WEBVTT

- NOTE duration:"01:02:41.2480000"
- NOTE language:en-us
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87638587

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:01.950 Thank you and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:00:24.930 --> 00:00:26.650 Alright, I think we're ready

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:00:26.650 \longrightarrow 00:00:28.026$ to get started everybody.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:00:28.030 --> 00:00:30.086 Hello, my name is Lauren Tobias

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:00:30.086 \rightarrow 00:00:32.150$ and I'd like to welcome you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:00:32.150 --> 00:00:33.870 Doris Yale State Sleep seminar,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:00:33.870 --> 00:00:34.719 Yale sleep seminar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}00{:}34.719 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}36.417$ This afternoon I have a few

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:00:36.417 --> 00:00:38.067 quick announcements before I

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:00:38.067 -> 00:00:39.375 introduce today's speaker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:00:39.380 \longrightarrow 00:00:41.100$ First, please take a moment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:00:41.100 - 00:00:42.820 to ensure that you're muted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:00:42.820 --> 00:00:44.535 Also, in order to receive

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:00:44.535 --> 00:00:45.907 CME credit for attendance,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- $00:00:45.910 \longrightarrow 00:00:48.318$ please see the chat room for instructions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- $00{:}00{:}48.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}50.665$ You can text the unique ID for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- $00:00:50.665 \rightarrow 00:00:52.099$ this conference anytime until
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- 00:00:52.099 --> 00:00:54.295 3:15 PM if you're not already
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- $00:00:54.295 \rightarrow 00:00:55.890$ registered with Chelsea and me,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- $00:00:55.890 \longrightarrow 00:00:58.536$ you will need to do that first.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- 00:00:58.540 --> 00:01:00.175 If you have any questions
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- $00:01:00.175 \longrightarrow 00:01:01.156$ during the presentation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- $00{:}01{:}01{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}03{.}328$ I encourage you to make use of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- 00:01:03.328 --> 00:01:05.512 chat room throughout the hour and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- $00:01:05.512 \rightarrow 00:01:07.482$ recorded versions of these lectures
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- $00{:}01{:}07{.}482 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}09{.}759$ will be available on line within two
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- $00:01:09.759 \rightarrow 00:01:12.274$ weeks at the link provided in the chat.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- 00:01:12.274 --> 00:01:12.600 Finally,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- $00{:}01{:}12.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}14.544$ please feel free to share the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:14.544 \rightarrow 00:01:16.224$ announcements for our weekly lecture

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:16.224 \rightarrow 00:01:18.808$ series to anyone else who may be interested,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:18.810 \longrightarrow 00:01:20.415$ or contact Debbie Lovejoy to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:20.415 \longrightarrow 00:01:22.410$ be added to our email list.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}01{:}22.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}24.664$ So now I'm delighted to introduce Doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:24.664 \dashrightarrow 00:01:26.658$ Ulysses Magalang as our speaker today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:01:26.660 --> 00:01:29.089 Doctor Magalong is a professor of medicine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}01{:}29{.}090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}31{.}300$ And neuroscience in the division

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}01{:}31{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}33{.}510$ of pulmonary critical care and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:01:33.582 --> 00:01:36.066 Sleep Medicine at the Ohio State

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}01{:}36.066 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}38.229$ University and director of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:01:38.229 --> 00:01:39.969 OSU Sleep Medicine program.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:01:39.970 --> 00:01:42.938 He is a member of the American

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:01:42.938 --> 00:01:44.210 Thoracic Society Scientific

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:44.283 \dashrightarrow 00:01:46.473$ Advisory Committee and a founding

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:01:46.473 - > 00:01:48.663 member of the Sleep Apnea,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- 00:01:48.670 --> 00:01:49.972 Global Interdiscipline or

00:01:49.972 --> 00:01:50.840 Interdisciplinary Consortium,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:50.840 \longrightarrow 00:01:52.475$ which promotes collaboration

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:52.475 \rightarrow 00:01:54.110$ between international experts

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}01{:}54{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}57{.}148$ working in the field of genetics

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}01{:}57{.}148 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}59{.}118$ and genomics of sleep apnea.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:59.120 \longrightarrow 00:02:01.585$ Doctor Magalong's is in an

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:01.585 \rightarrow 00:02:03.557$ accomplished researcher whose work

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}02{:}03.557 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}06.062$ examines the effects of intermittent

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:02:06.062 --> 00:02:08.487 hypoxia on adipose tissue biology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:08.490 \rightarrow 00:02:10.955$ particularly its effects on glucose

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}02{:}10.955 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}13.420$ control and diabetes and a therogenesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:13.420 \dashrightarrow 00:02:16.864$ His funding sources include the NIH an,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}02{:}16.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}18.325$ the ASM Foundation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:18.325 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.750$ and he has projects including

- $00:02:20.750 \longrightarrow 00:02:22.780$ looking at the genetic,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- 00:02:22.780 --> 00:02:23.273 epigenetic,

 $00{:}02{:}23{.}273 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}25{.}738$ and metabolomic basis of different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:02:25.738 --> 00:02:27.217 subtypes of OSA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:27.220 \dashrightarrow 00:02:29.790$ and another project looking at.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:02:29.790 --> 00:02:31.538 Transcranial direct current stimulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:31.538 \longrightarrow 00:02:33.286$ therapy for central hypersomnia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:02:33.290 --> 00:02:35.034 He regularly speaks nationally

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:35.034 \longrightarrow 00:02:35.906$ and internationally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}02{:}35{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}38{.}335$ and topics including phenotypes of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:38.335 \rightarrow 00:02:40.760$ sleep apnea and the neurobiology

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}02{:}40.835 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}43.091$ of breathing and I am delighted

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}02{:}43.091 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}46.410$ that he's here today to give a talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:46.410 \longrightarrow 00:02:48.146$ entitled RCT's of cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}02{:}48.146 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}50.292$ outcomes and obstructive sleep apnea.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:50.292 \rightarrow 00:02:53.830$ Is it time for an alternative trial design,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747
- $00:02:53.830 \rightarrow 00:02:59.780$ and with that I will turn it over to you.

00:02:59.780 --> 00:03:00.160 Thanks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

00:03:00.160 --> 00:03:01.303 Lauren, good afternoon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00:03:01.303 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.827$ Thanks for inviting me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00{:}03{:}02{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}05{.}050$ So when I first received the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00{:}03{:}05{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}07{.}001$ invitation I thought about presenting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00{:}03{:}07{.}001 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}09{.}383$ some of the animal studies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

00:03:09.383 --> 00:03:11.589 we're doing here at Ohio State.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

00:03:11.590 --> 00:03:12.733 However, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00:03:12.733 \rightarrow 00:03:15.400$ given the audience of this seminar series,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

00:03:15.400 --> 00:03:17.310 I quickly changed my mind.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00{:}03{:}17{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}19{.}482$ So this afternoon we're going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00{:}03{:}19{.}482 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}21{.}880$ talk about humans and that rodents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}03{:}24{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}27{.}066$ So this is my first slide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}03{:}27.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}30.500$ I have no conflict of interest to

 $00:03:30.500 \rightarrow 00:03:34.049$ report in relation to this presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}03{:}34.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}39.026$ Let me start with this headline from 2017.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:03:39.030 --> 00:03:43.440 From CNN Health stating that sleep apnea's NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:03:43.440 \dashrightarrow 00:03:47.040$ CPAP machine doesn't cut heart risks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:03:47.040 \dashrightarrow 00:03:51.376$ And of course the article is referring to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:03:51.380 \rightarrow 00:03:53.920$ The now famous Safe Study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:03:53.920 \rightarrow 00:03:59.198$ its largest trial so far up CPAP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:03:59.200 \dashrightarrow 00:04:01.585$ In in cardiovascular disease that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:04:01.585 --> 00:04:04.538 was published in the New England

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:04:04.538 --> 00:04:07.430 Journal of Medicine in late 2016,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:07.430 \dashrightarrow 00:04:10.944$ and the studies show that CPAP did NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:04:10.944 --> 00:04:13.438 not prevent cardiova
scular events in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:04:13.438 --> 00:04:16.150 patients with moderate to severe OSA

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:04:16.150 --> 00:04:19.449 and stab Lish cardiova
scular disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}04{:}19{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}22{.}502$ It did confirm results of prior studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:22.502 \rightarrow 00:04:25.339$ that CPAP improve daytime sleepiness,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00:04:25.340 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.740$ health related quality of life.

 $00:04:28.740 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.020$ And mood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:31.020 \longrightarrow 00:04:33.996$ So in the next 40 minutes or So

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:33.996 \rightarrow 00:04:36.698$ what I'm going to talk about?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}04{:}36{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}38{.}948$ RCT's cardiovascular outcomes in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:38.948 \rightarrow 00:04:42.320$ OSA and biases in this RCT's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:42.320 \longrightarrow 00:04:44.560$ However, before before that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:44.560 \longrightarrow 00:04:47.920$ I'm gonna that's on a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:04:48.026 --> 00:04:50.190 bit about OSA disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:04:50.190 --> 00:04:53.015 heterogeneity as well as some

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:53.015 \rightarrow 00:04:55.840$ of the preclinical and large

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}04{:}55{.}944 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}58{.}672$ epidemiological studies that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}04{:}58.672 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}02.764$ been done and published that you're.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}05{:}02{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}06{.}016$ All familiar with just as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:05:06.016 \rightarrow 00:05:08.180$ review to put the.

- 00:05:08.180 --> 00:05:10.930 Results of the RCT's in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00{:}05{:}10{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}12{.}580$ the proper perspective.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00:05:12.580 \longrightarrow 00:05:15.298$ And then finally we will discuss
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00:05:15.298 \rightarrow 00:05:17.760$ alternative designs for future studies.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- 00:05:17.760 --> 00:05:19.078 In particular,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00:05:19.078 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.373$ we're going to touch on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00:05:22.373 \dashrightarrow 00:05:24.350$ propensity score matching.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00{:}05{:}24.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}27.790$ So this is the famous Sir Bradford Hill
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00{:}05{:}27{.}790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}31{.}692$ who in the 60s published the criteria
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00{:}05{:}31.692 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}34.637$ for the assessment of causation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00:05:34.640 \rightarrow 00:05:38.222$ What I have listed here are some of the NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00:05:38.222 \rightarrow 00:05:40.861$ criteria as well as the corresponding
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00:05:40.861 \rightarrow 00:05:44.628$ types of studies in the right side to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00:05:44.628 \dashrightarrow 00:05:47.168$ fulfill the criteria for causation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00{:}05{:}47.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}49.622$ So mechanistic and preclinical
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00:05:49.622 \rightarrow 00:05:52.074$ experiments both in animals.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723
- $00:05:52.080 \rightarrow 00:05:55.881$ In humans are typically done to explore

 $00:05:55.881 \rightarrow 00:05:58.680$ the biologic plausibility of causation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:05:58.680 \rightarrow 00:06:00.945$ Epidemiological cross sectional

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:06:00.945 -> 00:06:03.965 studies showed the strength.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}06{:}03{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}08{.}422$ Consistency and dose response of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:06:08.422 \rightarrow 00:06:11.390$ Association while longitudinal studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:06:11.390 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.778$ Show that the timing is right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:06:13.780 \longrightarrow 00:06:16.180$ you know the chronology is right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:06:16.180 \longrightarrow 00:06:18.170$ and then finally you have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:06:18.170 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.770$ Of course interventional studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:06:19.770 --> 00:06:21.370 which can be observation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}06{:}21{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}24{.}156$ ull or in the form of RCT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}06{:}24.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}26.320$ So randomized control trials that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}06{:}26{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}28{.}950$ used to evaluate the treatment effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00:06:31.230 \dashrightarrow 00:06:34.198$ As far as treatment trials are concerned,

00:06:34.200 --> 00:06:37.350 you know proponents, of course of evidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00{:}06{:}37.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}40.257$ based medicine state that there is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00{:}06{:}40.257 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}42.483$ hierarchy of evidence with RCT's and NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00:06:42.561 \rightarrow 00:06:44.736$ systematic reviews and meta analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00:06:44.736 \longrightarrow 00:06:47.470$ occupying the top of the triangle.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00{:}06{:}47{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}51{.}320$ And the reason for that is indeed NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00:06:51.320 \longrightarrow 00:06:54.528$ the quality of evidence shown with

NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00{:}06{:}54{.}528 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}58{.}568$ the error on the right hand side is

NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00{:}06{:}58{.}568 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}01{.}837$ higher from the bottom to the top.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00{:}07{:}01.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}06.736$ And mainly because of the effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00:07:06.736 \longrightarrow 00:07:08.368$ of confounding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00:07:08.370 \longrightarrow 00:07:10.050$ As shown on the left,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

 $00:07:10.050 \rightarrow 00:07:12.730$ the increasing arrows on the left hand side.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:07:15.290 \dashrightarrow 00:07:18.235$ However, there are situations where

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:07:18.235 \longrightarrow 00:07:21.970$ randomization is not possible or ethical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:07:21.970 \longrightarrow 00:07:23.515$ So for example,

 $00{:}07{:}23.515 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}27.120$ it would be unethical to randomize to

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}07{:}27.226 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}31.120$ no smoking versus versus smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:07:31.120 \dashrightarrow 00:07:33.808$ And this is to illustrate this point.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:07:33.810 \longrightarrow 00:07:36.192$ This is an article published in

