The conclusion here is useless.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:08:59.110 \longrightarrow 00:09:00.163$  As a predictor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:00.163 \dashrightarrow 00:09:03.165$  I have little doubt over and above any

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:03.165 \dashrightarrow 00:09:05.505$  prediction model which we published.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:05.510 \rightarrow 00:09:07.270$  These brain imaging does nothing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

00:09:07.270 --> 00:09:09.920 You can better do predict

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:09.920 \dashrightarrow 00:09:11.510$  with socioe conomic factors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00{:}09{:}11.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}13.990$  better predict with clinical factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:13.990 \longrightarrow 00:09:17.086$  You can better predict with well-being.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:17.090 \longrightarrow 00:09:19.022$  It does not predict and this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:19.022 \rightarrow 00:09:20.608$  the biggest imaging study so far.

 $00:09:20.610 \longrightarrow 00:09:22.617$  So it may be that one day all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

00:09:22.617 --> 00:09:24.721 you will search for more specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:24.721 \dashrightarrow 00:09:26.494$  markers and we'll do resting

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:26.494 \rightarrow 00:09:27.886$  state analysis and whatever.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00{:}09{:}27.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}29.918$  But we had this unique data

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:29.918 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.817$  set with repeated imaging and

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:31.817 \longrightarrow 00:09:33.254$  repeated hallucinations over

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:33.254 \rightarrow 00:09:35.170$  the really relevant period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:35.170 \dashrightarrow 00:09:38.122$  I would give this a one out of five

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

 $00:09:38.122 \rightarrow 00:09:40.574$  in population public health relevance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

00:09:40.574 --> 00:09:43.290 It does not add to any child

NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429

00:09:43.365 --> 00:09:45.049 psychiatric clinicians.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:09:47.420 \longrightarrow 00:09:48.756$  Addiction, the rapeutic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:09:48.756 \longrightarrow 00:09:50.092$  understanding model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:09:50.092 \rightarrow 00:09:52.520$  I would say we've done

 $00:09:52.520 \rightarrow 00:09:53.780$  lots of this type of work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00{:}09{:}53.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}55.492$  It's fascinating, it's fun.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:09:55.492 \rightarrow 00:09:58.060$  I think it's important to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:09:58.132 \rightarrow 00:09:59.937$  that the brain can predict,

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:09:59.940 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.460$  but it is not clinically useful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:10:02.460 \dashrightarrow 00:10:05.380$  Let me go on with transition to the work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:10:05.380 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.612$  I'm going to show where I think we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:10:07.612 \rightarrow 00:10:11.534$  discuss public health relevance And again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:10:11.534 \rightarrow 00:10:14.276$  this is a crude analysis, I know that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:10:14.276 \rightarrow 00:10:16.388$  Actually more fine grain didn't predict,

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00{:}10{:}16{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}18{.}274$  more if you do multiple testing

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00{:}10{:}18{.}274 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}20{.}590$  correction and the prediction was small.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

00:10:20.590 --> 00:10:22.264 This is a paper I'm not going to discuss,

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:10:22.270 \rightarrow 00:10:24.142$  I'm just going to recommend it for your read.

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:10:24.150 \longrightarrow 00:10:25.950$  From last year we said thought

NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429

 $00:10:25.950 \longrightarrow 00:10:27.845$  it harder that the population of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429
- $00:10:27.845 \rightarrow 00:10:30.349$  science is the best paper of the year
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429
- 00:10:30.350 --> 00:10:33.350 and so it got our prize for that,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429
- $00:10:33.350 \longrightarrow 00:10:35.296$  whoever cares.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429
- $00{:}10{:}35{.}296 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}39{.}606$  And what it does is it uses the biggest
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429
- $00{:}10{:}39.606 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}41.845$  databases like the UK Biobank and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429
- $00{:}10{:}41{.}845 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}44{.}309$  the ABCD studies and others to show.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.904444878571429
- $00{:}10{:}44{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}45{.}870$  That for a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429
- 00:10:49.030 --> 00:10:51.806 if you don't zoom in on our ones
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429
- $00{:}10{:}51{.}806 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}54{.}588$  but you take a broader approach
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429
- $00:10:54.590 \longrightarrow 00:10:58.647$  for resting state and for volumes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429
- $00:10:58.647 \rightarrow 00:11:02.109$  that you need to find anything.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429
- $00:11:02.110 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.309$  They say it's three to 6000 people in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429
- $00:11:05.309 \rightarrow 00:11:08.027$  the general population to find anything
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429
- 00:11:08.030 --> 00:11:10.382 you can argue in your clinical sample
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429
- $00{:}11{:}10.382 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}12.120$  it's different there's a letter or.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429

 $00:11:12.120 \rightarrow 00:11:14.542$  An answer to nature arguing that very

NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429

00:11:14.542 --> 00:11:16.133 recently I actually fundamentally

NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429

00:11:16.133 --> 00:11:18.077 disagree with that letter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429

00:11:18.080 --> 00:11:20.198 I think they have it right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429

00:11:20.200 --> 00:11:22.960 It's my own experience too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429

 $00:11:22.960 \rightarrow 00:11:25.840$  and the only thing I'm not so sure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429

 $00:11:25.840 \longrightarrow 00:11:27.880$  and that's the judgment that's out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936659528571429

00:11:27.880 --> 00:11:31.000 This analysis is clearly only cross-sectional

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

00:11:33.240 --> 00:11:35.880 and actually I'm not so interested

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:11:35.880 \rightarrow 00:11:37.200$  in cross-sectional prediction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00{:}11{:}37{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}38{.}880$  So we would have to move to longitudinal

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:11:38.880 \rightarrow 00:11:40.916$  and if you've got repeated brain measures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

00:11:40.920 --> 00:11:43.584 I would argue because you control

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

00:11:43.584 --> 00:11:46.900 for quite a bit and you have change

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:11:46.900 \rightarrow 00:11:49.110$  that could be different, although we

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:11:49.110 \longrightarrow 00:11:51.120$  don't know what's the interval change.

 $00:11:51.120 \rightarrow 00:11:53.796$  Secondly, they have very poor phenotypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

00:11:53.800 --> 00:11:54.625 You could argue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:11:54.625 \rightarrow 00:11:56.550$  I think they should have used multiple

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

00:11:56.606 --> 00:11:58.890 informant and other approaches, but anyway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:11:58.890 \rightarrow 00:12:02.300$  it was all that critique I think.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00{:}12{:}02{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}04{.}148$  It's very humbling that all of a sudden

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00{:}12{:}04{.}148 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}06{.}065$  after so many years where we had studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

00:12:06.065 --> 00:12:08.778 of 1520 people and found big effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00{:}12{:}08.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}10.868$  we now have people that say if we want

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:12:10.868 \rightarrow 00:12:14.820$  to do it well, we need 3 to 5000.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

00:12:14.820 --> 00:12:17.871 So I would argue in child psychiatry so far

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00{:}12{:}17.871 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}20.736$  without very few exceptions you can think of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00{:}12{:}20{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}23{.}938$  you know, but very rare syndromes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00{:}12{:}23{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}26{.}180$  not so sure OCD, there's some debate that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:12:26.180 \dashrightarrow 00:12:29.450$  that's quite specific, but otherwise.

00:12:29.450 --> 00:12:30.850 I think it's poor discrimination,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00{:}12{:}30{.}850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}32{.}790$  poor specificity, poor sensitivity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

00:12:32.790 --> 00:12:34.730 We've done machine learning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:12:34.730 \longrightarrow 00:12:36.090$  I'm not talking about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

00:12:36.090 --> 00:12:36.855 To overcome that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00{:}12{:}36.855 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}39.426$  what we find is a very small signal and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:12:39.426 \rightarrow 00:12:41.246$  actually something we already knew.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:12:41.250 \longrightarrow 00:12:43.990$  It's quite broad changes in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:12:43.990 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.086$  externalizing behaviors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:12:45.090 \rightarrow 00:12:46.546$  nothing very specific either.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

00:12:46.546 --> 00:12:48.730 So I think in sharp psychiatry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:12:48.730 \rightarrow 00:12:51.385$  my research has not contributed

NOTE Confidence: 0.9536714666666667

 $00:12:51.385 \longrightarrow 00:12:53.608$  that much for public health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00:12:55.870 \rightarrow 00:12:57.700$  That does not mean it's useless, of course.

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00:12:57.700 \rightarrow 00:12:59.905$  I would like to discuss prenatal exposures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00{:}12{:}59{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}02{.}054$  some old work and then zoom in more

- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:13:02.054 --> 00:13:04.630 recent work, ongoing work even.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}13{:}04{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}07{.}060$  And we identify important introduction
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}13{:}07.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}08.630$  influences on the Turtle Shine house.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}13{:}08.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}11.390$  And we've done a lot over the years.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:13:11.390 \longrightarrow 00:13:13.958$  We sort of in generation are measured as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}13{:}13{.}958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}16{.}890$  much as we could and we were quite creative.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:13:16.890 --> 00:13:18.310 We've got environmental toxins,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:13:18.310 --> 00:13:19.586 we've got thyroid poverty.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:13:19.586 --> 00:13:22.126 That's the recent thing that I added to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}13{:}22.126 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}24.406$  the list because I was interested in that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:13:24.410 \longrightarrow 00:13:24.730$  Depression.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}13{:}24.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}27.290$  So the bold ones are zooming on today.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:13:27.290 --> 00:13:30.441 One or two of you will know earlier work,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}13{:}30{.}441 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}33{.}220$  but poverty is very recent and the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:13:33.303 \rightarrow 00:13:36.749$  environmental stuff is just out last year.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

- $00:13:36.749 \longrightarrow 00:13:38.168$  So that's cool.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}13{:}38{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}40{.}538$  Discuss with me what you think is the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:13:40.538 \rightarrow 00:13:42.970$  role of imaging, which is so well funded.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:13:42.970 --> 00:13:45.077 You know, if you take the European
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:13:45.077 \rightarrow 00:13:46.850$  funding in the neuroscience,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:13:46.850 \rightarrow 00:13:49.850$  probably 1/2 goes to brain imaging,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:13:49.850 \longrightarrow 00:13:52.139$  which is shoot.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}13{:}52{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}54{.}006$  Not as much in the US
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}13{:}54.006 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}54.939$  interestingly relatively speaking,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:13:54.940 \rightarrow 00:13:58.810$  but a lot Okay just a bit about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:13:58.810 \rightarrow 00:14:00.380$  Generation R as a prospective cohort.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:14:00.380 --> 00:14:02.389 It started in early fetal life but
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:14:02.389 \longrightarrow 00:14:03.864$  early the inclusion we promised
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:14:03.864 \rightarrow 00:14:05.538$  and we had funding for 10,000,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}14{:}05{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}06{.}667$  I don't know for whatever reason the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:14:06.667 -> 00:14:08.180 end of the year came and we had to stop.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:14:08.180 \longrightarrow 00:14:09.788$  So we didn't manage the 10,000
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:14:09.788 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.860$  but we got close,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:14:10.860 --> 00:14:12.855 it's 10,000 if you know who's active.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}14{:}12{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}15{.}188$  It's still more than 5000 are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:14:15.188 --> 00:14:16.740 contributing participating 6000 which
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:14:16.798 --> 00:14:18.940 is very good if you start prenatally.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:14:18.940 --> 00:14:20.604 I think it's much better in a way
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:14:20.604 \rightarrow 00:14:22.574$  than ABCD because they have a 15%
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}14{:}22{.}574 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}24{.}938$  response rate at baseline or lower.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:14:24.940 \longrightarrow 00:14:27.633$  So this is a 62% response rate
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:14:27.633 --> 00:14:29.739 and then the Dutch majority group,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:14:29.740 \longrightarrow 00:14:31.018$  it's actually 70%.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}14{:}31{.}018 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}33{.}574$  So it's more selective in minorities,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:14:33.580 --> 00:14:35.617 it's urban and multiethnic and I do
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}14{:}35{.}617 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}38{.}007$  because I have a slide later on this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00{:}14{:}38{.}007 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}40{.}340$  ethnicity normally I sort of gloss over it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00:14:40.340 \rightarrow 00:14:41.540$  Note that if you're on Rotterdam,

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00{:}14{:}41{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}45{.}520$  it's not much different than in many of

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00:14:45.520 \rightarrow 00:14:48.130$  the Americans cities that about half.

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00:14:48.130 \longrightarrow 00:14:52.543$  Of the population is Dutch means

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00{:}14{:}52{.}543 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}55{.}608$  that has Dutch ancestry origin

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00:14:55.610 \longrightarrow 00:14:57.050 \ 10\%$  would be other Europeans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00:14:57.050 \longrightarrow 00:14:59.690$  So that's expats largely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

00:14:59.690 --> 00:15:01.684 And then you've got both migrant

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

00:15:01.684 --> 00:15:03.568 or guest worker I should say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00{:}15{:}03.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}05.646$  which are the Turkish for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00{:}15{:}05{.}650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}06{.}649$  and the Moroccans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00:15:06.649 \rightarrow 00:15:08.647$  And then you've got colonial history,

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

00:15:08.650 --> 00:15:10.850 people like tsunamis, Cape roses,

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

00:15:10.850 --> 00:15:12.029 also guest workers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00:15:12.029 \rightarrow 00:15:13.208$  but Dutch Antilles.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}15{:}13{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}16{.}059$  Are ex colonies of the Netherlands where
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}15{:}16.059 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}18.688$  people could migrate easily into meaning.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:15:18.690 --> 00:15:20.130 It's a very dangerous city.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:15:20.130 \longrightarrow 00:15:24.278$  And yeah, that's important because we'll
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:15:24.278 \rightarrow 00:15:28.330$  talk about poverty just about the measures.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:15:28.330 --> 00:15:29.130 I have no pointer,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:15:29.130 \rightarrow 00:15:30.130$  but I have a cursor,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- 00:15:30.130 --> 00:15:30.690 I'm told,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:15:30.690 \rightarrow 00:15:32.930$  so I don't want to go through measures.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:15:32.930 \rightarrow 00:15:34.178$  Nothing is more boring than telling
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}15{:}34{.}178 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}35{.}530$  you what we measured in the study,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}15{:}35{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}37{.}402$  but we measured a lot ultrasound
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}15{:}37{.}402 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}38{.}650$  in the beginning question naires,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00{:}15{:}38.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}40.966$  lots of motor development was exciting.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015
- $00:15:40.970 \rightarrow 00:15:42.636$  We have IQ measures but also actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00:15:42.636 \rightarrow 00:15:44.369$  of the parents which are the mother.

