## WEBVTT

NOTE duration: "01:02:41.2480000"

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.87638587

 $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:01.950$  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

 $00{:}00{:}30.086 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}32.150$  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 --> 00:00:36.417 This afternoon I have a few

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:00:36.417 \longrightarrow 00:00:38.067$  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 --> 00:00:41.100 First, please take a moment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:00:41.100 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.820$  to ensure that you're muted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:00:42.820 \longrightarrow 00:00:44.535$  Also, in order to receive

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

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

 $00:00:45.910 \longrightarrow 00:00:48.318$  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

 $00:00:50.665 \longrightarrow 00:00:52.099$  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 --> 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

 $00:00:58.540 \longrightarrow 00:01:00.175$  If you have any questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:01:00.175 --> 00:01:01.156 during the presentation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}01{:}01.160 \longrightarrow 00{:}01{:}03.328$  I encourage you to make use of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}01{:}03.328 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}05.512$  chat room throughout the hour and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:05.512 \longrightarrow 00:01:07.482$  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

 $00:01:09.759 \dashrightarrow 00:01:12.274$  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

 $00:01:12.600 \longrightarrow 00:01:14.544$  please feel free to share the

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:01:16.224 --> 00:01:18.808 series to anyone else who may be interested,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:01:18.810 --> 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:01:24.664 --> 00:01:26.658 Ulysses Magalang as our speaker today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:26.660 \longrightarrow 00:01:29.089$  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

 $00{:}01{:}31.300 \longrightarrow 00{:}01{:}33.510$  of pulmonary critical care and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:33.582 \longrightarrow 00:01:36.066$  Sleep Medicine at the Ohio State

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}01{:}36.066 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}01{:}38.229$  University and director of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:38.229 \longrightarrow 00:01:39.969$  OSU Sleep Medicine program.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:01:39.970 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.938$  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 --> 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,

00:01:48.670 --> 00:01:49.972 Global Interdiscipline or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}01{:}49.972 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}50.840$  Inter disciplinary Consortium,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:01:54.110 --> 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:03.557 \longrightarrow 00:02:06.062$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:10.955 \longrightarrow 00:02:13.420$  control and diabetes and atherogenesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:16.870 \longrightarrow 00:02:18.325$  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

 $00:02:22.780 \longrightarrow 00:02:23.273$  epigenetic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:23.273 \longrightarrow 00:02:25.738$  and metabolomic basis of different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:25.738 \longrightarrow 00:02:27.217$  subtypes of OSA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:29.790 \longrightarrow 00:02:31.538$  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

 $00:02:33.290 \longrightarrow 00:02:35.034$  He regularly speaks nationally

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:02:35.034 --> 00:02:35.906 and internationally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:35.910 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.335$  and topics including phenotypes of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00{:}02{:}38.335 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}40.760$  sleep apnea and the neurobiology

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:40.835 \longrightarrow 00:02:43.091$  of breathing and I am delighted

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:02:46.410 --> 00:02:48.146 entitled RCT's of cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:48.146 \longrightarrow 00:02:50.292$  outcomes and obstructive sleep apnea.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

00:02:50.292 --> 00:02:53.830 Is it time for an alternative trial design,

 $00:02:53.830 \longrightarrow 00:02:59.780$  and with that I will turn it over to you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8383747

 $00:02:59.780 \longrightarrow 00:03:00.160$  Thanks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00:03:00.160 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.303$  Lauren, good afternoon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00:03:02.830 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.050$  So when I first received the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00:03:05.050 \longrightarrow 00:03:07.001$  invitation I thought about presenting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00:03:07.001 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.383$  some of the animal studies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00{:}03{:}09.383 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}11.589$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8716507

 $00:03:15.400 \longrightarrow 00:03:17.310$  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

 $00:03:24.420 \longrightarrow 00:03:27.066$  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

 $00:03:30.500 \longrightarrow 00:03:34.049$  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 --> 00:03:47.040 CPAP machine doesn't cut heart risks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:03:59.200 \longrightarrow 00:04:01.585$  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

 $00:04:10.944 \longrightarrow 00:04:13.438$  not prevent cardiovascular events in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:13.438 \longrightarrow 00:04:16.150$  patients with moderate to severe OSA

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:16.150 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.449$  and stab Lish cardiovascular disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:19.450 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.502$  It did confirm results of prior studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

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

 $00:04:25.340 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.740$  health related quality of life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:28.740 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.020$  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

 $00:04:33.996 \longrightarrow 00:04:36.698$  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

 $00:04:38.948 \longrightarrow 00:04:42.320$  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

 $00:04:48.026 \longrightarrow 00:04:50.190$  bit about OSA disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:50.190 \longrightarrow 00:04:53.015$  heterogeneity as well as some

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00{:}04{:}53.015 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}55.840$  of the preclinical and large

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:04:55.944 \longrightarrow 00:04:58.672$  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

 $00:05:02.770 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.016$  All familiar with just as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

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

 $00:05:08.180 \longrightarrow 00:05:10.930$  Results of the RCT's in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:05:10.930 --> 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

 $00:05:15.298 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.760$  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 --> 00:05:24.350 propensity score matching.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:05:24.350 --> 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 --> 00:05:34.637 for the assessment of causation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:05:34.640 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.222$  What I have listed here are some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:05:38.222 \longrightarrow 00:05:40.861$  criteria as well as the corresponding

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:05:40.861 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.628$  types of studies in the right side to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

00:05:44.628 --> 00:05:47.168 fulfill the criteria for causation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:05:47.170 \longrightarrow 00:05:49.622$  So mechanistic and preclinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:05:49.622 \longrightarrow 00:05:52.074$  experiments both in animals.

 $00:05:52.080 \longrightarrow 00:05:55.881$  In humans are typically done to explore

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:06:00.945 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.965$  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

 $00:06:08.422 \longrightarrow 00:06:11.390$  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 --> 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

 $00{:}06{:}18.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}19.770$  Of course interventional studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:06:19.770 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.370$  which can be observation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:06:21.370 \longrightarrow 00:06:24.156$  ull or in the form of RCT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:06:24.160 \longrightarrow 00:06:26.320$  So randomized control trials that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9003723

 $00:06:26.320 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.950$  used to evaluate the treatment effects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82505476

00:06:31.230 --> 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

 $00:06:42.561 \longrightarrow 00:06:44.736$  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

 $00:06:47.470 \longrightarrow 00:06:51.320$  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

 $00:06:54.528 \longrightarrow 00:06:58.568$  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

 $00:07:01.840 \longrightarrow 00:07:06.736$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:07:15.290 \longrightarrow 00:07:18.235$  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,

 $00:07:23.515 \longrightarrow 00:07:27.120$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:07:38.420 \longrightarrow 00:07:41.492$  You know there they are known to publish

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

00:07:41.492 --> 00:07:44.948 this kind of articles around Christmas time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:07:44.950 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.956$  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

 $00:07:51.155 \longrightarrow 00:07:53.395$  injury after gravitational challenge,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:07:53.400 \longrightarrow 00:07:56.120$  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

 $00:08:01.884 \longrightarrow 00:08:04.370$  and found of course that know

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

00:08:04.370 --> 00:08:06.465 our cities have been performed,

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:08:09.067 \longrightarrow 00:08:11.789$  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 --> 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

 $00:08:17.520 \longrightarrow 00:08:18.474$  That is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:08:18.474 \longrightarrow 00:08:21.336$  those individuals who jumped from an