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:07:36.192 \dashrightarrow 00:07:38.419$ the Christmas edition of The BMJ.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}07{:}38{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}41{.}492$ You know there they are known to publish

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}07{:}41.492 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}44.948$ this kind of articles around Christmas time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}07{:}44.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}47.956$ And this manuscript addresses the issue

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}07{:}47.956 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}51.155$ that parachutes reduces the risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

00:07:51.155 --> 00:07:53.395 injury after gravitational challenge,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}07{:}53.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}56.120$ but their effectiveness has

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:07:56.120 \longrightarrow 00:07:59.520$ not been proven by RCT's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}07{:}59{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}01{.}884$ So they perform a systematic review

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}08{:}01{.}884 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}04{.}370$ and found of course that know

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:08:04.370 \dashrightarrow 00:08:06.465$ our cities have been performed,

 $00:08:06.470 \dashrightarrow 00:08:09.067$ and they conclude that the basis for

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:08:09.067 \rightarrow 00:08:11.789$ power should use is purely observation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

00:08:11.790 --> 00:08:13.850 ULL and it's apparent efficacy

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:08:13.850 \rightarrow 00:08:15.498$ could potentially be explained

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:08:15.498 \longrightarrow 00:08:17.519$ by a healthy cohort effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}08{:}17.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}18.474$ That is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}08{:}18.474 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}21.336$ those individuals who jumped from an

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}08{:}21.336 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}23.806$ airplane without without a parachute

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}08{:}23.806 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}26.680$ are likely to be mentally unhealthy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:08:26.680 \longrightarrow 00:08:29.329$ And that individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00{:}08{:}29{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}31{.}160$ Who insist that all intervention

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:08:31.160 \rightarrow 00:08:33.248$ interventions need to be validated by

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:08:33.248 \dashrightarrow 00:08:36.488$ our CPS? Need to come down to earth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:08:36.490 \longrightarrow 00:08:37.249$ With a bomb.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8304738

 $00{:}08{:}39{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}41{.}870$ Of course they could have answered

NOTE Confidence: 0.8304738

 $00:08:41.870 \rightarrow 00:08:44.609$ your question had they included all

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8304738
- $00:08:44.609 \rightarrow 00:08:47.892$ observational data and not only are cities,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8304738
- $00{:}08{:}47{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}51{.}050$ so it turns out that the US
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8304738
- 00:08:51.050 --> 00:08:52.400 Parachute Association registers
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8304738
- $00:08:52.479 \rightarrow 00:08:55.149$ every single jump from an airplane.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806
- $00:08:57.230 \longrightarrow 00:08:59.660$ Of course, with the parachute.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806
- $00:08:59.660 \longrightarrow 00:09:04.160$ And in 2007 there were over 2 million jumps,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806
- 00:09:04.160 --> 00:09:07.660 resulting in 821 injuries and 18 deaths,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806
- $00{:}09{:}07{.}660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}10{.}485$ so that's a relative risk
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806
- $00:09:10.485 \longrightarrow 00:09:12.745$ reduction of about 99.9%.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806
- $00:09:12.750 \longrightarrow 00:09:14.540$ A huge can argue so.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806
- $00:09:14.540 \rightarrow 00:09:18.180$ Huge effect size that cannot be ignored.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806
- $00{:}09{:}18.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}20.400$ So I have to be honest,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806
- $00{:}09{:}20{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}22{.}290$ I he
sitated to use example
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806
- $00:09:22.290 \longrightarrow 00:09:24.180$ because now it's probably the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806
- $00:09:24.251 \longrightarrow 00:09:26.357$ only the only slide that you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806

 $00:09:26.357 \longrightarrow 00:09:28.170$ will remember from this talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

00:09:30.890 --> 00:09:33.548 But observation ULL study set value,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

 $00:09:33.550 \longrightarrow 00:09:36.220$ but they still have to be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

 $00{:}09{:}36{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}39{.}540$ The methods should be rigorous.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

 $00{:}09{:}39{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}43{.}229$ And I I would present argument that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

 $00:09:43.229 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.563$ perhaps propensity score matching

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

 $00:09:45.563 \dashrightarrow 00:09:49.517$ provides as meta methodology to robustly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

 $00:09:49.517 \dashrightarrow 00:09:52.290$ assess the cardiovascular benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

 $00:09:52.290 \dashrightarrow 00:09:55.335$ Of CPAP in in real world patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

00:09:57.430 --> 00:10:00.118 So let's talk about OSA disease heterogen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

00:10:00.120 --> 00:10:04.630 Nyati we've been at Ohio State.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}10{:}04{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}07{.}264$ We've been actively participating in an

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:10:07.264 \rightarrow 00:10:09.020$ international consortium called Sajik.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}10{:}09{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}12{.}248$ As Lauren alluded to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}10{:}12.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}13.642$ You know there's there's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:10:13.642 \rightarrow 00:10:15.730$ There's two sides in the US.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- 00:10:15.730 --> 00:10:17.118 There's two in Australia,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- 00:10:17.118 --> 00:10:18.506 a couple in Europe,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00:10:18.510 \longrightarrow 00:10:21.898$ and then the rest in in Asia.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00:10:21.900 \rightarrow 00:10:24.876$ And one of the object objectives of Sajik
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}10{:}24.876 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}28.274$ is to establish a large multinational
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00:10:28.274 \rightarrow 00:10:30.846$ cohort with detailed phenotyping.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- 00:10:30.850 --> 00:10:34.648 To understand common and ethnicity specific
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- 00:10:34.648 --> 00:10:38.499 always say presentations and risk profiles.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00:10:38.500 \longrightarrow 00:10:40.790$ So sleep apnea, of course,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}10{:}40.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}43.526$ is a heterogeneous disease that's that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}10{:}43.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}46.519$ Is 2 patients with the same severity
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}10{:}46.519 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}49.065$ of the condition may present
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}10{:}49.065 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}51.429$ with totally different symptoms.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- 00:10:51.430 --> 00:10:55.138 And using cluster analysis we published
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}10{:}55{.}138$ --> $00{:}10{:}59{.}762$ an article about two years ago showing NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:10:59.762 \longrightarrow 00:11:03.162$ that indeed there are different

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

00:11:03.162 --> 00:11:06.178 symptom clusters of sleep apnea.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:11:06.180 \longrightarrow 00:11:10.128$ And they are the consist of

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:11:10.128 \longrightarrow 00:11:13.893$ obstructive sleep apnea patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:11:13.893 \rightarrow 00:11:16.938$ predominantly insomnia symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

00:11:16.940 --> 00:11:19.600 The typical OSA with excessive

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}11{:}19.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}23.775$ sleepiness as well as the third class

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:11:23.775 \rightarrow 00:11:27.305$ are composed of relatively asymptomatic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}11{:}27{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}30{.}748$ Always say patience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:11:30.750 \rightarrow 00:11:32.430$ So what is clustering?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}11{:}32{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}34{.}530$ I probably don't need to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}11{:}34{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}39{.}570$ Tell this group about this since.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}11{:}39{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}42{.}550$ Claire and doctors in truck.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}11{:}42.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}46.852$ Actually at Publix up articles about

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}11{:}46.852 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}50.369$ clustering cluster analysis begins with

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:11:50.369 \rightarrow 00:11:53.639$ a predefined set of input variables

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00:11:53.639 \rightarrow 00:11:57.199$ targeted to a specific question.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00:11:57.200 \rightarrow 00:12:01.680$ Example other symptom based subtypes of OSA.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}12{:}01{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}04{.}770$ You then apply a clustering algorithm
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}12{:}04{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}09{.}224$ and an many are available to group the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00:12:09.224 \longrightarrow 00:12:12.662$ patients such that within a cluster.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}12{:}12{.}670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}15{.}784$ Patients are as similar as possible
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00:12:15.784 \rightarrow 00:12:18.446$ and then between clastres they
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}12{:}18.446 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}20.926$ are as dissimilar as possible.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}12{:}20{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}23{.}990$ The clustering method is unbiased,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- 00:12:23.990 --> 00:12:26.862 meaning it is unsupervised
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00:12:26.862 \longrightarrow 00:12:30.452$ and typically uses the lowest.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}12{:}30{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}34{.}204$ Value of the so-called BICR valuation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00:12:34.204 \rightarrow 00:12:37.332$ information criteria to define the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00{:}12{:}37{.}332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}40{.}554$ optimal number of number of clusters.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841
- $00:12:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:12:42.888$ So this table is busy,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:12:42.890 \longrightarrow 00:12:46.994$ but it's just meant to simply show the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}12{:}46{.}994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}50{.}130$ symptom questions and there's a variety.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:12:50.130 \longrightarrow 00:12:52.560$ To define the clusters that

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:12:52.560 \longrightarrow 00:12:54.990$ was used in our study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}12{:}54{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}57{.}195$ Shows the characteristic's of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}12{:}57{.}195 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}59{.}885$ three clusters with the value side

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:12:59.885 \longrightarrow 00:13:01.930$ light that that helped define.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:13:01.930 \longrightarrow 00:13:04.035$ You know this this clusters

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}13{:}04.035 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}05.719$ in different colors there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:09.490 \rightarrow 00:13:12.080$ So the first clustering study was actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:12.080 \rightarrow 00:13:15.477$ done in a clinical population in Iceland,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00{:}13{:}15{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}17{.}928$ and the results are shown here

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00{:}13{:}17{.}928 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}21{.}050$ in the on the left hand side.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

00:13:21.050 - 00:13:25.594 What is known as the Ice Axe study?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:25.600 \rightarrow 00:13:29.275$ Showing indeed that there are three clusters

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:29.275 \dashrightarrow 00:13:32.947$ and that that's shown on the left side.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.86681
- $00:13:32.950 \rightarrow 00:13:36.374$ And what is not known after that article,

 $00{:}13{:}36{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}39{.}082$ as Publius is that if the classes

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:39.082 \longrightarrow 00:13:42.429$ are unique to Iceland with its

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:42.429 \rightarrow 00:13:44.526$ relatively homogeneous population?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:44.530 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.450$ We did find in our paper that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00{:}13{:}47{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}50{.}950$ same 3 classers generalize in an

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:50.950 \rightarrow 00:13:54.295$ international sample of clinic patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

00:13:54.300 - 00:13:57.378 although with some what you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

00:13:57.380 --> 00:14:00.770 different prevalence of the insomnia

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00{:}14{:}00{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}03{.}482$ and minimally symptomatic groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:14:03.482 \longrightarrow 00:14:06.618$ as shown in the figure here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00{:}14{:}06.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}08.068$ The sleeping group remained

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:14:08.068 \longrightarrow 00:14:09.516$ constant at about 40%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:14:09.520 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.676$ and by the way,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:14:10.676 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.891$ I just want to point out that

 $00:14:12.891 \longrightarrow 00:14:14.916$ the responses that defined the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

00:14:14.916 --> 00:14:17.741 sleepy group was not solely on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00{:}14{:}17.741 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}20.003$ basis of the Epworth score score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00{:}14{:}20{.}010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}22{.}558$ but that was all that was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00{:}14{:}22.558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}24.000$ was part of it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

 $00:14:26.510 \longrightarrow 00:14:29.470$ So this three symptoms sub

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

 $00:14:29.470 \longrightarrow 00:14:32.430$ subtypes are found in both.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

00:14:32.430 --> 00:14:35.860 In both clinical and community

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

 $00{:}14{:}35{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}37{.}918$ based samples worldwide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

 $00:14:37.920 \longrightarrow 00:14:39.628$ So that's the original

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

00:14:39.628 --> 00:14:41.763 I sax study in Iceland.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

 $00:14:41.770 \longrightarrow 00:14:44.770$ This is our study in Sajik

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

 $00:14:44.770 \longrightarrow 00:14:46.770$ which we compared to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

 $00:14:46.770 \longrightarrow 00:14:50.010$ Up the the nine Iceland,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

 $00:14:50.010 \longrightarrow 00:14:53.496$ we also have a in the paper.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

 $00:14:53.500 \rightarrow 00:14:57.028$ There was a second group of Iceland

- NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186
- $00:14:57.028 \rightarrow 00:14:59.290$ patients that basically reproduced
- NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186
- $00{:}14{:}59{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}02{.}570$ their their their original finding.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186
- $00{:}15{:}02{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}06{.}850$ And this is been shown also in a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186
- $00{:}15{:}06{.}850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}10{.}050$ population based cohort in South Korea
- NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186
- $00:15:10.050 \rightarrow 00:15:14.709$ as well as in Europe and most recently,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186
- $00{:}15{:}14.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}18.028$ although this is not published yet,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186
- $00:15:18.030 \longrightarrow 00:15:21.189$ but it's been.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186
- 00:15:21.190 --> 00:15:23.038 Found and generalized,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186
- $00{:}15{:}23.038 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}25.502$ the three subtypes generalized
- NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186
- $00{:}15{:}25{.}502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}28{.}869$ to the Canadian biobank samples.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- $00{:}15{:}33.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}37.805$ And most importantly, so this is a.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- $00{:}15{:}37{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}39{.}790$ A study that was published
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- $00:15:39.790 \longrightarrow 00:15:42.273$ in the Blue Journal by Diego
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- 00:15:42.273 --> 00:15:44.769 Mazzotti out of the pen group.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- 00:15:44.770 --> 00:15:46.782 In 2019, recent analysis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:15:46.782 \longrightarrow 00:15:50.444$ So this is a re analysis of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:15:50.444 --> 00:15:53.129 the Sleep Heart Health study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}15{:}53{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}57{.}990$ And this indicates that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}15{:}57{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}00{.}906$ increased cardiovascular risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:00.910 \rightarrow 00:16:03.997$ Would always say is driven by patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}16{:}03.997 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}06.559$ in the excessively sleepy subtype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:06.560 \rightarrow 00:16:10.879$ So these are survival plots of knew,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:10.880 \longrightarrow 00:16:11.497$ incident.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:16:11.497 --> 00:16:13.348 Coronary heart disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:13.348 \rightarrow 00:16:15.816$ knew incident cardiovascular disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}16{:}15{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}19{.}110$ and knew incident heart failure

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:19.110 \longrightarrow 00:16:22.400$ and after adjusting for covariates

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}16{:}22{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}25{.}686$ in the in the adjusted analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}16{:}25.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}28.595$ it's only this excessively sleepy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}16{:}28.595 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}31.500$ subtype that predicted the occurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:16:31.582 --> 00:16:33.709 of cardiovascular disease,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- $00:16:33.710 \longrightarrow 00:16:37.838$ and that's perhaps shown better here.

