WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"03:52:14"

NOTE recognizability:0.811

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:03.612 Hello everyone, I'd like to welcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

 $00{:}00{:}03.612 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}07.574$  everyone to the 2022 O'Brien Kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

 $00{:}00{:}07{.}574 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}11{.}164$  Center at Yale Research Symposium.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

00:00:11.170 --> 00:00:12.834 Advances in kidney research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

 $00:00:12.834 \rightarrow 00:00:15.807$  Very grateful to shoot a Shelby for

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

 $00:00:15.807 \rightarrow 00:00:17.817$  organizing this with antibodies help

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

 $00{:}00{:}17.817 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}20.644$  and thank you all for coming in

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

 $00:00:20.644 \rightarrow 00:00:22.930$  attendance and and thank the speakers

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

 $00:00:22.930 \longrightarrow 00:00:25.994$  who are here and and speakers who will

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

 $00{:}00{:}25{.}994 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}27{.}770$  participate virtually for wonderful

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

 $00:00:27.770 \rightarrow 00:00:30.295$  symposium that SHOOTED has organized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

 $00{:}00{:}30{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}31{.}548$  I want to say a couple of words.

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

 $00{:}00{:}31.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}34.476$  About what our O'Brien Center is about.

 $00:00:34.480 \longrightarrow 00:00:36.185$  Because there are services that

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

00:00:36.185 --> 00:00:38.301 might be useful to members of

NOTE Confidence: 0.807361907222222

 $00{:}00{:}38{.}301 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}40{.}089$  the kidney community, so let me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00{:}00{:}43.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}46.241$  The NDK has several kinds of research

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00{:}00{:}46.241 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}48.859$  centers of these research centers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

00:00:48.860 --> 00:00:50.666 The O'Brien kidney centers are picked up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00{:}00{:}50{.}670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}54{.}018$  particular subcategory and and these really

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00:00:54.018 \rightarrow 00:00:57.809$  provide core services to aid investigators.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

00:00:57.810 --> 00:00:58.965 There's eight O'Brien

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

00:00:58.965 --> 00:01:00.505 centers around the country.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00{:}01{:}00{.}510$  -->  $00{:}01{:}02{.}491$  These are not not not not have

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00:01:02.491 \longrightarrow 00:01:04.278$  major research grants that the major

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00:01:04.278 \longrightarrow 00:01:06.042$  mission of these is to support

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00:01:06.042 \rightarrow 00:01:07.858$  research by providing core services,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00:01:07.860 \longrightarrow 00:01:10.600$  they also have pilot grant

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

00:01:10.600 --> 00:01:12.244 programs including ours.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00:01:12.250 \longrightarrow 00:01:13.780$  The organization of our particular.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00:01:13.780 \longrightarrow 00:01:16.468$  Center is shown here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00{:}01{:}16.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}19.790$  The we have three main cores that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00:01:19.790 \dashrightarrow 00:01:21.740$  provide different types of services,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00:01:21.740 \longrightarrow 00:01:24.148$  but they kind of integrate to study kidney
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00{:}01{:}24.148 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}26.740$  disease at different levels of investigation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00:01:26.740 \longrightarrow 00:01:28.625$  We have an animal Physiology
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00:01:28.625 \rightarrow 00:01:29.756$  and phenotyping core.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00:01:29.760 \longrightarrow 00:01:32.776$  This led by Pat Price big that does
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- 00:01:32.776 --> 00:01:34.151 measurements different physiological
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- 00:01:34.151 --> 00:01:36.339 categories on small animals,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00:01:36.340 \longrightarrow 00:01:37.126$  mainly mice.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00:01:37.126 \longrightarrow 00:01:39.484$  We have a disease models and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00{:}01{:}39{.}484 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}41{.}373$  mechanisms core that generates a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975
- $00{:}01{:}41.373 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}43.781$  mouse and and cell line models of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00:01:43.859 \rightarrow 00:01:46.478$  disease and then we have a really a a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

00:01:46.480 --> 00:01:47.234 Complex core,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00{:}01{:}47{.}234 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}49{.}119$  the Human Genetics and clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00{:}01{:}49{.}119 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}50{.}769$  research core that provides

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00{:}01{:}50.769 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}52.577$  resources for genetic studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00{:}01{:}52{.}577 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}54{.}385$  and clinical research studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

00:01:54.390 --> 00:01:57.970 biomarker assays, kidney injury studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00:01:57.970 \longrightarrow 00:01:59.422$  and I'll say more about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.74927117975

 $00{:}01{:}59{.}422 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}00{.}390$  services in a minute.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00{:}02{:}03{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}06{.}150$  So the animal Physiology and

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:02:06.150 \dashrightarrow 00:02:08.320$  phenotyping core provides a range

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00{:}02{:}08{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}10{.}600$  of services that are listed here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00{:}02{:}10.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}13.220$  GFR measurements and small

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00{:}02{:}13.220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}15.840$  animals mice profusion fixation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:02:15.840 \rightarrow 00:02:18.486$  Essentially, a chemistry lab for measuring

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:02:18.486 \rightarrow 00:02:21.180$  relevant serum and urine electrolytes,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- 00:02:21.180 --> 00:02:22.548 and creatinine. Blood,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- 00:02:22.548 --> 00:02:24.668 gas parameters, balance studies,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- 00:02:24.668 --> 00:02:26.480 circadian rhythm studies.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:02:26.480 \rightarrow 00:02:28.444$  Blood pressure measurements both
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00{:}02{:}28{.}444 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}31{.}390$  in an esthetized mice and in a wake
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:02:31.472 \rightarrow 00:02:33.260$  mice by radio telemetry.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:02:33.260 \rightarrow 00:02:35.255$  Of the disease models and mechanisms core,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:02:35.260 \longrightarrow 00:02:36.618$  which is led by Steve somehow and,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- 00:02:36.620 --> 00:02:37.492 like Cantley,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- 00:02:37.492 --> 00:02:39.672 provides access to unique mouse
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:02:39.672 \rightarrow 00:02:42.129$  models and cell line resources.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:02:42.130 \longrightarrow 00:02:44.566$  And it includes bacterial
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:02:44.566 \rightarrow 00:02:46.393$  artificial chromosome transgenesis
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00{:}02{:}46{.}393 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}49{.}269$  the support for CRISPR cast.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00{:}02{:}49{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}51{.}670$ You know, I'm editing support support
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:02:51.670 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.100$  for kidney cell line production.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

00:02:54.100 --> 00:02:56.152 Performance of kidney ischemia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

00:02:56.152 --> 00:02:57.178 reperfusion surgery,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:02:57.180 \rightarrow 00:02:59.118$  and support for development of imaging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:02:59.120 \longrightarrow 00:03:00.368$  mass cytometry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:03:00.368 \dashrightarrow 00:03:03.488$  and human kidney biopsy samples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:03:03.490 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.212$  And then finally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:03:05.212 \longrightarrow 00:03:06.360$  there's the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00{:}03{:}06{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}08{.}280$  Genetics and clinical research

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:03:08.280 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.484$  for that has multiple directors

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00{:}03{:}10{.}484 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}11{.}777$  overseeing different components.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

00:03:11.780 --> 00:03:14.180 Perry Wilson, Srikant Mani and Steve.

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00{:}03{:}14.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}16.637$  Somehow here at Yale and Chirag Parikh

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

00:03:16.637 --> 00:03:18.699 overseeing the component of Johns Hopkins,

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00{:}03{:}18{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}20{.}986$  and this provides services to enhance

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:03:20.986 \rightarrow 00:03:22.510$  different aspects of translational

- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- 00:03:22.569 --> 00:03:23.997 studies and kidney disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:03:24.000 \rightarrow 00:03:25.990$  the genetics and genomic studies
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- 00:03:25.990 --> 00:03:27.980 include DNA extraction and archiving,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:03:27.980 \rightarrow 00:03:31.444$  snip genotyping, exome sequencing,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00{:}03{:}31{.}444 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}33{.}176$  transcriptome analysis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:03:33.180 \dashrightarrow 00:03:34.863$  and bioinformatics support.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:03:34.863 \dashrightarrow 00:03:36.546$  Clinical Research Services.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- 00:03:36.550 --> 00:03:37.966 Through protocol development,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- 00:03:37.966 --> 00:03:40.326 patient recruitment and sample processing,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- 00:03:40.330 > 00:03:42.805 bio and data banking archive
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:03:42.805 \rightarrow 00:03:44.785$  samples from NIH studies.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- 00:03:44.790 --> 00:03:47.020 Many types of biomarker assays,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00:03:47.020 \rightarrow 00:03:49.050$  and importantly and most recently,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- 00:03:49.050 --> 00:03:50.196 extraction analysis of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857
- $00{:}03{:}50{.}196 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}51{.}724$  electronic health record data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:03:51.730 \rightarrow 00:03:53.950$  Machine learning and biostatistical

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:03:53.950 \dashrightarrow 00:03:56.639$  support and Perry Wilson provides

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00{:}03{:}56.639 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}58.984$  a course on research methods

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:03:58.984 \rightarrow 00:04:00.391$  and statistical interpretation

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:04:00.391 \dashrightarrow 00:04:02.099$  that's available through Coursera

NOTE Confidence: 0.765896327142857

 $00:04:02.099 \longrightarrow 00:04:04.433$  and that can be found online.

NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405

 $00:04:06.570 \longrightarrow 00:04:07.690$  And we're very grateful

NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405

00:04:07.690 --> 00:04:08.810 to our External Board,

NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405

00:04:08.810 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:04:10.910 the Chair Peter Igarashi has traveled

NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405

 $00{:}04{:}10{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}13{.}129$  here from Minnesota to attend today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405

00:04:13.130 --> 00:04:15.242 The other members of the board of Laura

NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405

00:04:15.242 --> 00:04:17.227 Denver at Ali Garavi and Marco Cusa,

NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405

 $00{:}04{:}17{.}230$  -->  $00{:}04{:}19{.}710$  and they provide a very important function in

NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405

 $00{:}04{:}19.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}21.730$  providing advice and guidance to the center,

NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405

 $00:04:21.730 \longrightarrow 00:04:23.602$  and also they provide the review

NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405

 $00:04:23.602 \longrightarrow 00:04:25.400$  of our pilot grant program.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405
- $00:04:25.400 \longrightarrow 00:04:27.002$  We recently had a deadline and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405
- $00:04:27.002 \longrightarrow 00:04:28.881$  the beginning of May and these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405
- $00:04:28.881 \rightarrow 00:04:30.638$  grants will be reviewed by this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405
- $00:04:30.699 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.404$  group and we're very grateful
- NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405
- $00:04:32.404 \longrightarrow 00:04:33.768$  for their participation and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405
- $00:04:33.768 \rightarrow 00:04:36.930$  helping the center be successful.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405
- $00:04:36.930 \longrightarrow 00:04:37.722$  So with that,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405
- $00:04:37.722 \longrightarrow 00:04:39.570$  we'll get to the business that you're
- NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405
- $00{:}04{:}39{.}631 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}41{.}409$  here for is to hear the wonderful
- NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405
- $00:04:41.409 \longrightarrow 00:04:43.100$  talks that have been lined up by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405
- 00:04:43.100 --> 00:04:44.836 shutta and let me turn it over to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.892226405
- $00:04:44.836 \longrightarrow 00:04:46.114$  Shruti to introduce our first speaker.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667
- $00:04:53.400 \longrightarrow 00:04:55.044$  It's great that we were able
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667
- $00:04:55.044 \rightarrow 00:04:56.800$  to do this online this year,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667
- 00:04:56.800 00:04:58.627 and people who were able to join
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667

 $00:04:58.627 \rightarrow 00:05:00.304$  us physically as well as virtually

NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667

 $00{:}05{:}00{.}304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}01{.}972$  for those who are joining us.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667

00:05:01.980 --> 00:05:04.135 Virtually. Please ask your questions

NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667

 $00:05:04.135 \rightarrow 00:05:06.805$  by chat and I'll be visualizing

NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667

 $00{:}05{:}06.805 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}09.836$  it while I listen to these talks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667

 $00:05:09.840 \dashrightarrow 00:05:12.776$  So the first speaker will be doctor Jody

NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667

00:05:12.776 --> 00:05:15.178 Babbitt from Harvard Medical School,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667

 $00:05:15.180 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.616$  and she'll be talking to us

NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667

 $00:05:17.616 \dashrightarrow 00:05:19.240$  about systemic iron homeostasis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667

 $00:05:19.240 \dashrightarrow 00:05:20.884$  translating molecular discoveries

NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667

 $00:05:20.884 \rightarrow 00:05:23.624$  to chronic kidney disease patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815431719166667

 $00:05:23.630 \longrightarrow 00:05:24.110$  Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:05:51.160 \longrightarrow 00:05:53.356$  Great thank you for that kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00{:}05{:}53{.}356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}55{.}603$  introduction and I thank you for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:05:55.603 \dashrightarrow 00:05:57.739$  the opportunity to speak with you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:05:57.740 \longrightarrow 00:05:59.400$  Very exciting to finally be

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:05:59.400 \dashrightarrow 00:06:01.540$  back at some in person meetings
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:06:01.540 \longrightarrow 00:06:03.590$  or hybrid meetings at least.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- 00:06:03.590 --> 00:06:05.390 So I'm going to talk to you today
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:06:05.390 \rightarrow 00:06:06.690$  about systemic iron homeostasis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:06:06.690 \rightarrow 00:06:08.892$  translating molecular discoveries,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- 00:06:08.892 --> 00:06:10.360 sophisticated patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:06:10.360 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.180$  disclosures are shown here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:06:13.180 \dashrightarrow 00:06:14.908$  So the goals of this presentation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00{:}06{:}14.908 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}16.419$  are to understand the important
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:06:16.419 \longrightarrow 00:06:18.255$  role of iron in health disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:06:18.260 \rightarrow 00:06:20.199$  To understand the central role of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:06:20.199 \rightarrow 00:06:22.103$  upside and Fairport and access and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- 00:06:22.103 --> 00:06:23.803 systemic iron homeostasis regulation and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:06:23.803 \rightarrow 00:06:25.558$  iron disorders including the anemia,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- 00:06:25.560 --> 00:06:26.688 afrinic kidney disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:06:26.688 \dashrightarrow 00:06:28.568$  Do you understand the molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

00:06:28.568 --> 00:06:30.476 regulation of hepcidin and how

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:06:30.476 \rightarrow 00:06:32.301$  abnormalities in these pathways contribute

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:06:32.301 \longrightarrow 00:06:34.837$  to iron disorders and to discuss

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:06:34.837 \longrightarrow 00:06:36.145$  potential translational applications

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:06:36.145 \rightarrow 00:06:39.450$  of these molecular discoveries?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

00:06:39.450 --> 00:06:40.890 So as I'm sure I don't need to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:06:40.890 \longrightarrow 00:06:42.229$  tell this audience anemia is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:06:42.229 \rightarrow 00:06:43.779$  prevalent in chronic kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00{:}06{:}43.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}45.593$  This is data from CK Dopps showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:06:45.593 \rightarrow 00:06:47.304$  that in countries across the world

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

00:06:47.304 --> 00:06:48.769 as patients reach stage three,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

00:06:48.770 --> 00:06:52.706 CKD already about 50% of patients are anemic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:06:52.710 \longrightarrow 00:06:55.846$  This increases to 90% in stage five

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

 $00:06:55.846 \dashrightarrow 00:06:58.735$  CKD and becoming almost universal

NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667

00:06:58.735 - 00:07:00.910 in hemodialysis patients.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00{:}07{:}00{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}02.665$  Anemia and CKD is associated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:07:02.665 \rightarrow 00:07:04.069$  with numerous address outcomes,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- 00:07:04.070 --> 00:07:05.768 including a reduced quality of life,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:07:05.770 \longrightarrow 00:07:07.186$  cardiovascular disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- 00:07:07.186 --> 00:07:09.310 hospitalizations, cognitive impairment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- 00:07:09.310 --> 00:07:13.050 CKD progression, and mortality.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:07:13.050 \longrightarrow 00:07:16.178$  And and this is illustrated in one such
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:07:16.178 \rightarrow 00:07:19.160$  study here of of US male veterans showing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:07:19.160 \longrightarrow 00:07:22.058$  that as patients become more anemic,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:07:22.060 \longrightarrow 00:07:23.615$  there is an increasing risk
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:07:23.615 \longrightarrow 00:07:25.900$  of the end point of end stage,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00{:}07{:}25{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}27{.}432$  kidney disease or mortality.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00:07:27.432 \dashrightarrow 00:07:30.312$  And this is still significant even after
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9168368066666667
- $00{:}07{:}30{.}312 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}32{.}360$  adjusting for potential confounders.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588
- $00{:}07{:}34{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}36{.}782$  Now there are two important ingredients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:07:36.782 \longrightarrow 00:07:38.719$  in red cell production that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00{:}07{:}38{.}719 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}40{.}349$  disturbed in kidney disease patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:07:40.350 \longrightarrow 00:07:41.490$  One is the mythopoetic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:07:41.490 \longrightarrow 00:07:43.595$  the hormone made by the kidney that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00{:}07{:}43.595 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}45.623$  important to induce the maturation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00{:}07{:}45.623 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}47.788$  fluoridation of red cells from the precursors

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:07:47.788 \longrightarrow 00:07:50.682$  in the bone marrow and the 2nd is iron,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:07:50.682 \rightarrow 00:07:53.580$  which is an essential component of hemoglobin

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00{:}07{:}53.652 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}56.148$  that allows it to transport oxygen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:07:56.150 \longrightarrow 00:07:57.925$  The problem with EPO is

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00{:}07{:}57{.}925 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}59{.}345$  illustrated in this slide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00{:}07{:}59{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}00{.}782$  So in patients without

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

00:08:00.782 --> 00:08:01.856 chronic kidney disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:08:01.860 \rightarrow 00:08:03.650$  as patients become more anemic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:08:03.650 \rightarrow 00:08:05.912$  they're able to robustly induce the

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:08:05.912 \dashrightarrow 00:08:08.838$  production of reports in which can help treat

 $00:08:08.838 \rightarrow 00:08:11.468$  the reverse the anemia as CKD progresses,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:08:11.468 \longrightarrow 00:08:14.450$  patients lose the ability for anemia to

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:08:14.531 \rightarrow 00:08:17.399$  induce the production of earth portion,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:08:17.400 \longrightarrow 00:08:19.136$  and this is one of the major causes

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

00:08:19.136 --> 00:08:20.928 of anemia and chronic kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

00:08:20.930 --> 00:08:21.680 And of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00{:}08{:}21.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}24.118$  this has led to the use of recombinant

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:08:24.118 \rightarrow 00:08:26.610$  erythropoietin or other erythropoiesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

00:08:26.610 --> 00:08:27.866 Stimulating agents which are

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

00:08:27.866 --> 00:08:29.436 a mainstay of anemia therapy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:08:29.440 \rightarrow 00:08:31.230$  and these have really revolutionized

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:08:31.230 \longrightarrow 00:08:33.481$  anemia therapy and that they have

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

00:08:33.481 --> 00:08:35.863 improved quality of life and have

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:08:35.863 \dashrightarrow 00:08:37.054$  reduced transfusion requirements.