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

00:15:44.370 --> 00:15:46.395 It's very important to control

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

00:15:46.395 - 00:15:47.576 for baseline confounding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.943608015

 $00:15:47.576 \rightarrow 00:15:49.406$  If you have intrauterine infectors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:15:49.410 \longrightarrow 00:15:52.040$  what is sort of genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:15:52.040 \rightarrow 00:15:53.774$  background and then the imaging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:15:53.774 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.580$  I'll focus much of my talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:15:55.580 \longrightarrow 00:15:58.177$  On the imaging at age 9 to

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}15{:}58{.}177 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}00{.}860$  10 which is at 4000 people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}16{:}00{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}03{.}357$  I have one study later where we do a

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:16:03.357 \rightarrow 00:16:05.413$  follow up of the imaging which we have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:16:05.420 \longrightarrow 00:16:06.380$  This is actually a typo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:16:06.380 \longrightarrow 00:16:07.916$  It shouldn't be 4050.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:16:07.916 \longrightarrow 00:16:09.836$  This should be 3 thousands

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}16{:}09{.}836 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}11{.}474$  and 52 hundred 3200.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:16:11.474 \rightarrow 00:16:14.400$  Just copy pasted the wrong thing here.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:16:14.400 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.822$  So we have now three wave
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:16:15.822 \rightarrow 00:16:17.480$  completed and the 4th wave ongoing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:16:17.480 \longrightarrow 00:16:19.923$  In total it would be 6000 different
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}16{:}19{.}923 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}21{.}653$  individuals that have been scanned
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:16:21.653 \rightarrow 00:16:24.067$  of 5500 and the overlap is not that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:16:24.067 \rightarrow 00:16:27.190$  big but it is there to do nice multi
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:16:27.190 \longrightarrow 00:16:29.679$  level analysis over three waves already.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:16:29.680 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.157$  I would like to start with my
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:16:31.157 \rightarrow 00:16:32.575$  classical one of my classical
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- 00:16:32.575 --> 00:16:33.676 papers maternal depression.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:16:33.680 \longrightarrow 00:16:35.592$  So I think there we can learn a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}16{:}35{.}592 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}37{.}267$  bit about public health relevance
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}16{:}37{.}267 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}39{.}541$  and actually I'm saying that also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:16:39.541 \longrightarrow 00:16:41.524$  because it informed a study or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:16:41.524 \rightarrow 00:16:43.069$  work that I'm doing currently.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:16:43.070 \rightarrow 00:16:45.626$  Maternal depression from fetal life forward.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

00:16:45.630 --> 00:16:48.332 What I'm trying to show you is

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}16{:}48.332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}50.190$  that we've measured maternal

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:16:50.190 \rightarrow 00:16:52.690$  depressive symptoms at three time

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

00:16:52.690 --> 00:16:54.190 points during pregnancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}16{:}54{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}56{.}140$  This would have been for give me

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:16:56.140 \rightarrow 00:16:58.108$  that the error is not quite good.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:16:58.110 \rightarrow 00:17:00.390$  It should be after birth at two months,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}17{:}00{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}02{.}630$  after birth at three years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

00:17:02.630 --> 00:17:04.275 We didn't use that and we used

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:17:04.275 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.790$  it at 9 to 10 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}17{:}05{.}790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}09{.}125$  So 4 measures of maternal depression 1/2

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:17:09.125 \rightarrow 00:17:13.085$  just after birth in the early childhood and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:17:13.090 \longrightarrow 00:17:13.650$  At 10,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:17:13.650 \longrightarrow 00:17:14.770$  why is 10 interesting?

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}17{:}14.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}16.050$  That is interesting because that

- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:17:16.050 \rightarrow 00:17:17.330$  is cross-sectional if you wish.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:17:17.330 \longrightarrow 00:17:18.730$  Was the brain imaging,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}17{:}18.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}20.830$  focusing on the brain imaging at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:17:20.900 \longrightarrow 00:17:22.570$  10 years when we measured 4000
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}17{:}22{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}24{.}310$  children and not all in study
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:17:24.376 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.133$  at the end there will always be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- 00:17:26.133 --> 00:17:27.967 only 2000 or 3000 in the study,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:17:27.970 \rightarrow 00:17:30.562$  but that's at that time a very big study.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}17{:}30{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}33{.}770$  Certainly the biggest study was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}17{:}33.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}36.146$  prenatal exposure assessment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- 00:17:36.146 --> 00:17:39.618 prospective prenatal exposure assessment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}17{:}39.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}41.572$  And I always ask when I see the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:17:41.572 \dashrightarrow 00:17:43.698$  slides and those who have not seen it,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}17{:}43.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}48.525$  what time is there a strongest relation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}17{:}48.525 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}50.864$  of maternal depressive symptoms to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:17:50.864 \rightarrow 00:17:54.140$  the brain of a child measured at age 10?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

 $00{:}17{:}56{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}00{.}356$  So we've got it at during pregnancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

00:18:00.356 --> 00:18:04.214 just after birth, early childhood

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

 $00:18:04.214 \rightarrow 00:18:08.399$  and cross-sectional with the MRI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

 $00:18:08.400 \longrightarrow 00:18:11.420$  And the question is when?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

 $00{:}18{:}11{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}15{.}140$  Is there a relation between the NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

00:18:15.140 --> 00:18:17.000 maternal depressive symptoms

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

00:18:17.000 - 00:18:20.732 and the volume and connectivity

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

 $00:18:20.732 \longrightarrow 00:18:24.120$  of the child brain at age 10?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

00:18:24.120 --> 00:18:26.745 So is there a long term influence

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

00:18:26.745 --> 00:18:28.520 from prenatal life forward?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

 $00:18:28.520 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.374$  Is there an influence of early

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

 $00:18:32.374 \rightarrow 00:18:36.430$  after birth perinatal depression?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

 $00{:}18{:}36{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}38{.}788$  Is an influence of childhood depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

00:18:38.790 --> 00:18:43.930 or an influence of cross-sectional just

NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554

 $00:18:43.930 \rightarrow 00:18:47.230$  concurrent depression to the mother?

- NOTE Confidence: 0.90635554
- $00{:}18{:}47{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}48{.}740$  Talk about structure of the

 $00:18:48.740 \longrightarrow 00:18:50.750$  brain of the child at age 10.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

00:18:54.670 --> 00:18:55.909 So I'm not, as I sometimes do,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

 $00:18:55.910 \longrightarrow 00:18:57.350$  pull somebody up and say what

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

 $00:18:57.350 \longrightarrow 00:18:59.028$  do you think I'll do it myself.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

 $00{:}18{:}59{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}02{.}934$  You can think many people would think

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

 $00:19:02.934 \rightarrow 00:19:04.780$  it's either prenatal depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

 $00:19:04.780 \longrightarrow 00:19:07.265$  That has a big effect because that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

 $00:19:07.265 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.106$  when the child is in the womb.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

 $00{:}19{:}09{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}12{.}014$  So you would think that the mother's

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

00:19:12.014 --> 00:19:14.523 depression influences her Physiology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

 $00:19:14.523 \longrightarrow 00:19:17.588$  and that impacts the child.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

 $00{:}19{:}17{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}21{.}230$  You could argue for just after the birth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

 $00{:}19{:}21{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}25.066$  because that's a key period of attachment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857

 $00{:}19{:}25{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}26{.}445$  You could even argue somewhat

- $00:19:26.445 \longrightarrow 00:19:27.545$  less for the childhood,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- $00{:}19{:}27{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}30{.}259$  but you could argue for that because it's a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- 00:19:30.259 --> 00:19:32.843 long period of childhood upbringing anyway.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- $00:19:32.843 \longrightarrow 00:19:34.508$  If you look at this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- $00:19:34.510 \longrightarrow 00:19:36.030$  this is just very broad.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- $00:19:36.030 \rightarrow 00:19:38.350$  Total measures, Total white measure.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- $00:19:38.350 \longrightarrow 00:19:39.283$  Total Gray measure.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- 00:19:39.283 --> 00:19:40.527 Because we start with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- 00:19:40.527 --> 00:19:41.149 hierarchical approaches,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- $00:19:41.150 \longrightarrow 00:19:42.860$  doing big parts of the brain
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- $00{:}19{:}42.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}44.764$  and then zooming in on specific
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- $00:19:44.764 \longrightarrow 00:19:46.504$  regions if we find something.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- $00{:}19{:}46{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}48{.}750$  You can look at these small effects.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- 00:19:48.750 --> 00:19:51.510 They're actually translatable in centimeters.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.905031707142857
- 00:19:51.510 --> 00:19:52.030 Cubic.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- $00:19:55.350 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.880$  You can see nothing was

- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- $00:19:56.880 \longrightarrow 00:19:58.104$  the white matter much.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- $00{:}19{:}58{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}00{.}718$  And if you look at the Gray matter.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- $00:20:00.720 \longrightarrow 00:20:01.776$  There is a period,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- $00{:}20{:}01.776 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}04.190$  two months where there is an effect and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- $00:20:04.190 \longrightarrow 00:20:06.115$  again that survives multiple testing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- 00:20:06.120 --> 00:20:08.920 So if you want an answer from this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- $00{:}20{:}08{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}09{.}718$  it is not.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- 00:20:09.718 --> 00:20:11.314 And I've said that many times,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- $00{:}20{:}11{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}12{.}391$  for me, this is one of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- 00:20:12.391 --> 00:20:13.638 big it's a few years old now,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- $00:20:13.640 \longrightarrow 00:20:16.436$  four years ago we published it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556
- 00:20:16.440 --> 00:20:16.880 It's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00{:}20{:}19{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}21{.}634$  not the prenatal exposure that is most
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:20:21.634 \rightarrow 00:20:24.278$  important and we see that in some of this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:20:24.280 \longrightarrow 00:20:28.186$  it is actually just after birth.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
$00:20:28.190 \longrightarrow 00:20:30.446$  Where we see an effect and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

00:20:30.446 --> 00:20:31.950 that's actually very consistent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00{:}20{:}31{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}35{.}586$  So there's two ways to look at the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00:20:35.590 \rightarrow 00:20:38.621$  One is prenatal is not everything and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00{:}20{:}38.621 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}41.710$  sometimes the Doha people would tell you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00{:}20{:}41.710$  -->  $00{:}20{:}46.565$  Secondly, effects are small and if anything NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00{:}20{:}46.565 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}49.940$  that is a small effect postnatal depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

00:20:49.940 --> 00:20:53.390 which makes sense if you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00{:}20{:}53{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}54{.}702$  the literature and attachment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00{:}20{:}54.702 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}56.870$  maternal bonding and how important it is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00{:}20{:}56{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}59{.}229$  To have and how that is impacted

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00{:}20{:}59{.}229 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}00{.}790$  in clinically depressed mothers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

00:21:00.790 --> 00:21:02.509 If you look at and I'll show later some,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00:21:02.510 \longrightarrow 00:21:03.630$  I think some more DTI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00{:}21{:}03{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}05{.}870$  This is a slide of how we look at DTI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00:21:05.870 \longrightarrow 00:21:08.145$  We sort of don't integrate it all.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- 00:21:08.150 --> 00:21:09.510 We look at different tracts
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00{:}21{:}09{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}10.870$  which we then sometimes sum.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:10.870 \longrightarrow 00:21:12.790$  So this would be the connectivity
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:12.790 \longrightarrow 00:21:14.070$  in the white matter.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- 00:21:14.070 --> 00:21:16.662 You measure that with two measures FA or MD,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:16.670 \longrightarrow 00:21:18.290$  but it essentially shows you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:18.290 \longrightarrow 00:21:20.566$  the integrity of the in these.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00{:}21{:}20.566 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}21.542$  Different tracts.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:21.542 \longrightarrow 00:21:23.355$  We measured that. Well,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00{:}21{:}23.355 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}25.770$  that was just the global brain measures.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:25.770 \longrightarrow 00:21:28.038$  And I can tell you this effect is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00{:}21{:}28.038 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}30.530$  quite broad across parts of the brain.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:30.530 \longrightarrow 00:21:31.671$  So it's not just in the temporal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00{:}21{:}31{.}671 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}32{.}690$  lobe or the frontal lobe.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:32.690 \longrightarrow 00:21:35.210$  We find it a global effect.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

- $00:21:35.210 \longrightarrow 00:21:36.939$  And then we also looked at the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00{:}21{:}36{.}939 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}38{.}610$  DTI and what is interesting,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:38.610 \longrightarrow 00:21:39.570$  that's not so surprising.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:39.570 \rightarrow 00:21:42.407$  Well, there was nothing in the white matter.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:42.410 \longrightarrow 00:21:45.815$  We saw that the tracts, the general tracts,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00{:}21{:}45.815 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}47.690$  the integrity of the tracts.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:47.690 \longrightarrow 00:21:51.122$  Again, depression at 2:00.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:51.122 \rightarrow 00:21:53.692$  Months Postnatally there was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00{:}21{:}53.692 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}55.722$  less integrity of these tracts
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00{:}21{:}55{.}722 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}57{.}654$  together and trust me there's not
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:57.654 \longrightarrow 00:21:59.438$  a single track that does it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:21:59.440 \rightarrow 00:22:03.199$  These global integrity of tracts is less,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:22:03.200 \longrightarrow 00:22:06.476$  is less clear is there's less
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:22:06.480 \longrightarrow 00:22:07.880$  integrity in these tracts.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00{:}22{:}07{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}10{.}760$  And then in fact was the depression at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:22:10.760 \longrightarrow 00:22:13.884$  two months on the child brain of 10 years.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725
- $00:22:13.884 \rightarrow 00:22:15.936$  So it's different exposure times was

 $00{:}22{:}15{.}936 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}18{.}098$  one outcome time always at 10 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00{:}22{:}18{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}19{.}465$  So you see the effect and there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00:22:19.465 \rightarrow 00:22:19.855$  nothing Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9224557725

 $00:22:19.860 \longrightarrow 00:22:20.740$  there's prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.936899133333333

 $00{:}22{:}24.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}29.188$  If we discuss public health relevance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936899133333333

 $00{:}22{:}29{.}188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}33{.}124$  you will not want me to say we now

NOTE Confidence: 0.936899133333333

 $00{:}22{:}33{.}124 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}34{.}984$  found that maternal depression is

NOTE Confidence: 0.936899133333333

 $00{:}22{:}34{.}984 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}36{.}723$  important because there's fifty years

NOTE Confidence: 0.936899133333333

 $00:22:36.723 \longrightarrow 00:22:38.979$  or 100 years of research to show that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936899133333333

00:22:38.980 --> 00:22:41.500 You might want to say, wow, he has a

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}22{:}44.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}48.410$  way of finding sensitive periods.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}22{:}48.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}50.608$  And that's why I would think perhaps,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}22{:}50.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}53.564$  but really, honestly, I don't think so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