 $00:16:37.840 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.279$ In this figure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}16{:}40.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}44.879$ In the sleep part field study there was a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:44.880 \rightarrow 00:16:48.230$ Another group called moderately sleepy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}16{:}48.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}51.085$ but it's the excessively sleepy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:51.085 \rightarrow 00:16:55.004$ subgroup where that had the increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:16:55.004 --> 00:16:58.194 cardiovascular risk, Interestingly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:58.194 \rightarrow 00:17:05.718$ Sleepy patients or subjects without OSA?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:17:05.720 \longrightarrow 00:17:07.046$ That wasn't there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:17:07.046 --> 00:17:09.698 not at risk for future garbage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:17:09.700 \longrightarrow 00:17:12.090$ Cardiovascular events.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:17:12.090 --> 00:17:14.138 So, just to summarize,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:17:14.138 \rightarrow 00:17:16.698$ there are three symptom clusters

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:17:16.698 --> 00:17:19.512 that generalize the moderate severe

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:17:19.512 --> 00:17:22.282 OSA patients in both community

 $00:17:22.282 \longrightarrow 00:17:24.379$ and clinical samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}17{:}24.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}27.338$ The OSA cardiovascular risk comes from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:17:27.338 \rightarrow 00:17:29.990$ only the excessively sleepy subtype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}17{:}29{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}33{.}140$ And sleepiness in those without OSA

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}17{:}33.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}35.720$ did not increase cardiovascular risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}17{:}35{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}38{.}445$ Anne Anne it's conceivable that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:17:38.445 --> 00:17:41.170 distinct molecular responses to OSA

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:17:41.259 \rightarrow 00:17:44.069$ result in sleepiness and increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:17:44.069 --> 00:17:46.879 risk of cardiova
scular disease in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:17:46.880 \longrightarrow 00:17:49.140$ And in certain patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}17{:}49{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}50{.}835$ to this end,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}17{:}50{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}55{.}558$ this was actually the basis of a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:17:55.560 --> 00:17:58.590 Dot Med grant application between Penn,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:17:58.590 --> 00:18:01.620 Ohio State and University of British

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}18{:}01{.}620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}04{.}617$ Columbia with innogy bias and Alan

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}18{:}04{.}617 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}07{.}305$ Pack that's looking at the molecular

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- $00:18:07.305 \rightarrow 00:18:10.463$ basis for differences between or say

 $00:18:10.463 \rightarrow 00:18:13.733$ subtypes because that's not known right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:13.740 \longrightarrow 00:18:15.525$ we just this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:15.525 \rightarrow 00:18:17.905$ This just got funded.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:17.910 \longrightarrow 00:18:20.796$ And we got funded for 3000

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:20.796 \rightarrow 00:18:23.180$ samples from patients with OSA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:23.180 \longrightarrow 00:18:26.295$ So basically the idea is a thousands

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:26.295 \longrightarrow 00:18:29.408$ of samples in its three subtypes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}18{:}29{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}32{.}330$ and the top Med program

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:32.330 \longrightarrow 00:18:34.666$ doesn't give you resources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}18{:}34.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}36.910$ For collection that they collecting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}18{:}36{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}40{.}230$ the samples but it does give you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:40.230 \rightarrow 00:18:42.735$ resources for the following whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}18{:}42.735 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}45.380$ whole genome sequencing DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:45.380 \longrightarrow 00:18:48.035$ patterns as well as metabolomics,

- $00:18:48.040 \rightarrow 00:18:51.420$ so they'll do that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- $00{:}18{:}51{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}54{.}995$ Those three things in in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- $00{:}18{:}54{.}995 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}57{.}855$ all the 3000 samples.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- $00{:}18{:}57{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}00{.}659$ I believe this is going to be a good
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- 00:19:00.659 --> 00:19:02.976 resource because you know that that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- $00{:}19{:}02{.}976$ --> $00{:}19{:}05{.}420$ Med program releases the data for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786
- $00{:}19{:}05{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}07{.}610$ two other two other investigators.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00{:}19{:}09{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}13{.}148$ So just quickly I'm going to touch on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- 00:19:13.148 --> 00:19:15.880 preclinical and epidemiological studies.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00{:}19{:}15{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}19{.}730$ You guys all know this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- 00:19:19.730 --> 00:19:22.645 Numerous studies looking at biological
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00{:}19{:}22.645 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}24.977$ plausibility of obstructive sleep
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00{:}19{:}24{.}977 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}27{.}659$ apnea and cardiovascular disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00:19:27.660 \longrightarrow 00:19:30.846$ just to name a few increased
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00:19:30.846 \longrightarrow 00:19:32.970$ oxidative stress through impaired
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- 00:19:33.064 --> 00:19:36.409 vasoreactivity increase catecholamines.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00:19:36.410 \rightarrow 00:19:40.106$ Increase platelet aggregation and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00:19:40.106 \longrightarrow 00:19:43.802$ increase inflammation and this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00:19:43.802 \longrightarrow 00:19:48.239$ been shown in many animals and.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00{:}19{:}48{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}49{.}779$ And human studies.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00:19:49.779 \longrightarrow 00:19:53.824$ They are small, but it does show
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00:19:53.824 \rightarrow 00:19:56.954$ a biological plausibility of the.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00:19:56.960 \longrightarrow 00:19:59.460$ Of obstructive sleep apnea
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00:19:59.460 \longrightarrow 00:20:00.710$ causing cardiovascular.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- 00:20:00.710 --> 00:20:04.700 Events just to give you an example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00:20:04.700 \longrightarrow 00:20:08.214$ you guys are very familiar with Seabass.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- 00:20:08.220 --> 00:20:09.334 Apollo skis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00{:}20{:}09{.}334 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}13{.}790$ A paper that was published in the Blue
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- $00:20:13.906 \rightarrow 00:20:18.274$ Journal many years ago where he exposed.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- 00:20:18.280 --> 00:20:21.444 C57 Black 6 mice.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747
- 00:20:21.444 --> 00:20:26.190 Two chronic intermittent hypoxia and found.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:20:26.190 \longrightarrow 00:20:29.361$ In panel D here that if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

00:20:29.361 --> 00:20:30.720 combine intermittent hypoxia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}20{:}30{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}32{.}956$ exposure with high cholesterol NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:20:32.956 \longrightarrow 00:20:36.310$ diet that the this is sections

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}20{:}36{.}405 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}40{.}122$ of the order that you will find

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}20{:}40{.}122 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}42{.}235$ a therosclerotic plaques or as NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:20:42.235 \longrightarrow 00:20:44.749$ all the other groups did not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}20{:}44.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}46.935$ This is our own metaanalysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

00:20:46.935 --> 00:20:50.280 also from out of the Sajik group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}20{:}50{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}52{.}758$ showing that the effects of CPAP

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:20:52.758 \rightarrow 00:20:55.543$ on blood pressure in patients with NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}20{:}55{.}543 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}58{.}158$ resistant hypertension and the forest NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:20:58.158 \rightarrow 00:21:01.298$ flat shown here shows the results

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}21{:}01{.}298 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}03{.}783$ of the randomized control trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

00:21:03.790 --> 00:21:07.678 On 24 hour systolic blood pressure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:21:07.680 \rightarrow 00:21:10.879$ And in this analysis we found that

 $00:21:10.879 \rightarrow 00:21:14.792$ there is a large decreases in systolic

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}21{:}14.792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}19.200$ blood pressure after CPAP use in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

00:21:19.200 --> 00:21:22.415 order about 7 millimeters Mercury.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}21{:}24.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}29.894$ Just to summarize, in the interest of time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}21{:}29{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}33{.}414$ See you all know that large epidemiological NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:21:33.414 \rightarrow 00:21:36.812$ studies consistently find that OSA is an

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:21:36.812 --> 00:21:39.077 independent risk factor for hypertension,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}21{:}39{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}41{.}490$ coronary artery disease, heart failure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}21{:}41{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}47{.}106$ stroke and death, and death due to CBT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:21:47.110 \longrightarrow 00:21:49.042$ And that individuals effectively

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}21{:}49.042 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}52.482$ treated with CPAP have the same rate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:21:52.482 \longrightarrow 00:21:54.807$ of cardiovascular events as age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}21{:}54.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}57.215$ sex and weight match controls

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}21{:}57{.}215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}59{.}620$ with no apnea or snoring.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:21:59.620 \longrightarrow 00:22:02.020$ I'm referring, of course,

 $00:22:02.020 \rightarrow 00:22:07.209$ to the very famous study of Doctor Marin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:22:07.210 --> 00:22:10.633 Where he showed that severe always saying

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}22{:}10.633 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}13.241$ Christmas trees of cardiovascular events NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}22{:}13{.}241 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}16{.}944$ and that CPAP use reduces this risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}22{:}16{.}944 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}19{.}599$ because those patients and always say

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}22{:}19{.}599 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}23{.}564$ we'd always say on C pap have the same NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:22:23.564 \rightarrow 00:22:25.969$ cardiovascular event rate as controls,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:22:25.970 --> 00:22:27.578 an inflamed snores,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}22{:}27{.}578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}30{.}794$ and the more important thing is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}22{:}30{.}794 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}34{.}378$ that I believe this is in a follow

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}22{:}34{.}378 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}37{.}370$ up paper where they showed that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}22{:}37{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}40{.}700$ Medication refill rates are similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}22{:}40.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}44.969$ in users and nonusers subsea of CPAP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:22:44.970 --> 00:22:47.100 Suggesting that healthy user bias,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}22{:}47.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}50.068$ which is of course a big confounder

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:22:50.068 \rightarrow 00:22:50.916$ in observation.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- $00{:}22{:}50{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}53{.}885$ ULL studies does not explain

00:22:53.885 --> 00:22:56.850 the observed benefit of CPAP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:22:56.850 \rightarrow 00:23:00.962$ So if you then look at Sir Bradford

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:23:00.962 \rightarrow 00:23:05.038$ Hill's criteria, you'll find that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:23:05.040 \rightarrow 00:23:10.503$ All of this things had been have been shown.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:23:10.510 \longrightarrow 00:23:13.480$ And except for our cities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:23:13.480 --> 00:23:16.050 So.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:23:16.050 - 00:23:18.978 Why is it that the three major are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}23{:}18.978 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}21.572$ cities that have been published so

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:23:21.572 --> 00:23:24.242 far have been have been negative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}23{:}24{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}27{.}530$ and I'm talking about course the SAFE study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:23:27.530 \longrightarrow 00:23:29.250$ which is the largest?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:23:29.250 \longrightarrow 00:23:31.830$ There's the re courage to study

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}23{:}31{.}914 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}34{.}542$ and then there's a dissect study

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}23{:}34{.}542 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}36{.}960$ that was published in Lancet

- $00:23:36.960 \rightarrow 00:23:39.865$ respiratory medicine just this year.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- 00:23:39.870 --> 00:23:41.991 So I'm going to send a review
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- 00:23:41.991 --> 00:23:42.900 real real quick.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- 00:23:42.900 --> 00:23:44.934 This three RCP's and we're going
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- $00{:}23{:}44{.}934 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}47{.}090$ to discuss some of the biases.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- $00{:}23{:}47.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}49.970$ That we believe are present.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- $00:23:49.970 \longrightarrow 00:23:52.840$ So the same, of course,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- 00:23:52.840 --> 00:23:53.974 very briefly,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- $00{:}23{:}53{.}974 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}57{.}943$ is a study multicenter study of roughly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- $00{:}23{:}57{.}943 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}02{.}040$ 2700 adults with moderate to severe OSA.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- 00:24:02.040 --> 00:24:06.174 And it's they have coronary or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- $00{:}24{:}06{.}174 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}08{.}930$ cerebral cerebral vascular disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- $00:24:08.930 \rightarrow 00:24:12.946$ They were randomized to see Pap less use,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- $00:24:12.950 \longrightarrow 00:24:16.457$ less useful care versus usual care alone.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- $00:24:16.460 \longrightarrow 00:24:20.142$ And of course the primacy of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- $00:24:20.142 \rightarrow 00:24:22.987$ primary composite endpoint scuse me

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883
- $00{:}24{:}22{.}987 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}25{.}917$ was death from cardiovascular causes.

