WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:17:09" NOTE recognizability:0.878

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:02.115 We're good. OK, OK, great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:00:02.115 --> 00:00:04.230 There are times a charm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}00{:}04.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}07.029$ So uhm so uh thanks it's been great to

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:07.029 \longrightarrow 00:00:10.085$ hear some of the talks from the morning I.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:10.090 \longrightarrow 00:00:11.385$ I think one of the things I

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:00:11.385 --> 00:00:12.599 was going to say and I'll,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:12.600 \longrightarrow 00:00:14.528$ I'll make mine a little bit more informal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:14.530 \longrightarrow 00:00:16.231$ So really, if people want to ask

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:16.231 \longrightarrow 00:00:17.550$ questions even in in between,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:17.550 \longrightarrow 00:00:18.582$ that'll be fine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}00{:}18.582 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}21.454$ One of the things that we did in

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}00{:}21.454 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}24.128$ inviting our trial pies was make a

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:24.128 \longrightarrow 00:00:26.617$ request today that they simply didn't

 $00:00:26.617 \longrightarrow 00:00:29.324$ talk about the protocol and the design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:29.324 \longrightarrow 00:00:31.196$ One. I think a lot of us have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:00:31.200 --> 00:00:32.880 Heard that that you know might

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:32.880 \longrightarrow 00:00:34.418$ be a little bit, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:34.418 \longrightarrow 00:00:35.881$ but what we thought we could do

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:35.881 \longrightarrow 00:00:37.647$ and I think this is an originally

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:00:37.647 --> 00:00:39.119 Lauren Sansing's idea to you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}00{:}39.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}41.010$ to ask him a little bit about

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:41.010 \longrightarrow 00:00:43.160$ the back story you know and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:00:43.160 --> 00:00:44.755 and some other questions about

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}00{:}44.755 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}46.860$ that you don't always hear about,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:00:46.860 --> 00:00:49.849 so I thought I would very much

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:49.849 \longrightarrow 00:00:51.950$ do that for a spire.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:00:51.950 --> 00:00:53.330 These aren't the things you would

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:53.330 \longrightarrow 00:00:54.899$ find in the protocol or the lead

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:54.899 \longrightarrow 00:00:56.299$ up that that might be relevant when

00:00:56.350 --> 00:00:57.928 you're thinking about your own trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:57.930 \longrightarrow 00:00:59.268$ because all of these things they

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:00:59.268 \longrightarrow 00:01:00.709$ always do have a back story.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:00.710 \longrightarrow 00:01:01.904$ Every little detail,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:01.904 \longrightarrow 00:01:04.292$ and the first thing really is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:04.300 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.164$ you know the waste.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:01:05.164 --> 00:01:06.754 One of the things that I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:06.754 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.224$ about at the beginning of really

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:08.224 \longrightarrow 00:01:10.033$ most of the projects I started is

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:10.033 \longrightarrow 00:01:11.652$ just don't say the choice of team

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:11.652 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.344$ but just the team that you either

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:13.344 \longrightarrow 00:01:15.038$ choose or that you end up working

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}01{:}15.094 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}16.578$ with and a little bit of both.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:16.580 \longrightarrow 00:01:19.364$ And you know I want to just mention

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:19.364 \longrightarrow 00:01:21.456$ a couple of people, of course.

 $00:01:21.456 \longrightarrow 00:01:23.560$ There are a lot of folks that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:23.624 \longrightarrow 00:01:25.359$ involved in a clinical trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:01:25.360 --> 00:01:26.017 but you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}01{:}26.017 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}27.798$ one of the things that I would say

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:01:27.798 --> 00:01:29.350 I think is as many of you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:01:29.350 --> 00:01:32.977 I'm a critical care neurologist and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}01{:}32.977 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}35.070$ here I was trying to think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:01:35.143 --> 00:01:37.488 proposing a stroke prevention trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}01{:}37.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}39.282$ so I thought that you know people

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:01:39.282 --> 00:01:41.628 might laugh and find that a little bit funny.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}01{:}41.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}43.510$ Doing stroke prevention is something

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:43.510 \longrightarrow 00:01:46.418$ that I always wanted to do ever since

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:01:46.418 --> 00:01:48.338 fellowship and it just happened to

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:48.338 \longrightarrow 00:01:50.372$ be that my clinical interests were

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:50.372 \longrightarrow 00:01:52.796$ mostly in sort of acute neurology.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}01{:}52.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}56.050$ So a few years ago I before a spire,

 $00:01:56.050 \longrightarrow 00:01:58.395$ you know where it's nice at Yale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:01:58.400 \longrightarrow 00:02:00.176$ We have sabbaticals every so often