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:08:21.336 \longrightarrow 00:08:23.806$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.90453327

 $00:08:33.248 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.488$  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

 $00:08:39.290 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.870$  Of course they could have answered

NOTE Confidence: 0.8304738

 $00{:}08{:}41.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}44.609$  your question had they included all

00:08:44.609 --> 00:08:47.892 observational data and not only are cities,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8304738

 $00:08:47.900 \longrightarrow 00:08:51.050$  so it turns out that the US

NOTE Confidence: 0.8304738

 $00:08:51.050 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.400$  Parachute Association registers

NOTE Confidence: 0.8304738

00:08:52.479 --> 00:08:55.149 every single jump from an airplane.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806

 $00{:}08{:}57.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}59.660$  Of course, with the parachute.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806

00:08:59.660 --> 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

 $00:09:07.660 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.485$  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

 $00:09:14.540 \longrightarrow 00:09:18.180$  Huge effect size that cannot be ignored.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806

 $00:09:18.180 \longrightarrow 00:09:20.400$  So I have to be honest,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80246806

 $00:09:20.400 \longrightarrow 00:09:22.290$  I hesitated 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

00:09:26.357 --> 00:09:28.170 will remember from this talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

 $00:09:30.890 \longrightarrow 00:09:33.548$  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

 $00:09:36.220 \longrightarrow 00:09:39.540$  The methods should be rigorous.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

00:09:39.540 --> 00:09:43.229 And I I would present argument that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

00:09:43.229 --> 00:09:45.563 perhaps propensity score matching

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8445632

 $00:09:49.517 \longrightarrow 00:09:52.290$  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

 $00:09:57.430 \dashrightarrow 00:10:00.118$  So let's talk about OSA disease heterogen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}10{:}00.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}04.630$ Nyati we've been at Ohio State.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:10:04.630 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.264$  We've been actively participating in an

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:10:09.020 \longrightarrow 00:10:12.248$  As Lauren alluded to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:10:12.250 \longrightarrow 00:10:13.642$  You know there's there's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

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

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 --> 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

 $00:10:28.274 \longrightarrow 00:10:30.846$  cohort with detailed phenotyping.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:10:30.850 \longrightarrow 00:10:34.648$  To understand common and ethnicity specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:10:34.648 \longrightarrow 00:10:38.499$  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 --> 00:10:49.065 of the condition may present

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:10:49.065 \longrightarrow 00:10:51.429$  with totally different symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:10:51.430 \longrightarrow 00:10:55.138$  And using cluster analysis we published

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:10:55.138 \longrightarrow 00:10:59.762$  an article about two years ago showing

 $00:10:59.762 \longrightarrow 00:11:03.162$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}11{:}16.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}19.600$  The typical OSA with excessive

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:11:19.600 \longrightarrow 00:11:23.775$  sleepiness as well as the third class

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

00:11:27.310 --> 00:11:30.748 Always say patience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:11:32.430 \longrightarrow 00:11:34.530$  I probably don't need to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:11:34.530 \longrightarrow 00:11:39.570$  Tell this group about this since.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:11:39.570 \longrightarrow 00:11:42.550$  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

 $00:11:46.852 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.369$  clustering cluster analysis begins with

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}11{:}50.369 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}11{:}53.639$  a predefined set of input variables

 $00:11:53.639 \longrightarrow 00:11:57.199$  targeted to a specific question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:11:57.200 \longrightarrow 00:12:01.680$  Example other symptom based subtypes of OSA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

00:12:01.680 --> 00:12:04.770 You then apply a clustering algorithm

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:12:04.770 \longrightarrow 00:12:09.224$  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

 $00:12:12.670 \longrightarrow 00:12:15.784$  Patients are as similar as possible

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:12:15.784 \longrightarrow 00:12:18.446$  and then between clastres they

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:12:18.446 \longrightarrow 00:12:20.926$  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

 $00:12:23.990 \longrightarrow 00:12:26.862$  meaning it is unsupervised

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00{:}12{:}26.862 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}30.452$  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

 $00{:}12{:}34.204 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}37.332$  information criteria to define the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:12:37.332 \longrightarrow 00:12:40.554$  optimal number of number of clusters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:12:40.560 \longrightarrow 00:12:42.888$  So this table is is busy,

 $00:12:42.890 \longrightarrow 00:12:46.994$  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

 $00:12:54.990 \longrightarrow 00:12:57.195$  Shows the characteristic's of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6602841

 $00:12:57.195 \longrightarrow 00:12:59.885$  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

 $00:13:04.035 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.719$  in different colors there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

00:13:09.490 --> 00:13:12.080 So the first clustering study was actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

00:13:12.080 --> 00:13:15.477 done in a clinical population in Iceland,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:15.480 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.928$  and the results are shown here

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:17.928 \longrightarrow 00:13:21.050$  in the on the left hand side.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:21.050 \longrightarrow 00:13:25.594$  What is known as the Ice Axe study?

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

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

00:13:32.950 --> 00:13:36.374 And what is not known after that article,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:36.380 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.082$  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 --> 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

 $00:13:47.450 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.950$  same 3 classers generalize in an

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:13:50.950 \longrightarrow 00:13:54.295$  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

 $00:13:57.380 \longrightarrow 00:14:00.770$  different prevalence of the insomnia

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:14:00.770 \longrightarrow 00:14:03.482$  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 --> 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 --> 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

 $00{:}14{:}14.916 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}17.741$  sleepy group was not solely on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

00:14:17.741 --> 00:14:20.003 basis of the Epworth score score,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:14:20.010 \longrightarrow 00:14:22.558$  but that was all that was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.86681

 $00:14:22.558 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.000$  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

 $00:14:39.628 \longrightarrow 00:14:41.763$  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

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

 $00:14:57.028 \longrightarrow 00:14:59.290$  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

 $00:15:02.570 \longrightarrow 00:15:06.850$  And this is been shown also in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

 $00:15:06.850 \longrightarrow 00:15:10.050$  population based cohort in South Korea

NOTE Confidence: 0.81988186

 $00:15:10.050 \longrightarrow 00:15:14.709$  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 --> 00:15:39.790 A study that was published

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}15{:}39.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}42.273$  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

 $00:15:44.770 \longrightarrow 00:15:46.782$  In 2019, recent analysis.

 $00:15:46.782 \longrightarrow 00:15:50.444$  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

 $00:15:53.130 \longrightarrow 00:15:57.990$  And this indicates that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:15:57.990 \longrightarrow 00:16:00.906$  increased cardiovascular risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:03.997 \longrightarrow 00:16:06.559$  in the excessively sleepy subtype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:06.560 \longrightarrow 00:16:10.879$  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 --> 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

 $00:16:22.500 \longrightarrow 00:16:25.686$  in the in the adjusted analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:28.595 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.500$  subtype that predicted the occurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:16:44.880 --> 00:16:48.230 Another group called moderately sleepy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:48.230 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.085$  but it's the excessively sleepy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:16:51.085 \longrightarrow 00:16:55.004$  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 --> 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

 $00{:}17{:}07.046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}09.698$  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

 $00{:}17{:}14.138 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}16.698$  there are three symptom clusters

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}17{:}16.698 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}19.512$  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

 $00:17:24.380 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.338$  The OSA cardiovascular risk comes from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:17:29.990 --> 00:17:33.140 And sleepiness in those without OSA

