WEBVTT

NOTE duration: "01:23:58.5600000"

NOTE recognizability:0.427

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.553211300:00:00.000 --> 00:00:00.240 I'm NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

 $00:00:03.280 \longrightarrow 00:00:04.480$ thank you everyone for coming

NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

 $00{:}00{:}04.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}05.440$ to the Psychedelic Seminar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

 $00:00:05.440 \longrightarrow 00:00:07.120$ This is the first time this year

NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

 $00:00:07.120 \longrightarrow 00:00:08.509$ we've had in person speakers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

 $00{:}00{:}08.509 \to 00{:}00{:}11.000$ So thank you so much for being here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

 $00:00:11.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:13.520$ We are scheduled, we have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

 $00:00:13.520 \dashrightarrow 00:00:15.320$ we have November and December scheduled.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

 $00:00:15.320 \longrightarrow 00:00:17.035$ Jessica, do you have the dates

NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

00:00:17.035 --> 00:00:18.560 of November and December handy?

NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

 $00:00:18.560 \dashrightarrow 00:00:20.440$ It's typically the third Friday of the month.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

 $00:00:23.320 \longrightarrow 00:00:27.024$ We're looking at November 17th talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

 $00:00:27.024 \longrightarrow 00:00:28.880$ about psychedelics and addiction.

00:00:28.880 --> 00:00:31.132 And then December 15th,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5532113

 $00{:}00{:}31.132 \longrightarrow 00{:}00{:}34.510$ I believe will be Jerry Sanacora.

NOTE Confidence: 0.42947567

00:00:35.590 --> 00:00:36.734 Yeah, Jerry and Ben will talk about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.42947567

 $00:00:36.734 \longrightarrow 00:00:38.846$ you saw in a depression study and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.42947567

 $00:00:38.846 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.150$ psychedelics and addiction. Who is that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.42947567

 $00:00:46.350 \longrightarrow 00:00:47.510$ It's cocaine from Alabama.

NOTE Confidence: 0.42947567

 $00:00:47.510 \longrightarrow 00:00:48.670$ I'm thinking on that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.42947567

 $00:00:49.110 \longrightarrow 00:00:50.343$ I know I can. Let me think of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00{:}00{:}56.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}58.340$ anyway those those should

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

00:00:58.340 --> 00:01:02.255 be good and then we're working on thanks

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:02.255 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.095$ to Julian Orutzi who I saw on here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:05.100 \longrightarrow 00:01:06.508$ We're putting together something

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00{:}01{:}06.508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}09.015$ in in February that I think will

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:09.015 \longrightarrow 00:01:11.019$ be really interesting which is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

00:01:11.019 --> 00:01:13.259 discussion panel of the regulatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00{:}01{:}13.259 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}15.020$ framework surrounding psychedelics.

 $00:01:15.020 \longrightarrow 00:01:17.001$ The Department of Health and Human Services

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00{:}01{:}17.001 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}18.580$ is putting together draft guidance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

00:01:18.580 --> 00:01:21.524 not for the FDA put out draft guidance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

00:01:21.530 --> 00:01:22.650 you know, real guidance a couple of

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00{:}01{:}22.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}25.420$ months ago, but this is HHS guidance

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:25.420 \longrightarrow 00:01:27.649$ about clinical use and that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:27.649 \longrightarrow 00:01:29.167$ should be coming out in November.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

00:01:29.170 --> 00:01:30.595 Then there'll be a commentary

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:30.595 \longrightarrow 00:01:32.343$ period and it'll be finalized by

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:32.343 \longrightarrow 00:01:34.145$ February and we'll have a number

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

00:01:34.145 --> 00:01:36.170 of of this academic discussions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

00:01:36.170 --> 00:01:37.858 but also to people from HHS who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00{:}01{:}37.858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}39.849$ like in the process of developing this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:39.850 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.406$ So I think it'll be a really interesting both

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:42.406 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.047$ informational and and discussion session.

 $00:01:44.050 \longrightarrow 00:01:45.408$ We're going to do that in person.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:45.410 \longrightarrow 00:01:46.942$ I expect that it'll be, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

00:01:46.942 --> 00:01:48.538 we'll advertise and I expect it'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:48.538 \longrightarrow 00:01:50.377$ be popular beyond our local community

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:50.380 \longrightarrow 00:01:51.814$ in the TAC Auditorium and it'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:51.814 \longrightarrow 00:01:53.379$ be a bit longer than usual.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:53.380 \longrightarrow 00:01:54.458$ So keep an eye out for that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:54.460 \longrightarrow 00:01:57.340$ That's in the third,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

00:01:57.340 --> 00:01:58.300 the 3rd, February,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31732166

 $00:01:58.300 \longrightarrow 00:02:01.019$ 3rd Friday in February.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00{:}02{:}01.220 --> 00{:}02{:}02.908$ So Chris, in November,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:02.908 \longrightarrow 00:02:04.580$ it's Peter Hendricks. Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:07.140 \longrightarrow 00:02:10.100$ All right. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

00:02:10.620 --> 00:02:12.724 with that, I'll turn it over to Jerry

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:12.724 \longrightarrow 00:02:14.699$ Sanacora to introduce today's speaker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:15.020 \longrightarrow 00:02:16.340$ Great. Thank you.

 $00:02:16.340 \longrightarrow 00:02:18.780$ Well, I'm really happy to have Luanne here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:18.780 \longrightarrow 00:02:21.762$ We managed to become friends and

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:21.762 \longrightarrow 00:02:24.670$ collaborators over the past few years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

00:02:24.670 --> 00:02:27.154 I I got to know Moana's work actually from

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00{:}02{:}27.154 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}28.918$ reading some of the stuff in ketamine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:28.918 \longrightarrow 00:02:31.214$ But then really started to read a

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:31.214 \longrightarrow 00:02:34.690$ lot of of your other work and how you

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:34.690 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.670$ incorporate the practice of placebo or

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:38.670 \longrightarrow 00:02:42.309$ the study of placebo into all of medicine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:42.309 \longrightarrow 00:02:44.787$ And you know starting with pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00{:}02{:}44.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}46.833$ I know you did your training back in Italy

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

00:02:46.833 --> 00:02:48.670 with Benedetti was one of the sort of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:48.670 \longrightarrow 00:02:50.070$ I don't want to say the father's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:50.070 \longrightarrow 00:02:52.494$ but one of the big names and placebo

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:02:52.494 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.469$ research one of the biggest names.

 $00:02:54.470 \longrightarrow 00:02:56.648$ But you've really managed to continue

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00{:}02{:}56.648 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}02{:}59.149$ that line of research largely in pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00{:}02{:}59.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}01.118$ But now I know your interests

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:01.118 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.102$ as a psychiatrist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:02.110 \longrightarrow 00:03:04.250$ also very interested in spreading

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:04.250 \longrightarrow 00:03:07.830$ out into a range of other illnesses.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:07.830 \longrightarrow 00:03:12.950$ And I think some of our discussions

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:12.950 \longrightarrow 00:03:16.640$ have really highlighted how

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00{:}03{:}16.640 --> 00{:}03{:}18.780$ you're looking at place bo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:18.780 \longrightarrow 00:03:21.812$ Not just as this sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

00:03:21.812 --> 00:03:23.596 pejorative negative thing like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:23.600 \longrightarrow 00:03:25.556$ oh, this is the placebo response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:25.560 \longrightarrow 00:03:28.240$ but how the some of the core components

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

00:03:28.240 --> 00:03:30.995 of placebo would be playing a major role.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:31.000 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.200$ Especially when we start thinking

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00{:}03{:}33.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}36.160$ about the effects of psychedelics,

 $00:03:36.160 \longrightarrow 00:03:38.680$ how psychedelics can actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:38.680 \longrightarrow 00:03:40.790$ obviously be influenced by things

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

00:03:40.790 --> 00:03:42.478 like expectancy and conditioning,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:42.480 \longrightarrow 00:03:45.100$ but also how they may actually have an

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00{:}03{:}45.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}46.842$ impact on expectancy and conditioning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:46.842 \longrightarrow 00:03:48.432$ So comes this very interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

00:03:48.432 --> 00:03:49.810 way of thinking about it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:49.810 \longrightarrow 00:03:52.738$ and I think Glenn has raised it to another

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

00:03:52.738 --> 00:03:54.370 level in the way of thinking about it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:54.370 \longrightarrow 00:03:56.290$ Not just so straightforward like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:56.290 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.530$ oh, this could all be

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:03:57.530 \longrightarrow 00:03:58.522$ explained just by expectancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00{:}03{:}58.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}00.246$ but actually thinking about the interaction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00{:}04{:}00.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}02.194$ So really interesting about

NOTE Confidence: 0.37012887

 $00:04:02.194 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.330$ hearing more what you have to say.

 $00:04:04.330 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.930$ Thanks a lot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:05.720 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.239$ Thank you very much for having me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:07.240 \longrightarrow 00:04:10.040$ And thank you for making this visit

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:10.040 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.040$ very insightful and thoughtful

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:12.040 \longrightarrow 00:04:13.504$ and wonderful conversation with

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

00:04:13.504 --> 00:04:16.040 all the people I met so far.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

00:04:16.040 --> 00:04:19.596 So I gave us title to Chris,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:19.600 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.795$ Jessica mind over Monaco's because

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:22.795 \longrightarrow 00:04:26.580$ sometime Placib effects bring a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

00:04:26.580 --> 00:04:29.278 of negative connotates and people tend

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00{:}04{:}29.278 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}31.870$ to believe that this Marilla bias

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:31.942 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.609$ you know when in reality we started

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:34.609 \longrightarrow 00:04:37.030$ this year because underlying changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

00:04:37.030 --> 00:04:39.430 across symptoms across disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:39.430 \longrightarrow 00:04:41.590$ And today I wanted to explain a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

00:04:41.590 --> 00:04:44.110 bit of neurobiology aspects of placebo,

 $00:04:44.110 \longrightarrow 00:04:47.080$ but also some implication towards

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:47.080 \longrightarrow 00:04:50.445$ the end about psychedelic and how

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:50.445 \longrightarrow 00:04:53.210$ this kind of knowledge can inform us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:53.210 \longrightarrow 00:04:56.090$ And I have to say that folks here

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00{:}04{:}56.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}58.610$ at Yale brought me to these fields

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:04:58.610 \longrightarrow 00:05:00.790$ and in particular Jerry's and Akora.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35778156

 $00:05:00.790 \longrightarrow 00:05:01.570$ So thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32298335 00:05:03.770 --> 00:05:03.880 So NOTE Confidence: 0.32298335

00:05:10.440 --> 00:05:11.120 Preston,

NOTE Confidence: 0.2988057

 $00:05:15.210 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.884$ let's talk about what placebo effects are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.2988057

 $00:05:17.890 \longrightarrow 00:05:19.194$ which are the mechanism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2988057

 $00{:}05{:}19.194 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}21.522$ And obviously I will talk about chronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.2988057

 $00{:}05{:}21.522 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}23.720$ pain because it's the main area of

NOTE Confidence: 0.2988057

 $00:05:23.720 \longrightarrow 00:05:25.690$ research we haven't been tackling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2988057

00:05:25.690 --> 00:05:28.210 But I hope what I will show to you

 $00:05:28.210 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.130$ can be translated into psychiatry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2988057

 $00{:}05{:}31.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}33.626$ And finally we can talk and tackle a

NOTE Confidence: 0.2988057

 $00:05:33.626 \longrightarrow 00:05:36.043$ little bit the show psychedelics and

NOTE Confidence: 0.2988057

 $00:05:36.043 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.629$ how Placip when treatment responses can

NOTE Confidence: 0.2988057

 $00:05:38.703 \longrightarrow 00:05:41.209$ interact and which are the controls or

NOTE Confidence: 0.2988057

 $00{:}05{:}41.209 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}45.283$ the design when we study psychedelics

NOTE Confidence: 0.2988057

 $00{:}05{:}45.283 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}47.348$ or antidepressants and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:05:49.510 \longrightarrow 00:05:52.330$ So placebo and drug effects no

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:05:52.330 \longrightarrow 00:05:54.630$ matter which treatment we use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:05:54.630 \longrightarrow 00:05:57.708$ This can be for example opioids,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:05:59.750 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.670$ surgical interventions or

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:01.670 \longrightarrow 00:06:04.230$ complementary and integrative medicine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:04.230 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.572$ There is some ways specific do

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:07.572 \longrightarrow 00:06:09.384$ I tend to dislike this word,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:09.390 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.258$ pharmacodynamic component and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:12.258 \longrightarrow 00:06:14.409$ placebo psychosocial component.

 $00{:}06{:}14.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}16.626$ The placebo psychosocial component

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:16.626 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.601$ is the context around any treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

00:06:19.601 --> 00:06:23.170 and at least when we talk about pain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:23.170 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.906$ the top down the descending pain

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}06{:}25.906 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}28.807$ modulator system can play a critical

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:28.807 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.287$ role in modulating pain outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

00:06:31.287 --> 00:06:34.122 sometimes more than the you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

00:06:34.122 --> 00:06:36.702 input not susceptive input coming

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:36.702 \longrightarrow 00:06:38.250$ from the periphery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:38.250 \longrightarrow 00:06:41.850$ And one of the first study we

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:41.850 \longrightarrow 00:06:45.290$ conduct while I was a PhD student in

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:45.290 \longrightarrow 00:06:47.919$ neuroscience was to try to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}06{:}47.919 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}50.860$ how the context can change outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}06{:}50.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}53.668$ So a very clinical simple observation

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:06:53.668 \longrightarrow 00:06:56.383$ where the same thing killer were

 $00:06:56.383 \longrightarrow 00:06:59.036$ given to a pump of infusion or

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}06{:}59.036 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}01.688$ with a physician a nurse at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:01.688 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.724$ bed decides telling patients now

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:03.724 \longrightarrow 00:07:05.536$ we're starting the treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:05.540 \longrightarrow 00:07:07.058$ When we wrote to this paper,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:07.060 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.910$ we had called this hidden

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

00:07:09.910 --> 00:07:11.620 versus open administration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:11.620 \longrightarrow 00:07:14.422$ but the editors suggest over to

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

00:07:14.422 --> 00:07:16.980 versus covert but still hidden.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

00:07:16.980 --> 00:07:19.155 Open paradox is very common

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:19.155 \longrightarrow 00:07:20.895$ in the placebo literature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:20.900 \longrightarrow 00:07:24.540$ So the Eden administration is this one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:24.540 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.280$ The open will be with physician,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:28.280 \longrightarrow 00:07:31.380$ a nurse around the patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

00:07:31.380 --> 00:07:33.576 And we were tackling the question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}07{:}33.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}35.890$ can we study Placib effects without

 $00:07:35.890 \longrightarrow 00:07:37.968$ any placebo, without tablets,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:37.968 \longrightarrow 00:07:39.930$ without selling solution.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:39.930 \longrightarrow 00:07:42.415$ And in this case we study patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

00:07:42.415 --> 00:07:44.890 who were you know in the hospital

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:44.890 \longrightarrow 00:07:46.650$ for removal of lung cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:46.650 \longrightarrow 00:07:48.750$ And the goal was to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:48.750 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.583$ how we can improve the outcome by

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}07{:}51.583 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}53.838$ manipulating the route of administration

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:53.838 \longrightarrow 00:07:56.528$ and the context around the drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:56.530 \longrightarrow 00:07:58.672$ For for those of you who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:07:58.672 \longrightarrow 00:08:00.600$ familiar with Penn Therapeutics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:00.600 \longrightarrow 00:08:04.530$ buprenorphine and Tramadol are opioids right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}08{:}04.530 --> 00{:}08{:}05.230 \ \mathrm{Keterolac},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}08{:}05.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}09.262$ metamazole are non opioids and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:09.262 \longrightarrow 00:08:12.922$ can see that opioid treatment like

 $00:08:12.922 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.338$ buprenorphine can reduce clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}08{:}15.338 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}17.695$ post operative pain significantly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:17.695 \longrightarrow 00:08:21.510$ But when we provide the same drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:21.510 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.438$ with the disclosure with the presence

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:24.438 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.594$ of the physician or the nurse there

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:27.594 \longrightarrow 00:08:30.216$ there is a optimization of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:30.216 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.126$ reduction of the pain For some drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:34.126 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.765$ this you know augmentation is even

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}08{:}36.765 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}39.302$ larger like tramadol if we merely

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:39.302 \longrightarrow 00:08:42.050$ use the gold standard to interpret

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}08{:}42.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}44.432$ clinical trial results merely the

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

00:08:44.432 --> 00:08:46.292 difference between hidden versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:46.292 \longrightarrow 00:08:48.942$ soap and represent to this specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

00:08:48.942 --> 00:08:51.288 component and all this part will

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:51.288 \longrightarrow 00:08:53.460$ be the placebo or psychosocial

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:53.460 \longrightarrow 00:08:56.512$ components and you can see that can

 $00:08:56.588 \longrightarrow 00:08:58.880$ be larger than the active drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:08:58.880 \longrightarrow 00:09:02.036$ So the same for Cathedral Ecometamazole,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:02.040 \longrightarrow 00:09:04.260$ but they're non opioids based,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:04.260 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.800$ so the observation was poorly

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:06.800 \longrightarrow 00:09:09.938$ clinical and we state that open

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}09{:}09{.}938 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}12.928$ administration of a drug working

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:12.928 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.320$ through psychosocial context can

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}09{:}15.406 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}18.136$ be more beneficial for patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:18.140 \longrightarrow 00:09:20.018$ What we did,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:20.020 \longrightarrow 00:09:22.420$ we used the same paradigm with

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:22.420 \longrightarrow 00:09:23.380$ the ads department.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:23.380 \longrightarrow 00:09:24.980$ Given that I'm talking to

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}09{:}24.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}26.260$ psychiatrists and psychologists,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:26.260 \longrightarrow 00:09:28.035$ this can be more informative

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:28.035 \longrightarrow 00:09:29.100$ than pain treatment.

00:09:29.100 --> 00:09:32.089 So open injection of the adzipan again

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00{:}09{:}32.089 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}35.043$ in patient who are cancer patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:35.043 \longrightarrow 00:09:37.698$ post operative setting can reduce

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:37.698 \longrightarrow 00:09:40.620$ situation and anxiety substantially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:40.620 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.780$ So when the same drug,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

00:09:41.780 --> 00:09:44.580 same dose was given in a hidden way,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:44.580 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.876$ there is no reduction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:45.876 \longrightarrow 00:09:47.496$ So the question here is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:47.500 \longrightarrow 00:09:50.650$ do we need somehow to have an

NOTE Confidence: 0.49085578

 $00:09:50.650 \longrightarrow 00:09:54.248$ expectancy for a drug to start to work?