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:02:00.176 \longrightarrow 00:02:03.204$ and so I I had a sabbatical and I

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:02:03.204 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.215$ used that experience to really think

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:02:05.215 \longrightarrow 00:02:07.420$ about how to design and think about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:02:07.420 --> 00:02:07.934 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:02:07.934 \longrightarrow 00:02:09.476$ doing a prevention trial in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:02:09.476 --> 00:02:10.948 disease that I did know something

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:02:10.948 --> 00:02:12.667 about and was was sort of passionate

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:02:12.667 --> 00:02:14.485 about and there was no interest,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:02:14.490 \longrightarrow 00:02:15.300$ real hemorrhage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:02:15.300 \longrightarrow 00:02:18.540$ And in doing that one of the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}02{:}18.629 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}21.923$ things that I did was reach out to a

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:02:21.923 --> 00:02:24.355 colleague who was many of you know who,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:02:24.360 \longrightarrow 00:02:25.182$ Monica Mellow.

00:02:25.182 --> 00:02:27.237 As my copii at Cornell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00{:}02{:}27.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}29.242$ and I say this with great respect

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:02:29.242 \longrightarrow 00:02:30.699$ to everyone on the call.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

00:02:30.700 --> 00:02:31.396 But you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870504936

 $00:02:31.396 \longrightarrow 00:02:33.020$ one of the reasons we reached out

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:02:33.072 \longrightarrow 00:02:34.524$ and I started working with him

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:02:34.524 --> 00:02:36.452 was one because of his, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:02:36.452 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.232$ deep and recent experience in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00{:}02{:}38.232 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}40.029$ getting Arcadia off the ground.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:02:40.030 \longrightarrow 00:02:41.406$ Even though it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00{:}02{:}41.406 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}42.438$ hemorrhaging is chemic strokes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:02:42.440 \longrightarrow 00:02:44.580$ Some of the questions and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00{:}02{:}44.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}45.864$ practical interventions were

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:02:45.864 \longrightarrow 00:02:48.288$ going to be very much the same,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:02:48.290 --> 00:02:50.626 and also because I really thought from our

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:02:50.626 \longrightarrow 00:02:52.778$ generation he was really one of the nicest,

00:02:52.780 --> 00:02:54.505 smartest people in the field

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00{:}02{:}54.505 \longrightarrow 00{:}02{:}56.870$ and so being able to capture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:02:56.870 --> 00:02:58.448 Both of those things you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:02:58.448 \longrightarrow 00:03:00.260$ was was a great opportunity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:00.260 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.748$ The other thing that ended up

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:01.748 \longrightarrow 00:03:03.160$ playing a big role for me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:03.160 \longrightarrow 00:03:04.588$ We've had a lot of folks

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:04.588 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.540$ in our steering committee,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:03:05.540 --> 00:03:08.178 but just being here at Yale was

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:03:08.178 --> 00:03:09.568 being close to Walt Kernan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:09.570 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.818$ And as all of you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:03:10.820 --> 00:03:11.877 I mean, I think many of you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00{:}03{:}11.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}13.450$ Karen and others were involved

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:13.450 \longrightarrow 00:03:14.706$ in the IRIS trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:14.710 \longrightarrow 00:03:16.859$ which was really only one of the

 $00:03:16.859 \longrightarrow 00:03:19.632$ one of the few sort of successful

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:03:19.632 --> 00:03:21.852 prevention trials in NIH history,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:21.860 \longrightarrow 00:03:24.070$ at least by efficacy outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:03:24.070 --> 00:03:25.015 and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:25.015 \longrightarrow 00:03:27.220$ to have that experience was very helpful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:03:27.220 --> 00:03:29.388 To have in hand and thinking about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:29.388 \longrightarrow 00:03:31.450$ concept but even big picture questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:31.450 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.004$ I remember one of the things that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00{:}03{:}33.004 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}34.717$ Walt asked me at the beginning was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00{:}03{:}34.720 \longrightarrow 00{:}03{:}36.968$ you know, do you really want to commit

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00{:}03{:}36.968 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}38.937$ potentially 7 to 10 years of your life?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:03:38.940 --> 00:03:39.488 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:03:39.488 --> 00:03:41.680 before you embark on an endeavor like that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:41.680 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.976$ you gotta really think about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:42.980 \longrightarrow 00:03:44.830$ So that was very helpful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:03:44.830 --> 00:03:47.486 The 4th person I haven't put here and