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00{:}08{:}37{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}39{.}398$  But they do not improve other adverse

 $00:08:39.398 \rightarrow 00:08:40.840$  outcomes associated with anemia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

00:08:40.840 --> 00:08:42.469 including cardiovascular disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

00:08:42.469 --> 00:08:44.098 hospitalization and mortality,

NOTE Confidence: 0.883932766470588

 $00:08:44.100 \rightarrow 00:08:45.930$  and prospective randomized control trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8865048925

 $00:08:48.950 \dashrightarrow 00:08:52.718$  Some of the key trials are listed here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8865048925

 $00:08:52.720 \longrightarrow 00:08:54.880$  So, So what about iron?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8865048925

00:08:54.880 --> 00:08:57.560 So just as anemia is prevalent in CKD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8865048925

 $00:08:57.560 \rightarrow 00:08:58.656$  so is iron deficiency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8865048925

00:08:58.656 --> 00:09:01.015 This is again data from CK Docs showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8865048925

 $00{:}09{:}01{.}015 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}02{.}965$  that in countries across the world

NOTE Confidence: 0.8865048925

 $00:09:02.965 \dashrightarrow 00:09:05.018$  and across different stages of CKD,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8865048925

 $00:09:05.020 \longrightarrow 00:09:07.176$  about 40 to 60% of patients have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8865048925

 $00:09:07.176 \longrightarrow 00:09:09.269$  some form of iron deficiency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00:09:12.510 \longrightarrow 00:09:13.605$  With adverse outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00{:}09{:}13.605 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}16.160$  this is a data from a historical

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00:09:16.229 \rightarrow 00:09:17.689$  cohort of US veterans.

00:09:17.690 --> 00:09:18.929 Almost 33,000 patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00:09:18.929 \rightarrow 00:09:22.429$  and what you can see is that patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00{:}09{:}22{.}429 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}25{.}573$  in the lowest quartiles of transparent

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00:09:25.573 \longrightarrow 00:09:28.767$  saturation that is below 16.6% had an

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

00:09:28.767 --> 00:09:31.041 increased risk of one year mortality

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00:09:31.041 \longrightarrow 00:09:33.210$  compared to the reference group and

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00:09:33.210 \rightarrow 00:09:35.450$  and as is usual in the in biology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00:09:35.450 \rightarrow 00:09:37.666$  there where there are often J shaped curves,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00:09:37.670 \longrightarrow 00:09:39.335$  they even found that that

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00:09:39.335 \rightarrow 00:09:40.667$  patients in the highest.

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00:09:40.670 \longrightarrow 00:09:42.782$  Modi also tended to have an

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00{:}09{:}42.782 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}44.376$  increased risk of talented,

NOTE Confidence: 0.729874166857143

 $00:09:44.376 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.448$  quite rich.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}09{:}47{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}50{.}460$  So in order to try to understand a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:09:50.531 \rightarrow 00:09:52.856$  more about why iron deficiency may be bad,

 $00:09:52.856 \rightarrow 00:09:55.060$  and perhaps too much iron may be harmful,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:09:55.060 --> 00:09:56.691 it's helpful to know a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:09:56.691 - > 00:09:58.219 more about the biology of iron.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:09:58.220 \rightarrow 00:10:00.900$  So let's discuss that briefly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:00.900 \longrightarrow 00:10:03.180$  So iron is a transition metal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:03.180 \longrightarrow 00:10:05.396$  It's it's ability to be able to readily

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:05.396 \rightarrow 00:10:07.679$  donate and accept electrons is what allows

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:07.679 \rightarrow 00:10:09.960$  iron to perform its biologic functions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}10{:}09{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}12{.}424$  This allows iron to perform the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:12.424 \rightarrow 00:10:14.617$  well known function as a component

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}10{:}14.617 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}16.753$  of heme and and transporting oxygen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:16.760 \longrightarrow 00:10:18.458$  But it's probably less well recognized

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:18.458 \longrightarrow 00:10:19.920$  and folks outside this field.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:19.920 \rightarrow 00:10:21.738$  It turns out that heme itself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}10{:}21.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}23.384$  as well as other iron functional

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}10{:}23.384 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}25.380$  groups such as iron sulfur crossers,

 $00{:}10{:}25{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}27{.}192$  are actually key components of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:27.192 \longrightarrow 00:10:29.388$  number of other proteins that perform

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:10:29.388 --> 00:10:30.786 fundamental cellular processes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:30.790 \rightarrow 00:10:33.502$  and everything from the TCA cycle

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:33.502 \longrightarrow 00:10:35.903$  to electron transport to DNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:35.903 \rightarrow 00:10:38.438$  synthesis and many other functions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:38.440 \longrightarrow 00:10:41.528$  And so iron really is essential for life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:41.530 \rightarrow 00:10:44.858$  And iron deficiency can not only lead to

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}10{:}44.858 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}47.978$ anemia but also cardiovascular strain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:10:47.980 --> 00:10:49.555 impaired muscle function,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:10:49.555 --> 00:10:52.180 exercise tolerance and work performance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}10{:}52.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}53.916$  altered immune function and

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:10:53.916 --> 00:10:55.218 increases in children.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:10:55.220 \longrightarrow 00:10:56.630$  Developmental defects,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}10{:}56.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}00.155$  growth retardation and neurologic defects.

 $00:11:00.160 \rightarrow 00:11:01.912$  This property of iron that allows

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:11:01.912 \longrightarrow 00:11:03.480$  it to perform its biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}11{:}03{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}05{.}538$  functions also means that when an

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:11:05.538 \rightarrow 00:11:07.952$  excess iron can participate in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:11:07.952 \rightarrow 00:11:09.716$  so-called Fenton mediated reaction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}11{:}09{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}11{.}827$  which leads to the production of pre

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:11:11.827 \rightarrow 00:11:13.840$  oxygen radicals that can damage proteins,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:11:13.840 \rightarrow 00:11:16.580$  lipids and nucleic acids.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:11:16.580 --> 00:11:19.520 Leading to cellular damage and dysfunction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}11{:}19{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}21{.}080$  and the most clear clinical evidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}11{:}21.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}22.885$  of of the the adverse consequences

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:11:22.885 \rightarrow 00:11:25.009$  of iron overload come from genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:11:25.009 --> 00:11:26.499 disorders of iron overload,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:11:26.500 \rightarrow 00:11:28.208$  such as hereditary hemochromatosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:11:28.208 \rightarrow 00:11:30.770$  where excess iron deposits and organs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:11:30.770 \longrightarrow 00:11:31.960$  such as the liver, heart,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- $00:11:31.960 \rightarrow 00:11:33.202$  and endocrine glands,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- 00:11:33.202 --> 00:11:34.858 leading to organ dysfunction.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- 00:11:34.860 --> 00:11:36.520 There's also another category of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- $00:11:36.520 \rightarrow 00:11:38.180$  diseases called iron loading anemias,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- $00{:}11{:}38{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}40{.}580$  of which Felicia is a prototypical
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- $00:11:40.580 \longrightarrow 00:11:42.180$  example in these disorders.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- $00:11:42.180 \longrightarrow 00:11:43.820$  Mutations in the protein components
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- $00:11:43.820 \rightarrow 00:11:45.869$  of hemoglobin and lead to ineffective
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- $00:11:45.869 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.619$  with the poises and anemia.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- $00:11:47.620 \rightarrow 00:11:49.755$  In more severe forms of these diseases,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- $00:11:49.760 \longrightarrow 00:11:51.096$  patients are transfusion dependent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- $00{:}11{:}51.096 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}53.100$  and can get secondary iron overload
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- $00:11:53.150 \longrightarrow 00:11:54.200$  from the transfusions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- 00:11:54.200 --> 00:11:55.544 But even in less severe forms
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143
- $00:11:55.544 \rightarrow 00:11:56.216$  of this disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:11:56.220 --> 00:11:57.390 there's actually underlying

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:11:57.390 \rightarrow 00:11:59.340$  pathophysiology in this disease that

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:11:59.340 \longrightarrow 00:12:01.780$  leads to dietary iron hyper absorption,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:01.780 \rightarrow 00:12:03.880$  which also contributes to iron overload,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}12{:}03.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}06.632$  and iron overload is a major cause of

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:06.632 \rightarrow 00:12:09.219$  morbidity and mortality in this disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:12:09.220 --> 00:12:09.566 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:09.566 \rightarrow 00:12:10.604$  because you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}12{:}10.604 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}12.680$  it turns out that even outside

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}12{:}12{.}746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}14.858$  the massive iron overload that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:14.858 \longrightarrow 00:12:16.990$  see in these genetic disorders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:16.990 \rightarrow 00:12:18.796$  there's also evidence in the literature

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}12{:}18.796 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}20.944$  that excess iron levels can also be

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}12{:}20{.}944 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}22{.}434$  associated with more common disorders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:22.440 \rightarrow 00:12:24.392$  Everything from diabetes melodus

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:24.392 \rightarrow 00:12:25.856$  to cardiovascular disease,

00:12:25.860 --> 00:12:28.040 neurogenic disorders, acute kidney injury,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:12:28.040 --> 00:12:28.570 and malignancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:12:28.570 --> 00:12:30.690 and just as all cells in our body

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:12:30.753 - 00:12:32.378 need iron to grow proliferate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00{:}12{:}32{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}34{.}180$  So do infectious organisms and and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:34.180 \longrightarrow 00:12:35.644$  And we know when and patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:35.644 \rightarrow 00:12:36.620$  with iron overload disorders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:36.620 \rightarrow 00:12:38.726$  that they're more prone to infection.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:38.730 \longrightarrow 00:12:40.454$  Certain types of infections.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:40.454 \longrightarrow 00:12:43.040$  For example Center for the bacteria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:12:43.040 --> 00:12:44.550 Now, because iron is essential,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

00:12:44.550 --> 00:12:46.335 but too much iron can be toxic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909468342857143

 $00:12:46.340 \rightarrow 00:12:48.706$  iron levels must be very carefully regulated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:12:48.710 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.594$  both at the cellular level and systemically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:12:51.600 \rightarrow 00:12:52.500$  and it's systemic.

 $00:12:52.500 \longrightarrow 00:12:54.000$  Own homemade stasis that we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}12{:}54{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}55{.}538$  going to talk about today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:12:55.540 \rightarrow 00:12:57.188$  So the way this works is we absorb

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:12:57.188 \rightarrow 00:12:58.819$  iron from the diet in the duodenum,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:12:58.820 \longrightarrow 00:13:01.200$  about 1 to 2 milligrams per day.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}13{:}01{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}03{.}580$  Iron circulates in the blood stream,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:03.580 \longrightarrow 00:13:05.420$  bound to a carrier protein

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}13{:}05{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}06{.}156$  called transferrin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:06.160 \rightarrow 00:13:08.472$  This helps to keep iron inert and also

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:08.472 \rightarrow 00:13:11.183$  helps it be delivered to all cells in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}13{:}11{.}183 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}13{.}740$  body via uptake via transparent receptors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:13.740 \rightarrow 00:13:15.890$  But much of the iron does go into the bone

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:15.949 \rightarrow 00:13:18.253$  marrow for the production of red blood cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:18.260 \rightarrow 00:13:19.954$  When the red blood cells get old,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:19.960 \rightarrow 00:13:21.878$  they get taken up into the macrophages,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:21.880 \rightarrow 00:13:23.903$  which can then recycle that iron and

 $00{:}13{:}23{.}903 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}25{.}769$  release it back into circulation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:25.770 \longrightarrow 00:13:26.566$  That's needed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:26.566 \longrightarrow 00:13:28.954$  we also get have iron storage

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:28.954 \rightarrow 00:13:31.710$  in the liver and other tissues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}13{:}31{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}33{.}900$  Now it turns out that most of the iron is

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:33.953 \rightarrow 00:13:36.088$  provided through this recycling process,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:36.090 \rightarrow 00:13:38.645$  about 20 to 25 milligrams per day,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:38.650 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.158$  so really much more than what's

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}13{:}41{.}158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}42{.}830$  provided through dietary absorption.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}13{:}42.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}44.510$  And in fact the circulating pool

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:44.510 \longrightarrow 00:13:46.330$  of iron is actually quite small.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:46.330 \longrightarrow 00:13:47.710$  It's only about 3 milligrams,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

00:13:47.710 --> 00:13:48.570 so as you can see,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}13{:}48.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}50.481$  you actually have to turn over the

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:50.481 \longrightarrow 00:13:51.970$  circulating pool about seven or eight

00:13:51.970 - 00:13:54.093 times a day in order to meet the daily

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:54.093 \rightarrow 00:13:55.668$  requirement for red cell production.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

00:13:55.670 --> 00:13:56.392 And finally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:13:56.392 \rightarrow 00:13:58.197$  there's really no regulated mechanism

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

00:13:58.197 - 00:14:00.088 for iron removal from the body.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:14:00.090 \rightarrow 00:14:01.730$  We lose iron through bleeding

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:14:01.730 \rightarrow 00:14:03.042$  through sloughing of cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:14:03.050 \longrightarrow 00:14:03.930$  but for the most part,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:14:03.930 \longrightarrow 00:14:06.015$  the regulation of iron homeostasis

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}14{:}06.015 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}08.100$  occurs through the regulation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}14{:}08{.}167 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}10{.}183$  the absorption from the diet and

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:14:10.183 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.030$  the release from body stores.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}14{:}12.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}13.878$  And a key mediator of this process

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:14:13.878 \rightarrow 00:14:15.848$  is a hormone called have decided,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:14:15.850 \longrightarrow 00:14:17.243$  and we're going to talk a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:14:17.243 \rightarrow 00:14:18.608$  bit more about this in a minute,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- 00:14:18.610 --> 00:14:20.346 but I just want to bring this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- 00:14:20.346 --> 00:14:22.110 back to kidney disease patients,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00:14:22.110 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.150$  so it turns out in kidney disease patients,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00{:}14{:}24{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}26{.}114$  there are numerous disturbances.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00{:}14{:}26{.}114 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}28{.}078$  And these homeostatic mechanisms,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- 00:14:28.080 --> 00:14:28.860 first of all,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00:14:28.860 \rightarrow 00:14:31.160$  patients tend to be a negative iron balance.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- 00:14:31.160 --> 00:14:32.420 Particularly hemodialysis patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00{:}14{:}32{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}34{.}940$  have been estimated to lose between
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- 00:14:34.940 --> 00:14:37.353 one and a half to 3 grams of iron per
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00:14:37.353 \rightarrow 00:14:39.618$  year due to increased bleeding tendency.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00:14:39.620 \rightarrow 00:14:41.780$  Blood trapping in the dialyzer tubing,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- 00:14:41.780 --> 00:14:45.740 frequent phlebotomy and many of our
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00{:}14{:}45{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}48{.}680$  patients don't absorb don't get very much.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00{:}14{:}48.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}49.472$  A dietary iron.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:14:49.472 \longrightarrow 00:14:51.895$  Some of this may be due to nutritional

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}14{:}51{.}895 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}53{.}911$  deficits or medications that

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}14{:}53{.}911 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}55{.}927$  interfere with iron absorption.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:14:55.930 \rightarrow 00:14:57.470$  But patients with kidney disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}14{:}57{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}59{.}462$  also have access levels of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

00:14:59.462 --> 00:15:01.050 iron regulatory hormone hepcidin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}15{:}01.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}03.070$  which actually also interferes

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:15:03.070 \longrightarrow 00:15:04.585$  with iron absorption.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}15{:}04{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}06{.}732$  Now these problems can lead to

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:15:06.732 \rightarrow 00:15:08.790$  a total body deficit of iron,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}15{:}08{.}790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}10{.}430$  something that we call absolute

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:15:10.430 \longrightarrow 00:15:11.086$  iron deficiency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}15{:}11.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}13.474$  And of course it makes sense to treat

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:15:13.474 \rightarrow 00:15:15.999$  this by giving iron supplementation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00{:}15{:}16.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}18.156$  But it turns out that the excess

NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714

 $00:15:18.156 \rightarrow 00:15:19.517$  helpside levels also contribute

- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00{:}15{:}19{.}517 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}21{.}779$  to this problem of of reticulate
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- 00:15:21.779 --> 00:15:23.500 endothelial cell iron blockade,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00:15:23.500 \rightarrow 00:15:25.474$  whereby even though the stores of iron
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00:15:25.474 \rightarrow 00:15:28.020$  in the body may be adequate or even high,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00:15:28.020 \longrightarrow 00:15:29.676$  they stores are just not able
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00:15:29.676 \rightarrow 00:15:31.520$  to be released into circulation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00:15:31.520 \rightarrow 00:15:32.680$  at least not efficiently
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844118134285714
- $00:15:32.680 \longrightarrow 00:15:34.420$  enough to meet the needs for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:15:34.483 \longrightarrow 00:15:35.578$  red cell production.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:15:35.580 \longrightarrow 00:15:37.545$  And this can be exacerbated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:15:37.545 \longrightarrow 00:15:39.478$  when patients are on ASA's,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:15:39.478 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.626$  which cause a rapid burst of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:15:41.626 \longrightarrow 00:15:42.700$  erythropoiesis that rapidly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- 00:15:42.763 --> 00:15:44.195 deplete the circulating pool
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00{:}15{:}44.195 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}46.343$  faster than it can be replenished.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:15:46.350 \longrightarrow 00:15:48.275$  And this is a problem that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

00:15:48.275 --> 00:15:49.770 call functional iron deficiency,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}15{:}49{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}51{.}220$  where it really the circulating

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:15:51.220 \longrightarrow 00:15:53.253$  pool of iron is limiting for with

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

00:15:53.253 --> 00:15:55.101 voices and for this entity it's less

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:15:55.101 \rightarrow 00:15:56.972$  clear that iron supplementation is NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:15:56.972 \rightarrow 00:15:58.524$  the right therapeutic strategy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:15:58.530 \rightarrow 00:16:00.308$  as we we might worry that giving

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}16{:}00{.}308 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}01{.}966$  patients more and more iron may

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:16:01.966 \rightarrow 00:16:03.658$  lead to problems with iron overload,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}16{:}03.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}05.172$  and so for this reason I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}16{:}05{.}172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}06{.}468$  it's helpful to understand a

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

00:16:06.468 --> 00:16:07.948 little bit more about hepcidin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:16:07.950 \longrightarrow 00:16:09.505$  biology and and thinking about

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:16:09.505 \rightarrow 00:16:11.990$  whether this may be a different way

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:16:11.990 \rightarrow 00:16:14.165$  of of targeting this therapeutically.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:16:14.170 \rightarrow 00:16:15.462$  So what is subsiding?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00{:}16{:}15{.}462 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}17{.}077$  It's a 25 amino acid.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- 00:16:17.080 --> 00:16:18.720 Peptide hormone that's made by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:16:18.720 \longrightarrow 00:16:20.716$  the liver circulates in the blood
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:16:20.716 \longrightarrow 00:16:22.510$  and is excreted by the kidneys.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00{:}16{:}22{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}24{.}175$  The function of hepcidin is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:16:24.175 \longrightarrow 00:16:25.507$  illustrated in this slide,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:16:25.510 \rightarrow 00:16:27.498$  So what I'm showing you here is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00{:}16{:}27{.}498 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}28{.}996$  the enterocyte that absorbs iron
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:16:28.996 \rightarrow 00:16:30.466$  in the in the intestine,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:16:30.470 \longrightarrow 00:16:32.558$  so elemental iron is taken up
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00{:}16{:}32.558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}34.414$  across the apical surface through
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00{:}16{:}34{.}414 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}36{.}369$  a transporter called DMT one.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00{:}16{:}36{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}37{.}398$  Once inside the cell,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:16:37.398 \rightarrow 00:16:39.345$  iron can be used by that cell
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

00:16:39.345 --> 00:16:41.070 for its old metabolic processes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

00:16:41.070 --> 00:16:42.070 or if it's not needed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

00:16:42.070 --> 00:16:44.506 it'll get stored in early in ferritin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:16:44.510 \longrightarrow 00:16:46.094$  which is the iron storage protein

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:16:46.094 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.680$  and all cells in our body.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}16{:}47.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}48.576$  And if this happens,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:16:48.576 \longrightarrow 00:16:50.474$  this iron is going to get lost as

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:16:50.474 \rightarrow 00:16:52.498$  these cells get sloughed off every few days.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}16{:}52{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}54{.}229$  In order for that iron to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:16:54.229 \rightarrow 00:16:56.000$  accessible to the Organism at large,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}16{:}56{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}58{.}590$  it needs to be exported across the

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}16{:}58{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}00{.}604$  basolateral surface through an iron

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}17{:}00{.}604 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}02{.}276$  export protein called ferroport in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:17:02.280 \longrightarrow 00:17:02.932$  The macrophages,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:17:02.932 \longrightarrow 00:17:04.888$  which recycle iron from the red

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:17:04.888 \longrightarrow 00:17:07.062$  cells again for that iron to be

- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00{:}17{:}07.062 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}08.527$  released back into the circulation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:17:08.588 \longrightarrow 00:17:10.310$  and also needs to go through
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:17:10.310 \longrightarrow 00:17:12.620$  Fairport so Fairport has really the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:17:12.620 \rightarrow 00:17:14.640$  gatekeeper that controls iron entry
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00{:}17{:}14.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}16.744$  into the circulation both from the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:17:16.744 \longrightarrow 00:17:18.949$  diet and from the body stores.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:17:18.950 \longrightarrow 00:17:20.606$  So the function of hepcidin is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:17:20.606 \rightarrow 00:17:22.400$  illustrated by this nice cryoem image
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00{:}17{:}22{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}24{.}320$  that was published recently in nature,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:17:24.320 \longrightarrow 00:17:26.140$  where and you can see here have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:17:26.140 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.535$  siding this colored in orange
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00{:}17{:}27.535 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}28.655$  and Fairport and green,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:17:28.660 \rightarrow 00:17:31.068$  and what you can see is that hepcidin
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00:17:31.068 \longrightarrow 00:17:32.693$  actually binds directly to the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615
- $00{:}17{:}32.693 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}34.607$  central cavity of Fairport and where
- NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

00:17:34.607 --> 00:17:36.609 it blocks iron export directly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}17{:}36.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}38.962$  Peptide binding to Fairport and also

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:17:38.962 \rightarrow 00:17:40.530$  induces the internalization and

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:17:40.591 \rightarrow 00:17:42.831$  degradation of Fairport and thereby

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:17:42.831 \rightarrow 00:17:44.623$  furthering inhibiting iron export.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}17{:}44.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}46.660$  So the consequence of this is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:17:46.660 \longrightarrow 00:17:48.237$  when hepcidin levels are high

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:17:48.237 \longrightarrow 00:17:49.537$  it binds ferroportin blocks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:17:49.540 \longrightarrow 00:17:51.856$  Iron export induces the degradation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:17:51.856 \rightarrow 00:17:54.720$  Fairport and to further inhibit iron export,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:17:54.720 \longrightarrow 00:17:56.208$  thereby leading to reduced

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:17:56.208 \rightarrow 00:17:57.696$  circulating levels of iron.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}17{:}57{.}700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}59{.}045$  And when this happens chronically

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}17{:}59.045 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}00.716$  this can lead to iron restricted

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}18{:}00{.}716 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}02{.}868$  with voices and anemia as we see for

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}18{:}02{.}868 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}04{.}310$  example in kidney disease patients

 $00:18:04.310 \rightarrow 00:18:07.142$  even though the stores of iron in the body.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

00:18:07.142 --> 00:18:08.678 Maybe normal or high?

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:18:08.680 \longrightarrow 00:18:10.665$  Low hepcidin actually leads to

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

00:18:10.665 - 00:18:11.856 the opposite situation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:18:11.860 \rightarrow 00:18:13.304$  There's unregulated Fairport and

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00:18:13.304 \rightarrow 00:18:15.470$  expression you can't turn off the

NOTE Confidence: 0.893422445384615

 $00{:}18{:}15{.}532 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}17{.}338$  absorption of iron from the diet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:18:17.340 \rightarrow 00:18:19.104$  Iron is continually released from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00{:}18{:}19{.}104 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}20{.}819$  cells designed to store it safely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00{:}18{:}20{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}22{.}822$  The macrophages and this excess iron then

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00{:}18{:}22.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}24.785$  can deposit in other tissues where it

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00{:}18{:}24.785 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}27.020$  can lead to organ damage and dysfunction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00{:}18{:}27{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}29{.}024$  and this is really the underlying

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:18:29.024 \longrightarrow 00:18:30.360$  pathophysiology of of iron

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:18:30.416 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.030$  overload and hemochromatosis,

 $00{:}18{:}32{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}35{.}838$  as well as thal assemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00{:}18{:}35{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}37{.}688$  Now as a key regulator of

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

00:18:37.688 --> 00:18:38.612 systemic iron homeostasis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:18:38.620 \longrightarrow 00:18:40.587$  the production of peptide and the liver

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:18:40.587 \rightarrow 00:18:42.720$  is regulated by a number of key signals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00{:}18{:}42.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}43.544$  So one is iron.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:18:43.544 \rightarrow 00:18:45.490$  So if you give a patient and I an

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:18:45.490 \longrightarrow 00:18:47.320$  injection of iron or take an iron pill,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00{:}18{:}47{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}49{.}200$  this will induce Obsidian to

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

00:18:49.200 --> 00:18:51.080 inhibit fair portion to inhibit

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:18:51.144 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.900$  iron absorption and release.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:18:52.900 \rightarrow 00:18:55.294$  This helps to maintain the steady state.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:18:55.300 \rightarrow 00:18:56.952$  Iron deficiency suppresses have

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00{:}18{:}56{.}952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}59{.}017$  decided to increase iron availability,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:18:59.020 \dashrightarrow 00:19:01.576$  again, keeping you in steady state.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:19:01.580 \rightarrow 00:19:03.280$  Anything that increases the risk

- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00:19:03.280 \rightarrow 00:19:05.300$  aquatic drive. So this would be anemia.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- 00:19:05.300 --> 00:19:06.977 Hypoxia, erythropoietin injections.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00:19:06.977 \rightarrow 00:19:10.331$  These all suppress upside and thereby
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00:19:10.331 \rightarrow 00:19:12.286$  increasing iron availability to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00:19:12.286 \rightarrow 00:19:14.944$  support the needed red cell production.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- 00:19:14.950 --> 00:19:15.754 And finally,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00:19:15.754 \longrightarrow 00:19:17.362$  inflammation is a stimulator
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00:19:17.362 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.568$  of hepcidin production.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00:19:18.570 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.098$  This likely developed evolutionarily
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00{:}19{:}20.098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}22.390$  as a protective mechanism to sequester
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00:19:22.444 \rightarrow 00:19:23.844$  iron from invading pathogens that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00{:}19{:}23.844 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}25.910$  need iron to grow and proliferate.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- 00:19:25.910 --> 00:19:27.390 But it's this pathway that,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00{:}19{:}27{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}28{.}960$  in the setting of chronic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- 00:19:28.960 --> 00:19:29.588 inflammatory diseases,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00{:}19{:}29{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}31{.}680$  can contribute to iron restricted

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00{:}19{:}31{.}680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}33{.}352$  with prices and anemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

00:19:33.360 --> 00:19:34.064 And indeed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:19:34.064 \longrightarrow 00:19:35.472$  kidney disease patients do

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:19:35.472 \longrightarrow 00:19:36.880$  have excess upside levels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

00:19:36.880 --> 00:19:37.693 That's been illustrated

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:19:37.693 \longrightarrow 00:19:39.048$  by a number of studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:19:39.050 \rightarrow 00:19:40.778$  This is one such study in Ashby at all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:19:40.780 \longrightarrow 00:19:42.468$  showing that hemodialysis patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:19:42.468 \rightarrow 00:19:45.000$  have much higher levels of circulating

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:19:45.064 \rightarrow 00:19:46.914$  hepcidin compared to control patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:19:46.914 \rightarrow 00:19:49.579$  and then patients with non dialysis CKD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:19:49.580 \longrightarrow 00:19:51.520$  There's an inverse correlation between

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

00:19:51.520 --> 00:19:53.460 estimated GFR and upside down,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:19:53.460 \rightarrow 00:19:54.528$  and again there's probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667

 $00:19:54.528 \longrightarrow 00:19:55.596$  2 mechanisms for this.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- 00:19:55.600 --> 00:19:57.460 Hepcidin is up regulated by inflammation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00{:}19{:}57{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}59{.}566$  so the inflammatory milieu of CKD
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00{:}19{:}59{.}566 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}00{.}970$  and hemodialysis can stimulate
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00:20:01.028 \rightarrow 00:20:02.671$  herbicide and production, and,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00{:}20{:}02{.}671 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}04{.}297$  you know, as a small peptoid.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- 00:20:04.300 --> 00:20:05.950 Form an excreted by the kidneys,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00:20:05.950 \longrightarrow 00:20:07.380$  kidney disease can lead to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00:20:07.380 \rightarrow 00:20:08.524$  reduced herbicide and clearance,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858139689166667
- $00{:}20{:}08.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}10.770$  which can also contribute to excess levels.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00{:}20{:}12{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}14{.}790$  So what our group has been interested
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00{:}20{:}14.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}16.997$  in is trying to understand how is it
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- 00:20:16.997 --> 00:20:19.210 that the liver integrates all of these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- 00:20:19.210 --> 00:20:20.770 different signals to appropriately
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00{:}20{:}20{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}22{.}330$  regulate upside and production.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- 00:20:22.330 --> 00:20:23.401 And that's what I'm going to talk
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:20:23.401 \longrightarrow 00:20:24.740$  to you a little bit about today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}20{:}24{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}26{.}972$  and then can we think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:20:26.972 \longrightarrow 00:20:28.088$  using this therapeutically?

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:20:28.090 \rightarrow 00:20:28.924$  Potentially so?

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

00:20:28.924 --> 00:20:31.843 First, let's talk about the iron signal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:20:31.850 \rightarrow 00:20:33.605$  so clues for understanding how

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

00:20:33.605 --> 00:20:35.009 iron regulate hepcidin come

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:20:35.009 \rightarrow 00:20:36.929$  from hereditary hemochromatosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}20{:}36{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}38{.}910$  We mean we discuss this briefly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}20{:}38{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}41{.}126$  This has caused a disorder of iron overload

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:20:41.126 \rightarrow 00:20:43.515$  caused by mutations in one of several genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:20:43.520 \longrightarrow 00:20:46.859$  So mutation in HFE are the most common cause.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:20:46.860 \longrightarrow 00:20:48.780$  Transparent receptor 2 causes of more

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:20:48.780 \longrightarrow 00:20:50.961$  rare adult onset form of this disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}20{:}50{.}961 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}52{.}935$  and mutations and have side in Excel

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:20:52.990 \rightarrow 00:20:55.041$  or another gene called him a jubilant

- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00:20:55.041 \rightarrow 00:20:57.460$  actually cause a more rare but more

 $00:20:57.460 \longrightarrow 00:21:00.430$  severe juvenile onset form of this disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}21{:}00{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}02{.}355$  All patients who have mutations in any

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}21{:}02{.}355 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}04{.}508$  of these genes have the same problem and

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}21{:}04.508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}06.484$  this is a deficiency of hepcidin that

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:21:06.484 \rightarrow 00:21:08.745$  fails to be appropriately induced by iron,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:21:08.750 \longrightarrow 00:21:10.418$  so that's illustrated in this slide

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:21:10.418 \rightarrow 00:21:12.869$  so you can see that these these these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:21:12.870 \longrightarrow 00:21:14.241$  these proteins HIV

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

00:21:14.241 - > 00:21:16.069 transferred to human javelin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

00:21:16.070 --> 00:21:17.948 They're all expressed in the liver,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

00:21:17.950 --> 00:21:20.486 and so somehow they must be involved in

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}21{:}20{.}486 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}22{.}915$  sensing iron levels and transducing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}21{:}22{.}915$  -->  $00{:}21{:}25{.}513$  signal to appropriately regulate upside and NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}21{:}25{.}575 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}28{.}315$  and so that if any of these genes is mutated,

 $00:21:28.320 \longrightarrow 00:21:29.940$  this leads to hepcidin

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:21:29.940 \longrightarrow 00:21:31.560$  deficiency in iron overload.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}21{:}31{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}33{.}639$  Now we got into this field because we were

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:21:33.639 \rightarrow 00:21:35.556$  studying him adjuvant for a different reason,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}21{:}35{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}37{.}583$  and that's because it's a family member

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}21{:}37{.}583 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}40{.}220$  of a family of three genes called the

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

00:21:40.220 --> 00:21:42.380 repulsive guidance molecule or RGM family,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:21:42.380 \rightarrow 00:21:44.666$  which in work that I did as a postdoc

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}21{:}44.666 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}47.159$  in Hartland's lab we showed function as

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}21{:}47{.}159 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}49{.}618$  Co receptors for the bull morphogenetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

00:21:49.618 --> 00:21:51.978 protein or BMP signaling pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:21:51.980 \longrightarrow 00:21:53.350$  So what are BMPS there?

