WEBVTT

- NOTE duration:"01:26:56.4800000"
- NOTE recognizability:0.436
- NOTE language:en-us
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- 00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:01.130 All right. So we're happening.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- $00:00:01.130 \longrightarrow 00:00:02.224$ Yes, we're happening.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- $00:00:02.224 \rightarrow 00:00:03.520$ Fantastic. Well, welcome
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- $00:00:03.520 \rightarrow 00:00:05.998$ everybody. Thanks so much for coming.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- $00:00:06.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:07.248$ I'll speak just for a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- $00{:}00{:}07{.}248 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}08{.}080$ minute and then introduce
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- $00:00:08.080 \longrightarrow 00:00:10.200$ our our guest for tonight.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- 00:00:10.200 --> 00:00:11.140 My name is Mark Mercury.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- $00:00:11.140 \longrightarrow 00:00:12.352$ I'm director of the Program
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- $00{:}00{:}12.352 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}13.506$ for Biomedical Ethics here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- 00:00:13.506 --> 00:00:14.918 And I'll start with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- $00:00:15.680 \longrightarrow 00:00:16.880$ a very brief story,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978
- $00{:}00{:}17.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}20.600$ very brief. So in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978

 $00{:}00{:}20{.}600$ --> $00{:}00{:}23{.}900$ March of 2020, when the pandemic was very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978

 $00{:}00{:}23{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}25{.}835$ it seemed very suddenly upon us and

NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978

 $00{:}00{:}25.835 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}27.800$ we saw what had happened in Italy. We

NOTE Confidence: 0.32690978

 $00:00:27.800 \rightarrow 00:00:29.116$ saw what was happening in New York.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00{:}00{:}30{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}31{.}358$ I reached out to the chief medical

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00:00:31.360 \longrightarrow 00:00:33.358$ officer of the hospital and said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00{:}00{:}33{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}34{.}608$ do we have a plan if we run

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

00:00:34.608 --> 00:00:36.120 out of stuff like ventilators?

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00{:}00{:}36{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}38{.}615$ And he said, well, no, we don't, But

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00{:}00{:}38.615 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}39.960$ there's some people who are working on it

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00:00:40.880 \rightarrow 00:00:41.996$ and I'd like you to be part of that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00{:}00{:}42.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}43.040$ And I said sure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00{:}00{:}43.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}45.586$ So he assembled and the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00:00:45.586 \rightarrow 00:00:46.372$ Ethics Committee leadership

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00:00:46.372 \rightarrow 00:00:47.840$ were here with us tonight,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

00:00:47.840 --> 00:00:49.280 assembled a small group of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356
- $00:00:49.280 \longrightarrow 00:00:50.720$ folks who were then reporting

 $00:00:50.720 \longrightarrow 00:00:52.238$ to a large group of folks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00:00:52.240 \longrightarrow 00:00:53.240$ And we very quickly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00:00:54.520 \longrightarrow 00:00:55.384$ it felt very quickly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

 $00:00:55.384 \longrightarrow 00:00:57.112$ we tried to work up a price of

NOTE Confidence: 0.39691356

00:00:57.112 --> 00:00:58.678 standard of care, a triage plan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042

 $00:00:59.040 \dashrightarrow 00:01:00.176$ What are we going to do when there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042

 $00{:}01{:}00{.}176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}01{.}223$ two people who need a ventilator and

NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042

 $00:01:01.223 \longrightarrow 00:01:02.320$ we don't have only one ventilator?

NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042

 $00:01:02.640 \longrightarrow 00:01:04.000$ What exactly is the plan?

NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042

 $00{:}01{:}04.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}05.836$ And of course it wasn't just Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042

00:01:05.840 --> 00:01:06.612 New Haven Hospital didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042

00:01:06.612 --> 00:01:07.932 have a specific plan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042

00:01:07.932 --> 00:01:09.072 People all over the country

NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042

 $00:01:09.072 \longrightarrow 00:01:10.638$ were caught off guard,

- $00:01:10.640 \longrightarrow 00:01:11.380$ some more than others.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- 00:01:11.380 --> 00:01:12.600 We had no guidance specifically
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- $00:01:12.600 \longrightarrow 00:01:14.040$ from the state.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- $00:01:14.040 \longrightarrow 00:01:15.870$ The health system need to put
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- 00:01:15.870 --> 00:01:16.480 something together.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- $00:01:16.480 \longrightarrow 00:01:18.280$ And it was a very remarkable time for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- $00{:}01{:}18.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}19.516$ a lot of reasons. We had
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- $00:01:20.560 \rightarrow 00:01:22.245$ terrific leadership here in particular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- 00:01:22.245 --> 00:01:24.354 by Ben Tolch and who really organized
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- 00:01:24.354 --> 00:01:25.930 our efforts here to come up with the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- 00:01:25.976 --> 00:01:27.975 crisis standards of care and many of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- $00{:}01{:}27{.}975 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}29{.}680$ the people who worked on those are here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- 00:01:29.680 --> 00:01:31.122 But there was a lot of cooperation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.36581042
- $00{:}01{:}31{.}122 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}32{.}598$ between people who were working on these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00:01:32.600 \longrightarrow 00:01:34.021$ things. And I'll tell you I was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00:01:34.021 \longrightarrow 00:01:35.399$ leading a double life at the time.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00:01:35.760 \longrightarrow 00:01:38.520$ I was chief of neonatology and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- 00:01:39.600 --> 00:01:41.200 and running this ethics program
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00:01:41.200 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.760$ And so I was doing both.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00:01:42.760 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.608$ And one of the things that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00:01:44.608 \dashrightarrow 00:01:46.205$ fascinated me is thankfully there
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00{:}01{:}46.205 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}48.017$ was a clinical director for the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- 00:01:48.017 --> 00:01:50.438 newborn ICU and an acting chief
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00:01:50.440 \dashrightarrow 00:01:52.078$ during that time as well because.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- 00:01:52.080 --> 00:01:53.884 But it seemed like the CDC every
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00:01:53.884 \rightarrow 00:01:56.712$ 5 minutes was coming out with new
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00{:}01{:}56{.}712 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}57{.}902$ recommendations for what we're supposed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00{:}01{:}57{.}902 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}59{.}973$ to do which babies we isolate how.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00:01:59.973 \longrightarrow 00:02:01.224$ And thankfully the NICU was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00:02:01.224 \dashrightarrow 00:02:02.830$ largely spared trouble from COVID.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- $00:02:02.830 \dashrightarrow 00:02:05.524$ Every time you turn around CDC had new
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992

00:02:05.524 --> 00:02:06.880 recommendations making everybody crazy. NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00{:}02{:}06.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}08.600$ But the flip side of that when it came to NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00:02:08.600 \rightarrow 00:02:10.840$ the allocation of the scarce resources, NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 00:02:10.840 - 00:02:13.000 when it came to crisis standards NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 00:02:13.066 - 00:02:14.516 of care or triage plan. NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00:02:14.520 \rightarrow 00:02:16.720$ The federal government was quiet as NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00:02:16.720 \longrightarrow 00:02:18.876$ a mouse and we were an occupancy. NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00:02:18.880 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.580$ Where's the CDC on this one? NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00{:}02{:}20.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}22.120$ And so we were doing our best. NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00:02:22.120 \rightarrow 00:02:24.506$ But what happened was there were others, NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00:02:24.506 \rightarrow 00:02:26.277$ some very smart people from all over NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00{:}02{:}26.277 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}28.084$ the country and all over the world who NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00:02:28.084 \rightarrow 00:02:29.560$ were working on these same questions. NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00:02:29.560 \rightarrow 00:02:32.638$ And so we found each other online on Zoom, NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00:02:32.640 \rightarrow 00:02:34.438$ and we got help from each other a lot. NOTE Confidence: 0.674992 $00:02:34.438 \rightarrow 00:02:36.940$ And so it was during that time that

- NOTE Confidence: 0.674992
- 00:02:36.940 --> 00:02:39.520 I had reconnected with Will Parker,

 $00:02:39.520 \longrightarrow 00:02:41.172$ who I've known since he was

NOTE Confidence: 0.674992

 $00:02:41.172 \longrightarrow 00:02:42.758$ a young medical student

NOTE Confidence: 0.8004039

 $00{:}02{:}42.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}45.910$ back in the day. Chicago and Will was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8004039

00:02:45.910 - 00:02:48.234 helpful to me and we've kept in touch.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8004039

00:02:48.240 --> 00:02:49.900 And so I'm delighted that he's agreed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8004039

 $00:02:49.900 \longrightarrow 00:02:51.280$ come here today because as you'll hear

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

 $00:02:51.280 \rightarrow 00:02:53.064$ when I read his his CV,

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

 $00{:}02{:}53.064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}54.812$ he's got some serious expertise that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

 $00:02:54.812 \rightarrow 00:02:57.880$ going to help us because importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

00:02:57.880 - > 00:02:59.640 we got caught. We worked very hard,

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

 $00{:}02{:}59{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}00{.}795$ very fast to come up with some

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

 $00{:}03{:}00{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}02{.}304$ crisis standard of cares.

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

 $00{:}03{:}02{.}304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}04{.}320$ And we built a plan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

 $00{:}03{:}04{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}06{.}285$ But I mean, the Ben who who leads

 $00{:}03{:}06{.}285 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}08{.}198$ the show would be the first to admit

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

 $00:03:08.200 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.000$ that our plan ain't perfect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

 $00{:}03{:}10{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}10{.}720$ We need this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

 $00:03:10.720 \longrightarrow 00:03:12.173$ This plan still needs work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

 $00{:}03{:}12{.}173 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}14{.}168$ So there's one approach which

NOTE Confidence: 0.41457623

 $00:03:14.168 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.680$ could be let's just wait

NOTE Confidence: 0.665871156153846

 $00{:}03{:}15.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}17.234$ until and the next pandemic is

NOTE Confidence: 0.665871156153846

 $00:03:17.234 \longrightarrow 00:03:19.198$ upon us and we're drowning to say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.665871156153846

 $00{:}03{:}19{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}20{.}124$ well, we should really try and

NOTE Confidence: 0.665871156153846

 $00:03:20.124 \rightarrow 00:03:21.560$ figure out what we're going to do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.665871156153846

 $00:03:21.560 \longrightarrow 00:03:24.000$ Or maybe now between crises

NOTE Confidence: 0.665871156153846

 $00:03:24.000 \rightarrow 00:03:25.596$ we can try and figure out what

NOTE Confidence: 0.665871156153846

 $00:03:25.600 \longrightarrow 00:03:27.097$ exactly the plan should be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.665871156153846

00:03:27.097 --> 00:03:28.765 So I would like for us and

NOTE Confidence: 0.665871156153846

 $00{:}03{:}28.765 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}29.515$ that's why those of you who

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00:03:29.520 \rightarrow 00:03:30.600$ have worked so hard on this,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124
- 00:03:30.600 --> 00:03:31.950 I would like for us to keep

 $00:03:31.950 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.560$ the conversation going and

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

00:03:33.560 --> 00:03:35.000 and and Mike, I appreciate you

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00:03:35.000 \rightarrow 00:03:36.208$ being here. You were so supportive

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

00:03:36.208 --> 00:03:39.160 during so much of this stuff.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00{:}03{:}39{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}40{.}840$ I know. So a lot of important people who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00:03:40.840 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.200$ in that effort were here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00:03:42.200 \dashrightarrow 00:03:43.248$ and a lot of people who had nothing

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00{:}03{:}43{.}248 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}44{.}790$ to do with that effort but may in

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00:03:44.790 \longrightarrow 00:03:47.280$ fact be leaders for the next one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00{:}03{:}47{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}48{.}724$ So pay attention and when you

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00{:}03{:}48.724 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}50.184$ have a good idea, share it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00:03:50.184 \rightarrow 00:03:51.984$ So with that, we're going to talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00{:}03{:}51{.}984 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}53{.}320$ about crisis standards of care,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00:03:53.320 \dashrightarrow 00:03:55.653$ preparing for the next pandemic. Dr.

 $00{:}03{:}55{.}653 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}57{.}808$ Will Parker is an assistant professor

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00{:}03{:}57{.}808 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}59{.}800$ of medicine and public Health Sciences

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00{:}03{:}59{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}01{.}420$ and assistant director of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

00:04:01.420 --> 00:04:03.040 McLean Center for Clinical Medical

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00:04:03.096 \rightarrow 00:04:05.720$ Ethics at the University of Chicago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00:04:05.720 \longrightarrow 00:04:06.288$ And by the way,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00:04:06.288 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.395$ I just have to say because

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

00:04:07.395 --> 00:04:08.520 I'm sweating in this thing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00{:}04{:}08.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}11.520$ the mask is because I've been exposed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00:04:11.520 \dashrightarrow 00:04:13.876$ just found out, not because I'm sick.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00{:}04{:}13.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}15.476$ And so this with the CDC site

NOTE Confidence: 0.6868124

 $00:04:15.480 \longrightarrow 00:04:16.280$ assures us is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.73452806

 $00{:}04{:}16.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}18.720$ is the adequate precaution indoors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73452806

 $00:04:18.720 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.924$ So I'll try not to get close

NOTE Confidence: 0.73452806

 $00:04:19.924 \longrightarrow 00:04:21.034$ to you, but that's what's

NOTE Confidence: 0.73452806

00:04:21.040 --> 00:04:22.290 going on. And I look around here, there's

- NOTE Confidence: 0.73452806
- $00:04:22.290 \rightarrow 00:04:23.770$ very few of us wearing the mask today.

00:04:23.770 --> 00:04:25.720 I think I look good in it. But, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.73452806

 $00:04:28.000 \rightarrow 00:04:31.519$ so, so Will really brings all the skills

NOTE Confidence: 0.73452806

 $00:04:29.960 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.520$ to the place. He's a, he's a pulmonary

NOTE Confidence: 0.73452806

00:04:31.520 --> 00:04:32.840 critical care physician.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73452806

 $00{:}04{:}32.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}35.040$ He's a clinical medical ethicist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.73452806

 $00{:}04{:}35{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}36{.}370$ He's a health service researcher

NOTE Confidence: 0.73452806

 $00{:}04{:}36{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}37{.}434$ who studies the allocation

NOTE Confidence: 0.73452806

 $00{:}04{:}37{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}38{.}960$ of scarce medical resources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

00:04:39.760 --> 00:04:41.104 He's specifically interested in

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00:04:41.104 \rightarrow 00:04:42.760$ absolute scarcity problems where

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00{:}04{:}42.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}45.040$ demand greatly exceeds supplies and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00:04:45.040 \rightarrow 00:04:47.600$ algorithms triage patients for treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

00:04:47.600 --> 00:04:50.550 He runs an NIH and Greenwald Foundation

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00:04:50.550 \dashrightarrow 00:04:52.960$ funded quantitative bioethics lab.

 $00:04:52.960 \rightarrow 00:04:55.388$ That's not nothing that applies advanced

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00{:}04{:}55{.}388 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}57{.}423$ empirical methods to evaluate and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00:04:57.423 \rightarrow 00:05:00.040$ design allocation systems according

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00:05:00.040 \longrightarrow 00:05:02.240$ to the underlying ethical principles.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00{:}05{:}02.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}04.160$ This is his academic work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00{:}05{:}04{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}06{.}410$ That sentence again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00{:}05{:}06{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}09{.}160$ OK advanced empirical methods to evaluate

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00:05:09.160 \rightarrow 00:05:12.240$ and design allocation systems according

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00{:}05{:}12.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}14.200$ to the underlying ethical Princess.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

00:05:14.200 --> 00:05:16.180 Current lab projects include

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00{:}05{:}16.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}18.160$ deceased donor organ allocations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

00:05:18.160 --> 00:05:19.920 policy life support,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00:05:19.920 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.440$ triage under crisis standards of care,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00{:}05{:}22.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}24.320$ and the allocation of novel

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00{:}05{:}24{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}25{.}400$ scarce the rapeutics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00:05:25.400 \rightarrow 00:05:27.640$ Will is a graduate from Williams College,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964
- $00{:}05{:}27.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}28.984$ and from then he's been

00:05:28.984 --> 00:05:29.940 at University of Chicago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00:05:29.940 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.336$ where he got his MD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00:05:31.336 \rightarrow 00:05:32.968$ where he did his medicine residency

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00:05:32.968 \dashrightarrow 00:05:34.640$ and critical care fellowship,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7229964

 $00{:}05{:}34{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}36{.}880$ where he got a master's degree in public

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:05:36.880 - > 00:05:38.872 health, where he got a PhD in

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}05{:}38.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}41.280$ public health and completed a

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}05{:}41.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}44.280$ fellowship in medical ethics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:05:44.280 \longrightarrow 00:05:45.680$ So Will is the perfect guy to

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:05:45.680 \dashrightarrow 00:05:46.640$ help guide this conversation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:05:46.640 --> 00:05:48.010 I'm so grateful you came

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}05{:}48.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}49.360$ all the way from Chicago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:05:49.360 \longrightarrow 00:05:50.840$ And with that, I introduced Dr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:05:50.840 \longrightarrow 00:05:51.400$ Will Parker.

00:05:57.640 - 00:05:59.878 All right, you guys hear me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}05{:}59{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}01{.}364$ Thank you so much,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}06{:}01{.}364 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}04{.}080$ Mark and program for bioethics for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}06{:}04.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}06.600$ invitation to give the seminars series

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:06.600 \rightarrow 00:06:08.316$ and that really kind of reduction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:06:08.320 --> 00:06:09.944 I hope you guys can help me

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:06:09.944 --> 00:06:11.120 think about this problem,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:11.120 \rightarrow 00:06:13.568$ which I think is incredibly challenging

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:06:13.568 --> 00:06:16.082 and I've been fortunate not to get

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:16.082 \rightarrow 00:06:18.439$ some support to to try and take it on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:06:18.440 --> 00:06:21.394 So hold on, just look in here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:21.400 \longrightarrow 00:06:23.840$ let's see if this works.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:06:23.840 --> 00:06:24.728 You know, my,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}06{:}24.728 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}26.800$ it's difficult to start these talks with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:26.800 \rightarrow 00:06:28.557$ This is where I've gone and been,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:28.560 \longrightarrow 00:06:30.072$ but I've basically been at UFC

- NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103
- $00:06:30.072 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.440$ the whole time this month.

 $00{:}06{:}31{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}33{.}000$ OK, so it'll be very boring

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:33.000 \longrightarrow 00:06:35.064$ with this one new C slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:35.064 \rightarrow 00:06:36.994$ but there was a transformational

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:36.994 \rightarrow 00:06:39.317$ experience that I had in medical school.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}06{:}39{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}41{.}091$ I participated in the fellowship at Outreach

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:41.091 \rightarrow 00:06:42.918$ in the study of professional ethics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}06{:}42.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}45.280$ This is the memorial for the murder of

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:45.280 \dashrightarrow 00:06:47.639$ Jersey used in front of Europe in Berlin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:47.640 \longrightarrow 00:06:49.215$ where we're learning where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:49.215 \longrightarrow 00:06:50.475$ the current processes are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}06{:}50{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}52{.}005$ Learning about the role that

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}06{:}52.005 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}52.920$ the medical professionals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}06{:}52{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}54{.}392$ the medical profession at

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}06{:}54.392 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}56.232$ large played in the Holocaust,

 $00:06:56.240 \longrightarrow 00:06:58.015$ learning that they weren't just

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:06:58.015 \longrightarrow 00:07:00.230$ by standers but in fact active perpetrators

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:07:00.230 \longrightarrow 00:07:02.474$ of key elements of the genocide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:07:02.480 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.644$ And this experience,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:07:03.644 \rightarrow 00:07:05.196$ as you might imagine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:07:05.200 \rightarrow 00:07:07.720$ is not something that leaves you lightly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:07:07.720 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.514$ especially when you get to spend

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:07:09.514 \dashrightarrow 00:07:11.558$ the week hanging out with this guy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}11.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}12.876$ This is what you look like then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}12.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}14.040$ So I think this is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}14.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}16.312$ this is how I remember you in my

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}16.312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}18.692$ mind with a full beard and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}18.692 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}21.954$ of of full week of seminars and

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:07:21.954 \rightarrow 00:07:24.440$ dedicated tutorial style ethics

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}24.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}27.328$ teaching which was really shaped

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}27.328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}29.296$ the way I think about clinical

- NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103
- $00:07:29.296 \dashrightarrow 00:07:31.400$ medical ethics and bioethics overall.

00:07:31.400 --> 00:07:32.288 And so naturally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:07:32.288 \longrightarrow 00:07:34.360$ when I was asked to help draft

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}34.422 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}35.838$ a crisis standard here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:07:35.840 \longrightarrow 00:07:37.670$ a triad protocol just like Mark

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:07:37.670 \longrightarrow 00:07:39.520$ was saying for my hospital,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}39{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}42{.}120$ I I emailed him and I was like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:07:42.120 --> 00:07:44.318 hey, I'm, I'm sure you Remember Me,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}44.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}46.770$ but I've been looking at your the

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}46.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}49.240$ Your Yell protocol that you put online,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}49{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}52{.}117$ and it's been a very helpful guide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}52.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}55.720$ And so I think this story just tells

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}55{.}720$ --> $00{:}07{:}57{.}408$ a little bit about where I where I

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:07:57.408 \dashrightarrow 00:07:59.516$ come from and my perspective on all of this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}07{:}59{.}520$ --> $00{:}08{:}01{.}942$ And another amazing thing is that now

 $00:08:01.942 \longrightarrow 00:08:04.782$ one of my medical students went on

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:08:04.782 --> 00:08:07.220 Vasby this year, Mark Kevin Lazenby,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:08:07.220 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.120$ who's worked in my lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:08:09.120 \longrightarrow 00:08:12.080$ let's all come full circle.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}08{:}12.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}15.839$ So with that hopefully Mike's an ecdote aside,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}08{:}15{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}17{.}806$ I just want to talk about my support

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:08:17.806 \dashrightarrow 00:08:20.800$ and funding for this talk I have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}08{:}20.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}22.714$ I'm unfortunate that I have a KOA

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}08{:}22.714 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}24.256$ from NHLBI that is focused on

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}08{:}24.256 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}25.919$ the heart allocation problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}08{:}25{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}27{.}760$ I'm not going to talk about directly today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}08{:}27.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}29.200$ And then also from the National

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:08:29.200 --> 00:08:29.920 Library of Medicine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:08:29.920 \dashrightarrow 00:08:31.560$ the Green Wall Foundation that

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}08{:}31{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}32{.}872$ directly supports this work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:08:32.880 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.198$ but no other conflicts of interest.

00:08:36.200 --> 00:08:38.616 So what I hope to get through today

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00{:}08{:}38.616 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}40.430$ and and open the questions and

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:08:40.430 \rightarrow 00:08:42.090$ interruptions at any time is defined

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:08:42.090 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.440$ prices as the standards of care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

 $00:08:43.440 \longrightarrow 00:08:44.480$ What are we talking about?

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:08:44.480 --> 00:08:44.877 Right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:08:44.877 --> 00:08:46.465 Then go through didactically

NOTE Confidence: 0.3890103

00:08:46.465 --> 00:08:48.450 the ethical values for life

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}08{:}48.518 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}50.598$ support allocation in the crisis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}08{:}50{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}52{.}624$ Just make sure we're all on the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:08:52.624 \rightarrow 00:08:54.264$ page from a normative perspective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}08{:}54{.}264 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}55{.}994$ And then finally there's four

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}08{:}55{.}994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}57{.}212$ active bioethical controversies

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}08{:}57{.}212 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}59{.}237$ and crisis standards of care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}08{:}59{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}01{.}103$ I hope that we can pause sort of after

 $00:09:01.103 \rightarrow 00:09:02.956$ each one and have a little discussion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:09:02.960 \dashrightarrow 00:09:04.112$ because they especially need

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:09:04.112 \longrightarrow 00:09:05.840$ help with like the third one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}09{:}05{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}08{.}720$ And so I'm looking to get as much out

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}09{:}08{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}11{.}514$ of this for as seminars as I can.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:09:11.520 \longrightarrow 00:09:13.690$ All right, So what do we What

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:09:13.690 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.200$ is crisis standards of care?