 $00:24:25.920 \longrightarrow 00:24:28.941$ Am I stroke?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}24{:}28{.}941 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}33{.}976$ Or hospitalization for unstable angina.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}24{:}33{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}36{.}878$ Heart failure or tie The mean follow-up

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:24:36.878 --> 00:24:40.614 was 3.7 years and the incidence of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}24{:}40{.}614 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}44{.}034$ the primary endpoint did not differ

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}24{:}44{.}034 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}46{.}520$ significantly in patients who did

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}24{:}46{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}49{.}895$ versus those that did not receive C

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:24:49.895 \longrightarrow 00:24:54.895$ Pap with a hard hazard ratio of 1.1.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}24{:}54{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}57{.}215$ And I mentioned earlier CPAP

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}24{:}57{.}215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}59{.}067$ did improve daytime sleepiness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}24{:}59{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}03{.}814$ health related quality of life and and mood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}25{:}03{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}06{.}830$ The records study was published in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}25{:}06{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}09{.}329$ Blue Journal about four years ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:25:09.330 \longrightarrow 00:25:12.578$ The single center RCT.

 $00:25:12.580 \longrightarrow 00:25:14.940$ There's it's a smaller study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:25:14.940 --> 00:25:15.902 Of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:25:15.902 \longrightarrow 00:25:18.307$ there's 244 patients with newly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}25{:}18{.}307 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}19{.}750$ revascularized coronary artery

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}25{:}19{.}821 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}22{.}091$ disease and moderate to severe

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}25{:}22.091 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}23.907$ OSA without day time sleepiness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:25:23.910 \longrightarrow 00:25:27.678$ So this this patient also had stab Lish,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:25:27.680 --> 00:25:29.261 coronary artery disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}25{:}29{.}261 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}31{.}896$ and obviously they were randomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}25{:}31.896 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}35.446$ to sip at versus no see bat and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:25:35.446 \rightarrow 00:25:37.600$ primary endpoint is listed there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:25:37.600 --> 00:25:38.542 It's again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:25:38.542 \rightarrow 00:25:40.897$ it's a composite endpoint endpoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:25:40.900 --> 00:25:43.828 Little bit longer follow up of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}25{:}43.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}45.714$ 4.75 years and again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:25:45.714 \rightarrow 00:25:48.540$ the incidence of the primary endpoint

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8930136
- $00:25:48.626 \rightarrow 00:25:51.548$ did not differ significantly in patients

 $00:25:51.548 \longrightarrow 00:25:55.019$ who did versus those who did not receive

NOTE Confidence: 0.8930136

 $00{:}25{:}55{.}019 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}58{.}960$ a seat back with a hazard ratio of a .8.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:02.280 \longrightarrow 00:26:04.790$ And in the third study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:04.790 \longrightarrow 00:26:08.213$ is that uh, is the Isak study

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00{:}26{:}08{.}213 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}10{.}810$ that was published this year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:10.810 \longrightarrow 00:26:13.320$ It's a multi center RCT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:13.320 \longrightarrow 00:26:15.830$ This patients have were admitted

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:15.830 \longrightarrow 00:26:17.838$ for acute coronary syndrome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:17.840 \rightarrow 00:26:21.856$ They were found to have moderate severe OSA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00{:}26{:}21.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}24.968$ diagnosed during the first 24 to

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:24.968 \longrightarrow 00:26:28.366$ 72 hours after admission and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:28.366 \rightarrow 00:26:30.738$ without daytime sleepiness. Um?

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00{:}26{:}30{.}738 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}34{.}364$ Of course you can question you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00{:}26{:}34{.}364 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}37{.}497$ there's some data that says that.

 $00:26:37.500 \rightarrow 00:26:40.045$ When you follow patients where

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

00:26:40.045 --> 00:26:42.590 admitted for acute coronary syndrome

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:42.666 \rightarrow 00:26:44.981$ that perhaps there hi changes

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00{:}26{:}44{.}981 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}47{.}296$ but nonetheless that was there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

00:26:49.580 --> 00:26:52.609 Entry criteria. Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

 $00{:}26{:}52.609 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}55.663$ randomized to see that versus know

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

 $00{:}26{:}55{.}663 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}58{.}737$ Steve at about 600 in each arm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

00:26:58.740 --> 00:27:01.288 Again, it composite endpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

 $00{:}27{:}01{.}288 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}04{.}473$ that's listed there with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

 $00:27:04.473 \longrightarrow 00:27:07.576$ median follow up of 3.3 years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

 $00{:}27{:}07{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}10{.}100$ And again, the primary endpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

 $00:27:10.100 \longrightarrow 00:27:12.116$ did not differ significantly

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

 $00:27:12.116 \longrightarrow 00:27:14.482$ in patients who did versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

 $00:27:14.482 \longrightarrow 00:27:16.702$ those who did not receive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

00:27:16.710 --> 00:27:18.030 C pap therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}27{:}20.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}23.398$ So what are the biases in the in this

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318
- 00:27:23.398 --> 00:27:26.378 published RCT's of cardiovascular outcomes?

00:27:26.380 --> 00:27:30.404 In no essay I I'm just going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:27:30.404 \longrightarrow 00:27:34.128$ touch on a couple. We believe that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:27:34.128 \longrightarrow 00:27:37.044$ there is a sample selection bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}27{:}37{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}41{.}478$ And and there are a few things to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}27{:}41.478 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}44.968$ consider here. But first thing is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:27:44.968 \longrightarrow 00:27:47.316$ are they recruited participants

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:27:47.316 \longrightarrow 00:27:50.617$ representative of real world and patients?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}27{:}50{.}620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}56{.}794$ And we believe the answer to this is no.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}27{:}56.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}00.022$ Based on the data that I presented to you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:28:00.030 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.754$ they included.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}28{:}01{.}754 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}06{.}064$ Non sleepy patients and excluded.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

00:28:06.070 - 00:28:09.740 The sleepy patients who are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}28{:}09{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}11{.}264$ The ones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:28:11.264 \longrightarrow 00:28:15.836$ That are primarily at risk of

 $00:28:15.836 \rightarrow 00:28:18.300$ developing cardiovascular events.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}28{:}18{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}21{.}541$ All these prior our cities were secondary

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}28{:}21{.}541 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}24{.}359$ prevention studies and and really that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}28{:}24{.}359 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}26{.}619$ was done deliberately because she,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}28{:}26.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}28.925$ you know they wanted a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:28:28.925 \longrightarrow 00:28:30.769$ higher event rates force.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:28:30.770 \longrightarrow 00:28:33.675$ But one of the downside of that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}28{:}33.675 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}37.792$ would be that you know a lot of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}28{:}37{.}792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}40{.}222$ patients were already being managed NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}28{:}40{.}222 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}43{.}645$ actively and they they are on statins NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:28:43.645 \longrightarrow 00:28:47.222$ and and perhaps the effect of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:28:47.222 \rightarrow 00:28:50.260$ Uh, partly the reason why it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:28:50.260 \longrightarrow 00:28:53.010$ negative is that the effect of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

00:28:53.010 --> 00:28:57.060 Of C PAP may have invented.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

00:28:57.060 - 00:29:00.200 The largest issue, we believe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

00:29:00.200 - > 00:29:04.190 is that you know where and how

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318
- $00:29:04.190 \longrightarrow 00:29:07.090$ this participants were recruited.

 $00{:}29{:}07{.}090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}12{.}698$ So all these RCT's focus and diagnosing OSA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

00:29:12.700 --> 00:29:15.520 Among relatively asymptomatic individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:29:15.520 \rightarrow 00:29:19.045$ with stab Lish cardiovascular disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}29{:}19.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}22.615$ As opposed to identifying adults

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:29:22.615 \longrightarrow 00:29:24.754$ with clinically diagnose.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:29:24.760 \longrightarrow 00:29:28.250$ Always saying, then randomizing them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:29:28.250 \rightarrow 00:29:32.066$ So there they are not from the sleep clinics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

00:29:34.460 --> 00:29:37.666 And we believe that symptomatic the bias

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

00:29:37.666 --> 00:29:39.837 occurs because symptomatic patients are

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

 $00{:}29{:}39{.}837 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}42{.}733$ less willing to be randomized to a study

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

 $00{:}29{:}42{.}808 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}45{.}489$ arm that receives no treatment for an

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

 $00{:}29{:}45{.}489 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}47{.}810$ extended period of time of follow-up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

 $00{:}29{:}47.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}50.540$ which is what you need for a

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

 $00{:}29{:}50.626$ --> $00{:}29{:}53.198$ study of cardiovascular events.

 $00:29:53.200 \longrightarrow 00:29:55.860$ Or their providers are less

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

 $00{:}29{:}55{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}57{.}988$ likely to recommend participation

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

 $00:29:57.988 \longrightarrow 00:30:00.250$ and such was the expiry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

 $00:30:00.250 \dashrightarrow 00:30:02.230$ As in some NH sponsored trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

 $00:30:02.230 \longrightarrow 00:30:04.540$ So for example, the Apple study had.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00{:}30{:}07{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}10{.}222$ You know, according to clip, Kushida had.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00{:}30{:}10.222 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}13.302$ Terrible time with recruitment in

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:30:13.302 \longrightarrow 00:30:17.439$ the sleep clinics and they had to

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00{:}30{:}17{.}439 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}20{.}169$ resort to really large advertising.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00{:}30{:}20{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}24{.}362$ The other trial that comes to mind is

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00{:}30{:}24.362 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}26.889$ nalaka Gooneratne's memories trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:30:26.890 \rightarrow 00:30:28.693$ Were he actually?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

00:30:28.693 --> 00:30:31.698 You know providers were not

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:30:31.698 \longrightarrow 00:30:34.080$ willing to randomize.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:30:34.080 \dashrightarrow 00:30:36.644$ Their subjects with cognitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:30:36.644 \rightarrow 00:30:39.849$ impairment if they have they

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:30:39.849 \longrightarrow 00:30:43.246$ were found to have sleep apnea.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:30:43.250 \longrightarrow 00:30:45.356$ So we believe that these are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:30:45.356 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.409$ not our patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:30:46.410 \longrightarrow 00:30:49.553$ If you look at the exclusion criteria
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00{:}30{:}49{.}553 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}52{.}142$ there that's listed and then the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:30:52.142 \longrightarrow 00:30:54.452$ average on the right hand side.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:30:54.460 \rightarrow 00:30:58.778$ The. The average effort,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:30:58.778 \longrightarrow 00:30:59.434$ sleepiness,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00{:}30{:}59{.}434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}03{.}995$ scale score that all the recent RCT
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00{:}31{:}03{.}995 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}07{.}115$ sub C Pap on cardiovascular events
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:31:07.115 \longrightarrow 00:31:10.658$ had had had had had the same bias.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00{:}31{:}10.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}11.662$ And of course,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00{:}31{:}11.662 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}14.000$ you know they had to exclude this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- 00:31:14.078 --> 00:31:15.946 patients because it's unethical
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:31:15.946 \dashrightarrow 00:31:18.281$ to randomize sleepy OSA patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

- $00{:}31{:}18.281 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}20.566$ to no treatment in cardiovascular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00{:}31{:}20.566 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}22.310$ trials of seed Bab,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:31:22.310 \rightarrow 00:31:25.946$ basically because of fear of automobile.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:31:25.950 \rightarrow 00:31:32.268$ Accidents as well as workplace accidents.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:31:32.270 \longrightarrow 00:31:34.964$ But but the sample bias likely
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:31:34.964 \longrightarrow 00:31:37.978$ led to the very low adherence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:31:37.978 \longrightarrow 00:31:40.768$ to CPAP that was reported.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:31:40.770 \longrightarrow 00:31:42.734$ So that's another bias,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:31:42.734 \rightarrow 00:31:45.680$ because low adherence to the rapy would
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00{:}31{:}45.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}48.766$ tend to underestimate the effect size.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:31:48.770 \longrightarrow 00:31:52.530$ And this is the summary.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:31:52.530 \longrightarrow 00:31:56.878$ Of the adherence data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00{:}31{:}56.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}00.100$ In in the three trials in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:32:00.100 \rightarrow 00:32:02.038$ records actually separated their
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:32:02.038 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.368$ users and all patients here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- $00:32:04.370 \rightarrow 00:32:06.150$ so all patients here,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485
- 00:32:06.150 --> 00:32:08.820 these are the CPAP users in

 $00:32:08.919 \longrightarrow 00:32:10.919$ the regards the trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00{:}32{:}10{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}15{.}078$ The bottom line is after 20 four

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:32:15.078 \rightarrow 00:32:18.529$ months roughly in the range of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:32:18.530 \longrightarrow 00:32:22.088 2.8$ to 3 hours per nine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:32:25.400 \longrightarrow 00:32:27.032$ And you'd say, well, that's what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:32:27.032 \rightarrow 00:32:28.750$ you're going to get with C pap,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:32:28.750 \longrightarrow 00:32:31.270$ but but there's some.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:32:31.270 \longrightarrow 00:32:33.450$ Evidence that they may not