NOTE Confidence: 0.2935229

 $00:09:54.250 \longrightarrow 00:09:56.450$ Also we try the opposite.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2935229

 $00:09:56.450 \longrightarrow 00:09:58.150$ We inform a patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.2935229

 $00:09:58.150 \longrightarrow 00:09:59.850$ we interrupt the drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2935229

 $00:09:59.850 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.615$ So those who had the responded with

NOTE Confidence: 0.2935229

00:10:02.615 --> 00:10:04.808 the open administration of the azapam,

NOTE Confidence: 0.2935229

 $00:10:04.810 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.090$ when we're told now we are not injected,

 $00:10:07.090 \longrightarrow 00:10:08.574$ we stop the treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2935229

 $00{:}10{:}08.574 \longrightarrow 00{:}10{:}12.226$ You can see that there is a worsening of

NOTE Confidence: 0.2935229

 $00:10:12.226 \longrightarrow 00:10:15.362$ anxiety and no change for the interruption.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2935229

00:10:15.370 --> 00:10:17.650 So with that, I hope I convince you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:10:21.840 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.264$ With that, I hope I convince

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:10:24.264 \longrightarrow 00:10:27.052$ you that somehow the open Eden

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:10:27.052 --> 00:10:30.196 administration can help us to study

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:10:30.196 \dashrightarrow 00:10:33.256$ a drug by eliminating silencing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:10:33.256 \longrightarrow 00:10:34.600$ eliminating placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:10:34.600 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.520$ So ethical issue related

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:10:36.520 \longrightarrow 00:10:37.960$ to placebo treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:10:37.960 \longrightarrow 00:10:40.830$ But there is a way to silence

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}10{:}40.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}42.312$ expectations and I don't know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:10:42.312 \longrightarrow 00:10:44.366$ maybe we can use this kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:10:44.366 --> 00:10:46.458 paradigm with further, you know,

00:10:46.458 --> 00:10:47.880 treatment and depressants

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:10:47.880 \longrightarrow 00:10:50.250$ that start working in acute

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}10{:}50.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}52.590$ like ketamine or psychedelics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:10:52.590 \longrightarrow 00:10:57.189$ This can be a paradigm to consider.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}10{:}57.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}59.662$ The next step would be to talk a

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:10:59.662 --> 00:11:02.285 little bit more about how I start

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:11:02.285 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.715$ to be interested in this phenomenon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:11:04.720 \longrightarrow 00:11:07.920$ So we were studying Parkinson's

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}11{:}07.920 \longrightarrow 00{:}11{:}10.572$ disorder and this was a special

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:11:10.572 --> 00:11:13.089 setting that for someone who had the

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:11:13.089 --> 00:11:15.798 Finnish MDM practising for about one year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:11:15.800 --> 00:11:18.880 It was something very comfortable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:11:18.880 \longrightarrow 00:11:22.044$ you know to go back to intraperative

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}11{:}22.044 \to 00{:}11{:}25.064$ room and study a changes that occurred

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:11:25.064 \longrightarrow 00:11:27.560$ at the level of neuronal discharge.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}11{:}27.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}30.008$ So patients who do not respond

 $00{:}11{:}30.008 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}31.860$ to the classical cocktail of

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:11:31.860 --> 00:11:33.672 dopamine agonist and antagonist

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:11:33.672 \longrightarrow 00:11:35.937$ to receive DP brain stimulation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}11{:}35.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}39.820$ DP brain stimulation consists of

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:11:39.820 \longrightarrow 00:11:42.820$ implanting on electrodes and sub

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:11:42.820 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.150$ thalamic nuclide and a battery

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:11:47.150 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.558$ eventually so that we have series of

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:11:50.558 --> 00:11:53.665 stimulation 12 to this patient managed

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}11{:}53.665 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}56.226$ their symptoms mostly for those who

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:11:56.226 \longrightarrow 00:11:58.080$ are not familiar but here everyone

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}11{:}58.136 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}59.990$ we are talking the same language.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:11:59.990 --> 00:12:02.186 You know these patients have rigidity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}12{:}02.190 --> 00{:}12{:}03.450 \ {\rm tremor},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}12{:}03.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}06.168$ bradykinesia as main Parkinson's

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:06.168 \longrightarrow 00:12:08.526$ symptom together with a lot

00:12:08.526 --> 00:12:09.870 of psychiatric problems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:12:09.870 --> 00:12:13.710 Here we try a pharmacological conditioning,

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:13.710 \longrightarrow 00:12:14.826$ so I work all of us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:14.830 \longrightarrow 00:12:17.441$ So to give a little of relief

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:12:17.441 --> 00:12:19.630 during the surgical implantation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:19.630 \longrightarrow 00:12:22.310$ this is a longer you know surgical procedure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:22.310 \longrightarrow 00:12:24.578$ We start early in the morning and

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:24.578 \longrightarrow 00:12:27.378$ then six 7-8 hour of intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}12{:}27.378 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}31.360$ So before the day of the surgery we

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:12:31.360 --> 00:12:33.256 condition patient with Apomorphine

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:33.256 \longrightarrow 00:12:35.390$ day one day 2 day three.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:35.390 \longrightarrow 00:12:37.950$ Apomorphine is a dopamine agonist

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:37.950 \longrightarrow 00:12:40.465$ and producer reduction of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}12{:}40.465 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}43.410$ three symptoms I mentioned to you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:43.410 \longrightarrow 00:12:46.525$ But the time life is very short,

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:46.530 \longrightarrow 00:12:49.320$ the volume prover about 20 minutes

 $00:12:49.320 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.690$ some for maximum one hour.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:51.690 \longrightarrow 00:12:54.876$ Therefore we were in the intraoperative

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}12{:}54.876 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}59.393$ room and the gun was to replace the

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:12:59.393 \longrightarrow 00:13:02.498$ drug Upomorphine with saline solution

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:02.498 \longrightarrow 00:13:06.092$ being injected subcutaneously while we

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:06.092 \longrightarrow 00:13:08.497$ were recording the neuronal activities

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:08.497 \longrightarrow 00:13:11.418$ from this this part of the brain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}13{:}11.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}14.619$ So for those who are not familiar,

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:14.620 \longrightarrow 00:13:18.067$ we are designed very well in terms of human

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:18.067 \longrightarrow 00:13:20.915$ being or also monkeys and other animals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:20.915 \longrightarrow 00:13:24.890$ So there is a zona incerta and then the

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}13{:}24.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}27.783$ supratalamic nucleus and then again a

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00{:}13{:}27.783 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}30.555$ silent area before the substancia negra.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:13:30.560 --> 00:13:34.480 So our goal in terms of neurophysiologists,

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:34.480 \longrightarrow 00:13:36.982$ surgeons was to identify this part

 $00:13:36.982 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.775$ of the brain and in order to make

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:39.775 \longrightarrow 00:13:42.363$ sure that we were there we record

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:42.363 \longrightarrow 00:13:44.319$ the several neuronal activities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:44.320 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.152$ many and so we had over 100 you

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:48.152 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.923$ know recordings and usually you

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:50.923 \longrightarrow 00:13:53.195$ see the typical firing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:53.200 \longrightarrow 00:13:56.427$ So and also this first activity where

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

00:13:56.427 --> 00:13:59.700 the spike become close to one another,

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:13:59.700 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.300$ so we counterbalance the nuclear

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:14:02.300 \longrightarrow 00:14:04.900$ serving gas control and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:14:04.996 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.340$ nuclear serving gas target.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:14:07.340 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.420$ So the goal was to see if some

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:14:10.420 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.396$ other suggestion of improvement

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:14:12.396 \longrightarrow 00:14:14.628$ along with the administration

NOTE Confidence: 0.53062505

 $00:14:14.628 \longrightarrow 00:14:16.860$ of selling solution can

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:14:16.943 \longrightarrow 00:14:19.493$ change the pattern of firing

00:14:19.493 --> 00:14:21.533 in the Subitalamic nuclear.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00{:}14{:}21.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}26.140$ And you can see that it's a very small area.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:14:26.140 \longrightarrow 00:14:30.790$ This is smaller than a bin in humans and

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:14:30.790 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.640$ was very you know unique cast contest.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:14:34.640 \longrightarrow 00:14:37.214$ So what we were interested was

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:14:37.214 \longrightarrow 00:14:40.079$ the self report by the patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:14:40.080 \longrightarrow 00:14:42.900$ A neurologist entered into the surgical

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:14:42.900 \longrightarrow 00:14:46.660$ room and in a blind way assess rigidity

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:14:46.660 \longrightarrow 00:14:50.080$ and the scale that they use is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00{:}14{:}50.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}54.119$ UPD RS4 point scale to assess rigidity

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:14:54.120 \longrightarrow 00:14:59.060$ and you can see here the circles and

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:14:59.060 \longrightarrow 00:15:01.550$ then we also measured the firing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00{:}15{:}01.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}04.702$ So these are only two examples of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:04.702 \longrightarrow 00:15:07.622$ many patients involved that but mostly all

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:07.622 \longrightarrow 00:15:10.908$ the neurons that we were able to record.

 $00:15:10.910 \longrightarrow 00:15:13.892$ We found congruency between what patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:13.892 \longrightarrow 00:15:16.367$ experience the reduction of clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00{:}15{:}16.367 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}18.821$ symptoms and the reduction of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:18.821 \longrightarrow 00:15:22.028$ firing at the level of subitalamic area.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:22.030 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.944$ But there were also patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00{:}15{:}23.944 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}26.074$ didn't improve and for those patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

00:15:26.074 --> 00:15:27.259 who didn't improve,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:27.260 \longrightarrow 00:15:29.380$ they didn't experience a benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:29.380 \longrightarrow 00:15:32.296$ The neurologist didn't detect any change.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:32.300 \longrightarrow 00:15:35.348$ And so it when we compared the neuronal

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00{:}15{:}35.348 \to 00{:}15{:}38.017$ discharge before and after selling solution,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:38.020 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.692$ we found in a changes that was you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:41.700 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.095$ important study to me for two reasons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00{:}15{:}45.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}47.556$ First was a sort of epiphany you hear

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:47.556 \longrightarrow 00:15:50.248$ the spike and then when you go back

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

00:15:50.248 --> 00:15:52.452 towards these neurons and see this

 $00:15:52.452 \longrightarrow 00:15:54.858$ change associated with plasymbi fats 10.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:54.860 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.806$ Last one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:15:55.806 \longrightarrow 00:15:59.208$ there is something here more than a bias,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

00:15:59.208 --> 00:16:01.470 more than another effects as many

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

00:16:01.546 --> 00:16:04.060 people try to think about placebo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:16:04.060 \longrightarrow 00:16:06.265$ but also this question why some people

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:16:06.265 \longrightarrow 00:16:08.820$ respond and some other people don't respond.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

00:16:08.820 --> 00:16:11.140 It's still an open question and the main

NOTE Confidence: 0.31534237

 $00:16:11.140 \longrightarrow 00:16:13.537$ line of the research in my lab today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:16:20.440 \longrightarrow 00:16:23.205$ So from this sort of pioneering studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:16:23.205 --> 00:16:25.877 that was running when I start my PhD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:16:25.880 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.808$ we continue and I decided to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00{:}16{:}28.808 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}31.280$ transition from Parkinson to pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:16:31.280 \longrightarrow 00:16:34.772$ But the simple reason that I had so many

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:16:34.772 \longrightarrow 00:16:37.064$ questions Parkinson patients are very

00:16:37.064 --> 00:16:39.920 difficult to be studied the disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00{:}16{:}39.920 \to 00{:}16{:}42.320$ it's difficult to model enough controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:16:42.320 --> 00:16:44.800 You don't make people becoming,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:16:44.800 --> 00:16:48.250 you know, parkinsonian patient and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:16:48.250 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.980$ also the amount of surgical procedure

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:16:50.980 \longrightarrow 00:16:53.860$ we were conducting was 2/3 per months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:16:53.860 \longrightarrow 00:16:57.580$ So I was literally too slow to finish a PhD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:16:57.580 \longrightarrow 00:16:59.360$ That's also not good.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:16:59.360 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.585$ That's model to understand other

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:01.585 \longrightarrow 00:17:03.419$ questions related to placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:03.420 \longrightarrow 00:17:06.057$ So I thought pain can be a good model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:06.060 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.900$ We can work with pain with health control.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:08.900 \longrightarrow 00:17:10.220$ So we have animal models.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:10.220 \longrightarrow 00:17:13.256$ So we have chronic pain patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:17:13.260 --> 00:17:16.820 So we started to do a variety of studies to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:16.910 \longrightarrow 00:17:19.153$ understand some psychological questions.

00:17:19.153 --> 00:17:21.979 What can treat the ablazific effect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:21.980 \longrightarrow 00:17:23.200$ expectations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:23.200 \longrightarrow 00:17:25.640$ verbal suggestions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:25.640 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.860$ conditioning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:17:26.860 --> 00:17:31.672 And I really continue the line of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:31.672 \longrightarrow 00:17:33.364$ research like hypomorphine where

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:33.364 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.426$ we were giving the administration

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:17:35.426 --> 00:17:38.548 of medications and you can do the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:17:38.548 --> 00:17:41.250 same thing with pain by reduction

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:41.250 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.873$ of pain intensity you can simulate

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00{:}17{:}43.873 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}46.078$ a benefit without giving 12

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:46.078 \longrightarrow 00:17:47.830$ participants morphine for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:47.830 \longrightarrow 00:17:50.188$ Although we did this so too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00{:}17{:}50.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}53.746$ So currently there is a sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:17:53.746 \longrightarrow 00:17:56.350$ understanding that verbal suggestion,

 $00:17:56.350 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.870$ this is a wonderful antidepressant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00{:}17{:}58.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}01.246$ Your depression can improve

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:18:01.246 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.028$ therapeutic prior experience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:18:03.030 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.126$ How many of your patients come and say I

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:18:06.126 --> 00:18:09.304 like this drug because I benefit from it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:18:09.310 \longrightarrow 00:18:11.900$ Observation from other people and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:18:11.900 \longrightarrow 00:18:15.164$ contextual effects like the Open Eden

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:18:15.164 \longrightarrow 00:18:18.134$ paradigm and of course interpersonal

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00{:}18{:}18.134 \to 00{:}18{:}22.090$ interaction can trigger place be effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:18:22.090 --> 00:18:24.190 Expectancy is something that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:18:24.190 \longrightarrow 00:18:26.290$ continue to intrigue us,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00{:}18{:}26.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}28.810$ and when we talk about expectancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00{:}18{:}28.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}31.346$ we can refer to something that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:18:31.346 \longrightarrow 00:18:33.609$ measure and we call it expectations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:18:33.610 --> 00:18:37.165 With a scale from zero to 100 for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:18:37.170 --> 00:18:39.140 how much benefit you have

00:18:39.140 --> 00:18:42.140 expect from zero to maximum?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:18:42.140 \longrightarrow 00:18:43.860$ But also there are expectancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:18:43.860 \longrightarrow 00:18:45.580$ that we study in animals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:18:45.580 --> 00:18:48.300 we study in non human model or sometimes

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:18:48.300 \longrightarrow 00:18:51.149$ we are not even able to model in

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:18:51.149 --> 00:18:53.049 humans because can not necessarily

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:18:53.049 \longrightarrow 00:18:55.659$ be captured by a simple scale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:18:55.660 --> 00:18:57.774 How much do you expect to improve?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:18:57.780 \longrightarrow 00:19:00.216$ And it is when we do modeling

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00{:}19{:}00.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}03.490$ other brain imaging approach to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

00:19:03.490 --> 00:19:06.106 understand how expectancy can

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:19:06.106 \dashrightarrow 00:19:09.097$ modulate drug and Placid beefast.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00{:}19{:}09.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}11.182$ An interesting aspect is that at

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:19:11.182 \longrightarrow 00:19:13.787$ least for pain as you can see on

NOTE Confidence: 0.7061442

 $00:19:13.787 \longrightarrow 00:19:15.980$ this part of the graph is that

 $00:19:18.060 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.727$ you know the descending component in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:19:20.727 \dashrightarrow 00:19:23.712$ dotted line in blue can be so relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:19:23.712 \longrightarrow 00:19:25.982$ make pain disappear in some patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:19:25.982 \longrightarrow 00:19:28.538$ at least in the placebo responders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:19:28.540 \longrightarrow 00:19:31.004$ And so they're all of the descending

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:19:31.004 \longrightarrow 00:19:33.662$ pathway is so relevant to when we

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:19:33.662 \longrightarrow 00:19:36.400$ study placebo effects in pain to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

00:19:36.400 --> 00:19:38.450 point that the ascending component,

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00{:}19{:}38.450 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>} 00{:}19{:}41.610$ it can become less prevalent

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

00:19:41.610 --> 00:19:42.966 from the part of the brain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:19:42.970 \longrightarrow 00:19:44.606$ at least for pain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00{:}19{:}44.606 \operatorname{--}{>} 00{:}19{:}46.651$ that are critical in modulating

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:19:46.651 \longrightarrow 00:19:50.159$ placip effects are the frontal area.

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:19:50.159 \longrightarrow 00:19:53.131$ So ventromedia dorsolateral prefrontal

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:19:53.131 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.070$ cortex where ventromedia prefrontal

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:19:56.070 \longrightarrow 00:19:59.834$ cortex has been associated to the

 $00:19:59.834 \longrightarrow 00:20:03.354$ decision process versus the dorsolateral

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00{:}20{:}03.354 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}07.430$ prefrontal cortex being more involved in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:20:07.430 \longrightarrow 00:20:09.830$ Maintaining A placebo effects and of

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:20:09.830 \longrightarrow 00:20:12.353$ course the nuclear compounds and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:20:12.353 \longrightarrow 00:20:14.503$ trastriatom become so critical because

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00{:}20{:}14.503 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}16.908$ especially in patients seeking a reward,

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

00:20:16.910 --> 00:20:19.110 the seeking reduction of Parkinson's

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00{:}20{:}19.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}21.310$ symptom or pain or depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.58686125

 $00:20:21.310 \longrightarrow 00:20:24.630$ Mathematica. It's a big deal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26277643

 $00{:}20{:}27.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}32.350$ So, and of course there are some genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.26277643

 $00:20:32.350 \longrightarrow 00:20:35.600$ factors that can serve us predictors

NOTE Confidence: 0.26277643

00:20:35.600 --> 00:20:37.280 to see those people who respond and

NOTE Confidence: 0.26277643

 $00{:}20{:}37.280 \rightarrow 00{:}20{:}38.880$ those people who don't respond.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5063826 00:20:44.440 --> 00:20:44.880 So NOTE Confidence: 0.5063826

00:20:47.560 --> 00:20:50.280 if expectancy are so relevant,

 $00:20:50.280 \longrightarrow 00:20:52.145$ then we thought it's time

NOTE Confidence: 0.5063826

00:20:52.145 --> 00:20:54.664 to try to understand how we

NOTE Confidence: 0.5063826

 $00:20:54.664 \longrightarrow 00:20:56.398$ can manipulate expectations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5063826

 $00:20:56.400 \longrightarrow 00:20:58.590$ When we study pain in health

NOTE Confidence: 0.5063826

 $00:20:58.590 \longrightarrow 00:21:00.640$ controls and placebo nocibo effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5063826

 $00:21:00.640 \longrightarrow 00:21:03.332$ usually we use thermal stimulation which

NOTE Confidence: 0.5063826

 $00:21:03.332 \longrightarrow 00:21:05.384$ is the thermal stimulation that has

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:21:05.390 \longrightarrow 00:21:06.950$ been used at first labs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:21:07.470 \longrightarrow 00:21:11.870$ And in this case we use visual cue

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:21:11.870 --> 00:21:15.470 red during the anticipatory phase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:21:15.470 --> 00:21:18.314 And then when the painful stimulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:21:18.314 \longrightarrow 00:21:21.830$ was used, you can see that we had the

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:21:21.830 \longrightarrow 00:21:24.402$ emotional component fearful phase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:21:24.402 \longrightarrow 00:21:29.261$ With yellow we had neutral phase and with

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:21:29.261 \longrightarrow 00:21:33.520$ green epiphase the most critical component

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00{:}21{:}33.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}36.738$ was for us to create an experience of

00:21:36.738 --> 00:21:39.580 eye pain and low pain and control pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:21:39.580 \longrightarrow 00:21:42.009$ So this is a visual analogue scale

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:21:42.009 \longrightarrow 00:21:44.937$ and we raise the intensity of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:21:44.937 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.520$ thermal stimulation to 8050 or 12 day.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00{:}21{:}48.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}51.295$ One participant received many stimulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:21:51.295 --> 00:21:54.660 seeks to be precise and that allow us

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:21:54.660 --> 00:21:57.940 to create an experience of eye pain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:21:57.940 --> 00:22:01.160 low pain as compared to moderate pain

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:22:01.160 \longrightarrow 00:22:05.324$ day 2 in the scanner we set all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:22:05.324 \longrightarrow 00:22:08.123$ intensity out to the same level and

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:22:08.123 --> 00:22:10.703 operationally we define a change in

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00{:}22{:}10.703 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}14.398$ the red pair stimulation and green pair

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00{:}22{:}14.398 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}17.872$ stimulation as place bo and nocible effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:22:17.880 \longrightarrow 00:22:19.816$ We want to see how the

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:22:19.816 --> 00:22:21.640 prior experience day one,

 $00:22:21.640 \longrightarrow 00:22:23.392$ but also the anticipation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:22:23.392 \longrightarrow 00:22:26.553$ the expectation of higher low pain would

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:22:26.553 \longrightarrow 00:22:29.759$ have changed when we mismatch the conditions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:22:29.760 \longrightarrow 00:22:32.840$ That is why we use two visual stimulation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:22:32.840 \longrightarrow 00:22:35.160$ you know 2 cures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:22:35.160 --> 00:22:37.880 And so when participants receive

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:22:37.880 --> 00:22:41.360 identical stimulation in a match patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:22:41.360 \longrightarrow 00:22:44.125$ you can see that same identical level

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00{:}22{:}44.125 \to 00{:}22{:}46.680$ of tumor stimulation produce lower pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:22:46.680 \longrightarrow 00:22:50.016$ This is their circle report as compared to

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00{:}22{:}50.016 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}53.478$ our control in dire pain when they expect IP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:22:53.480 \longrightarrow 00:22:56.574$ So what we expect can drive moderate

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:22:56.574 \longrightarrow 00:22:59.603$ level of pain to become high or

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:22:59.603 --> 00:23:02.587 low and that is what you know we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:02.587 \longrightarrow 00:23:05.550$ got nocebo and placebo response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:05.550 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.150$ However when we mismatch,

 $00:23:07.150 \longrightarrow 00:23:09.150$ so we manipulate the expectation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00{:}23{:}09.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}11.298$ we manipulate the events and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:23:11.298 --> 00:23:14.557 bet that all of us had experienced

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:14.557 \longrightarrow 00:23:16.306$ violation of expectations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:23:16.310 --> 00:23:18.308 You know, you go towards something,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:23:18.310 --> 00:23:19.810 you expect something and

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:19.810 \longrightarrow 00:23:21.310$ you get something else.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:21.310 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.270$ And this is the story of many patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:23.270 \longrightarrow 00:23:24.960$ They went to the clinic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:24.960 \longrightarrow 00:23:27.676$ they want to be healed and treated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00{:}23{:}27.680 \rightarrow 00{:}23{:}29.560$ but eventually their depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:23:29.560 --> 00:23:31.440 or symptom doesn't change.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:31.440 \longrightarrow 00:23:33.612$ Every time we see a violation

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:33.612 \longrightarrow 00:23:35.726$ of expectation that can trigger

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:35.726 \longrightarrow 00:23:37.517$ a neurobiological response.