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

00:09:15.200 --> 00:09:15.866 Bernie Lowe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}09{:}15.866 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}18.197$ who's one of the leaders in bioethics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:09:18.200 \rightarrow 00:09:20.520$ is probably known the most in this room.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:09:20.520 \dashrightarrow 00:09:25.240$ I presented it this way at a talk to those NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:09:25.240 \rightarrow 00:09:27.039$ very apartment and right to the point.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:09:27.040 \rightarrow 00:09:30.400$ This is Memorial Hospital in New Orleans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:09:30.400 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.155$ Several days after the levees

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

00:09:32.155 --> 00:09:33.559 break and Hurricane Katrina.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:09:33.560 \longrightarrow 00:09:35.744$ You can see that the hospital

- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:09:35.744 \rightarrow 00:09:37.568$ is completely flooded and they
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- 00:09:37.568 --> 00:09:39.040 were losing power completely,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:09:39.040 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.084$ running out of most of the resources
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:09:41.084 \rightarrow 00:09:43.198$ to provide life support and hospital.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:09:43.200 \rightarrow 00:09:45.234$ And what happened in Memorial Hospital
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00{:}09{:}45{.}234 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}47{.}080$ is still contentious and debated.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:09:47.080 \dashrightarrow 00:09:49.439$ It's been made into a Netflix series,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:09:49.440 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.736$ but it clearly is not in accordance
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:09:51.736 \dashrightarrow 00:09:53.645$ with the principles of bioethics
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:09:53.645 \rightarrow 00:09:55.720$ released at several different levels.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:09:55.720 \dashrightarrow 00:09:59.910$ And this event and the 1st H1A1 influenza
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00{:}09{:}59{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}01{.}760$ pandemic spurred the Institute of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00{:}10{:}01{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}04{.}050$ Medicine that is now called the National
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- 00:10:04.050 --> 00:10:05.880 Academy of Medicine at the time,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00{:}10{:}05{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}08{.}127$ to form a ad hoc committee and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

00:10:08.127 --> 00:10:09.639 define crisis standard of care,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}10{:}09{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}11{.}852$ which is a recognition that a disaster

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:10:11.852 \longrightarrow 00:10:14.238$ is making it so we can't give

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:10:14.238 \rightarrow 00:10:15.958$ everyone the treatment they need.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

00:10:15.960 --> 00:10:16.840 In particular,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:10:16.840 \longrightarrow 00:10:19.480$ we can't give them life support

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:10:19.480 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.176$ even if they're in acute respiratory

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:10:22.176 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.256$ cardiac failure and needed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}10{:}24.256 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}25.920$ prevent them from dying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:10:25.920 \rightarrow 00:10:29.595$ So truly a tragic and horrible circumstance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:10:29.600 \longrightarrow 00:10:32.175$ So how does one approach

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:10:32.175 \rightarrow 00:10:34.235$ such a terrible problem?

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

00:10:34.240 - > 00:10:36.312 Either when you have an acute crisis

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}10{:}36{.}312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}38{.}243$ names of care like Hurricane Katrina

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}10{:}38.243 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}40.982$ or a perhaps subacute one with a COVID

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:10:40.982 \rightarrow 00:10:42.957$ pandemic surge where the patients,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:10:42.960 \longrightarrow 00:10:44.444$ as those of us who worked in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:10:44.444 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.400$ the ICU that time,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:10:45.400 \rightarrow 00:10:47.808$ seemed to keep coming faster and faster
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:10:47.808 \rightarrow 00:10:50.305$ each day and the panic that we were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00{:}10{:}50{.}305 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}52{.}960$ going to run out of life support rose.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- 00:10:52.960 --> 00:10:53.554 You know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:10:53.554 \rightarrow 00:10:55.633$ how do we approach the stereo problem?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00{:}10{:}55{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}57{.}705$ I think it's actually one of a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00{:}10{:}57.705 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}59.678$ set of problems as Mark moved
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- 00:10:59.678 --> 00:11:01.034 to in his introduction,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00{:}11{:}01{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}03{.}320$ a set of problems where we've
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- 00:11:03.320 --> 00:11:04.840 we've recognized the scarcity,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00{:}11{:}04{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}07{.}042$ we've recognized that the the treatments
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00{:}11{:}07{.}042 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}08{.}882$ are incredibly important and valuable
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00{:}11{:}08{.}882 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}11{.}296$ and life saving and a central authority.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

00:11:11.296 --> 00:11:13.880 Maybe it's a health system like Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

00:11:13.880 --> 00:11:16.652 Maybe it's the entire United States

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:11:16.652 \rightarrow 00:11:19.591$ government in deceased or organs has NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:11:19.591 \rightarrow 00:11:22.897$ taken control of the resource and

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}11{:}22.897 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}24.810$ is algorithmically allocating it

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}11{:}24.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}26.835$ according to an explicit protocol.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}11{:}26.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}29.252$ So there's something written down on

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:11:29.252 \rightarrow 00:11:31.484$ paper which takes patients and puts

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}11{:}31{.}484 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}33{.}776$ them in a list and triages the treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}11{:}33{.}776 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}35{.}932$ So that's the central focus of my

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

00:11:35.932 --> 00:11:38.541 lab and I hope the parallel between

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

00:11:38.541 -> 00:11:40.033 the different clinical domains,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00{:}11{:}40.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}43.337$ what I think is the same bioethical

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:11:43.337 \rightarrow 00:11:46.120$ challenge fundamentally is clear.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

00:11:46.120 --> 00:11:48.640 So how do we, how do we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908

 $00:11:48.640 \rightarrow 00:11:49.824$ starting from the ethics,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.34980908
- $00:11:49.824 \rightarrow 00:11:51.600$ how do we approach this problem?

00:11:51.600 --> 00:11:54.520 How do we construct A protocol

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:11:54.520 \rightarrow 00:11:56.320$ based on what ethical principles?

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:11:56.320 \rightarrow 00:11:58.760$ Where, Where to begin?

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:11:58.760 \longrightarrow 00:12:01.546$ I think about this this way that

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:12:01.546 \longrightarrow 00:12:03.791$ several several of my mentors

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:12:03.791 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.719$ had written and described.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:12:05.720 \longrightarrow 00:12:07.967$ Govind Prasad is sort of chief probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}12{:}07{.}967$ --> $00{:}12{:}10{.}812$ among them and I think laying out the NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:12:10.812 \longrightarrow 00:12:12.627$ space of reasonable ethical principles

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}12{:}12{.}692 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}15{.}440$ that should be considered when you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}12{:}15{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}17{.}272$ allocating scarce healthcare resources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:12:17.280 --> 00:12:20.368 I think this framework has also been

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}12{:}20.368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}22.180$ adapted substantially by my mentor at NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:12:22.232 --> 00:12:24.112 the University of Chicago, Monica Peek. NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084 00:12:24.112 --> 00:12:26.184 And of course Zeke Emanuel has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}12{:}26.184 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}28.038$ involved with this from the beginning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}12{:}28.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}30.750$ So what I'm going to do now is just go NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}12{:}30{.}824$ --> $00{:}12{:}34{.}186$ through these four sets of of values and NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:12:34.186 \longrightarrow 00:12:37.198$ and describe them in greater detail.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}12{:}37{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}39{.}414$ So the first is that we should treat people

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:12:39.414 --> 00:12:41.360 equally coming from respects with persons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:12:41.360 \longrightarrow 00:12:41.728$ right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}12{:}41.728 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}44.672$ We don't have enough treatment to go around.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:12:44.680 \rightarrow 00:12:45.440$ Everybody's a human being.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:12:45.440 \longrightarrow 00:12:46.760$ They all need it, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}12{:}46.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}49.124$ They're all in the in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:12:49.124 \longrightarrow 00:12:50.679$ case of crisis and care,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:12:50.680 \rightarrow 00:12:52.984$ they need life support and they'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:12:52.984 \rightarrow 00:12:54.520$ die of respiratory failure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:12:54.520 \rightarrow 00:12:55.678$ So we should treat them equally.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00:12:55.680 \longrightarrow 00:12:57.240$ So a lottery would do that,

 $00:12:57.240 \rightarrow 00:12:57.745$ right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:12:57.745 --> 00:13:01.280 You would just randomly assign the treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:13:01.280 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.077$ and that sort of respects this principle.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:13:05.080 \longrightarrow 00:13:07.726$ So that in here lotteries and

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:13:07.726 \longrightarrow 00:13:09.920$ actually in a protocol too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:13:09.920 \longrightarrow 00:13:11.310$ That's in contrast with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:13:11.310 --> 00:13:13.080 idea of first come first serve,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}13{:}13{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}14{.}982$ which is that patients queue up

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}13{:}14.982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}16.830$ for treatment and then they sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:13:16.830 \dashrightarrow 00:13:18.894$ of survive for as long as they can

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}13{:}18{.}959 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}20{.}975$ on the wait list before they get

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:13:20.975 \longrightarrow 00:13:23.160$ they get treated and in practice

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}13{:}23.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}24.920$ first come first served.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:13:24.920 --> 00:13:25.266 You know,

 $00:13:25.266 \rightarrow 00:13:26.650$ while it might be a good way to

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:13:26.695 --> 00:13:27.919 allocate dinner reservations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:13:27.920 \longrightarrow 00:13:29.720$ so we can talk about that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:13:29.720 \longrightarrow 00:13:31.869$ I think it's a pretty bad way

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:13:31.869 --> 00:13:33.752 to allocate scarce health care

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:13:33.752 --> 00:13:35.130 resources specifically because the

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}13{:}35{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}37{.}682$ people who end up at the front of

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}13{:}37.682 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}39.608$ the line usually use their socio

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}13{:}39{.}608 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}41{.}199$ economic advantage to get there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}13{:}41{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}44{.}072$ And one of the I think greatest reversal

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}13{:}44.072 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}46.469$ of the structurally racist healthcare

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:13:46.469 \longrightarrow 00:13:49.673$ policy in recent history was the

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:13:49.680 --> 00:13:51.720 2014 change the kidney allocation system,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:13:51.720 --> 00:13:52.842 which which Romenka,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}13{:}52{.}842 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}55{.}460$ who's here at Yale was very involved

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:13:55.529 \rightarrow 00:13:57.380$ with this where pre dialysis waiting

- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00:13:57.380 \longrightarrow 00:13:59.672$ time started to be counted as points
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00:13:59.672 \rightarrow 00:14:02.038$ for patients in the king transplant list.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- 00:14:02.040 --> 00:14:03.726 So let's say you'd been listed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00{:}14{:}03.726 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}05.467$ at a transplant center and you'd
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00{:}14{:}05{.}467 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}06{.}595$ waited for five years,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00:14:06.600 \longrightarrow 00:14:07.540$ then you would when you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00:14:07.540 \longrightarrow 00:14:08.480$ finally got on the list,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00:14:08.480 \longrightarrow 00:14:09.998$ you'd get five years of credit.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00:14:10.000 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.196$ Before that you'd start with 0.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00:14:12.200 \longrightarrow 00:14:13.852$ So it's a cue,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00:14:13.852 \rightarrow 00:14:15.826$ but inherently unfair and skewed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00{:}14{:}15.826 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}17.736$ towards people who can list
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00:14:17.736 \rightarrow 00:14:19.678$ preemptively before their kidneys fail,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00:14:19.680 \rightarrow 00:14:22.124$ who are predominantly privately
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084
- $00:14:22.124 \rightarrow 00:14:23.957$ insured and white.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:14:23.960 \longrightarrow 00:14:25.880$ And so once they fix this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:14:25.880 \longrightarrow 00:14:28.976$ this huge racial disparity in kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:14:28.976 \rightarrow 00:14:31.880$ transplantation rates went away overnight.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}14{:}31{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}34{.}580$ So this is an example of where and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:14:34.580 \longrightarrow 00:14:37.051$ idea of treating people equally but with

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}14{:}37{.}051 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}40{.}200$ a with a first come first served cue

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:14:40.200 --> 00:14:42.714 doesn't actually work out in practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00{:}14{:}42.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}44.745$ So that's the first set

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:14:44.745 \longrightarrow 00:14:45.960$ treating people equally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:14:45.960 \longrightarrow 00:14:48.840$ The next set of principles is

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

00:14:48.840 --> 00:14:50.548 maximizing total benefits, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:14:50.548 \longrightarrow 00:14:51.352$ We have a,

NOTE Confidence: 0.35795084

 $00:14:51.352 \rightarrow 00:14:52.960$ we have a security healthcare resource.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40948012

 $00:14:52.960 \longrightarrow 00:14:55.111$ We want to use it not just sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.40948012

 $00:14:55.111 \rightarrow 00:14:56.640$ randomly across the population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.40948012

 $00:14:56.640 \rightarrow 00:14:59.439$ We want to use it to maximize the benefit,

 $00:14:59.440 \longrightarrow 00:15:01.036$ which can be formalized in a bunch

NOTE Confidence: 0.40948012

 $00{:}15{:}01{.}036 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}02{.}642$ of different ways and just listed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.40948012

 $00{:}15{:}02.642 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}04.520$ save lives and save life years. Here

NOTE Confidence: 0.40948012

 $00:15:06.760 \rightarrow 00:15:09.560$ what you can imagine what interaction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00{:}15{:}11.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}14.358$ excuse me, quality just these years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00:15:17.920 \longrightarrow 00:15:19.738$ So in this example you would

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

00:15:19.738 --> 00:15:21.759 if you wanted to save lives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

00:15:21.760 --> 00:15:23.752 you clearly would allocate to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00{:}15{:}23.752 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}26.285$ gentleman on the on the left here who

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00:15:26.285 \longrightarrow 00:15:28.560$ has an 80% survivor of the discharge.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

00:15:28.560 --> 00:15:30.560 But if you wanted to save life years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00{:}15{:}32{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}35{.}440$ you also have to know how old the patient is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00{:}15{:}35{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}38{.}260$ So here we have an 80 year old with an

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00{:}15{:}38{.}337 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}40{.}600$ 80% survival discharge and a 40 year

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00:15:40.600 \rightarrow 00:15:43.000$ old with a 40% survival discharge.

- $00:15:43.000 \rightarrow 00:15:44.560$ In this situation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:15:44.560 --> 00:15:46.680 if your goal had to save life years,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}15{:}46{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}48{.}556$ the total number of lives gained from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}15{:}48{.}556$ --> $00{:}15{:}50{.}687$ the resource you would allocate to the NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 1011 Connuclice: 0.40405052
- 00:15:50.687 --> 00:15:52.277 second patient because their expected
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:15:52.277 --> 00:15:54.040 life years gained from treatment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}15{:}54.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}55.925$ in this case with mechanical
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:15:55.925 --> 00:15:57.433 ventilator for COVID-19 pneumonia,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}15{:}57{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}00{.}833$ is 20 compared to 8 to the other patient.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}16{:}00{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}03{.}630$ So already the utilitarian derived idea
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}16{:}03.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}06.346$ of maximizing total benefits has some
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:16:06.346 \rightarrow 00:16:09.076$ problems here because we have to specify NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- NOTE Confidence: 0.40405052
- 00:16:09.076 --> 00:16:11.319 exactly what benefits we're after.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}16{:}11.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}13.078$ Next is this concept that there's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:16:13.078 \rightarrow 00:16:14.623$ certain people who enter the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:16:14.623 \rightarrow 00:16:16.220$ allocation being worse off, right?

- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:16:16.220 \rightarrow 00:16:18.600$ They've been sort of screwed over by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}16{:}18.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}20.917$ society or by their disease process,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}16{:}20{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}23{.}545$ and we should account for that in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:16:23.545 \rightarrow 00:16:25.599$ the allocation protocol we developed.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:16:25.600 --> 00:16:28.904 Now, one idea is the rule of rescue, right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}16{:}28{.}904 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}31{.}208$ You're going to treat the person
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:16:31.208 \longrightarrow 00:16:32.636$ who's the sickest 1st.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}16{:}32{.}636 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}34{.}844$ And of course I think we can all
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}16{:}34{.}844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}36{.}575$ imagine in a crisis standards
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:16:36.575 \rightarrow 00:16:38.306$ and care scenario where basically
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:16:38.306 \rightarrow 00:16:40.036$ everyone will die without treatment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:16:40.040 --> 00:16:42.448 If you treated the sickest people with the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:16:42.448 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.158$ highest predicted probability of death,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}16{:}44{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}46{.}918$ that would lead to enormously low benefits,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:16:46.920 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.246$ right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00:16:47.246 \longrightarrow 00:16:49.528$ So while sickest first is actually used

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

00:16:49.528 --> 00:16:52.076 in liver allocation like the melt score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00{:}16{:}52{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}54{.}132$ that's only because those patients actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00:16:54.132 \rightarrow 00:16:56.120$ have high benefits from transplant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00{:}16{:}56{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}58{.}794$ In a crisis standards and care scenario,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00{:}16{:}58{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}00{.}552$ sickest first would lead to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00{:}17{:}00{.}552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}02{.}431$ least optimal solution in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00:17:02.431 \rightarrow 00:17:04.076$ with respect to maximizing benefits.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00{:}17{:}04.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}06.558$ So that's in general is out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00:17:06.560 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.048$ So what other classes of people

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00:17:08.048 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.792$ are worse off?

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00:17:08.800 \rightarrow 00:17:09.742$ Well, the Youngs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

00:17:09.742 --> 00:17:11.626 if you develop end stage organ

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

00:17:11.626 --> 00:17:13.184 failure or achieve respiratory

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00:17:13.184 \rightarrow 00:17:14.756$ failure when you're young,

NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

 $00:17:14.760 \longrightarrow 00:17:16.004$ a life threatening medical

- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:17:16.004 --> 00:17:17.559 condition and you die young,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:17.560 \longrightarrow 00:17:18.980$ then you haven't got to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:17:18.980 --> 00:17:20.400 live your whole life right.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:20.400 \longrightarrow 00:17:22.128$ You haven't got to play your
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:22.128 \longrightarrow 00:17:23.280$ 9 innings of baseball.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:23.280 \rightarrow 00:17:25.422$ This is the concept of Fair innings
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:25.422 \rightarrow 00:17:27.405$ that every person is deserve some of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}17{:}27{.}405 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}29{.}470$ the full life and we should allocate
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:29.527 \rightarrow 00:17:32.079$ resources in order to ensure that it happens.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}17{:}32.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}34.992$ So this is a more General Health care
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}17{:}34{.}992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}36{.}735$ allocation argument than just
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:36.735 \longrightarrow 00:17:38.840$ the absolute scarcity problem we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:17:38.840 --> 00:17:39.708 might articulated,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:17:39.708 --> 00:17:41.878 probably perhaps passed by Norm,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}17{:}41.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}42.968$ Norm Daniels,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632

- $00:17:42.968 \rightarrow 00:17:44.600$ but applied here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:44.600 \longrightarrow 00:17:47.270$ this would end up with ideas
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}17{:}47.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}49.049$ like pediatric candidates for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}17{:}49.049 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}50.821$ organ transplantation should be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:50.821 \rightarrow 00:17:52.560$ categorically prioritized over adults,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:52.560 \longrightarrow 00:17:53.918$ which is actually the way we do.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:53.920 \longrightarrow 00:17:56.240$ We do things right.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:56.240 \longrightarrow 00:17:57.540$ But there's another group of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:17:57.540 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.840$ patients who are worse off,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}17{:}58{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}00{.}877$ and those are people who have been
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:18:00.880 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.552$ structurally disadvantaged by society
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:18:03.552 \rightarrow 00:18:07.560$ and in structural laws and rules.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}18{:}07.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}08.036$ I think.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:18:08.036 --> 00:18:09.940 I don't know if many people are having
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:18:09.995 --> 00:18:11.717 any familiar area in Chicago here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:18:11.720 \rightarrow 00:18:16.400$ but the map's pretty clear.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:18:16.400 \rightarrow 00:18:19.840$ All of the areas that are dark here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:18:19.840 \longrightarrow 00:18:22.728$ the highest are the highest
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:18:22.728 --> 00:18:24.270 percentage of African Americans
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:18:24.270 \longrightarrow 00:18:26.640$ or people identify who are black.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}18{:}26{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}30{.}128$ And there are also areas that have been
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00{:}18{:}30{.}128 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}33{.}019$ structurally disadvantaged by du jour,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- 00:18:33.019 --> 00:18:35.358 structural racist policies like,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.46465632
- $00:18:35.358 \rightarrow 00:18:38.220$ and I'm going to go into this more later
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496
- $00{:}18{:}38{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}41{.}295$ in the talk, like detailed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496
- $00:18:41.295 \rightarrow 00:18:43.080$ well in the color of the law,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496
- 00:18:43.080 --> 00:18:46.878 color of law or redlining specifically,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496
- $00{:}18{:}46{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}48{.}560$ and we'll talk about this more.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496
- 00:18:48.560 --> 00:18:50.544 But you can imagine if you're if you're
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496
- $00:18:50.544 \rightarrow 00:18:52.295$ living in one of these neighbourhoods
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496
- $00{:}18{:}52.295 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}54.435$ and the pandemic is hitting you unequally
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:18:54.435 \rightarrow 00:18:56.169$ because the city has been designed

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:18:56.169 \rightarrow 00:18:58.180$ to make your neighbourhood worse off,

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:18:58.180 \longrightarrow 00:19:00.080$ should we account for that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:00.080 \longrightarrow 00:19:03.048$ So this is the concept of favouring

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:03.048 \rightarrow 00:19:05.195$ the disadvantage somehow in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:05.195 \longrightarrow 00:19:06.795$ in your allocation protocol.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:06.800 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.000$ And finally, the last category

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

00:19:09.000 --> 00:19:10.760 is rewarding social usefulness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

00:19:10.760 --> 00:19:12.867 which already kind of seems a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:12.867 \rightarrow 00:19:14.919$ icky when you just say it right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:14.920 \longrightarrow 00:19:16.171$ But we actually,

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

00:19:16.171 --> 00:19:17.839 in order an allocation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:17.840 \longrightarrow 00:19:21.177$ use this principle pretty in

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

00:19:21.177 - 00:19:23.679 a very concrete and big way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:23.680 \longrightarrow 00:19:25.512$ So if you are a living Kitty donor

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:25.512 \rightarrow 00:19:27.197$ and your Kitty goes on to fail,

 $00{:}19{:}27{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}30{.}240$ you get 4 years of waiting time points.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:30.240 \longrightarrow 00:19:33.005$ And the idea there is that you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:33.005 \rightarrow 00:19:35.514$ getting paid back for being good

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:35.514 \rightarrow 00:19:37.579$ in the past right Reciprocity

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00:19:37.579 \longrightarrow 00:19:39.492$ for your previous good deeds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67711496

 $00{:}19{:}39{.}492 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}41{.}357$ But the the other idea

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}19{:}44.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}46.176$ here is that there's some people who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:19:46.176 --> 00:19:48.380 like very valuable to society, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:19:48.380 --> 00:19:51.280 They have a multiplier effect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}19{:}51{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}53{.}376$ like for example a famous CEO who is

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:19:53.376 \longrightarrow 00:19:55.591$ a job creator or something, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:19:55.591 --> 00:19:57.768 And if we should give them the

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}19{:}57.768 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}59.436$ resource because then they'll keep

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}19{:}59{.}436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}01{.}398$ them alive and help other people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}20{:}01{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}04{.}730$ That seems, I think, why I picked a CEO.

00:20:04.730 --> 00:20:06.200 That may not be the most popular

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}20{:}06{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}10.576$ on on purpose, but that reasoning

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:20:10.576 -> 00:20:12.800 actually overwhelms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:20:12.800 --> 00:20:14.840 The COVID-19 vaccine allocation

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:20:14.840 --> 00:20:17.900 aside from elderly patients and long

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}20{:}17{.}979 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}21{.}004$ term care facilities who went first?

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}20{:}21.004 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}24.106$ Us. I remember getting a second

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:20:24.106 --> 00:20:26.238 dose in mid January,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}20{:}26{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}28{.}823$ well before weeks before any of my

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}20{:}28{.}823 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}31{.}222$ vulnerable patients and I realized that NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}20{:}31{.}222 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}33{.}664$ the weight on instrumental value and NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:20:33.664 --> 00:20:35.190 reciprocity was severely miscalibrated. NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:20:35.190 \longrightarrow 00:20:38.480$ But that's a different talk I see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:20:38.480 --> 00:20:40.982 So hopefully what's become obvious is

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}20{:}40{.}982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}43{.}197$ I've laid these values and criticisms

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}20{:}43.197 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}45.111$ out is that they're inherently in

 $00:20:45.111 \rightarrow 00:20:46.588$ conflict with each other, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}20{:}46.588 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}47.820$ There's there's certain times

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:20:47.820 \longrightarrow 00:20:49.680$ where they go hand in hand,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:20:49.680 \longrightarrow 00:20:51.380$ but if you're trying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:20:51.380 \longrightarrow 00:20:52.400$ maximize total benefits,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:20:52.400 \longrightarrow 00:20:54.320$ you're by definition not

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:20:54.320 \longrightarrow 00:20:55.760$ treating people equally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:20:55.760 \longrightarrow 00:20:57.360$ There's no way around that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:20:57.360 --> 00:20:59.880 So how do you, how do you move forward?

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:20:59.880 \longrightarrow 00:21:02.040$ This is terrible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}02{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}03{.}870$ Well fortunately Gobin has thought about

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}03.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}06.598$ this a lot and he's a lawyer bioethic ist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}06{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}08{.}760$ not at the University of Denver but has

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}08.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}11.040$ spent a lot of time at on the East Coast.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}11{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}13{.}704$ And so some of you may have come across NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}13.704 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}16.478$ in different times is a mazing thinker

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:21:16.480 --> 00:21:18.780 and you know his point is that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}18.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}21.674$ have to you can't some some may be NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:21:21.674 \rightarrow 00:21:23.818$ better than others and there could be NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}23{.}818$ --> $00{:}21{:}25{.}563$ arguments based on more fundamental NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}25{.}563 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}27{.}423$ principles that make may help you NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}27{.}423 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}29{.}073$ rank order the four big categories

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:21:29.080 \longrightarrow 00:21:30.556$ but you can't ignore them all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}30{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}32{.}765$ You can't ignore ones and you have NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:21:32.765 --> 00:21:34.640 to do the hard bioethical work

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}34.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}36.785$ to combine them with the multi

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:21:36.785 --> 00:21:38.360 principle allocation systems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}38{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}39{.}998$ And I think that's very much true.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}40.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}41.792$ And we'll see as we look at some

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}21{:}41.792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}43.148$ examples of crisis standards of

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:21:43.148 \rightarrow 00:21:45.480$ care and attempts to do just this,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976
- $00:21:45.480 \rightarrow 00:21:48.120$ invoke multiple ethically relevant

 $00{:}21{:}48.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}50.760$ principles into a protocol.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:21:50.760 --> 00:21:53.280 OK, I got through that quicker than I hoped,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:21:53.280 \rightarrow 00:21:55.610$ which is good because now now we

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:21:55.610 - 00:21:57.679 get to the hard part, which is OK,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:21:57.679 \rightarrow 00:22:00.157$ what are the key bioethical controversies?