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}17{:}33.140 --> 00{:}17{:}35.720$  did not increase cardiovascular risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:17:35.720 \longrightarrow 00:17:38.445$  Anne Anne it's conceivable that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}17{:}38.445 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}41.170$  distinct molecular responses to OSA

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:17:41.259 --> 00:17:44.069 result in sleepiness and increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:17:44.069 \longrightarrow 00:17:46.879$  risk of cardiovascular disease in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:17:46.880 --> 00:17:49.140 And in certain patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:17:49.140 \longrightarrow 00:17:50.835$  to this end,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:17:50.840 \longrightarrow 00:17:55.558$  this was actually the basis of a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:17:55.560 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.590$  Dot Med grant application between Penn,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}17{:}58.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}01.620$  Ohio State and University of British

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:18:01.620 --> 00:18:04.617 Columbia with innogy bias and Alan

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:04.617 \longrightarrow 00:18:07.305$  Pack that's looking at the molecular

00:18:07.305 --> 00:18:10.463 basis for differences between or say

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:18:10.463 --> 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

 $00:18:15.525 \longrightarrow 00:18:17.905$  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

 $00:18:20.796 \longrightarrow 00:18:23.180$  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

 $00{:}18{:}26.295 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}29.408$  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 --> 00:18:34.666 doesn't give you resources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:34.670 \longrightarrow 00:18:36.910$  For collection that they collecting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:18:36.910 --> 00:18:40.230 the samples but it does give you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:18:40.230 --> 00:18:42.735 resources for the following whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:42.735 \longrightarrow 00:18:45.380$  whole genome sequencing DNA methylation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

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

 $00:18:48.040 \longrightarrow 00:18:51.420$  so they'll do that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

00:18:51.420 --> 00:18:54.995 Those three things in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:54.995 \longrightarrow 00:18:57.855$  all the 3000 samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:18:57.860 \longrightarrow 00:19:00.659$  I believe this is going to be a good

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00:19:00.659 \longrightarrow 00:19:02.976$  resource because you know that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8828786

 $00{:}19{:}02.976 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}05.420$  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 --> 00:19:13.148 So just quickly I'm going to touch on

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}19{:}13.148 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}15.880$  preclinical and epidemiological studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:19:15.880 \longrightarrow 00:19:19.730$  You guys all know this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:19:19.730 \longrightarrow 00:19:22.645$  Numerous studies looking at biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

00:19:22.645 --> 00:19:24.977 plausibility of obstructive sleep

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:19:24.977 \longrightarrow 00:19:27.659$  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

 $00{:}19{:}33.064 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}36.409$  vasore activity increase catecholamines.

 $00:19:36.410 \longrightarrow 00:19:40.106$  Increase platelet aggregation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

00:19:40.106 --> 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

 $00:19:48.240 \longrightarrow 00:19:49.779$  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

 $00:19:53.824 \longrightarrow 00:19:56.954$  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 --> 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

 $00{:}20{:}13.906 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}18.274$  Journal many years ago where he exposed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:20:18.280 \longrightarrow 00:20:21.444$  C57 Black 6 mice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:20:21.444 \longrightarrow 00:20:26.190$  Two chronic intermittent hypoxia and found.

00:20:26.190 --> 00:20:29.361 In panel D here that if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}20{:}29.361 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}30.720$  combine intermittent hypoxia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:20:30.720 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.956$  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

 $00:20:36.405 \longrightarrow 00:20:40.122$  of the order that you will find

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}20{:}40.122 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}42.235$  atherosclerotic 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 --> 00:20:46.935 This is our own metaanalysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}20{:}46.935 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}50.280$  also from out of the Sajik group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

00:20:50.280 --> 00:20:52.758 showing that the effects of CPAP

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00{:}20{:}52.758 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}55.543$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:21:01.298 \longrightarrow 00:21:03.783$  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

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

00:21:10.879 --> 00:21:14.792 there is a large decreases in systolic

NOTE Confidence: 0.77920747

 $00:21:14.792 \longrightarrow 00:21:19.200$  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 --> 00:21:29.894 Just to summarize, in the interest of time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:21:29.900 \longrightarrow 00:21:33.414$  See you all know that large epidemiological

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:21:33.414 \longrightarrow 00:21:36.812$  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 --> 00:21:41.490 coronary artery disease, heart failure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:21:41.490 \longrightarrow 00:21:47.106$  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

 $00:21:49.042 \longrightarrow 00:21:52.482$  treated with CPAP have the same rate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:21:52.482 --> 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

 $00:21:57.215 \longrightarrow 00:21:59.620$  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 --> 00:22:07.209 to the very famous study of Doctor Marin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}22{:}07.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}10.633$  Where he showed that severe always saying

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:22:10.633 \longrightarrow 00:22:13.241$  Christmas trees of cardiovascular events

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:22:13.241 --> 00:22:16.944 and that CPAP use reduces this risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:22:16.944 \longrightarrow 00:22:19.599$  because those patients and always say

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:22:19.599 --> 00:22:23.564 we'd always say on C pap have the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:22:25.970 \longrightarrow 00:22:27.578$  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

 $00:22:30.794 \longrightarrow 00:22:34.378$  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

 $00:22:37.370 \longrightarrow 00:22:40.700$  Medication refill rates are similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:22:40.700 \longrightarrow 00:22:44.969$  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

 $00:22:47.100 \longrightarrow 00:22:50.068$  which is of course a big confounder

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

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

00:22:50.920 --> 00:22:53.885 ULL studies does not explain

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:22:53.885 \longrightarrow 00:22:56.850$  the observed benefit of CPAP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:23:00.962 --> 00:23:05.038 Hill's criteria, you'll find that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:23:05.040 \longrightarrow 00:23:10.503$  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

 $00:23:16.050 \longrightarrow 00:23:18.978$  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

 $00:23:34.542 \longrightarrow 00:23:36.960$  that was published in Lancet

 $00:23:36.960 \longrightarrow 00:23:39.865$  respiratory medicine just this year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}23{:}39.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}41.991$  So I'm going to send a review

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:23:41.991 \longrightarrow 00:23:42.900$  real real quick.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:23:42.900 \longrightarrow 00:23:44.934$  This three RCP's and we're going

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:23:44.934 \longrightarrow 00:23:47.090$  to discuss some of the biases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:23:47.090 \longrightarrow 00:23:49.970$  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

 $00:23:53.974 \longrightarrow 00:23:57.943$  is a study multicenter study of roughly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:23:57.943 \longrightarrow 00:24:02.040$  2700 adults with moderate to severe OSA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:24:02.040 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.174$  And it's they have coronary or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:24:06.174 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.930$  cerebral cerebral vascular disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:24:08.930 \longrightarrow 00:24:12.946$  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

 $00:24:20.142 \longrightarrow 00:24:22.987$  primary composite endpoint scuse me

 $00:24:22.987 \longrightarrow 00:24:25.917$  was death from cardiovascular causes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:24:25.920 --> 00:24:28.941 Am I stroke?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:24:28.941 \longrightarrow 00:24:33.976$  Or hospitalization for unstable angina.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:24:33.980 \longrightarrow 00:24:36.878$  Heart failure ortic The mean follow-up

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:24:36.878 \longrightarrow 00:24:40.614$  was 3.7 years and the incidence of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:24:40.614 --> 00:24:44.034 the primary endpoint did not differ

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:24:44.034 --> 00:24:46.520 significantly in patients who did