00:22:53.570 --> 00:22:58.030 And I'll tell you why I tell you that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504  $00{:}23{:}00{.}836 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}03{.}314$  differently that you can with Social NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504  $00:23:03.314 \rightarrow 00:23:07.284$  adversity study sensitive periods. NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504 00:23:07.284 --> 00:23:09.643 I actually have tried to do that NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504  $00:23:09.643 \rightarrow 00:23:11.426$  now with measure of homelessness NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504  $00:23:11.426 \rightarrow 00:23:13.490$  and other work in my group. NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504  $00{:}23{:}13.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}16.538$  We feel that is largely flawed. NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504 00:23:16.540 --> 00:23:18.780 Because of the following thing, NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504 00:23:18.780 --> 00:23:21.125 depression in mothers does not NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504  $00:23:21.125 \rightarrow 00:23:23.940$  occur in isolate meaning over time. NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504  $00{:}23{:}23{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}25{.}948$  What I mean is that is a mother NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504  $00:23:25.948 \longrightarrow 00:23:28.025$  that is depressed at two months NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504  $00:23:28.025 \rightarrow 00:23:30.956$  after birth has likely some elevated NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504  $00:23:30.956 \rightarrow 00:23:32.919$  symptoms already during pregnancy. NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504 00:23:32.919 --> 00:23:35.608 Not only likely, very likely, NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504  $00:23:35.608 \rightarrow 00:23:41.060$  meaning that all these poverty, abuse, 41

00:22:58.030 --> 00:23:00.836 And I know people in everywhere think

00:23:41.060 --> 00:23:43.180 depression, all these risk factors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}23{:}43.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}45.880$  all these social adversities are studying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}23{:}45{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}49{.}788$  Have a high carry over and we cannot NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}23{:}49{.}788 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}53{.}680$  validly or have seen very little studies NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00:23:53.790 \longrightarrow 00:23:56.268$  to validly study the period specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

00:23:56.268 --> 00:23:57.924 exposure because then you would have

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00:23:57.924 \longrightarrow 00:23:59.831$  to have people that have it only in

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

00:23:59.831 - 00:24:01.399 this period and not in the others.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

00:24:01.400 --> 00:24:03.647 And if you see how carefully they

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00:24:03.647 \rightarrow 00:24:05.599$  account for the other periods,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}24{:}05{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}08{.}080$  I can tell you in most models I've

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}24{:}08{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}10.617$  seen that is flawed, including my own.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

00:24:10.617 --> 00:24:13.270 So I'll show you why it's flawed

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}24{:}13.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}15.550$  and this is the trajectories.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}24{:}15{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}17{.}338$  It's flawed because the mothers who

 $00:24:17.338 \rightarrow 00:24:19.297$  have that peak of depressive symptoms

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}24{:}19{.}297 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}21{.}421$  at two months were actually those

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00:24:21.421 \longrightarrow 00:24:23.427$  that were on average as a group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00:24:23.430 \longrightarrow 00:24:24.798$  If we just do these trajectories

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}24{:}24{.}798 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}26{.}190$  and we classify them in groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00:24:26.190 \longrightarrow 00:24:27.265$  and we forget about that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00:24:27.270 \longrightarrow 00:24:28.910$  this is of course a continuum, this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}24{:}28{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}30{.}870$  this series of continuum on that level.

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}24{:}30{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}32{.}270$  But if we do them in four groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00:24:32.270 \rightarrow 00:24:33.859$  we see this group that actually I

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}24{:}33.859 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}35.589$  can tell you carries the results,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00:24:35.590 \rightarrow 00:24:36.938$  has high levels here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00:24:36.938 \rightarrow 00:24:39.330$  super high levels here and then keeps

NOTE Confidence: 0.95635504

 $00{:}24{:}39{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}41{.}706$  on in the all these ten years after.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00:24:43.780 \rightarrow 00:24:46.120$  Assessments to be reasonably high because

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00:24:46.120 \longrightarrow 00:24:49.024$  this is 0.7 is exactly where the clinical

- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:24:49.024 \rightarrow 00:24:51.460$  line of clinical severity would have been,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}24{:}51{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}53{.}292$  meaning that there is a group that has
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}24{:}53{.}292 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}54{.}860$  clinical symptoms but they're high all over.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}24{:}54{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}56{.}080$  And of course there are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:24:56.080 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.300$  some that have only high.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}24{:}57{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}59{.}148$  When the children get older, only in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:24:59.148 \rightarrow 00:25:01.416$  sort of childhood life they develop it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:25:01.420 \longrightarrow 00:25:03.140$  It's a small group actually,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}25{:}03{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}06{.}578$  but the important thing is that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:25:06.580 \longrightarrow 00:25:07.732$  These are so tied,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}25{:}07{.}732 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}10.648$  So to say that this is the unique effect
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- 00:25:10.648 --> 00:25:13.748 of this episode when they're far be above
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}25{:}13.748 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}16.695$  clinical levels and others makes no sense.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}25{:}16.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}19.100$  It is because it's not like an infection.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}25{:}19{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}20{.}871$  It's not like a COVID infection where
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00:25:20.871 \rightarrow 00:25:22.757$  you can say that during pregnancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

00:25:22.757 --> 00:25:24.893 because you don't have continuous COVID,

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00:25:24.900 \longrightarrow 00:25:26.720$  well, not the infection probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00:25:26.720 \longrightarrow 00:25:28.540$  over 10 years is different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00{:}25{:}28.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}29.580$  I think it doesn't work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00{:}25{:}29{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}31{.}836$  We've done it with homelessness and then we

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00:25:31.836 \rightarrow 00:25:34.318$  have a set where people experience only.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00{:}25{:}34{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}35{.}958$  Short time and then find housing again

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00{:}25{:}35{.}958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}37{.}841$  and if you have very detailed data I

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00{:}25{:}37{.}841 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}39{.}639$  think you can do that with poverty.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00{:}25{:}39{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}42{.}769$  But people who are really below the

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00:25:42.769 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.348$  poverty line will have been mostly

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00:25:45.348 \rightarrow 00:25:48.840$  in a tough spot a year or two later

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00:25:48.939 \longrightarrow 00:25:51.159$  or a year or two before.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00{:}25{:}51{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}52{.}680$  So indeed that was consistent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00:25:52.680 \rightarrow 00:25:55.480$  So there is this carry over effects,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:25:55.480 \longrightarrow 00:25:57.280$  there is these.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}25{:}57{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}58{.}664$  Perhaps there's a biological
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:25:58.664 \rightarrow 00:26:00.048$  rapid development post natally
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:26:00.048 \rightarrow 00:26:01.600$  there are sensitive peers,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:26:01.600 \longrightarrow 00:26:02.284$  there's good ideas.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:26:02.284 \longrightarrow 00:26:04.319$  I think we might be able to do that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:26:04.320 \rightarrow 00:26:05.766$  I'll show you later something with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:26:05.766 \rightarrow 00:26:07.202$  the thyroid hormones where we managed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}26{:}07{.}202 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}08{.}480$  to do that with sensitive peers.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}26{:}08.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}10.655$  I think with social adversities
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:26:10.655 \longrightarrow 00:26:12.395$  we cannot do that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00{:}26{:}12.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}14.944$  So if you judge this study
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- 00:26:14.944 --> 00:26:16.640 against public health relevance,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- 00:26:16.640 --> 00:26:19.763 give me a two out of five because I
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075
- $00:26:19.763 \rightarrow 00:26:22.580$  think the carry sort of the sensitive
- NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00:26:22.580 \rightarrow 00:26:25.440$  period effects which I marketed as.

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

 $00{:}26{:}25{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}27{.}920$  Don't convince me myself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.949059075

00:26:27.920 --> 00:26:29.355 and I hope I don't convince you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

00:26:31.400 --> 00:26:32.190 It's interesting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

00:26:32.190 --> 00:26:34.955 but I don't think it should guide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00{:}26{:}34{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}35{.}720$  It did for a while,

00:26:35.720 --> 00:26:37.252 influenced me that I thought, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00{:}26{:}37{.}252 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}39{.}520$  I have to put more of my research

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:26:39.520 \rightarrow 00:26:41.160$  time into very early depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

00:26:41.160 --> 00:26:42.960 I think that's still valid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:26:42.960 \longrightarrow 00:26:45.840$  but I'm not so sure that we need

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:26:45.840 \longrightarrow 00:26:47.600$  imaging research to show that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:26:47.600 \longrightarrow 00:26:49.472$  I'll show you because it's very

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:26:49.472 \rightarrow 00:26:52.058$  popular now to do imaging and poverty.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:26:52.060 \longrightarrow 00:26:54.108$  I'll show you a bit of that result

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

00:26:54.108 --> 00:26:56.180 and then an angle I tried to take

 $00{:}26{:}56{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}57{.}996$  and I'm trying to hear your thoughts

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:26:57.996 \longrightarrow 00:27:00.232$  or at least look at you whether it

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:00.232 \rightarrow 00:27:02.136$  might convince you what we did there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00{:}27{:}02{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}04{.}805$  So household income has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:04.805 \longrightarrow 00:27:06.937$  associated with brain morphology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:06.940 \longrightarrow 00:27:10.166$  We had this data prospectively from it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:10.166 \rightarrow 00:27:12.934$  Life again that's a sort of marketing trick.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:12.940 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.054$  So we show you that we did that and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.944726222222222

 $00{:}27{:}16.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}18.328$  I was interested in two things, the timing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:18.328 \longrightarrow 00:27:21.100$  So is it different if it's prenatal or later?

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00{:}27{:}21{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}23{.}151$  And I was also interested if it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

00:27:23.151 -> 00:27:24.364 different in minority majority

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00{:}27{:}24.364 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}26.580$  and I'll come to that why I'm so

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00{:}27{:}26.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}27.978$  interested in that in a minute.

 $00:27:27.980 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.143$  So if we have 2000 children against

00:27:30.143 - > 00:27:32.658 imaging at 10 years poverty defined as

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:32.660 \longrightarrow 00:27:34.580$  national low income threshold in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:34.580 \longrightarrow 00:27:36.400$  Netherlands, that's nicely defined.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:36.400 \rightarrow 00:27:39.872$  So you get different analyses, you can do it.

 $00{:}27{:}39{.}872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}41{.}780$  Never low income and ever low income.

 $00{:}27{:}41.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}43.775$  Note that we have repeatedly assessed income,

 $00:27:43.780 \longrightarrow 00:27:46.490$  So what people? You can just simply do it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

00:27:46.490 --> 00:27:48.765 Have you ever in any period been

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00{:}27{:}48.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}50.968$  poor and we can do that chronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:50.968 \rightarrow 00:27:53.210$  or for example in pregnancy only.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:53.210 \longrightarrow 00:27:56.896$  And what you see is just the

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:56.896 \longrightarrow 00:27:58.689$  distribution which made it for me,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:27:58.690 \rightarrow 00:28:03.328$  made this a very complicated distribution

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00{:}28{:}03{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}06{.}954$  because in the Netherlands and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.944726222222222

 $00:28:06.954 \rightarrow 00:28:09.130$  see a very similar pattern in the US,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:09.130 \longrightarrow 00:28:11.657$  it's just not immigrant.

00:28:11.657 --> 00:28:13.598 Or non western,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:13.598 \rightarrow 00:28:17.342$  it's just classified as white and non white.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00{:}28{:}17{.}342 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}19{.}550$  You would see a very similar pattern

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:19.550 \longrightarrow 00:28:23.598$  that those that are poor are very often

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:23.598 \longrightarrow 00:28:25.950$  from here from a non western background.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00{:}28{:}25{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}28{.}830$  So there is a racial ethnic patterning

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:28.830 \longrightarrow 00:28:30.830$  of poverty in the Netherlands.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00{:}28{:}30{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}33{.}630$  There's a racial ethnic pattern

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:33.630 \longrightarrow 00:28:37.838$  of poverty in the in America.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

00:28:37.840 - 00:28:39.800 So you see that of the four hundreds,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:39.800 \longrightarrow 00:28:41.156$  quite a few that were poor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00{:}28{:}41{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}45{.}110$  so 20% were poor at one time a

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:45.110 \longrightarrow 00:28:47.260$  majority would have been from

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:47.260 \longrightarrow 00:28:48.892$  long Western and then we have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:48.892 \rightarrow 00:28:50.346$  you can see the numbers 100 people

 $00:28:50.346 \longrightarrow 00:28:51.596$  that were poor in pregnancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:51.600 \longrightarrow 00:28:54.440$  100 and 200 that were poor at any one time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:54.440 \longrightarrow 00:28:55.718$  So you can see the breakdown

NOTE Confidence: 0.94472622222222

 $00:28:55.718 \longrightarrow 00:28:56.357$  of these numbers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00:28:58.760 \longrightarrow 00:29:01.560$  Here is so how it looks at truth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00{:}29{:}01.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}02.928$  You can see all the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00:29:02.928 \longrightarrow 00:29:03.840$  results that you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

00:29:03.840 --> 00:29:05.280 If you analyze, you get,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00{:}29{:}05{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}07{.}384$  even if you take this broad approach of

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00{:}29{:}07{.}384 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}09{.}291$  total brain volume and Gray volume and

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00{:}29{:}09{.}291 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}10{.}980$  then the typical hippocampus, amygdala.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00:29:10.980 \longrightarrow 00:29:14.480$  If you do this mix of global and

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00:29:14.480 \longrightarrow 00:29:16.417$  to specific areas, researchers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

00:29:16.417 -> 00:29:18.679 regions of interest, you see with

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00:29:18.679 \rightarrow 00:29:20.800$  these many poverty categorizations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00:29:20.800 \longrightarrow 00:29:24.448$  you see all these patterns and then you

- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- $00:29:24.448 \rightarrow 00:29:26.926$  can look where there's significance.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- 00:29:26.926 --> 00:29:28.810 And honestly, you could find,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- 00:29:28.810 --> 00:29:30.770 that's why I had it in red,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- $00{:}29{:}30{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}32{.}350$  some association between the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- $00{:}29{:}32{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}33{.}930$  amygdala volume and poverty.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- 00:29:33.930 --> 00:29:35.085 And if you look at it carefully,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- $00:29:35.090 \rightarrow 00:29:36.570$  this is the reference group.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- 00:29:36.570 --> 00:29:37.926 Never. Then you see what's this?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- $00{:}29{:}37{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}39{.}568$  This is the low income childhood only.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- $00:29:39.570 \longrightarrow 00:29:40.890$  There seems to be no effect.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- 00:29:40.890 --> 00:29:43.450 But if you're chronically poor,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- 00:29:43.450 --> 00:29:46.824 if you're chronic poor, or if you're.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- $00:29:46.830 \longrightarrow 00:29:48.030$  So ever low income is cost,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- $00:29:48.030 \longrightarrow 00:29:48.486$  a combination,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225
- $00:29:48.486 \longrightarrow 00:29:49.854$  but it's really by low income
- NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

00:29:49.854 --> 00:29:51.028 and pregnancy or chronic force.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

00:29:51.030 --> 00:29:53.420 So it really seems to be, if anything,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00:29:53.420 \rightarrow 00:29:56.030$  the pregnancy that might drive it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00{:}29{:}56{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}56{.}674$  the amygdala.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00{:}29{:}56.674 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}59.250$  But I can truthfully tell you that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00{:}29{:}59{.}319 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}01{.}389$  does not survive multiple testing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00:30:01.390 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.698$  So there would be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00:30:02.698 \rightarrow 00:30:05.110$  if anything overall in the total group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.915885225

 $00{:}30{:}05{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}06{.}350$  no real.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

 $00:30:10.690 \rightarrow 00:30:13.130$  Convincing or strong consistent effect?