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:22:00.160 --> 00:22:01.066 And you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}22{:}01.066 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}02.878$ where this is the bioethic seminar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:22:02.880 --> 00:22:06.096 So we're gonna focus on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:22:06.096 --> 00:22:08.240 life support triage protocols,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:22:08.240 \longrightarrow 00:22:09.840$ a lot of hypothetical situations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:22:09.840 \longrightarrow 00:22:12.040$ and engage these deep,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}22{:}12.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}13.171$ deep bioethical issues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:22:13.171 --> 00:22:15.433 I want to say there's entirely

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}22{:}15{.}433 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}17{.}397$ another set of equally important,

00:22:17.400 - 00:22:19.020 maybe even more important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:22:19.020 --> 00:22:20.640 practical considerations during crisis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:22:20.640 \longrightarrow 00:22:22.376$ tangent care and procedural

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}22{:}22{.}376$ --> $00{:}22{:}24{.}546$ considerations about load sharing and

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:22:24.546 - > 00:22:26.998 how how would the triage team work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:22:27.000 \longrightarrow 00:22:27.452$ for example?

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}22{:}27{.}452 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}29{.}260$ I'm going to set those all aside so

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:22:29.308 \longrightarrow 00:22:31.268$ we can just kind of do more thought

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}22{:}31{.}268 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}32{.}275$ experiment stuff because that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:22:32.275 \rightarrow 00:22:34.155$ where we're doing the bio or do it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

00:22:34.160 --> 00:22:37.880 We're bioethics tonight, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}22{:}37{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}39{.}861$ So these are the four big problems

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00{:}22{:}39{.}861 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}41{.}789$ and I'm hoping maybe we can just

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:22:41.789 \longrightarrow 00:22:43.752$ pause after each one for a brief

NOTE Confidence: 0.57877976

 $00:22:43.752 \longrightarrow 00:22:44.880$ round of discussion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:22:44.880 \rightarrow 00:22:46.476$ We never end up getting whatever.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115
- 00:22:46.480 --> 00:22:47.992 I'm worrying when I get to the last one,

 $00{:}22{:}48.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}49.380$ and that's perhaps the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:22:49.380 \longrightarrow 00:22:51.429$ important that I think we need to

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:22:51.429 \rightarrow 00:22:52.954$ resolve before the next pandemic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}22{:}52{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}54{.}913$ We need to improve crisis standards of

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}22{:}54{.}913 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}57{.}197$ care and deal with these four questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:22:57.200 \rightarrow 00:23:01.320$ So first let's take down sofa together, huh?

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:23:01.320 \longrightarrow 00:23:04.294$ I think we have a lot of friendly

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}23{:}04{.}294 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}06{.}669$ people in this room for this particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:23:06.669 \rightarrow 00:23:08.880$ point so early in the pandemic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:23:08.880 \longrightarrow 00:23:10.356$ Gina Pistacello is now in rush.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}23{:}10.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}13.246$ She's emerging leader in the serious

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}23{:}13.246 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}15.676$ illness conversation space or so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

00:23:15.680 --> 00:23:17.360 She's now at Pittsburgh, excuse me,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

00:23:17.360 --> 00:23:18.431 since Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.

00:23:18.431 --> 00:23:21.370 So watch out for what she's going to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}23{:}21{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}23{.}720$ next in terms of clinical medical ethics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

00:23:23.720 --> 00:23:26.984 She read every single state crisis

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:23:26.984 \rightarrow 00:23:31.056$ standard of care protocol in like a week,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}23{:}31.056 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}32.478$ accurately categorized them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}23{:}32{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}34{.}080$ convinced like three other people

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:23:34.080 \longrightarrow 00:23:35.680$ to check everything she did,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:23:35.680 \rightarrow 00:23:39.348$ and and published the My Eyes Cited

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}23{:}39{.}348 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}43{.}240$ paper ever the landmark survey of

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}23{:}43{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}46{.}080$ US ventilator allocation guidelines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:23:46.080 \rightarrow 00:23:48.117$ And what we found is that everybody,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:23:48.120 \rightarrow 00:23:50.360$ for the most part, was using SOFA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}23{:}50{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}52{.}397$ And I'm a pulmonary critical care doctor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:23:52.400 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.038$ so I knew what SOFA was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:23:54.040 \longrightarrow 00:23:55.240$ And this is what, of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:23:55.240 \rightarrow 00:23:58.360$ we started to write into our algorithm too.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115
- $00:23:58.360 \longrightarrow 00:24:01.240$ And here's an example of the

00:24:01.240 --> 00:24:03.880 way SOFA was going to be used.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

00:24:03.880 - > 00:24:05.336 This is from Pennsylvania.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:05.336 \longrightarrow 00:24:07.156$ It's still on their website.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:07.160 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.636$ A lot of these are still on the website,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:08.640 \longrightarrow 00:24:09.792$ even though they've been.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:09.792 \longrightarrow 00:24:11.200$ We, as we as all show,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:11.200 \longrightarrow 00:24:13.132$ we've moved on in a big way

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:13.132 \longrightarrow 00:24:14.879$ for some of these ideas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:14.880 \longrightarrow 00:24:17.640$ But in order to save the most lives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}24{:}17.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}19.880$ remember that's the ethical principle.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}24{:}19{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}22{.}547$ We're going to divide people up into

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}24{:}22.547 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}24.920$ categories based on their sofa score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}24{:}24{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}26{.}320$ And I'll explain what the Sofa score is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}24{:}26{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}29{.}264$ The next slide where if the sofa scores NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

00:24:29.264 --> 00:24:31.160 higher, then we're likely to die,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

00:24:31.160 --> 00:24:31.373 right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

00:24:31.373 - 00:24:33.077 So they get more points and it's like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:33.080 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.760$ oh, you want less points,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}24{:}34{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}36{.}916$ lower score is better and people will

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:36.916 \rightarrow 00:24:38.840$ be rank ordered by their scores.

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}24{:}38{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}40{.}814$ And one interesting thing that Mark and

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:40.814 \rightarrow 00:24:42.892$ I were talking about on the way over

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}24{:}42.892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}44.959$ here is by bidding sofa scores together,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:44.960 \rightarrow 00:24:46.322$ what you're doing is allowing tie

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

00:24:46.322 --> 00:24:48.120 Breakers to kind of kick in more, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}24{:}48.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}50.640$ So all right, if you have the same points,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:50.640 \rightarrow 00:24:54.280$ two points, and and this primary calculation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00{:}24{:}54{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}56{.}716$ then we start to do other considerations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:56.720 \longrightarrow 00:24:58.640$ life cycle considerations or

NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115

 $00:24:58.640 \rightarrow 00:25:00.080$ fair endings considerations.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115
- $00{:}25{:}00{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}01{.}994$ But hopefully you guys can all
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115
- $00{:}25{:}01{.}994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}04{.}012$ appreciate how this is an attempt
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115
- $00{:}25{:}04.012 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}06.034$ to take those ethical values and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115
- $00:25:06.034 \rightarrow 00:25:07.902$ principles I discussed and force
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115
- $00{:}25{:}07{.}902 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}09{.}648$ it into an actual protocol that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115
- $00:25:09.648 \longrightarrow 00:25:11.520$ could be used in in real life.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.32344115
- 00:25:11.520 --> 00:25:11.600 So
- NOTE Confidence: 0.49643952
- $00:25:14.640 \rightarrow 00:25:18.160$ what I'm going to focus on is the sofa score.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.49643952
- $00{:}25{:}18.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}20.920$ And the problem with the sofa score,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.49643952
- $00{:}25{:}20{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}22{.}500$ the sequential organ failure
- NOTE Confidence: 0.49643952
- $00:25:22.500 \longrightarrow 00:25:24.080$ assessment score is old.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.49643952
- $00:25:24.080 \longrightarrow 00:25:25.928$ It's almost 30 years old now and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.49643952
- $00:25:25.928 \longrightarrow 00:25:27.639$ it's based on expert opinion.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.49643952
- $00{:}25{:}27.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}29.568$ So this table, which I see a lot
- NOTE Confidence: 0.49643952
- $00:25:29.568 \rightarrow 00:25:31.070$ of people squinting their eyes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.49643952

 $00:25:31.070 \dashrightarrow 00:25:33.317$ glazing over and I don't blame you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.49643952

 $00{:}25{:}33{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}35{.}084$ was made-up in the 90s at a

NOTE Confidence: 0.49643952

 $00:25:35.084 \longrightarrow 00:25:35.840$ critical care conference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:25:37.960 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.320$ It's not based on a regression model that

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:25:41.320 \rightarrow 00:25:44.236$ this is to predict like the Apache 2 score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}25{:}44{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}47{.}198$ LEPS 2 score or LPS score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:25:47.200 \longrightarrow 00:25:48.775$ Both of those are predictive

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

00:25:48.775 --> 00:25:50.350 models designed to predict the

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}25{:}50{.}408 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}52{.}278$ outcome Survival ties to discharge,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:25:52.280 \longrightarrow 00:25:53.680$ not so far, they just made it up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}25{:}53{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}55{.}330$ So it's actually kind of remarkable

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

00:25:55.330 --> 00:25:56.386 it predicts anything, right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}25{:}56{.}386 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}57{.}968$ because that means that means we must

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:25:57.968 \rightarrow 00:25:59.479$ know what we're doing in stockers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}25{:}59{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}01{.}664$ So the the this first column is

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:26:01.664 \rightarrow 00:26:03.999$ the degree of respiratory failure

 $00:26:04.000 \rightarrow 00:26:05.918$ and the more the lower your PA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:26:05.920 \longrightarrow 00:26:09.852$ O2, FI, O2 ratio is the the work

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

00:26:09.852 --> 00:26:11.076 of hypoxic respiratory failure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:26:11.080 \rightarrow 00:26:13.520$ So that's the first column In the

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

00:26:13.520 --> 00:26:15.120 in the third column here or the 4th

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}15.174 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}16.724$ column you'll see this cardiov ascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:26:16.724 \longrightarrow 00:26:18.274$ column which is supposed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:26:18.327 \longrightarrow 00:26:19.757$ measure the severity of shock.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}19.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}21.629$ And for those again in the critical

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

00:26:21.629 --> 00:26:23.172 care space or anybody who's really

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:26:23.172 \longrightarrow 00:26:25.320$ worked in a in a hospital,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}25{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}26{.}598$ well, we don't use that much,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}26{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}28{.}546$ don't need anymore for very good reasons

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}28{.}546 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}30{.}908$ and we have a lot of other vaso active

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}30{.}908 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}33{.}079$ medicines that are not listed on that row.

00:26:33.080 --> 00:26:35.240 Speaking to that in practice people

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}35{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}37{.}490$ do not calculate this according to

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}37{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}39{.}716$ their original formula in any way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:26:39.720 \longrightarrow 00:26:42.312$ And but that being said about

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}42.312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}44.040$ all those potential problems,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:26:44.040 \longrightarrow 00:26:45.400$ it actually works pretty well

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}45{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}47{.}000$ for patients already in the ICU.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

00:26:47.000 --> 00:26:49.136 If you make a couple corrections

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

00:26:49.136 --> 00:26:50.560 in that cardiova
scular component,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:26:50.560 \longrightarrow 00:26:51.502$ you calculate it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}51{.}502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}53{.}386$ And if some one's been in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}53{.}386 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}55{.}600$ ICU for 48 hours and you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:26:55.600 \longrightarrow 00:26:57.240$ time to calculate all those,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00:26:57.240 \rightarrow 00:26:58.720$ get all those laboratory measurements,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}26{:}58{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}00{.}922$ calculate the score and take the

NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

 $00{:}27{:}00{.}922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}03{.}437$ maximum and worst value in all of them,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00:27:03.440 \longrightarrow 00:27:04.524$ it works pretty well.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00{:}27{:}04{.}524 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}06{.}997$ So this is the SOFA scores on the X axis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00:27:07.000 \longrightarrow 00:27:08.988$ This is a large population of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00{:}27{:}08{.}988 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}10{.}208$ patients with susceptive infection
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00{:}27{:}10.208 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}11.798$ in Australia and New Zealand.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00{:}27{:}11.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}14.332$ ICU and the locality should have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00:27:14.332 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.440$ like logistic function right then.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00:27:16.440 \longrightarrow 00:27:17.576$ The higher sofa score,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00:27:17.576 \longrightarrow 00:27:18.996$ the more likelier to die,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- 00:27:19.000 --> 00:27:22.056 each one of these points turning into
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00{:}27{:}22.056 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}25.960$ like a 5% or so increase in mortality.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00:27:25.960 \rightarrow 00:27:29.278$ However, that's not the triage situation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00:27:29.280 \longrightarrow 00:27:31.050$ That's the triage situation is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00:27:31.050 \rightarrow 00:27:33.319$ that the patients in front of you,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00:27:33.320 \longrightarrow 00:27:34.838$ you have much you don't have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556

- $00:27:34.838 \longrightarrow 00:27:36.533$ 48 hours of information of them
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- 00:27:36.533 --> 00:27:37.797 already receiving life support.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00{:}27{:}37{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}39{.}645$ You have to decide whether or not to put
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00:27:39.645 \rightarrow 00:27:41.394$ them on life support in the 1st place.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43064556
- $00{:}27{:}41.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}41.840$ So
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213
- $00{:}27{:}45{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}48{.}456$ when you actually evaluate it as a triage
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213
- 00:27:48.456 --> 00:27:50.068 score, SOFA performs quite poorly.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213
- $00{:}27{:}50.068 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}52.800$ So this is the area of the receiver
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213
- $00{:}27{:}52{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}54{.}775$ under the receiver operating curve
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213
- $00{:}27{:}54.775 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}56.355$ or measure of discrimination.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213
- 00:27:56.360 --> 00:27:58.160 A coin flip is, you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213
- $00{:}27{:}58{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}00{.}603$ this has this dotted line here and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213
- 00:28:00.603 00:28:02.731 as you can see sofa's not doing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213
- 00:28:02.731 --> 00:28:04.273 much better than flipping a coin.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213
- $00:28:04.280 \rightarrow 00:28:07.675$ It's a near sort of lottery situation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213
- $00:28:07.680 \rightarrow 00:28:10.524$ And so this was a landmark paper that I

- NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213
- $00{:}28{:}10.524 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}12.317$ think casts a lot of doubts about using

 $00{:}28{:}12{.}317 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}14{.}000$ SOFA in the crisis Standards of Care

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

00:28:14.000 --> 00:28:15.920 is that it doesn't work well in this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00:28:15.920 \rightarrow 00:28:19.196$ in the situation that people are applying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}19{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}22{.}240$ And on top of that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}22{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}23{.}940$ the SOFA score would exacerbate

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00:28:23.940 \longrightarrow 00:28:24.920$ health inequity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00:28:24.920 \longrightarrow 00:28:26.108$ It doesn't incorporate age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00:28:26.108 \longrightarrow 00:28:27.593$ which we'll talk about next,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00:28:27.600 \rightarrow 00:28:30.260$ but it also uses the patient's absolute

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}30{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}33{.}078$ value of creatinine to compute a renal score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}33{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}33{.}455$ right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}33.455 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}36.080$ So this is problematic for two reasons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}36{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}38{.}159$ One, some patients end up or show up to

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00:28:38.159 \rightarrow 00:28:40.438$ the hospital with chronic kidney disease,

 $00:28:40.440 \rightarrow 00:28:42.239$ so they have higher creatinines at baseline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}42{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}44{.}886$ but it's not an acute problem and

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}44{.}886 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}47{.}395$ they might walk in the door with

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}47{.}395 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}49{.}202$ like two or three cell phone points

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}49{.}202 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}50{.}800$ just 'cause they have chronic kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}50{.}800$ --> $00{:}28{:}52{.}760$ disease that's in no way correlated to

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}52{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}54{.}517$ their probability of actually dying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.52479213

 $00{:}28{:}54{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}54{.}720$ And

NOTE Confidence: 0.27280143

00:28:57.400 --> 00:28:59.794 the second problem is that certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.27280143

 $00:28:59.794 \rightarrow 00:29:01.760$ populations with higher muscle mass,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27280143

 $00:29:01.760 \longrightarrow 00:29:03.280$ particularly those people who

NOTE Confidence: 0.27280143

00:29:03.280 --> 00:29:04.800 are self identified black,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27280143

 $00{:}29{:}04.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}06.192$ have higher creatinine bodies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27280143

00:29:06.192 --> 00:29:09.000 This is this whole estimated GFR controversy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27280143

 $00{:}29{:}09{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}11{.}352$ why race was used in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.27280143

 $00:29:11.352 \rightarrow 00:29:12.920$ equation to begin with.

 $00:29:12.920 \rightarrow 00:29:15.216$ And so the same patient with the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.27280143

 $00{:}29{:}15{.}216$ --> $00{:}29{:}17{.}604$ amount of renal function might get who's

NOTE Confidence: 0.27280143

00:29:17.604 --> 00:29:19.768 black might get two points compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.27280143

 $00:29:19.768 \longrightarrow 00:29:21.916$ to one for somebody who's white.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}29{:}24{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}29{.}116$ So a lot of people have gone on

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:29:29.116 \longrightarrow 00:29:31.624$ to examine the potential bias of

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:29:31.624 \rightarrow 00:29:34.359$ surface core against black patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:29:34.360 \longrightarrow 00:29:38.120$ Most notable here at Yale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

00:29:38.120 --> 00:29:40.150 where I was very inspired by both

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:29:40.150 \longrightarrow 00:29:42.091$ of these papers to replicate your

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

00:29:42.091 - > 00:29:43.837 findings in the EICU data set.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}29{:}43.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}45.240$ I don't know when they were polished,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:29:45.240 \rightarrow 00:29:47.011$ but you know I was very they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}29{:}47.011 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}48.400$ all about the same time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:29:48.400 \rightarrow 00:29:50.000$ We all were thinking alike,

 $00:29:50.000 \longrightarrow 00:29:52.436$ and we all show that black patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:29:52.436 \rightarrow 00:29:55.151$ would have higher SOPA scores than white

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}29{:}55{.}151 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}57{.}474$ patients with the same survival, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

00:29:57.474 --> 00:29:59.358 So instead of giving because of

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}29{:}59{.}358 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}00{.}970$ that chronic kidney disease point

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:30:00.970 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.800$ or the OR the creatinine point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:30:02.800 \rightarrow 00:30:05.250$ a white person will get a sofa of or be

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:30:05.314 \rightarrow 00:30:07.636$ more likely to allocate a ventilator.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:30:07.640 \dashrightarrow 00:30:09.872$ Black person will get a SOFA score of five.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}30{:}09{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}12{.}456$ So that's a a form of actual

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

00:30:12.456 --> 00:30:13.749 statistical bias, right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:30:13.749 \longrightarrow 00:30:15.396$ It's it's miscalibrated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}30{:}15{.}396 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}18{.}141$ So it was miscalibrated against

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}30{:}18.141 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}20.597$ patients who identified as black.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}30{:}20.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}21.600$ And this is a big,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

00:30:21.600 - 00:30:24.078 this is a really nice figure from

- NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443
- $00:30:24.080 \rightarrow 00:30:27.604$ Deepishana's version of this paper,

 $00{:}30{:}27.604 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}30{.}310$ which was using pen and cosmic

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}30{:}30{.}396 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}33{.}554$ fermente data and they show that 10%

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}30{:}33{.}554 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}36{.}158$ of black patients would be assigned

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}30{:}36{.}158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}38{.}137$ to inappropriate SOFA level, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}30{:}38{.}137 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}39{.}804$ So it would effect on 10% of them

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:30:39.804 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.616$ and most of the city's patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

00:30:41.616 - > 00:30:43.920 would be shunted into these higher,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:30:43.920 \longrightarrow 00:30:44.652$ higher groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}30{:}44.652 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}47.580$ And we found the same thing that for

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:30:47.655 \rightarrow 00:30:50.600$ conditional upon their assigned priority,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}30{:}50{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}52{.}075$ black patients are much more

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:30:52.075 \longrightarrow 00:30:52.960$ likely to survive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}30{:}52{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}54{.}560$ So it's a little confusing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}30{:}54{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}58{.}436$ but basically the score is assigning

 $00:30:58.440 \longrightarrow 00:31:00.652$ a higher level of mortality risk to

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:31:00.652 \rightarrow 00:31:02.758$ black patients than they actually have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}31{:}02.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}05.200$ which is a form of bias that leads to both.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

00:31:05.200 --> 00:31:06.433 Obviously it's discriminatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:31:06.433 \longrightarrow 00:31:08.077$ and it's black people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}31{:}08{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}11{.}080$ but it's also inefficient because

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:31:11.080 \rightarrow 00:31:14.080$ it's worse at identifying survivors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:31:14.080 \longrightarrow 00:31:19.240$ So the really we took a a

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}31{:}19{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}19{.}975$ population with COVID-19,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}31{:}19{.}975 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}21{.}959$ a lot of the pre prior studies were

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

00:31:21.959 --> 00:31:23.520 pre you know like the pandemic was

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}31{:}23.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}24.768$ still going on so there wasn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

00:31:24.768 --> 00:31:25.713 a lot of COVID data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}31{:}25{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}29{.}280$ So this is the same sort of analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00{:}31{:}29{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}31{.}812$ but in patients who had COVID-19

NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443

 $00:31:31.812 \rightarrow 00:31:33.078$ required mechanical ventilator.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443
- $00:31:33.080 \longrightarrow 00:31:35.117$ We also added a little bit more,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443
- $00:31:35.120 \longrightarrow 00:31:36.908$ met the logic breaker here with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443
- $00:31:36.908 \rightarrow 00:31:38.480$ a very simple simulation where
- NOTE Confidence: 0.37383443
- $00:31:38.480 \longrightarrow 00:31:39.760$ we applied triage rules.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003
- $00:31:41.840 \dashrightarrow 00:31:43.648$ And when we did that, unsurprisingly,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003
- $00{:}31{:}43.648 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}47.296$ we found that using a silicate
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003
- 00:31:47.296 --> 00:31:49.816 tier system would systematically
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003
- $00{:}31{:}49{.}816 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}52{.}408$ disadvantage individuals who identified
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003
- $00{:}31{:}52{.}408 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}56{.}880$ as black without improving efficiency.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003
- 00:31:56.880 --> 00:31:59.200 In fact, it performed substantially
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003
- $00{:}31{:}59{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}02{.}780$ worse than young is first or a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003
- $00:32:02.780 \dashrightarrow 00:32:05.656$ combination model and not as you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003
- $00:32:05.656 \longrightarrow 00:32:08.080$ can see in the lottery system.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003
- $00{:}32{:}08{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}09{.}428$ Black and Hispanic people,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003
- $00:32:09.428 \longrightarrow 00:32:11.113$ although it's not significant actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:11.113 \rightarrow 00:32:13.239$ have higher survival than white patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}32{:}13.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}14.810$ And that's because white patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}32{:}14.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}16.769$ who end up in respiratory failure

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:16.769 \longrightarrow 00:32:18.109$ with COVID-19 throughout the

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

00:32:18.109 - 00:32:20.160 pandemic tended to be much older,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}32{:}20{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}22{.}560$ which will be the next topic

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:22.560 \longrightarrow 00:32:23.760$ of the discussion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

00:32:23.760 --> 00:32:26.436 And unfortunately because of some actions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:26.440 \longrightarrow 00:32:27.384$ misguided actions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

00:32:27.384 --> 00:32:29.194 I believe by, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:29.194 \rightarrow 00:32:30.376$ office civil rights from the Department

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

00:32:30.376 --> 00:32:31.438 of Health and Human Services,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}32{:}31{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}33{.}288$ SOFA is now even more dominant in

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:33.288 \longrightarrow 00:32:34.644$ crisis standards care protocols across

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:34.644 \rightarrow 00:32:36.436$ the country than it used to be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:36.440 \longrightarrow 00:32:39.908$ This is a paper from May 2022

- NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003
- $00:32:39.908 \longrightarrow 00:32:42.476$ and most states now have one.

00:32:42.480 --> 00:32:42.930 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:42.930 \longrightarrow 00:32:44.730$ remember our first map had a lot more

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:44.780 \rightarrow 00:32:46.600$ holes because everyone was scrambling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:46.600 \dashrightarrow 00:32:49.435$ Now it's still in some states had no plan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

00:32:49.440 --> 00:32:50.610 I don't know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}32{:}50{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}53{.}947$ And the plan is SOFA for the vast

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}32{:}53{.}947 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}56{.}900$ majority of these sofa in various forms

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:56.900 \rightarrow 00:32:59.680$ with little other elements of the protocol.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:32:59.680 \longrightarrow 00:33:02.053$ So I think this is really deeply

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}33{:}02{.}053 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}04{.}494$ problematic and one of the things is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}33{:}04{.}494 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}07{.}596$ main gap our grant is trying to fail.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}33{:}07{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}11{.}452$ So in conclusion you know so I

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}33{:}11{.}452 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}13{.}210$ think I've said all this sofa's

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}33{:}13.285 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}15.439$ outdated it's not a triage score.