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:21:53.350 \rightarrow 00:21:55.198$  There are some family of the Tiger

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

00:21:55.198 --> 00:21:56.440 beta superfamily of ligands,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:21:56.440 \rightarrow 00:21:59.527$  which is a super family of over 40 members

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}21{:}59{.}527 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}01{.}987$  including TGF Betas and BMP's themselves.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00{:}22{:}01{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}03{.}875$  As well as malaria and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- 00:22:03.875 --> 00:22:05.006 inhibiting substance activists,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00:22:05.010 \longrightarrow 00:22:07.130$  inhibitions and growth in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- 00:22:07.130 --> 00:22:08.190 differentiation factors,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00{:}22{:}08{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}10{.}773$  these are disulfide and dimers that share
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00{:}22{:}10.773 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}12.584$  overall structural similarities and a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- 00:22:12.584 --> 00:22:14.209 common paradigm of signal transduction.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00:22:14.210 \longrightarrow 00:22:16.359$  Where the login will bind to a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00{:}22{:}16.359 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}18.741$  complex of two type one and two
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- 00:22:18.741 --> 00:22:20.829 Type 2 serine 39 kinase receptors.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- 00:22:20.830 --> 00:22:22.470 Upon formation of the complex,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00{:}22{:}22{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}24{.}318$  the Type 2 receptors flex sporulate,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00:22:24.320 \rightarrow 00:22:26.882$  the Type 1 receptors which then
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- $00:22:26.882 \rightarrow 00:22:28.590$  phosphorylate interest sosmed proteins.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976
- 00:22:28.590 00:22:30.590 There are two subsets of smeds Med 1/5
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:22:30.590 \rightarrow 00:22:32.770$  and eight that are activated by the beam.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}22{:}32{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}33{.}998$  Keys and some ads.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}22{:}33{.}998 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}35{.}840$  Two and three that are activated

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:22:35.910 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.540$  by activists and TGF fades.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}22{:}37{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}39{.}310$  These form a complex with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}22{:}39{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}39{.}900$  common mediators.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}22{:}39{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}42{.}054$  Med four and these are transcription

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:22:42.054 \rightarrow 00:22:44.332$  factors that that migrate to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}22{:}44{.}332 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}46{.}277$  nucleus and regulate gene transcription,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

00:22:46.280 --> 00:22:48.908 leading to a diverse array of

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:22:48.908 \longrightarrow 00:22:49.784$  biological functions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00{:}22{:}49.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}50.770$  Now, as I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:22:50.770 \longrightarrow 00:22:52.535$  there's over 40 ligands and one of

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:22:52.535 \rightarrow 00:22:53.760$  the interesting questions in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:22:53.760 \rightarrow 00:22:55.658$  field is how is it that these ligands

NOTE Confidence: 0.850496976

 $00:22:55.658 \longrightarrow 00:22:56.960$  are able to lead to this

- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00:22:56.960 \rightarrow 00:22:59.430$  diverse array of biological functions
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00:22:59.430 \rightarrow 00:23:02.989$  with a very limited subset of receptors?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- 00:23:02.990 --> 00:23:05.720 So there's only five Type 2 receptors,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00:23:05.720 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.524$  7 type 1 receptors,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00:23:07.524 \rightarrow 00:23:11.150$  and these two subsets of SMAD proteins.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00:23:11.150 \longrightarrow 00:23:12.473$  And at least part of the answer
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00:23:12.473 \longrightarrow 00:23:13.818$  to that question is that there's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00{:}23{:}13.818 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}14.790$  regulation of this pathway.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00:23:14.790 \longrightarrow 00:23:16.360$  A number of different levels
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00:23:16.360 \longrightarrow 00:23:17.616$  from the extracellular surface,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- 00:23:17.620 00:23:19.588 which we'll hear a little bit about later,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00:23:19.590 \rightarrow 00:23:22.092$  so the membrane surface to intracellularly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00:23:22.092 \longrightarrow 00:23:25.184$  and one of the the levels of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00{:}23{:}25{.}184 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}27{.}424$  regulation is through Co receptors.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948
- $00{:}23{:}27{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}28{.}750$  And this is where our data
- NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:23:28.750 --> 00:23:29.823 suggests that HEMA, jubilant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}23{:}29{.}823 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}33{.}127$  and the other GM's are functioning as Co

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:23:33.127 \rightarrow 00:23:35.819$  receptors for the BMP side of the pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}23{:}35{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}37{.}188$  And this is based on data

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:23:37.188 \longrightarrow 00:23:38.100$  such as the following.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}23{:}38{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}40{.}284$  So if we take liver cells and culture

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}23{:}40{.}284 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}43{.}185$  and we transfect them with the BMP

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:23:43.185 \rightarrow 00:23:44.559$  responsive luciferase reporter,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}23{:}44.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}46.438$  when we add in exogenous BMP

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:23:46.438 \longrightarrow 00:23:48.568$  ligands we get an increase in

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}23{:}48.568 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}50.980$  luciferase activity and we see a

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}23{:}50{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}53{.}271$  similar effect if if we transfect

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:23:53.271 --> 00:23:55.395 in C DNA encoding human juggling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}23{:}55{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}57{.}206$  This is specific for the BMP side

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:23:57.206 - 00:23:59.226 of the pathway because if we use

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:23:59.226 \rightarrow 00:24:00.410$  another reporter that responds

00:24:00.410 --> 00:24:02.410 to TGF beta signals for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:24:02.410 \longrightarrow 00:24:04.774$  we don't see any effect from

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:24:04.774 \longrightarrow 00:24:05.956$  human junelyn transfection.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}05{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}08{.}158$  And we showed that this is working

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:24:08.158 --> 00:24:10.100 through the canonical BMP SMAD signaling

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}10{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}12{.}298$  pathway that I showed to you through.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:24:12.300 \rightarrow 00:24:14.800$  Endogenously expressed the empty lagans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:24:14.800 \longrightarrow 00:24:16.180$  the empty receptors and BMP

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}16.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}18.209$  smads because if we knock down or

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:24:18.209 --> 00:24:19.694 inhibit any of these components,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:24:19.700 \longrightarrow 00:24:21.396$  this blocks the signaling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:24:21.396 --> 00:24:24.410 Now as I was generating this data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}24{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}26.618$  a paper came out linking mutations

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}26.618 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}29.260$  and HEMA juvelen to hemochromatosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:24:29.260 \rightarrow 00:24:31.066$  So we asked ourselves the obvious question,

 $00:24:31.070 \rightarrow 00:24:33.730$  is this BMP signaling function of human

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}33{.}730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}35{.}670$  javelin somehow important for its

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:24:35.670 \rightarrow 00:24:37.510$  role in iron homeostasis regulation?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:24:37.510 --> 00:24:38.107 And of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}38{.}107 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}39{.}301$  the role that we thought about

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}39{.}301 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}40{.}767$  was in the regulation of hepcidin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}40.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}42.570$  Since this is where human Julian

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:24:42.570 \longrightarrow 00:24:43.770$  was proposed to act,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}43.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}45.632$  and indeed we found that the MP's

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}45{.}632 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}47{.}418$  are quite potent stimulators of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}47{.}418 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}48{.}350$  hepcidin production.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:24:48.350 \rightarrow 00:24:50.275$  So this is another cell culture assay

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}24{:}50{.}275 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}52{.}050$  using liver cells and we treat them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:24:52.050 --> 00:24:54.160 What different Joe Biden super

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:24:54.160 \longrightarrow 00:24:56.270$  family ligands and measure hepcidin

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:24:56.335 \rightarrow 00:24:58.542$  by Q PCR and you can see that BMP's

00:24:58.542 --> 00:25:01.006 induced have siding by 200 to 1000

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}01.006$  -->  $00{:}25{:}03.396$  folds and many BMP's can do this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:25:03.400 --> 00:25:06.390 including BMP, 24567 and nine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:25:06.390 \longrightarrow 00:25:08.561$  but it's really the BMP is rather

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}08.561 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}10.589$  than the other Super family members

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}10.589 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}12.944$  of the most robust inducers of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}12{.}944 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}14{.}762$  hepcidin and it was subsequently

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:25:14.762 \rightarrow 00:25:16.850$  shown that this is acting directly

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}16{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}18{.}590$  to transcriptional level through

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:25:18.590 \longrightarrow 00:25:20.690$  two specific SMAD binding elements

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}20.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}22.490$  in the hepcidin promoter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:25:22.490 --> 00:25:24.992 Now subsequently we were interested in

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}24.992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}27.167$  understanding which of these ligands

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}27.167 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}29.347$  is important endogenously in vivo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:25:29.350 --> 00:25:29.653 right?

 $00:25:29.653 \rightarrow 00:25:31.168$  If we add them exogenously,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:25:31.170 - 00:25:32.568 many of them can induce subsided,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:25:32.570 -> 00:25:34.526 but which ones are really the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:25:34.526 --> 00:25:35.830 important players in vivo?

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}35{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}38{.}270$  So clues for this came from 2 avenues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

00:25:38.270 --> 00:25:38.790 One was,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}38{.}790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}40{.}610$  some was from our work looking at

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:25:40.610 \rightarrow 00:25:42.690$  the binding affinity of the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}42.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}44.445$  RGM proteins to BMP ligands.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}44{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}45{.}746$  In our initial paper,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00{:}25{:}45.746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}47.690$  we had demonstrated that our GM

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:25:47.756 \longrightarrow 00:25:49.346$  proteins bind directly to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90598948

 $00:25:49.346 \longrightarrow 00:25:50.936$  ligands and and in

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:25:50.940 \longrightarrow 00:25:52.134$  2015 Christian Siebold.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}25{:}52{.}134 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}53{.}726$  They're actually published a

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:25:53.726 \rightarrow 00:25:55.318$  beautiful crystal structure showing

 $00:25:55.318 \rightarrow 00:25:57.058$  this that the binding interaction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:25:57.060 \rightarrow 00:25:58.885$  This is our data using

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}25{:}58.885 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}59.980$  surface plasmon resonance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}25{:}59{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}01{.}996$  What we did is we compared the binding

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}01{.}996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}03{.}741$  affinity of the different RGM for

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}03.741 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}05.523$  the different BMP ligands and they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:05.579 \rightarrow 00:26:07.319$  colored differently based on their

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}07{.}319 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}09{.}059$  different subfamilies and what you

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}09{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}11{.}924$  can see is that all of the RGM's had

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:11.924 \rightarrow 00:26:13.976$  the relatively highest affinity for BMP,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:13.980 \longrightarrow 00:26:14.766$  two and four,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}14.766 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}17.005$  none of them bound to BMP nine and

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

00:26:17.005 --> 00:26:18.705 what stood out about hemogoblin

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}18.705 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}21.647$  compared to the other GM's is it had a

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}21.647 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}23.660$  relatively higher affinity for the BMP.

00:26:23.660 --> 00:26:27.090 567 subfamily compared to the other GM's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}27.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}29.001$  so we thought if there was some

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

00:26:29.001 --> 00:26:30.888 function of human Julian that couldn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:30.888 \rightarrow 00:26:32.898$  be compensated by the other GM's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}32{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}33{.}998$  we thought it might have something

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:33.998 \longrightarrow 00:26:35.150$  to do with the subfamily.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:35.150 \longrightarrow 00:26:38.118$  In particular BMP 6.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}38.120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}40.976$  Another clue came from this experiment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}40.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}42.807$  so here we took mice and we made them

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:42.807 \rightarrow 00:26:44.435$  iron deficient by putting them on a

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}44{.}435 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}46{.}152$  low iron diet or iron overloaded by

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:46.152 \rightarrow 00:26:47.916$  putting them on a high iron diet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:47.920 \longrightarrow 00:26:48.992$  And you can see,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:48.992 \longrightarrow 00:26:49.796$  as discussed earlier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}26{:}49{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}51{.}970$  the iron deficiency suppresses upside

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:51.970 \longrightarrow 00:26:54.939$  in and iron overload induces subside in.

 $00:26:54.940 \longrightarrow 00:26:56.220$  So we asked the question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

00:26:56.220 --> 00:26:57.724 are any BMP ligands?

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:57.724 \rightarrow 00:26:59.228$  Is there expression regulated

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:26:59.228 \longrightarrow 00:27:00.960$  by iron and the liver?

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}00{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}03{.}624$  And it turns out only two ligands are

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}03.624 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}06.802$  one is being P6 reduced by a low iron

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:27:06.802 \rightarrow 00:27:09.207$  diet induced by a high iron diet?

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:27:09.210 \longrightarrow 00:27:11.046$  And the other was BMP two,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:27:11.050 \rightarrow 00:27:13.246$  so these were really good candidate

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

00:27:13.246 --> 00:27:14.710 and dodging US regulators.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}14.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}17.078$  But in order so we wanted to validate

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}17.078 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}18.909$  this using a genetic approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}18{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}20{.}358$  But in order to do this we needed

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}20.358 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}21.775$  to know which were the cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:27:21.775 \longrightarrow 00:27:23.030$  that we're making the ligands,

 $00{:}27{:}23.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}25.046$  because the amps are very important

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}25.046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}26.830$  during development and can

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:27:26.830 \rightarrow 00:27:28.350$  lead to developmental problems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:27:28.350 \longrightarrow 00:27:30.206$  And so we looked and it turns out

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}30{.}206 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}32{.}287$  in the liver it's predominantly the

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}32{.}287 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}34{.}621$  endothelial cells that are making both NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}34.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}37.137$  the P6 and P and P2 rather than the

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:27:37.137 \longrightarrow 00:27:38.298$  parenchymal cells that had ascites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}38{.}298 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}40{.}019$  which are the cells that actually make the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}40.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}42.990$  Side and or the resident tissue

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}42.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}44.970$  macrophages the Cooper cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}44{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}47{.}031$  So we then went on to make a knock out

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}47.031 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}48.722$  mice and this is the data for BP

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:27:48.722 \longrightarrow 00:27:50.923$  6 and you can see in the both the

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:27:50.923 \rightarrow 00:27:52.754$  the the global knockout is red,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:27:52.754 \rightarrow 00:27:54.764$  the endothelial knockout is blue,

00:27:54.770 --> 00:27:57.829 macrophage is green and hepatocyte is purple.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:27:57.830 \longrightarrow 00:27:59.606$  And what you can see is both a

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}27{:}59.606 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}01.189$  global and the endothelial BMP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

00:28:01.190 --> 00:28:03.005 6 knock<br/>out mice had profound

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}28{:}03.005 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}04.820$  deficiency of hepcidin and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}28{:}04.887 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}07.359$  was associated with all of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}28{:}07{.}359 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}09{.}007$  features of hemochromatosis including

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:28:09.068 \rightarrow 00:28:11.246$  massive iron overload and the liver,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}28{:}11{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}13{.}070$  which is quantitated here on the left.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}28{:}13.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}15.230$  Here you can see the global knock out in red.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00:28:15.230 \longrightarrow 00:28:16.850$  In the end of the and that kind of

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}28{:}16.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}18.540$  blue and on the right that this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}28{:}18{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}19{.}958$  a Prussian blue stain that stains

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}28{:}19{.}958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}20{.}699$  the iron blue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}28{:}20.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}22.680$  So you can clearly visualize the

 $00{:}28{:}22.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}24.700$  massive iron overload in these mice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}28{:}24.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}25.784$  For me and B2,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68272287375

 $00{:}28{:}25{.}784 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}27{.}410$  the global knockout mice are embryonic

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:28:27.462 \rightarrow 00:28:29.548$  lethal, but we did look at endothelial

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}28{:}29{.}548 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}31{.}970$  BMP 2 knock out mice and similar to BMP 6.

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:28:31.970 - 00:28:33.685 These mice also had profound

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:28:33.685 \longrightarrow 00:28:35.400$  hepcidin deficiency and all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:28:35.459 \rightarrow 00:28:37.319$  the features of hemochromatosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}28{:}37{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}40{.}578$  including iron overload and in fact

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}28{:}40{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}42{.}170$  more recent data suggests that BMP

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:28:42.170 \rightarrow 00:28:44.116$  two and six are actually working

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}28{:}44.116 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}45.776$  together to regulate hepcidin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:28:45.780 \longrightarrow 00:28:47.000$  It turns out these ligands,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:28:47.000 -> 00:28:49.214 their dimers, and they can either

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}28{:}49{.}214 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}51{.}065$  function as as homodimers where

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:28:51.065 - 00:28:52.938 there's two of the same ligand,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00:28:52.938 \longrightarrow 00:28:54.370$  or heterodimers where they're
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- 00:28:54.370 00:28:55.444 two different ligands.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00{:}28{:}55{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}57{.}025$  And there's an increasing recognition
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00{:}28{:}57{.}025 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}59{.}359$  in this field that there are some
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00:28:59.359 \rightarrow 00:29:00.763$  biological contexts where only
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00{:}29{:}00.763 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}02.167$  heterodimers can function and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00{:}29{:}02{.}221 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}03{.}541$  homodimers can't compensate and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- 00:29:03.541 --> 00:29:05.191 our data suggests that that's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- 00:29:05.191 --> 00:29:07.630 how BP two and six are working.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- 00:29:07.630 --> 00:29:09.735 So just to summarize what
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00:29:09.735 \longrightarrow 00:29:11.840$  I've shown you so far.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00{:}29{:}11.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}15.615$  Iron increases in iron will induce and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00:29:15.615 \rightarrow 00:29:17.815$  athelia cells in the liver to produce BMP,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00{:}29{:}17.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}19.740$  two and BMP 6 ligands.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00{:}29{:}19{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}22{.}351$  These bind to the Coreceptor came a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:29:22.351 \rightarrow 00:29:24.920$  jubilant activate the BMP receptor complex,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:29:24.920 --> 00:29:27.278 induce the phosphorylation of SMAD proteins,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:29:27.280 \longrightarrow 00:29:30.195$  which is a major transcriptional

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:29:30.195 \rightarrow 00:29:31.944$  regulator of hepcidin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}29{:}31{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}34{.}002$  So now let's switch gears and talk a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:29:34.002 \rightarrow 00:29:35.830$  bit about the erythropoietic signal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:29:35.830 \longrightarrow 00:29:37.335$  Now it's been known for a long

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:29:37.335 - 00:29:38.648 time that whatever the signal is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}29{:}38.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}40.426$  it must be coming from the bone marrow,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:29:40.430 \longrightarrow 00:29:42.789$  because if you wipe out the bone

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}29{:}42.789 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}44.629$  marrow with chemotherapy or radiation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:29:44.630 - > 00:29:46.375 and the ability of erythropoietin

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}29{:}46.375 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}48.120$  and these other stimulators to

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:29:48.178 --> 00:29:49.868 suppressive side and goes away,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}29{:}49{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}51{.}695$  so it's been hypothesized that

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}29{:}51.695 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}53.947$  there must be some secreted factor

- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00:29:53.947 \longrightarrow 00:29:56.101$  that the bone marrow is making
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- 00:29:56.101 -> 00:29:57.810 that is suppressing hepcidin.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- 00:29:57.810 --> 00:29:58.986 Several years ago now,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00{:}29{:}58{.}986 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}00{.}750$  Tom Ganz's Group discovered one of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00{:}30{:}00{.}807 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}02{.}767$  these erythroid regulators of peptide,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00:30:02.770 \dashrightarrow 00:30:05.866$  and this is called erythro Faron or Urfi,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- 00:30:05.870 --> 00:30:07.019 or FAM 132B,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00:30:07.019 \rightarrow 00:30:10.310$  and this is some data from Toms Group.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00{:}30{:}10{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}12{.}360$  What you can see is if you phlebotomies
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00:30:12.360 \rightarrow 00:30:14.670$  mice or treat them with a report,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00{:}30{:}14.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}16.992$  and this causes a robust induction
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00{:}30{:}16.992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}19.290$  of the production of aritha faron
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00:30:19.290 \longrightarrow 00:30:21.642$  in the bone marrow by 4 hours,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00:30:21.650 \dashrightarrow 00:30:24.989$  which then starts to go down after 15 hours.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909
- $00:30:24.990 \longrightarrow 00:30:26.430$  And this is a sort of a mirror
- NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:30:26.430 \longrightarrow 00:30:27.807$  image of what happens to have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:30:27.810 --> 00:30:28.070 Right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:30:28.070 - 00:30:29.890 and so after a referral goes up

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:30:29.890 \rightarrow 00:30:31.608$  upside and gets suppressed and is

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}30{:}31{.}608 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}33{.}324$  a referral starts to come down.