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

 $00{:}30{:}13.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}15.090$  Not on the global measures for sure

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

 $00:30:15.090 \dashrightarrow 00:30:16.326$  and on these regions of interest.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

00:30:16.330 --> 00:30:18.460 Well, if you find it somewhere

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

00:30:18.460 -> 00:30:19.525 just borderline significant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

 $00:30:19.530 \longrightarrow 00:30:23.130$  you should probably discount it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

 $00:30:23.130 \longrightarrow 00:30:25.248$  However, we had very good data

- NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576
- $00:30:25.248 \longrightarrow 00:30:27.672$  from Child IQ that certainly the

 $00{:}30{:}27.672 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}30.012$  pregnancy was very different in

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

 $00:30:30.012 \rightarrow 00:30:32.650$  minority groups and majority groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

 $00{:}30{:}32{.}650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}35{.}116$  so we had reason from that

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

 $00:30:35.116 \longrightarrow 00:30:37.749$  paper to stratify a sample in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

 $00{:}30{:}37{.}750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}39{.}710$  Let me call it Western or Nonwestern.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

00:30:39.710 --> 00:30:41.824 That's the Dutch, Dutch language in America.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

00:30:41.830 --> 00:30:43.355 Western on Western is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

00:30:43.355 - 00:30:44.270 really cool anymore,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96440576

 $00:30:44.270 \longrightarrow 00:30:45.750$  So I'd rather should say

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

00:30:48.030 --> 00:30:49.422 it's not immigrants,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00{:}30{:}49{.}422 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}52{.}206$  it's people whose ancestors were born

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00:30:52.206 \rightarrow 00:30:54.620$  in probably not high income countries

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00{:}30{:}54.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}57.445$  and came to the Netherlands for colonial

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

00:30:57.445 --> 00:30:59.465 history reasons or work reasons,

 $00:30:59.470 \rightarrow 00:31:04.134$  and the Dutch and the Dutch and European.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

00:31:04.134 --> 00:31:06.774 Community on the other hand,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00:31:06.780 \longrightarrow 00:31:09.412$  and why do I think that's a very

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

00:31:09.412 --> 00:31:10.820 important difference in poverty?

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00:31:10.820 \rightarrow 00:31:12.740$  Not only did we have some prior results,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00:31:12.740 \longrightarrow 00:31:15.099$  but also we know that if you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00:31:15.099 \dashrightarrow 00:31:16.465$  financially strained and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

00:31:16.465 - 00:31:18.217 have a network in the country,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00{:}31{:}18{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}19{.}996$  that's a different thing if your

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00:31:19.996 \rightarrow 00:31:21.982$  family lives there than if you come

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00{:}31{:}21{.}982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}23{.}718$  as an immigrant from the Cape Verin

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00{:}31{:}23.779 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}25.417$  Islands to work in the harbour.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00:31:25.420 \rightarrow 00:31:28.093$  If you're then out of job then you're really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00:31:28.100 \rightarrow 00:31:29.628$  it really is tough.

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00:31:29.628 \longrightarrow 00:31:31.538$  So that's why we stratified

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00:31:31.538 \rightarrow 00:31:33.648$  for these groups and then.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- $00{:}31{:}33.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}35.505$  We see if we do that and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- 00:31:35.505 00:31:37.089 this is only the Dutch,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- $00{:}31{:}37{.}090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}39{.}372$  we actually all of a sudden saw
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- $00:31:39.372 \rightarrow 00:31:41.548$  very broad effects on cerebral and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- $00:31:41.548 \rightarrow 00:31:43.810$  other broad parameters of the brain.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- $00:31:43.810 \longrightarrow 00:31:48.248$  So taking out this big group of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- 00:31:48.250 --> 00:31:50.418 non Dutch ancestry participants,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- $00:31:50.418 \rightarrow 00:31:54.120$  let's call it that way, not Dutch ancestry,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- $00{:}31{:}54{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}56{.}430$  but taking them out shoulders all of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- $00:31:56.498 \dashrightarrow 00:32:00.310$  a sudden we had a strong effect in.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- $00:32:00.310 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.674$  The overall brain volume.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- $00:32:01.674 \rightarrow 00:32:03.720$  But what was perhaps more interesting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- $00{:}32{:}03.775 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}04.747$  in the numb Dutch.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- 00:32:04.750 --> 00:32:06.110 So this was the Dutch.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896
- $00:32:06.110 \longrightarrow 00:32:07.510$  This is the numb Dutch.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00:32:07.510 \longrightarrow 00:32:09.268$  We didn't see any global parameters,

NOTE Confidence: 0.950316896

 $00{:}32{:}09{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}11.790$  but we see very consistently

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:32:14.190 \rightarrow 00:32:16.864$  the effects of in pregnancy or chronic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

00:32:16.870 - 00:32:18.250 which also means in pregnancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}32{:}18.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}19.630$  and later on as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}32{:}19.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}21.542$  If you pull that group to sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:32:21.542 \rightarrow 00:32:24.206$  ever in pregnancy, we get a very.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

00:32:24.206 --> 00:32:26.510 Very significant effect on consistent because

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:32:26.577 \rightarrow 00:32:29.454$  it's significant in both of the subgroupings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

00:32:29.460 --> 00:32:31.168 If you pull it, it gets very

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}32{:}31{.}168 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}32{.}740$  significant in effect on the amygdala.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:32:32.740 \dashrightarrow 00:32:34.819$  So we get a very different pattern.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}32{:}34{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}37{.}740$  So we get a much more stress related

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}32{:}37{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}41{.}264$  grain poverty pattern in the non Dutch

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:32:41.264 \rightarrow 00:32:43.938$  ancestry group and a very global effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:32:43.940 \dashrightarrow 00:32:46.500$  It's very hard to think what that means.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:32:46.500 \longrightarrow 00:32:47.229$  Does that valid?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- 00:32:47.229 --> 00:32:48.687 I can tell you I immediately
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00{:}32{:}48.687 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}49.896$  looked at the ABCD data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:32:49.896 \longrightarrow 00:32:52.122$  Does it also fall apart in similar
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:32:52.122 \rightarrow 00:32:54.430$  patterning and again of course that would be.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:32:54.430 \longrightarrow 00:32:56.386$  Would be none, white and white,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:32:56.390 \longrightarrow 00:32:57.950$  probably what you could do.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- 00:32:57.950 --> 00:32:58.823 And it's interesting,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00{:}32{:}58.823 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}00.860$  we saw the same similar different complicated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:33:00.905 \rightarrow 00:33:02.470$  pattern for the behavioral outcomes,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:33:02.470 \longrightarrow 00:33:04.227$  but not so much for the brain.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00{:}33{:}04{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}07{.}200$  So there is some reason to think that if
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:33:07.200 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.668$  poverty comes with different stresses,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00{:}33{:}09{.}670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}10{.}870$  it could have a different
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:33:10.870 \longrightarrow 00:33:11.830$  meaning for the brain.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:11.830 \longrightarrow 00:33:13.606$  We see that very clearly for

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

00:33:13.606 - 00:33:15.150 the behaviour also in ABCD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}33{:}15{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}16{.}550$  but not for the brain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:16.550 \dashrightarrow 00:33:19.077$  And I haven't looked at the amygdala.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}33{:}19{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}20{.}928$  As they make that and actually in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}33{:}20{.}928 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}22{.}479$  Dutch this really predicted school

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:22.479 \rightarrow 00:33:24.199$  performance so it was meaningful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}33{:}24.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}26.912$  So if you summarize early in life poverty

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}33{:}26{.}912 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}29{.}600$  and pre adolescent brain morphology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:29.600 \rightarrow 00:33:31.630$  there is an association but they really

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:31.630 \dashrightarrow 00:33:33.518$  differ from majority and minority groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}33{:}33{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}35{.}571$  And was all the caveats that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}33{:}35{.}571 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}37{.}394$  hate this subtyping of majority and

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:37.394 \rightarrow 00:33:39.680$  minority that's up to you to dislike it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:39.680 \rightarrow 00:33:42.150$  I think that is some evidence that we do it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:42.150 \longrightarrow 00:33:42.532$  In America,

 $00:33:42.532 \longrightarrow 00:33:44.060$  I would say we should do it to

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}33{:}44.106 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}45.781$  some extent because poverty and

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

00:33:45.781 --> 00:33:46.786 discrimination go together,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:46.790 \rightarrow 00:33:49.548$  which makes a very different terrible mix.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}33{:}49{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}51{.}727$  In the Netherlands it is also discrimination

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:51.727 \rightarrow 00:33:54.269$  and stress of surviving financial strength.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}33{:}54{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}56{.}318$  So there is some reason to do that

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:56.318 \rightarrow 00:33:58.508$  and this I think what that reflects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:58.510 \longrightarrow 00:33:59.323$  I'll be very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:33:59.323 \longrightarrow 00:34:00.949$  very careful to speculate about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:34:00.950 \longrightarrow 00:34:02.588$  I think it could also be

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:34:02.590 \longrightarrow 00:34:03.758$  genetically associated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:34:03.758 \longrightarrow 00:34:05.510$  we don't know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}34{:}05{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}09{.}426$  but in the in the minority groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}34{:}09{.}426 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}11{.}460$  as I call them here or.

 $00:34:11.460 \rightarrow 00:34:13.014$  If you want the real nice terminology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

00:34:13.020 -> 00:34:16.050 I think the exact terminology the

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:34:16.050 \rightarrow 00:34:17.873$  non Dutch and ancestry group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

00:34:17.873 - 00:34:19.499 I think it is likely stressed

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}34{:}19{.}499 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}21{.}107$  by discrimination and because we

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}34{:}21.107 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}23.259$  have that variable in the model I

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:34:23.259 \longrightarrow 00:34:25.512$  can tell you pull it in and it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:34:25.512 \rightarrow 00:34:27.776$  substantially weakened the association.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

00:34:27.780 --> 00:34:29.495 So it's not a real mediation analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}34{:}29{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}31{.}012$  but there is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}34{:}31{.}012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}33{.}020$  About 30% of the association and

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:34:33.020 \longrightarrow 00:34:34.860$  that was a very crude measure of

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:34:34.860 \rightarrow 00:34:35.724$  discrimination disappeared once

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:34:35.724 \rightarrow 00:34:37.452$  we put that in the model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00:34:37.460 \longrightarrow 00:34:39.140$  So I think there's real reason to

NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714

 $00{:}34{:}39{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}40{.}950$  think that could be different and we

- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:34:40.950 \rightarrow 00:34:42.504$  have to think more carefully about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00{:}34{:}42{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}44{.}099$  our neurodevelopmental measures.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- 00:34:44.100 --> 00:34:47.156 I'll do the thyroid and then another,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:34:47.156 \longrightarrow 00:34:48.820$  I'll do that quickly.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:34:48.820 \rightarrow 00:34:50.578$  I've presented that for many times.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00{:}34{:}50{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}55{.}920$  So what would that be in if you give me.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- 00:34:55.920 --> 00:34:57.168 My sort of scale,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946004114285714
- $00:34:57.168 \longrightarrow 00:34:59.040$  my own scales is rating your
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90946515
- $00{:}34{:}59{.}109 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}00{.}960$ own work. But let's do it critical.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90946515
- $00:35:00.960 \longrightarrow 00:35:03.174$  I think we're still only at a three out
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90946515
- $00:35:03.174 \dashrightarrow 00:35:06.010$  of five of public health because to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90946515
- $00:35:06.010 \dashrightarrow 00:35:09.235$  think that poverty measures mentioned
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90946515
- $00:35:09.240 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.120$  poverty matters for the brain,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90946515
- $00{:}35{:}11{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}14{.}153$  I don't think we need too much brain imaging.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90946515
- $00{:}35{:}14.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}17.170$  But, you know, to carefully dissect the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90946515

00:35:17.170 --> 00:35:19.728 effects of minority groups again, Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90946515

 $00{:}35{:}19.728 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}21.712$  really, do we need the imaging for that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:35:23.850 \longrightarrow 00:35:25.638$  Although I think that it has

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:35:25.638 \rightarrow 00:35:27.290$  lasting effects on child brains,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}35{:}27{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}30{.}020$  that it what is it affects is

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:35:30.020 \rightarrow 00:35:32.460$  associated with child brains may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:35:32.460 \dashrightarrow 00:35:34.285$  very different How it associates

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:35:34.285 \rightarrow 00:35:36.807$  with the brain where you come from,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}35{:}36{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}39{.}058$  It's at least makes us think so give

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:35:39.058 \rightarrow 00:35:41.780$  me a three out of five perhaps we want

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:35:41.780 \longrightarrow 00:35:43.716$  to go to four out of five, don't we?