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:24:46.520 --> 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 --> 00:24:59.067 did improve daytime sleepiness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:24:59.070 \longrightarrow 00:25:03.814$  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

 $00:25:06.830 \longrightarrow 00:25:09.329$  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

 $00:25:14.940 \longrightarrow 00:25:15.902$  Of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:25:15.902 --> 00:25:18.307 there's 244 patients with newly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:25:18.307 \longrightarrow 00:25:19.750$  revascularized coronary artery

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:25:19.821 --> 00:25:22.091 disease and moderate to severe

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}25{:}22.091 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}23.907$  OSA without daytime 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

 $00:25:31.896 \longrightarrow 00:25:35.446$  to sipat versus no see bat and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

00:25:35.446 --> 00:25:37.600 primary endpoint is listed there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:25:37.600 \longrightarrow 00:25:38.542$  It's again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00{:}25{:}40.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}43.828$  Little bit longer follow up of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

 $00:25:43.830 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.714 4.75$  years and again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8820883

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

 $00:25:48.626 \longrightarrow 00:25:51.548$  did not differ significantly in patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.8930136

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8930136

 $00:25:55.019 \longrightarrow 00:25:58.960$  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

 $00:26:08.213 \longrightarrow 00:26:10.810$  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 --> 00:26:15.830 This patients have were admitted

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

00:26:15.830 --> 00:26:17.838 for a cute coronary syndrome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

00:26:17.840 --> 00:26:21.856 They were found to have moderate severe OSA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:21.860 \longrightarrow 00:26:24.968$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:30.738 \longrightarrow 00:26:34.364$  Of course you can question you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:34.364 \longrightarrow 00:26:37.497$  there's some data that says that.

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00{:}26{:}40.045 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}26{:}42.590$  admitted for a cute coronary syndrome

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.82090217

 $00:26:44.981 \longrightarrow 00:26:47.296$  but nonetheless that was there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

 $00:26:52.609 \longrightarrow 00:26:55.663$  randomized to see that versus know

NOTE Confidence: 0.84707826

 $00:26:55.663 \longrightarrow 00:26:58.737$  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

 $00:27:01.288 \longrightarrow 00:27:04.473$  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 --> 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

 $00:27:16.710 \longrightarrow 00:27:18.030$  C pap therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:27:20.140 \longrightarrow 00:27:23.398$  So what are the biases in the in this

 $00:27:23.398 \longrightarrow 00:27:26.378$  published RCT's of cardiovascular outcomes?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

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 --> 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

 $00:27:50.620 \longrightarrow 00:27:56.794$  And we believe the answer to this is no.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:27:56.800 \longrightarrow 00:28:00.022$  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

 $00:28:06.070 \longrightarrow 00:28:09.740$  The sleepy patients who are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:28:09.740 \longrightarrow 00:28:11.264$  The ones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

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

 $00:28:15.836 \longrightarrow 00:28:18.300$  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

 $00:28:21.541 \longrightarrow 00:28:24.359$  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

 $00:28:26.620 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.925$  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 --> 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

 $00:28:40.222 \longrightarrow 00:28:43.645$  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 --> 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

 $00:28:53.010 \longrightarrow 00:28:57.060$  Of C PAP may have invented.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:28:57.060 \longrightarrow 00:29:00.200$  The largest issue, we believe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:29:00.200 \longrightarrow 00:29:04.190$  is that you know where and how

 $00:29:04.190 \longrightarrow 00:29:07.090$  this participants were recruited.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00{:}29{:}07.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}12.698$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

 $00:29:19.050 \longrightarrow 00:29:22.615$  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 --> 00:29:28.250 Always saying, then randomizing them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7654318

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

 $00:29:34.460 \longrightarrow 00:29:37.666$  And we believe that symptomatic the bias

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

 $00{:}29{:}37.666 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}39.837$  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

 $00:29:42.808 \longrightarrow 00:29:45.489$  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

 $00:29:47.810 \longrightarrow 00:29:50.540$  which is what you need for a

NOTE Confidence: 0.85450685

 $00:29:50.626 \longrightarrow 00:29:53.198$  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

 $00:30:00.250 \longrightarrow 00:30:02.230$  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 --> 00:30:10.222 You know, according to clip, Kushida had.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:30:10.222 \longrightarrow 00:30:13.302$  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

 $00:30:20.170 \longrightarrow 00:30:24.362$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:30:28.693 \longrightarrow 00:30:31.698$  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 --> 00:30:36.644 Their subjects with cognitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

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

 $00:30:39.849 \longrightarrow 00:30:43.246$  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 --> 00:30:49.553 If you look at the exclusion criteria

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:30:49.553 \longrightarrow 00:30:52.142$  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

 $00:30:54.460 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.778$  The. The average effort,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

00:30:58.778 --> 00:30:59.434 sleepiness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:30:59.434 \longrightarrow 00:31:03.995$  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 the same bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

00:31:10.660 --> 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

 $00:31:14.078 \longrightarrow 00:31:15.946$  patients because it's unethical

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:31:15.946 \longrightarrow 00:31:18.281$  to randomize sleepy OSA patients

 $00:31:18.281 \longrightarrow 00:31:20.566$  to no treatment in cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00{:}31{:}20.566 {\: -->\:} 00{:}31{:}22.310$  trials of seed Bab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:31:22.310 \longrightarrow 00:31:25.946$  basically because of fear of automobile.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:31:25.950 \longrightarrow 00:31:32.268$  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

 $00:31:42.734 \longrightarrow 00:31:45.680$  because low adherence to the rapy would

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:31:45.760 \longrightarrow 00:31:48.766$  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

 $00:31:56.880 \longrightarrow 00:32:00.100$  In in the three trials in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:32:00.100 \longrightarrow 00:32:02.038$  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

 $00:32:04.370 \longrightarrow 00:32:06.150$  so all patients here,

 $00:32:06.150 \longrightarrow 00:32:08.820$  these are the CPAP users in

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:32:10.920 \longrightarrow 00:32:15.078$  The bottom line is after 20 four

NOTE Confidence: 0.6423485

 $00:32:15.078 \longrightarrow 00:32:18.529$  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 --> 00:32:27.032 And you'd say, well, that's what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

00:32:27.032 --> 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

 $00{:}32{:}39.344 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}43.787$  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

 $00:32:51.557 \longrightarrow 00:32:55.098$  see that that indeed the device usage

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:32:59.050 \longrightarrow 00:33:02.394$  To 70% now, I mean this this study

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:33:02.394 \longrightarrow 00:33:05.128$  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

 $00:33:16.090 \longrightarrow 00:33:20.325$  They won't have the data and then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:33:20.330 \longrightarrow 00:33:21.990$  And and it is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00{:}33{:}25.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}29.596$  Off of the rapy. But still some some evidence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8543448

 $00:33:33.090 \longrightarrow 00:33:36.576$  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,

 $00:33:52.360 \longrightarrow 00:33:56.728$  likely some of the selection bias that accord

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00:33:56.728 \longrightarrow 00:34:00.506$  resulted in the lowest seat belt usage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

00:34:00.510 --> 00:34:03.982 The two of these studies in fact did

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

00:34:03.982 --> 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

 $00:34:10.350 \longrightarrow 00:34:14.995$  Um? So the Save and Isaac did this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00:34:14.995 \longrightarrow 00:34:18.657$  and they got a point estimate of a .8.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00{:}34{:}18.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}22.564$  I would just point out and this is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00:34:22.570 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.035$  This was I think it was Dan Gottlieb who,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