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:32:33.450 \longrightarrow 00:32:35.630$ be in our patients so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00{:}32{:}35{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}39{.}344$ This is Peter's studies study that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

00:32:39.344 --> 00:32:43.787 was published in 2019 using big data

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:32:43.787 \dashrightarrow 00:32:48.120$ looking at CPAP usage in clinic patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00{:}32{:}48{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}51{.}557$.6 million patients and and you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00{:}32{:}51{.}557 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}55{.}098$ see that that indeed the device usage

 $00:32:55.098 \rightarrow 00:32:59.050$ is roughly in the area of about 62.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

00:32:59.050 --> 00:33:02.394 To 70% now, I mean this this study

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00{:}33{:}02{.}394 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}05{.}128$ of course is limited because.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:33:05.130 \longrightarrow 00:33:07.446$ You know these are they didn't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

00:33:07.450 --> 00:33:09.958 They didn't include those who did

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00{:}33{:}09{.}958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}13{.}178$ not drop up or return their seat

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:33:13.178 \longrightarrow 00:33:16.082$ that because that's going to be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

00:33:16.090 - 00:33:20.325 They won't have the data and then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00{:}33{:}20{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}21{.}990$ And and it is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00{:}33{:}21.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}25.617$ In addition, this was only the 90 days so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:33:25.620 \rightarrow 00:33:29.596$ Off of therapy. But still some some evidence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:33:29.600 \rightarrow 00:33:33.086$ Not great that perhaps our clinic patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:33:33.090 \dashrightarrow 00:33:36.576$ If you if you enroll them in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

00:33:36.576 --> 00:33:41.058 a in a in a trial of C pap.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00{:}33{:}43.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}48.568$ Would perhaps use? Their seat belt

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

00:33:48.568 --> 00:33:52.360 more and then you know as I mentioned,

00:33:52.360 --> 00:33:56.728 likely some of the selection bias that accord

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00{:}33{:}56{.}728 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}00{.}506$ resulted in the lowest seat belt usage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00{:}34{:}00{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}03{.}982$ The two of these studies in fact did

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00{:}34{:}03{.}982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}07{.}102$ a propensity score matching in those

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00:34:07.102 \longrightarrow 00:34:10.342$ who are adherent versus non adherent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00{:}34{:}10{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}14{.}995$ Um? So the Save and Isaac did this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

00:34:14.995 - 00:34:18.657 and they got a point estimate of a .8.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

00:34:18.660 --> 00:34:22.564 I would just point out and this is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

00:34:22.570 --> 00:34:26.035 This was I think it was Dan Gottlieb who,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00{:}34{:}26{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}28{.}254$ in an editorial in JAMA pointed

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00:34:28.254 \longrightarrow 00:34:30.270$ this out at this point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00{:}34{:}30{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}33{.}854$ estimates similar to the meta analysis of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00{:}34{:}33{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}36{.}060$ That that's that's off of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00{:}34{:}36{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}38{.}260$ our cities Anstatt in trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:34:40.670 \dashrightarrow 00:34:45.901$ And but at the end of the day, you know this.

 $00:34:45.901 \rightarrow 00:34:48.436$ This post hoc analysis using

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

00:34:48.436 --> 00:34:50.300 propensity score matching.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:34{:}50.300$ --> $00{:}34{:}53.475$ Where or underpowered because of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

00:34:53.475 --> 00:34:57.936 the event rate, the recuts a study

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}34{:}57{.}936 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}02{.}737$ did show that they if you separate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}35{:}02{.}737 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}08{.}456$ out the users versus non users that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}35{:}08{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}11{.}400$ There was a difference in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}35{:}11{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}14{.}155$ cardiovascular events in a different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}35{:}14.155 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}16.939$ versus non adherent subjects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:35:16.940 \longrightarrow 00:35:20.420$ So the question is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}35{:}20{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}22{.}760$ What are the alternative

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}35{:}22.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}25.100$ designs for future studies?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:35:25.100 \longrightarrow 00:35:26.452$ If you think about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}35{:}26{.}452 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}28{.}480$ we believe there are three three

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}35{:}28{.}552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}30{.}972$ ways of doing this. One is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}35{:}30{.}972 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}33{.}927$ We can include the excessive

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:35:33.927 \rightarrow 00:35:37.019$ sleep patients in the trials,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:35:37.020 \longrightarrow 00:35:39.470$ include them in the useful
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:35:39.470 \longrightarrow 00:35:42.300$ RCT you know the question is,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:35:42.300 \longrightarrow 00:35:43.557$ is this ethical?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00{:}35{:}43{.}557 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}46{.}071$ And then there's also the question
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:35:46.071 \rightarrow 00:35:48.160$ of whether symptomatic patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:35:48.160 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.800$ and their providers agreed to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- 00:35:50.800 00:35:53.339 not being treated for years.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:35:53.340 \dashrightarrow 00:35:56.268$ The second one was actually published
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:35:56.268 \rightarrow 00:35:59.099$ and was written by a doctor,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- 00:35:59.100 --> 00:36:00.570 Javaherian colleagues in,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00{:}36{:}00{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}02{.}530$ and they suggested that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:36:02.530 \dashrightarrow 00:36:06.418$ Let's do the RCT with pharmacological
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00{:}36{:}06{.}418 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}09{.}867$ management of sleepiness using using
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:36:09.867 \dashrightarrow 00:36:13.426$ Modafinil. We don't think this to wait.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

- $00:36:13.430 \longrightarrow 00:36:16.220$ Wait, are the way to go.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:36:16.220 \longrightarrow 00:36:17.453$ It's probably we.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- 00:36:17.453 --> 00:36:20.330 We believe that using a study design
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:36:20.411 \longrightarrow 00:36:23.151$ using propensity score matching that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:36:23.151 \rightarrow 00:36:25.891$ allows the inclusion of excessively
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- 00:36:25.973 --> 00:36:28.029 sleepy or Safeway patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00{:}36{:}28.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}30.658$ Most likely to show a cardiov ascular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- 00:36:30.658 --> 00:36:33.349 benefit from CPAP and not only
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00{:}36{:}33{.}349 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}35{.}929$ that because you're in a propensity
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00{:}36{:}35{.}929 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}38{.}608$ score design and real world patient,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- 00:36:38.610 --> 00:36:40.815 you're going to compare users
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:36:40.815 \longrightarrow 00:36:42.138$ versus non users.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:36:42.140 \longrightarrow 00:36:44.762$ You could examine the true benefit
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- 00:36:44.762 --> 00:36:47.953 of C pap therapy on cardiovascular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:36:47.953 \rightarrow 00:36:52.003$ outcomes within real world clinical patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- 00:36:52.010 00:36:55.098 And this is the the paper that I

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948
- $00:36:55.098 \rightarrow 00:36:57.849$ was alluding to that was published.

00:36:57.850 --> 00:36:59.930 They estimate that they would

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}36{:}59{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}01{.}594$ need a sample size,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:37:01.600 \rightarrow 00:37:04.519$ about 24,000 with 12,000 in each arm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:37:04.520 \rightarrow 00:37:06.920$ Using pharmacological management of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:37:06.920 \longrightarrow 00:37:08.120$ Of sleepiness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:37:10.240 \longrightarrow 00:37:13.607$ This is the way we think that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}37{:}13.607 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}17.019$ this the using propensity score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:37:17.020 \longrightarrow 00:37:18.646$ Should be done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

00:37:18.646 --> 00:37:21.356 You know you have include.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}37{:}21.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}24.006$ Subjects who are seen in the clinic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}37{:}24.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}26.670$ So you have the inclusion criteria there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:37:26.670 \rightarrow 00:37:29.246$ Of course there will be sleepy subjects

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}37{:}29{.}246 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}32{.}263$ based on the sleepy subtype and they will

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}37{:}32{.}263 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}35{.}379$ be treated with CPAP in all the patients.

 $00:37:35.380 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.858$ But the most important thing there

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}37{:}37{.}858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}40{.}782$ in any propensity score design is to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}37{:}40.782 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}43.176$ obtain the covariates and I'll explain

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:37:43.176 \longrightarrow 00:37:46.000$ that in a little bit and then you can.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:37:46.000 \dashrightarrow 00:37:50.304$ You can then compare those who are adherents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}37{:}50{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}51{.}798$ Versus those who declined

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}37{:}51.798 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}53.286$ the rapy or non users.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}37{:}53{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}55{.}810$ You could define this as less than

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}37{:}55{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}58{.}655$ two hours per night or you could say

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}37{:}58.655 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}01.235$ less than one hour per night without

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}38{:}01{.}235 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}03{.}665$ using the without CPAP you states

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:03.665 \rightarrow 00:38:07.414$ in the last 30 days and then you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}38{:}07{.}414 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}10{.}899$ can do a propensity score design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:10.900 \rightarrow 00:38:15.476$ With an annual follow up of CPAP adherence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:15.480 \longrightarrow 00:38:19.190$ an major adverse cardiovascular events.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:19.190 \rightarrow 00:38:22.118$ For for a number of years.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913
- $00:38:22.120 \rightarrow 00:38:25.936$ So this is crucial for any PS design study.

 $00{:}38{:}25{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}28{.}484$ You need to include a rich

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:28.484 \longrightarrow 00:38:30.180$ set of clinical relevant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:30.180 \rightarrow 00:38:32.040$ clinically relevant covariates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}38{:}32{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}33{.}280$ Associated with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:33.280 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.292$ Basically we do things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}38{:}35{.}292 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}38{.}310$ the CPAP adherence and the outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}38{:}38{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}41{.}460$ and this reduces the bias associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}38{:}41{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}44{.}530$ with observed and unobserved covariates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

00:38:44.530 --> 00:38:47.407 And just in the interest of time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}38{:}47{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}51{.}658$ I'll you know these are the useful things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}38{:}51{.}660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}54{.}740$ That we would think would be important

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}38{:}54{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}57{.}350$ as predictors of CPAP adherence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}38{:}57{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}00{.}524$ Including educational attainment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:39:00.524 \longrightarrow 00:39:03.698$ Social economic factors.

- 00:39:03.700 --> 00:39:04.558 Insoft,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913
- $00{:}39{:}04.558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}08.848$ presence of insomnia and psychological
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913
- $00{:}39{:}08{.}848 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}13{.}840$ problems but also include measures of.

 $00:39:13.840 \longrightarrow 00:39:16.280$ Self efficacy as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00{:}39{:}16{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}18{.}110$ as medication adherence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8403714

 $00:39{:}21.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}23.866$ The predictors of the events obviously

NOTE Confidence: 0.8403714

 $00{:}39{:}23.866 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}26.708$ are the useful things that we consider.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:39:28.980 --> 00:39:34.080 Gender, obesity, prevalence, CVD, smoking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}39{:}34.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}36.872$ Lipids, family history and

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:39:36.872 \dashrightarrow 00:39:41.060$ physical activity as well as Dyett.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:39:41.060 \rightarrow 00:39:46.880$ Assessment so what's propensity score?

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:39:46.880 \longrightarrow 00:39:48.800$ So the definition,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:39:48.800 -> 00:39:52.000 the PS is the probability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:39:52.000 \rightarrow 00:39:55.528$ Or being in the treated group conditional

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}39{:}55{.}528 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}58{.}899$ on all relevant baseline covariates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:39:58.900 \longrightarrow 00:40:00.444$ And at here's the.