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:35:43.716 \dashrightarrow 00:35:45.954$  So here's thyroid where I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:35:45.954 \longrightarrow 00:35:47.569$  we can manage thy roid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}35{:}47{.}569 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}50{.}440$  Old work of mine and it was one recent

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

00:35:50.514 --> 00:35:53.370 update which is I think quite spectacular.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}35{:}53{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}54{.}746$  Thyroid of the brain,

 $00:35:54.746 \rightarrow 00:35:57.250$  So note that the maternal thyroid brain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:35:57.250 \rightarrow 00:35:59.026$  So maternal thyroid hormones are very

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:35:59.026 \rightarrow 00:36:00.850$  important for the brain development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:36:00.850 \dashrightarrow 00:36:02.850$  Animal work has shown convincingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}36{:}02{.}850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}04{.}450$  that actually it's fascinating

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}36{:}04{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}06{.}687$  that the neurogenesis and it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:36:06.687 \rightarrow 00:36:08.467$  particularly the neuro neuromigration

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

00:36:08.467 --> 00:36:10.450 which actually comes from around,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:36:10.450 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.030$  you know the central,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}36{:}12.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}14.570$  the ventricles and then the neurons

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

00:36:14.570 --> 00:36:16.970 migrate out to your cortex.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

00:36:16.970 - 00:36:19.230 Obviously that's where they are

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}36{:}19{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}22{.}429$  in our brains that is guided by.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}36{:}22{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}26{.}130$  Thyroid hormones that happens in

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}36{:}26{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}30{.}355$  early embryonic life when the embryo

 $00:36:30.355 \rightarrow 00:36:34.950$  is reliant on the maternal thyroid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:36:34.950 \dashrightarrow 00:36:37.310$  So much of the neurodevelopment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:36:37.310 \longrightarrow 00:36:39.298$  So the nature is seem sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:36:39.298 \longrightarrow 00:36:39.866$  very pasimonious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}36{:}39{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}41{.}290$  It has only 10 mechanisms

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}36{:}41.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}42.710$  and what does you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}36{:}42.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}44.565$  vitamin D does something and

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:36:44.565 \rightarrow 00:36:46.420$  serotonin do something very different

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:36:46.483 \longrightarrow 00:36:48.577$  in the fetal life they're much

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}36{:}48{.}577 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}49{.}973$  more neurodevelopmental than in

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:36:50.030 \rightarrow 00:36:51.098$  us where they have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

00:36:51.100 --> 00:36:52.316 Very new endocrine function,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

00:36:52.316 --> 00:36:53.836 but they have very new

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:36:53.836 \rightarrow 00:36:54.660$  developmental functions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}36{:}54{.}660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}57{.}498$  All these systems and in particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:36:57.498 \rightarrow 00:37:00.211$  thyroid in pregnancy and only in

 $00:37:00.211 \longrightarrow 00:37:02.801$  week 14 does then the fetus produce

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:02.801 \longrightarrow 00:37:05.776$  its own thyroid and only by week 20,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:05.780 \dashrightarrow 00:37:08.264$  so sometime later does it produce

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:08.264 \rightarrow 00:37:10.700$  somewhat sufficient levels and takes over.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}37{:}10.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}13.364$  So in that time the mother

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:13.364 \longrightarrow 00:37:14.696$  supplies the thyroid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}37{:}14.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}17.049$  In that time many women who have a low

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:17.049 \longrightarrow 00:37:19.267$  thyroid function actually become a bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:19.267 \rightarrow 00:37:21.167$  hyperthyroid because they need more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:21.170 \rightarrow 00:37:22.034$  There's very good graphs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:22.034 \rightarrow 00:37:23.573$  I haven't got them with me because

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}37{:}23{.}573 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}25{.}125$  I do a short version of this talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

00:37:25.130 - 00:37:27.090 But trust me, there's very good work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

00:37:27.090 --> 00:37:28.170 mostly animal work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}37{:}28.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}30.330$  very consistent that we need the

 $00:37:30.330 \longrightarrow 00:37:32.610$  thyroid levels for a brain development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:32.610 \longrightarrow 00:37:34.914$  And what we showed in the very early

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:34.914 \rightarrow 00:37:36.730$  publications, nearly ten years ago now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:36.730 \rightarrow 00:37:39.410$  is that if you take the total sample,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}37{:}39{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}44{.}106$  and this is the measure of s s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

00:37:44.110 --> 00:37:44.448 SRS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}37{:}44{.}448 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}46{.}138$  the social responsiveness of good

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}37{:}46.138 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}47.910$  population trait measure of autism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}37{:}47{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}49{.}440$  you see that the people with

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:49.440 \longrightarrow 00:37:50.950$  good levels of the mothers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}37{:}50{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}53{.}344$  the offspring of mothers with normal

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:53.344 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.794$  levels of thyroid hormone have much

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:55.794 \rightarrow 00:37:58.545$  lower levels than those that have subautimal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:37:58.550 \longrightarrow 00:37:59.686$  And this is subclinical,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}37{:}59.686 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}01.390$  we're not talking about a clinical,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:38:01.390 \longrightarrow 00:38:03.918$  this is untreated hypothics,

00:38:03.918 --> 00:38:05.206 thyroxinemia, you can do severe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

00:38:05.206 --> 00:38:06.026 you can do less severe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:38:06.030 \longrightarrow 00:38:08.002$  but it's all subclinical,

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00:38:08.002 \rightarrow 00:38:10.467$  so it's just low levels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

00:38:10.470 --> 00:38:12.090 Of thyroid hormone in the mother

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}38{:}12.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}13.785$  and you saw that association which

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

 $00{:}38{:}13.785 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}15.717$  we showed and then we move on

NOTE Confidence: 0.945742648181818

00:38:15.717 --> 00:38:16.990 to more recent work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}38{:}19{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}22{.}324$  a first Lancet endocrinology paper where

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:38:22.324 \rightarrow 00:38:26.384$  we showed that if we take the levels

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:38:26.384 \rightarrow 00:38:28.734$  continuous now FT-4 that's the thyroid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}38{:}28{.}734 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}30{.}464$  So this means more thy roid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:38:30.470 \longrightarrow 00:38:32.014$  this means less thyroid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}38{:}32{.}014 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}33{.}944$  We showed actually a a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:38:33.944 \dashrightarrow 00:38:35.708$  curvilinear association with IQ.

 $00:38:35.710 \longrightarrow 00:38:37.875$  It's most robust in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}38{:}37{.}875 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}39{.}607$  low thy roid levels here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:38:39.610 \longrightarrow 00:38:40.666$  And then this is a quite

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

00:38:40.666 --> 00:38:41.370 a wide confident role,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:38:41.370 \longrightarrow 00:38:44.088$  but you see some significant down decline.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:38:44.088 \rightarrow 00:38:46.314$  So there is a tightly regulated level

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}38{:}46{.}314 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}48{.}287$  and that's where most mothers are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:38:48.290 \rightarrow 00:38:49.564$  If you see the distribution of hormones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}38{:}49{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}52{.}258$  it would be just most people are in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:38:52.258 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.650$  this space, some are in the low,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:38:54.650 \rightarrow 00:38:55.810$  some are in the high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:38:55.810 \rightarrow 00:38:59.634$  And we saw a very robust relation with IQ.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}38{:}59{.}634 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}01{.}930$  And later we've replicated this in 2-3

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:39:01.997 \rightarrow 00:39:04.167$  other cohorts where I must be honest,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}39{:}04.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}07.800$  this ups this low levels of and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:39:07.800 \rightarrow 00:39:09.725$  relation to low IQ is extremely robust.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00:39:09.730 \rightarrow 00:39:11.650$  This in other cars looks more like this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00{:}39{:}11.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}13.408$  going sort of much more flat.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00{:}39{:}13.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}15.050$  There's not such a decline,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00:39:15.050 \rightarrow 00:39:19.313$  but there is a very robust association
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00:39:19.313 \dashrightarrow 00:39:22.889$  between prenatal thyroid hormones and I Q.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00{:}39{:}22{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}26{.}112$  And then we move to another
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00:39:26.112 \longrightarrow 00:39:27.723$  hormone thyroid parameter.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00:39:27.730 \longrightarrow 00:39:28.483$  So be careful.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- 00:39:28.483 --> 00:39:29.487 This is now thyroid,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00:39:29.490 \longrightarrow 00:39:30.642$  thyroid stimulating hormone.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00{:}39{:}30{.}642 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}33{.}330$  This means that now you'd beware that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- 00:39:33.391 --> 00:39:35.587 higher levels of the stimulating hormones
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00:39:35.587 \rightarrow 00:39:38.050$  means lower levels of thyroid hormone.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- 00:39:38.050 -> 00:39:38.522 It's flipped.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00:39:38.522 \rightarrow 00:39:40.822$  I think you have to be a doctor or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}39{:}40.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}42.246$  an endocrinologist or physiologist

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}39{:}42{.}246 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}43{.}670$  who immediately get it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}39{:}43.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}47.478$  But trust me whereas we had easy more

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}39{:}47{.}478 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}49{.}470$  hormone is we thought better but this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:39:49.470 \dashrightarrow 00:39:51.349$  is not the case because it gets worse here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:39:51.350 \longrightarrow 00:39:52.830$  But this is more hormones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:39:52.830 \longrightarrow 00:39:54.530$  This is less hormones and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:39:54.530 \dashrightarrow 00:39:56.230$  less hormones means lower IQ.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:39:56.230 \longrightarrow 00:39:58.946$  Here it is two different things modeled.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:39:58.950 \longrightarrow 00:40:00.708$  It's not IQ, it's Gray matter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:00.710 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.426$  So it's not a brain parameter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:02.430 \longrightarrow 00:40:05.510$  And you see this is essentially flipped.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:05.510 \longrightarrow 00:40:07.022$  So this means.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}40{:}07{.}022 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}08{.}030$  Less hormones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:08.030 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.670$  This would mean more hormones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:09.670 \rightarrow 00:40:12.436$  but I'm presenting at the stimulating

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00:40:12.436 \longrightarrow 00:40:15.413$  axis hormone and what you see is

00:40:15.413 --> 00:40:17.632 the same similar inverted U-shaped

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:17.632 \longrightarrow 00:40:20.537$  curve tightly regulated on all

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}40{:}20{.}537 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}23{.}921$  levels of the thyroid between the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:23.921 \longrightarrow 00:40:26.820$  brain and the between the brain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:26.820 \longrightarrow 00:40:29.070$  And the thyroid hormone and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

00:40:29.070 --> 00:40:30.980 it's highly significant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

00:40:30.980 --> 00:40:33.059 So it's 2000 children at age 10,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

00:40:33.060 --> 00:40:34.524 it's their prenatal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:34.524 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.964$  their mothers in the early

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

00:40:36.964 --> 00:40:39.140 mostly around week 10 to 14,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:39.140 \longrightarrow 00:40:41.140$  it's their thyroid hormone levels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}40{:}41.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42.694$  And this has led to some guidelines

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}40{:}42.694 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}43.860$  and discussion and guidelines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

00:40:43.860 - 00:40:45.950 Should we measure more thyroid
$00:40:45.950 \longrightarrow 00:40:48.458$  hormones in women that have no

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}40{:}48.458 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}50.725$  symptoms and no history of and there

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}40{:}50.725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}52.300$  have been trials based on this work

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:52.300 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.089$  which it have to have been largely

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:54.089 \rightarrow 00:40:55.374$  negative or very small effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:55.380 \longrightarrow 00:40:56.952$  So they're sort of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

00:40:56.952 --> 00:40:58.917 Equivocal trials have been done,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:40:58.920 \rightarrow 00:41:00.032$  so we don't know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}41{:}00{.}032 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}02{.}400$  but there is some evidence that it is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:41:02.400 \rightarrow 00:41:04.314$  a very important parameter to regulate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}41{:}04{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}07{.}080$  And now comes the recent work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

00:41:07.080 --> 00:41:07.737 I don't know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}41{:}07{.}737 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}09{.}270$  I don't have a date when that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:41:09.326 \rightarrow 00:41:10.957$  was published 2 years or so ago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00{:}41{:}10.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}12.672$  which is very fascinating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:41:12.672 \longrightarrow 00:41:13.956$  We did that.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $00{:}41{:}13.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}16.096$  We just realized this data because

 $00:41:16.096 \rightarrow 00:41:18.874$  we had the idea what actually we

NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

 $00:41:18.874 \rightarrow 00:41:21.436$  included the women at different ages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:41:21.440 \rightarrow 00:41:25.472$  So we can model always in about 200 women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:41:25.480 \rightarrow 00:41:27.604$  The curve essentially continuously

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00{:}41{:}27.604 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}31.717$  moving the curve with a time interaction

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:41:31.717 \rightarrow 00:41:34.144$  variable across the inclusion period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00{:}41{:}34{.}144 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}36{.}520$  So the first women came to

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:41:36.599 \rightarrow 00:41:38.801$  generation out to be included and

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:41:38.801 \longrightarrow 00:41:41.358$  we took the blood at week seven.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:41:41.360 \longrightarrow 00:41:43.310$  The latest that we included

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

00:41:43.310 --> 00:41:44.480 were week eighteen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00{:}41{:}44{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}46{.}034$  Note these are not the same women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00{:}41{:}46.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}49.264$  This is the first blood assessment we

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00{:}41{:}49{.}264 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}51{.}840$  had where we did the thyroid hormones.

 $00{:}41{:}51{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}54{.}528$  So what we modeled it as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

00:41:54.528 --> 00:41:56.115 sort of continuous model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:41:56.115 \longrightarrow 00:41:59.160$  but then cut it for the doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:41:59.160 \longrightarrow 00:42:00.572$  essentially the intercept for

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:42:00.572 \longrightarrow 00:42:02.516$  the different week 7 to 18.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00{:}42{:}02{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}07{.}740$  And what we see is that this curvy linear

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:42:07.740 \rightarrow 00:42:10.560$  pattern which is very remarked up to age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:42:10.560 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.074$  then sort of disappears at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:42:13.074 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.400$  end of this inclusion period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.941371755555556

 $00:42:15.400 \rightarrow 00:42:17.600$  And this was still 200 women on average.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}42{:}19.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}22.434$  Time period per week and what this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

00:42:22.434 --> 00:42:24.940 shows you I think is convincingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}42{:}24{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}27{.}115$  a sensitive period because it

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}42{:}27.115 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}30.659$  is in the same study measured at

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:42:30.659 \rightarrow 00:42:32.679$  different time points specifically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:42:32.680 \longrightarrow 00:42:34.276$  And why is that so credible?