 $00:33:15.440 \rightarrow 00:33:17.372$ It's less accurate than the Young's

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}33{:}17{.}372 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}19{.}006$ first and statistically diet but

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}33{:}19.006 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}20.441$ advised means black patients which

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00:33:20.441 \dashrightarrow 00:33:22.200$ makes it even more inaccurate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

00:33:22.200 --> 00:33:24.400 So I I think SOFA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}33{:}24{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}26{.}074$ you know should be eliminated in

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}33{:}26.074 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}27.784$ crisis and secure protocols across the

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}33{:}27.784 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}29.404$ country and replaced with a better

NOTE Confidence: 0.34667003

 $00{:}33{:}29{.}404 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}31{.}435$ triage score than one that we're working on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.45257384

 $00{:}33{:}33{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}36{.}880$ So that's the first problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.45257384

00:33:36.880 --> 00:33:38.844 I obviously have a
we some

NOTE Confidence: 0.45257384

 $00{:}33{:}38{.}844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}40{.}317$ strong opinionated conclusions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.45257384

 $00{:}33{:}40{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}41{.}755$ I'm not asking for someone to defend.

NOTE Confidence: 0.45257384

00:33:41.760 --> 00:33:43.504 So Mark, I don't know if you want

NOTE Confidence: 0.45257384

 $00:33:43.504 \rightarrow 00:33:45.375$ me to move on to age or if if

NOTE Confidence: 0.45257384

00:33:45.375 - 00:33:47.289 you want to have any questions or

- NOTE Confidence: 0.45257384
- $00:33:47.289 \rightarrow 00:33:49.194$ feedback just about that this this.

00:33:49.194 --> 00:33:51.078 So let me, because I didn't,

NOTE Confidence: 0.45257384

00:33:51.080 --> 00:33:54.436 I I didn't do my job beautifully

NOTE Confidence: 0.6678989

 $00:33:54.440 \longrightarrow 00:33:55.025$ at the beginning,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6678989

00:33:55.025 --> 00:33:56.390 which was to remind you guys and

NOTE Confidence: 0.6678989

 $00:33:56.429 \longrightarrow 00:33:58.120$ let you know that we're going to go,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6678989

 $00:33:58.120 \longrightarrow 00:34:01.165$ we're going to go until 6:30 and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.6678989

00:34:01.165 -> 00:34:02.320 there's going to be a hard stop.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6678989

 $00:34:02.320 \longrightarrow 00:34:03.600$ So I apologize if there's something

NOTE Confidence: 0.6678989

00:34:03.600 --> 00:34:04.720 you really wanted to ask or say

NOTE Confidence: 0.6678989

 $00{:}34{:}04{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}08{.}440$ and you didn't get the chance. However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6678989

 $00{:}34{:}08{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}10{.}800$ typically the speaker goes in total 5:50 or

NOTE Confidence: 0.6678989

 $00{:}34{:}10.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}12.210$ 5:00 to 6:00 and then we

NOTE Confidence: 0.6678989

 $00:34:12.210 \longrightarrow 00:34:13.079$ have questions, but the way

NOTE Confidence: 0.6678989

 $00{:}34{:}13.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}14.528$ Will's outlined this week and kind

 $00:34:14.528 \rightarrow 00:34:16.159$ of stop at each of these important

NOTE Confidence: 0.479315828

 $00{:}34{:}16{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}18{.}080$ points and have a conversation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.479315828

 $00{:}34{:}18{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}19{.}039$ So I would say if someone wants

NOTE Confidence: 0.479315828

 $00:34:19.039 \longrightarrow 00:34:20.460$ to speak specifically to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.479315828

 $00:34:20.460 \longrightarrow 00:34:22.358$ sofa issue now we can do that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.479315828

 $00{:}34{:}22{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}24{.}079$ But I want to tell you one other thing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.479315828

 $00:34:24.080 \longrightarrow 00:34:25.700$ since I'm up here and have

NOTE Confidence: 0.479315828

 $00:34:25.700 \rightarrow 00:34:27.160$ the podium, Karen Cold,

NOTE Confidence: 0.479315828

 $00{:}34{:}27.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}29.132$ who organizes these things so nicely,

NOTE Confidence: 0.479315828

 $00:34:29.132 \longrightarrow 00:34:30.386$ is herself out sick.

NOTE Confidence: 0.479315828

00:34:30.386 --> 00:34:32.916 So we wish Karen a speedy recovery.

NOTE Confidence: 0.479315828

 $00{:}34{:}32{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}35{.}384$ She reminds me to remind the people in

NOTE Confidence: 0.479315828

 $00{:}34{:}35{.}384 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}37{.}280$ Zoom land this number which Karen, please

NOTE Confidence: 0.43217006

 $00{:}34{:}37{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}38{.}320$ add it to the chat. Also

NOTE Confidence: 0.43217006

00:34:41.680 --> 00:34:42.613 203-442-9435, that's the

NOTE Confidence: 0.43217006

 $00:34:42.613 \dashrightarrow 00:34:44.479$ number to get your CME credit.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- 00:34:47.360 --> 00:34:51.040 2O3442, 9435 out of town, please call
- NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- 00:34:49.440 --> 00:34:50.840 collect. No, that's not right. And
- NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- $00{:}34{:}51{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}52{.}438$ the code is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- $00:34:56.400 \longrightarrow 00:34:57.691$ 409-624-0962. So that's enough
- NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- 00:34:57.691 -> 00:34:58.879 house keeping. I think it's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- $00:34:58.880 \longrightarrow 00:34:59.680$ fine. Mark has something
- NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- $00:34:59.680 \longrightarrow 00:35:01.048$ he wants to say about sofa.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- $00:35:01.048 \rightarrow 00:35:02.840$ So why don't we spend like because
- NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- 00:35:02.840 --> 00:35:03.785 I know, I know will you would
- NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- $00:35:03.785 \dashrightarrow 00:35:04.919$ want to get to the other problem.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- 00:35:04.920 --> 00:35:06.740 So let's do, let's spend 5 minutes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- $00{:}35{:}06{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}08{.}033$ talking about sofa and then move NOTE Confidence: 0.60076916
- $00{:}35{:}08.033 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}09.398$ on to the next. Go ahead, Mark.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584
- $00:35:16.720 \dashrightarrow 00:35:18.464$ Yeah, I I I should also say thanks NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584
- $00:35:18.464 \dashrightarrow 00:35:20.120$ so much Amir that especially for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00:35:20.120 \longrightarrow 00:35:21.280$ the folks who are on the Zoom call,

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00:35:21.280 \rightarrow 00:35:23.520$ Please wait till you get the microphone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00:35:23.520 \longrightarrow 00:35:24.396$ I should have thought of that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00{:}35{:}24{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}25{.}040$ Thank you Amir. So, so

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00:35:27.640 \dashrightarrow 00:35:30.792$ yeah, I I think we did a good job so far.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00{:}35{:}30.792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}31.848$ So it can be replaced with

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00:35:31.848 \dashrightarrow 00:35:34.208$ something and I'm excited to hear

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00:35:34.208 \longrightarrow 00:35:36.140$ about why you're working on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

00:35:36.140 --> 00:35:38.512 But pending that you know I, I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00:35:38.512 \dashrightarrow 00:35:41.022$ I in parts of some sessions where we NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00:35:41.022 \rightarrow 00:35:42.736$ talked about other severity illness

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

00:35:42.736 --> 00:35:44.950 sports and I I thought practically

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00{:}35{:}44{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}47{.}080$ software was chosen but very simple.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

00:35:47.080 --> 00:35:49.600 But even if you look at Apache

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

00:35:49.600 - 00:35:51.680 two and talk to the developers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00:35:51.680 \rightarrow 00:35:53.560$ they said these were population

NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584 00:35:53.560 --> 00:35:55.738 statistics to sort of adjust in NOTE Confidence: 0.2821584

 $00{:}35{:}55{.}738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}57{.}959$ large clinical trials and things like

NOTE Confidence: 0.31171604

 $00{:}35{:}57{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}00{.}160$ that. They weren't really intended

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00{:}36{:}00{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}03{.}232$ to be a bed side test. Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00{:}36{:}03.232 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}05.104$ The question about how an individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00{:}36{:}05{.}104 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}06{.}932$ person was going to do So do we

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00{:}36{:}06{.}932 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}08{.}168$ anticipate that there are any trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:36:08.168 \rightarrow 00:36:09.719$ that would actually work well in an or,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00{:}36{:}12.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}13.620$ you know, measure that you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

00:36:13.620 --> 00:36:14.600 use for individual patients?

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

00:36:14.600 - 00:36:15.880 That would be, yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

00:36:15.880 --> 00:36:17.718 I know the next, the next topic

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:36:17.718 \rightarrow 00:36:18.834$ when we start talking about age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

00:36:18.840 --> 00:36:20.838 I think a score, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00{:}36{:}20{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}22{.}576$ kind of giving away when we're talking

 $00:36:22.576 \longrightarrow 00:36:24.805$ about a score that includes age and

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:36:24.805 \rightarrow 00:36:26.237$ several important clinical predictors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:36:26.240 \longrightarrow 00:36:27.440$ Like is the patient in shock,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:36:27.440 \longrightarrow 00:36:28.440$ the degree of their hypoxia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00{:}36{:}28{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}30{.}404$ respiratory failure in combination

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00{:}36{:}30{.}404 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}33{.}835$ with perhaps having a four hour trial NOTE Confidence: $0{.}3152254$

 $00:36:33.835 \dashrightarrow 00:36:36.265$ period on life support to collect

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:36:36.265 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.838$ more data that if we fit a score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00{:}36{:}38{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}40{.}304$ a multigradable prediction model

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00{:}36{:}40{.}304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}41{.}778$ of that Haitian population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:36:41.778 \dashrightarrow 00:36:44.361$ I think we can get something that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00{:}36{:}44{.}361 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}46{.}389$ parsimonious that doesn't require a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00{:}36{:}46{.}389 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}48{.}321$ of heavy duty calculation trying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:36:48.321 \dashrightarrow 00:36:50.230$ avoid sort of deep learning AI approaches,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:36:50.230 \rightarrow 00:36:51.880$ which I'm always very excited about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

00:36:51.880 --> 00:36:54.553 But it I think in practice like you said,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:36:54.560 \rightarrow 00:36:56.756$ SOFA was chosen because it's practical.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:36:56.760 \longrightarrow 00:36:58.594$ We can sort of see how someone
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00{:}36{:}58{.}594 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}59{.}880$ can calculate the bed side.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:36:59.880 \dashrightarrow 00:37:01.882$ Although if you ever look at those
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00{:}37{:}01.882 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}03.904$ SOFA scores that are epic and then
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:37:03.904 \rightarrow 00:37:05.554$ you look at the actual numbers,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- 00:37:05.560 00:37:06.919 they're very discordant.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- 00:37:06.919 --> 00:37:09.637 So I think SOFA is actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:37:09.640 \dashrightarrow 00:37:12.760$ fairly complicated to calculate.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- 00:37:12.760 --> 00:37:14.800 So you know personality is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:37:14.800 \longrightarrow 00:37:16.432$ not a partners for.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00{:}37{:}16{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}20{.}344$ I mean the related thing is one of the things
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:37:20.344 \rightarrow 00:37:24.038$ we working on this system is trajectory.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00{:}37{:}24.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}24.504$ You know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00{:}37{:}24.504 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}25.664$ you you see some body getting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

- $00:37:25.664 \rightarrow 00:37:26.960$ better and somebody getting worse.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00{:}37{:}26.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}28.400$ And that's.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- 00:37:28.400 --> 00:37:28.659 Yeah,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- 00:37:28.659 --> 00:37:28.918 no,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:37:28.918 \dashrightarrow 00:37:30.472$ that's why we really should try
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00{:}37{:}30{.}472 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}32{.}255$ to get to the platform because
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:37:32.255 \longrightarrow 00:37:34.132$ then that's that's exactly right.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00{:}37{:}34{.}132 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}36{.}480$ I think one of a lot of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00{:}37{:}36{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}37{.}520$ thought experiments around this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:37:37.520 \longrightarrow 00:37:38.870$ imagine a bunch of patients in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:37:38.870 \longrightarrow 00:37:40.559$ a room with the one ventilator,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:37:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:37:42.758$ and that's not the situation at all.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:37:42.760 \dashrightarrow 00:37:45.000$ You have is population of ICU patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- 00:37:45.000 --> 00:37:46.758 And once they're in the ICU,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- 00:37:46.760 --> 00:37:48.944 you can actually run much more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:37:48.944 \rightarrow 00:37:50.036$ complicated prediction models.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254
- $00:37:50.040 \longrightarrow 00:37:51.636$ You have a lot more information.

00:37:51.640 --> 00:37:53.537 You might be able to know very

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:37:53.537 \rightarrow 00:37:54.678$ specifically what their survival's

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:37:54.678 \rightarrow 00:37:56.610$ gonna be with a lot more certainty

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:37:56.610 \rightarrow 00:37:58.519$ than that person who just showed up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3152254

 $00:37:58.520 \longrightarrow 00:37:58.680$ Right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44416642

 $00:38:01.120 \longrightarrow 00:38:02.158$ Good. Can't we have someone here?

NOTE Confidence: 0.44416642

 $00:38:02.160 \longrightarrow 00:38:04.878$ Fight for the sofa. Come on. Anybody.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44416642

00:38:04.880 --> 00:38:07.560 Nobody wants to do that. No expense, OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.44416642

00:38:07.560 --> 00:38:08.519 The Ben's not going to have time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

 $00{:}38{:}09{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}10{.}400$ Yeah, it's gone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

 $00{:}38{:}10{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}12{.}240$ Move it on. Right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

00:38:12.240 --> 00:38:15.076 OK How about how old is somebody?

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

 $00:38:15.080 \longrightarrow 00:38:17.520$ Can we can we use, can we use that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

 $00{:}38{:}17{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}18{.}440$ Obviously a fair innings.

00:38:18.440 --> 00:38:19.960 A ******* fair innings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

00:38:19.960 --> 00:38:21.100 Prudential Lifespan Equity

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

00:38:21.100 --> 00:38:22.520 person would say yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

 $00:38:22.520 \longrightarrow 00:38:25.648$ But we live in America,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

 $00{:}38{:}25.648 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}28.960$ so it's a little bit more complicated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

00:38:28.960 --> 00:38:30.660 This was Utah's triage

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

 $00:38:30.660 \longrightarrow 00:38:32.360$ score before the pandemic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

00:38:32.360 - 00:38:33.816 They actually were one of the rare

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

 $00{:}38{:}33{.}816 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}34{.}962$ states that had like something

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

 $00{:}38{:}34{.}962 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}36{.}396$ written down like New York did.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

 $00{:}38{:}36{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}39{.}040$ New York was just all based on sofa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

00:38:39.040 --> 00:38:40.720 I don't know if everyone knows that story,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

 $00{:}38{:}40{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}42{.}196$ but most studies never activating it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27907595

00:38:42.200 --> 00:38:42.320 But

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:38:45.560 \longrightarrow 00:38:47.432$ Utah's career school score

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:38:47.432 \longrightarrow 00:38:48.836$ has estimated survival,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00:38:48.840 \rightarrow 00:38:51.560$ so saving lives is protocolized,

 $00:38:51.560 \longrightarrow 00:38:52.872$ explicitly right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:38:52.872 \longrightarrow 00:38:55.840$ 3 bins and sort of equally as

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:38:55.840 \rightarrow 00:38:58.120$ important as how old someone is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:38:58.120 \longrightarrow 00:39:00.757$ So are they. They're less than 30 years old.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39:00.760 \longrightarrow 00:39:01.880$ They get only one point.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39:01.880 \rightarrow 00:39:03.398$ If they're over the over 60,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39:03.400 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.668$ they get three points.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39:04.668 \dashrightarrow 00:39:07.535$ So being over 60 is the same as having

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:39:07.535 - > 00:39:09.959 less than a 10% chance of survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}39{:}09{.}959 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}14.096$ So this is a very large, I would argue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39:14.096 \rightarrow 00:39:18.320$ fair innings weight in this protocol.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39:18.320 \longrightarrow 00:39:21.488$ Not that this was none of this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39{:}21.488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}23.256$ explicitly argued from bio in perspective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:39:23.256 --> 00:39:24.969 Like it just sort of somebody writes

 $00{:}39{:}24.969 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}26.529$ it down and then you can kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}39{:}26{.}529 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}28{.}611$ see which is what I think is so

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39:28.611 \rightarrow 00:39:29.738$ interesting about quantitative biotics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}39{:}29{.}738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}31{.}766$ But then this mid category is

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:39:31.766 --> 00:39:33.506 kind of problematic too, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:39:33.506 --> 00:39:35.200 It's, it's an ASA score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39:35.200 \longrightarrow 00:39:37.150$ so it's capturing the patient's

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:39:37.150 --> 00:39:38.320 chronic disease state,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:39:38.320 --> 00:39:40.220 but it's a different access

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}39{:}40{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}41{.}671$ than estimated survival, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:39:41.671 - 00:39:44.159 So the idea is that people who are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39:44.160 \longrightarrow 00:39:45.915$ the problem potentially with this

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39:45.915 \rightarrow 00:39:48.579$ is that people who have disease are

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39:48.579 \rightarrow 00:39:51.094$ somehow less deserving of the resource,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:39:51.094 --> 00:39:51.512 right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:39:51.512 \rightarrow 00:39:54.840$ That's what this is kind of implying,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00{:}39{:}54{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}57{.}320$ because if these factors matter
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00:39:57.320 \longrightarrow 00:39:59.720$ for their Bible to discharge,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00:39:59.720 \longrightarrow 00:40:01.045$ they would be incorporated in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00:40:01.045 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.351$ this bottom column, right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00{:}40{:}02{.}351 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}04{.}906$ And if these factors are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- 00:40:04.906 --> 00:40:06.636 about life expectancy, OK,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00:40:06.636 \longrightarrow 00:40:08.204$ And then you can sort of see how
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00:40:08.204 \rightarrow 00:40:09.719$ these would be combined together.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- 00:40:09.720 --> 00:40:11.118 It's still a fair innings argument,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00:40:11.120 \longrightarrow 00:40:11.448$ potentially.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00:40:11.448 \longrightarrow 00:40:12.432$ Not really, though,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00:40:12.432 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.400$ because what if you're a child?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00{:}40{:}14.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}16.719$ This is yours.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00{:}40{:}16.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}19.144$ This is a little muddled both
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- $00:40:19.144 \longrightarrow 00:40:20.356$ bioethically and practically.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:40:20.360 --> 00:40:25.170 And so protocols like this cause a

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}40{:}25.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}28.464$ lot of action over the summer after

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}40{:}28{.}464$ --> $00{:}40{:}30{.}936$ our initial waves by the Department NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:40:30.936 --> 00:40:32.952 of Health and Human Services Office

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}40{:}32{.}952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}34{.}794$ of Civil Rights where they sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}40{:}34{.}794 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}36{.}614$ of went through all the CSCS and

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}40{:}36.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}38.716$ stripped out mention of age or

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}40{:}38.716 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}40.810$ disability in a primary score and

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}40{:}40{.}879 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}43{.}477$ even sometimes in the secondary score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}40{:}43{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}44{.}218$ a tiebreaker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}40{:}44{.}218 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}46{.}801$ So This is why that map is

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:40:46.801 \longrightarrow 00:40:48.520$ all sofa only sofa,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}40{:}48.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}51.136$ because all considerations of age or

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:40:51.136 \rightarrow 00:40:52.880$ disability were essentially removed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}40{:}52.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}54.744$ I think Doug White was able to keep

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}40{:}54{.}744 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}56{.}760$ like his tiebreaker in there somehow.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554
- 00:40:56.760 --> 00:40:58.880 But you know, in general,

 $00:40:58.880 \rightarrow 00:41:00.844$ age was dramatically deprioritized

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:41:00.844 --> 00:41:03.325 from the OR removed from these

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}41{:}03{.}325 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}05{.}000$ protocols where using age to

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}41{:}05{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}06{.}997$ decide how you're going to triage

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}41{:}07.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}09.765$ was essentially from a regulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}41{:}09.765 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}10.864$ standpoint made impossible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:41:10.864 \longrightarrow 00:41:12.768$ So they did this in like 10

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}41{:}12.768 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}14.360$ different States and this is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:41:14.360 --> 00:41:15.880 type of language they would use,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:41:15.880 \longrightarrow 00:41:17.520$ move on to life expectancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:41:17.520 --> 00:41:19.680 categorical exclusion based on age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}41{:}19.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}20.876$ disability and functional impairment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}41{:}20.876 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}23.024$ There's a lot of concern in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}41{:}23.024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}24.549$ disability community that there would

 $00:41:24.549 \rightarrow 00:41:26.312$ be explicit discrimination against

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:41:26.312 \longrightarrow 00:41:28.720$ patients with chronic physical

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:41:28.720 \longrightarrow 00:41:30.760$ or neurological disabilities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}41{:}30.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}32.368$ Impairment and like would take

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}41{:}32{.}368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}33{.}296$ ventilators away from people

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:41:33.296 \rightarrow 00:41:34.759$ who are chronically ventilated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:41:34.760 \longrightarrow 00:41:36.720$ for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:41:36.720 \rightarrow 00:41:38.598$ and make sure that people with

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}41{:}38{.}598 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}39{.}850$ disabilities are valued based

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:41:39.903 \longrightarrow 00:41:41.518$ on their actual mortality risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:41:41.520 \longrightarrow 00:41:44.600$ not the value of their life or their,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:41:44.600 --> 00:41:46.316 you know, sort of qualities remaining.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00{:}41{:}46{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}50{.}320$ Right. And so apparently they changed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

 $00:41:50.320 \longrightarrow 00:41:52.080$ Utah, changed their plan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27438554

00:41:52.080 --> 00:41:53.074 But when I clicked on the link,

NOTE Confidence: 0.42489943

00:41:53.080 --> 00:41:54.452 it's broken. I did a lot of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.42489943
- 00:41:54.452 --> 00:41:55.296 searching last night. I'm like,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.42489943
- $00{:}41{:}55{.}296 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}56{.}192$ oh, what did they change it to?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.42489943
- 00:41:56.200 --> 00:41:58.636 But it's probably just this bottom,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.42489943
- $00:42:00.920 \longrightarrow 00:42:02.258$ the bottom one. Now this is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.42489943
- 00:42:02.258 --> 00:42:03.600 kind of like well payment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.42489943
- $00:42:03.600 \longrightarrow 00:42:04.512$ so we're going to have to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.42489943
- $00:42:04.512 \longrightarrow 00:42:05.120$ really worry about it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.42489943
- $00:42:05.120 \longrightarrow 00:42:07.766$ But I assume state of Utah is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.42489943
- $00{:}42{:}07.766 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}09.515$ just about estimated survival
- NOTE Confidence: 0.42489943
- $00:42:09.515 \longrightarrow 00:42:12.165$ and throwing all these these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.42489943
- 00:42:12.165 00:42:15.840 other considerations out. So I
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504
- 00:42:15.840 --> 00:42:16.360 want to talk about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504
- $00:42:16.360 \rightarrow 00:42:18.110$ the two potential ethical justifications
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504
- $00{:}42{:}18.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}20.460$ for using age, and this is a good
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504
- $00{:}42{:}20.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}21.760$ time to have some discussion.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:42:21.760 \longrightarrow 00:42:24.224$ The first idea is that the value

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:42:24.224 --> 00:42:26.080 of younger lives is higher.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}42{:}26.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}28.608$ This of course has been sort of explicitly

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}42{:}28.608 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}30.530$ rejected by the previous administration's

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}42{:}30{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}32{.}680$ Health and Human Services department.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:42:32.680 \longrightarrow 00:42:34.678$ But, you know, this is justified.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}42{:}34{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}36{.}969$ And this fits into the idea that

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:42:36.969 --> 00:42:39.296 younger lives in general, not always,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}42{:}39{.}296 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}42{.}095$ but have more like years to gain, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:42:42.095 \rightarrow 00:42:43.600$ If you're like like a previous example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:42:43.600 \longrightarrow 00:42:45.080$ if you're 40 years old,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:42:45.080 \longrightarrow 00:42:47.096$ even if you have a higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:42:47.096 --> 00:42:48.886 probability of short term mortality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:42:48.886 \rightarrow 00:42:51.430$ you're much more likely to gain

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}42{:}51{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}52{.}980$ more life years with treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:42:52.980 \longrightarrow 00:42:54.840$ than some others in their 80s.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504
- $00:42:54.840 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.760$ And then the second idea,

 $00:42:55.760 \rightarrow 00:42:57.028$ as we discussed 4,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:42:57.028 \rightarrow 00:42:58.930$ is that younger lives really are

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}42{:}58{.}996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}01{.}082$ higher in terms of that they haven't

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:01.082 \rightarrow 00:43:03.599$ got to play in their 90s at baseball.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}43{:}03{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}07{.}640$ So we owe them because they're worse off.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}43{:}07{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}09{.}840$ But there's another reason to

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:09.840 \longrightarrow 00:43:11.728$ use age in a triage war.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}43{:}11.728 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}13.770$ And that age is a strong independent

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}43{:}13.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}16.080$ predictor of short term survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:16.080 \longrightarrow 00:43:17.970$ Who was most likely to die

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:17.970 \longrightarrow 00:43:19.452$ from COVID the elderly?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}43{:}19{.}452 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}22{.}434$ Who did we allocate COVID vaccines to?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:22.440 \longrightarrow 00:43:25.144$ 1st the elderly?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:25.144 \longrightarrow 00:43:28.168$ We used age because it was a