 $00:03:47.486 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.480$ that's because she's oftentimes pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:49.480 \longrightarrow 00:03:51.994$ humble about these kinds of things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:03:52.000 --> 00:03:53.180 And it is, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:03:53.180 --> 00:03:54.710 if you go to Google pictures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:54.710 \longrightarrow 00:03:56.897$ you really cannot even find a picture of her.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:56.900 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.938$ I mean, it's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:03:57.938 --> 00:03:58.976 Really quite remarkable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:03:58.980 \longrightarrow 00:04:01.437$ and that and that's Catherine Visco Lee.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:04:01.440 --> 00:04:02.982 So Catherine Viscol is some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:04:02.982 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.802$ you know that this is the picture

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00{:}04{:}04.802 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}06.524$ that she did send me of herself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:04:06.530 \longrightarrow 00:04:08.778$ which in some ways you know it's it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00{:}04{:}08.778 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}11.219$ not not an inappropriate picture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:04:11.220 \longrightarrow 00:04:12.336$ I'll tell you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:04:12.336 --> 00:04:13.080 But Catherine,

 $00:04:13.080 \longrightarrow 00:04:15.824$ this Coley is is not a clinician,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:04:15.830 \longrightarrow 00:04:18.210$ but actually has been involved

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:04:18.210 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.638$ in stroke investigation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

00:04:19.640 --> 00:04:20.200 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00:04:20.200 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.820$ for many many years and I I don't know

NOTE Confidence: 0.9332078

 $00{:}04{:}22.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}24.983$ if people at Yale even know this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:04:27.020 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.286$ Sort of having some of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:04:28.286 \longrightarrow 00:04:30.466$ slides out of order, what's up?

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:04:30.466 --> 00:04:33.138 But you know Catherine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}04{:}33.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}35.332$ Actually, you know has a CV in some

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}04{:}35.332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}37.531$ ways that you know some stroke

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:04:37.531 \longrightarrow 00:04:39.740$ investigators would never have, even at

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}04{:}39.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}41.910$ over the course of their whole career.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}04{:}41.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}44.458$ And you know she happened to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:04:44.458 --> 00:04:46.429 this rich experience in thinking

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:04:46.429 --> 00:04:48.853 about not just conducting the trial,

00:04:48.860 --> 00:04:51.260 but analyzing it, reporting it

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:04:51.260 \longrightarrow 00:04:53.660$ really doing everything from A-Z.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:04:53.660 \longrightarrow 00:04:55.820$ Not only in these studies that you see here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:04:55.820 \longrightarrow 00:04:57.080$ but all still in the iris.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:04:57.080 --> 00:05:01.130 Trial and, uh, so that you know, working.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:01.130 \longrightarrow 00:05:04.000$ I think with this team from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:04.000 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.040$ beginning was just as much I,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:06.040 \longrightarrow 00:05:08.434$ I think as important as the fundamental

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}05{:}08.434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}10.060$ sort of scientific question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:10.060 \longrightarrow 00:05:11.338$ So I I just wanted to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}05{:}11.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}12.999$ I think this is obvious to everyone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:13.000 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.680$ but just to give a couple of

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}05{:}14.680 \to 00{:}05{:}16.520$ pieces for how this came together,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}05{:}16.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}18.456$ I think it's a critical part of how

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:18.456 \longrightarrow 00:05:20.239$ the trial concepts come together.

00:05:20.240 --> 00:05:20.694 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:20.694 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.510$ in that context what I would say is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:22.510 \longrightarrow 00:05:24.390$ and there are a lot of people I.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:24.390 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.298$ I'm just highlighting a few here

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:05:26.298 --> 00:05:28.873 to make a point and make a point

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:28.873 \longrightarrow 00:05:30.418$ in the context of aspire.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}05{:}30.420 \to 00{:}05{:}32.250$ You know, when we were designing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:05:32.250 --> 00:05:34.007 and as we've been conducting this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}05{:}34.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}34.982$ we've been thinking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:34.982 \longrightarrow 00:05:36.197$ a lot of different things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}05{:}36.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}37.306$ As you'll hear about in a minute,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:37.310 \longrightarrow 00:05:39.144$ you know what are the right outcomes?

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:39.150 \longrightarrow 00:05:43.670$ What can we learn about aspire beyond aspire?

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:05:43.670 --> 00:05:45.648 You know what are the relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:05:45.648 --> 00:05:48.336 outcomes beyond our top line outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:48.340 \longrightarrow 00:05:50.516$ and you can see here, you know,

 $00:05:50.516 \longrightarrow 00:05:52.728$ Lauren Gaido, Alessandro Biffi.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:05:52.730 --> 00:05:54.580 I mean they've all had, I think,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:54.580 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.290$ really key pieces of input into

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:56.290 \longrightarrow 00:05:58.488$ that and really unique perspectives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:05:58.490 --> 00:05:59.830 You know, we didn't choose,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:05:59.830 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.456$ but you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:06:01.456 --> 00:06:05.481 the current chair of the DSMB is Clark Haley.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:05.481 \longrightarrow 00:06:07.023$ So as many of you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}06{:}07.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}09.172$ Clark Haley was very involved in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:09.172 \longrightarrow 00:06:11.756$ leadership of the original NINDS TPA trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:06:11.756 --> 00:06:14.430 and it turns out that these historical

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:14.499 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.565$ things become relevant because you know what?