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536
- $00:42:34.280 \longrightarrow 00:42:35.880$  Because the reviews they sort

 $00:42:35.880 \rightarrow 00:42:37.160$  of were extremely excited.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:42:37.160 \longrightarrow 00:42:39.036$  I've never got anything in that sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:42:39.036 \longrightarrow 00:42:40.877$  of Lancet like paper that easily

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}42{:}40.877 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}42.517$  because as in chronologist said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}42{:}42{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}44{.}725$  I've done animal work and I showed

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:42:44.725 \longrightarrow 00:42:46.904$  by week 15 the child produces

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:42:46.904 \rightarrow 00:42:49.232$  on thyroid and thus the mother.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:42:49.240 \longrightarrow 00:42:52.516$  Thyroid is just not informative anymore.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}42{:}52{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}56{.}176$  So while I marketed as a final we

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}42{:}56.176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}59.638$  got their sensitive period study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}42{:}59{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}02{.}132$  the reviewer toned it down to saying

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}43{:}02{.}132 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}04{.}245$  it's really showing that the measure

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}43{:}04{.}245 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}06{.}195$  is not informative At age 15.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:43:06.200 \longrightarrow 00:43:07.718$  It may still influence the brain,

 $00:43:07.720 \rightarrow 00:43:09.838$  but you're measuring the wrong parameter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}43{:}09{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}12{.}234$  So this is getting closer to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

00:43:12.234 --> 00:43:13.608 sensitive period. Holy Grail.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}43{:}13.608 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}15.328$  That's all these Doha epinologists

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:43:15.328 \rightarrow 00:43:17.479$  want to get to, but even there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}43{:}17{.}479 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}19{.}237$  a very careful reviewer can tell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

00:43:19.240 --> 00:43:20.680 Tell you you're not there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}43{:}20.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}23.312$  It just means that from week 14 onwards

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}43{:}23{.}312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}25{.}040$  you're measuring the wrong person,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:43:25.040 \rightarrow 00:43:27.476$  essentially like having the wrong informant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:43:27.480 \longrightarrow 00:43:30.000$  But what does it tell you?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:43:30.000 \longrightarrow 00:43:32.040$  It tells you what.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}43{:}32.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}36.470$  I think that this is valid because how

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:43:36.470 \longrightarrow 00:43:39.322$  could it's if you then have the right

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:43:39.322 \rightarrow 00:43:41.478$  measure and you find what you expected,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:43:41.480 \rightarrow 00:43:43.874$  perhaps that's sort of a circumvential say.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536
- 00:43:43.880 00:43:45.950 I don't think it proves causality.

 $00{:}43{:}45{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}47{.}525$  But it's getting better that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:43:47.525 \longrightarrow 00:43:48.785$  this is quite credible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:43:48.790 \longrightarrow 00:43:51.254$  So I do think in all honesty there

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}43{:}51{.}254 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}53{.}889$  is a true curvilinear relationship

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:43:53.889 \rightarrow 00:43:57.004$  between thyroid hormone and the brain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

00:43:57.004 --> 00:43:58.606 I do think given the biology

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

00:43:58.606 - 00:44:00.390 it is likely to be causal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:44:00.390 \longrightarrow 00:44:02.310$  Whether that's amenable for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:44:02.310 \longrightarrow 00:44:04.230$  intervention is another study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00:44:04.230 \longrightarrow 00:44:06.030$  I've got the wrong slides.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

00:44:06.030 --> 00:44:08.318 I was going to ask you so

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}44{:}08{.}318$  -->  $00{:}44{:}09{.}790$  transition to new results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

00:44:09.790 --> 00:44:11.960 I missed my transition slide because I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536

 $00{:}44{:}11{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}14{.}537$  pulled it up yesterday night after the.

- $00{:}44{:}14{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}16{.}500$  Chemical exposure for the colleague.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9402536
- 00:44:16.500 --> 00:44:17.858 I hope she's there on the zoom.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.94654315375
- 00:44:20.660 --> 00:44:22.780 Does anybody know what trans fatty acids are?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335446
- $00:44:24.900 \rightarrow 00:44:26.574$  Take a sip of coffee while you tell me.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.951754571428572
- $00{:}44{:}30{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}33{.}774$  Is that forgotten? You're not bisphosals and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.883993432
- 00:44:38.100 -> 00:44:38.500 organophosphates?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.883993432
- $00:44:38.500 \longrightarrow 00:44:40.100$  Which are about what?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.883993432
- 00:44:40.100 --> 00:44:41.004 Does anybody still know
- NOTE Confidence: 0.883993432
- $00:44:41.004 \rightarrow 00:44:42.134$  what trans fatty acids are?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- 00:44:47.190 --> 00:44:49.188 I'll tell you, trans fatty assets
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:44:51.310 \longrightarrow 00:44:55.069$  in the Netherlands were a big scandal,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00{:}44{:}55{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}57{.}387$  a public health scandal of big proportions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- 00:44:57.390 --> 00:45:01.386 Why? Because in the 1990s eighties,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00{:}45{:}01{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}02{.}986$  I don't know, to that time,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:45:02.990 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.696$  your grandparents wouldn't have eaten butter.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:45:05.700 \longrightarrow 00:45:06.380$  Which they would have

- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00{:}45{:}06{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}07{.}060$  lived in these countries.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00{:}45{:}07.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}09.013$  And then there comes the introduction of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:45:09.013 \rightarrow 00:45:11.057$  margarines which is better for public health?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- 00:45:11.060 --> 00:45:13.678 Okay, it's better for your fat because
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00{:}45{:}13.678 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}15.500$  it's unsaturated and saturated.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00{:}45{:}15{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}17{.}858$  Fatty Acids in butter versus margarine.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:45:17.860 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.856$  And these are people that eat,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $00:45:18.860 \longrightarrow 00:45:21.900$  you know bread butter and I don't know cheese
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:45:24.020 \longrightarrow 00:45:26.708$  on twice a day.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00{:}45{:}26.708 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}30.350$  And so the problem was that these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- 00:45:30.350 00:45:32.100 margarines where fatty acids,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:45:32.100 \dashrightarrow 00:45:34.760$  but they also had trans fatty acids.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:45:34.760 \longrightarrow 00:45:36.620$  Meaning these are industrial fatty
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00{:}45{:}36{.}620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}38{.}900$  acids which come with the production
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:45:38.900 \longrightarrow 00:45:41.336$  of fat and essentially if you produce
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:45:41.336 \rightarrow 00:45:43.982$  fat and if you have sort of a if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:45:43.982 \rightarrow 00:45:46.310$  fry your French fries and you have very

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

00:45:46.377 --> 00:45:48.596 poor fat in one of these, I don't know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:45:48.596 \rightarrow 00:45:50.640$  I don't want to point at any cart here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:45:50.640 \longrightarrow 00:45:51.996$  but if you have very poor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:45:52.000 \rightarrow 00:45:54.387$  you get trans fatty acids in them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:45:54.390 \longrightarrow 00:45:55.750$  And those were really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:45:55.750 \longrightarrow 00:45:57.790$  it turned out to be terrible

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

00:45:57.857 --> 00:45:59.588 for cardiovascular health,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:45:59.590 \rightarrow 00:46:02.208$  actually so bad so that the whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:46:02.208 \longrightarrow 00:46:04.661$  benefit of eating margarine was offset

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}46{:}04{.}661 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}07{.}587$  by the effect of trans fatty assets.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}46{:}07{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}10{.}510$  It was a real scandal in the 1990s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:46:10.510 \longrightarrow 00:46:12.950$  OK, It's sort of forgotten.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

00:46:12.950 --> 00:46:13.666 And I don't know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}46{:}13.666 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}15.310$  and I don't know anything much about America.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- 00:46:15.310 --> 00:46:16.870 My work is mostly from Europe.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:46:16.870 \longrightarrow 00:46:18.820$  So there what happened is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:46:18.820 \longrightarrow 00:46:19.990$  there were countries.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- 00:46:19.990 --> 00:46:21.454 It's already interesting to see what
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:46:21.454 \rightarrow 00:46:22.750$  happens in countries once that's,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:46:22.750 \longrightarrow 00:46:23.406$  you know.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:46:23.406 \longrightarrow 00:46:25.702$  Detected that Hans very as a mouse
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00{:}46{:}25.702 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}28.159$  models and humans and observational and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00{:}46{:}28.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}31.440$  is really bad and sort of kills you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00{:}46{:}31{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}33{.}396$  the there's countries that forbid it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- 00:46:33.400 --> 00:46:35.308 Okay Denmark said gone two years
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00{:}46{:}35{.}308 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}37{.}838$  and we phase it out of production.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- 00:46:37.840 --> 00:46:39.352 It's easy you can just make
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00{:}46{:}39{.}352 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}42{.}160$  a bit more expensive oils.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00{:}46{:}42.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}44.596$  The Dutch you might not know them
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

00:46:44.596 --> 00:46:46.530 are sort of compromising country

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:46:46.530 \longrightarrow 00:46:49.200$  so they say to the industry

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:46:49.200 \longrightarrow 00:46:51.500$  you know it would be good.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:46:51.500 \longrightarrow 00:46:53.192$  If you reduced it in your

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:46:53.192 \rightarrow 00:46:55.059$  products in the next five years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}46{:}55{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}57{.}031$  we do that on a voluntary basis and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:46:57.031 \rightarrow 00:46:59.136$  will also do a bit of shaming and naming.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:46:59.140 \longrightarrow 00:47:01.100$  So there is some pressure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}47{:}01{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}02{.}220$  That's the Dutch approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}47{:}02{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}04{.}260$  Now you would laugh about the Dutch,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}47{:}04.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}07.418$  but they do get it done so slowly, by slowly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

00:47:07.418 --> 00:47:07.936 Uni Lever,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}47{:}07{.}936 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}10{.}020$  whom you know from the Dove products,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

00:47:10.020 --> 00:47:12.460 is a real big you know you Lever

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}47{:}12{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}14{.}624$  is the modern maker in that time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:47:14.624 \rightarrow 00:47:16.871$  I don't know if they still do it and

- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:47:16.871 \rightarrow 00:47:19.464$  they phased it out, which leaves.

00:47:19.464 --> 00:47:22.317 Other products like um,

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:47:22.317 \rightarrow 00:47:24.279$  cheap bakery products where it's still

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:47:24.279 \rightarrow 00:47:26.350$  used because they couldn't care less.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

00:47:26.350 --> 00:47:27.622 You know, that's the fringe market

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}47{:}27.622 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}28.470$  and they couldn't care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:47:28.470 \longrightarrow 00:47:29.790$  It's cheap to do that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:47:29.790 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.028$  So what we found, um, so here is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}47{:}34{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}35{.}918$  If you want to know trans and sis

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:47:35.918 \rightarrow 00:47:38.148$  fatty acids, so this is the big difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00:47:38.150 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.950$  Industrial fatty acids like trans would have

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}47{:}40{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}43{.}468$  the hydrogen here instead of like this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

00:47:43.470 --> 00:47:44.910 Wow, you think that's the difference?

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}47{:}44{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}45{.}496$  That's it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448

 $00{:}47{:}45{.}496 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}46{.}668$  Yes, that's the difference.

- $00:47:46.670 \longrightarrow 00:47:47.270$  That's it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00{:}47{:}47{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}48{.}470$  And where are they?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- 00:47:48.470 --> 00:47:49.630 They're found in fried foods,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:47:49.630 \rightarrow 00:47:50.918$  commercial bakers and processions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:47:50.918 \rightarrow 00:47:53.150$  But what happens in the statcha pros?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:47:53.150 \longrightarrow 00:47:54.790$  There was not a law to stop them,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:47:54.790 \longrightarrow 00:47:55.704$  but really,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:47:55.704 \rightarrow 00:47:59.268$  in the early 2000s in this country, this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00{:}47{:}59{.}268 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}02{.}132$  And the changes in the Netherlands went down
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:48:02.132 \rightarrow 00:48:05.130$  in vegetable oils and fat in those years.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:48:05.130 \rightarrow 00:48:08.170$  The production went down dramatically.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:48:08.170 \longrightarrow 00:48:08.658$  So without,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:48:08.658 \rightarrow 00:48:10.366$  I'm not saying that's the best approach,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00:48:10.370 \longrightarrow 00:48:12.290$  but both in the Netherlands
- NOTE Confidence: 0.928177448
- $00{:}48{:}12.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}14.210$  and Denmark and other countries
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:48:14.279 \rightarrow 00:48:16.810$  in Europe, they reduce these fatty acids.

00:48:16.810 --> 00:48:18.666 And why is that? Why am I telling

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

00:48:18.666 --> 00:48:20.607 you all this in an imaging study?

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:48:20.610 \longrightarrow 00:48:23.290$  I'll tell you why.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:48:23.290 \longrightarrow 00:48:24.226$  It's really fascinating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:48:24.226 \dashrightarrow 00:48:27.550$  I saw this once and I thought these are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}48{:}27{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}32{.}110$  The inclusion years of the Generation R study

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

00:48:32.110 --> 00:48:39.670 we included from 2003 to actually to 2007,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:48:39.670 \longrightarrow 00:48:43.310$  we included in exactly the years when

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}48{:}43{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}48{.}974$  trans fatty acids disappeared in the in

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}48{:}48{.}974 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}51{.}902$  the food industry in the Netherlands.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:48:51.910 \longrightarrow 00:48:54.639$  That means we can look at.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}48{:}54{.}639 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}57{.}502$  The blood levels of women who came

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}48{:}57{.}502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}00{.}088$  at different times in those years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}49{:}00{.}090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}01{.}086$  and we did. And you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}49{:}01.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}03.370$  you'd think you'd see the same exact curve,

- 00:49:03.370 --> 00:49:04.408 But you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:04.408 \rightarrow 00:49:08.542$  we saw a 10/10 a quarter of decline,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:08.542 \longrightarrow 00:49:10.194$  which for anything in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:10.194 \longrightarrow 00:49:12.249$  biology is quite dramatic.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:12.250 \longrightarrow 00:49:13.519$  So in 2000,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:13.519 \rightarrow 00:49:17.320$  the people who included in 2005 had only 3/4
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:17.320 \longrightarrow 00:49:20.810$  of the levels of those included in 2002.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}49{:}20{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}25{.}070$  So it indeed related to a.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}49{:}25{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}28{.}534$  Reduction in the blood of a women and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:28.534 \rightarrow 00:49:30.486$  I don't know if they knew and they
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}49{:}30{.}486 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}32{.}368$  didn't change their eating behavior,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:32.370 \longrightarrow 00:49:34.422$  they just ate the same bread
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}49{:}34{.}422 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}36{.}370$  and French fries as before,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:36.370 \longrightarrow 00:49:37.966$  but they got less of this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:37.970 \longrightarrow 00:49:40.580$  Which means if we can relate
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:40.580 \longrightarrow 00:49:43.210$  this to a child outcome,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- 00:49:43.210 > 00:49:45.856 we have something which we call
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- 00:49:45.856 --> 00:49:47.179 instrumental barrel approach
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:47.179 \longrightarrow 00:49:49.116$  because it is a policy change.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:49.120 \longrightarrow 00:49:51.160$  That is related to biology
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:51.160 \longrightarrow 00:49:53.200$  in the blood of people.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:53.200 \longrightarrow 00:49:54.514$  And so we published that last
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:49:54.514 \longrightarrow 00:49:56.004$  year after sort of after I had
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}49{:}56{.}004 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}57{.}313$  what I don't know how I came.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- 00:49:57.320 --> 00:49:59.039 I come from a Baker's family to be honest,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- 00:49:59.040 --> 00:49:59.560 I was, I don't know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}49{:}59{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}01{.}832$  reading this in the sort of Baker thing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}50{:}01.832 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}03.658$  digest and I was quite fascinated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}50{:}03.658 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}06.040$  and I thought, yes, you can do that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}50{:}06{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}07{.}970$  And so we did the.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}50{:}07{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}10{.}091$  Trans fatty acids in the blood and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