 $00:23:37.520 \longrightarrow 00:23:40.691$ And we can call this nausea if it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:23:40.691 --> 00:23:42.199 a worsening in symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:42.200 \longrightarrow 00:23:45.625$ So nausea effects didn't disappear

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:23:45.625 --> 00:23:48.959 when mismatched cues were presented,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:48.959 \longrightarrow 00:23:52.877$ but mismatched cues abolish plessive effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:52.880 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.520$ So I was asked today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00{:}23{:}54.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}57.328$ how can we somehow reduce place bo

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:57.328 \longrightarrow 00:23:59.200$ responses in clinical trials?

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:23:59.200 \longrightarrow 00:24:01.840$ One strategy will be to create

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:24:01.840 \longrightarrow 00:24:04.564$ mismatch of expectations and that can

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00{:}24{:}04.564 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}07.372$ somehow help to reduce the place bo

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:24:07.372 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.984$ component and focus purely on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:24:09.984 \longrightarrow 00:24:12.039$ drug that we are studying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:24:12.040 --> 00:24:14.515 And of course, so if you are a physician,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

00:24:14.520 --> 00:24:17.160 you may want to amplify

NOTE Confidence: 0.4575084

 $00:24:17.160 \longrightarrow 00:24:18.540$ the placebo component.

 $00:24:18.540 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.920$ So it depends.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734735

00:24:20.450 --> 00:24:22.250 Can I ask you so all of this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734735

 $00:24:22.250 \longrightarrow 00:24:23.810$ the beautiful studies you've shown us

NOTE Confidence: 0.734735

00:24:23.810 --> 00:24:27.082 are all acute acute change in anxiety,

NOTE Confidence: 0.734735

00:24:27.082 --> 00:24:28.896 acute change in pain, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734735

 $00:24:28.896 \longrightarrow 00:24:30.200$ Whereas clinically what's relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.734735

 $00:24:30.200 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.430$ is in including in a drug trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.734735

 $00:24:32.430 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.050$ as you were just referring to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.734735

 $00:24:34.050 \longrightarrow 00:24:36.095$ What's relevant is chronic effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.734735

 $00{:}24{:}36.095 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}38.788$ and it's not obvious that those are

NOTE Confidence: 0.734735

 $00:24:38.788 \longrightarrow 00:24:40.734$ going to be through the same mechanism

NOTE Confidence: 0.734735

 $00{:}24{:}40.734 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}42.089$ or have the same characteristics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:24:42.330 \longrightarrow 00:24:44.418$ So the study I chose and we do in

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:24:44.418 \longrightarrow 00:24:46.410$ the lab are mostly one session,

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:24:46.410 \longrightarrow 00:24:48.340$ although now we are studying

 $00:24:48.340 \longrightarrow 00:24:50.270$ chronic pain patient who have

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00{:}24{:}50.343 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}52.299$ long lasting effects and we call

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:24:52.299 \longrightarrow 00:24:54.610$ them back to the lab after six,

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:24:54.610 \longrightarrow 00:24:56.962$ one year time to see if they

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:24:56.962 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.970$ continue to benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

00:24:57.970 --> 00:25:01.710 And I mean we don't study

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:25:01.710 \longrightarrow 00:25:03.290$ a report or don't publish,

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:25:03.290 \longrightarrow 00:25:05.684$ but we have some of our patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00{:}25{:}05.684 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}07.984$ who improve with this kind of sham

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:25:07.984 \longrightarrow 00:25:10.168$ electrodes and they went to buy

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

00:25:10.168 --> 00:25:12.059 because their pain was solved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:25:12.060 \longrightarrow 00:25:14.860$ So and of course there are many

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:25:14.860 \longrightarrow 00:25:17.379$ clinical trials show that the placebo

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

00:25:17.380 --> 00:25:19.528 component lasts over time And we

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:25:19.528 \longrightarrow 00:25:22.192$ know also from the failure of many

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:25:22.192 \longrightarrow 00:25:24.818$ trials the reason why we look at

 $00:25:24.818 \longrightarrow 00:25:26.460$ this response with cross-sectional

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00{:}25{:}26.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}29.580$ studies mostly for you know brain

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

00:25:29.580 --> 00:25:31.140 imaging mechanistic approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:25:31.140 \longrightarrow 00:25:34.086$ But that doesn't mean and that

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:25:34.086 \longrightarrow 00:25:36.590$ placebo effects extinguish over time

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:25:36.590 \longrightarrow 00:25:39.308$ or patient who have chronic disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.54941934

 $00:25:39.310 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.470$ actual experience placebo effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

00:25:42.150 --> 00:25:44.075 And I guess the question I'm wondering

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00{:}25{:}44.075 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}45.748$ if clearly there are long lasting

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:25:45.750 \longrightarrow 00:25:47.566$ placebo effects and we've all seen them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00{:}25{:}47.566 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}49.630$ are the mechanisms of the later phase or

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:25:49.630 \longrightarrow 00:25:51.950$ the persistence of the place bo the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00{:}25{:}52.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}54.000$ as the mechanisms of the CUE

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

00:25:54.000 --> 00:25:54.945 driven immediate environment?

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:25:54.950 \longrightarrow 00:25:56.525$ That's the question I was asking and

 $00:25:56.525 \longrightarrow 00:25:57.590$ it's an experimentally difficult

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00{:}25{:}58.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}00.290$ question and there are other

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:00.290 \longrightarrow 00:26:01.830$ groups that are studying this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:01.830 \longrightarrow 00:26:05.430$ For example Vanya Caparia is interested

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:05.430 \longrightarrow 00:26:08.805$ in brain imaging and long lasting

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:08.805 \longrightarrow 00:26:11.763$ effect of placebo and the mechanism

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

00:26:11.763 --> 00:26:14.349 that he has been publishing are

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:14.349 \longrightarrow 00:26:16.939$ primarily related to the reward the

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00{:}26{:}16.939 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}19.517$ system and there are similarity in

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

00:26:19.517 --> 00:26:22.013 terms of our expectation can trigger

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00{:}26{:}22.013 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}24.202$ uplasi effects in chronic pain

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:24.202 \longrightarrow 00:26:26.066$ patients in particular osteoarthritis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00{:}26{:}26.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}29.514$ For his line of research we are

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00{:}26{:}29.514 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}33.384$ doing that in for a facial pain and

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:33.384 \longrightarrow 00:26:35.568$ yes the goal is to try to see how

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:35.568 \longrightarrow 00:26:37.968$ long we can maintain these effects

 $00{:}26{:}37.968 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}39.396$ and translate the rapeutically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:39.400 \longrightarrow 00:26:42.721$ We are not there yet but that is one

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:42.721 \longrightarrow 00:26:46.120$ of the question we try to address.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:46.120 \longrightarrow 00:26:48.800$ Another aspects that is relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:48.800 \longrightarrow 00:26:52.091$ especially when we talk about clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:26:52.091 \longrightarrow 00:26:55.146$ situations is the negative component

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

00:26:55.146 --> 00:26:58.349 Nasib effects because Nasib effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

00:26:58.349 --> 00:27:01.443 somehow amplify negative you know and

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

00:27:01.443 --> 00:27:04.090 worsening of symptoms in this case

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

00:27:04.090 --> 00:27:08.360 we show in a very you know simple way

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:27:08.360 \longrightarrow 00:27:11.124$ for time restriction that Nosibo the

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:27:11.124 \longrightarrow 00:27:14.088$ negative or component of placebo effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00{:}27{:}14.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}16.470$ Actually with pharmacological study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:27:16.470 \longrightarrow 00:27:20.710$ we know that work through the engagement

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

00:27:20.710 --> 00:27:23.860 of the coagcystokines systems in

00:27:23.860 --> 00:27:26.822 particular A&B receptors with studying

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00{:}27{:}26.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}29.737$ both animal models and humans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00{:}27{:}29.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}32.788$ there is a change in the new opioids

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:27:32.788 \longrightarrow 00:27:34.987$ availability as well as the release

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:27:34.987 \longrightarrow 00:27:36.692$ of D2 and D3 dopamine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:27:36.700 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.689$ So this nocebo component can be even

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:27:39.689 \longrightarrow 00:27:41.464$ clinically speaking more relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

00:27:41.464 --> 00:27:43.984 because every time we see worsening

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00{:}27{:}43.984 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}46.579$ in symptom pain or other symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:27:46.580 \longrightarrow 00:27:49.040$ There is also an engagement of

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:27:49.040 \longrightarrow 00:27:51.300$ circles that are not parallel to

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:27:51.300 \longrightarrow 00:27:52.380$ the placebo mechanism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

00:27:52.380 --> 00:27:54.536 at least in terms of brain imaging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:27:54.540 \longrightarrow 00:27:56.184$ but yet it can,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

00:27:56.184 --> 00:27:57.006 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3972127

 $00:27:57.010 \longrightarrow 00:27:59.460$ be triggered by expectation and

 $00:27:59.460 \longrightarrow 00:28:00.930$ similar psychological mechanisms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:06.560 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.996$ So to tackle the question about

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:28:08.996 --> 00:28:11.480 Placib effects in chronic conditions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:14.240 \longrightarrow 00:28:17.696$ we study chronic or facial pain

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:17.696 \longrightarrow 00:28:20.000$ and temporal mandibular disorders

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:20.000 \longrightarrow 00:28:21.740$ because after about had decades

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:28:21.740 --> 00:28:23.480 of studies in earth controls,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:23.480 \longrightarrow 00:28:25.676$ we were wondering what if we

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:28:25.676 --> 00:28:27.140 study chronic pain patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:27.140 \longrightarrow 00:28:30.059$ they do show the same placebo effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:28:30.060 --> 00:28:32.856 this sort of huge change in

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:28:32.856 --> 00:28:35.745 the pain reports and you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}28{:}35.745 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}38.220$ affective component of the pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:38.220 \longrightarrow 00:28:41.196$ So we brought in patients for

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:41.196 \longrightarrow 00:28:43.998$ in depth clinical screening of

 $00:28:43.998 \longrightarrow 00:28:46.389$ temporomandibular pain at UMB where

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}28{:}46.389 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}47.954$ the Brothman or official clinic

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:47.954 \longrightarrow 00:28:50.124$ that is one of the major clinic

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:50.124 \longrightarrow 00:28:52.090$ for this condition in the states.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:52.090 \longrightarrow 00:28:54.841$ And then we did the same manipulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:28:54.841 --> 00:28:57.090 individual calibration of pen sensitivity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:57.090 \longrightarrow 00:28:59.526$ we call this quantitative sensory test.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:28:59.530 \longrightarrow 00:29:01.610$ We assess baseline expectation

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}29{:}01.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}04.730$ and we expose them to conditioning

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:29:04.810 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.400$ with 24 trials where we you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}29{:}08.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}11.120$ we're in a pseudorandom way,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:29:11.120 \longrightarrow 00:29:12.948$ deliver eye painful and

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:29:12.948 --> 00:29:14.319 low painful stimulation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}29{:}14.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}16.693$ And we told them that every time

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:29:16.693 --> 00:29:18.480 this sham electrodes was active,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}29{:}18.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}21.144$ the painful stimulation was the same

 $00:29:21.144 \longrightarrow 00:29:23.680$ but eventually they perceive less pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}29{:}23.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}26.752$ The idea is to avoid to create a

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:29:26.752 \longrightarrow 00:29:29.016$ conditioning with morphine or other

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:29:29.016 --> 00:29:31.366 painkillers rather expose them to

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}29{:}31.366 \rightarrow 00{:}29{:}34.124$ low intensity stimulations and after

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:29:34.124 \longrightarrow 00:29:37.550$ that we reassess expectation and your

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:29:37.633 \longrightarrow 00:29:41.056$ expectation improve if you have a benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:29:41.060 \longrightarrow 00:29:43.900$ We call this reinforced expectation

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:29:43.900 \longrightarrow 00:29:46.448$ and then we test for placebo first

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:29:46.448 \longrightarrow 00:29:49.155$ testing phase where we use identical eye

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:29:49.155 --> 00:29:51.465 level log thermal stimulation to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}29{:}51.533 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}54.081$ if somehow there is a place bo response

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:29:54.081 \longrightarrow 00:29:59.100$ in chronic pain patient with this condition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}29{:}59.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}02.228$ These are the data and you can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:30:02.228 --> 00:30:05.100 that we match people for race,

 $00:30:05.100 \longrightarrow 00:30:07.119$ age and sex.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:30:07.119 --> 00:30:09.844 The distribution of placebo

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:30:09.844 \longrightarrow 00:30:12.660$ response assessed several time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:30:12.660 \longrightarrow 00:30:15.623$ you know trial by trial are identical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:30:15.623 \longrightarrow 00:30:18.761$ So no matter if people had

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:30:18.761 --> 00:30:22.019 chronic pain or no chronic pain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:30:22.020 \dashrightarrow 00:30:25.700$ there was some place bo analgesia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:30:25.700 \longrightarrow 00:30:28.730$ When we compare the proportion of

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}30{:}28.730 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}30{:}30.926$ place bo responders with permutation

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:30:30.926 \longrightarrow 00:30:35.060$ test to see some who are the placebo

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}30{:}35.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}38.239$ responders and for our you know the

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:30:38.239 --> 00:30:40.686 proportion of responders in TMD

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:30:40.686 --> 00:30:43.764 where the 53 percentage of placebo

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:30:43.764 \longrightarrow 00:30:45.942$ responders that was significantly

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:30:45.942 \longrightarrow 00:30:49.128$ lower but still quite high than

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}30{:}49.128 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!\!>}\ 00{:}30{:}52.272$ pain free people 67.8 percentage.

 $00{:}30{:}52.272 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}56.628$ But this numbers make clinical trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:30:56.628 \longrightarrow 00:30:59.700$ fail because with this proportion of

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:30:59.700 \longrightarrow 00:31:02.040$ placebo responsivity is extremely high.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:31:02.040 --> 00:31:04.988 But if we talk about patient benefits,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}31{:}04.988 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}07.712$ that can be actually good because

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:31:07.712 \longrightarrow 00:31:11.252$ if we look at the number needed

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:31:11.252 --> 00:31:13.292 to treat anticonvulsionant and

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:31:13.292 \longrightarrow 00:31:15.674$ opioids vary from 1.7 to 3.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:31:15.674 \longrightarrow 00:31:17.822$ And when we look at our

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:31:17.822 \longrightarrow 00:31:19.158$ depression in the lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:31:19.160 \longrightarrow 00:31:22.280$ you can see that the NNT

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:31:22.280 \longrightarrow 00:31:25.750$ for TMD it's about 1.8.