00:34:26.040 --> 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

 $00:34:33.860 \longrightarrow 00:34:36.060$  That that's that's off of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7898935

 $00:34:36.060 \longrightarrow 00:34:38.260$  our cities Anstatt in trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

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

00:34:45.901 --> 00:34:48.436 This post hoc analysis using

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}34{:}48.436 \to 00{:}34{:}50.300$  propensity score matching.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:34:50.300 \longrightarrow 00:34:53.475$  Where or underpowered because of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:34:53.475 \longrightarrow 00:34:57.936$  the event rate, the recuts a study

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:34:57.936 \longrightarrow 00:35:02.737$  did show that they if you separate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:35:02.737 \longrightarrow 00:35:08.456$  out the users versus non users that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:35:08.460 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.400$  There was a difference in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:35:11.400 \longrightarrow 00:35:14.155$  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

 $00:35:20.420 \longrightarrow 00:35:22.760$  What are the alternative

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

00:35:22.760 --> 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

 $00:35:26.452 \longrightarrow 00:35:28.480$  we believe there are three three

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:35:28.552 \longrightarrow 00:35:30.972$  ways of doing this. One is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}35{:}30.972 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}33.927$  We can include the excessive

 $00:35:33.927 \longrightarrow 00:35:37.019$  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

 $00:35:43.557 \longrightarrow 00:35:46.071$  And then there's also the question

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:35:46.071 \longrightarrow 00:35:48.160$  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

 $00:35:50.800 \longrightarrow 00:35:53.339$  not being treated for years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:35:53.340 \longrightarrow 00:35:56.268$  The second one was actually published

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:35:56.268 \longrightarrow 00:35:59.099$  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

 $00:36:00.570 \longrightarrow 00:36:02.530$  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

 $00:36:06.418 \longrightarrow 00:36:09.867$  management of sleepiness using using

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:36:09.867 \longrightarrow 00:36:13.426$  Modafinil. We don't think this to wait.

 $00:36:13.430 \longrightarrow 00:36:16.220$  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

 $00:36:17.453 \longrightarrow 00:36:20.330$  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

 $00:36:23.151 \longrightarrow 00:36:25.891$  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 cardiovascular

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 --> 00:36:38.608 score design and real world patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00{:}36{:}38.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}40.815$  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

 $00{:}36{:}42.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}44.762$  You could examine the true benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:36:44.762 \longrightarrow 00:36:47.953$  of C pap therapy on cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:36:47.953 \longrightarrow 00:36:52.003$  outcomes within real world clinical patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:36:52.010 \dashrightarrow 00:36:55.098$  And this is the the paper that I

00:36:55.098 --> 00:36:57.849 was alluding to that was published.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:36:57.850 \longrightarrow 00:36:59.930$  They estimate that they would

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:36:59.930 \longrightarrow 00:37:01.594$  need a sample size,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8753948

 $00:37:04.520 \longrightarrow 00:37:06.920$  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

 $00:37:24.010 \longrightarrow 00:37:26.670$  So you have the inclusion criteria there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:37:29.246 \longrightarrow 00:37:32.263$  based on the sleepy subtype and they will

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:37:32.263 \longrightarrow 00:37:35.379$  be treated with CPAP in all the patients.

00:37:35.380 --> 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:37:50.310 \longrightarrow 00:37:51.798$  Versus those who declined

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

00:37:51.798 --> 00:37:53.286 therapy or non users.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:37:53.290 \longrightarrow 00:37:55.810$  You could define this as less than

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

00:37:55.810 --> 00:37:58.655 two hours per night or you could say

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

00:37:58.655 --> 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:07.414 \longrightarrow 00:38:10.899$  can do a propensity score design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:10.900 \longrightarrow 00:38:15.476$  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

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

00:38:22.120 --> 00:38:25.936 So this is crucial for any PS design study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:25.940 \longrightarrow 00:38:28.484$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:32.040 \longrightarrow 00:38:33.280$  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 --> 00:38:38.310 the CPAP adherence and the outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:38.310 \longrightarrow 00:38:41.460$  and this reduces the bias associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:41.460 \longrightarrow 00:38:44.530$  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

 $00:38:51.660 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.740$  That we would think would be important

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

00:38:54.740 --> 00:38:57.350 as predictors of CPAP adherence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:38:57.350 \longrightarrow 00:39:00.524$  Including educational attainment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

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

 $00:39:03.700 \longrightarrow 00:39:04.558$  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.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8505913

 $00:39:16.280 \longrightarrow 00:39:18.110$  as medication adherence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8403714

 $00:39:21.430 \longrightarrow 00:39:23.866$  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

 $00:39:34.080 \longrightarrow 00:39:36.872$  Lipids, family history and

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:39:36.872 --> 00:39:41.060 physical activity as well as Dyett.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:39:41.060 --> 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

 $00:39:48.800 \longrightarrow 00:39:52.000$  the PS is the probability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:39:55.528 \longrightarrow 00:39:58.899$  on all relevant baseline covariates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

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

 $00:40:00.444 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.760$  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 --> 00:40:17.090 If it's the same then analysis may proceed

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:40:23.730 \longrightarrow 00:40:27.170$  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

 $00:40:32.220 \longrightarrow 00:40:35.472$  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 --> 00:40:40.480 probability of treatment waiting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:40:40.480 \longrightarrow 00:40:43.370$  but the fondle fundamental considerations

 $00:40:43.370 \longrightarrow 00:40:47.550$  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 --> 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

 $00:40:59.170 \longrightarrow 00:41:02.368$  To make a decision whether to

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:41:02.368 --> 00:41:04.500 approve surgeries or devices.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:41:04.500 \longrightarrow 00:41:09.156$  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

 $00:41:12.597 \longrightarrow 00:41:15.802$  outcome data and therefore the PS

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:41:15.802 --> 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

 $00:41:22.730 \longrightarrow 00:41:24.778$  You perform a observation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:41:24.778 --> 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}41{:}35.657 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}38.765$  day you got PS based matched pairs.

 $00:41:38.770 \longrightarrow 00:41:41.750$  So this is nothing new.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}41{:}41.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}44.928$  Independent group has used this to assess

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:41:44.928 \longrightarrow 00:41:47.509$  CPAP treatment and fasting lipids.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:41:47.510 --> 00:41:48.462 For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:41:48.462 \longrightarrow 00:41:53.270$  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

 $00:41:55.982 \longrightarrow 00:41:58.550$  and the PS design sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:41:58.550 \longrightarrow 00:42:00.542$  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

 $00:42:10.392 \longrightarrow 00:42:12.580$  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

 $00:42:15.418 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.310$  treatment effects in observation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00{:}42{:}17.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}19.415$  ULL Data Bay creating covariate

00:42:19.415 --> 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

 $00:42:30.799 \longrightarrow 00:42:34.960$  those that you choose to be randomized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

00:42:34.960 --> 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

 $00:42:40.430 \longrightarrow 00:42:42.860$  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

 $00{:}42{:}47.165 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}50.254$ trial so you can just, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:42:53.206 \longrightarrow 00:42:56.169$  the context of clinical practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:42:56.170 \longrightarrow 00:42:57.076$  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

 $00:42:59.794 \longrightarrow 00:43:02.877$  level of evidence in ideal world,

 $00:43:02.880 \longrightarrow 00:43:06.126$  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

 $00:43:07.750 \longrightarrow 00:43:12.356$  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 --> 00:43:16.347 I certainly am not an expert on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.69759923

 $00:43:16.347 \longrightarrow 00:43:18.693$  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 --> 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

 $00:43:29.930 \longrightarrow 00:43:31.310$  propensity score matching,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7878788

 $00:43:31.310 \longrightarrow 00:43:32.922$  and this this manuscript.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7878788

 $00{:}43{:}32.922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}36.830$  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

 $00:43:39.130 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.430$  recently accepted paper in sleep.