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:30:33.330 --> 00:30:34.392 Hepcidin levels rebound.

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:30:34.392 --> 00:30:36.516 And indeed if you inject purified

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:30:36.516 \longrightarrow 00:30:38.330$  it with a ferret into mice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:30:38.330 \rightarrow 00:30:40.316$  it's the prices have sign expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}30{:}40{.}316$  -->  $00{:}30{:}42{.}650$  and moreover if you look at everything

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}30{:}42.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}44.848$  fair and knock out mice you know in

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:30:44.909 --> 00:30:47.107 wild type mice where when you give

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}30{:}47.107 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}48.905$  them phlebotomy or with points in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:30:48.905 --> 00:30:50.900 this will suppress upside and but in

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

00:30:50.961 --> 00:30:53.418 the earth of Fair knock<br/>out mice the

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:30:53.418 \rightarrow 00:30:54.970$  suppression is significantly blunted,

 $00:30:54.970 \rightarrow 00:30:56.908$  although there is still some suppression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}30{:}56{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}57{.}432$  suggesting that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:30:57.432 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.998$  There are other friend is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:30:58.998 \rightarrow 00:31:00.520$  the only erythroid regulator,

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:31:00.520 \rightarrow 00:31:02.501$  but certainly it is an important one

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:31:02.501 \longrightarrow 00:31:04.221$  and this is functionally relevant

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:31:04.221 \rightarrow 00:31:06.633$  because it delays the recovery from

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}31{:}06{.}633 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}08{.}679$  anemia and these knock out mice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}31{:}08.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}11.046$  And they also showed that this plays

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:31:11.046 \longrightarrow 00:31:13.374$  an important role in the hepcidin

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:31:13.374 \rightarrow 00:31:15.876$  deficiency in iron overload and thal assemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00{:}31{:}15.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}17.650$  So our group was interested in

NOTE Confidence: 0.674513729090909

 $00:31:17.650 \longrightarrow 00:31:18.830$  trying to understand how

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

00:31:18.892 --> 00:31:20.156 does Erythro Farren work

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:31:20.156 \longrightarrow 00:31:21.420$  to suppress upside in.

 $00:31:21.420 \rightarrow 00:31:23.124$  So we went back to our cell culture

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:31:23.124 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.736$  model and liver cells and you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}31{:}24.736 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}26.151$  see here that similar to what

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

00:31:26.151 - 00:31:27.740 happens in the mice if you treat

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:31:27.740 \longrightarrow 00:31:29.540$  cells with a rifle and protein,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}31{:}29{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}30{.}880$  this will suppressive Sidon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

00:31:30.880 --> 00:31:31.630 And interestingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:31:31.630 \longrightarrow 00:31:33.880$  this also led to a reduction

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}31{:}33{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}35{.}380$  in SMAD signaling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}31{:}35{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}37{.}696$  as evidenced by reduction in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}31{:}37.696 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}39.900$  phosphorylation of Smad 15 proteins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:31:39.900 \longrightarrow 00:31:42.196$  So this suggests that the the way

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

00:31:42.196 --> 00:31:44.358 Erythro Farren is working is by

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:31:44.358 \dashrightarrow 00:31:46.208$  inhibiting the BMP SMAD pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}31{:}46{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}47{.}535$  Now because of whether fairness

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

00:31:47.535 --> 00:31:48.330 a secreted protein,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:31:48.330 \rightarrow 00:31:50.388$  we reasoned it might be interacting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:31:50.388 \rightarrow 00:31:52.522$  directly with BMP ligands or receptors
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:31:52.522 \rightarrow 00:31:54.287$  to interfere with this pathway.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:31:54.290 \longrightarrow 00:31:57.286$  And so we tested that using a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:31:57.286 \rightarrow 00:31:58.142$  communoprecipitation approach.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:31:58.150 \longrightarrow 00:32:00.302$  So here what we did is we mixed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:32:00.302 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.849$  BMP ligands and a flag tag.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:32:01.850 \longrightarrow 00:32:03.608$  The with warfarin together and this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- 00:32:03.608 --> 00:32:06.010 here is a BMP 26 heterodimeric Lagann
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:32:06.010 \dashrightarrow 00:32:08.830$  and here is BMP 6 homodimeric ligand.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:32:08.830 \rightarrow 00:32:10.286$  We we immunoprecipitated erythroxylum
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00{:}32{:}10{.}286 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}12{.}773$  with a flag antibody and you can
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00{:}32{:}12.773 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}14.261$  see that the ligand comes down
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00{:}32{:}14{.}261 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}16{.}328$  with it so this demonstrates that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:32:16.330 \rightarrow 00:32:18.202$  Both are fair and is actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:32:18.202 \rightarrow 00:32:20.219$  binding directly to the BMP ligands.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

00:32:20.220 --> 00:32:21.128 In contrast,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}32{:}21.128 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}23.852$  there is no interaction between over

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:32:23.852 \dashrightarrow 00:32:26.569$  the farm and the BMP receptors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:32:26.570 \longrightarrow 00:32:28.355$  So the way we think this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}32{:}28{.}355 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}30{.}173$  working is illustrated by this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:32:30.173 \rightarrow 00:32:31.169$  immunoprecipitation experiment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:32:31.170 \rightarrow 00:32:33.771$  So here what we do is we're mixing together

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:32:33.771 \dashrightarrow 00:32:36.149$  the BMP ligand and the BMP receptors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:32:36.150 \rightarrow 00:32:39.188$  So if you immuno precipitate the receptor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:32:39.190 \longrightarrow 00:32:40.380$  the ligand comes down with

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:32:40.380 \longrightarrow 00:32:41.570$  it as you would expect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:32:41.570 \rightarrow 00:32:43.430$  the ligand binds to the receptor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}32{:}43{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}46{.}103$  But this is in the absence of Aritha Faron.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}32{:}46{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}47{.}342$  When you add increasing

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:32:47.342 \longrightarrow 00:32:48.882$  Aritha Faron to this mixture,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:32:48.890 \rightarrow 00:32:51.346$  what happens is you compete for the ability
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00{:}32{:}51{.}346 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}53{.}927$  of the ligand to bind to the receptor.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:32:53.930 \dashrightarrow 00:32:55.610$  So this suggests that the way with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:32:55.610 \rightarrow 00:32:56.730$  referring is working is like.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- 00:32:56.730 --> 00:32:57.360 Ligand trek,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00{:}32{:}57{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}59{.}250$  it binds the ligands and sequesters
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:32:59.250 \rightarrow 00:33:01.517$  it and prevents it from interacting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- 00:33:01.517 --> 00:33:02.696 with the receptors,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:33:02.700 \longrightarrow 00:33:05.538$  thereby inhibiting signaling.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- 00:33:05.540 --> 00:33:05.793 So,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- 00:33:05.793 --> 00:33:06.552 just to summarize,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00{:}33{:}06{.}552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}07{.}817$  this part of the talk,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:33:07.820 \dashrightarrow 00:33:10.196$  here's the the canonical BMP signaling
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- 00:33:10.196 --> 00:33:12.340 pathway that we discussed earlier,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00{:}33{:}12{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}14{.}488$  and Othello cells make BMP ligands
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:33:14.488 \longrightarrow 00:33:16.907$  which bind to the BMP receptor

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

00:33:16.907 --> 00:33:19.202 complex to induce the transcription

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

00:33:19.202 --> 00:33:21.310 of hepcidin in the context of Earth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:33:21.310 \rightarrow 00:33:24.397$  reported drive like EPO injections or anemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:33:24.400 \dashrightarrow 00:33:26.600$  This acts on the kidney to induce the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:33:26.600 \rightarrow 00:33:27.827$  production of erythropoietin which

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}33{:}27{.}827 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}30{.}011$  acts on the bone marrow to induce

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

00:33:30.011 -> 00:33:31.840 the production of Arthur Farum,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}33{:}31{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}34{.}228$  which then goes to the liver

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:33:34.228 \rightarrow 00:33:35.820$  where spines and sequesters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00{:}33{:}35{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}37{.}704$  BMP ligands inhibit signaling

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:33:37.704 \rightarrow 00:33:39.117$  through this pathway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:33:39.120 \longrightarrow 00:33:42.580$  thereby lowering hepcidin expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:33:42.580 \longrightarrow 00:33:43.176$  So finally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:33:43.176 \longrightarrow 00:33:45.262$  let's talk a little bit about inflammation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667

 $00:33:45.270 \longrightarrow 00:33:46.698$  You know we mentioned this is

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:33:46.698 \rightarrow 00:33:48.265$  probably one of the the mechanisms
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- 00:33:48.265 --> 00:33:49.957 by which have sided is increased
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- 00:33:49.957 --> 00:33:51.299 in chronic kidney disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:33:51.300 \rightarrow 00:33:53.418$  So how does inflammation regulate herbicide?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00{:}33{:}53{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}55{.}548$  And so this was illustrated by a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:33:55.548 \dashrightarrow 00:33:57.210$  number of different groups that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- 00:33:57.210 --> 00:33:58.590 inflammatory cytokines such as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:33:58.590 \longrightarrow 00:34:01.292$  aisle 6 will act through the Jack
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00{:}34{:}01{.}292 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}03{.}397$  stat pathway through a direct
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:34:03.397 \longrightarrow 00:34:04.594$  transcriptional mechanism through
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00:34:04.594 \rightarrow 00:34:06.718$  a stat binding element on the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00{:}34{:}06{.}718 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}07{.}780$  herbicide and promoter.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- 00:34:07.780 --> 00:34:08.111 Now,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- $00{:}34{:}08{.}111 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}09{.}766$  although this is a distinct
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7634490766666667
- 00:34:09.766 --> 00:34:11.090 pathway from the BMP
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

00:34:11.157 --> 00:34:13.620 SMAD pathway. It still turns out that

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:34:13.620 \rightarrow 00:34:16.230$  this being piece Med pathway is important

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:34:16.230 \rightarrow 00:34:18.870$  for the inflammatory reaction to occur,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:34:18.870 \longrightarrow 00:34:21.450$  and that's illustrated in this experiment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:34:21.450 \longrightarrow 00:34:23.482$  So what we did is we made mice

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}34{:}23.482 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}25.419$  where we knocked out the smed

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:34:25.419 \longrightarrow 00:34:27.453 1/5$  and eight in the parasites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:34:27.460 \longrightarrow 00:34:28.670$  and as you might expect,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}34{:}28.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}30.655$  these mice have a profound

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

00:34:30.655 - 00:34:31.846 have signed deficiency.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:34:31.850 \dashrightarrow 00:34:34.690$  Kind of like the BMP ligand knockout mice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:34:34.690 \dashrightarrow 00:34:37.224$  and compared to the the control mice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}34{:}37{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}40{.}016$  Now if we treat these mice with

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:34:40.016 \rightarrow 00:34:42.140$  lipopolysaccharide to induce inflammation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:34:42.140 \longrightarrow 00:34:44.639$  Hepcidin is actually induced both in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:34:44.639 \rightarrow 00:34:47.313$  knockout mice and in the wild type mice

00:34:47.313 - 00:34:49.530 because this aisle 6 pathway is intact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}34{:}49{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}51{.}474$  but because pepsin levels start out

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}34{:}51{.}474 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}53{.}959$  so much lower in the knock out mice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:34:53.960 \rightarrow 00:34:56.445$  the ending helpside values are still much

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}34{:}56{.}445 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}59{.}134$  lower in this man knock out mice because

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}34{:}59{.}134 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}01{.}980$  of the reduction in basil hepcidin levels,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:01.980 \dashrightarrow 00:35:04.080$  so this suggests that one could

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:04.080 \rightarrow 00:35:05.775$  actually think about targeting any

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}35{:}05{.}775 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}07{.}840$  of these molecular pathways as as as

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:07.840 \longrightarrow 00:35:09.902$  a strategy to think about lowering

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:09.902 \rightarrow 00:35:12.020$  upside and in chronic kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:12.020 \dashrightarrow 00:35:13.532$  Questions and a number of groups

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}35{:}13.532 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}15.270$  have done a number of these things

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}35{:}15{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}17{.}133$  and I'm just going to show you a

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}35{:}17{.}133 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}18{.}687$  little bit of data from our group.

 $00{:}35{:}18.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}21.161$  So the first strategy that we thought

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:21.161 \rightarrow 00:35:22.951$  about was something was making

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

00:35:22.951 - > 00:35:24.949 a soluble form of human javelin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:24.950 \longrightarrow 00:35:26.638$  So here what we do is we replace

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}35{:}26.638 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}28.378$  the GPI anchor that anchors him.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:28.380 \rightarrow 00:35:30.036$  The jubilant to the membrane surface,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:30.040 \dashrightarrow 00:35:32.861$  and we replace it with an FC

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

00:35:32.861 - 00:35:34.070 tail from immunoglobulin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:34.070 \rightarrow 00:35:36.352$  The idea being kind of like erythroxylum

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:36.352 \rightarrow 00:35:38.190$  because it binds to the ligand,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:38.190 \longrightarrow 00:35:39.565$  but it's not associated anymore

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:39.565 \longrightarrow 00:35:40.665$  with the cell surface.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

00:35:40.670 - 00:35:42.574 It may act as a ligand track.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:42.580 \longrightarrow 00:35:44.470$  And the beauty of this type of

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:44.470 \rightarrow 00:35:46.543$  strategy is we were able to design

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:35:46.543 \rightarrow 00:35:48.863$  this even before we knew which were

- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- $00:35:48.863 \rightarrow 00:35:50.687$  the important endogenous ligands.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- $00:35:50.690 \rightarrow 00:35:52.419$  We reasoned that whatever those ligands are,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- $00:35:52.420 \longrightarrow 00:35:54.538$  they must bind to human Julian
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- $00:35:54.538 \dashrightarrow 00:35:56.560$  because it's the endogenous receptor.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- $00{:}35{:}56{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}57{.}148$  Subsequently,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- 00:35:57.148 --> 00:36:00.676 we also developed a BMP 6
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- 00:36:00.676 --> 00:36:02.440 neutralizing antibody strategy.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- $00{:}36{:}02{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}05{.}170$  Once we identified BMP six as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- $00{:}36{:}05{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}06{.}812$  an important endogenous ligand.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- $00:36:06.812 \longrightarrow 00:36:09.374$  So here's a little bit of data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- $00:36:09.380 \longrightarrow 00:36:11.348$  This was done in collaboration with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- 00:36:11.348 --> 00:36:13.050 Igor thorough and Doctor Weiss.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- 00:36:13.050 --> 00:36:15.540 This is in a rat model of any of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- $00{:}36{:}15{.}612 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}17{.}997$  information induced by injection of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333
- $00{:}36{:}17.997 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}20.382$  peptidoglycan from Group A strep.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

00:36:20.390 --> 00:36:21.728 When you inject this into mice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

00:36:21.730 --> 00:36:22.900 they get a chronic relapsing

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:36:22.900 \longrightarrow 00:36:24.423$  arthritis with all of the features

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:36:24.423 \rightarrow 00:36:25.639$  of anemia of inflammation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:36:25.640 \longrightarrow 00:36:26.804$  including high peptide levels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:36:26.804 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.179$  So what you can see here is that NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:36:29.179 \rightarrow 00:36:30.895$  the rats treated with the soluble

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

00:36:30.895 --> 00:36:32.922 human Julian had at least a trend

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}36{:}32{.}922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}34{.}322$  toward a reduction and hepcidin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:36:34.330 \dashrightarrow 00:36:36.070$  although that didn't quite reach

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}36{:}36{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}37{.}810$  statistical significance in this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}36{:}37{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}40{.}222$  but it was enough to stabilize

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00{:}36{:}40.222 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}42.236$  Fairport and protein expression and

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:36:42.236 \longrightarrow 00:36:44.240$  mobilize iron out of the stores.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:36:44.240 \rightarrow 00:36:46.496$  Into the blood and importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802749805833333

 $00:36:46.500 \longrightarrow 00:36:48.726$  it was able to improve anemia.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00{:}36{:}51{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}53{.}823$  Similar data we're also shown what the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00:36:53.823 \rightarrow 00:36:56.092$  neutralizing the MP six antibody now,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00:36:56.092 \dashrightarrow 00:36:58.984$  interestingly, as a study was published
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00{:}36{:}58{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}01{.}216$  recently where they did a first in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00:37:01.216 \rightarrow 00:37:03.479$  human trial for the neutralizing BMP 6
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00:37:03.479 \longrightarrow 00:37:05.990$  antibody as a way to lower hepcidin.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- 00:37:05.990 --> 00:37:08.284 Anemia of chronic kidney disease. Now,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- 00:37:08.284 --> 00:37:11.290 as as I'm sure most of this audience knows,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00{:}37{:}11{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}13{.}243$  in phase one trials, the purpose of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00:37:13.243 \rightarrow 00:37:15.370$  the trial is to look for toxicity.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- 00:37:15.370 --> 00:37:16.342 A dose finding right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- 00:37:16.342 --> 00:37:17.314 It's not an efficacy.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00{:}37{:}17{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}19{.}398$  It's not designed as an efficacy trial, but.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- 00:37:19.398 --> 00:37:21.414 At times people of course do measure
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00{:}37{:}21{.}414 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}23{.}194$  some efficacy and points to get some
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00:37:23.194 \dashrightarrow 00:37:25.184$  hints if if your drug might be doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

00:37:25.184 --> 00:37:27.011 what you think it's supposed to do,

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00{:}37{:}27.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}28.900$  and that's what they did in the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00:37:28.900 \rightarrow 00:37:30.846$  So here these are all in kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00:37:30.846 \dashrightarrow 00:37:32.594$  disease patients and they the red

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00{:}37{:}32{.}594 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}34{.}014$  triangles show patients who got

NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00{:}37{:}34.014 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}36.137$  one dose of the neutralizing BMP 6

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00:37:36.137 \dashrightarrow 00:37:38.306$  antibody and the black circles are the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00:37:38.306 \dashrightarrow 00:37:40.304$  control and they didn't provide any

NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00:37:40.304 \dashrightarrow 00:37:41.698$  statistical analysis in the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

00:37:41.700 --> 00:37:43.324 And again I'm sure it was underpowered

NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00:37:43.324 \rightarrow 00:37:45.258$  to look at these efficacy endpoints,

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00:37:45.260 \rightarrow 00:37:47.017$  but what you can see here intriguingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00{:}37{:}47.017 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}48.798$  is that the neutralizing the MP

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00{:}37{:}48.798 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}50.428$  six antibodies seem to suppress.