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00{:}31{:}25.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}27.760$ So suggesting that protein effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

00:31:27.760 --> 00:31:30.176 are real can be important in

NOTE Confidence: 0.49906704

 $00:31:30.176 \longrightarrow 00:31:32.186$ chronic pain patient and even with

 $00:31:32.186 \longrightarrow 00:31:34.669$ an empty the desired and controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00{:}31{:}37.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}39.030$ Do you want to may be just go through

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00{:}31{:}39.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}40.668$ that a little bit because I'm not

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

00:31:40.668 --> 00:31:42.106 sure people fully get the number

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

00:31:42.106 --> 00:31:43.879 needed to treat and what it would

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:31:43.879 \longrightarrow 00:31:45.589$ be compared to an active medicine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:31:46.830 \longrightarrow 00:31:51.415$ yes. So the number needed to treat

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:31:51.415 \longrightarrow 00:31:54.990$ is one of the way to assess it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

00:31:54.990 --> 00:31:56.854 But treatment is efficacious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:31:56.854 \longrightarrow 00:32:00.866$ So when we run a clinical trial that is

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:00.866 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.199$ the number that the index and then T and

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:04.199 \longrightarrow 00:32:07.174$ so for opioids and anticonvulsion and it

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:07.174 \longrightarrow 00:32:10.359$ has been published in the literature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:10.360 \longrightarrow 00:32:13.684$ this critical number is 1.7 for

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:13.684 \longrightarrow 00:32:16.439$ anticonvulsion and and opioids is 3.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:16.440 \longrightarrow 00:32:19.160$ And the reason why we want to somehow

 $00:32:19.160 \longrightarrow 00:32:21.530$ compare for our placebo manipulation was

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:21.530 \longrightarrow 00:32:24.440$ to try to understand where we stand.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:24.440 \longrightarrow 00:32:27.275$ And so you can see that it's within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

00:32:27.275 --> 00:32:30.408 range of current use pain therapeutics

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:30.408 \longrightarrow 00:32:34.320$ for neuropathic pain or chronic pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:34.320 \longrightarrow 00:32:36.960$ And the fact that even manipulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:36.960 \longrightarrow 00:32:39.824$ in the lab, the reduction can change

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:39.824 \longrightarrow 00:32:41.754$ the mindset of a patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:41.760 \longrightarrow 00:32:44.704$ And that is why I call this stock

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:44.704 \dashrightarrow 00:32:47.353$ mind over molecules even you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:47.353 \longrightarrow 00:32:51.110$ the exposure to low pain that can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:51.110 \longrightarrow 00:32:54.050$ translated in improvements or mode for

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00{:}32{:}54.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}56.523$ antidepressant can be so important

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

 $00:32:56.523 \longrightarrow 00:32:58.898$ in manipulating the expectation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

00:32:58.898 --> 00:33:03.090 trigger somehow this you know index

 $00:33:03.090 \longrightarrow 00:33:06.870$ to help us eventually to validate

NOTE Confidence: 0.3284985

00:33:06.870 --> 00:33:08.620 the drug or treat patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

00:33:08.620 --> 00:33:10.340 So would you conceive of this number

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:33:10.340 \longrightarrow 00:33:11.940$ needed to treat number is essentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:33:11.940 \longrightarrow 00:33:13.572$ an effect size of treatments and

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00{:}33{:}13.572 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}15.404$ what you're saying is the effect size

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

00:33:15.404 --> 00:33:18.260 of yes is the same as it's a that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:33:18.260 \longrightarrow 00:33:19.820$ that's amazing. Yes that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00{:}33{:}19.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}21.140$ a that's a big point Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:33:21.620 \longrightarrow 00:33:23.460$ Yes it's it's thriller.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:33:25.740 \longrightarrow 00:33:26.780$ So the other thing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00{:}33{:}29.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}34.498$ when I move from an age University

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:33:34.498 \longrightarrow 00:33:37.338$ of Maryland in Baltimore, I realised

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:33:37.338 \longrightarrow 00:33:39.326$ first that my lab was very diverse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:33:39.330 \longrightarrow 00:33:41.730$ I had a PhD student of

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

00:33:41.730 --> 00:33:43.330 American black white patients,

 $00:33:43.330 \longrightarrow 00:33:46.130$ but also the patients were quite diverse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

00:33:46.130 --> 00:33:47.930 So despite this not to begin

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:33:47.930 \longrightarrow 00:33:49.850$ a name of our everyone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

00:33:49.850 --> 00:33:52.671 I thought I needed to keep record

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00{:}33{:}52.671 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}57.234$ because the data can be some biased

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:33:57.234 \longrightarrow 00:34:01.114$ by race and ethnicity and eventually

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

00:34:01.114 --> 00:34:03.984 you know our beautiful collegiality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00{:}34{:}03.984 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}07.806$ It was environment with students a

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00{:}34{:}07.806 \to 00{:}34{:}12.758$ student of mine bogus Sago was you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:12.758 \longrightarrow 00:34:15.716$ very talent and Young came and say Lana,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:15.716 \longrightarrow 00:34:17.746$ can I study race differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00{:}34{:}17.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}19.906$ That's a perfect we have the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00{:}34{:}19.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}22.668$ So we started diving into the data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:22.670 \longrightarrow 00:34:23.910$ see if somehow the race,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:23.910 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.115$ ethnicity of the patient and

00:34:26.115 --> 00:34:28.320 the experimenter can change the

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

00:34:28.397 --> 00:34:30.527 money to the plus CB effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:30.530 \longrightarrow 00:34:32.290$ And we have suffered that

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:32.290 \longrightarrow 00:34:34.050$ only for chronic pain patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:34.050 \longrightarrow 00:34:37.272$ Same concordance of rays produce larger

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00{:}34{:}37.272 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}41.298$ plus CB effects dark blue as compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:41.298 \longrightarrow 00:34:44.480$ to different experiment patient rays.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:44.480 \longrightarrow 00:34:47.260$ But this doesn't become

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:47.260 \longrightarrow 00:34:49.574$ relevant for health controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:49.574 \longrightarrow 00:34:52.346$ So we are still diving into

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:52.346 \longrightarrow 00:34:54.650$ this kind of differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:54.650 \longrightarrow 00:34:54.970$ Why?

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:54.970 \longrightarrow 00:34:56.890$ And this is the disparities that

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:56.890 \longrightarrow 00:34:59.290$ we read in the literature and

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:34:59.290 \longrightarrow 00:35:01.524$ clinical practice when there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:35:01.524 \longrightarrow 00:35:03.684$ other groups earlier cram from

00:35:03.684 --> 00:35:06.499 Stanford that is studying this bias,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00{:}35{:}06.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}08.817$ something under the skin and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:35:08.820 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.646$ We are now tackling these questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:35:11.646 \longrightarrow 00:35:13.059$ with neurobiological measurements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

00:35:13.060 --> 00:35:17.260 Try to understand if it's an implicit bias,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

00:35:17.260 --> 00:35:19.900 if it's related to immigration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:35:19.900 \longrightarrow 00:35:21.612$ media, where they live,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:35:21.612 \longrightarrow 00:35:22.896$ where everything from,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:35:22.900 \longrightarrow 00:35:24.550$ you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

00:35:24.550 --> 00:35:28.546 social demographic position for the ancestry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:35:28.550 \longrightarrow 00:35:31.546$ because we are intrigued by this difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24997637

 $00:35:31.550 \longrightarrow 00:35:31.790$ Seems

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

00:35:31.790 --> 00:35:32.930 like the possibility that

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00{:}35{:}32.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}34.070$ those effects in psychedelics

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:35:34.070 \longrightarrow 00:35:35.790$ is a bit more right.

 $00:35:35.950 \longrightarrow 00:35:38.206$ That's gonna be great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:35:38.206 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.590$ So definitely something to think about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00{:}35{:}41.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}44.038$ But also chronic benefit is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:35:44.038 \longrightarrow 00:35:46.425$ disease for women in the sense

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:35:46.425 \longrightarrow 00:35:48.350$ that the prevalence of women

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:35:48.350 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.865$ affected by chronic pain is 3 to 1.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00{:}35{:}50.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}54.294$ So we were wondering within TMD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

00:35:54.294 --> 00:35:56.736 but no in health controls in

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00{:}35{:}56.736 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}59.639$ T in TMD which is stronger,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:35:59.640 \longrightarrow 00:36:02.262$ you know prevalence of the disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:36:02.262 \longrightarrow 00:36:05.048$ among women but also larger PLACIP

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:36:05.048 \longrightarrow 00:36:07.952$ effects in women and we don't see

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:36:07.952 \longrightarrow 00:36:09.792$ that again in health controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:36:09.800 \longrightarrow 00:36:12.824$ So we dive into the data here and

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:36:12.824 \longrightarrow 00:36:15.595$ we measure very colorfully the

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

00:36:15.595 --> 00:36:18.770 menstrual cycle periods and the

 $00:36:18.770 \longrightarrow 00:36:23.630$ gonadal hormones Luter with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00{:}36{:}23.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}26.705$ follicular phase register and versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:36:26.705 \longrightarrow 00:36:30.560$ estrogen And we found no effects of

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:36:30.560 \longrightarrow 00:36:33.092$ gonadal hormones for placebo effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

00:36:33.092 --> 00:36:36.480 Yet we saw that the pain threshold

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:36:36.480 \longrightarrow 00:36:39.720$ out when we use the term and change

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:36:39.720 \longrightarrow 00:36:42.232$ in women based on the middle

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:36:42.232 \longrightarrow 00:36:45.352$ follicular or lutal phase as compared,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

00:36:45.352 --> 00:36:46.264 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00{:}36{:}46.264 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}48.544$ to the general understanding that

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:36:48.544 \longrightarrow 00:36:50.449$ men are more tolerant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00{:}36{:}50.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}53.138$ So men are more tolerant than women

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

00:36:53.138 --> 00:36:57.008 only when a woman is in the looter phase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:36:57.010 \longrightarrow 00:36:59.802$ But also despite we didn't see any effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

00:36:59.802 --> 00:37:02.487 of gonadal hormones and placebo effects,

 $00:37:02.490 \longrightarrow 00:37:05.647$ we did the sea effects on expectations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

00:37:05.650 --> 00:37:07.790 But this effects didn't moderate

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:37:07.790 \longrightarrow 00:37:09.930$ mediate any change in placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:37:09.930 \longrightarrow 00:37:12.482$ That is why I tended to think that

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:37:12.482 \longrightarrow 00:37:14.472$ expectancy and expectations from a

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:37:14.472 \longrightarrow 00:37:17.046$ cognitive point of view is something

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

00:37:17.046 --> 00:37:18.850 different than PLACIP effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:37:18.850 \longrightarrow 00:37:21.566$ at least when we use conditioning paradigm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00{:}37{:}21.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}24.658$ So you can see that we found the

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

00:37:24.658 --> 00:37:26.825 difference in expectation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00{:}37{:}26.825 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}29.381$ improvement when we compare men

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:37:29.381 \longrightarrow 00:37:31.883$ with women in with diluted face,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:37:31.890 \longrightarrow 00:37:35.194$ but no in women in diluted face.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:37:35.200 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.200$ And also of course there is a difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.25151125

 $00:37:37.200 \longrightarrow 00:37:38.720$ between the two places in women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:37:43.840 \longrightarrow 00:37:46.598$ And when we look at the concordance

 $00:37:46.600 \longrightarrow 00:37:50.304$ experimental where men or women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00{:}37{:}50.304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}52.134$ and I'm talking in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:37:52.134 \longrightarrow 00:37:54.546$ of biological sex here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:37:54.546 \longrightarrow 00:37:58.116$ you can see that at least for now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:37:58.116 \longrightarrow 00:38:01.000$ we have not power to study gender effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:38:01.000 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.200$ You can see that actually in women

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:38:06.200 \longrightarrow 00:38:08.960$ when we had a man experimenter,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00{:}38{:}08.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}13.375$ the effects in terms of place bo algea

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:38:13.375 \longrightarrow 00:38:16.897$ is different than when we had same sex.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:38:16.897 \dashrightarrow 00:38:19.816$ So same sex local Placib effects when

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:38:19.816 \longrightarrow 00:38:23.439$ a man experimenter was studying them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

00:38:23.440 --> 00:38:24.733 larger Placib effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00{:}38{:}24.733 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}27.319$ And again this is something that

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:38:27.319 \longrightarrow 00:38:30.208$ human wants to keep you know in mind

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:38:30.208 \longrightarrow 00:38:32.410$ when you study not just psychedelics

 $00:38:32.483 \longrightarrow 00:38:34.808$ but any antidepressants because you

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:38:34.808 \longrightarrow 00:38:38.684$ may observe this sort of participant

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:38:38.684 \longrightarrow 00:38:43.100$ experiment or sex biases or differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29335818

 $00:38:43.100 \longrightarrow 00:38:43.540$ Is there

NOTE Confidence: 0.39747304

 $00:38:43.540 \longrightarrow 00:38:46.220$ any That's a very cool finding fact

NOTE Confidence: 0.39747304

 $00{:}38{:}46.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}47.978$ that you know seems to be opposite in

NOTE Confidence: 0.39747304

 $00:38:48.140 \longrightarrow 00:38:49.020$ in men even though

NOTE Confidence: 0.39747304

 $00:38:50.340 \longrightarrow 00:38:51.858$ has that been done cross culturally?

NOTE Confidence: 0.39747304

 $00:38:52.340 \longrightarrow 00:38:53.018$ Sorry, I mean

NOTE Confidence: 0.39747304

 $00:38:54.500 \longrightarrow 00:38:57.140$ what is up battered good,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26573345

 $00:38:59.780 \longrightarrow 00:39:01.872$ this is the higher number

NOTE Confidence: 0.26573345

 $00:39:01.872 \longrightarrow 00:39:03.656$ more analgesia or less

NOTE Confidence: 0.26573345

 $00:39:04.060 \longrightarrow 00:39:05.275$ different more analgesia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26573345

 $00:39:05.275 \longrightarrow 00:39:08.380$ this is higher and more analgesic

NOTE Confidence: 0.26573345

 $00:39:08.380 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.419$ improvement, larger plus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26573345

00:39:11.420 --> 00:39:14.900 So a man experiment was triggering

00:39:14.900 --> 00:39:19.060 larger plus CB effects in our women TMD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26573345

00:39:19.060 --> 00:39:21.724 but in men TMD patients we

NOTE Confidence: 0.26573345

 $00:39:21.724 \longrightarrow 00:39:23.500$ didn't see this effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:39:25.370 \longrightarrow 00:39:27.324$ Sorry, sorry, no not at all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

00:39:27.324 --> 00:39:28.974 I'm wondering I I assume that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:39:28.974 \longrightarrow 00:39:30.970$ mean this is a recent paper but

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

00:39:31.050 --> 00:39:32.555 but thinking about this culturally

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00{:}39{:}32.555 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}34.488$ like a different you know different

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00{:}39{:}34.488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}36.626$ expectations and gender roles could I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:39:36.626 \longrightarrow 00:39:38.649$ glad that you asked that could influence

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

00:39:38.650 --> 00:39:42.070 because we have another PhD student

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

00:39:42.070 --> 00:39:46.289 now who is diving into spirituality

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00{:}39{:}46.290 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}39{:}49.314$ and try to understand if somehow

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:39:49.314 \longrightarrow 00:39:51.851$ the interplay between sex race

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

00:39:51.851 --> 00:39:54.350 effects are you know dependent

 $00:39:54.350 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.390$ on spirituality and religiosity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:39:57.390 \dashrightarrow 00:39:59.922$ So in terms of cultural difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:39:59.922 \longrightarrow 00:40:03.118$ we are tackling this in two way

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:40:03.118 \longrightarrow 00:40:05.024$ studying immigration and religiosity

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:40:05.024 \longrightarrow 00:40:07.886$ and spirituality to try to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:40:07.886 \longrightarrow 00:40:10.730$ how this can influence both

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:40:10.730 \longrightarrow 00:40:13.146$ expectations and placing difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:40:13.150 \longrightarrow 00:40:15.750$ I can tell you that we see difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:40:15.750 \longrightarrow 00:40:20.176$ for well this is sort of recorded

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:40:20.176 \longrightarrow 00:40:22.220$ then online but expectations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00{:}40{:}22.220 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}40{:}24.740$ Somebody based on religiosity

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

00:40:24.740 --> 00:40:27.260 but no plessive effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:40:27.260 \longrightarrow 00:40:29.870$ at least when we use our

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156

 $00:40:29.870 \longrightarrow 00:40:30.740$ conditioning paradigm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40626156 00:40:30.740 --> 00:40:30.940 So NOTE Confidence: 0.28797182

 $00:40:31.020 \longrightarrow 00:40:32.937$ I mean if you go wait like in the

00:40:32.937 --> 00:40:34.576 1950s Jerome Frank out of your,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28797182

 $00:40:34.580 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.995$ I mean he really distilled it down

NOTE Confidence: 0.28797182

00:40:36.995 --> 00:40:39.960 to three things basically competence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28797182

 $00:40:39.960 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.580$ compassion and connective saying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.28797182

 $00:40:42.580 \longrightarrow 00:40:45.035$ I mean you can imagine

NOTE Confidence: 0.28797182

 $00:40:45.035 \longrightarrow 00:40:47.244$ how those play a big role,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28797182

00:40:47.244 --> 00:40:48.774 you know the perceived competence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28797182

 $00:40:48.780 \longrightarrow 00:40:51.190$ you know something

NOTE Confidence: 0.3393348

 $00:40:51.230 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.030$ that we do for all our experiments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3393348

 $00:40:54.030 \longrightarrow 00:40:57.180$ At the end of the experiment we

NOTE Confidence: 0.3393348

 $00{:}40{:}57.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}59.121$ ask participants health controls

NOTE Confidence: 0.3393348

 $00{:}40{:}59.121 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}02.212$ or chronic pain patients to rate

NOTE Confidence: 0.3393348

 $00{:}41{:}02.212 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}04.967$ our experimenter a warm confident

NOTE Confidence: 0.3393348

 $00:41:04.967 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.248$ they were and so far we didn't see

NOTE Confidence: 0.3393348

 $00:41:08.248 \longrightarrow 00:41:10.350$ any significant effects on placebo.

00:41:11.270 --> 00:41:12.878 So this is not so it's not looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.3393348

 $00:41:12.878 \longrightarrow 00:41:14.470$ at you to explain this effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3393348

 $00:41:14.510 \longrightarrow 00:41:17.597$ Yes. We were not able to explain

NOTE Confidence: 0.3393348

00:41:17.597 --> 00:41:20.080 with warm competency or empathy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4084049

00:41:28.200 --> 00:41:29.822 But I mentioned to you, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4084049

00:41:29.822 --> 00:41:31.477 I'm very intrigued about phenotyping,

NOTE Confidence: 0.4084049

 $00:41:31.480 \longrightarrow 00:41:34.320$ place bo responder and non responders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4084049

00:41:34.320 --> 00:41:37.560 This was a project led by Doctor Wang.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4084049

 $00{:}41{:}37.560 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}41{:}40.020$ Currently she is an assistant

NOTE Confidence: 0.4084049

 $00:41:40.020 \longrightarrow 00:41:42.966$ professor in our department at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.4084049

 $00{:}41{:}42.966 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}45.354$ time she was supposed to talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4084049

 $00:41:45.360 \longrightarrow 00:41:51.408$ So we use a very large scale of

NOTE Confidence: 0.4084049

 $00:41:51.410 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.095$ surveys for psychological factors or

NOTE Confidence: 0.4084049

 $00:41:55.095 \longrightarrow 00:41:59.182$ personality factors and so using our

NOTE Confidence: 0.4084049

00:41:59.182 --> 00:42:01.490 placebo responders, no responders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:42:03.610 \longrightarrow 00:42:05.585$ Instead of using median or

00:42:05.585 --> 00:42:07.165 average or standard deviation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

00:42:07.170 --> 00:42:10.768 we use permutation tests to account for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

00:42:10.770 --> 00:42:13.885 you know, trial by trial placebo effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:42:13.890 \longrightarrow 00:42:16.375$ This is the time course you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00{:}42{:}16.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}20.460$ and in blue place bo responders

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:42:20.460 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.772$ and the two different shape here

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:42:23.772 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.980$ represents TMD and controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00{:}42{:}25.980 \to 00{:}42{:}28.528$ You can see that having a chronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00{:}42{:}28.528 \longrightarrow 00{:}42{:}30.869$ disorders for pain that affect release

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00{:}42{:}30.869 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}33.613$ of endogenic fluids and so on didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00{:}42{:}33.686 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}36.332$ really change the ability to experience

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:42:36.332 \longrightarrow 00:42:38.850$ a placebo response over time and

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:42:38.850 \longrightarrow 00:42:41.475$ the same dose were not responders no

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:42:41.475 \longrightarrow 00:42:44.019$ matter if they have pain or no pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:42:44.020 \longrightarrow 00:42:46.320$ The trend is similar.