00:43:28.168 --> 00:43:30.760 tremendous predictor of benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:30.760 \longrightarrow 00:43:32.920$ from COVID-19 vaccination.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:32.920 \longrightarrow 00:43:35.008$ The converse is true here that

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:35.008 \rightarrow 00:43:37.672$ younger patients are much more likely

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}43{:}37.672 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}40.593$ to be nefit to survive from life

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:40.593 \rightarrow 00:43:43.038$ support if they develop respiratory

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:43:43.038 --> 00:43:45.250 failure or chronic respiratory

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:45.250 \longrightarrow 00:43:47.434$ failure or chronic failure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:43:47.440 --> 00:43:49.216 So you need to use age if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}43{:}49{.}216 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}50{.}920$ want to save the most lives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}43{:}50{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}53{.}236$ We don't have an alternative number.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:53.240 \longrightarrow 00:43:54.196$ That's the practical thing

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}43{:}54{.}196 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}56{.}080$ that we can do on the bed side.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:56.080 \longrightarrow 00:43:58.384$ And this is some data that

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}43{:}58{.}384 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}59{.}920$ we have under review.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:43:59.920 \rightarrow 00:44:02.560$ We we presented ATS,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504
- $00:44:02.560 \longrightarrow 00:44:03.952$ the American Thrust Society

00:44:03.952 --> 00:44:04.996 conference last spring,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:44:05.000 --> 00:44:06.836 so I'll walk you through it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:44:06.840 \rightarrow 00:44:10.092$ The X axis is how old the person went and

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:44:10.092 --> 00:44:12.297 this is the population of like 90% COVID,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:44:12.297 \longrightarrow 00:44:12.714 \ 10\%.$

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:44:12.714 --> 00:44:15.462 Others supposed to simulate a pandemic surge.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}44{:}15{.}462 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}17{.}779$ And then the black bars are what

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:44:17.779 --> 00:44:19.398 percentage of them actually died.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:44:19.400 --> 00:44:20.960 So as you can see yes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:44:20.960 --> 00:44:22.079 people get older.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}44{:}22.079 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}24.729$ The probability of death goes up the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}44{:}24{.}729 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}27{.}183$ the red bars are their predicted

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:44:27.183 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.478$ mortality by sofa score of all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}44{:}29{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}31{.}046$ And remember we've defined this as

 $00:44:31.046 \rightarrow 00:44:32.640$ a crisis standard care population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}44{:}32.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}34.332$ So they're all quite they're pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:44:34.332 --> 00:44:36.296 sick and they have higher sof
a scores

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:44:36.296 \rightarrow 00:44:38.796$ and it just all is pretty much the same.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:44:38.800 \longrightarrow 00:44:40.960$ So the red bars are all the same.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:44:40.960 \longrightarrow 00:44:43.408$ But if you make a new model that

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:44:43.408 \longrightarrow 00:44:44.879$ incorporates both sofa and age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:44:44.880 \longrightarrow 00:44:45.924$ you're much more accurate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}44{:}45{.}924 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}46{.}707$ You're actually predicting

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:44:46.707 - 00:44:47.840 who's going to survive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}44{:}47{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}48{.}920$ And any critical care physician

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:44:48.920 \longrightarrow 00:44:50.000$ in the room would say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}44{:}50{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}51{.}729$ I'd much rather have a patient who's

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}44{:}51.729 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}53.631$ 40 with a Silva of eight than an

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}44{:}53{.}631 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}55{.}599$ 80 year old with a Silva of three.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:44:55.600 --> 00:44:56.680 Right.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504
- 00:44:56.680 --> 00:44:59.745 That age tells you so much

00:44:59.745 --> 00:45:01.333 clinically about someone's ability

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}45{:}01{.}333 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}03{.}559$ to survive critical fullness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:45:03.560 \longrightarrow 00:45:04.252$ This is nothing new.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

00:45:04.252 --> 00:45:05.559 It's why I'm trying to get this

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:45:05.559 \rightarrow 00:45:06.684$ published cause the critical care

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:45:06.684 \rightarrow 00:45:07.920$ journal's like this is obvious.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00:45:07.920 \longrightarrow 00:45:09.740$ This is why age is in Apache

NOTE Confidence: 0.6721504

 $00{:}45{:}09{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}10{.}520$ and all those

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}45{:}10.582 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}12.902$ other scores and then you know like what's

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}45{:}12{.}902 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}14{.}519$ all this ethics stuff in the discussion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}45{:}14.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}15.840$ But we'll we'll get there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}45{:}15{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}18{.}280$ We'll get there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:45:18.280 \longrightarrow 00:45:19.600$ Why are you talking about law?

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

00:45:19.600 --> 00:45:21.240 Like what's what is happening

- $00:45:21.240 \longrightarrow 00:45:22.552$ in this paper Bud?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278
- 00:45:22.560 --> 00:45:24.837 I think you know it sort of jumps off

 $00{:}45{:}24.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}27.400$ the the page to me that you know if

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:45:27.400 \rightarrow 00:45:29.600$ your if your goal is to save the most lives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:45:29.600 \rightarrow 00:45:30.600$ you have to use age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:45:30.600 \rightarrow 00:45:34.360$ just like we use age to distribute vaccines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}45{:}34{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}37{.}120$ So I think there's a robust

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:45:37.120 \longrightarrow 00:45:38.040$ ethical justification.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

00:45:38.040 --> 00:45:39.500 And even Dan Salmaisy who

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}45{:}39{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}40{.}960$ used to be in Chicago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:45:40.960 \longrightarrow 00:45:42.664$ who's really against fair

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

00:45:42.664 --> 00:45:44.794 innings and saving life years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:45:44.800 \longrightarrow 00:45:45.920$ concedes his first point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:45:45.920 \longrightarrow 00:45:47.320$ that using age as one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}45{:}47{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}49{.}196$ as one variable among many to save

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:45:49.196 \longrightarrow 00:45:51.320$ lives as a robust justification.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278
- $00:45:51.320 \longrightarrow 00:45:52.445$ If you remove age from

 $00{:}45{:}52{.}445 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}53{.}120$ life support allocation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:45:53.120 \rightarrow 00:45:56.080$ I would say that's like anti young ages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

00:45:56.080 --> 00:45:57.720 I'm almost like you're penalizing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:45:57.720 \rightarrow 00:45:59.729$ you're you're saying the lives of younger

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}45{:}59{.}729 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}02{.}000$ people are less valuable than older people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:46:02.000 \longrightarrow 00:46:03.548$ I would argue that's what our

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}46{:}03{.}548 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}04{.}760$ current trans protocols would do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:46:04.760 \longrightarrow 00:46:08.112$ And then finally, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:46:08.112 \longrightarrow 00:46:09.736$ all these ideas, fair things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

00:46:09.736 --> 00:46:10.472 parental lifespan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}46{:}10.472 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}12.680$ equity saving lives have broad appeal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}46{:}12.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}14.493$ And I would argue that CSCS ignoring

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}46{:}14{.}493 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}15{.}920$ these ideas are problematic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}46{:}15{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}17{.}894$ And the nice thing is if you

 $00:46:17.894 \rightarrow 00:46:19.799$ just use it to save lives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

00:46:19.800 --> 00:46:20.592 you get, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}46{:}20.592 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}21.780$ kind of knock on benefits across

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:46:21.825 \rightarrow 00:46:23.213$ these other principles, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:46:23.213 \longrightarrow 00:46:25.678$ They tend to go together.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}46{:}25.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}27.871$ So even though your objective with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:46:27.871 \rightarrow 00:46:30.157$ protocol could be to save the most lives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00:46:30.160 \longrightarrow 00:46:31.576$ there will be sort of secondary

NOTE Confidence: 0.27974278

 $00{:}46{:}31{.}576$ --> $00{:}46{:}32{.}920$ benefits for the other balance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39421406

 $00:46:35.400 \longrightarrow 00:46:36.600$ So that's age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39421406

 $00{:}46{:}36{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}39{.}000$ I'd like to hear people's thoughts

NOTE Confidence: 0.39421406

00:46:39.000 --> 00:46:41.599 and comments about using agency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39421406

00:46:41.600 --> 00:46:44.525 S ES Ben. Oh yeah. Sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39421406

00:46:44.525 --> 00:46:45.400 Wait probably wait for that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39396146

00:46:47.960 --> 00:46:48.640 So, so I I

NOTE Confidence: 0.39396146

 $00:46:49.200 \longrightarrow 00:46:50.400$ strongly agree with the

- NOTE Confidence: 0.39396146
- $00:46:51.520 \longrightarrow 00:46:55.720$ argument for using a based on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39396146
- $00:46:55.720 \longrightarrow 00:46:59.080$ predictive value when when we turned
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39396146
- 00:46:59.080 --> 00:47:02.960 away from sofa aid was was definitely,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39396146
- $00:47:03.440 \longrightarrow 00:47:04.610$ you know the the comparator
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39396146
- $00:47:04.610 \longrightarrow 00:47:07.640$ we were looking at was more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39396146
- $00{:}47{:}07{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}10{.}560$ accurate in in our community.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39396146
- $00:47:10.560 \longrightarrow 00:47:13.640$ The white patients were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39396146
- $00{:}47{:}13.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}14.840$ just fortunately older than
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25442088
- 00:47:15.760 --> 00:47:18.240 David Doss. Yeah same thing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25442088
- $00:47:18.240 \longrightarrow 00:47:20.360$ So it would have been you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25442088
- $00:47:20.360 \longrightarrow 00:47:21.960$ know the perspective of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25442088
- $00:47:22.160 \longrightarrow 00:47:23.140$ racial equity would have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25442088
- $00{:}47{:}23.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}24.120$ been better than sofa.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25442088
- $00{:}47{:}26.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}29.066$ Yeah and so it's and and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25442088
- 00:47:29.066 --> 00:47:31.280 also it was much easier.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25442088

00:47:31.280 --> 00:47:33.345 We didn't we couldn't put

NOTE Confidence: 0.25442088

 $00{:}47{:}33{.}345 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}34{.}997$ together triage things just

NOTE Confidence: 0.25442088

 $00{:}47{:}35{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}36{.}490$ from a feasibility perspective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25442088

 $00:47:36.490 \longrightarrow 00:47:38.520$ Age would have been needed to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00{:}47{:}38{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}41{.}336$ right and age is of course not chronological

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00{:}47{:}41.336 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}43.678$ age is surrogate for biological age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00:47:43.680 \longrightarrow 00:47:45.600$ There's like they're you know it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

00:47:45.600 --> 00:47:47.146 imperfect right. But it's something

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00{:}47{:}47{.}146 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}48.654$ that's verifiable and easy. Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

00:47:48.654 --> 00:47:50.712 I was hoping that age plus sofa

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00{:}47{:}50{.}712 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}52{.}570$ score would debias it. It doesn't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00:47:52.570 \longrightarrow 00:47:54.400$ You have to do something else.

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

00:47:54.400 - 00:47:56.240 I'll show you later on we get there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00{:}47{:}56{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}59{.}960$ But so there's still a sofa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00:47:59.960 \rightarrow 00:48:02.096$ Score's bias is so severe even if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00{:}48{:}02.096 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}03.928$ account for the fact that black and

00:48:03.928 --> 00:48:05.512 Hispanic patients are younger and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00:48:05.512 \longrightarrow 00:48:07.336$ in the in the predictive score you

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00:48:07.336 \rightarrow 00:48:09.319$ still have to over with the disparity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00:48:09.320 \longrightarrow 00:48:11.216$ So that's but I think as we said

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00{:}48{:}11{.}216 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}13{.}017$ the most logical thing to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00:48:13.017 \rightarrow 00:48:14.592$ is throw soap out completely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00{:}48{:}14.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}16.160$ You can build a new score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

00:48:16.160 --> 00:48:17.975 We're trying out SEPA severity

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

00:48:17.975 --> 00:48:20.173 illness plus age 'cause we don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

00:48:20.173 -> 00:48:22.399 want to start with age that like

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00{:}48{:}22{.}399 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}24{.}176$ trigger the anti ageist people like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.441581434285714

 $00{:}48{:}24.176$ --> $00{:}48{:}25.596$ So that's what we're starting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.31783116

 $00:48:28.280 \longrightarrow 00:48:29.615$ One other point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31783116

 $00{:}48{:}29.615$ --> $00{:}48{:}32.285$ even with one national triage that I'm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31783116

 $00{:}48{:}32{.}285 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}33{.}275$ I'm aware of that we've done

 $00:48:33.280 \longrightarrow 00:48:35.746$ recently with vaccines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31783116

 $00{:}48{:}35{.}746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}39{.}373$ age was universally accepted, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.31783116

 $00:48:39.373 \longrightarrow 00:48:42.548$ It's bizarre to me that it was so

NOTE Confidence: 0.31783116

 $00:48:42.548 \rightarrow 00:48:44.060$ widely accepted and uncontroversial

NOTE Confidence: 0.31783116

 $00:48:44.130 \longrightarrow 00:48:45.965$ in the allocation of vaccines

NOTE Confidence: 0.31783116

 $00:48:45.965 \longrightarrow 00:48:48.080$ that which has been so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.31783116

 $00{:}48{:}48{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}51{.}560$ so controversial in ICU allocation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:48:51.760 --> 00:48:52.936 Yeah, I think part of it is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:48:52.936 --> 00:48:53.963 if you don't allocate someone

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:48:53.963 \rightarrow 00:48:55.118$ life support and needs it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:48:55.120 \longrightarrow 00:48:57.240$ they just will die immediately.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:48:57.240 --> 00:48:59.400 Whereas young people, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:48:59.400 \longrightarrow 00:49:00.720 \text{ most of them just were able to wait.}$

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:49:00.720 --> 00:49:02.155 You guys can wait and get their

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}02{.}155 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}03{.}505$ vaccine later on and they survive

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:49:03.505 \rightarrow 00:49:05.331$ except for the ones who didn't, right.

00:49:05.331 --> 00:49:08.378 And and I think there were you

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}08{.}378 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}10{.}406$ know there was there was trade-offs

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:49:10.406 \longrightarrow 00:49:12.720$ there with that decision of 65 plus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}12.720$ --> $00{:}49{:}14.876$ right for for vaccines obviously I think NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}14.876$ --> $00{:}49{:}16.660$ they were justified because we saved

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}16.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}18.529$ a lot more lives by vaccinating the

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:49:18.587 - 00:49:20.435 elderly people than people under 65.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}20{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}22{.}162$ But make no mistake that was a

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}22.162 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}23.981$ choice and there were a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}23{.}981 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}25{.}517$ people who were sixty with diabetes

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:49:25.578 --> 00:49:28.375 would Incarnate settings who died of

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:49:28.375 --> 00:49:31.720 COVID and waited for their vaccine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}31{.}720$ --> $00{:}49{:}35{.}128$ So any other comments on age just NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

Ito I E confidence: 0.05501010

00:49:35.128 --> 00:49:37.570 just I I haven't not in the past I

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}37{.}570$ --> $00{:}49{:}39{.}565$ might not see you next could you just NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:49:39.565 --> 00:49:41.983 clarify for us now so so you you make

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}41{.}983 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}43{.}959$ a good argument for using age and

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:49:43.959 --> 00:49:46.470 I I I agree with that too but can

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:49:46.549 \rightarrow 00:49:49.034$ you just clarify for us where the

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}49{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}51{.}038$ federal government stands on this now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:49:51.040 --> 00:49:53.360 Well, it's a new administration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}53{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}55{.}652$ presumably there's been some shake up NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:49:55.652 --> 00:49:57.822 this hasn't this actually never went

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}57{.}822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}59{.}124$ to court And then Scoben's explained NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}49{:}59{.}124 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}00{.}733$ this to me like 5 times with the law NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}00{.}733 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}02{.}000$ of stuff and then it was screwed up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}02.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}03.560$ But it's never been litigated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}03{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}05{.}320$ So it's not like it's gone to court,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}05{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}07{.}324$ federal court and they've said the

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:50:07.324 \rightarrow 00:50:09.916$ using age in the CSC violates the age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}09{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}12{.}020$ just anti Age Discrimination Act

 $00{:}50{:}12.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}13.859$ of 1976 or whatever.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}13.859 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}16.697$ And then also like from a

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}16.697 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}18.240$ constitutional perspective,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}18.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}20.248$ age is not a protected class in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}20{.}248 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}22{.}236$ same way as race and ethnicity is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:50:22.240 \longrightarrow 00:50:23.251$ So a, a,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}23.251 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}25.273$ a state could presumably pass a

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:50:25.273 \rightarrow 00:50:27.991$ law that says we care about saving

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}27{.}991 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}30{.}680$ life years and that would hold up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:50:30.680 \longrightarrow 00:50:32.031$ although none of this he has like

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}32.031 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}33.590$ a huge law review article on that

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}33{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}35{.}055$ can't make sense on this. So.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:50:35.055 \rightarrow 00:50:37.120$ So yeah, that's where it is now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:50:37.120 --> 00:50:38.280 I I don't think.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}38{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}40{.}160$ I think the first step from a

 $00:50:40.160 \rightarrow 00:50:41.780$ research perspective and bioethical

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}41.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}44.520$ perspective is just to kind of like

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:50:44.520 \rightarrow 00:50:46.278$ hammer this home in the literature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:50:46.280 --> 00:50:48.222 right, And just show like, hey,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}48.222 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}49.776$ this is if you're making a triage

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:50:49.776 \longrightarrow 00:50:51.000$ for how old someone is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:50:51.000 \longrightarrow 00:50:52.392$ is critically important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:50:52.392 \rightarrow 00:50:55.640$ And hopefully the weight of that evidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}55{.}718 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}56{.}960$ will effect policy down the line.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00{:}50{:}56{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}59{.}109$ But we're really far away from having

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:50:59.109 \rightarrow 00:51:00.679$ sensible CSC policy these days.

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

00:51:00.680 --> 00:51:02.160 And just a quick note,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:51:02.160 \longrightarrow 00:51:02.916$ because I think a lot of people

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:51:02.916 \longrightarrow 00:51:03.400$ in the room know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:51:03.400 \longrightarrow 00:51:04.660$ certainly other people who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873

 $00:51:04.660 \rightarrow 00:51:05.920$ working on our policy here

- NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873
- $00:51:05.920 \rightarrow 00:51:07.280$ because in the pediatric world,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873
- 00:51:07.280 --> 00:51:09.835 the sofa isn't really for the kids.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873
- $00{:}51{:}09{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}11{.}380$ So we used a different store called
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873
- 00:51:11.380 --> 00:51:12.840 the PLA Two and for new borns
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873
- $00:51:12.840 \longrightarrow 00:51:13.800$ there was nothing available.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873
- 00:51:13.800 --> 00:51:15.840 So we actually sort of jury rigged
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873
- $00:51:15.840 \rightarrow 00:51:17.080$ something for the purposes of our.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873
- 00:51:17.080 --> 00:51:20.960 Yeah, our here. Yeah, You know, they don't.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.39907873
- $00:51:20.960 \longrightarrow 00:51:21.760$ So there we go first.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788
- 00:51:21.760 --> 00:51:24.920 Yeah, favouring the young person,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788
- $00:51:24.920 \rightarrow 00:51:26.570$ the old becomes hugely important
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788
- $00{:}51{:}26{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}28{.}849$ when for example here in Yale it's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788
- $00:51:28.849 \rightarrow 00:51:30.367$ essentially the same ventilators that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788
- $00{:}51{:}30{.}367 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}32{.}194$ we use for the 80 year olds and two
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788
- $00{:}51{:}32{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}34{.}440$ year olds and the 23 week preterm baby.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

 $00:51:34.440 \longrightarrow 00:51:36.480$ Now that may be changed by the time the next.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

00:51:36.480 --> 00:51:37.360 Sure. Yeah it's a little,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

00:51:37.360 --> 00:51:39.352 I guess it's a little U-shaped

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

 $00:51:39.352 \longrightarrow 00:51:41.752$ in the sense that a 23 week old,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

 $00{:}51{:}41{.}752 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}43{.}715$ you know may may have a you

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

 $00:51:43.715 \rightarrow 00:51:45.375$ know 50% mortality or something.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

 $00:51:45.375 \longrightarrow 00:51:47.930$ So that that those types of

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

 $00:51:48.000 \rightarrow 00:51:50.325$ considerations would happen and obviously

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

 $00{:}51{:}50{.}325 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}53{.}136$ with with COVID since infecting you

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

00:51:53.136 --> 00:51:56.455 know 99% adults then in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

00:51:56.455 --> 00:51:58.355 causing critical illness anyway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

 $00{:}51{:}58{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}59{.}701$ we kind of got a free pass on that

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

 $00{:}51{:}59{.}701 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}00{.}850$ but that's another issue with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

 $00{:}52{:}00{.}850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}02{.}479$ age that we have to deal with right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29941788

 $00:52:02.480 \dashrightarrow 00:52:03.400$ Thanks. Here's another question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29667825

 $00{:}52{:}05{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}07{.}616$ So I'm a first year my student never

- NOTE Confidence: 0.29667825
- $00{:}52{:}07.616 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}09.598$ heard of sofa before this but I would just

00:52:09.920 --> 00:52:11.000 hopefully you'll never hear again.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29667825

00:52:11.000 --> 00:52:11.876 No, it's going to be around.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29667825

 $00:52:11.880 \longrightarrow 00:52:13.356$ It's been around for 30 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29667825

 $00:52:13.360 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.439$ People like people would go stick or sofa for

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:52:16.240 \longrightarrow 00:52:16.879$ This is why?

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:52:24.160 \longrightarrow 00:52:25.838$ Well this is that's a great question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:52:25.840 \longrightarrow 00:52:28.080$ This is a cohort defined

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:52:28.080 \longrightarrow 00:52:29.872$ as critically ill people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:52:29.880 \longrightarrow 00:52:32.060$ So everyone here needed a

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00{:}52{:}32.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}33.804$ ventilator or needed basolactin

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00{:}52{:}33{.}804 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}35{.}639$ medications to treat their shock.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:52:35.640 \longrightarrow 00:52:37.220$ So the by construction

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00{:}52{:}37{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}39{.}195$ this is a sick population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:52:39.200 \longrightarrow 00:52:40.825$ the population that you would

 $00:52:40.825 \rightarrow 00:52:42.450$ be running crisis standard care

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00{:}52{:}42{.}507 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}44{.}157$ protocol like you have to have,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:52:44.160 \longrightarrow 00:52:45.770$ you have to have at least like

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:52:45.770 \longrightarrow 00:52:47.419$ a SOFA by construction of three

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00{:}52{:}47{.}419 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}49{.}512$ or four if you think about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:52:49.574 \rightarrow 00:52:51.359$ score in order to get in there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:52:51.360 \longrightarrow 00:52:53.586$ But yes, there isn't as much correlation

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:52:53.586 \rightarrow 00:52:55.797$ between age and sofa as you'd expect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00{:}52{:}55{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}58{.}248$ But remember this is part of the problem of NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

00:52:58.248 --> 00:53:01.920 it just it's before the life support starts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00{:}53{:}01{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}05{.}840$ So you're just using like how how bad was

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00{:}53{:}05{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}09{.}636$ there pulse oximetry to its own problems too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:53:09.640 \rightarrow 00:53:11.635$ right before they started on the ventilator.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00{:}53{:}11.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}14.080$ And so every one's was bad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00:53:14.080 \rightarrow 00:53:15.880$ The old people and young people

NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062

 $00{:}53{:}15{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}17{.}976$ are about the same right there.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062
- 00:53:17.976 --> 00:53:20.120 If you recalculated everything,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062
- $00{:}53{:}20{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}23{.}080$ couple days into the ICU stay age and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062
- $00{:}53{:}23{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}25{.}320$ silk would start to be more better
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062
- $00:53:25.320 \rightarrow 00:53:27.278$ correlating and like you would see this red,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062
- $00{:}53{:}27{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}28{.}445$ these red lines kind of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062
- 00:53:28.445 --> 00:53:29.456 **** a little like that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062
- $00:53:29.456 \longrightarrow 00:53:30.780$ Does that make sense? Yeah.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062
- $00:53:30.780 \longrightarrow 00:53:31.520$ Thank you.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062
- 00:53:31.520 --> 00:53:32.000 All right,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062
- $00:53:32.000 \rightarrow 00:53:32.480$ great question.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25546062
- 00:53:32.480 --> 00:53:32.720 So,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378
- $00{:}53{:}41.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}42.809$ so with age, the issue is so I
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378
- $00:53:42.809 \rightarrow 00:53:44.599$ work in the emergency department,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378
- $00{:}53{:}44.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}46.488$ they tell me about 30 patients of theirs
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378
- $00:53:46.488 \rightarrow 00:53:48.280$ and stuff like this is an 80 year old,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00:53:48.280 \longrightarrow 00:53:49.276$ blah blah. And I said stop.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00:53:49.280 \longrightarrow 00:53:51.503$ Is this an 80 year old who was playing

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00{:}53{:}51{.}503 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}53{.}622$ golf earlier today or is this an 80 year

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00{:}53{:}53{.}622 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}55{.}277$ old who scrolled up in a ball in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00:53:55.277 \rightarrow 00:53:57.080$ nursing home with three times of cancer?