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00:37:50.430 \longrightarrow 00:37:52.929$  Side and levels.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- 00:37:52.930 --> 00:37:53.632 Lowered ferritin,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00:37:53.632 \rightarrow 00:37:56.089$  so ferritin is the iron storage protein,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00{:}37{:}56.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}57.962$  so this suggests that iron is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00:37:57.962 \rightarrow 00:37:59.930$  being mobilized out of the stores,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00:37:59.930 \longrightarrow 00:38:01.226$  increased serum iron levels,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00{:}38{:}01{.}226 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}03{.}665$  and actually at least cause a tendency
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- 00:38:03.665 00:38:05.409 to increase hemoglobin levels.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00:38:05.410 \longrightarrow 00:38:08.161$  So kind of intriguing hints that that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00:38:08.161 \rightarrow 00:38:11.787$  there may be a clinical possibilities here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- 00:38:11.790 --> 00:38:13.426 and so you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00:38:13.426 \longrightarrow 00:38:15.062$  understanding all these molecular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00{:}38{:}15{.}062 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}16{.}990$  pathways has LED not only us,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00{:}38{:}16{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}18{.}831$  but a number of different groups to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- 00:38:18.831 --> 00:38:20.206 think about targeting these pathways
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00{:}38{:}20{.}206 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}22{.}387$  as a strategy. And people have.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00:38:22.387 \rightarrow 00:38:24.223$  Targeted everything from hepcidin

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

00:38:24.223 --> 00:38:26.768 and Fairport and directly to BMP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00:38:26.770 \longrightarrow 00:38:28.674$  6 logins to him.

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00:38:28.674 \rightarrow 00:38:31.054$  Adjuvant coreceptor to BMP receptors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00:38:31.060 \dashrightarrow 00:38:32.836$  SMAD proteins and also the aisle.

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00{:}38{:}32{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}34{.}432$ 6 stat. 3 pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00:38:34.432 \rightarrow 00:38:36.820$  All of these strategies are actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00{:}38{:}36{.}894 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}39{.}477$  shown benefit in animal models and a

NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00{:}38{:}39{.}477 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}42{.}027$  number of them have actually advanced

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00{:}38{:}42.027 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}45.219$  to various stages of of clinical trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

00:38:45.220 --> 00:38:45.854 So finally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00:38:45.854 \dashrightarrow 00:38:47.756$  I'll just conclude with the saying

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00{:}38{:}47.756$  -->  $00{:}38{:}49.742$  that that I hope I've convinced

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00{:}38{:}49{.}742 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}51{.}680$  you that there's been a revolution,

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00:38:51.680 \rightarrow 00:38:53.625$  and our molecular understanding of

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00:38:53.625 \rightarrow 00:38:55.181$  systemic iron homeostasis regulation

- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00:38:55.181 \rightarrow 00:38:57.439$  and the pathogenesis of iron disorders,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- 00:38:57.440 --> 00:39:00.180 including anemia, chronic kidney disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00:39:00.180 \longrightarrow 00:39:02.630$  and these findings hold the promise for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00:39:02.630 \rightarrow 00:39:04.798$  more targeted therapies for iron disorders,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00:39:04.800 \rightarrow 00:39:06.040$  particularly for kidney disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- 00:39:06.040 --> 00:39:06.970 Patients have signed.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00:39:06.970 \dashrightarrow 00:39:09.100$  This elevates that in these patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00:39:09.100 \dashrightarrow 00:39:11.024$  and contributes to iron restricted
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00{:}39{:}11.024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}13.146$  with poisonous and anemia, peptide,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00:39:13.146 \longrightarrow 00:39:14.976$  and fairpoint and access modulators.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- 00:39:14.980 00:39:16.604 May have a role in treating anemia,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- 00:39:16.610 --> 00:39:18.992 CKD by increasing iron availability from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667
- $00{:}39{:}18{.}992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}22{.}230$  the diet and from the patient's own body.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00{:}39{:}22{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}25{.}068$  Stores and studies are ongoing to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667
- $00:39:25.068 \rightarrow 00:39:28.086$  determine efficacy and safety of these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00:39:28.086 \rightarrow 00:39:30.186$  strategies in inpatient patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00{:}39{:}30{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}31{.}782$  I'll just end by thanking the folks in

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00{:}39{:}31.782 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}33.688$  my lab and our collaborators around the

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00:39:33.688 \rightarrow 00:39:35.550$  world who've contributed to these studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00{:}39{:}35{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}37{.}426$  as well as our funding sources and

NOTE Confidence: 0.658735201666667

 $00:39:37.426 \rightarrow 00:39:39.049$  thank everyone for your attention,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6587352016666667

 $00:39:39.050 \rightarrow 00:39:41.106$  and I'll be happy to answer any questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5741738

 $00:39:51.630 \rightarrow 00:39:55.120$  Sure. That was a lovely talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.5741738

 $00{:}39{:}55{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}57{.}838$  couple of questions like my so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5741738

 $00:39:57.840 \longrightarrow 00:39:59.786$  So first of all, it sounds like

NOTE Confidence: 0.5741738

 $00:39:59.786 \longrightarrow 00:40:01.525$  the iron sensor governing the

NOTE Confidence: 0.5741738

 $00:40:01.525 \rightarrow 00:40:03.635$  production side really designed for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00:40:05.990 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.020$  So this it's actually more complicated

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}09{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}10.818$  than that, so it turns out that there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}10.818 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}12.230$  two different kinds of iron signals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00:40:12.230 \longrightarrow 00:40:13.438$  There's the stores signal

 $00{:}40{:}13.438 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}14.646$  that's kind of reflective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00:40:14.650 \longrightarrow 00:40:15.742$  The total body stores,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00:40:15.742 \rightarrow 00:40:17.774$  and that signal we think is coming

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}17.774$  -->  $00{:}40{:}19.784$  from the endothelial cells and data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}19.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}22.166$  I didn't have time to show you today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}22.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}24.088$  We and other groups have worked out

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}24.088 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}26.375$  that one of the mechanisms is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}26.375 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}28.125$  iron induces oxidative stress and

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}28.125 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}30.410$  NRF 2 pathway and endothelial cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00:40:30.410 \longrightarrow 00:40:32.140$  And this is actually a

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00:40:32.140 \longrightarrow 00:40:33.524$  transcriptional regulator of B6.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}33{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}35{.}038$  So that's one pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}35{.}038 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}37{.}747$  But it turns out that circulating iron

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}37.747 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}39.997$  levels actually seem to be sensed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}40{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}42{.}718$  We think directly in the hepatocytes

00:40:42.718 -> 00:40:44.077 via transparent receptors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}44.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}46.060$  so there's two different transparent

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00:40:46.060 \rightarrow 00:40:48.040$  receptors in the liver transparent

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}48.098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}50.474$  receptor 2 which is mutated in

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}50{.}474 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}51{.}662$  hemochromatosis and transparent

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}51.662 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}53.957$  receptor one which actually binds to

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00:40:53.957 \rightarrow 00:40:55.797$  the other hemochromatosis protein HFV.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00:40:55.800 \rightarrow 00:40:58.089$  And when circulating iron levels go up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}40{:}58.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}00.925$  it's sensed by those proteins and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

00:41:00.925 --> 00:41:03.588 somehow that causes HF and transparent

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}41{:}03.588 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}05.898$  receptor 2 to regulate hepcidin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00:41:05.900 \longrightarrow 00:41:07.670$  So it's actually a complex I.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00:41:07.670 \longrightarrow 00:41:09.038$  I simplified it here and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}41{:}09{.}038 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}10{.}709$  focused on one part of the pathway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919158825

 $00{:}41{:}10.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}12.240$  but there's probably multiple signals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.686870208333333

 $00:41:14.870 \rightarrow 00:41:18.990$  Have some items on the 25. Please.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00:41:21.120 \rightarrow 00:41:23.229$  What's the biology?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00{:}41{:}23{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}25{.}456$  Yes, so it is cleaved at.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00{:}41{:}25{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}27{.}416$  It's cleaved by Furin and furin.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00{:}41{:}27{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}28{.}610$  Like proteins.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00:41:28.610 \longrightarrow 00:41:30.990$  There isn't any people.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00{:}41{:}30{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}33{.}699$  Have looked at the Pro, the pro hormone.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00{:}41{:}33.699 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}35.817$  It doesn't have a biological function
- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00{:}41{:}35{.}817 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}38{.}718$  as far as we know and there's no clear
- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00:41:38.718 \rightarrow 00:41:40.889$  known function of the cleavage project.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00:41:40.890 \longrightarrow 00:41:42.510$  The end terminal cleavage,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00:41:42.510 \longrightarrow 00:41:44.130$  the other cleavage products
- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00:41:44.130 \longrightarrow 00:41:45.520$  that have sighted.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.700318063333333
- $00:41:45.520 \longrightarrow 00:41:46.810$  That's all we know right now.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.763553722577778
- $00{:}42{:}02{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}04{.}764$  Yeah, so hepcid in turns out this turned
- NOTE Confidence: 0.763553722577778
- $00{:}42{:}04{.}764 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}06{.}633$  over really quickly and that's been
- NOTE Confidence: 0.763553722577778

 $00{:}42{:}06{.}633 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}08{.}907$  I think one of the the downsides of

NOTE Confidence: 0.763553722577778

00:42:08.907 --> 00:42:10.839 trying to target upside and directly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.763553722577778

 $00:42:10.840 \longrightarrow 00:42:12.360$  So obviously that was one of the first NOTE Confidence: 0.763553722577778

 $00:42:12.360 \longrightarrow 00:42:13.660$  things that people tried to target,

NOTE Confidence: 0.763553722577778

00:42:13.660 --> 00:42:16.796 but I think that's one of the limitations

NOTE Confidence: 0.763553722577778

 $00{:}42{:}16.796$  -->  $00{:}42{:}18.592$  of targeting peptide and protein directly. NOTE Confidence: 0.763553722577778

00:42:18.592 --> 00:42:20.660 I don't have the numbers on the top of

NOTE Confidence: 0.763553722577778

 $00{:}42{:}20.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}22.370$  my head, but it's very fast. Server.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888243302857143

 $00:42:24.980 \longrightarrow 00:42:27.395$  I don't know that it's fully understood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888243302857143

00:42:27.400 --> 00:42:29.296 It's there's some evidence that suggests

NOTE Confidence: 0.888243302857143

 $00{:}42{:}29{.}296 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}32{.}117$  that it could be taken up in the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.888243302857143

 $00:42:32.117 \rightarrow 00:42:34.010$  proximal tubule and maybe degraded there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888243302857143

 $00:42:34.010 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.110$  but I don't know that people have

NOTE Confidence: 0.888243302857143

 $00{:}42{:}36{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}38{.}090$  fully worked out how that happens.

NOTE Confidence: 0.663728835076923

 $00:42:42.670 \rightarrow 00:42:44.746$  Do you think that transferring and

NOTE Confidence: 0.663728835076923

 $00:42:44.746 \rightarrow 00:42:47.288$  ferritin are still the things to measure?

- NOTE Confidence: 0.663728835076923
- $00{:}42{:}47.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}49.684$  Are there other modalities that that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.663728835076923
- $00:42:49.684 \rightarrow 00:42:51.880$  we seem like since, like training?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- 00:42:53.900 --> 00:42:55.258 Yeah, I think that's a great question.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- $00:42:55.260 \rightarrow 00:42:57.555$  I think they're definitely limitations
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- $00:42:57.555 \longrightarrow 00:43:00.519$  of the the measures we have.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- 00:43:00.520 --> 00:43:01.864 You know, particularly ferritin,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- $00:43:01.864 \longrightarrow 00:43:03.208$  because ferritin is also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- $00:43:03.208 \longrightarrow 00:43:04.699$  an acute phase reactant,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- 00:43:04.700 --> 00:43:06.356 so it's also induced by inflammation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- $00:43:06.360 \rightarrow 00:43:08.264$  and if you have liver disease or malignancy,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- 00:43:08.270 --> 00:43:09.596 these things kind of affect ferritin,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- $00{:}43{:}09{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}12{.}100$  so it makes it very hard if ferritin is low,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- $00:43:12.100 \longrightarrow 00:43:13.591$  it's a good indicator that iron stores
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- $00{:}43{:}13.591 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}15.400$  are low, but if ferritin is not low,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822
- $00:43:15.400 \longrightarrow 00:43:17.276$  it's hard to know is it's from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

00:43:17.276 --> 00:43:18.660 inflammation is it's from iron,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

 $00{:}43{:}18.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}22.346$  so we do need better tests and and

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

 $00:43:22.346 \rightarrow 00:43:23.874$  you know transparent saturation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

00:43:23.880 --> 00:43:25.028 You know it's helpful,

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

 $00{:}43{:}25{.}028 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}26{.}463$  but I think functional markers

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

 $00:43:26.463 \longrightarrow 00:43:27.289$  would be useful.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

 $00{:}43{:}27{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}29{.}887$  I think there's some interest in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

 $00:43:29.887 \rightarrow 00:43:32.519$  trying to adapt more widely things

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

00:43:32.519 --> 00:43:34.919 like reticulocyte hemoglobin or a

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

00:43:34.919 --> 00:43:37.490 percentage of hypochromic red cells NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

 $00{:}43{:}37{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}40{.}040$  which are more functional markers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

 $00{:}43{:}40{.}040$  -->  $00{:}43{:}42{.}686$  But I think we this is 1 area where

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

 $00{:}43{:}42.686 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}45.572$  we need more work to develop better

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

 $00{:}43{:}45{.}572 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}48{.}224$  biomarkers to help us understand what

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

 $00{:}43{:}48{.}224 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}51{.}360$  the iron status of our patients are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.93397822

 $00:43:51.360 \longrightarrow 00:43:53.968$  Karen I was curious about.

00:44:11.800 --> 00:44:13.000 Yeah, I think that's a good

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00{:}44{:}13.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}14.249$  question and you know when Aiden

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00{:}44{:}14.249 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}15.269$  was first discovered there was

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:15.269 \longrightarrow 00:44:16.778$  a lot of interest in thinking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00{:}44{:}16.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}18.082$  Oh, can we use hepcidin as

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:18.082 \rightarrow 00:44:19.439$  a new biomarker to you know?

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

00:44:19.440 --> 00:44:21.720 Figure out if patients are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

00:44:21.720 --> 00:44:22.960 you know, truly are deficient

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:22.960 \longrightarrow 00:44:23.952$  or functionally are deficient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:23.960 \longrightarrow 00:44:25.728$  but the problem is that have signed is

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:25.728 \rightarrow 00:44:27.247$  regulated by so many different things

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:27.247 \longrightarrow 00:44:28.783$  that are changing in our patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:28.790 \longrightarrow 00:44:30.950$  People have shown that erythropoietin

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

00:44:30.950 --> 00:44:32.678 suppresses subsided in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:32.678 \longrightarrow 00:44:34.664$  kidney disease patients in no.

00:44:34.664 --> 00:44:36.146 It's induced by inflammation if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:36.146 \rightarrow 00:44:37.818$  give iron that will actually induce

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

00:44:37.818 --> 00:44:39.790 subsidence of patients were an IV iron,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

00:44:39.790 --> 00:44:40.166 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:40.166 \longrightarrow 00:44:41.482$  so it's there's so many factors that

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:41.482 \rightarrow 00:44:43.027$  are influencing have signed expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:43.030 \longrightarrow 00:44:45.076$  I think that's why it hasn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:45.076 \rightarrow 00:44:47.249$  necessarily been useful as a biomarker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:47.250 \longrightarrow 00:44:48.966$  You know the group that discovered

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:48.966 \rightarrow 00:44:50.110$  everything Farren has developed

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00{:}44{:}50{.}153 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}51{.}593$  and Eliza assay to measure Earth

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00:44:51.593 \rightarrow 00:44:52.313$  of Farrah levels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00{:}44{:}52{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}54{.}098$  And I know this is something that

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00{:}44{:}54{.}098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}55{.}748$  they're that people are looking into as

NOTE Confidence: 0.853120551130435

 $00{:}44{:}55{.}748 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}57{.}879$  to whether that can be a useful biomarker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893815143333333

 $00:45:13.340 \rightarrow 00:45:15.824$  So the question is, what do we know about?