 $00:42:46.320 \longrightarrow 00:42:48.770$ So below 0 we consider

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:42:48.770 \longrightarrow 00:42:50.240$ this nocebo responders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

00:42:50.240 --> 00:42:52.529 you tell them that they will benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:42:52.529 \longrightarrow 00:42:54.805$ and they get worse and that will

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

00:42:54.805 --> 00:42:56.870 be the next I think cut chapter

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:42:56.939 \longrightarrow 00:42:59.004$ in our lab to try to understand

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:42:59.004 \longrightarrow 00:43:01.598$ who are these people and why they

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:43:01.598 \longrightarrow 00:43:03.238$ respond to like paradoxically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00{:}43{:}03.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}05.752$ So this is the large array of survey

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:43:05.752 \longrightarrow 00:43:09.161$ that we have been using in the lab and

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00{:}43{:}09.161 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}13.366$ it's intriguing because across countries,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:43:13.370 \longrightarrow 00:43:14.917$ I mean we are a small community

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

00:43:14.917 --> 00:43:16.130 of people working on placebo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00{:}43{:}16.130 --> 00{:}43{:}17.146 \ {\rm relatively \ small}.$

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

00:43:17.146 --> 00:43:20.194 So we know that Manchester has

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

00:43:20.194 --> 00:43:23.490 data with optimist placity effects,

 $00:43:23.490 \longrightarrow 00:43:25.610$ Toledo and and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:43:25.610 \longrightarrow 00:43:29.102$ So this was a collection of surveys that

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:43:29.102 \longrightarrow 00:43:31.286$ have been published in the literature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:43:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:43:35.042$ A single survey that a somehow was critical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:43:35.042 \longrightarrow 00:43:37.046$ Like how can a single survey

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

00:43:37.046 --> 00:43:38.792 predict plasive effects in one lab

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:43:38.792 \longrightarrow 00:43:40.647$ and then you move to Baltimore

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

00:43:40.647 --> 00:43:42.399 and doesn't predict anymore.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:43:42.400 \longrightarrow 00:43:44.400$ Maybe because we are diverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:43:44.400 \longrightarrow 00:43:48.600$ so we use the NMH approach of

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:43:48.600 \longrightarrow 00:43:50.400$ distinguish the balance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5261186

 $00:43:50.400 \longrightarrow 00:43:51.080$ So we did the

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:43:53.560 --> 00:43:58.880 PPCA to somehow create 4 domains

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:43:58.880 \longrightarrow 00:44:02.576$ of coming from all the 17 surveys

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:44:02.576 \longrightarrow 00:44:05.165$ for our 1000 questions that we do

00:44:05.165 --> 00:44:07.562 every time as part of the screening

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00{:}44{:}07.562 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}09.572$ participant know that it's important

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:44:09.572 --> 00:44:12.434 they get to compensate for stay with

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:44:12.434 \longrightarrow 00:44:14.793$ us two hours to address all that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:44:14.800 \longrightarrow 00:44:17.200$ And so we define emotional distress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:44:17.200 --> 00:44:19.400 reward, the sickness, pain related,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:44:19.400 --> 00:44:21.485 the fear catastrophizing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:44:21.485 \longrightarrow 00:44:25.655$ empathy and openness as critical violence

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:44:25.655 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.718$ to somehow study three different aspects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:44:29.718 --> 00:44:32.998 Expectation Learning index we call

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00{:}44{:}32.998 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}35.670$ conditioning strengths that this can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:44:35.670 \longrightarrow 00:44:40.188$ called learning index or implacive effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:44:40.190 --> 00:44:43.238 So our goal was OK based on this

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:44:43.238 --> 00:44:45.869 PCA approach and balance approach,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:44:45.870 \longrightarrow 00:44:49.686$ how can this for violence help

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:44:49.686 \longrightarrow 00:44:52.230$ us to interpret expectation,

00:44:52.230 --> 00:44:54.042 conditioning and placive effects?

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00{:}44{:}54.042 --> 00{:}44{:}56.760$ The first question was do we

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:44:56.834 \longrightarrow 00:44:59.462$ see a difference between TMD and

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:44:59.462 --> 00:45:00.776 chronic pain patient?

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00{:}45{:}00.780 \longrightarrow 00{:}45{:}04.060$ Yes, When it comes to reward the seeking

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:04.060 \longrightarrow 00:45:06.538$ chronic pain patients seek a reward.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:06.540 \longrightarrow 00:45:08.922$ People who don't experience pain care

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00{:}45{:}08.922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}11.820$ less when you say this is an algesic

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:11.820 \longrightarrow 00:45:14.179$ and so expectation tended to be lower.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:14.180 \longrightarrow 00:45:15.734$ As you can see from the scale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:15.740 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.512$ when people have a fear of pain

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:45:18.512 --> 00:45:19.700 and catastrophizing thoughts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:19.700 \longrightarrow 00:45:22.604$ they tended to be higher when

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:45:22.604 --> 00:45:25.690 people have open mind and empathy

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:25.690 \longrightarrow 00:45:28.366$ in terms of ability to learn.

 $00:45:28.370 \longrightarrow 00:45:29.636$ Trial by trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:29.636 \longrightarrow 00:45:31.746$ emotional distress impaired the ability

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00{:}45{:}31.746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}34.631$ to learn and the personal to know in

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:34.631 \longrightarrow 00:45:37.009$ the literature and for Placib effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:37.010 \longrightarrow 00:45:39.074$ fear of the pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:39.074 \longrightarrow 00:45:41.138$ Catastrophizing was associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:45:41.138 --> 00:45:43.754 smaller Placib effects in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:45:43.754 --> 00:45:46.259 of magnitude and proportion of

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00{:}45{:}46.259 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}48.402$ responsiveness and also emotional

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:45:48.402 --> 00:45:51.048 distress is associated with higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:51.048 \longrightarrow 00:45:54.100$ extension rate or Placib effects and

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

00:45:54.100 --> 00:45:56.860 lower money to the end responsivity

NOTE Confidence: 0.26479432

 $00:45:56.860 \longrightarrow 00:45:57.320$ proportion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:01.280 \longrightarrow 00:46:03.904$ And the last part of this talk is

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:03.904 \longrightarrow 00:46:06.870$ focus on more you know the topics that

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

00:46:06.870 --> 00:46:10.960 you study in here, you know at CL.

00:46:10.960 --> 00:46:13.154 So we've Todd Gordo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00{:}46{:}13.154 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}15.896$ we decided to start doing some

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:15.896 \longrightarrow 00:46:18.592$ conditioning in mice for ketamine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:18.592 \longrightarrow 00:46:20.824$ So what we did,

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:20.830 \longrightarrow 00:46:24.855$ we know that ketamine is this rapid

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:24.855 \longrightarrow 00:46:26.580$ antidepressant slash anaesthetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

00:46:26.665 --> 00:46:29.710 drug and we study Anaidonia in mice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:29.710 \longrightarrow 00:46:31.114$ This is quite complex.

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:31.114 \longrightarrow 00:46:33.659$ All the controls so that we need

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:33.659 \longrightarrow 00:46:35.464$ the conditioning was done for

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:35.464 \longrightarrow 00:46:39.346$ 3 * 2 weeks apart to somehow

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:39.350 \longrightarrow 00:46:41.110$ eliminate the carryover effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:41.110 \longrightarrow 00:46:44.163$ And our goal was to understand if

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

00:46:44.163 --> 00:46:46.749 we expose mice to the ketamine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:46.750 \longrightarrow 00:46:48.775$ can we create a ketamine

 $00:46:48.775 \longrightarrow 00:46:50.800$ like effects when we replace

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00{:}46{:}50.877 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}55.308$ ketamine with place bo in mice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.33421454

 $00:46:55.310 \longrightarrow 00:46:56.870$ So the results show

NOTE Confidence: 0.7107004

 $00:47:00.310 \longrightarrow 00:47:03.698$ the morphic effects in the sense that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7107004

 $00:47:03.698 \longrightarrow 00:47:09.000$ in males we had some responses that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7107004

 $00:47:09.000 \longrightarrow 00:47:13.425$ were you know here you can see that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7107004

 $00{:}47{:}13.425 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}15.700$ we produce a ketamine like effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.7107004

 $00:47:15.700 \longrightarrow 00:47:18.479$ when we use saline solution and these

NOTE Confidence: 0.7107004

 $00{:}47{:}18.479 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}21.221$ are all the comparisons at one hour

NOTE Confidence: 0.7107004

00:47:21.221 --> 00:47:24.590 and 24 hours in females we didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.7107004

 $00{:}47{:}24.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}27.036$ observe A ketamine like effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7107004

 $00:47:27.036 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.141$ So we were not able to create a sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.7107004

00:47:31.141 --> 00:47:33.895 of dose extension effects of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7107004

 $00{:}47{:}33.895 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}36.946$ ketamine given for an edonia in in mice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7107004

00:47:36.950 --> 00:47:37.750 Hey guys, goodnight to mine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:47:45.280 \longrightarrow 00:47:50.388$ So it is something that we publish here

 $00:47:50.388 \longrightarrow 00:47:53.171$ in collaboration with Professor Sinacora.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:47:53.171 --> 00:47:56.633 So we start thinking more about

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:47:56.633 --> 00:47:58.639 expectations and therapeutic

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:47:58.639 --> 00:48:01.315 outcome in psychedelic surgeons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:01.320 \longrightarrow 00:48:04.040$ The idea is that this is a viewpoint,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:04.040 \longrightarrow 00:48:05.960$ paper is still to be tested,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:05.960 \longrightarrow 00:48:08.966$ but the idea is that when we use psychedelics

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}48{:}08.966 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}11.820$ we can change the mindset of patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:11.820 \longrightarrow 00:48:14.262$ So we suggest that it's very

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}48{:}14.262 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}16.831$ critical to assess expectation in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}48{:}16.831 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}18.575$ patient who received psychedelics

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:18.580 \longrightarrow 00:48:21.576$ at the time Zero before we start,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}48{:}21.580 \to 00{:}48{:}25.172$ you know the procedure and also later on

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:25.172 \longrightarrow 00:48:27.841$ expecting that psychedelics somehow can

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:27.841 \longrightarrow 00:48:31.213$ change the mindset to the perception.

 $00:48:31.220 \longrightarrow 00:48:33.940$ And I show to you that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}48{:}33.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}35.330$ manipulate expectation by exposing

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:35.330 \longrightarrow 00:48:37.890$ the people to a reduction of the pain

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:37.963 \longrightarrow 00:48:40.222$ that is a manipulation of experience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:48:40.222 --> 00:48:43.954 The psychedelics can create a strong,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:48:43.960 --> 00:48:45.800 you know, different perception of

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:45.800 \longrightarrow 00:48:48.000$ the world around the patient from,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:48:48.000 --> 00:48:50.450 you know, a mystical experience

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}48{:}50.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}52.875$ to improvement of the mood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:52.880 \longrightarrow 00:48:55.305$ And so this can somehow

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:55.305 \longrightarrow 00:48:56.760$ create new expectation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:48:56.760 \longrightarrow 00:49:00.008$ And the goal is when every time we

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:00.008 \longrightarrow 00:49:02.256$ study psychedelics to somehow keep in

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:02.256 \longrightarrow 00:49:04.501$ mind that we can have neurobiological

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:04.501 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.248$ phenomenon that we can call you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:08.248 \longrightarrow 00:49:10.843$ molecular effects and effects on

00:49:10.843 --> 00:49:13.722 expectation we can change through

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:13.722 \longrightarrow 00:49:16.570$ the biological effect expectancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:16.570 \longrightarrow 00:49:19.890$ And of course this needed to be reflect

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:19.890 \longrightarrow 00:49:23.467$ at the level of recommendation so that

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:23.467 \longrightarrow 00:49:26.674$ expectation become a multiple assessment of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:49:26.674 --> 00:49:27.766 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:27.770 \longrightarrow 00:49:30.610$ the benefits induced by psycho,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:30.610 \longrightarrow 00:49:33.086$ psychedelic and other psychotherapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:33.086 \longrightarrow 00:49:35.562$ especially when we use

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:35.562 \longrightarrow 00:49:38.010$ psychedelics with psychotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:38.010 \longrightarrow 00:49:40.201$ So then if we continue to think

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:40.201 \longrightarrow 00:49:43.412$ about what we learn from pain to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}49{:}43.412 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}45.607$ translated into the psychedelic medicine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:45.610 \longrightarrow 00:49:47.810$ one big question is what is the control,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:47.810 \longrightarrow 00:49:50.026$ what is the design?

 $00:49:50.026 \longrightarrow 00:49:53.725$ And as long I read in the literature

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}49{:}53.725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}55.760$ there are no place bo balanced

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:49:55.837 --> 00:49:58.249 placebo design for psychedelics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:49:58.250 \longrightarrow 00:50:00.488$ but it's a balanced placebo design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:00.490 \longrightarrow 00:50:02.690$ Essentially we wrote a very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:02.690 \longrightarrow 00:50:03.950$ you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:03.950 \longrightarrow 00:50:06.470$ methodological focus review on

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:06.470 \longrightarrow 00:50:07.100$ osteoarthritis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:50:07.100 --> 00:50:10.620 And in preparing this talk I was thinking

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:50:10.620 --> 00:50:14.860 of paying us a lot to teach to psychiatry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}50{:}14.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}17.158$ So the balanced place bo design is

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:50:17.158 --> 00:50:20.096 a design where we have forearms and

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:20.096 \longrightarrow 00:50:22.754$ patient received the active drug and

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:22.754 \longrightarrow 00:50:25.584$ they are told this is not the active

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:25.584 \longrightarrow 00:50:28.040$ drug or they receive the active drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:28.040 \longrightarrow 00:50:30.650$ and they are told you receive the

 $00:50:30.650 \longrightarrow 00:50:32.780$ active drug and the same for placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:32.780 \longrightarrow 00:50:35.460$ They are then administration where

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:50:35.460 --> 00:50:39.382 they say this is a placebo deceptively

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:39.382 \longrightarrow 00:50:42.406$ or this is a placebo and actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:42.406 \longrightarrow 00:50:43.950$ the receiver placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:50:43.950 --> 00:50:45.294 Probably by manipulating

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:45.294 \longrightarrow 00:50:47.982$ expectation and what they are told,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}50{:}47.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}51.615$ we can disentangle the psychedelics

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:51.615 \longrightarrow 00:50:54.910$ component versus the expectancy action

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:50:54.910 \longrightarrow 00:50:59.390$ in that play a role in this case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}50{:}59.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}03.572$ And so the hypothetical balance that

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:51:03.572 \longrightarrow 00:51:07.240$ can be a crossover or parallel design

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}51{:}07.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}10.327$ can help us to understand what is

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:51:10.327 \longrightarrow 00:51:13.263$ the place bo minus the interactive

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:51:13.263 \longrightarrow 00:51:16.315$ effects of psychedelic unexpectation.

 $00:51:16.320 \longrightarrow 00:51:16.922$ The guard.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}51{:}16.922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}18.427$ The standard of additivity may

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:51:18.427 --> 00:51:20.120 not work for psychedelics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:51:20.120 \longrightarrow 00:51:22.570$ especially if we believe that

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:51:22.570 \longrightarrow 00:51:24.040$ we change expectations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

00:51:24.040 --> 00:51:24.547 Therefore,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:51:24.547 \longrightarrow 00:51:28.096$ we needed to talk about synergic effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:51:28.100 \longrightarrow 00:51:30.552$ interaction effects between expectation

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}51{:}30.552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}33.792$ and drugs and thinking outside the

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}51{:}33.792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}36.810$ box with new design for clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00{:}51{:}36.905 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{\:{\mbox{-}}} 00{:}51{:}39.960$ trials or psychedelics can help us

NOTE Confidence: 0.32759595

 $00:51:39.960 \longrightarrow 00:51:43.350$ to understand the drug versus the

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:51:43.455 \longrightarrow 00:51:45.753$ placebo interactive effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}51{:}45.753 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}48.817$ and action and expectations

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:51:53.700 \longrightarrow 00:51:56.060$ in concluding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:51:56.060 \longrightarrow 00:51:59.140$ So when we aim to understand more

00:51:59.140 --> 00:52:02.080 placebo must be first the design,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:02.080 \dashrightarrow 00:52:05.195$ the control group are the critical component.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:05.200 \longrightarrow 00:52:07.120$ If we start a placebo effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:07.120 \longrightarrow 00:52:10.039$ we do need a no interventional group

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}52{:}10.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}14.036$ and also an assessment of expectations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:14.040 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.968$ This is a call for all the people

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:15.968 \longrightarrow 00:52:17.598$ who work with animal models,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:17.600 \longrightarrow 00:52:20.280$ the more the better, so that we can,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}52{:}20.280 \to 00{:}52{:}21.798$ understanding the molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:21.798 \longrightarrow 00:52:23.316$ and genetic mechanism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}52{:}23.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}25.308$ underline psychedelic effects but

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}52{:}25.308 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}28.290$ also antidepress ant where there is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:28.366 \longrightarrow 00:52:30.584$ need for more studies, larger study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:30.584 \longrightarrow 00:52:32.873$ We wanted to share our data because

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:32.873 \longrightarrow 00:52:35.418$ the modelling I do is different than

 $00:52:35.418 \longrightarrow 00:52:37.967$ modelling other people in this room can do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:37.970 \longrightarrow 00:52:40.634$ And by interacting with one another

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

00:52:40.634 --> 00:52:43.554 we can discover new mechanism and

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:43.554 \longrightarrow 00:52:46.204$ way to tackle impulsive effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:46.210 \longrightarrow 00:52:47.735$ And of course, replication when

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:47.735 \longrightarrow 00:52:49.969$ it starts from a lab as we know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:49.970 \longrightarrow 00:52:51.012$ means nothing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

00:52:51.012 --> 00:52:53.617 So in doing clinical trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}52{:}53.620 --> 00{:}52{:}56.700$ then let's try to learn how to

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

00:52:56.700 --> 00:52:59.100 measure expectation of improvement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:52:59.100 \longrightarrow 00:53:00.148$ allocation, assessment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:00.148 \longrightarrow 00:53:03.816$ but also standardise the words you use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:03.820 \longrightarrow 00:53:05.362$ The longer the time you spend

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

00:53:05.362 --> 00:53:06.133 with your patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:06.140 \longrightarrow 00:53:08.685$ the larger the PLACIP effects the

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

00:53:08.685 --> 00:53:10.515 larger the number of visits the

 $00:53:10.515 \longrightarrow 00:53:12.201$ larger the PLACIP effects more

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}53{:}12.201 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}14.313$ marketing like in this country where

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

00:53:14.313 --> 00:53:16.057 the largest placip effects over

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:16.057 \longrightarrow 00:53:18.019$ any other country in the world.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}53{:}18.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}20.460$ Because I'm going to be I'm not we

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:20.460 \longrightarrow 00:53:22.460$ have a beautiful marketing strategy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:22.460 \longrightarrow 00:53:24.896$ So this increase placi be fast.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:24.900 \longrightarrow 00:53:27.154$ So the number of sites more sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:27.154 \longrightarrow 00:53:28.540$ more placi be fast.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}53{:}28.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}31.372$ So the checklist how to collect

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}53{:}31.372 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}34.047$ adverse events and preming it best

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}53{:}34.047 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}36.792$ can be so relevant and I'm glad to

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}53{:}36.792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}39.294$ discuss more on these things I oppose.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:39.294 \longrightarrow 00:53:42.213$ Just a talk where you can think

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:42.213 \longrightarrow 00:53:44.140$ about this is my team,

 $00:53:44.140 \longrightarrow 00:53:46.924$ so a bigger thank you to all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}53{:}46.924 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}49.588$ them that do an amazing job in

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:49.588 \longrightarrow 00:53:52.662$ that come with new ideas but also

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:52.662 \longrightarrow 00:53:55.678$ work hard to get all this done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:55.680 \longrightarrow 00:53:57.450$ And in about 2-3 weeks this

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:57.450 \longrightarrow 00:53:59.639$ book will be out and it's free.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:53:59.640 \longrightarrow 00:54:02.468$ So if you wish to learn more

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

00:54:02.468 --> 00:54:03.680 about Placid effects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}54{:}03.680 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}54{:}06.638$ Oxford University Press are more from

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:54:06.640 \longrightarrow 00:54:09.680$ N7 to read this book for free online.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00.54:09.680 \longrightarrow 00.54:11.412$ So feel free to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

00:54:11.412 --> 00:54:12.278 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:54:12.280 \longrightarrow 00:54:15.266$ Google and a big thank you to

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:54:15.266 \longrightarrow 00:54:15.959$ the Funding Agency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

00:54:15.960 --> 00:54:17.790 But more important to all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00{:}54{:}17.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}19.820$ you who are interested in this

 $00:54:19.820 \longrightarrow 00:54:22.032$ topic that can help us learn

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:54:22.032 \longrightarrow 00:54:24.192$ more about not just psychedelics

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:54:24.192 \longrightarrow 00:54:25.920$ but psychiatry in general.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78663087

 $00:54:25.920 \longrightarrow 00:54:26.360$ Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

00:54:33.380 --> 00:54:34.712 Thanks. So I this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:54:34.712 \longrightarrow 00:54:36.562$ I mean from somebody who's

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

00:54:36.562 --> 00:54:38.138 actually doing psychedelic work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

00:54:38.140 --> 00:54:41.580 I mean it's hard to disambiguate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:54:41.580 \longrightarrow 00:54:44.118$ I mean they're so tied together,

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:54:44.118 \longrightarrow 00:54:46.270$ you know it's really hard to separate and

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:54:46.321 \longrightarrow 00:54:48.337$ then look at people doing animal research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:54:48.340 \longrightarrow 00:54:50.740$ If you're getting these results,

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00{:}54{:}50.740 --> 00{:}54{:}52.540$ how do you, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00{:}54{:}52.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}54.876$ how do you make sense of the fact

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:54:54.876 \longrightarrow 00:54:56.641$ that you're able to get this without

00:54:56.641 --> 00:54:59.568 any objective or or you would

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00{:}54{:}59.568 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}55{:}01.108$ assume any expectations on part

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:55:01.108 \longrightarrow 00:55:03.099$ of the animals said they're good.