 $00:40:00.444 \rightarrow 00:40:02.760$ Is the formula there and basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:40:02.838 \longrightarrow 00:40:05.694$ it says that given two subjects with

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:40:05.694 --> 00:40:08.600 identical values of your propensity score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:40:08.600 \longrightarrow 00:40:11.576$ one from the treated group and

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:40:11.576 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.250$ one from the control group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}40{:}14.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}17.090$ If it's the same then analysis may proceed

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:40:17.090 \rightarrow 00:40:20.019$ as if the subjects were randomized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:40:20.020 \rightarrow 00:40:23.728$ And of course the key assumption is that no,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}40{:}23.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}27.170$ there are no observed confounders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:40:27.170 \longrightarrow 00:40:30.128$ There's three types of PS design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:40:30.130 \longrightarrow 00:40:32.220$ She used stratification by PSR

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}40{:}32.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}35.472$ subclasses at one to one matching or

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}40{:}35{.}472 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}38{.}172$ there's a technique called inverse

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}40{:}38.172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}40.480$ probability of treatment waiting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}40{:}40{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}43{.}370$ but the fondle fundamental considerations

 $00{:}40{:}43{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}47{.}550$ of this science is that the outcome days

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}40{:}47{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}51{.}329$ that data is not used in the PS design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:40:51.330 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.738$ So in regulatory studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:40:54.740 \longrightarrow 00:40:59.168$ So FDA actually uses these two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}40{:}59{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}02{.}368$ To make a decision whether to

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:41:02.368 \rightarrow 00:41:04.500$ approve surgeries or devices.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}41{:}04{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}09{.}156$ It must be documented that the PS design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}41{:}09{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}12{.}597$ Start decision had no access to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:41:12.597 --> 00:41:15.802 outcome data and therefore the PS

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}41{:}15.802 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}19.072$ design faces a second design phase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}41{:}19.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}22.727$ Very briefly, this is just a schematic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:41:22.730 --> 00:41:24.778 You perform a observation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}41{:}24.778 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}28.576$ ULL study and you have the developed

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:41:28.576 --> 00:41:31.088 propensity scores using this

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:41:31.088 \rightarrow 00:41:35.657$ techniques and then at the end of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:41:35.657 --> 00:41:38.765 day you got PS based matched pairs.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00:41:38.770 \longrightarrow 00:41:41.750$ So this is nothing new.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- 00:41:41.750 --> 00:41:44.928 Independent group has used this to assess
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00{:}41{:}44{.}928 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}47{.}509$ CPAP treatment and fasting lipids.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00:41:47.510 \longrightarrow 00:41:48.462$ For example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00:41:48.462 \rightarrow 00:41:53.270$ and you'll see this is known as the lab plot,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00:41:53.270 \longrightarrow 00:41:55.982$ and here are the cold marriage
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00{:}41{:}55{.}982 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}58{.}550$ and the PS design sample.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- 00:41:58.550 --> 00:42:00.542 As you can see,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00:42:00.542 \longrightarrow 00:42:03.530$ simulates that of us if you've
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00{:}42{:}03.643 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}07.108$ done a randomized control trial.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00:42:07.110 \longrightarrow 00:42:10.392$ So we believe that the benefits
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- 00:42:10.392 --> 00:42:12.580 of a PS assign.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00{:}42{:}12{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}15{.}418$ And obtain valid estimates of causal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00{:}42{:}15{.}418 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}17{.}310$ treatment effects in observation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00:42:17.310 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.415$ ULL Data Bay creating covariate
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:42:19.415 \longrightarrow 00:42:22.184$ balance similar to or even better

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:42:22.184 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.930$ than under randomization.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}42{:}23.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}27.276$ You can use real world patient data

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:42:27.276 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.799$ that is often not well represented in

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}42{:}30.799 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}34.960$ those that you choose to be randomized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}42{:}34{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}37{.}816$ You can include patients that cannot be

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:42:37.816 --> 00:42:40.429 otherwise ethically be randomized in RCT's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}42{:}40{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}42{.}860$ and you can evaluate benefits of

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}42{:}42{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}45{.}060$ treatment efficiently in larger samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:42:45.060 \longrightarrow 00:42:47.165$ Because this is a pragmatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:42:47.165 --> 00:42:50.254 trial so you can just, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:42:50.254 \rightarrow 00:42:53.206$ you can easily insert this within

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}42{:}53.206 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}56.169$ the context of clinical practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:42:56.170 --> 00:42:57.076 And so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:42:57.076 \longrightarrow 00:42:59.794$ while an RCT provides the preferred

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:42:59.794 --> 00:43:02.877 level of evidence in ideal world,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00{:}43{:}02.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}06.126$ PS designs can achieve the same
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00:43:06.126 \longrightarrow 00:43:07.749$ level of evidence.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00{:}43{:}07.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}12.356$ For treatment effects in the real world.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- 00:43:12.360 --> 00:43:13.299 And you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- 00:43:13.299 --> 00:43:13.612 I,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00{:}43{:}13.612 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}16.347$ I certainly am not an expert on the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00{:}43{:}16{.}347 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}18{.}693$ propensity score matching at the sign.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923
- $00{:}43{:}18.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}21.859$ Greg Maislin in our group is the one that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7878788
- $00:43:23.950 \longrightarrow 00:43:27.170$ That that has worked with Donald Rubin,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7878788
- $00:43:27.170 \longrightarrow 00:43:29.930$ who is the inventor of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7878788
- 00:43:29.930 --> 00:43:31.310 propensity score matching,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7878788
- $00{:}43{:}31{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}32{.}922$ and this this manuscript.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7878788
- $00:43:32.922 \rightarrow 00:43:36.830$ He did a good job in explaining this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7878788
- $00{:}43{:}36{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}39{.}130$ If you're interested, there's a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7878788
- $00{:}43{:}39{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}41{.}430$ recently accepted paper in sleep.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:43:43.540 \longrightarrow 00:43:46.980$ That was accepted just.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

00:43:46.980 --> 00:43:49.770 Last last week I believe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00{:}43{:}49{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}53{.}940$ where he explained in detail more

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:43:53.940 \longrightarrow 00:43:56.720$ the propensity score matching.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00{:}43{:}56.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}59.312$ So the proposed clinical trial would

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00{:}43{:}59{.}312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}02{.}484$ be a multi center RCT of patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00{:}44{:}02{.}484 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}05{.}202$ with moderate to severe OSA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00{:}44{:}05{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}08{.}479$ We believe we can do this with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00{:}44{:}08{.}479 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}12{.}219$ either 10 or 1310 to 13 sites you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:12.219 \longrightarrow 00:44:15.540$ offer seat up to all patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00{:}44{:}15{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}18{.}403$ The primary would be similar to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:18.403 \rightarrow 00:44:21.478$ same a composet endpoint follow up of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00{:}44{:}21{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}23{.}960$ Two to five years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:23.960 \rightarrow 00:44:27.056$ And we believe that we with 11,000 subjects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:27.060 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.407$ and that includes additional 10% to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:29.407 \rightarrow 00:44:31.849$ maintain power after loss to follow

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558
- $00:44:31.849 \longrightarrow 00:44:34.564$ up or trimming of patients in the

 $00{:}44{:}34{.}564 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}37{.}150$ PS design that you could do this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:37.150 \longrightarrow 00:44:40.633$ Now you say, well, that's a lot of subjects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:40.640 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.368$ We actually did a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00{:}44{:}42{.}368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}47{.}120$ So if you look at the number of subjects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00{:}44{:}47{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}49{.}780$ We included this data in in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:49.780 \longrightarrow 00:44:52.059$ recent grant that we submitted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:52.060 \dashrightarrow 00:44:55.196$ The total here is like this is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:55.196 \rightarrow 00:44:57.859$ annual number of subjects in the centers

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:57.859 \rightarrow 00:45:01.129$ and you have 7 to 6000 potentially.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}45{:}03.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}05.144$ And rollable patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}45{:}05{.}144 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}07{.}892$ So we believe that we could

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}45{:}07{.}892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}10{.}168$ we could do this study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

00:45:10.170 -> 00:45:14.630 It's going to be a heavy lift. We we, we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}45{:}14.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}18.390$ we we think but but it's worth trying.

- $00:45:18.390 \longrightarrow 00:45:20.919$ So to summarize.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- $00:45:20.920 \longrightarrow 00:45:24.180$ Get few minutes for questions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- 00:45:24.180 --> 00:45:27.792 Sleep apnea is heterogeneous disease symptom
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- $00:45:27.792 \rightarrow 00:45:32.000$ clusters of those with daytime sleepiness,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- $00:45:32.000 \rightarrow 00:45:34.472$ insomnia, and asymptomatic groups.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- $00{:}45{:}34{.}472 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}37{.}562$ Are consistently shown in community
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- $00{:}45{:}37{.}562 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}40{.}518$ and clinical samples worldwide.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- $00:45:40.520 \rightarrow 00:45:42.590$ It's important because EDS we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- 00:45:42.590 --> 00:45:45.216 believe is a marker of cardiovascular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- $00:45:45.216 \rightarrow 00:45:48.018$ risk in in those with OSA,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- $00:45:48.020 \rightarrow 00:45:51.919$ but not in those without always say.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- 00:45:51.920 --> 00:45:55.202 And Publix are cities of cardio
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- $00{:}45{:}55{.}202 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}57{.}390$ cardiovascular outcomes in OSA
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- $00:45:57.483 \rightarrow 00:46:00.613$ have been negative and inconsistent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- $00:46:00.613 \rightarrow 00:46:03.117$ with the large epidemiological
- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- 00:46:03.117 -> 00:46:05.957 data because of major biases.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494
- $00:46:05.960 \rightarrow 00:46:09.662$ That's primarily the sample selection bias

 $00{:}46{:}09{.}662 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}14{.}468$ and bias due to adherence to the rapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}46{:}14.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}17.470$ In future studies need to include

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:46:17.470 \rightarrow 00:46:20.420$ and focus on sleepy subjects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

00:46:20.420 --> 00:46:21.899 Ethical lamp limitations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:46:21.899 \longrightarrow 00:46:23.871$ including this patients can

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}46{:}23.871 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}26.270$ be overcome with observation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:46:26.270 \longrightarrow 00:46:29.180$ ULL designs using propensity scores an

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}46{:}29{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}32{.}660$ to obtain a robust treatment effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:46:32.660 \longrightarrow 00:46:35.135$ This designs need to directly

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:46:35.135 \rightarrow 00:46:37.610$ ensure balance of covariates related

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:46:37.692 \longrightarrow 00:46:39.570$ to cardiovascular events,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

00:46:39.570 --> 00:46:41.994 including measures of healthy

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}46{:}41.994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}45.024$ used user in healthy adhere bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}46{:}45{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}47{.}682$ In patients who are very compliant

 $00:46:47.682 \rightarrow 00:46:50.286$ seat back compared to non users

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}46{:}50{.}286 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}52{.}536$ and I'm going to stop there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}46{:}52{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}53{.}130$ Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

00:46:55.240 --> 00:46:57.748 Thank you so much Doctor Magalong,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

 $00{:}46{:}57{.}750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}00{.}138$ that was really a fantastic talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

00:47:00.138 --> 00:47:03.115 and I think really help to clarify

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

 $00{:}47{:}03.115 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}05.719$ some of the the residual questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

 $00:47:05.720 \longrightarrow 00:47:09.488$ that a lot of us had about how we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

00:47:09.488 --> 00:47:11.578 should be characterizing the benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

00:47:11.580 --> 00:47:13.770 The cardiovascular benefit of CPAP

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

 $00{:}47{:}13.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}16.420$ for patients after these these recent NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

 $00:47:16.420 \longrightarrow 00:47:19.157$ trials I want to invite people to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

 $00{:}47{:}19{.}157 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}21{.}219$ unmute themselves and ask questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

 $00{:}47{:}21{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}24{.}980$ I expect there probably are some. Not

NOTE Confidence: 0.7751113

 $00{:}47{:}24.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}27.180$ really, I was going to say I'm not

NOTE Confidence: 0.7751113

 $00:47:27.180 \longrightarrow 00:47:29.746$ sure I have access to the chat room,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7751113
- 00:47:29.750 --> 00:47:33.490 but you could just tell us up, Garth. How

 $00:47:33.490 \longrightarrow 00:47:35.830$ are you? Thank you so much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:47:35.830 \rightarrow 00:47:38.170$ That was a really thoughtful presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:47:38.170 \longrightarrow 00:47:40.120$ I'm so sorry we can't

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:47:40.120 \longrightarrow 00:47:42.070$ have you here in person,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

00:47:42.070 --> 00:47:44.776 but we really appreciate you making

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}47{:}44.776 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}47.239$ the time and congratulations on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:47:47.239 \rightarrow 00:47:49.408$ top Med project and I, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:47:49.408 \rightarrow 00:47:52.240$ I agree with with so much of what

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}47{:}52.325 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}55.552$ you were saying and I think the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}47{:}55{.}552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}57{.}359$ propensity score matched approach

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}47{:}57{.}359 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}00{.}392$ is a great is a great idea and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}00{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}03{.}368$ I think I also want to emphasize.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}03{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}07{.}240$ A point that you made which is you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}07{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}10{.}040$ the trials that have been the three

 $00:48:10.040 \longrightarrow 00:48:12.231$ trials that you referenced that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:12.231 \rightarrow 00:48:15.402$ would really have been done to date,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}15{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}17{.}811$ and I think we're really in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}17.811 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}19.809$ the infancy of doing randomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:19.809 \longrightarrow 00:48:22.491$ control trials in our field compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}22{.}491 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}25{.}883$ to the size of the trials that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

00:48:25.883 --> 00:48:27.819 typically occur in cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:27.819 \longrightarrow 00:48:31.802$ disease are tiny and with so many

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}31.802 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}33.548$ pharmacological treatments available.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}33{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}36{.}266$ That that actually reflects some of the NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}36{.}266 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}38{.}783$ biologic pathways by which sleep apnea NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:38.783 \rightarrow 00:48:40.923$ can lead to cardiovascular disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}40{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}43{.}170$ You really need so those large sample NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}43.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}45.737$ sizes to to demonstrate an additional

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:45.737 \rightarrow 00:48:48.307$ benefit associated with CPAP therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

00:48:48.310 --> 00:48:50.838 But I think one point I would add

- NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886
- $00:48:50.838 \rightarrow 00:48:53.674$ is that I think the outcomes may

 $00{:}48{:}53.674 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}56.395$ be also different depending on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:56.395 \rightarrow 00:48:58.970$ cardiovascular event that is chosen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}58{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}01{.}763$ and I think save may have pointed

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:49:01.763 \longrightarrow 00:49:04.080$ to this a little bit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}49{:}04{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}06{.}824$ Some of our studies and stroke have

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}49{:}06{.}824 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}09{.}172$ suggested this as well that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:49:09.172 \longrightarrow 00:49:12.170$ there may be a more robust affect in

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}49{:}12.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}14.830$ stroke for some reason compared to MI,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}49{:}14.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}17.518$ and I think some of the observation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}49{:}17.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}21.240$ ULL data support that but.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

00:49:21.240 --> 00:49:24.498 Another another approach I think to

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:49:24.498 \longrightarrow 00:49:27.260$ doing a randomized controlled trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}49{:}27{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}30{.}382$ We've done is is more of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

00:49:30.382 --> 00:49:31.720 comparative effectiveness approach,

 $00:49:31.720 \longrightarrow 00:49:34.204$ and so you're not randomizing a NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886 $00:49:34.204 \longrightarrow 00:49:36.420$ patient that you have diagnosed NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886 $00:49:36.420 \longrightarrow 00:49:39.300$ with sleep apnea and not treated, NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886 $00:49:39.300 \rightarrow 00:49:42.296$ but but rather randomizing to a diagnosis NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886 $00:49:42.296 \rightarrow 00:49:44.210$ and treatment intervention strategy, NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886 $00:49:44.210 \rightarrow 00:49:46.880$ trial versus the usual care approach, NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886 $00:49:46.880 \longrightarrow 00:49:49.414$ and I think that that might help NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886 $00:49:49.414 \rightarrow 00:49:52.333$ to get through some of the ethical NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886 $00{:}49{:}52{.}333 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}54{.}967$ challenges and could be a potentially NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886 $00:49:55.045 \rightarrow 00:49:58.225$ useful strategy in a very high NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886 $00:49:58.225 \rightarrow 00:49:59.815$ pretest probability population. NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701 00:50:00.640 --> 00:50:01.690 Thank you Clark. NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701 00:50:01.690 --> 00:50:04.280 With it, you know I just didn't have NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701 $00:50:04.280 \longrightarrow 00:50:07.270$ the time to to go into those details, NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701 $00:50:07.270 \longrightarrow 00:50:09.020$ but that was those points. NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701 00:50:09.020 --> 00:50:10.756 Your point about Cerebro

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701
- $00{:}50{:}10.756 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}12.058$ vascular disease versus.