- NOTE Confidence: 0.24480686
- $00:45:20.330 \longrightarrow 00:45:20.830$  Specifically.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:45:23.980 \longrightarrow 00:45:25.360$  Yeah, so that's a great question.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- 00:45:25.360 --> 00:45:26.435 I think it's not just
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:45:26.435 \rightarrow 00:45:27.295$  macrophages in the spleen,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:45:27.300 \rightarrow 00:45:28.938$  I think that's classically thought about,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00{:}45{:}28{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}31{.}094$  but actually there there was a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:45:31.094 \rightarrow 00:45:33.900$  study that I was part of where
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:45:33.900 \longrightarrow 00:45:36.050$  they actually did certain like.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00{:}45{:}36{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}37{.}802$  Partial hepatectomy and compared it with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:45:37.802 \rightarrow 00:45:39.896$  splenectomy to look at how his iron where
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00{:}45{:}39{.}896 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}41{.}720$  is most of the iron turnover happening.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00{:}45{:}41.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}43.729$  And it turns out that the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00{:}45{:}43.729 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}45.247$  liver macrophages also play an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00{:}45{:}45{.}247 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}47{.}035$  important role in an iron recycling.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:45:47.040 \longrightarrow 00:45:49.460$  It's not just swing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867318836666667

 $00:45:49.460 \longrightarrow 00:45:51.092$  I don't think that much is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00{:}45{:}51.092 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}52.180$  known about kidney macrophages.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00:45:52.180 \longrightarrow 00:45:54.076$  As far as how much of a role

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00:45:54.076 \rightarrow 00:45:55.738$  they play in iron recycling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00:45:55.740 \longrightarrow 00:45:57.865$  it's at the spleen, and the liver

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00:45:57.865 \rightarrow 00:45:59.140$  are probably the predominant sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00:45:59.140 \longrightarrow 00:46:00.292$  But it's an interesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00:46:00.292 \rightarrow 00:46:01.444$  question and you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867318836666667

 $00:46:01.450 \longrightarrow 00:46:03.238$  there's there these sort of conflicting

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00:46:03.238 \rightarrow 00:46:05.458$  data about is iron helpful or harmful,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00:46:05.460 \longrightarrow 00:46:06.496$  and acute kidney injury.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

00:46:06.496 --> 00:46:08.050 And I think part of it

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00:46:08.110 \longrightarrow 00:46:09.490$  may be where the iron is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00:46:09.490 \rightarrow 00:46:10.495$  There's you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00:46:10.495 \longrightarrow 00:46:11.500$  Macrophages are designed

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667

 $00:46:11.500 \rightarrow 00:46:12.840$  to store iron safely,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:46:12.840 \longrightarrow 00:46:14.230$  and there's some evidence that,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- 00:46:14.230 --> 00:46:15.328 like with preconditioning,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:46:15.328 \longrightarrow 00:46:16.792$  you can induce protective
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:46:16.792 \longrightarrow 00:46:17.524$  antioxidant pathways.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- 00:46:17.530 --> 00:46:18.970 And maybe that's a good thing,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:46:18.970 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.250$  but it probably depends where the iron is,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- 00:46:21.250 --> 00:46:22.384 and I think when you're thinking
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867318836666667
- 00:46:22.384 --> 00:46:23.790 about iron levels of different organs,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:46:23.790 \longrightarrow 00:46:25.342$  that's an important point.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00:46:25.342 \longrightarrow 00:46:26.506$  But that's not.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00{:}46{:}26{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}28{.}085$  I don't know that a lot of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00{:}46{:}28.085 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}29.550$  work has been done on that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00{:}46{:}29.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}31.150$  I think that's an interesting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673188366666667
- $00{:}46{:}31{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}32{.}430$  area for future research.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.4626096466666667
- $00:46:44.860 \longrightarrow 00:46:45.868$  Not that progress.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.885585891

 $00:47:03.880 \longrightarrow 00:47:06.110$  The next speaker is Doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.885585891

00:47:06.110 --> 00:47:08.340 Peter Harris from Mayo Clinic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.885585891

 $00{:}47{:}08{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}11{.}280$  and he'll be discussing genetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.885585891

00:47:11.280 --> 00:47:13.920 complexity in AD PKD. Well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00{:}47{:}18.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}21.730$  So I went to thank Judy and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00{:}47{:}21.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}24.308$  organizers for inviting me here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00{:}47{:}24.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}26.277$  I mean it's we will appreciate the

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00{:}47{:}26.277 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}28.423$  work that the O'Brien Center is on

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00{:}47{:}28{.}423 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}30{.}283$  the P80 Centers for that matter,

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:47:30.290 \longrightarrow 00:47:33.210$  do around the country providing

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00{:}47{:}33{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}36{.}130$  resources for for kidney research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:47:36.130 \longrightarrow 00:47:37.640$  So I'm doing something a

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00{:}47{:}37{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}38{.}546$  little dangerous here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00{:}47{:}38.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}40.646$  I'm talking about a PKD at Yale and

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:47:40.646 \rightarrow 00:47:42.738$  think that some people here may know

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:47:42.738 \rightarrow 00:47:44.589$  more about the disease than I do,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:47:44.590 \longrightarrow 00:47:47.174$  but I'll try and stick to the genetic.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00{:}47{:}47{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}50{.}141$  Aspects of the disease and and and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:47:50.141 \rightarrow 00:47:53.181$  see what our understanding of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:47:53.181 \rightarrow 00:47:56.529$  complexity of this disease can provide
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:47:56.529 \rightarrow 00:48:00.429$  in terms of understanding pathogenesis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:48:00.430 \longrightarrow 00:48:04.366$  So you know about 80 PKD.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:48:04.370 \longrightarrow 00:48:07.286$  This is a a common genetic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:48:07.286 \longrightarrow 00:48:09.850$  disease about one in 1000.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:48:09.850 \longrightarrow 00:48:11.610$  Individuals have this disorder.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:48:11.610 \rightarrow 00:48:14.250$  It's a progressive disease that develops
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:48:14.312 \longrightarrow 00:48:16.388$  over the lifetime of the patients,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:48:16.390 \longrightarrow 00:48:19.300$  so that 50% of patients experienced
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- 00:48:19.300 --> 00:48:21.683 renal failure around 60 years
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- 00:48:21.683 --> 00:48:24.846 of age and about 5% of the the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00{:}48{:}24{.}846 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}27{.}420$  population that has on dialysis or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:48:27.510 \longrightarrow 00:48:30.370$  transplantation in this country.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00{:}48{:}30{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}33{.}135$  Has ADPKD and and worldwide

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:48:33.135 \longrightarrow 00:48:35.900$  that number is even higher.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:48:35.900 \longrightarrow 00:48:40.535$  So the the major genes are peak 81 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

00:48:40.540 --> 00:48:43.316 P82P-81 is a kind of complicated gene,

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:48:43.320 \longrightarrow 00:48:46.057$  has an open reading frame or a

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:48:46.057 \rightarrow 00:48:48.400$  coding region of nearly 13 KB.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:48:48.400 \longrightarrow 00:48:51.436$  It lies on the light green.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00{:}48{:}51{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}54{.}079$  Here shows that the area that lies

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:48:54.079 \rightarrow 00:48:56.607$  within a duplicated part of the genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:48:56.610 \longrightarrow 00:48:59.364$  So even though now with whole

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00{:}48{:}59{.}364 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}01{.}200$  exome sequencing and capturing

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

00:49:01.277 - 00:49:03.755 methods it's still a little tricky

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:49:03.755 \rightarrow 00:49:05.790$  to screen this gene for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

 $00:49:05.790 \longrightarrow 00:49:07.226$  Pathogenic variants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769

00:49:07.226 --> 00:49:12.252 Peak 82 is a more normal gene.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- 00:49:12.260 --> 00:49:14.846 An open reading frame of about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:49:14.846 \longrightarrow 00:49:17.730$  3 KB here with a 15 exons,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- 00:49:17.730 --> 00:49:21.307 so about 78% of patients have PKD,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:49:21.310 \longrightarrow 00:49:24.306$  one as the cause of their ADP
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00{:}49{:}24{.}306$  -->  $00{:}49{:}28{.}171$  KD and about 15% PKD 2 and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:49:28.171 \longrightarrow 00:49:31.433$  then we for the remaining 7%.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:49:31.433 \rightarrow 00:49:34.048$  Some of these are unresolved,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:49:34.050 \longrightarrow 00:49:35.314$  there's some other loci.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00{:}49{:}35{.}314 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}38{.}343$  That I'm going to go on to talk about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:49:38.343 \rightarrow 00:49:40.118$  and some other genetic complexity
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836409810230769
- $00:49:40.118 \longrightarrow 00:49:42.218$  that I want to mention too.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.4284077316666667
- $00{:}49{:}44{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}47{.}280$  So a PKD or PKD 1?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.4284077316666667
- 00:49:47.280 --> 00:49:49.722 PKD 2 are very likely heterogeneous
- NOTE Confidence: 0.4284077316666667
- $00{:}49{:}49{.}722 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}52{.}477$  as a wide range of different
- NOTE Confidence: 0.428407731666667
- $00{:}49{:}52{.}477 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}55{.}097$  mutations that cause the disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.428407731666667

 $00:49:55.100 \longrightarrow 00:49:57.260$  If we look at the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.4284077316666667

00:49:57.260 --> 00:49:59.576 types of mutations that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.428407731666667

00:49:59.576 --> 00:50:01.176 find causing human disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.428407731666667

 $00:50:01.180 \longrightarrow 00:50:03.190$  then all of those are represented

NOTE Confidence: 0.428407731666667

 $00{:}50{:}03.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}05.642$  here for beginning one we can see the

NOTE Confidence: 0.428407731666667

 $00:50:05.642 \rightarrow 00:50:07.820$  mutations are in all parts of the gene.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4284077316666667

00:50:07.820 --> 00:50:09.300 There's no real hot spots,

NOTE Confidence: 0.428407731666667

 $00:50:09.300 \longrightarrow 00:50:12.375$  although some areas probably have

NOTE Confidence: 0.428407731666667

 $00:50:12.375 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.450$  an enrichment for missense changes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.428407731666667

 $00{:}50{:}15{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}18{.}434$  I think 80 PKD is a common disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.428407731666667

00:50:18.434 --> 00:50:21.219 because any single inactivating variant

NOTE Confidence: 0.4284077316666667

 $00:50:21.219 \rightarrow 00:50:24.469$  can cause polycystic kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4284077316666667

 $00:50:24.470 \longrightarrow 00:50:26.468$  There's no single variant accounts for

NOTE Confidence: 0.4284077316666667

 $00:50:26.468 \rightarrow 00:50:29.570$  more than 2% of the families worldwide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.428407731666667

 $00{:}50{:}29{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}32{.}198$  and there's over 1600 different

NOTE Confidence: 0.428407731666667

 $00:50:32.198 \rightarrow 00:50:34.818$  variants that have been described.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00:50:38.100 \longrightarrow 00:50:40.140$  So as well as genetics,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00{:}50{:}40{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}43{.}254$  we can use the size of the kidneys to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00:50:43.254 \rightarrow 00:50:45.737$  determine the severity of the disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00{:}50{:}45{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}48{.}548$  This is work done by Maria Rosabel at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00{:}50{:}48{.}548 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}51{.}261$  Mayo and the idea here is to divide
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00{:}50{:}51{.}261 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}54{.}061$  the the size of the kidney divided by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- 00:50:54.061 00:50:58.510 the hate at the height of the patient.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00:50:58.510 \rightarrow 00:51:01.195$  So total kidney volume measured
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00:51:01.195 \rightarrow 00:51:04.280$  by MRI and then determining put
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00:51:04.280 \dashrightarrow 00:51:06.280$  them into different groups here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00{:}51{:}06{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}09{.}143$  So these are obviously patients with larger
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00{:}51{:}09{.}143 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}11{.}778$  kidneys and patients with smaller kidneys.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00{:}51{:}11{.}780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}14{.}764$  And then if you look at the outcome
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- 00:51:14.764 --> 00:51:18.504 of those measurements in terms of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944
- $00:51:18.504 \dashrightarrow 00:51:22.272$  decline in renal function or EGFR.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944

 $00:51:22.280 \rightarrow 00:51:25.295$  We can see that the larger kidneys are much

NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944

 $00{:}51{:}25{.}295 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}27{.}922$  more likely to proceed to more rapidly

NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944

 $00{:}51{:}27{.}922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}30{.}589$  to renal failure on the on the list,

NOTE Confidence: 0.844536944

00:51:30.590 - 00:51:32.876 smaller kidneys are less likely to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:51:34.930 \longrightarrow 00:51:39.221$  We did some analysis using both genotypic

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

00:51:39.221 --> 00:51:41.930 groups and a size to the kidneys,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}51{:}41{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}44{.}898$  so the Mayo imaging class to look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:51:44.898 \rightarrow 00:51:47.777$  outcomes in terms of end stage renal

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

00:51:47.777 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:51:50.115 disease and we can see here that topic

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:51:50.115 \rightarrow 00:51:52.448$  82 has been known for a long time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:51:52.450 \longrightarrow 00:51:55.570$  as the mildest form of the disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:51:55.570 \longrightarrow 00:51:56.456$  truncating peak.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:51:56.456 \rightarrow 00:51:59.557$  Anyone mutations have the and the average

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:51:59.557 \rightarrow 00:52:02.506$  age and then stage of around 55 years,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:52:02.510 \longrightarrow 00:52:04.974$  and then we divided the non truncating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:52:04.980 \longrightarrow 00:52:05.796$  Changes here,

 $00:52:05.796 \rightarrow 00:52:08.244$  so these are mainly missense changes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}52{:}08{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}10{.}070$  but we've used bioinformatic methods

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}52{:}10.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}12.919$  to do to predict ones that are more

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:52:12.919 \rightarrow 00:52:14.839$  likely to be fully penetrant and

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:52:14.839 \dashrightarrow 00:52:17.047$  less likely to be fully penetrant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:52:17.050 \longrightarrow 00:52:19.290$  And you can see that these fit

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:52:19.290 \longrightarrow 00:52:21.180$  in somewhere between the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

00:52:21.180 --> 00:52:23.970 peak 81 truncating and peak 82.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}52{:}23{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}25{.}769$  If we look at the imaging classes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}52{:}25{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}28{.}338$  you can see that the patients which would

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}52{:}28{.}338 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}30{.}744$  have the smallest kidneys don't usually

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}52{:}30{.}744 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}33{.}288$  proceed to end stage renal disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}52{:}33{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}35{.}600$  whereas the ones with larger kidneys.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}52{:}35{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}37{.}574$  Have an average age event stage at

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}52{:}37{.}574 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}40{.}072$  45 years so we can see that the the

 $00:52:40.072 \rightarrow 00:52:42.661$  size of the kidneys is a sa fairly

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}52{:}42.661 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}44.131$  good predictor of when patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

00:52:44.140 --> 00:52:46.126 are going to reach end stage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:52:46.130 \longrightarrow 00:52:48.056$  although with all of these measurements

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:52:48.056 \rightarrow 00:52:50.718$  as quite a spread here in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:52:50.718 \longrightarrow 00:52:51.699$  in the population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:52:51.700 \rightarrow 00:52:54.528$  So obviously the size of the kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}52{:}54{.}528 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}57{.}880$  is is reflecting more than just the

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:52:57.880 \rightarrow 00:52:59.940$  the germline mutation information.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:52:59.940 \rightarrow 00:53:02.852$  Probably other genetic modifiers

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00{:}53{:}02{.}852 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}06{.}492$  and other phenotypic and lifestyle.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:53:06.500 \rightarrow 00:53:08.810$  And factors that are influencing

NOTE Confidence: 0.782317843333333

 $00:53:08.810 \longrightarrow 00:53:11.120$  the severity of the disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692

 $00{:}53{:}13{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}16{.}388$  We looked at how the disease progresses

NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692

 $00{:}53{:}16.388 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}19.733$  in terms of decline in the EGFR

NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692

 $00:53:19.733 \rightarrow 00:53:22.565$  of both by these genotypic groups

- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- $00:53:22.658 \rightarrow 00:53:25.508$  and by the imaging classes here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- $00{:}53{:}25{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}27{.}028$  the kind of classical view in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- $00{:}53{:}27.028 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}28.848$  80P KD is kind of like this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- $00:53:28.850 \rightarrow 00:53:30.900$  I think, where patients have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- $00{:}53{:}30{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}32{.}950$  preserved renal function for a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- $00{:}53{:}33{.}025 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}35{.}524$  while and then it starts to decline.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- $00:53:35.530 \longrightarrow 00:53:37.343$  But we found, at least in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- $00:53:37.343 \longrightarrow 00:53:38.590$  the most severe groups,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- $00{:}53{:}38{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}40{.}726$  the patients with the largest kidneys
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- 00:53:40.726 --> 00:53:43.190 and also pick any one truncating.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- $00:53:43.190 \rightarrow 00:53:46.102$  Mutations was a decline from a fairly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- 00:53:46.102 --> 00:53:49.320 early age and in a fairly linear way.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- $00:53:49.320 \rightarrow 00:53:51.552$  For these more severe groups and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- $00{:}53{:}51{.}552 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}53{.}757$  only in the milder groups did
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692
- 00:53:53.757 -> 00:53:55.944 we see this preservation of of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692

 $00{:}53{:}55{.}944 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}58{.}392$  function and then decline later on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692

 $00{:}53{:}58{.}400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}59{.}470$  And as you see here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692

 $00:53:59.470 \longrightarrow 00:54:01.906$  the 1A not really a declining

NOTE Confidence: 0.836697217307692

 $00:54:01.906 \longrightarrow 00:54:03.530$  into to renal failure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}54{:}06{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}09{.}913$  We also looked at how the kidneys

NOTE Confidence: 0.872888561666667

00:54:09.913 --> 00:54:12.570 increase in size over time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}54{:}12{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}16{.}385$  depending again on these same groups and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:54:16.385 \longrightarrow 00:54:19.705$  and for P-80 for the different P-81 groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}54{:}19{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}21{.}924$  It was not really a significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}54{:}21{.}924 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}24{.}489$  difference in the way that the that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}54{:}24{.}489 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}27{.}243$  the the speed of the progression

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:54:27.243 \rightarrow 00:54:30.544$  of the disease for for the imaging

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}54{:}30{.}544 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}33{.}298$  class we can see some difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}54{:}33{.}387 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}36{.}299$  here with a with a lower rate of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:54:36.300 \rightarrow 00:54:39.681$  Of progression here for 1A and 1B

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

00:54:39.681 - > 00:54:43.064 compared to the 1E and 1D groups.