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:55:03.100 \longrightarrow 00:55:04.604$ I mean I think these are the big

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:55:04.604 \longrightarrow 00:55:05.940$ questions like how do you get these

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00{:}55{:}05.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}07.420$ results if you don't have expectations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00{:}55{:}07.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}11.835$ But I think the the real question is

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

00:55:11.835 --> 00:55:14.966 how do you do these studies when there

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00{:}55{:}14.966 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}17.110$ is such an acute effect of the drug

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:55:17.110 \longrightarrow 00:55:20.456$ that it unmasked every single time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

00:55:20.456 --> 00:55:22.748 So you can't really do a

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:55:22.750 \longrightarrow 00:55:24.043$ placebo-controlled study unless

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:55:24.043 \longrightarrow 00:55:26.629$ you have something else that can

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

00:55:26.629 --> 00:55:29.270 generate a similar effect acutely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

00:55:29.270 --> 00:55:31.020 But it I do have an idea

NOTE Confidence: 0.42521125

 $00:55:31.020 \longrightarrow 00:55:32.070$ how do you get around that

00:55:33.070 --> 00:55:34.590 This is a big equation. You know

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}55{:}34.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}36.030$ what is the control for secondary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:55:36.190 \longrightarrow 00:55:37.590$ I mean it's if you talk to

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:55:37.590 \longrightarrow 00:55:38.734$ the FDA, you talk to anybody.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:55:38.734 \longrightarrow 00:55:39.664$ This is the big question

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:55:39.830 \longrightarrow 00:55:43.440$ how do you so and I I thought

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:55:43.440 \longrightarrow 00:55:45.240$ a lot before coming here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:55:45.240 \longrightarrow 00:55:48.030$ There are you know different studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}55{:}48.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}51.633$ where they try to change the dose so

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}55{:}51.633 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}54.104$ sub clinical doses but still you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:55:54.104 \longrightarrow 00:55:56.629$ the sub clinical doses people don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:55:56.629 \longrightarrow 00:56:01.508$ have the same mystical or you know wow

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}56{:}01.508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}04.076$ reaction that the psychedelics can cause.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}56{:}04.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}09.204$ So sub the the rapeutic dose does the

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:56:09.204 \longrightarrow 00:56:12.495$ classical approach of you know know

 $00:56:12.495 \longrightarrow 00:56:14.865$ those has not been the solution.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:56:14.870 \longrightarrow 00:56:17.198$ Some other people have tried placebo

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:56:17.198 \longrightarrow 00:56:20.022$ and of course you you know somehow

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}56{:}20.022 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}22.142$ destroying all the blinding because

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:56:22.142 \longrightarrow 00:56:24.840$ it's so clear that a placebo versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:56:24.840 \longrightarrow 00:56:28.095$ psychedelics is easy to guess what here

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:56:28.095 \longrightarrow 00:56:31.666$ is there so the allocation doesn't work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

00:56:31.670 --> 00:56:34.628 Other people try Tamizo or other

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}56{:}34.628 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}37.562$ drugs to have some sides effects and

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:56:37.562 \longrightarrow 00:56:40.926$ we do know that when we produce sides

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}56{:}40.926 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}44.024$ effects we increase the chance to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:56:44.024 \longrightarrow 00:56:46.712$ a placebo response because a patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}56{:}46.712 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}50.702$ say OK I'm feeling and as I feel sick

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

00:56:50.702 --> 00:56:53.151 probably I receive the active drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:56:53.151 \longrightarrow 00:56:55.930$ So the question first I would suggest

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:56:56.006 \longrightarrow 00:56:58.958$ for any person who does psychedelic

 $00:56:58.958 \longrightarrow 00:57:01.644$ treatment to assess expectation and to

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}57{:}01.644 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}57{:}04.423$ tackle this kind of you know question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:57:04.423 \longrightarrow 00:57:07.429$ none with the gold standard of

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

00:57:07.429 --> 00:57:11.420 additivity that clearly this kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:57:11.420 \longrightarrow 00:57:14.456$ you know urgent go beyond additivity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:57:14.460 \longrightarrow 00:57:16.965$ You can't merely compare PLACIP

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:57:16.965 \longrightarrow 00:57:20.140$ versus you know psychedelics or active

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:57:20.140 \longrightarrow 00:57:23.060$ comparators or sub therapeutic doses.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:57:23.060 \longrightarrow 00:57:26.580$ Then it's time to think about other approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}57{:}26.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}30.827$ Other approach can be you know challen

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}57{:}30.827 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}32.863$ challenging because of regulatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00:57:32.863 \longrightarrow 00:57:35.020$ requirements that they may not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

 $00{:}57{:}35.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}37.114$ but also you know the balance

NOTE Confidence: 0.38415885

00:57:37.114 --> 00:57:38.980 plus simple design that can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.6122345

00:57:41.160 --> 00:57:42.684 double-blind plus simple

00:57:42.684 --> 00:57:45.732 design where we blind both the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6122345

 $00{:}57{:}45.732 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}47.959$ the rapist and the patient with,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6122345

00:57:47.960 --> 00:57:50.136 you know, misleading information

NOTE Confidence: 0.6122345

 $00:57:50.136 \longrightarrow 00:57:52.880$ with that has not been tested.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6122345

 $00:57:52.880 \longrightarrow 00:57:56.732$ Maybe that can help somehow to

NOTE Confidence: 0.6122345

00:57:56.732 --> 00:58:00.312 see how you know, using balance

NOTE Confidence: 0.6122345

 $00:58:00.312 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.280$ plus simple design help, although

NOTE Confidence: 0.6122345

00:58:03.400 --> 00:58:05.224 that doesn't necessarily address

NOTE Confidence: 0.6122345

00:58:05.224 --> 00:58:06.760 the question about acute,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6122345

 $00:58:06.760 \longrightarrow 00:58:08.120$ you know, acute blind.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3747367

 $00:58:09.470 \longrightarrow 00:58:12.350$ I have I have a suggestion

NOTE Confidence: 0.3747367

00:58:12.350 --> 00:58:15.150 Cyril D'souza. One possibility

NOTE Confidence: 0.3747367

 $00:58:15.150 \longrightarrow 00:58:16.350$ is for example to use

NOTE Confidence: 0.3747367

 $00{:}58{:}17.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}18.870$ a drug that does produce

NOTE Confidence: 0.3747367

 $00:58:18.870 \longrightarrow 00:58:21.108$ hallucinogenic effects that is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.3747367

 $00:58:21.510 \longrightarrow 00:58:24.135$ predicted to, for example produce

 $00:58:24.135 \longrightarrow 00:58:26.190$ anti depression depressant effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3747367

 $00.58:26.190 \longrightarrow 00.58:28.830$ So that would be for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3747367

00:58:28.830 --> 00:58:30.390a drug like Salman RNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.3747367

 $00:58:30.390 \longrightarrow 00:58:32.790$ which is, which produces

NOTE Confidence: 0.3747367

 $00:58:32.790 \longrightarrow 00:58:35.950$ potent hallucinogenic effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.3747367

 $00{:}58{:}35.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}39.320$ but is generally perceived as being,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83140635

 $00.58:39.320 \longrightarrow 00.58:41.480$ you know, unpleasant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83140635

 $00{:}58{:}41.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}44.360$ at least for the moment. So that would be

NOTE Confidence: 0.83140635

00:58:45.640 --> 00:58:48.280 111 possibility. And the other possibility

NOTE Confidence: 0.83140635

 $00:58:48.280 \longrightarrow 00:58:50.360$ would be, for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83140635

 $00:58:50.360 \longrightarrow 00:58:51.980$ since in the case of depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83140635

 $00:58:51.980 \longrightarrow 00:58:55.130$ there may be patients who who go through

NOTE Confidence: 0.83140635

 $00:58:55.130 \longrightarrow 00:58:58.000$ ECT and receive anaesthesia for ECT,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83140635

 $00:58:58.320 \longrightarrow 00:58:59.040$ what if you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83140635

 $00:59:00.520 \longrightarrow 00:59:02.012$ you know, give them an anaesthetic

 $00:59:02.012 \longrightarrow 00:59:04.600$ agent so they don't experience

NOTE Confidence: 0.83140635

 $00:59:04.600 \longrightarrow 00:59:06.200$ the acute psychedelic effects?

NOTE Confidence: 0.83140635 00:59:07.360 --> 00:59:07.680 And NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:10.240 \longrightarrow 00:59:11.520$ I can't comment on that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

00:59:11.520 --> 00:59:13.005 Let's comment on both points

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:13.005 \longrightarrow 00:59:14.193$ that are very stimulating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:14.200 \longrightarrow 00:59:16.510$ Of course, a positive comparator

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:16.510 \longrightarrow 00:59:19.720$ where we can create the experience

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:19.720 \longrightarrow 00:59:22.440$ somehow without having antidepressant

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:22.440 \longrightarrow 00:59:25.340$ effects can be a strategy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:25.340 \longrightarrow 00:59:28.780$ The idea to have this drug while people

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:28.866 \longrightarrow 00:59:31.976$ are an esthetized has been shown recently

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:31.976 \longrightarrow 00:59:35.448$ by Boris and this team from Stanford.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:35.450 \longrightarrow 00:59:38.250$ And what do they have with ketamine?

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:38.250 \longrightarrow 00:59:40.010$ What do they did?

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:40.010 \longrightarrow 00:59:43.930$ They give ketamine to people who were,

 $00:59:43.930 \longrightarrow 00:59:46.810$ you know, prepared for their

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00{:}59{:}46.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}49.210$ surgical procedure and the idea

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:49.210 \longrightarrow 00:59:52.409$ was and they had major depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:52.410 \longrightarrow 00:59:54.450$ So if we inject ketamine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:54.450 \longrightarrow 00:59:57.740$ they should have long lasting effects of

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $00:59:57.740 \longrightarrow 01:00:00.850$ ketamine on their depression post surgery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:00.850 \longrightarrow 01:00:03.664$ And I suggest I little did this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:00:03.670 --> 01:00:05.788 The manuscript that is very intriguing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:00:05.790 --> 01:00:06.742 but probably,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:06.742 \longrightarrow 01:00:10.550$ I mean this is something like self marketing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:00:10.550 --> 01:00:14.502 There is an accord and I comment on

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:14.502 \longrightarrow 01:00:17.020$ this manuscript and the article that

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01{:}00{:}17.020 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}19.270$ came out today where we described

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:19.270 \longrightarrow 01:00:21.590$ by the challenging pitfalls,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:21.590 \longrightarrow 01:00:24.383$ but also how somehow when we create

 $01:00:24.383 \longrightarrow 01:00:26.940$ a sort of silencing expectation

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:26.940 \longrightarrow 01:00:30.110$ like the Open Eden Paradigm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:30.110 \longrightarrow 01:00:32.476$ we may also destroy all the effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:32.476 \longrightarrow 01:00:34.768$ of the antidepressant like ketamine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:34.768 \longrightarrow 01:00:35.840$ In fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:00:35.840 --> 01:00:38.320 patients who receive ketamine

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:38.320 \longrightarrow 01:00:40.800$ or placebo improve equally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:00:40.800 --> 01:00:42.712 Over 50\% responded, Yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:42.712 \longrightarrow 01:00:44.280$ and they both improve.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:44.280 \longrightarrow 01:00:45.640$ So that is the challenge.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:00:45.640 --> 01:00:47.185 If 50 percentage improve and

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:47.185 \longrightarrow 01:00:49.130$ this is the same 53 percentage

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:49.130 \longrightarrow 01:00:51.116$ that I saw in my patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:51.120 \longrightarrow 01:00:53.731$ no matter if they receive a placebo

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:00:53.731 \longrightarrow 01:00:55.839$ ketamine before beginning anesthetize it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01{:}00{:}55.840 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}58.270$ then the medicine that we practice

 $01{:}00{:}58.270 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}01{:}01{:}343$ may need to be scrutinized because

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:01.343 \longrightarrow 01:01:03.608$ expectation needed to be studied.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:03.610 \longrightarrow 01:01:07.906$ Because maybe that is a concept that some

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:01:07.906 --> 01:01:11.930 while some hours in 2003 very popular

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:11.930 \longrightarrow 01:01:14.658$ in the literature for antidepressant

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:14.658 \longrightarrow 01:01:17.106$ it's that you need the expectation

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:17.106 \longrightarrow 01:01:19.930$ to see an antidepressant effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:19.930 \longrightarrow 01:01:23.101$ When we did the Adziban with an

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:23.101 \longrightarrow 01:01:24.460$ Indian administration especially

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:24.538 \longrightarrow 01:01:25.957$ didn't improve Boris.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:01:25.957 --> 01:01:28.092 Today you have ketamine and

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:28.092 \longrightarrow 01:01:30.380$ placebo and they improve equally

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01{:}01{:}30.380 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}32.512$ not despite begin an esthetized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01{:}01{:}32.512 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}35.177$ So then let's tackle expectation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:35.180 \longrightarrow 01:01:37.791$ We truly needed to understand our wine

01:01:37.791 --> 01:01:40.186 desert that I molecular changes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01{:}01{:}40.186 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}43.467$ merely rely on the concept that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:43.467 \longrightarrow 01:01:45.831$ use the world standard of comparing

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:45.831 \longrightarrow 01:01:50.512$ A placebo armor with a ketamine or

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:01:50.512 --> 01:01:54.604 psychedelic are may not help us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:54.604 \longrightarrow 01:01:57.070$ And also Chris asked about

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:57.070 \longrightarrow 01:01:59.220$ the duration of this effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:01:59.220 \longrightarrow 01:02:02.324$ There are a paper in the literature show

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01{:}02{:}02.324 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}05.475$ that patients who had place bo responses 10

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:05.475 \longrightarrow 01:02:08.940$ years before they continue to be respondents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:02:08.940 --> 01:02:09.836 And anecdotally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:09.836 \longrightarrow 01:02:12.076$ when we were serious Parkinson

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:12.076 \longrightarrow 01:02:14.100$ patients that they received,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:02:14.100 --> 01:02:14.940 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:14.940 \longrightarrow 01:02:16.620$ treatment with a battery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:16.620 \longrightarrow 01:02:18.996$ we had the patients who came to the

 $01:02:18.996 \longrightarrow 01:02:21.372$ lab were being reassessed clinically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:21.372 \longrightarrow 01:02:24.480$ They didn't know that the battery

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:02:24.561 --> 01:02:26.966 was off because they travel from

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:26.966 \longrightarrow 01:02:28.862$ the metal detector and they were

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01{:}02{:}28.862 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}30.850$ continued to have huge improvement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:30.850 \longrightarrow 01:02:32.716$ They didn't realize.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:32.716 \longrightarrow 01:02:38.550$ So what can we call this a long lasting plus

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:38.550 \longrightarrow 01:02:41.234$ CB effects expectation that makes them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:02:41.234 --> 01:02:41.970 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:41.970 \longrightarrow 01:02:45.530$ not realizing that that resolve

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:45.530 \longrightarrow 01:02:47.330$ and they continue to improve

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

 $01:02:47.330 \longrightarrow 01:02:48.770$ and conducting their life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29364285

01:02:48.770 --> 01:02:49.050 I think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.36872393

01:02:51.570 --> 01:02:53.250 Luana, Luana, I have a question

NOTE Confidence: 0.36872393

 $01:02:53.250 \longrightarrow 01:02:56.953$ about how you would recommend we

01:02:56.953 --> 01:02:58.868 measure expectancy, because as yet

NOTE Confidence: 0.36872393

 $01{:}02{:}58.868 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 01{:}03{:}00.760$ I'm unaware of any standardized

NOTE Confidence: 0.36872393

01:03:00.760 --> 01:03:04.058 way of measuring expectancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.36872393

 $01:03:04.060 \longrightarrow 01:03:07.180$ especially for psychedelic studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.35384247

01:03:09.580 --> 01:03:10.979 about expectations and expectancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35384247

01:03:10.979 --> 01:03:12.737 just so it's clear to everybody.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35384247

 $01:03:14.340 \longrightarrow 01:03:16.720$ So we define operationally

NOTE Confidence: 0.35384247

 $01:03:16.720 \longrightarrow 01:03:19.695$ expectations when we measure it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35384247

 $01:03:19.700 \longrightarrow 01:03:21.900$ And there are several scales,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35384247

01:03:21.900 --> 01:03:25.130 like the Stanford Expectation Scale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35384247

01:03:25.130 --> 01:03:28.070 the Credibility scale or

NOTE Confidence: 0.35384247

 $01{:}03{:}28.070 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}31.010$ merely visual analogue scale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35384247

01:03:31.010 --> 01:03:33.728 We compare in the lab two

NOTE Confidence: 0.35384247

 $01:03:33.728 \longrightarrow 01:03:35.087$ different assessments and

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:03:37.330 \longrightarrow 01:03:40.410$ we see that the visual analogue scale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

01:03:40.410 --> 01:03:44.250 it's easy to understand and somehow

 $01:03:44.250 \longrightarrow 01:03:48.300$ helpful to understand the expectations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01{:}03{:}48.300 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}51.682$ In the paper that we publish with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:03:51.682 \longrightarrow 01:03:53.974$ distribution of Placib effects in chronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

01:03:53.974 --> 01:03:56.099 pain patients and earth controls,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:03:56.100 \longrightarrow 01:03:58.740$ the NMT and so on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:03:58.740 \longrightarrow 01:04:02.250$ there was an association between

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:04:02.250 \longrightarrow 01:04:04.814$ expectations versus Placib effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

01:04:04.814 --> 01:04:07.122 But expectation didn't mediate

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:04:07.122 \longrightarrow 01:04:08.853$ the Placib effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:04:08.860 \longrightarrow 01:04:11.905$ So if we want a simple tool,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

01:04:11.910 --> 01:04:14.310 I suggest visual Analogue Scale where

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:04:14.310 \longrightarrow 01:04:17.837$ they just have a cursor and we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01{:}04{:}17.837 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}20.142$ measure without any numerical anchors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

01:04:20.150 --> 01:04:22.985 But the expectancy to me is even

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:04:22.985 \longrightarrow 01:04:25.370$ more intriguing and important in

 $01:04:25.370 \longrightarrow 01:04:28.030$ a ideal world like us that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:04:28.030 \longrightarrow 01:04:31.317$ well funded and we have brain and

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:04:31.317 \longrightarrow 01:04:33.269$ resources to tackle questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

01:04:33.270 --> 01:04:36.189 I suggest not to study middle expectation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

01:04:36.190 --> 01:04:39.627 measuring how much people expect to improve,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

01:04:39.630 --> 01:04:42.710 rather measuring expectancy with modelling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:04:42.710 \longrightarrow 01:04:43.764$ brain imaging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

01:04:43.764 --> 01:04:47.453 And try to see how the interplay

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:04:47.453 \longrightarrow 01:04:51.257$ of beliefs and mindset at the level

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:04:51.257 \longrightarrow 01:04:53.840$ of neuronal change can help us

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01{:}04{:}53.840 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>01{:}04{:}55.480$ to understand the responsibility

NOTE Confidence: 0.6303803

 $01:04:55.480 \longrightarrow 01:04:56.550$ to treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

01:04:59.070 --> 01:05:01.090 about measuring expectation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01{:}05{:}01.090 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}03.110$ studying the brain correlates

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01:05:03.110 \longrightarrow 01:05:05.390$ of beliefs and expectancies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01:05:05.390 \longrightarrow 01:05:09.166$ Thank you. Sure. OK.