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00:53:57.080 \dashrightarrow 00:53:58.520$ Because it's very different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00{:}53{:}58{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}00{.}320$ But then immediately we're interested

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00{:}54{:}00{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}03{.}712$ in able ism, you know, And so you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00{:}54{:}03.712 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}05.740$ in medicine we rarely think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00:54:05.812 \rightarrow 00:54:07.637$ age in any other situation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00:54:07.640 \rightarrow 00:54:09.160$ We're always talking about functional status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00:54:09.160 \longrightarrow 00:54:10.845$ For 20 or 30 years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00{:}54{:}10.845 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}12.720$ it's all about functional status.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

00:54:12.720 --> 00:54:14.746 But then I just get, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

 $00:54:14.746 \longrightarrow 00:54:17.000$ twirled up and and stuck.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378

00:54:17.000 --> 00:54:19.116 Yeah, age doesn't even want his own.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.3049378
- $00{:}54{:}19{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}20{.}200$ But it it should matter.

 $00{:}54{:}20{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}24{.}075$ Yeah, I think it's obviously there's for

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00:54:24.075 \rightarrow 00:54:26.840$ any given numerical age someone is 80,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00:54:26.840 \longrightarrow 00:54:30.095$ let's say that that has there's a

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00{:}54{:}30.095 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}32.440$ distribution of what that means

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00:54:32.440 \longrightarrow 00:54:34.196$ for surviving critical illness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00:54:34.196 \longrightarrow 00:54:36.830$ Some 80 year olds probably are

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00:54:36.900 \longrightarrow 00:54:38.770$ actually like the average 70

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00:54:38.770 \longrightarrow 00:54:41.640$ year old or 65 year old, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00:54:41.640 \longrightarrow 00:54:43.532$ But that being said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00{:}54{:}43{.}532 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}45{.}920$ I think you using the average

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00{:}54{:}45{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}48{.}440$ value for the average 80 year old,

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00:54:48.440 \rightarrow 00:54:50.786$ so including your two extreme examples

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00{:}54{:}50{.}786 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}53{.}795$ in the middle is part of the triage

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

 $00:54:53.795 \rightarrow 00:54:55.630$ score is ethically justified because

 $00:54:55.701 \rightarrow 00:54:57.917$ our goal is to save the most lives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

00:54:57.920 --> 00:55:00.027 And you know if you look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.3101607

00:55:00.027 --> 00:55:01.280 the relationship between COVID

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

00:55:05.370 --> 00:55:08.055 anti pneumonia or critical illness

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

 $00:55:08.055 \rightarrow 00:55:10.918$ in general and survival or mortality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

 $00:55:10.918 \longrightarrow 00:55:12.688$ it just stopped like that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

 $00{:}55{:}12.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}15.865$ So particularly after 80 is

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

00:55:15.865 --> 00:55:18.405 when things really skyrocket.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

 $00{:}55{:}18{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}20{.}727$ But no, your point is well taken.

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

 $00{:}55{:}20{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}22{.}595$ Chronological age is an imperfect

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

00:55:22.595 --> 00:55:24.460 variable here but I would

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

 $00{:}55{:}24{.}532 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}26{.}367$ argue it's one complicated or

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

00:55:28.570 --> 00:55:29.614 question I have is you

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

 $00:55:29.614 \longrightarrow 00:55:30.760$ guys so much more did that

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

 $00{:}55{:}30{.}808 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}32{.}173$ was the type of the cycle plan

NOTE Confidence: 0.27277675

 $00{:}55{:}32{.}173 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}33{.}530$ as well as the subdivisnes

- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- $00:55:34.690 \longrightarrow 00:55:35.749$ that's there. Yeah.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- $00{:}55{:}35{.}749 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}38{.}552$ The sofa score does not have any history.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- $00:55:38.552 \rightarrow 00:55:40.960$ The the sofa score is just based
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- $00:55:41.029 \dashrightarrow 00:55:43.577$ on lab values and mild signs and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- $00:55:43.577 \rightarrow 00:55:46.120$ medications that the patient's receiving.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- 00:55:46.120 00:55:49.008 So the sofa score does not you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- $00:55:49.008 \rightarrow 00:55:49.800$ which is nice.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- $00:55:49.800 \rightarrow 00:55:51.432$ This is why he's appealing, right.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- $00{:}55{:}51{.}432 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}54{.}024$ It's like this kind of objective
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- $00:55:54.024 \rightarrow 00:55:55.768$ descrip description the patient's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- $00{:}55{:}55{.}768 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}57{.}560$ physiological state without any
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- $00:55:57.560 \longrightarrow 00:56:00.285$ stigmatizing points for their past medical
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3211300125
- $00:56:00.285 \rightarrow 00:56:02.395$ history or other medical conditions
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26052567
- $00{:}56{:}04.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}05.320$ And So what
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26052567
- $00{:}56{:}05{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}07{.}584$ if you are fit with other than that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26052567

 $00{:}56{:}07{.}584 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}10{.}351$ is is the fact that we do have other

NOTE Confidence: 0.26052567

 $00{:}56{:}10{.}351 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}12{.}760$ than that the which the substance use NOTE Confidence: 0.26052567

 $00{:}56{:}12.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}16.930$ as well as many on the site that we're NOTE Confidence: 0.26052567

 $00:56:16.930 \rightarrow 00:56:19.200$ dealing with after that the COVID.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26052567

 $00{:}56{:}19{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}21{.}695$ So I always call people to play into

NOTE Confidence: 0.26052567

 $00{:}56{:}21.695 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}23.350$ evaluating persons coming into the NOTE Confidence: 0.26052567

 $00:56:23.411 \rightarrow 00:56:25.463$ hospital where they can save them

NOTE Confidence: 0.26052567

 $00:56:25.463 \rightarrow 00:56:27.840$ because they're younger and they got it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26052567

 $00{:}56{:}27{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}30{.}160$ it might go out and do something with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

00:56:31.160 --> 00:56:31.750 guidance, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00:56:31.750 \longrightarrow 00:56:33.225$ This gets into what benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00{:}56{:}33.225 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}34.760$ are you trying to maximize?

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00{:}56{:}34{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}36{.}998$ Is there should you think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00:56:36.998 \longrightarrow 00:56:38.861$ other things than just who's

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00{:}56{:}38{.}861 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}40{.}919$ alive at the end of the day,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00:56:40.920 \rightarrow 00:56:42.544$ I think it's really tricky when you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173
- $00:56:42.544 \rightarrow 00:56:44.842$ start to do quality adjusted life years

 $00{:}56{:}44{.}842 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}46{.}394$ calculation and cost effectiveness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00:56:46.400 \rightarrow 00:56:47.640$ People love to do right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

00:56:47.640 --> 00:56:51.080 Discounting certain types of life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00:56:51.080 \rightarrow 00:56:53.348$ you know, how do you even assign that value

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00:56:53.348 \rightarrow 00:56:55.637$ if someone with substance use disorder,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00:56:55.640 \longrightarrow 00:56:57.570$ should they have like the

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00:56:57.570 \longrightarrow 00:56:59.114$ priority lower about 20%?

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

00:56:59.120 --> 00:57:01.232 I don't think that that's hard to build

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00{:}57{:}01{.}232 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}03{.}391$ that and justification to that nice thing

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00{:}57{:}03{.}391 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}05{.}680$ about lives just sort of objectively,

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

00:57:05.680 --> 00:57:07.430 I mean treats back to

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00:57:07.430 \longrightarrow 00:57:08.480$ treating people equally.

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

00:57:08.480 --> 00:57:09.776 Everyone's a person even if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.25709173

 $00{:}57{:}09{.}776$ --> $00{:}57{:}10{.}640$ have chronic medical conditions.

00:57:12.880 --> 00:57:13.840 One thing you mentioned

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:57:13.840 \longrightarrow 00:57:16.582$ right at the beginning of your

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}57{:}16{.}582 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}19{.}710$ talk and wondering if this might be

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:57:19.710 \longrightarrow 00:57:23.320$ accurate is user regression model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}57{:}23{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}27{.}133$ Instead of having a triage store where

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}57{:}27{.}133 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}30{.}304$ you with a triage store you're making NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}57{:}30{.}304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}32{.}800$ arbitrary decisions about what categories

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:57:32.800 \longrightarrow 00:57:37.656$ can predict mortality, and with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}57{:}37.656 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}40.680$ regression model you find out what.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:57:40.680 \rightarrow 00:57:43.837$ You find out what factors predict mortality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}57{:}43{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}47{.}662$ And it may be that in certain

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:57:47.662 \rightarrow 00:57:50.306$ cases age is important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

00:57:50.306 --> 00:57:53.731 But you know, I guess is if

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:57:53.731 \rightarrow 00:57:57.397$ somebody comes in short of breath,

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:57:57.400 \longrightarrow 00:57:59.402$ it's going to be way more important

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:57:59.402 \rightarrow 00:58:01.488$ that they have in your renal failure

- NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955
- $00:58:01.488 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.240$ than if they're 70 years old.

 $00{:}58{:}03{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}07{.}060$ I mean the the age is going to be,

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

00:58:07.060 --> 00:58:07.600 well, maybe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:58:07.600 \rightarrow 00:58:09.520$ but that's what the regression will test.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:58:09.520 \dashrightarrow 00:58:11.212$ So that's exactly right and that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}11.212 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}12.720$ exactly the approach we're taking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}12.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}14.065$ We're developing a development data

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}14.065 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}15.731$ set where we're fitting a multi

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}15{.}731 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}17{.}076$ variable prediction model which will

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}17.076 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}19.000$ probably just be a simple regression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:58:19.000 \longrightarrow 00:58:20.365$ From that regression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}20{.}365 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}22{.}640$ we'll make a triage score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}22.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}24.464$ All it does is all you do is

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}24{.}464 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}26{.}054$ convert the predictions from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}26.054 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}27.839$ model to numbers that's what.

 $00:58:27.840 \longrightarrow 00:58:30.829$ And then propose that and the relative

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}30{.}829 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}33{.}812$ weight of age to an urog renal

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}33{.}812 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}36{.}560$ failure will be something I make up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

00:58:36.560 - 00:58:38.723 It'll be based on the you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

00:58:38.723 --> 00:58:39.650 Cisco relationship between

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}39{.}705 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}41{.}440$ those variables and the outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}41{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}43{.}036$ So yeah thanks for that comment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:58:43.040 \rightarrow 00:58:44.120$ That's that's perfect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}44{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}45{.}200$ That's the plan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}58{:}45{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}46{.}856$ And that makes this prevents us

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

00:58:46.856 --> 00:58:48.386 from being anti ageist, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:58:48.386 \rightarrow 00:58:50.516$ Because that's just what the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:58:50.520 \rightarrow 00:58:52.902$ you know the fiscal relationship

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

00:58:52.902 --> 00:58:55.200 between age and ICU survival,

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:58:55.200 \longrightarrow 00:58:57.150$ controlling a pot for all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:58:57.150 \rightarrow 00:58:58.450$ other important medical variables

- NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955
- $00{:}58{:}58{.}507 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}00{.}159$ that we can measure at the time.

 $00:59:00.160 \longrightarrow 00:59:02.240$ It's not age alone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}59{:}02{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}03{.}680$ So I I I want.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:59:03.680 \rightarrow 00:59:05.792$ I'm worried that in in my mind that

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}59{:}05{.}792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}08{.}102$ maybe and some others it's easy to

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00{:}59{:}08{.}102 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}10{.}600$ complete 22 important but separate issues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:59:10.600 \longrightarrow 00:59:12.692$ One is that the age is going

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:59:12.692 \longrightarrow 00:59:13.744$ to predict survival.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:59:13.744 \longrightarrow 00:59:15.440$ But there's the separate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:59:15.440 \longrightarrow 00:59:15.840$ the fair.

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

 $00:59:15.840 \rightarrow 00:59:17.616$ The fair eatings argument is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

00:59:17.616 --> 00:59:19.036 a separate discussion isn't it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.36577955

00:59:19.040 --> 00:59:20.475 It's not just about how age predictions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00{:}59{:}21.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}22.480$ even if two individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00{:}59{:}22.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}24.702$ with the exact same likelihood of

00:59:24.702 --> 00:59:26.440 surviving COVID or whatever it is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00:59:26.440 \longrightarrow 00:59:29.250$ one is 80 and one is 30, Those of us,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00{:}59{:}29{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}30{.}840$ and I'm with those who advocate

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00:59:30.840 \longrightarrow 00:59:32.360$ for the fair eatings argument,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00{:}59{:}32{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}34{.}033$ we still say that then we should

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00{:}59{:}34{.}033 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}35{.}884$ favour the 30 year old over the 80

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00{:}59{:}35{.}884 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}38{.}768$ year old regardless of the predicted,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00:59:38.768 \rightarrow 00:59:42.440$ the predicted mortality is the same.

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

00:59:42.440 --> 00:59:44.501 Yeah, I mean that's what I was trying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00{:}59{:}44{.}501 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}46{.}618$ do with this slide is sort of separate

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00{:}59{:}46.618 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}48.960$ those two out and prevent that conflation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

00:59:48.960 --> 00:59:50.640 You know, I think that for for

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00{:}59{:}50{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}52{.}800$ those of us who are closet fairings,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

00:59:52.800 --> 00:59:55.765 people like Mossad, we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00{:}59{:}55{.}765 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}58{.}340$ I think we just make this argument right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

 $00:59:58.340 \longrightarrow 00:59:59.240$ The second one,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $00{:}59{:}59{.}240 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}01{.}402$ the one that is much harder to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- 01:00:01.402 --> 01:00:03.166 push back against because we can
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01:00:03.166 \longrightarrow 01:00:05.439$ forget we can fit regression models.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- 01:00:05.440 --> 01:00:06.456 We can.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01{:}00{:}06.456 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}08.488$ Isolate the independent prediction
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01{:}00{:}08.488 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}09.930$ of a effective age,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01{:}00{:}09{.}930 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}12{.}494$ and I should have said controlling for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01:00:12.494 \rightarrow 01:00:15.029$ all other measurable clinical variables
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01:00:15.029 \rightarrow 01:00:17.916$ that we can gather and just say all
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01:00:17.916 \rightarrow 01:00:19.760$ we're trying to do is save lives here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01:00:19.760 \longrightarrow 01:00:21.360$ We love old people.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01{:}00{:}21.360 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}22.160$ Their value,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01:00:22.160 \longrightarrow 01:00:23.630$ the life of an old person and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01{:}00{:}23.630 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}24.880$ a young person is the same.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01{:}00{:}24.880 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}27.080$ We're not going to do fair ending stuff,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687

- $01:00:27.080 \longrightarrow 01:00:28.046$ and in practice,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- 01:00:28.046 --> 01:00:30.717 though you will have life years and fairness
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01:00:30.717 \rightarrow 01:00:33.160$ benefits when you put that in place,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01:00:33.160 \longrightarrow 01:00:34.824$ if that makes sense.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01{:}00{:}34.824 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}38.106$ Even though you're not building that explicit
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01{:}00{:}38.106 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}40.735$ tiebreaker mechanism like you described,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- 01:00:40.735 --> 01:00:42.355 Mark into your score.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01:00:42.360 \longrightarrow 01:00:43.038$ At the end of the day,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01{:}00{:}43.040 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}44.276$ at the end of the simulation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01{:}00{:}44.280 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}46.872$ you're going to save a ton more life
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01:00:46.872 \longrightarrow 01:00:49.320$ years if you use age in this way.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.28912687
- $01:00:49.320 \longrightarrow 01:00:50.120$ Does that make sense?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727
- 01:00:53.240 --> 01:00:55.460 I was wondering I guess like on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727
- $01:00:55.460 \longrightarrow 01:00:56.930$ a slightly different note in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727
- $01:00:56.986 \longrightarrow 01:00:58.516$ context of the COVID vaccines,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727
- $01:00:58.520 \rightarrow 01:01:01.696$ when you said that the elderly got confers

 $01:01:01.696 \rightarrow 01:01:04.462$ because there was a stronger benefit, Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

01:01:04.462 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:01:07.216 To what extent is, I'm not familiar as

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01{:}01{:}07{.}216 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}08{.}560$ familiar with a lot of these models.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01:01:08.560 \rightarrow 01:01:10.510$ To what extent is the rapeutic benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

01:01:10.510 --> 01:01:13.131 included in these models or is that like a

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

01:01:13.131 --> 01:01:14.920 case specific thing or disease specific?

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

01:01:14.920 --> 01:01:17.512 Well, yeah, I mean the for for the vaccines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01{:}01{:}17{.}520 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}20{.}012$ it's you basically say who's most likely

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

01:01:20.012 --> 01:01:22.655 to die from COVID, who's on vaccinate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

01:01:22.655 --> 01:01:24.625 It's the oldest people, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01{:}01{:}24.625 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}28.160$ So by protecting them with the vaccine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01{:}01{:}28{.}160 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}30{.}368$ it's like the the exact opposite

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

01:01:30.368 --> 01:01:31.472 of this situation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01{:}01{:}31{.}480 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}33{.}125$ Then you dramatically lower their

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01{:}01{:}33.125 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}35.380$ risk of death from COVID and you

- $01:01:35.380 \longrightarrow 01:01:36.476$ save more lives here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727
- 01:01:36.480 --> 01:01:38.500 Everyone who doesn't get treated

 $01:01:38.500 \longrightarrow 01:01:40.874$ with life support dies by definition

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01:01:40.874 \rightarrow 01:01:42.759$ because they're in respiratory failure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

01:01:42.760 --> 01:01:45.439 cardiac failure, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01{:}01{:}45{.}440 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}47{.}988$ And so then you need to identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01:01:47.988 \longrightarrow 01:01:50.331$ the people most likely to survive

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01:01:50.331 \longrightarrow 01:01:52.276$ to save the most lives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

01:01:52.280 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:01:53.896 I should move on to the slack ones

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01:01:53.896 \rightarrow 01:01:55.936$ or if it gets harder, harder for me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01{:}01{:}55{.}936 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}58{.}440$ But Mark, do you want to say something or.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01:01:58.440 \longrightarrow 01:01:59.360$ Yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01{:}01{:}59{.}360 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}00{.}773$ so one thing that seems like there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

01:02:00.773 --> 01:02:03.038 like certain effort to remove

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01:02:03.040 \dashrightarrow 01:02:06.960$ judgment a lot of these metrics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01:02:06.960 \longrightarrow 01:02:08.836$ So, so for example,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727
- $01:02:08.836 \rightarrow 01:02:10.712$ we're taking something that's

 $01{:}02{:}10.712 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}13.038$ in controvertible like how old somebody is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01:02:13.040 \longrightarrow 01:02:13.295$ But,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01:02:13.295 \rightarrow 01:02:15.080$ but as you sort of applied before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01:02:15.080 \longrightarrow 01:02:15.568$ you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5167727

 $01{:}02{:}15.568 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}17.276$ you get some divisions in the room

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:02:18.400 \longrightarrow 01:02:19.240$ and they can probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:02:19.480 --> 01:02:21.400 predict a pretty algorithm too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}02{:}21{.}400 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}22{.}798$ like who's calling? And so I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}02{:}23.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}25.038$ wondering, have you thought about using

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}02{:}25{.}040 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}28{.}024$ and they probably use the person's H or

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}02{:}28.024 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}30.120$ they're pure H but a lot of things too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}02{:}30{.}120 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}31{.}776$ like like Karen is standing out

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:02:31.776 --> 01:02:33.320 like frailty or *****. Yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}02{:}33{.}320 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}35{.}892$ So have you thought at all about

01:02:35.892 --> 01:02:37.757 it taking a Bayesian statistical

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}02{:}37.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}39.200$ approach where some body says, well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:02:39.200 --> 01:02:41.748 I've got a pretest probability of XYZ

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:02:41.748 \rightarrow 01:02:43.720$ and now, you know, like some data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}02{:}43.720 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}46.765$ So actually having the for your absolute

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:02:46.765 \longrightarrow 01:02:49.079$ position state their prior belief,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:02:49.080 --> 01:02:50.800 I mean just to exhibit doesn't,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}02{:}50.800 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}52.582$ because I didn't mean that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:02:52.582 --> 01:02:53.760 statistic doesn't really stand

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}02{:}53.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}55.320$ alone in the absence of other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}02{:}55{.}320 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}58{.}757$ That's cool. That's a really cool idea.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}02{:}58.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}59.828$ I try to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:02:59.828 \rightarrow 01:03:02.320$ I'm trying now to keep things simpler,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:03:02.320 \longrightarrow 01:03:03.360$ but I really like that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}03{:}03{.}360 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}04{.}686$ So you would need of course

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:03:04.686 \rightarrow 01:03:06.280$ a data set of predictions,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01{:}03{:}06{.}280 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}07{.}516$ which would be hard to obtain,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01{:}03{:}07{.}520 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}08{.}687$ of subjective predictions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:08.687 \rightarrow 01:03:11.410$ You would need a data set perspectively
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:11.475 \rightarrow 01:03:13.599$ collected of prediction from the ER,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01{:}03{:}13.600 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}16.134$ for example, before they debated some other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:16.134 \rightarrow 01:03:18.759$ like what's the probability of survival?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:18.760 \longrightarrow 01:03:19.440$ That's cool.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- 01:03:19.440 --> 01:03:20.120 All right.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:20.120 \rightarrow 01:03:23.000$ So now this one is a really big problem,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:23.000 \rightarrow 01:03:27.285$ very perhaps the most contentious thing I
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:27.285 \rightarrow 01:03:29.560$ think in the current biological debate,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01{:}03{:}29{.}560 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}30{.}670$ and that's how to address
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:30.670 \longrightarrow 01:03:31.114$ structural inequity.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- 01:03:31.120 --> 01:03:31.960 I showed you this earlier,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- 01:03:31.960 --> 01:03:32.338 right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

- $01:03:32.338 \rightarrow 01:03:34.228$ Where people died in Chicago
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- 01:03:34.228 --> 01:03:36.320 was based on structural factors,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01{:}03{:}36{.}320 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}38{.}720$ based on a history of redlining.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01{:}03{:}38{.}720 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}40{.}352$ People with disadvantaged communities
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- 01:03:40.352 --> 01:03:43.297 were much more likely to acquire COVID-19
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:43.297 \rightarrow 01:03:46.279$ because of where they were living,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01{:}03{:}46.280 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}48.520$ because of where they had to work.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:48.520 \longrightarrow 01:03:49.568$ They had to be.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01{:}03{:}49.568 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}50.354$ They're essential workers.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- 01:03:50.360 --> 01:03:52.244 They're out acquiring COVID-19
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:52.244 \rightarrow 01:03:54.599$ living in congregate living settings.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:54.600 \rightarrow 01:03:56.334$ They didn't have the luxury of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:56.334 \rightarrow 01:03:57.490$ locking themselves in their
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01{:}03{:}57{.}543 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}59{.}037$ room and zooming all the time.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:03:59.040 \dashrightarrow 01:04:00.880$ They had to be out of that in the world.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:04:00.880 \longrightarrow 01:04:02.973$ And all of this is because the

- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:04:02.973 \longrightarrow 01:04:04.639$ city is designed on purpose,

01:04:04.640 --> 01:04:06.160 or was designed on purpose,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:04:06.160 --> 01:04:06.943 I should say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:04:06.943 \rightarrow 01:04:09.080$ by the federal government to look like that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:04:09.080 --> 01:04:09.496 right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:04:09.496 \rightarrow 01:04:11.160$ That's what redlining is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:04:11.160 \longrightarrow 01:04:13.504$ a systematic investment disinvestment

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:04:13.504 \rightarrow 01:04:16.434$ campaign that was explicitly racist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:04:16.440 --> 01:04:20.332 If you haven't read this Mapping

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:04:20.332 --> 01:04:20.996 Inequality website,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:04:20.996 --> 01:04:23.320 I strongly encourage you to see it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}04{:}23{.}320 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}25{.}560$ I The words are repugnant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}04{:}25{.}560 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}27{.}912$ but it makes it quite clear that

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:04:27.912 \longrightarrow 01:04:30.317$ our cities were designed by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}04{:}30{.}317 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}32{.}522$ federal government to be racially

01:04:32.522 --> 01:04:34.410 segregated on purpose, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}04{:}34{.}410 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}37{.}000$ And we have to deal with this

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:04:37.000 \longrightarrow 01:04:39.364$ in sort of everything we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:04:39.364 \rightarrow 01:04:41.140$ addressing from clinical medical

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}04{:}41{.}140 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}42{.}916$ ethics and bioethics perspective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}04{:}42.920 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}47.320$ But the question is how to handle this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:04:47.320 \longrightarrow 01:04:49.520$ this history of structural racism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:04:49.520 --> 01:04:52.797 this history of disadvantaging

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}04{:}52.797 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}54.982$ certain populations on purpose when

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01:04:54.982 \rightarrow 01:04:57.399$ we're making a triage score for,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:04:57.400 --> 01:04:57.748 like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:04:57.748 --> 01:04:58.444 crisis care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}04{:}58{.}444 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}00{.}532$ And what I'm gonna go through

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}05{:}00.532 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}02.896$ is 4 different ideas I have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

 $01{:}05{:}02.896 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}05.224$ Kind of taken from the machine

NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982

01:05:05.224 --> 01:05:06.680 learning literature actually,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:05:06.680 \rightarrow 01:05:08.445$ about different goals you could
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01{:}05{:}08.445 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}10.840$ have when you're making a protocol,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:05:10.840 \rightarrow 01:05:12.680$ and I'll go through these one by one.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- 01:05:12.680 --> 01:05:15.520 The 1st is demographic parity,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:05:15.520 \longrightarrow 01:05:18.872$ which is each member of any
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01{:}05{:}18.872 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}21.020$ racial ethnic group has the same
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- 01:05:21.099 --> 01:05:23.558 probability of receiving truth, right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:05:23.558 \rightarrow 01:05:25.782$ Probably the only way you can do that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:05:25.782 \rightarrow 01:05:28.316$ in practice mathematically is a lottery,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:05:28.320 \longrightarrow 01:05:29.244$ a random assignment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.26735982
- $01:05:29.244 \rightarrow 01:05:31.400$ It turns out that works pretty well,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01{:}05{:}31{.}400 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}34{.}217$ right? Almost as well as using sofa in terms
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01{:}05{:}34{.}217 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}37{.}000$ of saving lives because of sofa's bias.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- 01:05:37.000 --> 01:05:39.493 But if you it, it's far from the optimal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:05:39.493 \rightarrow 01:05:41.639$ solution in terms of maximizing benefits.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:05:41.640 \longrightarrow 01:05:45.030$ So a lottery while we achieve

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}05{:}45{.}030 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}47{.}600$ equal allocation does not

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

01:05:47.600 - 01:05:49.760 respect maximizing benefits.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}05{:}49{.}760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}52{.}640$ So then the next idea is non discrimination.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}05{:}52.640 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}54.504$ But make sure your SOFA is not biased

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:05:54.504 \rightarrow 01:05:56.158$ against the racial and ethnic group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:05:56.160 \rightarrow 01:05:57.798$ Be very sensitive that certain groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:05:57.800 \rightarrow 01:06:00.236$ particularly for black patients for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

01:06:00.240 --> 01:06:01.840 have been structurally disadvantaged

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}01{.}840 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}05{.}238$ by our society and we have to be extra

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}05{.}238 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}07{.}415$ careful to not make things worse when

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}07{.}481 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}09{.}637$ we're allocating scarce resources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}09{.}640 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}10{.}030$ Right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}10.030 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}12.760$ And I hopefully have made the argument

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}12.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}15.723$ and convinced you that SOFA would violate

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:06:15.723 \rightarrow 01:06:17.838$ this principle of non discrimination

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:06:17.840 \longrightarrow 01:06:20.594$ and it would exacerbate the disparities

 $01:06:20.594 \rightarrow 01:06:23.879$ that we've already seen in the COVID-19

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:06:23.879 \rightarrow 01:06:26.159$ pandemic if implemented to triage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:06:26.160 \rightarrow 01:06:28.158$ So that's the second principle,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:06:28.160 \longrightarrow 01:06:30.036$ which is these are kind of in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

01:06:30.040 --> 01:06:30.810 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:06:30.810 \longrightarrow 01:06:33.120$ oriented in terms of more and

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:06:33.120 \longrightarrow 01:06:34.880$ more equity potentially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}34.880 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}38.190$ So how do you debias the score that's biased

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

01:06:38.190 --> 01:06:40.320 against a particular racial ethnic group?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}40{.}320 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}43{.}902$ Well it turns out that using race

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}43{.}902 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}47{.}012$ ethnicity directly to fix SOFA

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}47.012 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}50.040$ like -1 if the person's black for

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}50.040 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}52.145$ example to sort of correct the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

01:06:52.145 --> 01:06:54.480 bias I described earlier is very

 $01:06:54.480 \rightarrow 01:06:56.716$ challenging for multiple dimensions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}56{.}720 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}59{.}120$ The state of Minnesota tried to do this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}06{:}59{.}120 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}01{.}472$ They they ran a regression model and NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:07:01.472 \rightarrow 01:07:03.947$ they put all the clinical variables

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

01:07:03.947 --> 01:07:06.692 including H for probability of death

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:07:06.692 \rightarrow 01:07:08.988$ from COVID-19 and they also NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}07{:}08.988 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}11.600$ included a term for that was Bipoc.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:07:11.600 \longrightarrow 01:07:12.816$ So basically non white.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}07{:}12.816$ --> $01{:}07{:}14.640$ Anybody who identified as non white NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}07{:}14.640 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}17.440$ and that term statistically and

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}07{:}17{.}440 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}19{.}152$ independently predicted COVID-19

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

01:07:19.152 --> 01:07:21.520 mortality because it's capturing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:07:21.520 \longrightarrow 01:07:23.320$ even though it's a social construct,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01{:}07{:}23.320 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}25.532$ correlated with other unmeasured

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

01:07:25.532 --> 01:07:26.638 clinical variables.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

 $01:07:26.640 \rightarrow 01:07:28.796$ So they put that into their score.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- 01:07:28.800 --> 01:07:31.232 If you were, you're the same person,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:07:31.232 \rightarrow 01:07:33.230$ the same age, same medical comorbidities.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- 01:07:33.230 --> 01:07:35.080 If you identified as Bipoc,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:07:35.080 \rightarrow 01:07:37.362$ you'd be more likely to get monoclonal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- 01:07:37.362 --> 01:07:39.160 antibody treatment if you got COVID.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:07:39.160 \longrightarrow 01:07:41.305$ This of course was grossly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:07:41.305 \rightarrow 01:07:43.021$ misinterpreted by certain people
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01{:}07{:}43.021 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}45.637$ and manipulated for political gain.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- 01:07:45.640 --> 01:07:48.520 That's a completely erroneous statement.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:07:48.520 \rightarrow 01:07:49.906$ But this is the political challenge
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01{:}07{:}49{.}906 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}51{.}917$ that we have to deal with these people.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- 01:07:51.920 --> 01:07:53.985 There are people like that in our
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:07:53.985 \longrightarrow 01:07:55.838$ country that we have to handle.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01{:}07{:}55{.}840 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}59{.}398$ And also from a constitutional perspective,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01{:}07{:}59{.}400 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}01{.}620$ with the recent affirmative action
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875

- $01:08:01.620 \rightarrow 01:08:03.840$ decision explicitly using someone's race,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:03.840 \longrightarrow 01:08:06.224$ it's like one of, you know the in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:06.224 \longrightarrow 01:08:08.320$ in general to allocate anything,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:08.320 \longrightarrow 01:08:10.276$ maybe run, it's a legal challenge.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- 01:08:10.280 --> 01:08:11.170 And finally,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01{:}08{:}11{.}170 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}13{.}395$ there's the practical one where,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- 01:08:13.400 --> 01:08:15.176 you know, if it's like you're
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- 01:08:15.176 --> 01:08:16.360 trying to give ventilators,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01{:}08{:}16.360 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}18.418$ and if some body who looks to your
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:18.418 \rightarrow 01:08:20.718$ eye that you would racialize them,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:20.720 \longrightarrow 01:08:21.839$ as White says,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:21.839 \longrightarrow 01:08:22.212$ oh,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- 01:08:22.212 --> 01:08:24.135 I'm black and I know your score
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:24.135 \longrightarrow 01:08:25.075$ gives me higher priority,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:25.080 \longrightarrow 01:08:26.620$ How do you handle that 'cause this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:26.620 \rightarrow 01:08:28.278$ is a life or death situation.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01{:}08{:}28{.}280 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}31{.}200$ And I think that practical issue
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:31.200 \longrightarrow 01:08:33.120$ of are you actually counting on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:33.120 \rightarrow 01:08:35.036$ triage teams to racialize people
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:35.036 \rightarrow 01:08:37.276$ and to socially constructed groups,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01:08:37.280 \longrightarrow 01:08:39.880$ that seems very problematic.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6536875
- $01{:}08{:}39{.}880 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}43{.}280$ So how do we get it on 'cause we have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996
- $01:08:43.376 \longrightarrow 01:08:44.622$ to one the what?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996
- $01:08:44.622 \rightarrow 01:08:46.366$ What people have done is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996
- $01:08:46.366 \longrightarrow 01:08:47.996$ just modify the sofa score.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996
- $01{:}08{:}48.000 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}49.560$ That's what state of Colorado's done.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996
- $01:08:49.560 \rightarrow 01:08:51.716$ So get rid of the renal component.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996
- $01:08:51.720 \longrightarrow 01:08:53.771$ I think it's best to just throw
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996
- $01:08:53.771 \longrightarrow 01:08:56.144$ it out all together and come up
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996
- $01{:}08{:}56{.}144 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}58{.}160$ with a new score that perhaps much
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996
- $01{:}08{:}58{.}225 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}00{.}480$ better captures acute renal failure.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

 $01:09:00.480 \dashrightarrow 01:09:02.440$ It's the extent that we can measure

NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

 $01:09:02.440 \longrightarrow 01:09:03.962$ them in triage scenario compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

 $01{:}09{:}03{.}962 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}06{.}153$ to this score which rolls in acute

NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

 $01:09:06.153 \rightarrow 01:09:08.036$ and chronic renal failure together.

NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

 $01{:}09{:}08.036 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}11.359$ But in the pulmonary data for the the grant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

 $01:09:11.360 \rightarrow 01:09:12.236$ which I think I took out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

01:09:12.240 --> 01:09:14.160 'cause I have way too many slides already,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

 $01:09:14.160 \longrightarrow 01:09:16.240$ we used area deprivation index,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

 $01:09:16.240 \longrightarrow 01:09:17.360$ which I'll talk about in a second,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

 $01:09:17.360 \longrightarrow 01:09:19.761$ where someone lives as a way to

NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

01:09:19.761 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:09:22.274 achieve the outcome that Minnesota was

NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

01:09:22.274 --> 01:09:24.629 going for without explicitly using

NOTE Confidence: 0.52647996

01:09:24.629 --> 01:09:26.919 someone's racial or ethnic identity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:09:29.440 \longrightarrow 01:09:31.620$ So the next idea,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:09:31.620 \longrightarrow 01:09:33.800$ aside from non discrimination,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:09:33.800 \rightarrow 01:09:37.376$ is to actually look at that map and say like,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:09:37.376 \rightarrow 01:09:39.560$ can we even the playing field here,

 $01:09:39.560 \longrightarrow 01:09:41.044$ right? Can we spread?

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:09:41.044 \rightarrow 01:09:45.190$ Can we mitigate the severe inequity of the NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}09{:}45{.}190 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}48{.}350$ pandemic by how we're allocating scarce NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:09{:}48.350$ --> $01{:}09{:}51.920$ life support treatments, and should we?

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}09{:}51{.}920 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}53{.}719$ There's tools, objective tools to do this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:09:53.720 \longrightarrow 01:09:56.564$ This is the area of deformation

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:09:56.564 \rightarrow 01:09:59.456$ index as you see this map of Chicago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:09:59.456 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:10:02.140 I don't know, I didn't explain that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:10:02.140 \longrightarrow 01:10:03.840$ This is where Druryville,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:10:03.840 \longrightarrow 01:10:05.215$ it's like the wealthiest area

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:10:05.215 --> 01:10:06.920 city is right by Navy Pier.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:10:06.920 \rightarrow 01:10:10.079$ This is like a park like way very wealthy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}10{:}10{.}080 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}13{.}112$ Here's Hyde Park sort of an island that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}10{:}13.112 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}15.919$ where Chicago is wealth and privilege.

 $01{:}10{:}15{.}920 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}18{.}040$ And then here's the South and West side

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:10:18.040 --> 01:10:19.200 structured disadvantaged neighborhoods,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:10:19.200 \longrightarrow 01:10:19.489$ right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:10:19.489 \longrightarrow 01:10:20.356$ So the homeowner,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}10{:}20.356 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}22.918$ you can sort of see in that homeowner

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:10:22.918 \rightarrow 01:10:24.823$ or the mapping inequality website

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:10:24.823 --> 01:10:26.960 how Hyde Park was constructed

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:10:26.960 \longrightarrow 01:10:29.245$ literally by the federal government

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:10:29.245 \longrightarrow 01:10:31.876$ to be to be blue on this map.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:10:31.880 --> 01:10:33.032 And so you can,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:10:33.032 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:10:34.760 you can take some
one's home address,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}10{:}34.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}37.680$ map it to this area of information index.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}10{:}37.680 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}39.396$ And what people like Doug White

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:10:39.400 --> 01:10:41.986 have suggested is that you literally

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}10{:}41.986 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}43.824$ would subtract points because

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:10:43.824 \rightarrow 01:10:46.503$ they're coming from a structurally

- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:10:46.503 --> 01:10:47.509 disadvantaged neighbourhood.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:10:47.509 --> 01:10:51.030 And the idea is that we're trying
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:10:51.106 \rightarrow 01:10:52.820$ to correct the structural inequity
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:10:52.820 \longrightarrow 01:10:54.795$ in the present day crisis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01{:}10{:}54.800 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}56.970$ We recognize that things are way worse
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01{:}10{:}56{.}970 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}58{.}560$ for certain communities than others.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:10:58.560 \rightarrow 01:11:01.360$ And we're taking one point off for that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:11:01.360 \longrightarrow 01:11:03.768$ And it turns out that there's an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:11:03.768 \rightarrow 01:11:05.160$ implicit ethical happening here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:11:05.160 --> 01:11:06.064 which is, you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:11:06.064 \rightarrow 01:11:07.760$ not really argued for in the paper.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:11:07.760 \longrightarrow 01:11:09.338$ But correcting this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:11:09.338 \longrightarrow 01:11:10.916$ correcting that map,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:11:10.920 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:11:12.804 making it the spreading the burden
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:11:12.804 --> 01:11:15.058 of COVID around is about 1/4 of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:11:15.058 --> 01:11:16.918 as important as saving most lives,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:11:16.920 --> 01:11:17.840 which I think is interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}11{:}17.840 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}20.176$ This is an example where one of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:11:20.176 --> 01:11:22.479 protocols can reveal the underlying ethics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}11{:}22.480 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}24.330$ Here's the narrative description they

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}11{:}24{.}330 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}27{.}413$ use in the paper about how sofa based

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:11:27.413 \rightarrow 01:11:29.753$ only system would prioritize this patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}11{:}29.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}33.346$ The second patient will be prioritized

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:11:33.346 \longrightarrow 01:11:35.600$ in their novel system and they,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:11:35.600 --> 01:11:36.320 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:11:36.320 \rightarrow 01:11:39.679$ hand kudos to Doug White and and Pittsburgh.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:11:39.680 - 01:11:41.878 They actually did this when they were

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}11{:}41.878 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}43.400$ allocating their monoclonal antibodies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01{:}11{:}43{.}400 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}45{.}554$ They got around that problem with

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

01:11:45.554 --> 01:11:48.313 you can't use race and ethnicity and

NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

 $01:11:48.313 \rightarrow 01:11:52.440$ they actually used where someone was,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:11:52.440 \longrightarrow 01:11:53.400$ where someone lived.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:11:53.400 --> 01:11:54.900 Calculate their ADI and give them
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:11:54.900 \longrightarrow 01:11:56.481$ twice the chance if they came
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:11:56.481 \rightarrow 01:11:57.796$ from a high ADI neighborhood.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01{:}11{:}57{.}800 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}00{.}096$ And that led to higher rates of allocation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01{:}12{:}00.096 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}02.000$ than people who identified as black,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:12:02.000 \longrightarrow 01:12:04.520$ which was their goal.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:12:04.520 \longrightarrow 01:12:06.751$ So why?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:12:06.751 --> 01:12:07.995 What are the potential
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:12:07.995 --> 01:12:09.239 criticisms of this approach?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:12:09.240 --> 01:12:10.506 Well, you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:12:10.506 \longrightarrow 01:12:12.194$ there's you're using these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:12:12.194 \longrightarrow 01:12:13.038$ narrative descriptions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01{:}12{:}13.040 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}14.400$ They didn't like the thesis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:12:14.400 --> 01:12:14.682 Hickett,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217

- 01:12:14.682 --> 01:12:16.092 Hickett handling 2 guys who
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01{:}12{:}16.092 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}17.576$ were involved with the National
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:12:17.576 --> 01:12:19.314 Academy of Medicine and you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:12:19.314 \rightarrow 01:12:21.113$ defining what crisis standards of care were,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01:12:21.120 \longrightarrow 01:12:22.280$ they really didn't like the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01{:}12{:}22.280 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}23.440$ narrative description of the patient,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:12:23.440 --> 01:12:23.780 right.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:12:23.780 --> 01:12:25.480 You're making one patient really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01{:}12{:}25{.}480 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}27{.}169$ appealing based on like being
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- 01:12:27.169 --> 01:12:29.059 a bus driver or whatever it was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01{:}12{:}29{.}059 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}30{.}609$ an essential worker and another
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80365217
- $01{:}12{:}30{.}609 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}32{.}517$ person you're really painting as a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:12:32.520 \longrightarrow 01:12:33.927$ 7 year old who's had been able
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:12:33.927 \longrightarrow 01:12:35.079$ to live their whole life.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- 01:12:35.080 --> 01:12:37.432 They're kind of like bleeding and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:12:37.432 \rightarrow 01:12:39.864$ fair innings there too. And of course,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:12:39.864 \rightarrow 01:12:41.880$ the triage team is not supposed to,

01:12:41.880 --> 01:12:43.410 you know, think about those

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:12:43.410 \longrightarrow 01:12:44.976$ social factors in triage, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:12:44.976 --> 01:12:46.656 And that's what's the thrust

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:12:46.656 \longrightarrow 01:12:48.000$ of their main argument.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:12:48.000 --> 01:12:49.856 They also talk about ADI not being granular

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}12{:}49.856 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}51.598$ enough to identify with disadvantaged.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:12:51.600 \rightarrow 01:12:54.152$ So one story about this is we very

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}12{:}54{.}152 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}55{.}516$ explicitly allocated our vaccine

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:12:55.516 --> 01:12:57.514 to our primary service area first,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:12:57.520 \rightarrow 01:12:59.440$ like around the University of Chicago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}12{:}59{.}440 \dashrightarrow 01{:}13{:}01{.}848$ And so that meant our wealthier patients who

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}13{:}01{.}848 \dashrightarrow 01{:}13{:}04{.}520$ live in the suburbs had to wait their turn.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:13:04.520 \longrightarrow 01:13:05.720$ And that's not something

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:13:05.720 \rightarrow 01:13:06.920$ they're used to doing.

- $01:13:06.920 \longrightarrow 01:13:09.280$ So once they found out the allocation system,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:09.280 \longrightarrow 01:13:10.060$ they say, well,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- 01:13:10.060 --> 01:13:11.696 if I buy an apartment in Inglewood,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:11.696 \longrightarrow 01:13:12.980$ which is one of the nearby
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- 01:13:13.026 --> 01:13:14.200 disadvantaged neighbourhoods,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:14.200 \longrightarrow 01:13:16.000$ can I get them by vaccine?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:16.000 \longrightarrow 01:13:19.272$ So not a lot of them are really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- 01:13:19.272 --> 01:13:21.828 nice people who care about such.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- 01:13:21.828 --> 01:13:23.368 I don't describe all of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:23.368 \longrightarrow 01:13:24.472$ our our patients that way,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:24.472 \longrightarrow 01:13:25.660$ but you know of course the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:25.706 \longrightarrow 01:13:26.840$ the bad apples and the ones,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:26.840 \longrightarrow 01:13:29.040$ the emails that you remember
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:29.040 \longrightarrow 01:13:31.240$ and so we said no,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- 01:13:31.240 --> 01:13:32.955 you have to just stay in your
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:32.960 \longrightarrow 01:13:34.773$ stay in your house for one more

- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:34.773 \longrightarrow 01:13:35.999$ week and you'll get it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- 01:13:36.000 --> 01:13:38.322 So you know but I think in in practice
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:38.322 \rightarrow 01:13:40.036$ aside from those extreme examples
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:40.036 \rightarrow 01:13:42.118$ it would be it's very granular.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- 01:13:42.120 --> 01:13:43.751 This is a census block like you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01{:}13{:}43.751 \dashrightarrow 01{:}13{:}45.201$ could look around you should play
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:45.201 \rightarrow 01:13:46.832$ go on the website and look around
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:46.883 \rightarrow 01:13:48.365$ and you can you know neighborhoods
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:48.365 \rightarrow 01:13:49.635$ that you know are systematically
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:49.635 \longrightarrow 01:13:51.560$ worse off will be red on there.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- 01:13:51.560 --> 01:13:53.318 It's pretty good.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01{:}13{:}53{.}320 \dashrightarrow 01{:}13{:}55{.}792$ And there's always this possibility of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01:13:55.792 \rightarrow 01:13:57.935$ introducing social factors in triage
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- 01:13:57.935 --> 01:13:59.655 of unintended consequences downstream
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01{:}13{:}59.655 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}02.600$ the facts that you haven't anticipated.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}14{:}02.600 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}05.400$ So these guys are OK with allocating

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:14:05.400 \longrightarrow 01:14:07.042$ vaccine and preventative medications

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:14:07.042 --> 01:14:09.526 based on error deprivation index or

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:14:09.526 --> 01:14:12.361 where someone lives as a way to address

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}14{:}12{.}361 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}14{.}439$ structural inequity but not life support.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:14:14.440 \longrightarrow 01:14:16.040$ So here's what people think.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:14:16.040 \longrightarrow 01:14:17.186$ And then finally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:14:17.186 \longrightarrow 01:14:19.478$ I think the last idea,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:14:19.480 --> 01:14:21.544 which is perhaps the most controversial

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}14{:}21{.}544 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}24{.}603$ and often is the criticism of efforts to

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:14:24.603 \rightarrow 01:14:27.033$ correct the present day structural equity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:14:27.040 \rightarrow 01:14:28.958$ is that you're really trying to correct,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:14:28.960 --> 01:14:29.956 like, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:14:29.956 \longrightarrow 01:14:31.948$ hundreds of years of wrongs on

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:14:31.948 --> 01:14:33.879 a particular population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:14:33.880 \rightarrow 01:14:36.280$ And is that really the best place to do that?

- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- $01{:}14{:}36{.}280 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}38{.}445$ And so that's the criticism

 $01:14:38.445 \longrightarrow 01:14:40.335$ of a reparations argument.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:14:40.335 --> 01:14:43.730 But it's distinct from trying to make

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:14:43.815 \rightarrow 01:14:46.916$ things more fair in the current crisis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:14:46.920 \longrightarrow 01:14:49.480$ if that makes sense.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:14:49.480 --> 01:14:50.960 All right, So with that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:14:50.960 \rightarrow 01:14:52.960$ I want to make sure we have some,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}14{:}52{.}960 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}54{.}715$ some at least 10 minutes

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:14:54.715 \longrightarrow 01:14:56.119$ for discussion on this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:14:56.120 --> 01:14:59.170 Or maybe I can, I can just,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}14{:}59{.}170 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}01{.}784$ why don't I just keep talking and we'll and

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}15{:}01{.}784 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}04{.}073$ we'll talk about the last two together.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:15:04.080 --> 01:15:05.400 Because I always,

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}15{:}05{.}400 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}06{.}780$ never, never this one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}15{:}06.780 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}09.040$ And I think this is the perhaps

- $01:15:09.040 \longrightarrow 01:15:10.560$ the approximate.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292
- 01:15:10.560 --> 01:15:11.588 You know,

 $01{:}15{:}11{.}588 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}14{.}410$ the Bob Trude wrote this article

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01:15:14.410 \rightarrow 01:15:15.910$ in the Hastings report very early

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}15{:}15{.}910 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}17{.}591$ on the pandemic and pointed out

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

 $01{:}15{:}17{.}591 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}19{.}061$ that essentially all the thought

NOTE Confidence: 0.43432292

01:15:19.061 -> 01:15:19.649 experiments people

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:19.697 \rightarrow 01:15:21.155$ were using were incorrect, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:15:21.155 --> 01:15:23.045 The way a pandemic would work

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:23.045 \rightarrow 01:15:25.238$ is that the ICU would fill up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:25.240 \longrightarrow 01:15:27.354$ then a new patient would show up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:27.360 \longrightarrow 01:15:28.608$ be in respiratory failure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}15{:}28.608 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}30.902$ and your decision would be to treat

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}15{:}30{.}902 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}33{.}044$ that person and withdraw life support

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:33.044 \rightarrow 01:15:35.024$ from someone already receiving it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:35.024 \rightarrow 01:15:36.744$ You very rarely would you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076
- $01:15:36.744 \rightarrow 01:15:38.120$ have this three patients,

01:15:38.120 --> 01:15:41.359 one validator and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:41.359 \rightarrow 01:15:43.618$ this is sort of an example, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}15{:}43.618 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}45.682$ The one thing I don't think I wrote

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:45.682 \longrightarrow 01:15:47.650$ here is that this person who's in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:15:47.650 --> 01:15:49.676 ICU to sit his patient in the ICU,

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:49.680 \rightarrow 01:15:51.664$ you would know with a great much higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:51.664 \rightarrow 01:15:53.523$ degree of certainty that they're what

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:53.523 \rightarrow 01:15:55.163$ their probability of survival is

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:55.163 \rightarrow 01:15:57.117$ than this person who just showed up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:15:57.120 --> 01:15:59.720 You know, you don't know much about them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:15:59.720 \longrightarrow 01:16:02.120$ that's whether they're 5050, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}16{:}02{.}120 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}05{.}000$ Whereas where you can have a lot more

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}16{:}05{.}000 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}07{.}170$ confidence but I think that confidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}16{:}07{.}170 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}08{.}980$ around their survival function is

 $01:16:09.046 \rightarrow 01:16:11.760$ much smaller and this is way so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:16:11.760 --> 01:16:14.598 Despite these crisis standards of care

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:16:14.598 \rightarrow 01:16:16.803$ being enormously long documents full NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}16{:}16{.}803 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}18{.}558$ of they're very hard to parse through.