00:50:10.091 -> 00:50:12.111 then we showed and you know you

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:50:12.111 \longrightarrow 00:50:14.183$  this is a very bad slides taken

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:50:14.183 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.967$  directly from the publication.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:50:15.970 \longrightarrow 00:50:17.446$  But you can see a highly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:50:17.450 \longrightarrow 00:50:19.778$  highly significant association of

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:50:19.778 \rightarrow 00:50:23.970$  trans fatty acids with fetal head growth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:50:23.970 \longrightarrow 00:50:25.368$  And this is true head growth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}50{:}25{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}27{.}162$  This is the change from fetal head

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00{:}50{:}27.162 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}29.009$  size from one point to the other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:50:29.010 \rightarrow 00:50:30.826$  It's not just growth and you say birth

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:50:30.826 \rightarrow 00:50:32.566$  weight is a measure of fetal growth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:50:32.570 \longrightarrow 00:50:34.145$  This is really fetal growth

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:50:34.145 \longrightarrow 00:50:36.150$  as it is a change from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

00:50:36.150 --> 00:50:37.766 2nd to 3rd trimester,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:50:37.766 \rightarrow 00:50:40.742$  there was no effect when the head is very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:50:40.742 \rightarrow 00:50:42.090$  very small, but when it expands,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:50:42.090 \longrightarrow 00:50:43.070$  when it gets big,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:50:43.070 \longrightarrow 00:50:44.066$  that's where all the growth is.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}50{:}44.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}46.611$  And that second to third end of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:50:46.611 \rightarrow 00:50:48.430$  trimester and 6000 children.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:50:48.430 \longrightarrow 00:50:49.590$  So that's a good inclusion.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}50{:}49{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}51{.}606$  We see super significant associations and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:50:51.606 \rightarrow 00:50:53.988$  then we can actually do the same trick.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:50:53.990 \longrightarrow 00:50:55.670$  We can only do the, the,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}50{:}55{.}670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}58{.}070$  the, the TFA measures.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:50:58.070 \longrightarrow 00:50:59.659$  We can do that with the high
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:50:59.659 \rightarrow 00:51:01.230$  and see very clear patterns,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:51:01.230 \longrightarrow 00:51:05.054$  but we can see that this calendar time.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}51{:}05{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}07{.}635$  There is an association of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00{:}51{:}07.635 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}11.460$  calendar time with fetal growth,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333
- $00:51:11.460 \longrightarrow 00:51:15.060$  meaning that in the course of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:51:15.060 \longrightarrow 00:51:18.072$  that studies the heads of

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

 $00:51:18.072 \rightarrow 00:51:20.496$  the children became a tiny bit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

00:51:20.500 --> 00:51:22.019 I must admit it's a tiny bit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946962533333333

00:51:22.020 --> 00:51:24.780 but fetal measures in 6000 are very precise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:51:24.780 \longrightarrow 00:51:28.372$  bigger and we think and we can show that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

00:51:28.372 --> 00:51:30.260 was an instrumental viral approach,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:51:30.260 \longrightarrow 00:51:31.795$  which is a different sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

00:51:31.795 - 00:51:32.716 of statistical technique.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00{:}51{:}32{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}37{.}048$  We can show that the association is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:51:37.048 \rightarrow 00:51:41.024$  driven by the reduction and the policy

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00{:}51{:}41{.}024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}43{.}616$  change and that is something I've been

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00{:}51{:}43.616 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}46.160$  working 20 years towards and never got done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00{:}51{:}46{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}50{.}472$  So that we show that policy translates

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:51:50.472 \rightarrow 00:51:53.585$  into biology and sad thing is we didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:51:53.585 \rightarrow 00:51:55.326$  get it to behaviour, so bigger heads.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:51:55.326 \rightarrow 00:51:57.330$  And I'm not really much related to behavior

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804
- $00:51:57.330 \rightarrow 00:51:59.434$  and then it becomes very messy and noisy.

00:51:59.440 --> 00:52:00.196 But you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:52:00.196 \longrightarrow 00:52:01.960$  the journal loved it that it was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:52:01.960 \longrightarrow 00:52:03.500$  And why does it have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:52:03.500 \rightarrow 00:52:06.000$  clinical health relevance?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

00:52:06.000 --> 00:52:07.278 Well, first of all, it does.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:52:07.280 \longrightarrow 00:52:08.459$  This is causality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:52:08.459 \longrightarrow 00:52:09.638$  not only policy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:52:09.640 \longrightarrow 00:52:10.840$  it is quite a causal approach,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:52:10.840 \longrightarrow 00:52:11.734$  but really interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

00:52:11.734 --> 00:52:13.522 If you look at the production

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:52:13.522 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.320$  of East Europe and South Asia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:52:15.320 \longrightarrow 00:52:17.095$  that's the Indian region and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

00:52:17.095 --> 00:52:18.870 the East European region where

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00{:}52{:}18{.}938 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}21{.}308$  there's nobody cares about this,

 $00:52:21.308 \rightarrow 00:52:24.230$  The levels are still shockingly high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

00:52:24.230 --> 00:52:25.430 So I think it's still relevant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00{:}52{:}25{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}27{.}998$  although for us it's a historic

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:52:27.998 \longrightarrow 00:52:29.710$  study to be honest.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

00:52:29.710 --> 00:52:32.250 And do I do one more or should I do

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00{:}52{:}32{.}331 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}34{.}310$  for questions. This is a good ending.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

00:52:34.310 --> 00:52:35.850 So I could do a physical activity

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00:52:35.850 \longrightarrow 00:52:36.510$  in the brain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9603804

 $00{:}52{:}36{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}36{.}790$  but

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00:52:41.190 \longrightarrow 00:52:42.390$  good, then I'll wrap up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00{:}52{:}42{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}44{.}040$  So I'll leave away that

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00{:}52{:}44.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}45.690$  there is an association with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00:52:45.690 \longrightarrow 00:52:47.270$  Brain change that I should

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

00:52:47.270 --> 00:52:48.850 I just do one slide?

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

00:52:48.850 --> 00:52:49.726 No, I don't do one slide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00:52:49.730 \longrightarrow 00:52:50.210$  It doesn't work.

 $00:52:50.210 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.684$  I do the, I do the IT doesn't work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00{:}52{:}52{.}684 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}55{.}554$  I just tell you it is we show that

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00:52:55.554 \longrightarrow 00:52:56.562$  would have been the last one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

00:52:56.570 --> 00:52:58.448 I sort of did too much

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

00:52:58.450 --> 00:53:01.770 fatty acids carried away.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

00:53:01.770 --> 00:53:03.989 I was going to show you that

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00:53:03.989 \longrightarrow 00:53:06.188$  we can show that physical

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00{:}53{:}06{.}188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}08{.}210$  activity is related not just to

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

00:53:08.210 - > 00:53:09.650 brain size and brain volume,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00:53:09.650 \longrightarrow 00:53:12.697$  but it is related to the volume

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00{:}53{:}12.697 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}15.478$  change over a dolescence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

00:53:15.480 --> 00:53:17.304 Which is quite a bit more and that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00:53:17.304 \longrightarrow 00:53:18.439$  essentially an answer to the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

00:53:18.440 --> 00:53:19.994 you know we need bigger studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00:53:19.994 \longrightarrow 00:53:21.600$  or we need studies of change.

 $00:53:21.600 \rightarrow 00:53:23.520$  We've now got the first studies of change.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00{:}53{:}23{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}24{.}400$  If you want to show,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93622814

 $00:53:24.400 \longrightarrow 00:53:25.600$  just show the result,

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:53:27.760 \rightarrow 00:53:30.240$  it's total physical activity really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:53:30.240 \longrightarrow 00:53:33.166$  not just the the also quite a

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}53{:}33{.}166 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}36{.}728$  bit of the hippocampus grows or.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}53{:}36{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}39{.}266$  Grows a bit faster if you do physical

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:53:39.266 \rightarrow 00:53:40.891$  activity and it's interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

00:53:40.891 --> 00:53:42.743 because it's consistent across

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}53{:}42{.}743 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}45{.}057$  parent and child reported physical

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

00:53:45.057 --> 00:53:47.445 activity reports Okay I'll wrap up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}53{:}47{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}51{.}300$  So the dominant force in research is NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

00:53:51.300 --> 00:53:54.398 the is the know you're imaging a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}53{:}54{.}398 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}57{.}435$  in autism and a DHDI would challenge

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}53{:}57{.}435 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}59{.}676$  or like to discuss with people who say

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}53{:}59{.}676$  -->  $00{:}54{:}01{.}538$  it's made a change in our clinical

 $00:54:01.538 \rightarrow 00:54:03.740$  treatment or in our public health

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}54{:}03{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}06{.}280$  understanding of autism and brain I think.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:54:06.280 \rightarrow 00:54:08.520$  It did a lot for understanding the disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}54{:}08{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}12{.}055$  I'm not so sure it did a lot for how we

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}54{:}12.055 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}14.760$  treat disease, which is a big difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}54{:}14.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}17.336$  I would say The effect sizes are often

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:54:17.336 \longrightarrow 00:54:20.400$  small and often correlational and not causal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}54{:}20{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}22{.}208$  There's a real problem which I didn't show

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}54{:}22.208 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}23.994$  you, but we've struggled with that a lot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

00:54:24.000 --> 00:54:27.920 Can we reproduce imaging results?

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}54{:}27{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}29{.}908$  Anybody who might talk today was talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}54{:}29{.}908 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}31{.}480$  about the heterogeneity of populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:54:31.480 \longrightarrow 00:54:32.440$  That's the same.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}54{:}32{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}34{.}680$  And I showed you that was the

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}54{:}34{.}758 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}37{.}058$  minority majority is one example.

 $00{:}54{:}37.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}39.844$  I think we have to, and that was my

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:54:39.844 \rightarrow 00:54:41.020$  first talk this morning was Kerim.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:54:41.020 \longrightarrow 00:54:42.780$  I think he's there in the back row.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:54:42.780 \longrightarrow 00:54:44.820$  We should really go to developmental

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

00:54:44.820 --> 00:54:46.180 approaches and longitudinal trajectories.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:54:46.180 \rightarrow 00:54:48.539$  I think that's the only way forward.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

00:54:48.540 --> 00:54:50.094 I fell short of showing you

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:54:50.094 \rightarrow 00:54:51.660$  that was the physical activity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}54{:}51{.}660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}55{.}140$  but I think that's what matters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:54:55.140 \rightarrow 00:54:56.100$  I'd like to wrap up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:54:56.100 \rightarrow 00:54:58.417$  it's not a diagnostic or prognostic tool.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:54:58.420 \rightarrow 00:55:01.059$  It does have some public health relevance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

00:55:01.060 --> 00:55:02.772 but I would say.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:55:02.772 \rightarrow 00:55:03.200$  Occasionally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:55:03.200 \rightarrow 00:55:06.610$  and sometimes even sort of coincidentally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:55:06.610 \rightarrow 00:55:11.320$  but it does as many other fancy techniques.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194
- $00:55:11.320 \rightarrow 00:55:13.198$  These are the students that helped

 $00:55:13.200 \longrightarrow 00:55:13.636$  Ryan Mitzler.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00{:}55{:}13.636 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}15.380$  I want to mention him because he does

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:55:15.431 \rightarrow 00:55:17.048$  much of my imaging in the Netherlands

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:55:17.048 \rightarrow 00:55:18.520$  and students who did these papers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

 $00:55:18.520 \rightarrow 00:55:20.160$  and of course the participants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.962393194

00:55:20.160 --> 00:55:21.040 Thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86864562

00:55:27.190 --> 00:55:27.830 Thank you so much, honey.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86864562

 $00:55:27.830 \longrightarrow 00:55:29.862$  I will just say that we do have

NOTE Confidence: 0.86864562

 $00:55:29.862 \dashrightarrow 00:55:31.469$  time after the presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86864562

 $00{:}55{:}31{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}33{.}162$  So if any one would like to stay in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86864562

 $00{:}55{:}33.162 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}34.708$  room and continue the conversation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86864562

 $00:55:34.710 \longrightarrow 00:55:36.306$  we're free until 2:30.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86864562

 $00:55:36.306 \longrightarrow 00:55:37.902$  And but any burning

NOTE Confidence: 0.86864562

 $00:55:37.902 \longrightarrow 00:55:39.630$  questions for Doctor Tamar

 $00:55:49.360 \rightarrow 00:55:51.276$  that was that was pretty interesting to me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $00{:}55{:}51{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}53{.}206$  And I just wonder your thoughts

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $00{:}55{:}53{.}206 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}56{.}040$  about how far do you go on

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

00:55:56.040 --> 00:55:59.808 restrictive public policy to?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $00{:}55{:}59{.}808 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}03{.}690$  Get the good for for young children

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $00{:}56{:}03.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}05.670$  who can't protect themselves.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $00{:}56{:}05{.}670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}09{.}710$  So for instance you know it's good to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $00:56:09.710 \rightarrow 00:56:12.635$  keep lead away from babies and and young

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

00:56:12.635 --> 00:56:15.070 children but when you start talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $00:56:15.070 \rightarrow 00:56:17.520$  you know dietary and cultural things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $00:56:17.520 \longrightarrow 00:56:18.510$  just your thoughts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

00:56:18.510 --> 00:56:19.990 How how far do you go with this?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $00{:}56{:}19{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}23{.}389$  Do you do you, you know say that's it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $00:56:23.390 \longrightarrow 00:56:25.130$  fruits and vegetables and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $00{:}56{:}25{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}27{.}150$  Mediterrane an diet for everyone or.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:56:28.010 \longrightarrow 00:56:29.230$  That's an interesting one.