 $01{:}05{:}09.166 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}10.296$ Mr. I got two questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01:05:10.300 \longrightarrow 01:05:12.804$ Yes, one is in that slide that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01:05:12.804 \longrightarrow 01:05:15.210$ showed all of the components of

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

01:05:15.210 --> 01:05:18.012 expectancy and the placebo effect, all that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01{:}05{:}18.012 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}19.692$ And then you mentioned certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01:05:19.692 \longrightarrow 01:05:21.084$ components of expectancy, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

01:05:21.084 --> 01:05:22.620 So the patient's priors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01:05:22.620 \longrightarrow 01:05:23.772$ experiences or beliefs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

01:05:23.772 --> 01:05:26.460 how did you get to those elements?

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01:05:26.460 \longrightarrow 01:05:28.020$ Like did you assess that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01:05:28.020 \longrightarrow 01:05:30.500$ Did you openly ask them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01:05:30.500 \longrightarrow 01:05:35.180$ so they're referring to this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01:05:35.180 \longrightarrow 01:05:37.210$ correct.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

01:05:37.210 --> 01:05:37.664 No, no,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5378341

 $01:05:37.664 \longrightarrow 01:05:39.026$ no way before like in the

 $01:05:39.026 \longrightarrow 01:05:40.130$ beginning of the present.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

01:05:40.130 --> 01:05:41.528 Yeah, I think in your overview

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

01:05:41.528 --> 01:05:43.050 slide you were saying all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:05:43.050 \longrightarrow 01:05:44.126$ things that could influence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:05:44.130 \longrightarrow 01:05:48.006$ Yes, that, so that expectancy there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:05:48.010 \longrightarrow 01:05:50.593$ So this is a summary of what we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:05:50.593 \longrightarrow 01:05:53.409$ been studying over the last 1-2 decades.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:05:53.410 \longrightarrow 01:05:55.295$ So the concept is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}05{:}55.295 \to 01{:}05{:}56.803$ expectations can be measured.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:05:56.810 \longrightarrow 01:05:59.912$ Expectancy is something more related to

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}05{:}59.912 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}03.431$ the brain changes when we don't measure

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:03.431 \longrightarrow 01:06:06.793$ expectations and so we know that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:06.793 \longrightarrow 01:06:09.958$ can study anticipation of treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

01:06:09.960 --> 01:06:12.276 So at least with brain imaging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:12.280 \longrightarrow 01:06:15.112$ we have been looking at anticipatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:15.112 \longrightarrow 01:06:18.773$ phase when you expect something acute a

 $01:06:18.773 \longrightarrow 01:06:21.583$ treatment and somehow this anticipation

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

01:06:21.583 --> 01:06:24.743 can trigger brain changes and it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:24.743 \longrightarrow 01:06:27.671$ our ability to predict future events.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:27.680 \longrightarrow 01:06:30.470$ So another way to think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:30.470 \longrightarrow 01:06:33.359$ this is real ability to predict

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:33.360 \longrightarrow 01:06:35.332$ and anticipate future events.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:35.332 \longrightarrow 01:06:39.240$ So we call this expectancy and in terms

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:39.240 \longrightarrow 01:06:42.120$ of expectation is more a measurement

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:42.120 \longrightarrow 01:06:45.700$ of patient believe and outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:45.700 \longrightarrow 01:06:48.800$ This is their ability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:48.800 \longrightarrow 01:06:52.279$ If your questions is about this part,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:52.280 \longrightarrow 01:06:54.872$ this is just a summer of all the studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:54.872 \longrightarrow 01:06:57.614$ that we have been conducting where we

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:57.614 \longrightarrow 01:06:59.782$ can manipulate the suggestion the rapeutic

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:06:59.782 \longrightarrow 01:07:03.214$ experience by asking patients about how

01:07:03.214 --> 01:07:06.256 many good clinical experience you had.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}07{:}06.256 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}08.466$ There are studies show observation

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}07{:}08.466 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}11.066$ in other people and contestual

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:07:11.066 \longrightarrow 01:07:12.890$ and interpersonal interaction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

01:07:12.890 --> 01:07:15.272 It's made last summer over 20

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}07{:}15.272 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}17.570$ years studies that we conduct,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:07:17.570 \longrightarrow 01:07:21.370$ other people conduct, yes, yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:07:21.370 \longrightarrow 01:07:23.610$ And the second question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}07{:}23.610 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}25.902$ So second question was with regards

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:07:25.902 \longrightarrow 01:07:29.512$ to the question physician aspects

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}07{:}29.512 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}32.576$ that might influence patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:07:32.580 \longrightarrow 01:07:32.793$ Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

01:07:32.793 --> 01:07:34.497 And you said that you tested the warmth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:07:34.500 \longrightarrow 01:07:38.256$ encompass empathy that that was negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

01:07:38.260 --> 01:07:41.298 But I was wondering if you investigated

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}07{:}41.298 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}43.785$ whether you can group physicians

 $01:07:43.785 \longrightarrow 01:07:46.545$ by their patients response because

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}07{:}46.545 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}49.602$ there's this paper on antidepressant

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:07:49.602 \longrightarrow 01:07:52.493$ effects that does that well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:07:52.493 \longrightarrow 01:07:54.358$ We did in our experiments.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:07:54.360 \longrightarrow 01:07:57.414$ So I would refrain from generalizing

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:07:57.414 \longrightarrow 01:08:00.428$ because there are other studies show

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:00.428 \longrightarrow 01:08:02.828$ that the physicians the study you

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}08{:}02.828 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}05.488$ mentioned and to other study warmer

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:05.488 \longrightarrow 01:08:08.560$ and competency influence outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:08.560 \longrightarrow 01:08:11.680$ We are not observing that implicit

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}08{:}11.680 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}13.760$ effects through our paradigm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:13.760 \longrightarrow 01:08:17.926$ But of course there are you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}08{:}17.930 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}20.750$ this are elements that are part

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}08{:}20.750 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}22.630$ of the interpersonal interaction

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:22.710 \longrightarrow 01:08:25.210$ that may affect clinical outcomes.

01:08:25.210 --> 01:08:26.810 But even without sorry, sorry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:26.810 \longrightarrow 01:08:28.832$ I'm sorry but even without knowing

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:28.832 \longrightarrow 01:08:30.939$ the specific component did you observe

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:30.939 \longrightarrow 01:08:33.117$ like a grouping among physicians like

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

01:08:33.117 --> 01:08:36.171 a certain physicians have we see an

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}08{:}36.171 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}38.114$ experimental effect we know that in

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:38.114 \longrightarrow 01:08:40.118$ the lab there are some people that

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

01:08:40.118 --> 01:08:42.176 trigger larger plus if effects we

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01{:}08{:}42.176 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}43.980$ should publish that the experimental

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:43.980 \longrightarrow 01:08:47.060$ effect and I bet that you see that

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

01:08:47.136 --> 01:08:49.926 with your experiment or your patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:49.930 \longrightarrow 01:08:52.776$ It's something that we don't know if

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:52.776 \longrightarrow 01:08:55.406$ it's the verbal nonverbal communication,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:55.410 \longrightarrow 01:08:57.516$ the attitude the way to connect

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

01:08:57.516 --> 01:08:58.569 with your patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43637162

 $01:08:58.570 \longrightarrow 01:09:01.209$ but we do see an experimental effect.

01:09:01.210 --> 01:09:03.340 Thanks for asking. Anything.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

01:09:03.860 --> 01:09:04.442 So, I'm sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

01:09:04.442 --> 01:09:06.220 I have to run off and catch a train,

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

 $01:09:06.220 \longrightarrow 01:09:08.140$ which means I have to take my computer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

 $01{:}09{:}08.140 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}10.100$ So I'm going to take my computer in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

 $01:09:10.100 \longrightarrow 01:09:11.216$ But that doesn't mean that this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

01:09:11.220 --> 01:09:13.318 I think you have anyone enough. No, no, no.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

01:09:13.318 --> 01:09:14.820 They'll stay on. Oh, they stay on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

01:09:15.780 --> 01:09:16.780 Your slides will go away.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

 $01:09:20.620 \longrightarrow 01:09:21.333$ All right, that's me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

 $01:09:21.333 \longrightarrow 01:09:23.180$ Let me make sure. Oh, watch

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

 $01:09:23.220 \longrightarrow 01:09:25.100$ this. I'm not going to kill the meeting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

 $01:09:25.100 \longrightarrow 01:09:26.646$ I've done this anytime where

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

 $01:09:26.646 \longrightarrow 01:09:27.686$ I've accidentally killed

NOTE Confidence: 0.2554846

 $01:09:27.686 \longrightarrow 01:09:28.860$ the meeting conditioned to

01:09:32.880 --> 01:09:34.518 OK, Jessica, you're the you're the boss.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

01:09:36.120 --> 01:09:39.839 Thank you. All right. OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

01:09:39.840 --> 01:09:40.800 Chris, while you're doing it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01:09:40.800 \longrightarrow 01:09:42.644$ I can say maybe address this too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

01:09:42.644 --> 01:09:44.672 It gets more complex though, too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

01:09:44.672 --> 01:09:47.320 because then there's contextual factors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01:09:47.320 \longrightarrow 01:09:51.152$ right? So what could be a a

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

01:09:51.152 --> 01:09:52.400 favorable placebo response?

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01{:}09{:}52.400 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}54.200$ Or who may be a person who's more

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01:09:54.200 \longrightarrow 01:09:55.833$ likely to have a placebo response

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01:09:55.833 \longrightarrow 01:09:57.525$ in one situation could be very

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01:09:57.586 \longrightarrow 01:09:59.210$ different in another situation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01:09:59.210 \longrightarrow 01:10:01.646$ So that and that's culturally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

01:10:01.646 --> 01:10:05.370 But even from 11 endless to another,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01:10:05.370 \longrightarrow 01:10:07.827$ a physician that may engender a good

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01:10:07.827 \longrightarrow 01:10:09.489$ political response to a surgery

 $01:10:09.490 \longrightarrow 01:10:12.580$ intervention may be a different thing

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01{:}10{:}12.580 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}14.774$ that would engender a good political

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01:10:14.774 \longrightarrow 01:10:17.250$ response to some other type of intervention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314 01:10:17.250 --> 01:10:17.541 They.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

01:10:17.541 --> 01:10:18.414 I think that's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01:10:18.414 \longrightarrow 01:10:21.514$ It's fair to say some of the more recent

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01:10:21.514 \longrightarrow 01:10:24.088$ research suggested that it's very contextual.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

 $01:10:24.090 \longrightarrow 01:10:25.094$ It's not so simple.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37161314

01:10:25.094 --> 01:10:25.847 It's not like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25623393

 $01:10:26.390 \longrightarrow 01:10:27.308$ which makes a lot of sense,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25623393

 $01:10:27.310 \longrightarrow 01:10:28.846$ like things that the things that make

NOTE Confidence: 0.25623393

 $01:10:28.846 \longrightarrow 01:10:31.150$ you confident in a plumber's skills

NOTE Confidence: 0.25623393

 $01{:}10{:}31.150 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}33.322$ are going to be very different in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.25623393

 $01:10:33.322 \longrightarrow 01:10:35.950$ person buying the plane, Right? Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25623393

 $01:10:35.950 \longrightarrow 01:10:39.390$ Plumbing I mean the Super response,

 $01{:}10{:}41.590 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}44.602$ yes can I also so about the our last

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

01:10:44.602 --> 01:10:47.009 how how can we know how much of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:10:47.009 \longrightarrow 01:10:49.229$ effect of the psychedelics of placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:10:49.230 \longrightarrow 01:10:51.550$ I know that in some studies to know

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:10:51.550 \longrightarrow 01:10:53.230$ how much of the effect is placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:10:53.230 \longrightarrow 01:10:54.550$ I mean it's mostly for pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:10:54.550 \longrightarrow 01:10:57.487$ I think it's they use naloxone because

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

01:10:57.487 --> 01:10:59.846 you know one of the underlying mechanism

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01{:}10{:}59.846 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}03.150$ of analysis in a place bo response

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

01:11:03.150 --> 01:11:06.648 in for pain is intrinsic opioid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:11:06.650 \longrightarrow 01:11:09.390$ So they use another song to mask that

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:11:09.390 \longrightarrow 01:11:11.705$ and to see how much of the effect is

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:11:11.705 \longrightarrow 01:11:13.845$ there like the real right for example

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:11:13.845 \longrightarrow 01:11:15.929$ keterolac for keterolac we can't do that

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

01:11:15.930 --> 01:11:19.376 but I mean we have been using monabant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:11:19.376 \longrightarrow 01:11:25.346$ So the idea I mean well place be analgesia

 $01:11:25.346 \longrightarrow 01:11:28.935$ has been you know study mostly with

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01{:}11{:}28.935 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}31.100$ pharmacological approach before we had

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:11:31.170 \longrightarrow 01:11:35.443$ the brain imaging and so on in 197374

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

01:11:35.443 --> 01:11:40.689 a teenage a patient with wisdom you

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:11:40.689 \longrightarrow 01:11:43.284$ know with drawal and surgical procedure

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:11:43.284 \longrightarrow 01:11:45.883$ were somehow randomized to selling

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

01:11:45.883 --> 01:11:48.547 and or morphine and pre injecting

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01{:}11{:}48.547 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}51.602$ idols of naloxone block completely the

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:11:51.602 \longrightarrow 01:11:54.347$ effects of placebo energies because

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:11:54.347 \longrightarrow 01:11:56.464$ patients respond also to selling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:11:56.464 \longrightarrow 01:11:58.830$ But this is also the bitcher story

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:11:58.903 \longrightarrow 01:12:01.127$ when he was in Sicily and the post

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:12:01.127 \longrightarrow 01:12:03.418$ war and somehow he is failing to

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

01:12:03.418 --> 01:12:05.705 treat good that the patient when

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:12:05.705 \longrightarrow 01:12:08.430$ he had finished you know the pain.

 $01:12:08.430 \longrightarrow 01:12:10.214$ So actually my question is that can we

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

01:12:10.214 --> 01:12:11.932 do that for psychologics I don't know

NOTE Confidence: 0.36159262

 $01:12:11.932 \longrightarrow 01:12:14.110$ how much of the like an antagonist does.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3292058

 $01:12:14.110 \longrightarrow 01:12:16.364$ So there's there is talk about using

NOTE Confidence: 0.3292058

 $01:12:16.364 \longrightarrow 01:12:18.366$ like tanzarin and some of the other

NOTE Confidence: 0.3292058

 $01:12:18.366 \longrightarrow 01:12:20.550$ 5 HD two drugs to block the effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

 $01:12:21.170 \longrightarrow 01:12:23.969$ But then what we can do like in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

 $01:12:23.969 \longrightarrow 01:12:26.896$ ketamine study with mice that use greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

01:12:26.896 --> 01:12:28.932 conditioning you know psychedelics 2

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

01:12:28.932 --> 01:12:31.599 weeks apart or one months apart and

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

 $01:12:31.599 \longrightarrow 01:12:34.972$ other psychedelics and then placebo by

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

01:12:34.972 --> 01:12:37.936 pre injecting psychedelic antagonist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

01:12:37.940 --> 01:12:41.420 Oh no no I'm actually not using about

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

 $01:12:41.420 \longrightarrow 01:12:43.569$ you're talking about not because I don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

01:12:43.569 --> 01:12:45.820 know the opioid you like the intro I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

 $01:12:45.820 \longrightarrow 01:12:47.796$ talking about using something to block she's.

 $01:12:47.796 \longrightarrow 01:12:50.180$ Yes I know that intrinsic opioids are

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

 $01:12:50.180 \longrightarrow 01:12:53.236$ like one of the one of the main you

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

01:12:53.236 --> 01:12:55.166 know circuits in the brain that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

 $01:12:55.166 \longrightarrow 01:12:57.133$ know not that is an absolutely nice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53082645

 $01:12:57.140 \longrightarrow 01:12:57.860$ Yeah ketamine

NOTE Confidence: 0.27070886

01:12:57.860 --> 01:13:01.820 also at Stanford using Nelloxon to

NOTE Confidence: 0.27070886

 $01:13:01.820 \longrightarrow 01:13:03.700$ reportedly block them the ketamine

NOTE Confidence: 0.27070886

 $01:13:03.700 \longrightarrow 01:13:05.970$ antidepressant response in a small number

NOTE Confidence: 0.36756226

 $01:13:06.690 \longrightarrow 01:13:08.738$ of people. So the idea is kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.36756226

 $01{:}13{:}08.738 \dashrightarrow 01{:}13{:}10.284$ we block the place bo components

NOTE Confidence: 0.36756226

 $01:13:10.284 \longrightarrow 01:13:12.644$ that are using in a given that

NOTE Confidence: 0.36756226

 $01:13:12.644 \longrightarrow 01:13:15.402$ the new opioid system is one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.36756226

 $01{:}13{:}15.402 \dashrightarrow 01{:}13{:}18.480$ the most important system that has

NOTE Confidence: 0.36756226

 $01:13:18.480 \longrightarrow 01:13:20.850$ been done for ketamine for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36756226

 $01:13:20.850 \longrightarrow 01:13:22.410$ And that's a cool idea.