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:16:18.560 --> 01:16:20.144 Almost none of them like really

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}16{:}20{.}144 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}21{.}984$ get into the weeds on this except

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:16:21.984 --> 01:16:24.082 for the New York plan which has an

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}16{:}24.082 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}25.797$ incredibly strict sofa based system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:16:25.800 --> 01:16:28.719 Like if your sofa doesn't go down,

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:16:28.720 \longrightarrow 01:16:29.564$ ventilator's out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}16{:}29{.}564 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}32{.}518$ so that's not been tested or validated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:16:32.520 \rightarrow 01:16:34.782$ Whereas Maryland would have a very

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:16:34.782 \longrightarrow 01:16:37.090$ high barrier to withdraw off the

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:16:37.090 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:16:38.915 the patient surrogates like said

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:16:38.920 --> 01:16:40.320 they don't withdraw life support,

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:16:40.320 \rightarrow 01:16:42.560$ then they would have this chance to appeal,

 $01:16:42.560 \rightarrow 01:16:45.230$ which of course would probably undermine

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:16:45.230 \rightarrow 01:16:47.680$ any active reallocation in practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:16:47.680 \longrightarrow 01:16:49.759$ So what we're doing in the grant

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:16:49.759 --> 01:16:51.758 is actually building a simulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}16{:}51{.}758 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}54{.}190$ model of sufficient complexity and

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}16{:}54{.}190 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}57{.}280$ depth to simulate what would happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}16{:}57{.}280 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}59{.}702$ And one of my main hypotheses is

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}16{:}59{.}702 \dashrightarrow 01{:}17{:}01{.}920$ that without some with drawal rule,

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}17{:}01{.}920 \dashrightarrow 01{:}17{:}03{.}255$ without some mechanism to remove

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:17:03.255 --> 01:17:04.590 life support and reallocate it

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:17:04.632 \longrightarrow 01:17:05.480$ to the waiting list,

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}17{:}05{.}480 \dashrightarrow 01{:}17{:}08{.}160$ it's going to be first and first serve.

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:17:08.160 --> 01:17:11.576 So you can make this fancy triage

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:17:11.576 --> 01:17:14.080 store and it's not going to matter

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}17{:}14.080 \dashrightarrow 01{:}17{:}16.238$ because it's just going to be who

 $01:17:16.238 \rightarrow 01:17:17.954$ showed up first and then there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

01:17:17.954 --> 01:17:20.345 going to be very and with sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01{:}17{:}20{.}345 \dashrightarrow 01{:}17{:}21{.}920$ randomness as people die if there's NOTE Confidence: 0.47515076

 $01:17:21.920 \rightarrow 01:17:23.120$ an available event when you arrive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:17:26.720 --> 01:17:30.880 All right. So with that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

 $01:17:30.880 \longrightarrow 01:17:32.692$ let's we can spend the rest

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

 $01{:}17{:}32.692 \dashrightarrow 01{:}17{:}34.306$ of the time on discussion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:17:34.306 --> 01:17:36.161 These are my big conclusions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:17:36.161 --> 01:17:38.807 I think life support triage protocols

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

 $01{:}17{:}38{.}807 \dashrightarrow 01{:}17{:}41{.}718$ across the US remain poorly defined.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:17:41.720 --> 01:17:44.080 Well, the practical ethical perspective

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:17:44.080 --> 01:17:46.036 get rid of sofa triage scores,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:17:46.040 --> 01:17:47.880 to use age, but only with the intention

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

 $01{:}17{:}47.880 \dashrightarrow 01{:}17{:}49.756$ of saving more lives in the short term,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

 $01:17:49.760 \longrightarrow 01:17:51.596$ just like we did for vaccines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

 $01:17:51.600 \rightarrow 01:17:53.917$ Not not necessarily for any fair innings

- NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886
- $01:17:53.917 \rightarrow 01:17:55.324$ purpose and structural inequities

01:17:55.324 --> 01:17:57.119 need to be directly addressed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:17:57.120 --> 01:17:59.286 but exactly what the correction link

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

 $01{:}17{:}59{.}286 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}01{.}591$ should be needs to be determined

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

 $01{:}18{:}01{.}591 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}03{.}955$ and then with draw of life support.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:18:03.960 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:18:05.780 Maybe the critical triage process

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

 $01:18:05.780 \longrightarrow 01:18:07.236$ should not be ignored.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:18:07.240 --> 01:18:08.476 And before we go to questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:18:08.480 --> 01:18:11.048 I just want to thank you to all

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

 $01{:}18{:}11.048 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}12.559$ my collaborators and mentors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:18:12.560 --> 01:18:12.966 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:18:12.966 --> 01:18:13.981 Govind's like this guy whose

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

01:18:13.981 --> 01:18:15.061 papers who've been reading forever

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

 $01{:}18{:}15{.}061 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}15{.}917$ and then he finally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886

 $01{:}18{:}15{.}920 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}17{.}513$ he's a real person and will talk to you,

- $01:18:17.520 \longrightarrow 01:18:19.800$ which was like an incredible experience.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886
- 01:18:19.800 --> 01:18:22.072 And then Monica Pete,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886
- 01:18:22.072 --> 01:18:25.205 who's a HealthEquity scholar and my
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886
- $01:18:25.205 \longrightarrow 01:18:27.280$ main mentor for all of this work.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886
- $01{:}18{:}27{.}280 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}29{.}555$ And Robert Gibbons is my PhD advisor
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886
- $01{:}18{:}29{.}555 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}31{.}647$ and Elvis Long and a simulation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886
- 01:18:31.647 -> 01:18:33.136 model expert at the University
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886
- 01:18:33.136 --> 01:18:34.840 of Chicago who's my KO8 mentor.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91769886
- 01:18:34.840 --> 01:18:35.120 So
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- 01:18:39.650 --> 01:18:42.236 yeah, QR code is my, it's my Google
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- 01:18:42.236 --> 01:18:43.568 stock page if it's not broken.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- $01:18:43.570 \longrightarrow 01:18:44.946$ So you can see some of the other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- $01:18:44.946 \rightarrow 01:18:46.140$ things they've written and thank you.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- $01{:}18{:}46{.}140 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}47{.}165$ Let's let's talk for them.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- $01:18:50.770 \longrightarrow 01:18:52.650$ That was fantastic.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- 01:18:52.650 --> 01:18:55.170 I'm actually having my friend task

- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- $01:18:55.170 \longrightarrow 01:18:58.089$ trying to stay away a little bit.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- 01:18:58.090 01:18:59.848 This was, this was really wonderful,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- 01:18:59.850 --> 01:19:01.650 you know, in terms of trying to deal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- $01:19:01.650 \longrightarrow 01:19:03.608$ with the issue of structural inequity,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- $01{:}19{:}03.610 \dashrightarrow 01{:}19{:}05.122$ how to address them.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- 01:19:05.122 --> 01:19:06.840 I mean Mike, who's here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- 01:19:06.840 --> 01:19:08.760 Mike and and you know Williams,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- $01:19:08.760 \longrightarrow 01:19:10.158$ they led the group that consisted
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- 01:19:10.158 --> 01:19:12.118 of some of our folks who built our,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- $01:19:12.120 \longrightarrow 01:19:14.017$ our protocol as well as some members
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- $01:19:14.017 \longrightarrow 01:19:15.959$ of the community all working together.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- 01:19:15.960 --> 01:19:17.200 Is it a fair, Stephen,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- $01:19:17.200 \longrightarrow 01:19:19.285$ Doctor Ivy that we never
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- $01:19:19.285 \longrightarrow 01:19:20.953$ really cracked that nut?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894
- 01:19:20.960 --> 01:19:21.605 If you did,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.29916894

01:19:21.605 - 01:19:23.598 I would love to know what you decide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

 $01{:}19{:}30{.}360 \dashrightarrow 01{:}19{:}32{.}184$ Thanks Martin. So so the health

NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

 $01:19:32.184 \rightarrow 01:19:34.560$ system was very concerned about the NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

01:19:34.560 --> 01:19:38.110 perception of the draft or public

NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

01:19:38.110 --> 01:19:40.985 development community so it bans

NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

 $01{:}19{:}40.985 \dashrightarrow 01{:}19{:}42.820$ suggestion system and and members NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

 $01:19:42.820 \longrightarrow 01:19:44.973$ of the committee put together the

NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

01:19:44.973 --> 01:19:48.468 transmitting we by members of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

01:19:48.468 --> 01:19:51.403 community like we intentionally reached NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

 $01{:}19{:}51{.}403 \dashrightarrow 01{:}19{:}54{.}900$ out to people with local media the

NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

01:19:54.900 --> 01:19:57.244 disabled community community staff NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

 $01:19:57.244 \rightarrow 01:19:59.638$ took the New Haven but in British NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

01:19:59.638 --> 01:20:01.519 Portland you landed in Greenwich a

NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

 $01:20:01.520 \rightarrow 01:20:03.716$ number of ministers and and rabbis NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

 $01{:}20{:}03.716 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}07.128$ and you know so we really tried to

NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827

 $01{:}20{:}07{.}128 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}09{.}340$ intentionally reach a large number of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.30202827
- $01:20:09.340 \longrightarrow 01:20:11.760$ people to break it wasn't that people

 $01:20:14.480 \longrightarrow 01:20:17.999$ but to explain what and it's not easy to

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:20:17.999 \rightarrow 01:20:20.918$ explain necessarily what you're doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

01:20:20.920 --> 01:20:22.392 To reunite people but

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:20:22.392 \longrightarrow 01:20:23.960$ it it seemed to go well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01{:}20{:}23.960 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}26.825$ I I don't think we cracked the code

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01{:}20{:}26.825 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}29.440$ of how to address Yeah I mean we had

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

01:20:29.440 --> 01:20:32.390 I had we had a similar experience

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:20:32.390 \longrightarrow 01:20:35.110$ presenting our trash for to our

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01{:}20{:}35{.}110 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}37{.}385$ community Advisory Council for our

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01{:}20{:}37{.}385 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}39{.}515$ hospital and what they were very

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01{:}20{:}39{.}515 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}41{.}880$ forceful about is removing all the major.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01{:}20{:}41.880 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}43.116$ I didn't really go into this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

01:20:43.120 --> 01:20:44.660 but there were a lot of original

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:20:44.660 \longrightarrow 01:20:46.500$ plans that if you had major chronic

- 01:20:46.500 --> 01:20:48.192 conditions like you were on dialysis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- $01:20:48.200 \rightarrow 01:20:50.600$ that huge deprioritization and they're like,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- $01:20:50.600 \longrightarrow 01:20:52.480$ no, that's good, that's out.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- $01:20:52.480 \rightarrow 01:20:55.433$ And so that was a very useful ex expe.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- $01:20:55.433 \rightarrow 01:20:56.598$ Every time I presented them,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- $01{:}20{:}56.600 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}57.320$ I learned so much.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- $01{:}20{:}57{.}320 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}58{.}760$ I mean, I really do think that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- $01:20:58.760 \longrightarrow 01:21:00.940$ that should be part of what health
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- $01:21:00.940 \longrightarrow 01:21:02.240$ system I think they should.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- $01{:}21{:}02{.}240 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}04{.}168$ But I do worry about you have these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- $01{:}21{:}04{.}168 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}05{.}907$ councils and groups and people leaders
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- $01{:}21{:}05{.}907 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}07{.}713$ in the community that you collect.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- 01:21:07.720 --> 01:21:08.804 But it's somewhat arbitrary,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- 01:21:08.804 --> 01:21:11.200 like these are just people, you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- 01:21:11.200 --> 01:21:13.800 they're also usually people who
- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- $01:21:13.800 \longrightarrow 01:21:15.436$ are in social, socio,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191
- 01:21:15.436 --> 01:21:16.663 economic status positions

 $01{:}21{:}16.663 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}18.542$ that are pretty high, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

01:21:18.542 --> 01:21:20.638 Like we have the guy who runs Howard

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01{:}21{:}20.638 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}22.719$ Brown Clinic on the South side on ours.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:21:22.720 \longrightarrow 01:21:23.620$ And yes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:21:23.620 \longrightarrow 01:21:26.320$ they may have the right race,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

01:21:26.320 --> 01:21:26.886 ethnicity, diversity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:21:26.886 \longrightarrow 01:21:28.584$ make up that you want to

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

01:21:28.584 --> 01:21:29.680 represent the community,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:21:29.680 \longrightarrow 01:21:32.382$ but do they really represent the socio

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

01:21:32.382 --> 01:21:34.440 economic spread or the community overall?

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

01:21:34.440 --> 01:21:35.080 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:21:35.080 \rightarrow 01:21:36.680$ it's just like these groups you put together.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

01:21:36.680 --> 01:21:37.590 So that's the that's the

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:21:37.590 \longrightarrow 01:21:38.318$ one problem with that.

01:21:38.320 --> 01:21:40.648 But I agree you for for thinking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:21:40.648 \longrightarrow 01:21:42.600$ ideas that you hadn't thought of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:21:42.600 \longrightarrow 01:21:43.290$ It's so helpful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

01:21:43.290 --> 01:21:44.440 I present all the time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.24887191

 $01:21:44.440 \longrightarrow 01:21:44.600$ although,

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01{:}21{:}48.160 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}50.440$ yeah, so just a big comment if you would and NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:21:50.440 \longrightarrow 01:21:52.278$ then Ben will be the last common question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

01:21:52.280 --> 01:21:54.200 So it's up real quick and I'll move to Ben.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

01:21:54.200 --> 01:21:56.552 Sure. It says run 4 minutes. I was 6 thirds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:21:56.552 \rightarrow 01:21:58.880$ I think that's fast, but yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

01:21:58.880 --> 01:22:01.200 Yeah, please. Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

01:22:01.200 --> 01:22:03.760 I I was just curious if you can describe the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01{:}22{:}03.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}06.744$ the process that goes into choosing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01{:}22{:}06.744 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}09.960$ data set used to build a regression model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

01:22:09.960 --> 01:22:12.864 Yeah, yeah. So I took all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:22:12.864 \longrightarrow 01:22:14.323$ clinical informatics slides out of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- $01{:}22{:}14{.}323 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}15{.}919$ here because it's an ethics talk.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- 01:22:15.920 --> 01:22:19.114 But we are constructing A collaborative
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- 01:22:19.114 --> 01:22:20.998 networks from based on where my
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- $01:22:20.998 \longrightarrow 01:22:22.956$ people are trained by one of my
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- 01:22:22.956 --> 01:22:24.156 old mentors across the country,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- 01:22:24.160 --> 01:22:26.608 ICU doctors who like are data
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- 01:22:26.608 --> 01:22:27.832 scientists too generally.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- $01:22:27.840 \longrightarrow 01:22:29.376$ And we're all clearing our data
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- $01:22:29.376 \longrightarrow 01:22:30.400$ in the same format.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- 01:22:30.400 --> 01:22:32.920 So what will happen is we'll collect,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- $01{:}22{:}32{.}920 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}35{.}908$ we'll collect all all the observation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- 01:22:35.908 --> 01:22:37.900 electronic healthcare record that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- $01{:}22{:}37{.}972 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}40{.}390$ would be relevant for a critically
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- 01:22:40.390 --> 01:22:42.472 I'll person and build a regression
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- $01:22:42.472 \longrightarrow 01:22:44.760$ model based on the data from their
- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:22:44.760 \longrightarrow 01:22:47.160$ like 42 hours before they start

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:22:47.160 \longrightarrow 01:22:49.540$ life support OR and then the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01{:}22{:}49{.}540 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}51{.}519$ six hours afterwards with the idea NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

01:22:51.519 --> 01:22:53.857 that like the ER would have this

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:22:53.857 \rightarrow 01:22:55.958$ temporary supply to stabilize patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

01:22:55.960 --> 01:22:57.900 Because my hypothesis is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:22:57.900 \longrightarrow 01:22:59.452$ that would dramatically improve

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:22:59.452 \longrightarrow 01:23:01.516$ the accuracy of the triage car.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

01:23:01.520 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:23:02.479 But the nice thing is we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

01:23:02.479 --> 01:23:03.120 track both of those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01{:}23{:}03{.}120 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}06{.}128$ And So what we're setting up with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:23:06.128 \rightarrow 01:23:07.310$ collaborative network is like develop

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:23:07.310 \longrightarrow 01:23:08.640$ the data in the University of Chicago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

01:23:08.640 --> 01:23:09.873 Northwestern tested it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:23:09.873 \rightarrow 01:23:11.517$ John Hopkins for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01{:}23{:}11{.}520 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}12{.}800$ We're about other collaborators

- NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843
- $01:23:12.800 \longrightarrow 01:23:14.720$ and that adds a lot more.

 $01{:}23{:}14.720 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}15.840$ Whenever you make a model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:23:15.840 \rightarrow 01:23:19.720$ you gotta keep your test data set separately.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:23:19.720 \longrightarrow 01:23:21.112$ So that's the plan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.30047843

 $01:23:21.112 \rightarrow 01:23:23.320$ Final question is Doctor Solch but you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.32308722

01:23:23.400 --> 01:23:25.638 just you know one with respect

NOTE Confidence: 0.32308722

 $01:23:25.638 \longrightarrow 01:23:27.920$ to the the community for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.32308722

 $01:23:27.920 \longrightarrow 01:23:29.560$ the night measures we actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

 $01{:}23{:}31{.}720 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}33{.}600$ sort of presented to them the

NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

 $01:23:33.600 \longrightarrow 01:23:35.400$ possibility of using the area

NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

 $01{:}23{:}35{.}400 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}37{.}080$ deprivation index as a modifier

NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

 $01{:}23{:}37{.}480 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}39{.}073$ of. So that's where we were at the time

NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

 $01{:}23{:}39{.}560 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}42{.}812$ and they we're we're not enthusia stic

NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

 $01{:}23{:}42.812$ --> $01{:}23{:}45.250$ about that and and the more I thought NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

 $01{:}23{:}45{.}250 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}47{.}151$ about it the less enthusia stic I've

01:23:47.151 --> 01:23:49.552 I've become overtime you know I I

NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

01:23:49.560 --> 01:23:54.328 I do I am concerned that that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

 $01:23:54.328 \rightarrow 01:23:56.752$ bringing in you know non clinical NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

01:23:56.752 --> 01:23:58.292 factors really opens the triad

NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

01:23:58.292 --> 01:24:01.870 vertical up to legitimate criticism

NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

 $01{:}24{:}01{.}870 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}04{.}245$ and and also illegitimate criticism

NOTE Confidence: 0.27695724

 $01{:}24{:}04{.}245 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}07{.}120$ and and undermines the entire project

NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963

 $01{:}24{:}07{.}560 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}09{.}640$ baby out with the bathwater I guess right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963

01:24:09.640 --> 01:24:12.195 You know, is the idea like sofa?

NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963

 $01{:}24{:}12{.}200 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}13{.}784$ Getting rid of sofa is sort of step

NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963

 $01{:}24{:}13.784 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}15.359$ one that will do most of the work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963

01:24:15.360 - 01:24:18.200 But if we try to do both at the same time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963

01:24:18.200 --> 01:24:24.600 then you know, I I agree and I worry

NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963

01:24:24.600 --> 01:24:27.200 about just very arbitrary weights

NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963

01:24:27.200 --> 01:24:30.120 to like this mapping, right? Why?

NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963

 $01:24:30.120 \rightarrow 01:24:32.160$ Where does that 4th come from?

- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- 01:24:32.160 --> 01:24:34.315 Why twice as many chances
- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- 01:24:34.315 --> 01:24:36.039 to get monoclonal antibody?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- 01:24:36.040 --> 01:24:37.692 Like I think that has to be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- $01:24:37.692 \longrightarrow 01:24:38.400$ really well justified.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- $01{:}24{:}38{.}400 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}40.675$ Harold Schmidt from Penn is thinking about,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- $01:24:40.680 \longrightarrow 01:24:42.512$ you know, you look at the map and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- $01{:}24{:}42.512 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}44.235$ see how the pandemic's hidden that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- $01{:}24{:}44{.}235 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}46{.}305$ the communities and then you design
- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- $01:24:46.305 \longrightarrow 01:24:48.318$ the weights proportional to that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- $01:24:48.320 \longrightarrow 01:24:49.116$ So that's an idea.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- $01{:}24{:}49{.}116 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}50{.}584$ But I think the nice thing about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- $01:24:50.584 \longrightarrow 01:24:51.714$ having a simulation model is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.53457963
- 01:24:51.714 --> 01:24:52.840 you can just try like
- NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888
- $01{:}24{:}55{.}560 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}57{.}372$ see what's ethical after you look
- NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888
- $01{:}24{:}57{.}372 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}58{.}652$ at your results. That's not the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888

 $01:24:58.652 \rightarrow 01:24:59.396$ way you're supposed to do it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888

 $01:25:00.720 \longrightarrow 01:25:02.968$ No, no. We said that sort of where

NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888

 $01{:}25{:}02{.}968 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}05{.}240$ where we ended up in Omicron when when NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888

 $01:25:05.240 \rightarrow 01:25:08.560$ we actually had our our most severe

NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888

 $01{:}25{:}08.560 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}13.200$ shortages were allowing 2 positions. They

NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888

 $01{:}25{:}15{.}920 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}21{.}813$ have a a lower threshold to to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888

01:25:21.813 --> 01:25:25.552 with Cold War with drawal and was

NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888

 $01:25:25.552 \rightarrow 01:25:27.657$ usually with drawal interventions and

NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888

 $01{:}25{:}27.657 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}30.651$ and so that sort of incorporated

NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888

 $01{:}25{:}30.651 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}33.093$ something that that Mark mentioned

NOTE Confidence: 0.2549888

01:25:33.093 --> 01:25:34.957 you know allowing clinicians

NOTE Confidence: 0.29083

 $01:25:35.640 \rightarrow 01:25:37.630$ to to use their clinical judgement.

NOTE Confidence: 0.29083

 $01{:}25{:}37.630 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}40.000$ And and also you know your your point

NOTE Confidence: 0.29083

 $01:25:40.000 \longrightarrow 01:25:42.630$ that it's actually less about

NOTE Confidence: 0.29083

 $01:25:42.630 \longrightarrow 01:25:44.280$ allocating 11 ventilator among

NOTE Confidence: 0.29083

 $01:25:44.280 \longrightarrow 01:25:46.480$ three patients than having some

- NOTE Confidence: 0.29083
- $01:25:46.480 \longrightarrow 01:25:49.560$ kind of mechanism to to discontinue
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3810770725
- $01:25:50.000 \rightarrow 01:25:52.400$ intervention where where seeing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3810770725
- $01:25:52.400 \longrightarrow 01:25:53.560$ that they're not beneficial. Right.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3810770725
- $01{:}25{:}53{.}560 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}56{.}116$ I I think if you don't have this then just NOTE Confidence: 0.3810770725
- 01:25:56.116 --> 01:25:57.922 for comfort that's but we'll have that's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3810770725
- $01{:}25{:}57{.}922 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}59{.}931$ the nice thing about having this a mod
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3810770725
- $01:25:59.931 \rightarrow 01:26:01.718$ you can actually test that hypothesis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3810770725
- 01:26:01.720 --> 01:26:04.040 So I completely agree. OK.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3810770725
- $01:26:04.040 \longrightarrow 01:26:06.040$ Well, thank you so much, Will.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3810770725
- 01:26:06.040 --> 01:26:08.000 And please
- NOTE Confidence: 0.41115943
- 01:26:09.120 --> 01:26:10.085 please join me in thanking
- NOTE Confidence: 0.41115943
- 01:26:10.085 --> 01:26:10.840 Will, first of all.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.41115943
- $01{:}26{:}15{.}920 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}17{.}616$ But, but so let's you know to realize that,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.41115943
- $01:26:17.616 \rightarrow 01:26:19.680$ I mean this is the program for biomedical NOTE Confidence: 0.529909318
- 01:26:19.680 --> 01:26:21.728 ethics and we need to approach this with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.529909318

 $01:26:21.728 \longrightarrow 01:26:23.080$ some ethical principles in mind and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.529909318

 $01{:}26{:}23.080 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}24.920$ have to agree on those first. But to have NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

IVIE Connuclice. 0.94910919

 $01{:}26{:}24{.}920 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}26{.}768$ some body here who's got really the

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

01:26:26.768 --> 01:26:29.140 ethical expertise as well as the clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

 $01{:}26{:}29{.}140 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}30{.}840$ expertise as well as the quantitative

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

 $01:26:31.200 \longrightarrow 01:26:33.774$ public health expertise in an individual

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

 $01{:}26{:}33.774 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}37.319$ and also give some marvelous presentations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

 $01{:}26{:}35{.}400 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}36{.}480$ this was a real treat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

01:26:36.480 --> 01:26:37.320 But thank you so much. I

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

 $01:26:37.320 \longrightarrow 01:26:38.520$ think this is going to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

01:26:38.520 --> 01:26:39.760 helpful. And I do hope to

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

 $01{:}26{:}39.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}40.796$ the ones who are leading the charge

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

 $01{:}26{:}40.796 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}41.946$ here and the ones who are going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

 $01{:}26{:}41.946 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}45.240$ lead the charge someday soon, I do hope

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

 $01:26:45.240 \rightarrow 01:26:46.880$ this would keep this going.

NOTE Confidence: 0.54310375

 $01:26:46.880 \longrightarrow 01:26:47.800$ We'll keep this going.

01:26:47.800 --> 01:26:49.480 Thank you all very much. Good night.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68558043

 $01{:}26{:}56{.}000 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}56{.}480$ OK, good.