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:43:46.980 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.770$  Last last week I believe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:43:49.770 \longrightarrow 00:43:53.940$  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

 $00:43:56.720 \longrightarrow 00:43:59.312$  So the proposed clinical trial would

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

00:43:59.312 --> 00:44:02.484 be a multi center RCT of patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:02.484 \longrightarrow 00:44:05.202$  with moderate to severe SSA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:05.210 \longrightarrow 00:44:08.479$  We believe we can do this with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:08.479 \longrightarrow 00:44:12.219$  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 --> 00:44:21.478 same a composet endpoint follow up of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:21.480 \longrightarrow 00:44:23.960$  Two to five years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

00:44:23.960 --> 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 --> 00:44:31.849 maintain power after loss to follow

 $00:44:31.849 \longrightarrow 00:44:34.564$  up or trimming of patients in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00{:}44{:}34.564 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}37.150$  PS design that you could do this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

00:44:37.150 --> 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

 $00:44:42.368 \longrightarrow 00:44:47.120$  So if you look at the number of subjects.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

 $00:44:47.120 \longrightarrow 00:44:49.780$  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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.9005558

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:45:03.770 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.144$  And rollable patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:45:05.144 \longrightarrow 00:45:07.892$  So we believe that we could

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:45:07.892 \longrightarrow 00:45:10.168$  we could do this study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:45:10.170 \longrightarrow 00:45:14.630$  It's going to be a heavy lift. We we, we,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:45:14.630 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.390$  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

 $00{:}45{:}20.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}24.180$  Get few minutes for questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}45{:}24.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}27.792$ Sleep apnea is heterogeneous disease symptom

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

00:45:27.792 --> 00:45:32.000 clusters of those with daytime sleepiness,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:45:32.000 \longrightarrow 00:45:34.472$  insomnia, and asymptomatic groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

00:45:34.472 --> 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

 $00:45:40.520 \longrightarrow 00:45:42.590$  It's important because EDS we

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:45:42.590 \longrightarrow 00:45:45.216$  believe is a marker of cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:45:45.216 \longrightarrow 00:45:48.018$  risk in in those with OSA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:45:48.020 \longrightarrow 00:45:51.919$  but not in those without always say.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:45:51.920 \longrightarrow 00:45:55.202$  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

 $00:45:57.483 \longrightarrow 00:46:00.613$  have been negative and inconsistent

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

00:46:00.613 --> 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.

 $00:46:05.960 \longrightarrow 00:46:09.662$  That's primarily the sample selection bias

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00{:}46{:}09.662 \to 00{:}46{:}14.468$  and bias due to a dherence to the rapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:46:14.470 \longrightarrow 00:46:17.470$  In future studies need to include

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:46:20.420 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.899$  Ethical lamp limitations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:46:23.871 \longrightarrow 00:46:26.270$  be overcome with observation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

00:46:26.270 --> 00:46:29.180 ULL designs using propensity scores an

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:46:29.180 \longrightarrow 00:46:32.660$  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

 $00:46:35.135 \longrightarrow 00:46:37.610$  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

 $00:46:39.570 \longrightarrow 00:46:41.994$  including measures of healthy

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:46:41.994 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.024$  used userin healthy adhere bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.77396494

 $00:46:45.030 \longrightarrow 00:46:47.682$  In patients who are very compliant

00:46:47.682 --> 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

 $00:46:52.540 \longrightarrow 00:46:53.130$  Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

 $00:46:57.750 \longrightarrow 00:47:00.138$  that was really a fantastic talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

 $00{:}47{:}00.138 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}03.115$  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

 $00{:}47{:}09.488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}11.578$  should be characterizing the benefit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8320763

 $00{:}47{:}11.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}13.770$  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 --> 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

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.7751113

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

 $00:47:29.750 \longrightarrow 00:47:33.490$  but you could just tell us up, Garth. How

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:47:35.830 \longrightarrow 00:47:38.170$  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 --> 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

 $00:47:44.776 \longrightarrow 00:47:47.239$  the time and congratulations on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}47{:}47.239 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}49.408$  top Med project and I, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

00:47:52.325 --> 00:47:55.552 you were saying and I think the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:47:55.552 \longrightarrow 00:47:57.359$  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

 $00:48:00.400 \longrightarrow 00:48:03.368$  I think I also want to emphasize.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

00:48:03.370 --> 00:48:07.240 A point that you made which is you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:07.240 \longrightarrow 00:48:10.040$  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 --> 00:48:15.402 would really have been done to date,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:15.410 \longrightarrow 00:48:17.811$  and I think we're really in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:17.811 \longrightarrow 00:48:19.809$  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

 $00:48:22.491 \longrightarrow 00:48:25.883$  to the size of the trials that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:25.883 \longrightarrow 00:48:27.819$  typically occur in cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

00:48:27.819 --> 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

 $00:48:33.550 \longrightarrow 00:48:36.266$  That that actually reflects some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:36.266 \longrightarrow 00:48:38.783$  biologic pathways by which sleep apnea

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:40.930 \longrightarrow 00:48:43.170$  You really need so those large sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:43.170 \longrightarrow 00:48:45.737$  sizes to to demonstrate an additional

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}48{:}48.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}50.838$  But I think one point I would add

 $00:48:50.838 \longrightarrow 00:48:53.674$  is that I think the outcomes may

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:48:53.674 \longrightarrow 00:48:56.395$  be also different depending on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

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

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

00:48:58.970 --> 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

 $00:49:04.080 \longrightarrow 00:49:06.824$  Some of our studies and stroke have

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:49:06.824 \longrightarrow 00:49:09.172$  suggested this as well that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}49{:}09.172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}12.170$  there may be a more robust affect in

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:49:12.170 \longrightarrow 00:49:14.830$  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

 $00{:}49{:}21.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}24.498$  Another another approach I think to

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}49{:}24.498 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}27.260$  doing a randomized controlled trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:49:27.260 \longrightarrow 00:49:30.382$  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

 $00{:}49{:}34.204 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}36.420$  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

 $00:49:39.300 \longrightarrow 00:49:42.296$  but but rather randomizing to a diagnosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

00:49:42.296 --> 00:49:44.210 and treatment intervention strategy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

00:49:44.210 --> 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

 $00:49:49.414 \longrightarrow 00:49:52.333$  to get through some of the ethical

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}49{:}52.333 \to 00{:}49{:}54.967$  challenges and could be a potentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00:49:55.045 \longrightarrow 00:49:58.225$  useful strategy in a very high

NOTE Confidence: 0.87652886

 $00{:}49{:}58.225 \to 00{:}49{:}59.815$  pretest probability population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:00.640 \longrightarrow 00:50:01.690$  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

 $00{:}50{:}04.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}07.270$  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

 $00{:}50{:}09.020 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}50{:}10.756$  Your point about Cerebro

00:50:10.756 --> 00:50:12.058 vascular disease versus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

00:50:12.060 --> 00:50:14.700 You know, ameisen all those

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

00:50:14.700 --> 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

 $00:50:25.633 \longrightarrow 00:50:29.428$  events and and the other issue

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:29.428 \longrightarrow 00:50:32.153$  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

 $00:50:40.822 \longrightarrow 00:50:43.248$  well, let's do an enhance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:43.248 \longrightarrow 00:50:48.096$  Add CPAP adherence so that that way you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:48.096 \longrightarrow 00:50:51.925$  have a separation between with usage right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:50:51.930 \longrightarrow 00:50:53.850$  We believe that they may.