 $01:13:22.410 \longrightarrow 01:13:26.494$ The caveat is that OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.36756226

01:13:26.494 --> 01:13:28.678 it's through the endogenous opioid

NOTE Confidence: 0.36756226

 $01:13:28.678 \longrightarrow 01:13:31.366$ system play a relevant role for placebo

NOTE Confidence: 0.36756226

01:13:31.366 --> 01:13:33.802 but it's not the only system we know

NOTE Confidence: 0.36756226

 $01:13:33.802 \longrightarrow 01:13:36.110$ that we have a release of dopamine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.36756226

 $01:13:36.110 \longrightarrow 01:13:38.228$ we have a release of endogenous

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01:13:40.750 \longrightarrow 01:13:43.654$ but people try to block expectation

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01:13:43.654 \longrightarrow 01:13:46.630$ with anesthetic drugs, you know. So

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01{:}13{:}46.990 \to 01{:}13{:}49.942$ I'm very curious about the nature of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01:13:49.942 \longrightarrow 01:13:52.256$ stimulus that trigger the placebo response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01:13:52.256 \longrightarrow 01:13:54.712$ Do we have any study that I don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

01:13:54.712 --> 01:13:57.220 know how an approach of more operant

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

01:13:57.220 --> 01:13:58.820 conditioning maybe engage people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01{:}13{:}58.820 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}01.228$ maybe saying even a ritualistic behaviour

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

01:14:01.228 --> 01:14:05.473 and see if the behaviour is changed a

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01:14:05.473 \longrightarrow 01:14:07.804$ magnitude of response and if there is

 $01:14:07.804 \longrightarrow 01:14:10.900$ a in some cases there is some effect of

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01:14:10.900 \longrightarrow 01:14:13.788$ novelty and oddness of that stimulus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01:14:13.788 \longrightarrow 01:14:16.580$ For example in case of psychedelics

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01:14:16.580 \longrightarrow 01:14:19.220$ we have because they are odd,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01:14:19.220 \longrightarrow 01:14:22.208$ they are doing that and maybe if we use

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01:14:22.208 \longrightarrow 01:14:24.220$ that multiple times it somehow has the

NOTE Confidence: 0.27090457

 $01:14:24.220 \longrightarrow 01:14:26.940$ effect wears off as it becomes more familiar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:14:28.340 \longrightarrow 01:14:31.604$ So the operant conditioning has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:14:31.604 \longrightarrow 01:14:35.340$ used both in humans and in animals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:14:35.340 \longrightarrow 01:14:38.420$ The number of studies is very limited.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

01:14:38.420 --> 01:14:42.100 So we have not too much knowledge yet

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:14:42.100 \longrightarrow 01:14:45.316$ and the idea was that's the novelty and

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:14:45.316 \longrightarrow 01:14:48.511$ actually I quoted a paper and we designed

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:14:48.511 \longrightarrow 01:14:50.670$ a study with they grew up in Leuven.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:14:50.670 \longrightarrow 01:14:55.078$ That study a lot of condition John named

 $01:14:55.078 \longrightarrow 01:14:58.787$ Lion and the results were not very appealing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

01:14:58.790 --> 01:15:02.304 I mean, we didn't find stronger PLACIP

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:15:02.304 \longrightarrow 01:15:05.200$ effects by using this operant conditioning,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:15:05.200 \longrightarrow 01:15:07.525$ yes, but probably we thought

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:15:07.525 \longrightarrow 01:15:09.590$ that was too complex,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

01:15:09.590 --> 01:15:11.828 too many stimulations that patients got,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:15:11.830 \longrightarrow 01:15:16.580$ participants got lost in the paradigm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

01:15:16.580 --> 01:15:19.538 But I mean there are a few

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

01:15:19.538 --> 01:15:20.770 studies in animals as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:15:20.770 \longrightarrow 01:15:23.210$ but there is also tend to be inconsistent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01{:}15{:}23.210 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}28.110$ So yes and the novelty doesn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01{:}15{:}28.110 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}30.986$ seems to be the critical component

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:15:30.986 \longrightarrow 01:15:33.898$ for placipic pets here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01{:}15{:}33.900 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}36.100$ But probably this interesting in

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:15:36.100 \longrightarrow 01:15:38.300$ psychedelic trials to study naive

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

01:15:38.367 --> 01:15:40.443 versus non naive patient and see

01:15:40.443 --> 01:15:42.400 how this change and perspective

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:15:42.400 \longrightarrow 01:15:44.900$ longitudinal study can also help.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

01:15:44.900 --> 01:15:47.681 You know if we go on with open label

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

01:15:47.681 --> 01:15:50.108 trials where they know that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01{:}15{:}50.108 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}52.356$ receive the treatment and we follow

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:15:52.356 \longrightarrow 01:15:54.512$ this patient for 5-10 years then we

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:15:54.512 \longrightarrow 01:15:56.276$ can understand the more especially

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:15:56.276 \longrightarrow 01:15:59.076$ if we have a large court of patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:15:59.076 \longrightarrow 01:16:01.038$ when we can start phenotyping and

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01{:}16{:}01.038 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}03.428$ try to study different aspects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39028335

 $01:16:03.428 \longrightarrow 01:16:04.580$ I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

01:16:04.820 --> 01:16:08.420 one of the main concerns regarding

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

 $01{:}16{:}08.420 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}12.410$ sort of expectations is all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

 $01:16:12.410 \longrightarrow 01:16:14.300$ well most of the studies done,

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

 $01:16:14.300 \longrightarrow 01:16:16.430$ most of the patients and psychedelics

01:16:16.430 --> 01:16:18.994 have been highly educated people

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

 $01{:}16{:}18.994 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}21.052$ that are well aware of these effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

01:16:21.052 --> 01:16:23.356 and I know it's one of the real

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

 $01:16:23.356 \longrightarrow 01:16:25.260$ concerns the FDA has does this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

01:16:25.260 --> 01:16:28.460 If you look at many of these studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

 $01:16:28.460 \longrightarrow 01:16:30.380$ 98% college graduates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

 $01:16:30.380 \longrightarrow 01:16:32.732$ you know there there's a real

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

01:16:32.732 --> 01:16:34.436 need to make sure that you're not

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

 $01{:}16{:}34.436 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 01{:}16{:}36.924$ just selecting people that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.59606475

01:16:36.924 --> 01:16:39.140 very high expectations about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.51350194

 $01{:}16{:}39.380 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}41.820$ yeah, diverse people, larger studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.51350194

 $01:16:41.820 \longrightarrow 01:16:45.140$ also the number are very small. It's

NOTE Confidence: 0.51350194

 $01:16:45.140 \longrightarrow 01:16:46.740$ the same thing in

NOTE Confidence: 0.51350194

 $01{:}16{:}46.740 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}47.499$ psychodynamic psychotherapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.51350194

 $01:16:47.499 \longrightarrow 01:16:50.012$ Going back 50 years ago if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.51350194

 $01{:}16{:}50.012 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}51.155$ weren't psychologically minded

 $01:16:51.155 \longrightarrow 01:16:52.980$ code word for intelligent and

NOTE Confidence: 0.51350194

 $01{:}16{:}52.980 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}54.440$ you've read about psychoanalysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.51350194

 $01:16:54.440 \longrightarrow 01:16:55.640$ it wasn't positive in effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:16:55.640 \longrightarrow 01:16:58.237$ So there is you just recruitment biases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:16:58.240 \longrightarrow 01:17:00.040$ This people wants to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:17:00.040 \longrightarrow 01:17:01.840$ in the trial you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

01:17:01.840 --> 01:17:04.928 So I think once a week truly study

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:17:04.928 \longrightarrow 01:17:07.942$ beliefs and expectations probably change,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:17:07.942 \longrightarrow 01:17:10.998$ you know the study design but also the

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:17:11.000 \longrightarrow 01:17:14.439$ change also I don't know if it's ethical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:17:14.440 \longrightarrow 01:17:16.560$ Maybe we can remove like

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

01:17:16.560 --> 01:17:18.450 eliminate non placebo responders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01{:}17{:}18.450 \dashrightarrow 01{:}17{:}21.570$ you know they're on a simple trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:17:21.570 \longrightarrow 01:17:24.650$ placebo responders and they can give you

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:17:24.650 \longrightarrow 01:17:28.810$ trial for the those who do not respond.

01:17:28.810 --> 01:17:30.730 But that's consistent though like

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

01:17:30.730 --> 01:17:32.266 are people consistently place bo

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

01:17:32.266 --> 01:17:33.580 responders regardless of their

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:17:33.580 \longrightarrow 01:17:35.362$ previous history with that specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:17:35.362 \longrightarrow 01:17:37.202$ treatment and that specific condition.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:17:37.210 \longrightarrow 01:17:40.222$ There are studies we call this

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:17:40.222 \longrightarrow 01:17:41.490$ reproducibility classy effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31495857

 $01:17:41.490 \longrightarrow 01:17:43.010$ So that means a,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468

01:17:45.130 --> 01:17:47.407 he is a person who is a receiver responder,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468

 $01:17:47.410 \longrightarrow 01:17:50.706$ constantly a placebo responder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468

 $01:17:50.706 \longrightarrow 01:17:53.900$ And our chronic pain patients came back

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468

 $01:17:53.900 \longrightarrow 01:17:58.610$ to the lab and there is a good proportion

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468

01:17:58.610 --> 01:18:00.991 of patients who continue to be a

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468

 $01{:}18{:}00.991 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}04.010$ responder in terms of general disability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468

01:18:04.010 --> 01:18:06.474 So someone who responded to a modality will

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468

 $01:18:06.474 \longrightarrow 01:18:09.090$ be also a responder to another modality.

 $01:18:09.090 \longrightarrow 01:18:11.304$ There are some studies so that

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468

 $01:18:11.304 \longrightarrow 01:18:13.250$ we can respond to pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468

01:18:13.250 --> 01:18:17.192 Also you know, a trigger to be a responder

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468

 $01:18:17.200 \longrightarrow 01:18:20.440$ to emotional regulation and more resolvers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468

01:18:20.440 --> 01:18:23.160 So if I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28924468 01:18:23.160 --> 01:18:23.760 I, I

NOTE Confidence: 0.3543838

01:18:23.760 --> 01:18:25.080 know we're running well beyond,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3543838

 $01{:}18{:}25.080 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}26.552$ we can continue to go, but I don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.3543838

01:18:26.552 --> 01:18:28.280 know if I'm holding anybody up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3543838

 $01:18:28.280 \longrightarrow 01:18:30.000$ but you can continue to go

NOTE Confidence: 0.3543838

 $01:18:31.040 \longrightarrow 01:18:33.398$ in terms of running the phase,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3543838

 $01:18:33.400 \longrightarrow 01:18:34.996$ that has been a big question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3543838

 $01:18:35.000 \longrightarrow 01:18:35.816$ You know, kind of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3543838

 $01:18:35.816 \longrightarrow 01:18:37.040$ We first to give a placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3543838

 $01:18:37.040 \longrightarrow 01:18:39.170$ If they respond, we remove them.

 $01:18:39.170 \longrightarrow 01:18:43.048$ Ethically speaking is not the best practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3543838

 $01:18:43.050 \longrightarrow 01:18:45.066$ And also again, we select the

NOTE Confidence: 0.3543838

 $01:18:45.066 \longrightarrow 01:18:47.290$ pool of people who respond. Here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

01:18:48.890 --> 01:18:50.590 it it reminds me of one of the studies I

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:18:50.639 \longrightarrow 01:18:52.535$ was just reading going back to the 1930s.

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

01:18:52.535 --> 01:18:56.156 Harry Gold, who is one of the Harry Gold,

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:18:56.156 \longrightarrow 01:18:57.168$ one of the leaders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:18:57.170 \longrightarrow 01:18:59.844$ the reason we do place bo control trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01{:}18{:}59.850 \dashrightarrow 01{:}19{:}01.128$ He was running a study with

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

01:19:01.130 --> 01:19:03.226 zantines for angina.

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:19:03.226 \longrightarrow 01:19:06.060$ You know cardiac pain and at the time

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:19:06.060 \longrightarrow 01:19:07.908$ it was about an 80% response rate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

01:19:07.908 --> 01:19:09.528 He takes his antenna and

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:19:09.528 \longrightarrow 01:19:10.500$ reduces cardiac pain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:19:10.500 \longrightarrow 01:19:12.372$ So he wanted to do a study in order.

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:19:12.380 \longrightarrow 01:19:14.550$ One of the early ideas of trying

 $01:19:14.550 \longrightarrow 01:19:16.900$ to rule out placebo responders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:19:16.900 \longrightarrow 01:19:18.742$ he was giving nitroglycerin to people

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:19:18.742 \longrightarrow 01:19:20.899$ who was having an engineer and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:19:20.899 \longrightarrow 01:19:22.850$ the goal was to exclude people that

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:19:22.850 \longrightarrow 01:19:24.347$ had a place bo response and only

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

01:19:24.347 --> 01:19:26.141 include the people that only had

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

01:19:26.141 --> 01:19:28.288 a real response to nitroglycerin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01{:}19{:}28.290 \dashrightarrow 01{:}19{:}29.222$ Do you know the results of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.48491967

 $01:19:29.222 \longrightarrow 01:19:32.370$ same exactly from everybody.

NOTE Confidence: 0.28692842

01:19:33.610 --> 01:19:34.765 So you couldn't you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.28692842

 $01:19:34.765 \longrightarrow 01:19:35.689$ it's really hard people

NOTE Confidence: 0.28692842

 $01:19:36.490 \longrightarrow 01:19:39.770$ new placebo responders emerged.

NOTE Confidence: 0.28692842

 $01{:}19{:}39.770 \dashrightarrow 01{:}19{:}43.770$ Yeah. I was curious about about this

NOTE Confidence: 0.28692842

 $01:19:43.770 \longrightarrow 01:19:45.584$ effect at the very beginning across

NOTE Confidence: 0.28692842

 $01:19:45.584 \longrightarrow 01:19:47.828$ analgesic you have different level of

01:19:47.828 --> 01:19:49.928 placebo effect and I was wondering

NOTE Confidence: 0.28692842

 $01:19:49.928 \longrightarrow 01:19:52.518$ whether we know if some drugs will

NOTE Confidence: 0.28692842

 $01:19:52.518 \longrightarrow 01:19:55.114$ have like higher place bo effects and

NOTE Confidence: 0.28692842

 $01:19:55.114 \longrightarrow 01:19:57.855$ if there is any reason in the at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.28692842

 $01:19:57.855 \longrightarrow 01:19:59.530$ narrow biological level for this. Yes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

01:20:01.770 --> 01:20:05.467 our thought was that for drugs that work

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01:20:05.467 \longrightarrow 01:20:10.082$ like opioids based as compared to some

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

01:20:10.082 --> 01:20:13.538 non opioids that stand to work less at

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01{:}20{:}13.538 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}17.940$ least for the post operative pain the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

01:20:17.940 --> 01:20:21.812 You know money to the placebo component

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01{:}20{:}21.812 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}24.960$ may varies because that reflects how

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01{:}20{:}24.960 \longrightarrow 01{:}20{:}29.740$ much if cautious or effective a drug is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01:20:29.740 \longrightarrow 01:20:33.808$ We also think that there is an interaction if

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

01:20:33.808 --> 01:20:39.279 that like with metamazole that is non opioid,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01:20:39.280 \longrightarrow 01:20:40.900$ we saw that the interaction

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01:20:40.900 \longrightarrow 01:20:42.196$ effect is very strong.

01:20:42.200 --> 01:20:45.890 I mean if you have also a placebo component

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01:20:45.890 \longrightarrow 01:20:48.631$ through the expectation probably the

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01:20:48.631 \longrightarrow 01:20:51.119$ money told of the same drug is larger.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01:20:51.120 \longrightarrow 01:20:54.256$ So in general drugs that per SE are

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01:20:54.256 \longrightarrow 01:20:57.397$ very effective tended to have a smaller

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

01:20:57.397 --> 01:21:00.213 placebo component unless there is an

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

01:21:00.213 --> 01:21:02.979 interaction if that's like they trigger

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01:21:02.979 \longrightarrow 01:21:06.192$ some molecular mechanism that can

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

01:21:06.192 --> 01:21:09.323 interact and we know how much the nuclear

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01:21:09.323 \longrightarrow 01:21:11.300$ system interact with other system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

 $01:21:11.300 \longrightarrow 01:21:14.338$ And in that sense you don't see

NOTE Confidence: 0.5034442

01:21:14.340 --> 01:21:15.900 cumulative effects, you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.26831526

 $01:21:17.300 \longrightarrow 01:21:18.340$ but when isn't it fair,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26831526

 $01:21:18.340 \longrightarrow 01:21:19.978$ I mean to getting your point that

NOTE Confidence: 0.26831526

 $01:21:19.978 \longrightarrow 01:21:21.842$ some of the other points like a

 $01:21:21.842 \longrightarrow 01:21:23.498$ drug that has an immediate effect

NOTE Confidence: 0.26831526

 $01:21:23.500 \longrightarrow 01:21:26.097$ is more likely to have a placebo

NOTE Confidence: 0.26831526

01:21:26.100 --> 01:21:28.180 response than a drug that that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.26831526

 $01:21:28.180 \longrightarrow 01:21:30.220$ is blind is truly math correct.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26831526

 $01:21:30.700 \longrightarrow 01:21:35.999$ I don't know also well the question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26831526

 $01:21:36.000 \longrightarrow 01:21:38.140$ The consciousness and self

NOTE Confidence: 0.26831526

01:21:38.140 --> 01:21:40.280 perception is very relevant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26831526

01:21:40.280 --> 01:21:42.360 The I don't know actually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26831526

01:21:42.360 --> 01:21:43.800 Now I understand the question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26831526

 $01:21:43.800 \longrightarrow 01:21:47.678$ but so for example, if we give people a

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:21:49.760 \longrightarrow 01:21:53.560$ normal that can change the

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:21:53.560 \longrightarrow 01:21:56.816$ level of cortisol in the body,

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:21:56.816 \longrightarrow 01:21:59.640$ the Placib effect is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

01:21:59.640 --> 01:22:02.680 existing or an antibiotic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:22:02.680 \longrightarrow 01:22:05.998$ then the placebo component is not there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01{:}22{:}06.000 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}08.400$ Somehow the place bo effects

 $01:22:08.400 \longrightarrow 01:22:10.800$ amplify the therapeutic benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

01:22:10.800 --> 01:22:13.236 When we have experience of that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

01:22:13.240 --> 01:22:15.856 I mean if you take a patient with

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

01:22:15.856 --> 01:22:17.503 genetic disorders and they don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:22:17.503 \longrightarrow 01:22:20.445$ feel pain and you tell them this

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

01:22:20.445 --> 01:22:22.576 treatment is analysis for them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

01:22:22.576 --> 01:22:24.290 doesn't mean anything, you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:22:24.290 \longrightarrow 01:22:26.425$ And so there will be not an

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01{:}22{:}26.425 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}27.840$ analgesic plasibe effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:22:27.840 \longrightarrow 01:22:30.512$ Or if we tell patients this drug is

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

01:22:30.512 --> 01:22:33.458 going to increase your cortisol level,

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:22:33.460 \longrightarrow 01:22:36.660$ they don't know what a cortisol level is

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01{:}22{:}36.660 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}40.188$ or we use some Atriptan back in Turin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:22:40.188 \longrightarrow 01:22:42.820$ you know that it's used for migraine

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

01:22:42.903 --> 01:22:46.300 attacks if but also some side effects.

 $01:22:46.300 \longrightarrow 01:22:49.812$ So they can get an improvement at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01{:}22{:}49.812 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}53.699$ level of migraine and pain related to

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:22:53.699 \longrightarrow 01:22:57.379$ the migraine but not necessarily the bio

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:22:57.380 \longrightarrow 01:23:00.817$ chemical change in markers in the blood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

01:23:00.820 --> 01:23:01.254 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:23:01.254 \longrightarrow 01:23:04.292$ if we use air conditioning like that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01{:}23{:}04.292 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}06.851$ been shown with you know cytokines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

01:23:06.851 --> 01:23:09.910 like if we use cyclosporine a several

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:23:09.991 \longrightarrow 01:23:13.057$ time and then we replace cyclosporine A,

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:23:13.060 \longrightarrow 01:23:16.300$ we see a modulation of Illinois 6 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01{:}23{:}16.300 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}18.691$ interferon gamma in the blood because

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01:23:18.691 \longrightarrow 01:23:22.448$ the body learn that kind of measurement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

01:23:22.450 --> 01:23:25.186 I am a big champion of framing plasy

NOTE Confidence: 0.30930802

 $01{:}23{:}25.186 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}27.887$ B effects as learning effects and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.32518166

 $01:23:29.930 \longrightarrow 01:23:34.810$ somehow we can either bypass our

NOTE Confidence: 0.32518166

 $01:23:34.810 \longrightarrow 01:23:36.438$ conscious perception of symptom.

01:23:36.438 --> 01:23:39.490 We can still act with conditioning paradigm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32518166

 $01:23:39.490 \longrightarrow 01:23:42.346$ you know and train our body

NOTE Confidence: 0.32518166

 $01:23:42.346 \longrightarrow 01:23:44.250$ to produce a response.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32518166

 $01:23:44.250 \longrightarrow 01:23:47.540$ But this kind of effects can't be

NOTE Confidence: 0.32518166

 $01:23:47.540 \longrightarrow 01:23:50.040$ elicit with verbal suggestion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32518166

01:23:50.040 --> 01:23:51.720 Yes, I think we, I mean,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32518166

 $01:23:51.720 \longrightarrow 01:23:52.840$ it's well beyond it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32518166

 $01:23:52.840 \longrightarrow 01:23:54.760$ Thank you all. Thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.28611216

01:23:54.760 --> 01:23:56.840 you. Thank you. That was great, Lena. Thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.28611216

 $01:23:56.840 \longrightarrow 01:23:58.560$ you. It's very cool.