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:17.570 \longrightarrow 00:06:19.740$ For in a different context,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:19.740 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.624$ when they were thinking about when

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:06:21.624 --> 00:06:23.908 they were looking at TPA and having

 $00:06:23.908 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.513$ those very early DSMB meetings

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:25.520 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.090$ for the NDS TPA trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:28.090 \longrightarrow 00:06:30.526$ they really had to think about this

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:06:30.526 --> 00:06:32.589 balance of efficacy and hemorrhage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:32.590 \longrightarrow 00:06:34.840$ bleeding and clotting in a very.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:06:34.840 --> 00:06:35.390 Sort of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:06:35.390 --> 00:06:35.940 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:35.940 \longrightarrow 00:06:37.937$ in an environment where they didn't really

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:37.937 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.988$ know that much from a clinical context,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:06:39.990 --> 00:06:43.616 and without you know sharing any sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:43.616 \longrightarrow 00:06:46.559$ of insight information from the trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:46.560 \longrightarrow 00:06:48.330$ I think everybody would understand that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:06:48.330 --> 00:06:50.374 You know when you're thinking about aspire,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}06{:}50.380 \to 00{:}06{:}51.600$ not just in the design,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:51.600 \longrightarrow 00:06:54.001$ but as the study goes along and

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:06:54.001 \longrightarrow 00:06:56.266$ people start having endpoints clotting

00:06:56.266 --> 00:06:58.598 endpoints or hemorrhaging points.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}06{:}58.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}00.679$ These issues really come to the fore.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:07:00.680 \longrightarrow 00:07:02.828$ I'll give you one concrete example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:07:02.830 \longrightarrow 00:07:05.174$ Oftentimes in a trial like this people will.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:07:05.180 \longrightarrow 00:07:07.360$ Think about having a hemorrhage

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:07:07.360 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.104$ as a safety outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

00:07:09.110 --> 00:07:12.182 Well, you could ask why, why should it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}07{:}12.182 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}13.118$ Why shouldn't hemorrhage only

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:07:13.118 \longrightarrow 00:07:14.200$ be a safety outcome?

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:07:14.200 \longrightarrow 00:07:16.120$ That's a that's if you think

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00:07:16.120 \longrightarrow 00:07:17.780$ about safety as active harm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}07{:}17.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}20.114$ But if you think about is chemic

NOTE Confidence: 0.852808542

 $00{:}07{:}20.114 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}21.670$ stroke as sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:21.752 \longrightarrow 00:07:24.926$ passive harm or passive safety endpoint,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:24.930 \longrightarrow 00:07:26.640$ then then is chaemia is can also

 $00:07:26.640 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.310$ be considered a safety endpoint,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:28.310 \longrightarrow 00:07:29.930$ not just an efficacy endpoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:07:29.930 --> 00:07:31.120 And believe it or not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:31.120 \longrightarrow 00:07:32.677$ some of these kinds of issues, really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00{:}07{:}32.677 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}34.966$ as we've learned during the course of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:07:34.966 --> 00:07:37.116 the trial, they're not completely baked.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:37.116 \longrightarrow 00:07:39.874$ They really are something that you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:07:39.874 --> 00:07:41.200 Requires ongoing conversation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00{:}07{:}41.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}44.119$ so it's been helpful to get all

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:44.119 \longrightarrow 00:07:45.370$ these different perspectives.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:45.370 \longrightarrow 00:07:47.066$ Uhm, choice of drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:47.066 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.186$ So what really happens when

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:49.186 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.408$ you think about the drug?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:51.410 \longrightarrow 00:07:52.722$ Well, I'll tell you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:07:52.722 --> 00:07:53.706 First of all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:53.710 \longrightarrow 00:07:56.030$ you know we went to we went to science right?