00:50:53.850 --> 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

 $00:51:04.430 \longrightarrow 00:51:07.886$  if that's the approach that you're going to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8163701

 $00:51:07.890 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.126$  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

 $00:51:18.500 \longrightarrow 00:51:19.658$  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 --> 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

 $00:51:28.540 \longrightarrow 00:51:29.689$  it kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806

 $00:51:29.690 \longrightarrow 00:51:30.848$  a different question.

 $00:51:30.850 \longrightarrow 00:51:33.938$  We're going to treat all patients with OSA

NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806

 $00{:}51{:}33.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}36.640$  that are sleepy because we have no

NOTE Confidence: 0.7638806

 $00:51:36.640 \longrightarrow 00:51:38.568$  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

 $00{:}51{:}43.155 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}45.928$  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

 $00:51:47.520 \longrightarrow 00:51:49.510$  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

 $00{:}51{:}53.474 \longrightarrow 00{:}51{:}55.860$  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

 $00{:}51{:}57.840 --> 00{:}52{:}00.540$  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

 $00:52:03.074 \longrightarrow 00:52:05.620$  like super, which lends itself to

00:52:05.620 --> 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

 $00:52:13.760 \longrightarrow 00:52:16.325$  Well, to the point of so the the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00{:}52{:}16.325 \rightarrow 00{:}52{:}18.535$  point or question is where are you

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

00:52:18.535 --> 00:52:20.949 going to treat this patient's anyway?

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

00:52:20.950 --> 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

 $00:52:26.467 \longrightarrow 00:52:28.910$  we believe that there is a reason

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

 $00:52:28.987 \longrightarrow 00:52:31.269$  and one of them there are other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82571155

00:52:31.270 --> 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

 $00:52:36.740 \longrightarrow 00:52:38.917$  You know right now I should know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835407286

 $00:52:41.840 \longrightarrow 00:52:45.520$  Screening for or identifying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835407286

 $00:52:45.520 \longrightarrow 00:52:48.075$  UH, patients, for example,

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

 $00:52:59.930 \longrightarrow 00:53:02.674$  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 --> 00:53:16.684 To identify more cases of sleep apnea and

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:53:16.684 \longrightarrow 00:53:19.985$  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

 $00:53:24.340 \longrightarrow 00:53:28.876$  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

 $00:53:32.396 \longrightarrow 00:53:35.250$  advocacy of treatment. For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:53:35.250 \longrightarrow 00:53:39.610$  if if if they know that the treatment

 $00:53:39.719 \longrightarrow 00:53:43.734$  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

 $00:53:47.630 \longrightarrow 00:53:50.990$  they would indeed encourage identification of

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

00:53:50.990 --> 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

 $00:53:59.198 \longrightarrow 00:54:03.488$  the in the cardiovascular literature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:54:03.490 \longrightarrow 00:54:09.266$  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

 $00:54:20.559 \longrightarrow 00:54:23.379$  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

 $00:54:31.250 \longrightarrow 00:54:34.820$  there is no rationale to treat them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:54:34.820 \longrightarrow 00:54:36.856 \text{ I mean, I know,}$ 

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:54:36.856 \longrightarrow 00:54:40.880$  I know that's probably a very controversial

 $00:54:40.880 \longrightarrow 00:54:46.016$  statement given some of the guidelines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:54:46.020 \longrightarrow 00:54:51.564$  About at least the data that we have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00.54.51.570 \longrightarrow 00.54.52.641$  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

 $00:54:54.783 \longrightarrow 00:54:56.860$  that needs to be replicated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:54:56.860 \longrightarrow 00:54:57.734$  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

 $00{:}54{:}59.919 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}02.657$  group that was that was at risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82042664

 $00:55:02.660 \longrightarrow 00:55:05.138$  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 --> 00:55:10.109 Yeah, the problem with the Epworth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:10.110 \longrightarrow 00:55:13.834$  which we use all of us use for assessing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:13.834 \longrightarrow 00:55:15.490$  subjective sleepiness is very,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

00:55:15.490 --> 00:55:16.729 very susceptible to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:16.730 \longrightarrow 00:55:17.969$  false negative scores.

 $00:55:17.969 \longrightarrow 00:55:20.034$  Yeah, I pointed that out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:20.040 \longrightarrow 00:55:22.465$  I specifically said that actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:22.465 \longrightarrow 00:55:25.819$  that the subtype of sleep apnea is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00{:}55{:}25.819 \longrightarrow 00{:}55{:}28.345$  not only does that only include.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:28.350 \longrightarrow 00:55:30.978$  The The Epworth Sleepiness Scale score.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:30.980 \longrightarrow 00:55:33.872$  So determining those subtypes is actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:33.872 \longrightarrow 00:55:37.038$  there are other questions that were included

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

00:55:37.038 --> 00:55:39.754 that although it's it's the F word,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:39.760 \longrightarrow 00:55:42.400$  was a component of defining the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:42.400 \longrightarrow 00:55:45.336$  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

 $00:55:49.830 \longrightarrow 00:55:51.980$  That defines the sleepy subtype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8487515

 $00:55:51.980 \longrightarrow 00:55:54.990$  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 --> 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.

 $00:56:02.730 \longrightarrow 00:56:05.310$  We use Epworth Aurora comperable type

NOTE Confidence: 0.809432

 $00:56:05.310 \longrightarrow 00:56:07.460$  of a self administered questionnaire

NOTE Confidence: 0.809432

 $00:56:07.460 \longrightarrow 00:56:08.750$  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

 $00:56:11.330 \longrightarrow 00:56:14.340$  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

 $00:56:16.490 \longrightarrow 00:56:19.930$  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: 0.770240916666667

 $00:56:21.220 \longrightarrow 00:56:23.964$  treatments. Right after that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.770240916666667

00:56:23.964 --> 00:56:28.080 and then we actually so Brendan

NOTE Confidence: 0.770240916666667

00:56:28.197 --> 00:56:31.503 Keenan at Penn actually has created

NOTE Confidence: 0.770240916666667

 $00{:}56{:}31.503 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}35.892$  a so based on the on the studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.770240916666667

 $00{:}56{:}35.892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}41.052$  that we publish it is there is a an

NOTE Confidence: 0.770240916666667

 $00{:}56{:}41.052 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}45.840$  app Web type app that you could.