 $00:50:12.060 \longrightarrow 00:50:14.700$ You know, a meisen all those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:14.700 \longrightarrow 00:50:16.812$ those kind of events?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00{:}50{:}16.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}19.922$ Certainly there is data to suggest

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:19.922 \longrightarrow 00:50:23.093$ that you'll have probably a greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:23.093 \longrightarrow 00:50:25.633$ effect on cerebral vascular effect

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00{:}50{:}25{.}633 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}29{.}428$ events and and the other issue

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:29.428 \rightarrow 00:50:32.153$ of doing a comparative effectiveness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

00:50:32.160 --> 00:50:34.810 I didn't list it here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:34.810 \longrightarrow 00:50:39.388$ it was actually in the paper.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

00:50:39.390 --> 00:50:40.822 Potentially you could say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00{:}50{:}40.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}43.248$ well, let's do an enhance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:43.248 \rightarrow 00:50:48.096$ Add CPAP adherence so that that way you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00{:}50{:}48.096 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}51.925$ have a separation between with usage right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00{:}50{:}51{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}53{.}850$ We believe that they may.

 $00:50:53.850 \rightarrow 00:50:56.524$ That might actually affect the sample size,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00{:}50{:}56{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}58{.}440$ and you're going to because

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:58.440 \longrightarrow 00:50:59.968$ it's you're going to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:59.970 \longrightarrow 00:51:02.870$ You're probably going to need.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:51:02.870 \longrightarrow 00:51:04.430$ A very large sample size,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:51:04.430 \dashrightarrow 00:51:07.886$ if that's the approach that you're going to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

00:51:07.890 --> 00:51:12.126 That you are going to take.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

00:51:12.130 --> 00:51:16.897 But but those are very good points.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806

00:51:18.500 --> 00:51:19.658 Can I hire

NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806

 $00:51:19.660 \longrightarrow 00:51:20.818$ lease is high

NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806

 $00:51:20.820 \longrightarrow 00:51:22.742$ High made Nelson? How are

NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806

 $00:51:22.742 \longrightarrow 00:51:25.058$ you good? Thanks oh that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806

 $00{:}51{:}25{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}26{.}608$ a great insightful talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806

00:51:26.610 --> 00:51:28.540 I'm just going to ask

NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806

00:51:28.540 --> 00:51:29.689 it kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806

 $00:51:29.690 \longrightarrow 00:51:30.848$ a different question.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806
- $00:51:30.850 \rightarrow 00:51:33.938$ We're going to treat all patients with OSA
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806
- 00:51:33.940 --> 00:51:36.640 that are sleepy because we have no
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806
- $00{:}51{:}36{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}38{.}568$ other better treatment than CPAP.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.851808
- $00:51:39.580 \longrightarrow 00:51:41.168$ If that's a statement,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.851808
- $00:51:41.170 \longrightarrow 00:51:43.155$ then who cares about whether
- NOTE Confidence: 0.851808
- $00:51:43.155 \rightarrow 00:51:45.928$ CPAP is going to reduce or not
- NOTE Confidence: 0.851808
- 00:51:45.928 --> 00:51:47.520 reduce cardiovascular events? OK,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.851808
- $00{:}51{:}47{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}49{.}510$ so the question is the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.851808
- $00{:}51{:}49{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}51{.}490$ non sleeping group that we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.851808
- $00:51:51.490 \longrightarrow 00:51:53.474$ don't really have the full
- NOTE Confidence: 0.851808
- $00{:}51{:}53{.}474 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}55{.}860$ confidence that whether they do or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.851808
- $00:51:55.860 \longrightarrow 00:51:57.840$ they do not have that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.843109183333333
- $00:51:57.840 \longrightarrow 00:52:00.540$ increase risk. And that's the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.843109183333333
- $00:52:00.540 \longrightarrow 00:52:03.074$ tough rope to trade with something
- NOTE Confidence: 0.843109183333333
- $00{:}52{:}03.074 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}05.620$ like super, which lends itself to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00:52:05.620 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.880$ suboptimal adherence on

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00:52:06.880 \longrightarrow 00:52:08.149$ a long term

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00:52:08.150 \longrightarrow 00:52:11.050$ basis. How we gonna actually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00:52:11.050 \longrightarrow 00:52:12.800$ Answered that question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00{:}52{:}13.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}16.325$ Well, to the point of so the the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

00:52:16.325 --> 00:52:18.535 point or question is where are you

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00:52:18.535 \rightarrow 00:52:20.949$ going to treat this patient's anyway?

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00:52:20.950 \rightarrow 00:52:23.239$ Because they're sleepy is that is that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00{:}52{:}23.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}26.467$ is that correct? Well, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00{:}52{:}26{.}467 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}28{.}910$ we believe that there is a reason

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00{:}52{:}28{.}987 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}31{.}269$ and one of them there are other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00{:}52{:}31{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}33{.}328$ You know. There are several reasons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00:52:33.330 \longrightarrow 00:52:36.738$ but the major one is that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

00:52:36.740 --> 00:52:38.917 You know right now I should know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835407286

00:52:41.840 --> 00:52:45.520 Screening for or identifying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835407286

00:52:45.520 --> 00:52:48.075 UH, patients, for example,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.835407286
- 00:52:48.075 --> 00:52:51.345 a large scale in primary practice
- NOTE Confidence: 0.835407286
- $00:52:51.345 \longrightarrow 00:52:54.368$ is is not recommended, right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.835407286
- $00:52:54.368 \longrightarrow 00:52:57.458$ So we believe that showing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.835407286
- $00:52:57.458 \longrightarrow 00:52:59.930$ that sifat indeed impacts.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.835407286
- 00:52:59.930 --> 00:53:02.674 On whether sudrow basket
- NOTE Confidence: 0.835407286
- $00:53:02.674 \longrightarrow 00:53:05.418$ or or cardiovascular event
- NOTE Confidence: 0.835407286
- 00:53:05.418 --> 00:53:08.428 would would sway you know.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.835407286
- $00:53:08.430 \longrightarrow 00:53:10.170$ A people too.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664
- $00:53:12.820 \rightarrow 00:53:16.684$ To identify more cases of sleep apnea and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664
- $00:53:16.684 \rightarrow 00:53:19.985$ perhaps towards towards screening, although
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664
- $00:53:19.985 \longrightarrow 00:53:24.335$ that's a different entirely different topic.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664
- $00{:}53{:}24{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}28{.}876$ The other thing is, as in other studies.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664
- $00{:}53{:}28{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}32{.}396$ That show that you know physician
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664
- $00{:}53{:}32{.}396 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}35{.}250$ advocacy of treatment. For example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664
- $00{:}53{:}35{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}39{.}610$ if if they know that the treatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:53:39.719 \longrightarrow 00:53:43.734$ makes a difference, they would indeed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

00:53:43.734 --> 00:53:47.622 Outside of the excessive daytime sleepiness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:53:47.630 \rightarrow 00:53:50.990$ they would indeed encourage identification of NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:53:50.990 \rightarrow 00:53:55.468$ patients as well as US treatment of patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00{:}53{:}55{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}59{.}198$ in that I think that's well known in

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00{:}53{:}59{.}198 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}03{.}488$ the in the cardiovascular literature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:54:03.490 \rightarrow 00:54:09.266$ Your second point is about the non sleepy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

00:54:09.270 --> 00:54:10.878 Patients out how we're going to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00{:}54{:}10{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}16{.}230$ how we're going to treat them. I.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:54:16.230 \longrightarrow 00:54:20.559$ It's. I mean, that's as far as there

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:54:20.559 \rightarrow 00:54:23.379$ are others who will argue with you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:54:23.380 \longrightarrow 00:54:28.908$ That if they are asymptomatic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:54:28.910 \longrightarrow 00:54:31.250$ Up at the present time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00{:}54{:}31{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}34{.}820$ there is no rationale to treat them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

00:54:34.820 --> 00:54:36.856 I mean, I know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:54:36.856 \rightarrow 00:54:40.880$ I know that's probably a very controversial

- NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664
- $00:54:40.880 \rightarrow 00:54:46.016$ statement given some of the guidelines.

 $00{:}54{:}46{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}51{.}564$ About at least the data that we have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00{:}54{:}51{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}52{.}641$ In the Sleep,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00{:}54{:}52{.}641 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}54{.}783$ Heart tells Saudi and of course

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00{:}54{:}54{.}783 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}56{.}860$ that needs to be replicated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:54:56.860 \rightarrow 00:54:57.734$ It's it's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

00:54:57.734 --> 00:54:59.919 It's actually only the sleepy

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

00:54:59.919 --> 00:55:02.657 group that was that was at risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00{:}55{:}02.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}05.138$ or at least that was what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:05.140 \longrightarrow 00:55:07.625$ was shown by the panel group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00{:}55{:}07.625 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}10.109$ Yeah, the problem with the Epworth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00{:}55{:}10.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}13.834$ which we use all of us use for assessing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00{:}55{:}13.834 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}15.490$ subjective sleepiness is very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00{:}55{:}15{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}16{.}729$ very susceptible to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:16.730 \longrightarrow 00:55:17.969$ false negative scores.

00:55:17.969 --> 00:55:20.034 Yeah, I pointed that out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00{:}55{:}20{.}040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}22{.}465$ I specifically said that actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00{:}55{:}22{.}465 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}25{.}819$ that the subtype of sleep apnea is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00{:}55{:}25{.}819 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}28{.}345$ not only does that only include.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00{:}55{:}28{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}30{.}978$ The The Epworth Sleepiness Scale score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00{:}55{:}30{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}33{.}872$ So determining those subtypes is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00{:}55{:}33.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}37.038$ there are other questions that were included

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:37.038 \rightarrow 00:55:39.754$ that although it's it's the F word,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

00:55:39.760 --> 00:55:42.400 was a component of defining the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:42.400 \rightarrow 00:55:45.336$ sleepy subtype. But it's it's not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00{:}55{:}45{.}336 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}49{.}830$ It's not the F word. Alone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:49.830 \dashrightarrow 00:55:51.980$ That defines the sleepy subtype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

00:55:51.980 --> 00:55:54.990 At least you know in, in, in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:54.990 \longrightarrow 00:55:57.570$ in the papers that we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.809432

 $00{:}55{:}57{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}00{.}150$ established what we have popped. It

NOTE Confidence: 0.809432

 $00:56:00.150 \longrightarrow 00:56:02.730$ have worked their real world situation.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.809432
- $00:56:02.730 \rightarrow 00:56:05.310$ We use Epworth Aurora comperable type

 $00:56:05.310 \rightarrow 00:56:07.460$ of a self administered questionnaire

NOTE Confidence: 0.809432

 $00{:}56{:}07{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}08{.}750$ as opposed in

NOTE Confidence: 0.809432

 $00:56:08.750 \longrightarrow 00:56:11.330$ a research based type of tools.