 $00:07:56.030 \longrightarrow 00:07:58.028$ And we went to the history that we had.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:58.030 \longrightarrow 00:07:59.918$ And as we know in the last decade

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:07:59.918 \longrightarrow 00:08:02.035$ 15 years there have been a rush of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:02.035 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.997$ a series of different no acts that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:03.997 \longrightarrow 00:08:05.964$ have been used and proposed that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:08:05.970 --> 00:08:08.098 different profiles for administration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:08.098 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.380$ safety, efficacy etc.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:08:09.380 --> 00:08:12.890 At the time when we were proposing the trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:12.890 \longrightarrow 00:08:14.318$ of course apixaban.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:08:14.318 --> 00:08:18.220 Had the what we thought was the safe,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00{:}08{:}18.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}20.788$ the best safety and efficacy profile,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00{:}08{:}20.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}22.764$ and the best recommendation from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:08:22.764 --> 00:08:24.429 American Heart Association for a FIB,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:24.430 \longrightarrow 00:08:25.840$ at least at the time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:25.840 \longrightarrow 00:08:28.234$ and so that was a big part of it.

 $00:08:28.240 \longrightarrow 00:08:31.048$ But there was another part of it too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00{:}08{:}31.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}33.437$ which was that you know, this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:33.437 \longrightarrow 00:08:35.459$ uh, as we've heard earlier today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:08:35.460 --> 00:08:36.980 I think from Martin Landsberg,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:08:36.980 --> 00:08:39.302 all of these trials cost a lot of money,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:39.310 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.782$ and I think for those of you several

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:41.782 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.574$ on the call who are proposing trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:08:43.580 --> 00:08:45.288 you know we're always trying to cut

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:08:45.288 --> 00:08:46.898 those costs as much as possible,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:46.900 \longrightarrow 00:08:49.114$ and one of the places where there is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00{:}08{:}49.114 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}51.355$ big ticket is in fact the study drug.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575 00:08:51.360 --> 00:08:52.158 In fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:08:52.158 --> 00:08:55.350 you know when the Arcadia trial got funded,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:55.350 \longrightarrow 00:08:56.730$ one of the things that really

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:56.730 \longrightarrow 00:08:58.250$ pushed them over the finish line.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:08:58.250 \longrightarrow 00:09:01.260$ From the 80 to the A1 admission

 $00:09:01.260 \longrightarrow 00:09:03.828$ submissions was the ability to get

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00{:}09{:}03.828 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}06.610$ the drug from Bristol Myers Squibb.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:06.610 \longrightarrow 00:09:07.254$ You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:09:07.254 --> 00:09:09.508 essentially at no cost or minimal cost,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:09:09.510 --> 00:09:12.355 you know to to the NINNINDS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:12.355 \longrightarrow 00:09:14.630$ and this comes up all the time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:14.630 \longrightarrow 00:09:17.782$ I'll tell you that we went around to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:09:17.782 --> 00:09:19.853 every manufacturer of know acts at

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00{:}09{:}19.853 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}22.580$ the time and asked them if they were

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:22.580 \longrightarrow 00:09:25.534$ interested and you know it was interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:09:25.540 --> 00:09:27.050 I mean, remember these patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:27.050 \longrightarrow 00:09:28.258$ have been excluded from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:28.260 \longrightarrow 00:09:30.700$ Every prior trial of anticoagulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:09:30.700 --> 00:09:34.470 and not only were they not interested,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:34.470 \longrightarrow 00:09:36.974$ several of them told us look you use

 $00:09:36.974 \longrightarrow 00:09:40.185$ our drug and you start to have safety events.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:40.190 \longrightarrow 00:09:41.660$ You know you may have lawsuits

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:41.660 \longrightarrow 00:09:42.960$ on your hand as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:42.960 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.159$ you know so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:45.160 \longrightarrow 00:09:46.660$ You know there's just a range

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:46.660 \longrightarrow 00:09:47.840$ of considerations that come up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:09:47.840 --> 00:09:49.610 I think when you're working with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:09:49.610 --> 00:09:50.200 different manufacturers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00{:}09{:}50.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}51.608$ different potential study drugs

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00{:}09{:}51.608 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}54.347$ and you know we we learned a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:54.347 \longrightarrow 00:09:55.479$ at those early stages,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00{:}09{:}55.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}58.840$ so this is sort of what I mean by no

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:09:58.938 \longrightarrow 00:10:01.442$ choice of drug and no free lunch.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

00:10:01.442 --> 00:10:01.990 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:10:01.990 \longrightarrow 00:10:04.654$ a lot of different sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00{:}10{:}04.654 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}05.986$ background background issues.

00:10:05.990 --> 00:10:08.195 What when you end up supplying your

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:10:08.195 \longrightarrow 00:10:10.544$ own drug and this was the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.8698586575

 $00:10:10.544 \longrightarrow 00:10:12.548$ time this had happened in stroke

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:10:12.623 \longrightarrow 00:10:15.243$ net where we had a trial that had it for

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:10:15.250 \longrightarrow 00:10:17.994$ a prevention trial that where we had to

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00{:}10{:}17.994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}20.504$ secure our own our own medication outside

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:10:20.504 \longrightarrow 00:10:23.698$ of a sponsor sort of providing it for us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:10:23.700 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.340$ Well, it raised all these other issues about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:10:26.340 \longrightarrow 00:10:29.850$ Well, if you're coming up with your own drug,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:10:29.850 \longrightarrow 00:10:31.712$ how are you going to come up

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:10:31.712 --> 00:10:33.080 with your own placebo?