NOTE Confidence: 0.770240916666667

 $00:56:45.840 \longrightarrow 00:56:48.174$  Plug in the answers to the

 $00:56:48.174 \longrightarrow 00:56:50.549$  questions and it will give you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.770240916666667

 $00:56:50.550 \longrightarrow 00:56:52.645$  The answer whether that patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.770240916666667

 $00:56:52.645 \longrightarrow 00:56:54.740$  belongs to a sleepy subtype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.770240916666667

 $00:56:54.740 \longrightarrow 00:56:57.330$  but you know whether that lends itself

NOTE Confidence: 0.770240916666667

 $00:56:57.330 \longrightarrow 00:57:00.190$  to the usual busy clinical practice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.770240916666667

00:57:00.190 --> 00:57:04.810 I I I agree with you. Yes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

00:57:04.810 --> 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

 $00{:}57{:}08.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}11.957$  I mean, there's a big literature showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00:57:11.957 \longrightarrow 00:57:14.439$  that subjective measures are terrible.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

00:57:14.440 --> 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

 $00:57:19.824 \longrightarrow 00:57:22.478$  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,

 $00:57:29.530 \longrightarrow 00:57:31.510$  the average patient was over,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00:57:31.510 \longrightarrow 00:57:33.500$  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 --> 00:57:39.848 is already really abnormal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00.57:39.848 \longrightarrow 00.57:41.039$  And for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

 $00:57:41.040 \longrightarrow 00:57:43.819$  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

 $00{:}57{:}55.380 \rightarrow 00{:}57{:}57.510$  They already were very heavy

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

00:57:57.510 --> 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,

 $00:58:01.480 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.385$  and that's the group that

NOTE Confidence: 0.88995653

00:58:03.385 --> 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

 $00:58:07.195 \longrightarrow 00:58:09.100$  have a bunch of diseases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:10.120 \longrightarrow 00:58:11.864$  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 --> 00:58:18.772 secondary prevention trials, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:18.772 \longrightarrow 00:58:21.980$  They had to have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:21.980 \longrightarrow 00:58:24.700$  CVD in order to be enrolled in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00{:}58{:}24.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}27.713$  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

 $00:58:30.703 \longrightarrow 00:58:33.043$  coronary syndrome and then the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00.58:33.043 \longrightarrow 00.58:35.935$  the other study they you have to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

00:58:35.935 --> 00:58:38.372 have a cast proven coronary artery

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00{:}58{:}38.372 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}41.179$  disease and and I agree with that.

 $00:58:41.180 \longrightarrow 00:58:44.200$  Perhaps you know the the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00{:}58{:}44.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}46.018$  Although I think the entry criteria

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00.58:46.018 \longrightarrow 00.58:48.220$  of the age is about is is 18,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:48.220 \longrightarrow 00:58:50.440$  but you're saying that the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:50.440 \longrightarrow 00:58:53.086$  The the average age is there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8474037

 $00:58:53.090 \longrightarrow 00:58:54.598$  they're older, they're older.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

00:58:54.600 --> 00:58:57.160 Yeah, I mean it. It reminds me of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:58:57.160 \longrightarrow 00:58:59.162$  the Women's Health Initiative study

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:58:59.162 \longrightarrow 00:59:02.151$  where the you know they were giving.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

00:59:02.160 --> 00:59:03.672 They were treating women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00{:}59{:}03.672 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}06.315$  You know, for menopause like 15 years

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00{:}59{:}06.315 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}08.584$  after their menopause, Ann and Dan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:59:08.584 \longrightarrow 00:59:11.231$  And that's you know. In other words,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:59:11.231 \longrightarrow 00:59:13.493$  we're treating patients way too late.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

00:59:13.500 --> 00:59:16.139 We ought to be screening them earlier,

00:59:16.140 --> 00:59:18.570 and that's where I think the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

00:59:18.570 --> 00:59:20.949 RTC should focus an in fact.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:59:20.950 \longrightarrow 00:59:22.750$  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 that the mortality

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:59:26.406 \longrightarrow 00:59:28.506$  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 --> 00:59:34.086 You know it's the younger ones that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8348341

 $00:59:34.086 \longrightarrow 00:59:36.788$  that seem to have the higher mortality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87799215

 $00:59:37.430 \longrightarrow 00:59:40.010$  Yeah, that's because of this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87799215

 $00:59:40.010 \longrightarrow 00:59:42.066$  Basically as survival effect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87799215

00:59:42.066 --> 00:59:44.710 right? Yeah, yeah. Ulysses

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

 $00:59:44.710 \longrightarrow 00:59:46.098$  I have a question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

00:59:46.100 --> 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

 $00:59:50.280 \longrightarrow 00:59:52.364$  Hi, my question is about the

 $00:59:52.364 \longrightarrow 00:59:54.448$  mechanisms of the sleepy patients and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

 $00:59:54.450 \longrightarrow 00:59:55.500$  CVD. So you've

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

 $00:59:55.500 \longrightarrow 00:59:57.240$  mentioned this study about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.79342604

 $00:59:57.240 \longrightarrow 00:59:59.326$  looking at genetics and 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

 $01:00:04.170 \longrightarrow 01:00:05.100$  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

 $01:00:08.181 \longrightarrow 01:00:09.730$  it's just it's inflammatory or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959

 $01:00:09.730 \longrightarrow 01:00:11.280$  it's some other underlying process.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8757959

 $01{:}00{:}11.280 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}12.376$  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 --> 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 --> 01:00:26.224 Well, that that Grant is, we don't know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:00:26.224 \longrightarrow 01:00:28.940$  Basically, you see that it's it's there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:00:28.940 \longrightarrow 01:00:31.267$  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 --> 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 --> 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

 $01:00:47.550 \longrightarrow 01:00:53.507$  The PV, the objective evidence of sleepiness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:00:53.510 \longrightarrow 01:00:55.976$  We could potentially add results of,

 $01:00:55.980 \longrightarrow 01:00:58.035$  although it's not really sleeping

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:00:58.035 \longrightarrow 01:00:59.679$  as its vigilance would.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

01:00:59.680 --> 01:01:02.140 That would be easy to incorporate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

01:01:02.140 --> 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 --> 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

 $01:01:12.047 \longrightarrow 01:01:14.263$  defining the sleepy subtype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8684457

 $01:01:14.270 \longrightarrow 01:01:17.750$  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

 $01:01:19.930 \longrightarrow 01:01:21.670$  it on an iPad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80611736

 $01{:}01{:}21.670 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}24.280$  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

 $01:01:26.455 \longrightarrow 01:01:28.630$  that could readily be incorporated

 $01:01:28.630 \longrightarrow 01:01:29.929$  into clinical encounters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

 $01:01:31.610 \longrightarrow 01:01:34.013$  It is just going back to the to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

01:01:34.013 --> 01:01:36.555 top match of the the way that would

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

 $01:01:36.555 \longrightarrow 01:01:38.938$  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

 $01:01:41.040 \longrightarrow 01:01:44.400$  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

 $01:01:48.144 \longrightarrow 01:01:51.440$  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

 $01:01:54.870 \longrightarrow 01:01:57.775$  Of course, when when the data is

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

 $01{:}01{:}57.775 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}59.870$  published in publicly available,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86336946

 $01:01:59.870 \longrightarrow 01:02:02.971$  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

 $01:02:10.330 \longrightarrow 01:02:12.250$  I think as there are a few minutes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196

 $01:02:12.250 \longrightarrow 01:02:14.180$  past the hour and people hung around

 $01:02:14.180 \longrightarrow 01:02:16.579$  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

 $01:02:19.420 \longrightarrow 01:02:20.552$  you again. Needless yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196

01:02:20.552 --> 01:02:21.684 Thanks for inviting me,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196

 $01{:}02{:}21.690 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}26.150$  I appreciate it. Thank you. Thanks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8460196

 $01{:}02{:}26.150 --> 01{:}02{:}27.950$  You like Michelle? Take care.