NOTE Confidence: 0.809432

 $00:56:11.330 \rightarrow 00:56:14.340$ So identifying those people with or without

NOTE Confidence: 0.809432

 $00:56:14.340 \longrightarrow 00:56:16.490$ sleepiness is going to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.809432

 $00{:}56{:}16{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}19{.}930$ prone to bias against or in favor of

NOTE Confidence: 0.809432

 $00:56:19.930 \longrightarrow 00:56:21.220$ selecting people for

NOTE Confidence: 0.7702409166666667

 $00:56:21.220 \longrightarrow 00:56:23.964$ treatments. Right after that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7702409166666667

 $00:56:23.964 \rightarrow 00:56:28.080$ and then we actually so Brendan

NOTE Confidence: 0.7702409166666667

00:56:28.197 --> 00:56:31.503 Keenan at Penn actually has created

NOTE Confidence: 0.7702409166666667

 $00{:}56{:}31{.}503 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}35{.}892$ a so based on the on the studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.7702409166666667

 $00{:}56{:}35{.}892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}41{.}052$ that we publish it is there is a an

NOTE Confidence: 0.7702409166666667

 $00{:}56{:}41.052 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}45.840$ app Web type app that you could.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7702409166666667

 $00:56:45.840 \longrightarrow 00:56:48.174$ Plug in the answers to the

 $00:56:48.174 \rightarrow 00:56:50.549$ questions and it will give you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7702409166666667

 $00:56:50.550 \rightarrow 00:56:52.645$ The answer whether that patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.7702409166666667

 $00:56:52.645 \rightarrow 00:56:54.740$ belongs to a sleepy subtype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7702409166666667

 $00:56:54.740 \rightarrow 00:56:57.330$ but you know whether that lends itself

NOTE Confidence: 0.7702409166666667

 $00:56:57.330 \longrightarrow 00:57:00.190$ to the usual busy clinical practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7702409166666667

 $00{:}57{:}00{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}04{.}810$ I I I agree with you. Yes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00:57:04.810 \rightarrow 00:57:07.330$ so why aren't we using objective

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00:57:07.330 \longrightarrow 00:57:08.590$ measures of sleepiness?

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

00:57:08.590 --> 00:57:11.957 I mean, there's a big literature showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00{:}57{:}11{.}957 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}14{.}439$ that subjective measures are terrible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00{:}57{:}14.440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}17.592$ An an an an so that's like, uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00:57:17.592 \longrightarrow 00:57:19.824$ that's that's a real problem and

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00{:}57{:}19{.}824 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}22{.}478$ I think the other problem in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00:57:22.478 \longrightarrow 00:57:25.212$ lot of these studies is that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00:57:25.212 \longrightarrow 00:57:27.537$ are studying patients too late.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00:57:27.540 \longrightarrow 00:57:29.530$ So in the safe trial,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- $00:57:29.530 \rightarrow 00:57:31.510$ the average patient was over,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- $00{:}57{:}31{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}33{.}500$ you know, 61 years old.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- $00:57:33.500 \longrightarrow 00:57:34.824$ By then the patient,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- $00:57:34.824 \longrightarrow 00:57:36.479$ already his cardiovasc he or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- 00:57:36.479 --> 00:57:38.260 her cardiovascular system,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- $00:57:38.260 \longrightarrow 00:57:39.848$ is already really abnormal.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- 00:57:39.848 --> 00:57:41.039 And for example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- 00:57:41.040 --> 00:57:43.819 in in an art clinic in Canada,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- 00:57:43.820 00:57:47.376 our average patient was 48 years old.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- $00:57:47.380 \longrightarrow 00:57:49.940$ And and and and at the age
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- $00:57:49.940 \longrightarrow 00:57:52.301$ of 48 they had already had
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- $00:57:52.301 \longrightarrow 00:57:55.380$ symptoms for like 5 to 10 years.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- $00:57:55.380 \longrightarrow 00:57:57.510$ They already were very heavy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- $00{:}57{:}57{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}59{.}640$ users of health care resource
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653
- $00:57:59.716 \longrightarrow 00:58:01.480$ is for five to 10 years,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00:58:01.480 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.385$ and that's the group that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00{:}58{:}03{.}385 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}05{.}290$ we ought to be studying,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00:58:05.290 \longrightarrow 00:58:07.195$ not the ones that already

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00{:}58{:}07{.}195 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}09{.}100$ have a bunch of diseases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

00:58:10.120 --> 00:58:11.864 Yeah, that's certainly true.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

00:58:11.864 --> 00:58:14.344 I mean, again, that May contributes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:14.344 \longrightarrow 00:58:16.349$ to remember these are all

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:16.349 \rightarrow 00:58:18.772$ secondary prevention trials, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00{:}58{:}18.772 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}21.980$ They had to have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00{:}58{:}21{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}24{.}700$ CVD in order to be enrolled in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

00:58:24.700 --> 00:58:27.713 the in the in the Safe study and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00{:}58{:}27{.}713$ --> $00{:}58{:}30{.}703$ the other ones are they had acute NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

101E Connuence. 0.0414031

00:58:30.703 --> 00:58:33.043 coronary syndrome and then the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00{:}58{:}33{.}043 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}35{.}935$ the other study they you have to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00{:}58{:}35{.}935 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}38{.}372$ have a cast proven coronary artery NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:38.372 \rightarrow 00:58:41.179$ disease and and I agree with that.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037
- $00:58:41.180 \longrightarrow 00:58:44.200$ Perhaps you know the the.

00:58:44.200 --> 00:58:46.018 Although I think the entry criteria

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:46.018 \rightarrow 00:58:48.220$ of the age is about is is 18,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:48.220 \rightarrow 00:58:50.440$ but you're saying that the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:50.440 \rightarrow 00:58:53.086$ The the the average age is there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:53.090 \rightarrow 00:58:54.598$ they're older, they're older.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:58:54.600 \rightarrow 00:58:57.160$ Yeah, I mean it. It reminds me of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00{:}58{:}57{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}59{.}162$ the Women's Health Initiative study

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00{:}58{:}59{.}162 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}02{.}151$ where the you know they were giving.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:59:02.160 \longrightarrow 00:59:03.672$ They were treating women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

00:59:03.672 --> 00:59:06.315 You know, for menopause like 15 years

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

00:59:06.315 --> 00:59:08.584 after their menopause, Ann and Dan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

00:59:08.584 --> 00:59:11.231 And that's you know. In other words,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00{:}59{:}11{.}231 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}13{.}493$ we're treating patients way too late.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:59:13.500 \rightarrow 00:59:16.139$ We ought to be screening them earlier,

 $00:59:16.140 \longrightarrow 00:59:18.570$ and that's where I think the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00{:}59{:}18{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}20{.}949$ RTC should focus an in fact.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

00:59:20.950 -> 00:59:22.750 There are several studies early,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:59:22.750 \longrightarrow 00:59:24.652$ you know years ago that showed

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:59:24.652 \longrightarrow 00:59:26.406$ that that the mortality

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00{:}59{:}26{.}406 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}28{.}506$ of patients with sleep apnea,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:59:28.510 \longrightarrow 00:59:31.390$ the older patients actually don't do so bad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:59:31.390 \rightarrow 00:59:34.086$ You know it's the younger ones that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00{:}59{:}34.086 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}36.788$ that seem to have the higher mortality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87799215

 $00{:}59{:}37{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}40{.}010$ Yeah, that's because of this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87799215

 $00{:}59{:}40.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}42.066$ Basically as survival effect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87799215

00:59:42.066 --> 00:59:44.710 right? Yeah, yeah. Ulysses

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

 $00{:}59{:}44{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}46{.}098$ I have a question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

 $00:59:46.100 \rightarrow 00:59:49.228$ This is Nancy Rediker High we met. I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

 $00:59:49.230 \longrightarrow 00:59:50.280$ that grant reviews.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

 $00:59:50.280 \rightarrow 00:59:52.364$ Hi, my question is about the

- NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604
- $00:59:52.364 \rightarrow 00:59:54.448$ mechanisms of the sleepy patients and

00:59:54.450 --> 00:59:55.500 CVD. So you've

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

 $00:59:55.500 \dashrightarrow 00:59:57.240$ mentioned this study about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

 $00:59:57.240 \rightarrow 00:59:59.326$ looking at genetics and what

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

00:59:59.326 --> 01:00:01.312 could you let? You know there's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

 $01:00:01.312 \longrightarrow 01:00:02.927$ so there's obviously all different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959

01:00:02.930 --> 01:00:04.170 kind of genetic pathways,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959

 $01{:}00{:}04{.}170 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}05{.}100$ but is it

NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959

 $01:00:05.100 \longrightarrow 01:00:06.640$ possible that this is just,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959

01:00:06.640 --> 01:00:08.181 you know, the sleepy patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959

01:00:08.181 --> 01:00:09.730 it's just it's inflammatory or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959

 $01{:}00{:}09{.}730 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}11{.}280$ it's some other underlying process.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959

 $01:00:11.280 \longrightarrow 01:00:12.376$ It's causing the connections,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959

01:00:12.376 --> 01:00:13.746 so that's really just an

NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959

 $01:00:13.746 \longrightarrow 01:00:15.121$ epic phenomenon that there's

- 01:00:15.121 --> 01:00:16.525 inflammation going on anyway,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959
- $01:00:16.530 \longrightarrow 01:00:17.758$ or it matches what
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959
- $01:00:17.760 \longrightarrow 01:00:18.690$ I'm guessing, but
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959
- 01:00:18.690 --> 01:00:19.930 what? What kind of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959
- 01:00:19.930 --> 01:00:21.778 genetic pathways are you looking at?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457
- $01{:}00{:}22.730 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}26.224$ Well, that that that Grant is, we don't know.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457
- 01:00:26.224 --> 01:00:28.940 Basically, you see that it's it's there,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457
- $01{:}00{:}28.940 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}31.267$ but there are possible mechanisms and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457
- $01{:}00{:}31{.}267 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}33{.}976$ and the number one suspect will be.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457
- $01:00:33.980 \rightarrow 01:00:36.696$ Of course what you mentioned is inflammation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457
- 01:00:36.700 --> 01:00:39.550 right? There is some evidence of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457
- $01{:}00{:}39{.}550 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}41{.}450$ inflammation activity may cause
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457
- $01:00:41.527 \longrightarrow 01:00:43.679$ you to be to be sleepy.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457
- $01:00:43.680 \longrightarrow 01:00:47.550$ Now to the point of.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457
- $01:00:47.550 \rightarrow 01:00:53.507$ The PV, the objective evidence of sleepiness.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457
- $01:00:53.510 \rightarrow 01:00:55.976$ We could potentially add results of,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457
- 01:00:55.980 --> 01:00:58.035 although it's not really sleeping

 $01:00:58.035 \rightarrow 01:00:59.679$ as its vigilance would.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:00:59.680 \dashrightarrow 01:01:02.140$ That would be easy to incorporate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:01:02.140 \longrightarrow 01:01:04.195$ would be psycho motor vigilance

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:01:04.195 \longrightarrow 01:01:05.428$ testing for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:01:05.430 \longrightarrow 01:01:06.558$ That might be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:01:06.558 \rightarrow 01:01:09.190$ That that might be a that might

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:01:09.277 \longrightarrow 01:01:12.047$ provide really confidence on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:01:12.047 \rightarrow 01:01:14.263$ defining the sleepy subtype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

01:01:14.270 --> 01:01:17.750 One Pvt is so easy to do now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:01:17.750 \longrightarrow 01:01:19.930$ I mean, we could do

NOTE Confidence: 0.80611736

01:01:19.930 --> 01:01:21.670 it on an iPad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80611736

 $01:01:21.670 \longrightarrow 01:01:24.280$ We don't need a special device.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80611736

 $01:01:24.280 \longrightarrow 01:01:26.455$ Yeah, it feels like something

NOTE Confidence: 0.80611736

 $01{:}01{:}26.455 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}28.630$ that could readily be incorporated

 $01:01:28.630 \longrightarrow 01:01:29.929$ into clinical encounters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

01:01:31.610 --> 01:01:34.013 It is just going back to the to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

 $01:01:34.013 \rightarrow 01:01:36.555$ top match of the the way that would NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

 $01{:}01{:}36.555 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}38.938$ that Grant was structured was that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

 $01:01:38.940 \longrightarrow 01:01:41.040$ We you know, it's basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

 $01:01:41.040 \rightarrow 01:01:44.400$ we're going to do a whole genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

 $01:01:44.400 \longrightarrow 01:01:48.144$ All all the mix an all the all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

01:01:48.144 $-\!\!>$ 01:01:51.440 epigenetic things and see if there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

 $01:01:51.440 \longrightarrow 01:01:54.870$ any differences in the in the subtypes. NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

01:01:54.870 --> 01:01:57.775 Of course, when when the data is

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

01:01:57.775 --> 01:01:59.870 published in publicly available,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

01:01:59.870 --> 01:02:02.971 there's a bunch of things that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

 $01{:}02{:}02{.}971 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}06{.}238$ could do with that with that data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196

 $01{:}02{:}08{.}340 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}10{.}328$ Thank you so much for the accounts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196

 $01{:}02{:}10{.}330 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}12{.}250$ I think as there are a few minutes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196

 $01:02:12.250 \rightarrow 01:02:14.180$ past the hour and people hung around

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196
- $01:02:14.180 \rightarrow 01:02:16.579$ because this is such a compelling topic,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196
- $01{:}02{:}16.580 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}19.420$ but we should still cut it off here and thank
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196
- 01:02:19.420 --> 01:02:20.552 you again. Needless yeah.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196
- $01:02:20.552 \longrightarrow 01:02:21.684$ Thanks for inviting me,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196
- $01:02:21.690 \longrightarrow 01:02:26.150$ I appreciate it. Thank you. Thanks.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196
- $01{:}02{:}26.150 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}27.950$ You like Michelle? Take care.