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:10:33.080 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.184$ And that meant how do you design it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00{:}10{:}36.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}39.718$ How do you know how closely should

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00{:}10{:}39.718 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}42.349$ resemble the actual study drug?

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:10:42.350 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.257$ You know when you get the drug from a

00:10:45.257 --> 00:10:48.118 sponsor, the sponsor owns the all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:10:48.118 --> 00:10:50.946 trademarks to the drug so they can really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:10:50.946 \longrightarrow 00:10:52.650$ truly make they're in a best

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:10:52.715 \longrightarrow 00:10:54.845$ position to make a matching placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:10:54.850 \longrightarrow 00:10:58.000$ When you go to a drug that still is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:10:58.084 --> 00:11:01.477 off patent and you have to make a placebo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:01.480 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.038$ there are issues come up about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:11:05.040 --> 00:11:06.708 Patents and trademarks actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:11:06.708 --> 00:11:08.894 so you have to, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:08.894 \longrightarrow 00:11:10.436$ somehow thread the needle to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00{:}11{:}10.436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}12.268$ able to get around those issues,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:12.270 \longrightarrow 00:11:14.220$ but also be able to provide

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:14.220 \longrightarrow 00:11:15.195$ a matching placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:15.200 \longrightarrow 00:11:15.719$ So those are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:15.719 \longrightarrow 00:11:16.930$ Those are the kinds of things that

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:16.966 \longrightarrow 00:11:18.114$ you know we had to work through,

 $00:11:18.120 \longrightarrow 00:11:20.680$ sort of at the beginning.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:20.680 \longrightarrow 00:11:22.870$ What about choice of endpoints and

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:11:22.870 --> 00:11:24.960 choice of population so you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:24.960 \longrightarrow 00:11:26.250$ we found this to be really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:11:26.250 --> 00:11:26.756 really interesting,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:11:26.756 --> 00:11:28.780 and I think something that a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:28.833 \longrightarrow 00:11:30.537$ folks here have a lot of interest in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:30.540 \longrightarrow 00:11:34.540$ You know some of the prelim data that we had,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00{:}11{:}34.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}36.526$ we and other groups have published

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:11:36.526 --> 00:11:39.210 really was. First of all, just codifying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:39.210 \longrightarrow 00:11:41.185$ What was I think essentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:41.185 \longrightarrow 00:11:43.160$ accepted sort of clinical question

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:11:43.229 --> 00:11:46.080 that it really wasn't sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:11:46.080 --> 00:11:49.284 showing efficacy versus you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:49.284 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.626$ a background.

 $00:11:50.630 \longrightarrow 00:11:53.190$ There's an active comparator arm and

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:53.190 \longrightarrow 00:11:56.230$ the other piece of that is that you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:11:56.230 --> 00:11:59.240 trying to figure out the difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:11:59.240 \longrightarrow 00:12:01.276$ between bleeding and clotting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:12:01.280 --> 00:12:03.560 And so traditionally, again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:03.560 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.840$ in stroke prevention trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00{:}12{:}05.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}08.820$ hard clinical endpoints like clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:08.820 \longrightarrow 00:12:12.660$ events have been the main piece of

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00{:}12{:}12.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}15.870$ what's used for trial endpoints.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:15.870 \longrightarrow 00:12:18.160$ In a sick population like

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00{:}12{:}18.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}19.534$ brain hemorrhage survivors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:12:19.540 --> 00:12:21.650 certainly mortality comes into play.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:21.650 \longrightarrow 00:12:25.395$ And we saw in our preliminary data

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:25.395 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.909$ that even when you looked at not

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:28.909 \longrightarrow 00:12:32.419$ low bar and non low bar patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00{:}12{:}32.419 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}35.634$ that you know certainly these

00:12:35.634 --> 00:12:38.138 endpoints were very important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:38.140 \longrightarrow 00:12:39.304$ but so was mortality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333 00:12:39.304 --> 00:12:39.886 In fact, NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:39.890 \longrightarrow 00:12:42.170$ you can see that the association

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:42.170 \longrightarrow 00:12:44.192$ with a protective signal on

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:44.192 \longrightarrow 00:12:46.357$ mortality was actually quite robust.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:46.360 \longrightarrow 00:12:48.725$ Acknowledging that all of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:12:48.725 --> 00:12:50.617 observation ull charities were