 $00{:}56{:}29{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}31{.}873$  So that's sort of the whole public health

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}56{:}31.873 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}35.526$  school of Harvard debates that every day

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:56:35.530 \rightarrow 00:56:37.818$  and seriously does if it's good to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:56:37.818 \rightarrow 00:56:40.076$  zoom in on an example because otherwise

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

00:56:40.076 --> 00:56:42.594 I'm going to give a sort of overreaching,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:56:42.594 \rightarrow 00:56:44.130$  I would be struggling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}56{:}44.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}45.888$  That's a little evening thing debate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:56:45.890 \rightarrow 00:56:48.410$  If you take the dietary example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}56{:}48{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}51{.}930$  I am in favor. Of restricting

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}56{:}51{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}55{.}230$  soda and sweet drinks in schools.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}56{:}55{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}57{.}430$  We have seen now that

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:56:57.430 \longrightarrow 00:56:59.630$  that is really so obesity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:56:59.630 \rightarrow 00:57:02.185$  making so much diabetes down the road.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}57{:}02.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}04.506$  I think we should go there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}57{:}04{.}510$  -->  $00{:}57{:}06{.}827$  Many of the others like no sweets,

 $00:57:06.830 \longrightarrow 00:57:07.710$  which are also, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

00:57:07.710 - 00:57:09.790 sugar is bad, but I would be very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:57:09.790 \longrightarrow 00:57:11.874$  very hesitant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:57:11.874 \longrightarrow 00:57:14.786$  I think the best way to do it

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}57{:}14.786 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}17.175$  is to think carefully with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}57{:}17.175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}19.200$  schools should sell them but.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}57{:}19{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}21{.}195$  To forbid them, perhaps a sugar tax.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}57{:}21.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}22.862$  But other than that I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}57{:}22.862 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}24.360$  very little is evidence based.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}57{:}24.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}26.320$  So much of these things are not causal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:57:26.320 \longrightarrow 00:57:26.850$  We changes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}57{:}26.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}28.705$  You know look at the history of

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00{:}57{:}28.705 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}30.600$  the Harvard schools of department

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:57:30.600 \longrightarrow 00:57:32.400$  of petition advice for diet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:57:32.400 \rightarrow 00:57:34.080$  You know that's a funny changing thing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077

 $00:57:34.080 \longrightarrow 00:57:36.425$  You know nuts and that and oils

- NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077
- $00:57:36.425 \longrightarrow 00:57:37.720$  and meat and alcohol.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077
- $00:57:37.720 \longrightarrow 00:57:39.320$  Just look at the alcohol.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077
- 00:57:39.320 --> 00:57:40.881 You know 20 years ago I was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077
- 00:57:40.881 --> 00:57:42.257 taught in Rotterdam alcohol is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077
- $00{:}57{:}42.257 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}43.557$  better than any concentration.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077
- $00{:}57{:}43.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}44.920$  You come to Harvard and they say no,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077
- $00:57:44.920 \longrightarrow 00:57:46.996$  but of alcohol is very good.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077
- 00:57:47.000 00:57:48.600 Now they have to sort of change that,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077
- $00{:}57{:}48.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}52.345$  but it took them 15 years to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077
- $00:57:52.345 \rightarrow 00:57:54.120$  really come to a conclusion there.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077
- $00:57:54.120 \longrightarrow 00:57:57.420$  So that encouraging of your
- NOTE Confidence: 0.946446386923077
- $00{:}57{:}57{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}58{.}360$  glass of red wine
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91061238
- 00:57:58.360 --> 00:57:59.780 is now gone. You know, you have to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91061238
- $00{:}57{:}59{.}780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}01{.}480$  have it was a bad conscience to night,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87985364
- 00:58:02.760 --> 00:58:04.080 but I think still think,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87985364

- $00:58:04.080 \rightarrow 00:58:04.840$  still think you should.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87985364
- 00:58:04.840 --> 00:58:07.152 So I'd be very, very restrictive,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87985364
- 00:58:07.152 --> 00:58:09.480 very, very cautious,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87985364
- 00:58:09.480 --> 00:58:12.036 but I wouldn't shy away from a few measures,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87985364
- 00:58:12.040 --> 00:58:13.000 very, very cautious.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87985364
- $00:58:13.000 \rightarrow 00:58:15.674$  But sometimes I think soda, we got it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87985364
- 00:58:15.674 --> 00:58:17.106 Sugars, we've got it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87985364
- $00:58:17.110 \longrightarrow 00:58:18.952$  So restrict the sugars in a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87985364
- $00{:}58{:}18{.}952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}20{.}782$  creative way and for not forbid
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87985364
- $00:58:20.782 \rightarrow 00:58:22.590$  but tax it and don't have it. Yeah,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844
- 00:58:24.830 --> 00:58:27.830 just really quickly. Perhaps relatedly,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844
- $00{:}58{:}27{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}29{.}552$  you know when you talk about your
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844
- 00:58:29.552 --> 00:58:31.228 trans fatty acid decline over time,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844
- $00:58:31.230 \dashrightarrow 00:58:33.090$  I was thinking about PER and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844
- $00{:}58{:}33.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}33.710$  polyfluoroloco substances.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844
- $00:58:33.710 \rightarrow 00:58:36.013$  You know, these forever chemicals and and.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844
- $00:58:36.013 \rightarrow 00:58:37.854$  You know, what we've seen in with

 $00:58:37.854 \longrightarrow 00:58:39.634$  some pilot data there is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844

 $00:58:39.634 \rightarrow 00:58:41.434$  there's a patterning by income level,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844

 $00:58:41.440 \rightarrow 00:58:44.478$  a patterning by income level per country.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844

 $00{:}58{:}44{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}46{.}256$  I'm just wondering the decline in

NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844

 $00:58:46.256 \dashrightarrow 00:58:48.239$  trans fatty acids that you described,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844

 $00:58:48.240 \rightarrow 00:58:50.076$  was there a patterning by SES?

NOTE Confidence: 0.96641844

00:58:50.080 --> 00:58:51.680 Did you observe A steeper? No.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00:58:51.680 \longrightarrow 00:58:53.472$  We see much less of that patterning

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00:58:53.472 \longrightarrow 00:58:55.160$  in the US than in the US.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00:58:55.160 \rightarrow 00:58:57.644$  In the US, every environmental exposure

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00{:}58{:}57{.}644 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}00{.}042$  is highly socially patterned to an

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00{:}59{:}00{.}042 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}01{.}737$  extent that sometimes escapes me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

00:59:01.740 --> 00:59:02.898 I don't quite know, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00:59:02.900 \rightarrow 00:59:04.615$  why are they having so much more?

 $00:59:04.620 \rightarrow 00:59:06.447$  And then I hear they have different

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00{:}59{:}06{.}447 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}07{.}978$  hair products and this and that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00:59:07.980 \dashrightarrow 00:59:09.898$  It's very hard for me to understand.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

00:59:09.900 - 00:59:11.380 In the Netherlands, for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

00:59:11.380 --> 00:59:13.820 I'll tell you, organo phosphates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00:59:13.820 \longrightarrow 00:59:15.050$  which is pesticides,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

00:59:15.050 - 00:59:17.510 were higher in the high SES

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00:59:17.510 \longrightarrow 00:59:19.459$  because they ate more fruit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00{:}59{:}19{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}21{.}737$  So in in the US we looked at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00:59:21.737 \rightarrow 00:59:23.699$  same thing and lo and behold,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00{:}59{:}23.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}28.890$  organo phosphates are lower in high SES.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

00:59:28.890 --> 00:59:30.465 I don't understand the US

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

00:59:30.465 --> 00:59:32.438 enough to understand why that is

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00:59:32.438 \longrightarrow 00:59:33.770$  such a ubiquitous pattern.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00:59:33.770 \longrightarrow 00:59:35.465$  In the Netherlands,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429

 $00:59:35.465 \rightarrow 00:59:38.770$  it's much less so people live.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- $00:59:38.770 \longrightarrow 00:59:41.890$  I don't know as many reasons.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- $00:59:41.890 \longrightarrow 00:59:43.290$  I don't quite understand that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- $00:59:43.290 \longrightarrow 00:59:44.186$  So in the Netherlands?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- 00:59:44.186 --> 00:59:45.130 No, not always,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- $00:59:45.130 \longrightarrow 00:59:47.650$  although some of some of the chemicals,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- $00:59:47.650 \longrightarrow 00:59:48.858$  yes, very much so,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- $00{:}59{:}48.858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}52.869$  but not as not as dramatic as here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- 00:59:52.870 --> 00:59:55.246 I think you're trans fatty policy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- $00:59:55.246 \rightarrow 00:59:58.229$  example is one of the most profound
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- $00:59:58.230 \rightarrow 01:00:00.151$  statements in support of integrating
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- $01:00:00.151 \rightarrow 01:00:01.356$  the research and policy says
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- $01:00:01.356 \rightarrow 01:00:02.870$  Thank you so much for sharing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931627828571429
- $01{:}00{:}02{.}870 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}04{.}347$  I definitely want to find out more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.94226628
- $01{:}00{:}04.350 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}05.550$  about that and track that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.94226628
- $01:00:05.550 \longrightarrow 01:00:06.750$  and try to replicate that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727

- 01:00:07.300 --> 01:00:08.560 My question for you is building
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- $01{:}00{:}08.560 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}09.660$  on all that you've done,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- $01:00:09.660 \rightarrow 01:00:11.860$  especially in the area of policy,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- $01:00:11.860 \longrightarrow 01:00:13.340$  what do you see next?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- 01:00:13.340 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:00:16.470 What do you see is the next area that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- 01:00:16.470 -> 01:00:18.540 you could be pursuing building out?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- $01:00:18.540 \rightarrow 01:00:19.788$  What does policy mean?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- $01{:}00{:}19.788 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}22.460$  Because when I when I looked at the data,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- $01{:}00{:}22.460 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}24.460$  I thought back to let.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- 01:00:24.460 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:00:25.900 Because in the United States there's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- $01{:}00{:}25{.}900 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}28{.}400$  definitely an association with with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- $01{:}00{:}28{.}400 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}30{.}305$  low income and and lead in your
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- 01:00:30.305 > 01:00:31.655 pipes and in your drinking water.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- 01:00:31.655 --> 01:00:33.780 So what is on your horizon
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941168397272727
- $01:00:33.780 \longrightarrow 01:00:37.100$  next in the space of of poverty
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9503171
- $01:00:38.340 \rightarrow 01:00:40.180$  and research and policy?

 $01{:}00{:}42.140 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}44.972$  Yeah there's there's in my school and in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8521864125

 $01{:}00{:}44.972 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}48.136$  my world thinking too 2 lines of research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8521864125

 $01:00:48.140 \longrightarrow 01:00:49.580$  One is always which we have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8521864125

01:00:49.580 --> 01:00:53.590 You know can you dissect. Why poverty?

NOTE Confidence: 0.945617048636363

 $01:00:56.230 \rightarrow 01:00:58.390$  What makes poverty relate to behavioral NOTE Confidence: 0.945617048636363

 $01:00:58.390 \rightarrow 01:01:00.175$  and new developmental cognitive school

NOTE Confidence: 0.945617048636363

 $01:01:00.175 \longrightarrow 01:01:01.909$  achievement problems or do you just

NOTE Confidence: 0.945617048636363

 $01{:}01{:}01{:}099 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}03.990$  think you know it's money. That's it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

01:01:08.110 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:01:12.176 You know I am it's I think those

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $01:01:12.176 \longrightarrow 01:01:14.270$  two are are totally separate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

01:01:14.270 --> 01:01:16.508 I think we should fight LED

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

 $01{:}01{:}16.508 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}18.290$  and environmental things really

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

01:01:18.290 --> 01:01:21.590 more better and full force.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

01:01:21.590 --> 01:01:22.955 Lead is just I can't yeah we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219

01:01:22.955 --> 01:01:24.405 discussed that I don't need to say that
- $01{:}01{:}24{.}405 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}25{.}948$  no none of us can believe that it's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219
- $01:01:25.948 \rightarrow 01:01:27.544$  still around as a public house hazard.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219
- $01:01:27.550 \longrightarrow 01:01:29.230$  It should be gone.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219
- 01:01:29.230 --> 01:01:30.910 It's just not acceptable.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219
- 01:01:30.910 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:01:33.566 At the same time I think make very
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219
- $01{:}01{:}33{.}566 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}36{.}734$  clear that as long as we have these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9352219
- $01{:}01{:}36.734 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}38.790$  substantial poverty gradients that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.922488011724138
- $01{:}01{:}41{.}310 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}43{.}654$  that is a policy taxing and that's you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.922488011724138
- 01:01:43.654 --> 01:01:46.071 know beyond me to to do much about the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.922488011724138
- $01:01:46.071 \rightarrow 01:01:47.870$  but it's clearly something that has
- NOTE Confidence: 0.922488011724138
- $01{:}01{:}47.870 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}50.348$  to be addressed because I think with.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.922488011724138
- 01:01:50.348 --> 01:01:52.938 Addressing LED, you will not
- NOTE Confidence: 0.922488011724138
- $01:01:52.940 \rightarrow 01:01:54.300$  substantially address the poverty
- NOTE Confidence: 0.922488011724138
- $01:01:54.300 \longrightarrow 01:01:56.000$  inequality in this country as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.922488011724138
- $01{:}01{:}56{.}000 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}57{.}697$  much as I think it's important,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.922488011724138
- $01:01:57.700 \rightarrow 01:01:59.980$  but it's completely different thing.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.922488011724138
- $01{:}01{:}59{.}980 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}01{.}380$  And you see that in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $01:02:03.660 \rightarrow 01:02:08.098$  we all know that, you know homelessness.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $01:02:08.100 \rightarrow 01:02:11.228$  I'm yeah, the the the extent of homelessness
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $01{:}02{:}11{.}228 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}14{.}081$  in Boston and other areas is just so
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $01{:}02{:}14.081 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}16.500$  dramatic and such a health hazard.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- $01{:}02{:}16.500 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}17.739$  I don't know why that's not addressed.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- 01:02:17.740 --> 01:02:20.372 I really fail to see that could
- NOTE Confidence: 0.941691228571429
- 01:02:20.372 --> 01:02:21.940 easily be addressed. Wonderful.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $01:02:21.940 \longrightarrow 01:02:22.765$  Well, just in the interest
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- 01:02:22.765 --> 01:02:23.260 of everyone's time,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- 01:02:23.260 --> 01:02:24.868 if anyone would like to stay on,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $01{:}02{:}24.868 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}26.180$  please do wait in the room.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- $01{:}02{:}26.180 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}27.900$  We can continue this conversation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- 01:02:27.900 --> 01:02:29.340 And but just please do join
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853
- 01:02:29.340 --> 01:02:30.500 me again in thanking Dr.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9452853

01:02:30.500 --> 01:02:31.660 Kmar for his presentation. NOTE Confidence: 0.902486077 01:02:34.260 --> 01:02:36.130 Yeah. Sorry to talk so NOTE Confidence: 0.902486077 01:02:36.130 --> 01:02:38.000 long and see you later.