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:12:50.617 --> 00:12:52.820 likely highly confounded by

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:52.820 \longrightarrow 00:12:55.270$ virtue of their their design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:55.270 \longrightarrow 00:12:57.769$ And you can see the point estimates

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:12:57.769 \longrightarrow 00:12:59.690$ for ischemic stroke very strong.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00{:}12{:}59.690 --> 00{:}13{:}00.255 \text{ Also},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:13:00.255 --> 00:13:03.645 like in prior studies of anticoagulation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:13:03.650 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.442$ but nevertheless not nearly

 $00:13:05.442 \longrightarrow 00:13:07.234$ as strong as mortality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00{:}13{:}07.240 --> 00{:}13{:}09.333$ The other thing that you can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:13:09.333 \longrightarrow 00:13:11.567$ that was quite strong was actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:13:11.567 \longrightarrow 00:13:13.677$ the effect on functional outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:13:13.680 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.955$ And we thought functional outcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:13:15.955 --> 00:13:18.851 actually might be a really attractive

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:13:18.851 --> 00:13:21.566 endpoint for a prevention study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:13:21.570 --> 00:13:24.858 in part because it may have

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:13:24.858 \longrightarrow 00:13:26.502$ more patient relevance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:13:26.510 --> 00:13:29.612 You know functional outcome and it

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

00:13:29.612 --> 00:13:32.635 is lesion and location naive, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.896476471333333

 $00:13:32.635 \longrightarrow 00:13:34.210$ We don't worry about whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.89647647133333300:13:34.210 --> 00:13:35.470 or not it's a

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:13:35.542 --> 00:13:37.877 small hemorrhage versus a large

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:13:37.877 --> 00:13:39.278 recurrent is chemic stroke.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:13:39.280 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.008$ And in some sense, maybe neither

00:13:41.008 --> 00:13:43.158 do patients what they care about is

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:13:43.158 \longrightarrow 00:13:44.723$ the disability that they're left.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:13:44.730 --> 00:13:46.362 So I'll tell you in our

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:13:46.362 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.730$ initial application to the NIH,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:13:47.730 \longrightarrow 00:13:50.010$ we actually proposed functional

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:13:50.010 \longrightarrow 00:13:53.430$ outcome MRSI as the primary endpoint

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:13:53.430 \longrightarrow 00:13:55.830$ and part of the feedback actually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:13:55.830 \longrightarrow 00:13:58.646$ Believe it or not from review was that

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00{:}13{:}58.646 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}01.338$ funk that was thought to be sort of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:01.340 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.318$ Two different 22.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:14:02.318 --> 00:14:05.453 I don't want to say two innovative but two

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00{:}14{:}05.453 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}07.805$ different compared to prior stroke trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:07.810 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.470$ So what we ended up doing is

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00{:}14{:}10.470 \longrightarrow 00{:}14{:}12.927$ actually making it our key secondary

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00{:}14{:}12.927 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}15.811$ and then reverting back to a more

 $00:14:15.896 \longrightarrow 00:14:18.158$ traditional stroke endpoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00{:}14{:}18.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}19.994$ I'll finally end in the last couple

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:19.994 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.701$ of minutes here and and just tell

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:14:21.701 --> 00:14:22.997 you as many of you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:23.000 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.674$ there have been other trials that

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:24.674 \longrightarrow 00:14:26.759$ have been going on around the world.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:26.760 \longrightarrow 00:14:29.840$ Other phase two and phase three type studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:29.840 \longrightarrow 00:14:31.484$ This was one that was published

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:14:31.484 --> 00:14:33.130 just recently in Lancet Neurology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:33.130 \longrightarrow 00:14:36.420$ an open label RCT in the UK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:36.420 \longrightarrow 00:14:38.676$ Lots of similarities, lots of differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:38.680 \longrightarrow 00:14:41.158$ There was an open label design

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:41.160 \longrightarrow 00:14:43.036$ they were looking at.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:43.036 \longrightarrow 00:14:45.381$ Non inferiority of anticoagulation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:45.381 \longrightarrow 00:14:48.569$ the comparison group had either aspirin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:48.570 \longrightarrow 00:14:51.630$ Or no anti thrombotic.

00:14:51.630 --> 00:14:54.570 Ultimately they were underpowered

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:54.570 \longrightarrow 00:14:58.980$ to look at any efficacy endpoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:14:58.980 \longrightarrow 00:15:01.255$ And they had a figure in their

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:01.255 \longrightarrow 00:15:03.472$ paper that showed the numerical

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:03.472 \longrightarrow 00:15:05.820$ differences between various endpoints,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:05.820 \longrightarrow 00:15:07.494$ and I draw your attention away

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:07.494 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.053$ from the bleeding and clotting

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:09.053 \longrightarrow 00:15:10.597$ because we know ultimately,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:10.600 \longrightarrow 00:15:11.924$ these were small numbers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:15:11.924 --> 00:15:13.579 none of which had significance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:13.580 \longrightarrow 00:15:14.918$ but something that we had been

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:15:14.918 --> 00:15:16.619 Penguin to a lot of attention to,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00{:}15{:}16.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}18.426$ and that we continue to do so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:18.430 \longrightarrow 00:15:19.350$ Which was that, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:19.350 \longrightarrow 00:15:21.373$ mortality was a part of our primary

00:15:21.373 --> 00:15:23.920 endpoint for a number of different reasons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00{:}15{:}23.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}26.954$ including the strong effect size combined

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:26.954 \longrightarrow 00:15:29.866$ with the feasibility of what we needed to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:29.870 \longrightarrow 00:15:32.005$ To propose in order to get a

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:32.005 \longrightarrow 00:15:33.938$ study funded and to go forward.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:33.940 \longrightarrow 00:15:35.176$ But you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00{:}15{:}35.176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}38.060$ we're very mindful of the fact that

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:38.060 \longrightarrow 00:15:40.444$ all causes of death are not the same,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:40.450 \longrightarrow 00:15:42.730$ and all of them may or may not

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:42.730 \longrightarrow 00:15:44.669$ be modified by anticoagulation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:44.670 \longrightarrow 00:15:45.828$ And I think you know this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:45.830 \longrightarrow 00:15:48.410$ This figure may support that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:15:48.410 --> 00:15:50.570 That's a potential concern going forward,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:50.570 \longrightarrow 00:15:53.041$ so that's something that I think that

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:15:53.041 --> 00:15:55.457 will all continue to pay attention to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:15:55.460 \longrightarrow 00:15:58.016$ Those are some of the aspects that went into.

00:15:58.020 --> 00:16:01.800 Ultimately, what are our overall aspiring's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:16:01.800 --> 00:16:02.600 which I think you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:16:02.600 \longrightarrow 00:16:04.656$ which is to really look to see if

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:16:04.656 --> 00:16:06.589 apixaban is superior or aspirin in

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:16:06.589 \longrightarrow 00:16:08.617$ a double blind design on traditional

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:16:08.676 \longrightarrow 00:16:09.650$ stroke endpoints.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:16:09.650 \longrightarrow 00:16:12.134$ But we are going to pay a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00{:}16{:}12.134 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}14.052$ attention to outcomes like the

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:16:14.052 \longrightarrow 00:16:16.416$ modified Rankin and and other outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:16:16.420 \longrightarrow 00:16:17.890$ The overall design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:16:17.890 \longrightarrow 00:16:20.830$ I think everyone is familiar with

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:16:20.830 --> 00:16:21.574 and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00{:}16{:}21.574 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}24.099$ for those of you who are on the call

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:16:24.099 \longrightarrow 00:16:26.277$ where we've launched this one campaign.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:16:26.280 --> 00:16:28.926 And in honor of U2 and Bono,

 $00:16:28.930 \longrightarrow 00:16:30.764$ for those of you who are from

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00{:}16{:}30.764 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}32.295$ that generation, and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

00:16:32.295 --> 00:16:33.970 we're hoping every center will

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:16:33.970 \longrightarrow 00:16:35.938$ be able to just put in one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852922882222222

 $00:16:35.940 \longrightarrow 00:16:37.840$ So I I think I'm towards the end of my

NOTE Confidence: 0.940449036363636

 $00:16:37.899 \longrightarrow 00:16:39.530$ time. But if there's time for

NOTE Confidence: 0.940449036363636

 $00:16:39.530 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.742$ questions, I'd be happy to

NOTE Confidence: 0.940449036363636

 $00:16:40.742 \longrightarrow 00:16:42.140$ answer any that you might have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.935263896

 $00{:}16{:}44.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}47.634$ Thank you so much Kevin. I don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.935263896

 $00:16:47.634 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.540$ see any questions in the chat box.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925793401428571

 $00:16:53.810 \longrightarrow 00:16:57.176$ I think if anyone has any questions please

NOTE Confidence: 0.925793401428571

 $00:16:57.176 \longrightarrow 00:17:00.020$ type them in the chat box or feel free

NOTE Confidence: 0.925793401428571

 $00{:}17{:}00.097 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}02.629$ to reach out Doctor Chat afterwards.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925793401428571

 $00:17:02.630 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.762$ I think for the interest of time it's 115.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925793401428571

 $00:17:05.770 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.994$ I will move on to the next speaker.