 $00:54:43.064 \rightarrow 00:54:46.160$  If we look at them together on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:54:46.252 \longrightarrow 00:54:49.180$  on the same slide we can see here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:54:49.180 \longrightarrow 00:54:52.274$  but I've showed you with this kind

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}54{:}52{.}274$  -->  $00{:}54{:}55{.}460$  of rapid decline in renal function in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}54{:}55{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}59{.}315$  terms of EGFR for the for the larger

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}54{:}59{.}315 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}02{.}724$  kidneys and then preserved for the for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:55:02.824 \rightarrow 00:55:06.316$  the for the for the for the smaller kidneys.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872888561666667

 $00:55:06.320 \longrightarrow 00:55:08.255$  If we look at the the genotype here we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}55{:}08.255 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}10.366$  can see there's not really a difference,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:55:10.370 \longrightarrow 00:55:12.278$  although there is a difference in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

00:55:12.278 --> 00:55:14.758 the in the start of the recordings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872888561666667

 $00:55:14.760 \longrightarrow 00:55:17.091$  Even at 20 years of age and we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}55{:}17.091 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}19.432$  see that that's even clearer here

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}55{:}19{.}432 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}21{.}040$  in the imaging classes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872888561666667

 $00{:}55{:}21.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}23.518$  so that's just telling us before 20

 $00:55:23.518 \rightarrow 00:55:25.851$  years of age during the pediatric

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:55:25.851 \rightarrow 00:55:29.071$  period that the the the rate that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:55:29.071 \rightarrow 00:55:31.549$  kidneys grow is quite a lot different

NOTE Confidence: 0.872888561666667

 $00:55:31.549 \rightarrow 00:55:34.114$  in the patients which are going to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.872888561666667

 $00:55:34.114 \rightarrow 00:55:36.518$  the worst outcomes with the largest kidneys.

NOTE Confidence: 0.872888561666667

 $00:55:36.520 \dashrightarrow 00:55:38.850$  Compared to the largest cities

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:55:38.850 \rightarrow 00:55:41.180$  compared to the smaller kidneys

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

00:55:41.262 --> 00:55:43.518 and also for PKD 1 truncation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.872888561666667

 $00:55:43.520 \longrightarrow 00:55:45.424$  they also develop more

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:55:45.424 \rightarrow 00:55:47.328$  quickly during that period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00{:}55{:}47{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}49{.}814$  So it seems like the development

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:55:49.814 \dashrightarrow 00:55:52.389$  and growth of kidneys during this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:55:52.390 \dashrightarrow 00:55:55.480$  pediatric period is important for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:55:55.480 \rightarrow 00:55:59.050$  determining the the outcomes of the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8728885616666667

 $00:55:59.050 \rightarrow 00:56:00.190$  The patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:56:02.290 \longrightarrow 00:56:04.168$  So this would be the bottom.

00:56:04.170 --> 00:56:07.166 Here would be our typical 80 P80

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

00:56:07.166 --> 00:56:09.587 pedigree where it's inherited in a

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}56{:}09{.}587 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}11{.}861$  dominant fashion of males and females

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:56:11.861 \longrightarrow 00:56:14.070$  are affected but but we don't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

00:56:14.070 --> 00:56:16.667 We quite often see this setup where

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}56{:}16{.}667 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}19{.}233$  apparently we have a a new mutation

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}56{:}19.233 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}21.774$  occurring in the in an individual here

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}56{:}21.774 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}24.210$  with sibs and the parents apparently

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:56:24.210 \longrightarrow 00:56:27.524$  unaffected and at least 10 to 20% of 80

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

00:56:27.524 --> 00:56:30.357 P80 families have this type of structure

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}56{:}30{.}357 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}33{.}057$  where we suspect that the Dinovo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}56{:}33.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}35.760$  Mutation has occurred.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}56{:}35{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}37{.}475$  One possibility with the DENOVO

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}56{:}37{.}475 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}39{.}532$  mutation is that it hasn't occurred

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:56:39.532 \longrightarrow 00:56:41.499$  in the sperm or the egg here,

 $00:56:41.500 \longrightarrow 00:56:43.714$  but it's occurred at a later

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:56:43.714 \longrightarrow 00:56:46.139$  stage of four cell stage here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}56{:}46{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}49{.}492$  and the result of that is that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}56{:}49{.}492 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}53{.}057$  patient is a mosaic of of cells that

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}56{:}53{.}057 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}56{.}302$  have the the mutation of ones that

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:56:56.302 \rightarrow 00:56:59.098$  don't have the the mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}56{:}59{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}01{.}332$  Then this has an influence on

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:57:01.332 \longrightarrow 00:57:02.820$  how the disease progresses,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}02.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}04.161$  presents and progresses.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}04{.}161 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}05{.}949$  If we look at.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}05{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}07{.}415$  That we published a paper

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

00:57:07.415 --> 00:57:08.880 a couple of years ago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}08.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}10.722$  about 20 families that with mosaicism

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}10.722 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}13.366$  and this is an example of one of them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:57:13.370 \longrightarrow 00:57:15.890$  Here, the mother is a mosaic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:57:15.890 \longrightarrow 00:57:18.146$  Can see this rather odd pattern

 $00:57:18.146 \longrightarrow 00:57:20.270$  of a rather small number,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}20{.}270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}22{.}454$  but at large assess within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:57:22.454 \longrightarrow 00:57:25.210$  kidney you can see the sun here

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}25{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}26{.}842$  has more typical presentation

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}26.842 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}29.708$  and now this is at 20 years of

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}29{.}708 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}31{.}956$  age compared to 47 years of age

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}31{.}956 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}34{.}014$  when we did the genetic analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}34.014 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}36.358$  we're able to find this insertion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}36{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}37{.}536$  Deletion mutation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:57:37.536 \longrightarrow 00:57:40.860$  That's a 50% of the cells in the sun,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:57:40.860 \longrightarrow 00:57:43.604$  but only at 17% of cells in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:57:43.604 \longrightarrow 00:57:46.099$  in the in the mother here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}46.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}49.518$  so we can see that this lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}49{.}518 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}52{.}031$  level of of mutant cells leads to

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}52{.}031 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}54{.}977$  a a milder progression of disease,

 $00:57:54.980 \rightarrow 00:57:56.740$  and if we look at the data overall,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}57{:}56{.}740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}58{.}480$  we can see that here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:57:58.480 \longrightarrow 00:58:00.136$  I hope you can see the red spots.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

00:58:00.140 --> 00:58:02.612 Here are the mosaics and the other is

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}58{:}02.612 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}04.883$  a control population of similar types

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:58:04.883 \rightarrow 00:58:06.888$  of mutations and you can see that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:58:06.890 \longrightarrow 00:58:09.225$  They tend to have preserved

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:58:09.225 \rightarrow 00:58:12.093$  kidney function and they have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

00:58:12.093 --> 00:58:14.793 smaller kidneys than we would see

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}58{:}14.793 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}17.379$  without the without the mosaicism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:58:17.380 \longrightarrow 00:58:19.290$  We're probably at least 1%

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:58:19.290 \longrightarrow 00:58:21.018$  of families with ADP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:58:21.018 \rightarrow 00:58:23.610$  KD have this type of mosaicism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00{:}58{:}23.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}25.848$  but may be more than that because

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

00:58:25.848 --> 00:58:28.386 low level of mosaicism may not get

NOTE Confidence: 0.89702069

 $00:58:28.386 \rightarrow 00:58:30.661$  into the blood cells that we usually

 $00:58:30.736 \rightarrow 00:58:32.840$  screen for pathogenic variants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

00:58:36.010 - 00:58:40.303 So as you know, by the by the name,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

00:58:40.310 --> 00:58:42.370 a PKD is normally a

NOTE Confidence: 0.828977714444444

00:58:42.370 --> 00:58:43.606 dominantly inherited disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00{:}58{:}43.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}47.234$  but sometimes it's a biallelic or

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00{:}58{:}47{.}234 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}50{.}550$  has a recessive inheritance pattern,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00{:}58{:}50{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}52{.}972$  and then you can see an example

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00:58:52.972 \rightarrow 00:58:55.820$  here in this consanguineous family.

NOTE Confidence: 0.828977714444444

 $00:58:55.820 \longrightarrow 00:58:57.945$  The only individuals that reached

NOTE Confidence: 0.828977714444444

 $00{:}58{:}57{.}945 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}00{.}884$  end stage here were ones that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00:59:00.884 \rightarrow 00:59:02.964$  homozygous for a missense change.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00{:}59{:}02{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}04{.}548$  You can see the missense change.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00{:}59{:}04{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}07{.}412$  Is it a well conceived position

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00{:}59{:}07{.}412 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}09{.}320$  in Orthodox and homologs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00{:}59{:}09{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}11{.}553$  and we can see that individuals that

00:59:11.553 - 00:59:13.992 just had one copy of this variant

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00:59:13.992 \longrightarrow 00:59:16.104$  tended to have very mild disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00:59:16.110 \longrightarrow 00:59:19.632$  like just a few cysts within

NOTE Confidence: 0.828977714444444

 $00{:}59{:}19{.}632 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}21{.}980$  the within the kidney.

NOTE Confidence: 0.828977714444444

 $00:59:21.980 \dashrightarrow 00:59:24.635$  So it was a lot of controversy about this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00{:}59{:}24.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}26.180$  People didn't really believe it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.828977714444444

 $00{:}59{:}26.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}27.130$  I guess.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

00:59:27.130 --> 00:59:30.455 So we we developed a model which

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

00:59:30.455 --> 00:59:33.072 in mimic this RC,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00:59:33.072 \dashrightarrow 00:59:41.476$  Leo and and this this showed that we have a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00{:}59{:}41{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}44{.}435$  We have this inherited slowly

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00{:}59{:}44{.}435 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}48{.}502$  inheritance of the the disease in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00{:}59{:}48{.}502 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}52{.}030$  homozygous RC animals here so that the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00:59:52.030 \rightarrow 00:59:54.125$  A disease developed slowly over

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $00:59:54.125 \longrightarrow 00:59:56.931$  the the lifetime of the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.828977714444444

 $00:59:56.931 \rightarrow 00:59:59.122$  mouse up to 12 months of age.

 $00:59:59.130 \longrightarrow 01:00:01.426$  So this showing if we if we

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

01:00:01.426 --> 01:00:03.170 had two inactivating mutations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $01:00:03.170 \rightarrow 01:00:06.350$  then the animal would die embryonically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $01:00:06.350 \longrightarrow 01:00:08.894$  And obviously if this was a

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

01:00:08.894 --> 01:00:10.590 variant of unknown significance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $01:00:10.590 \rightarrow 01:00:12.750$  we wouldn't develop polycystic kidneys.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $01:00:12.750 \longrightarrow 01:00:15.318$  So I think this is fairly good evidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.82897771444444

 $01:00:15.318 \rightarrow 01:00:17.738$  that this is a hypomorphic allele.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

01:00:19.950 --> 01:00:21.000 I don't know how to get rid

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:00:21.000 \rightarrow 01:00:21.889$  of this thing at the top.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

01:00:21.890 --> 01:00:25.934 Any good ideas? Anyway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01{:}00{:}25{.}934 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}31{.}082$  the so one other presentation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:00:31.082 \dashrightarrow 01:00:34.204$  the disease that is unusual in ADP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01{:}00{:}34{.}210 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}37{.}578$  KD is when we have very early onset

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01{:}00{:}37.578 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}40.011$  disease where where it's represents

 $01:00:40.011 \rightarrow 01:00:43.005$  very much like the recessive form

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

01:00:43.005 --> 01:00:45.830 of polycystic kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

01:00:45.830 --> 01:00:47.730 With this very large kidneys,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:00:47.730 \rightarrow 01:00:50.889$  even found in utero and this is a family

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:00:50.889 \rightarrow 01:00:53.670$  with this very early onset disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:00:53.670 \rightarrow 01:00:55.926$  They had a a typical truncating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01{:}00{:}55{.}930 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}58{.}410$  Mutation in the three individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:00:58.410 \longrightarrow 01:01:01.416$  here that had a typical presentation

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

01:01:01.416 --> 01:01:04.896 of 80 PKD but in the child here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:01:04.900 \longrightarrow 01:01:07.138$  with the in utero onset disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01{:}01{:}07{.}140 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}09{.}366$  we found that the same hypomorphic

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01{:}01{:}09{.}366 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}12{.}356$  variant that we found in the in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:01:12.356 \rightarrow 01:01:14.146$  previous family in homozygosity was

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01{:}01{:}14.146 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}16.696$  also inherited from the other allele.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:01:16.700 \longrightarrow 01:01:19.591$  So we think together these are lowering

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01{:}01{:}19{.}591 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}22{.}886$  the level of the the POLICYSTAT expression

- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- $01{:}01{:}22.886 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}26.560$  and account for this more severe disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- $01:01:26.560 \longrightarrow 01:01:27.955$  And again we mimic that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- $01:01:27.955 \longrightarrow 01:01:29.350$  situation in the mouse here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- $01:01:29.350 \longrightarrow 01:01:31.558$  where they now are C model.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- $01:01:31.560 \rightarrow 01:01:34.338$  These animals die on average around
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- $01:01:34.340 \longrightarrow 01:01:37.908$  28 days of age and you can see
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- $01:01:37.908 \longrightarrow 01:01:41.772$  by 25 days of age that the 25%
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- $01:01:41.772 \longrightarrow 01:01:43.676$  of the body weight is made
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- 01:01:43.676 --> 01:01:46.069 up of these very cystic kidneys.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- $01:01:46.070 \longrightarrow 01:01:49.486$  So again supporting this kind of level
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- 01:01:49.486 --> 01:01:52.157 of policy system being associated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- $01{:}01{:}52{.}157 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}55{.}487$  with the severity of the disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- $01{:}01{:}55{.}490 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}57{.}978$  If we look at.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- 01:01:57.980 --> 01:02:00.555 The level of polycystin expression
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769
- $01{:}02{:}00.555 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}02.615$  the functional polycystic expression.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:02:02.620 \longrightarrow 01:02:05.845$  We did this using urinary

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

01:02:05.845 --> 01:02:07.135 extracellular vesicles,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:02:07.140 \longrightarrow 01:02:09.905$  which have quite a high level of

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:02:09.905 \longrightarrow 01:02:12.677$  the the police system protein

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01{:}02{:}12.677 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}15.293$  where we can see here in the RC

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:02:15.293 \rightarrow 01:02:17.578$  model we have a a reduced level

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01{:}02{:}17.578 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}19.559$  of the protein to the back.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01{:}02{:}19{.}560 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}23{.}336$  40% of the the normal level compared to

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:02:23.336 \longrightarrow 01:02:27.910$  what we we see in the the normal situation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:02:27.910 \longrightarrow 01:02:30.682$  So we think that the level of

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:02:30.682 \longrightarrow 01:02:31.870$  the functional protein,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:02:31.870 \longrightarrow 01:02:33.240$  not the level of expression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01{:}02{:}33{.}240 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}35{.}845$  but a functional and trafficked

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:02:35.845 \rightarrow 01:02:38.450$  protein is is what's driving

NOTE Confidence: 0.931042349230769

 $01:02:38.546 \longrightarrow 01:02:40.718$  this more severe disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275

 $01{:}02{:}43.610 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}47.558$  So occasionally we see a digenic

- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- 01:02:47.558 --> 01:02:51.269 inheritance also in in any PKD.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- 01:02:51.270 --> 01:02:53.178 Your pay is described.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- 01:02:53.178 --> 01:02:55.730 A couple of pedigrees like this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01{:}02{:}55{.}730 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}58{.}318$  and this is one from the halt
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01{:}02{:}58.318 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}02.326$  PKD study from from Rome Peron.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01{:}03{:}02{.}330 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}05{.}228$  You can see that the individual here
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- 01:03:05.228 --> 01:03:08.510 has an inframe deletion of Piketty one,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:03:08.510 \rightarrow 01:03:11.033$  but a nonsense mutation in P82.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:03:11.033 \dashrightarrow 01:03:14.450$  You can see the age at end stage here 43.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:03:14.450 \longrightarrow 01:03:17.938$  Here so 10 to 15 years earlier than
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- 01:03:17.938 --> 01:03:20.199 typical for P-81 truncating change.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01{:}03{:}20{.}199 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}23{.}440$  Can see that the child here at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01{:}03{:}23{.}528 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}25{.}892$  six months was already had cysts
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:03:25.892 \longrightarrow 01:03:28.759$  in the in the kidney,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01{:}03{:}28{.}760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}31{.}448$  so we think that the combination of these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275

- $01:03:31.448 \rightarrow 01:03:33.620$  variants makes the disease more severe,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:03:33.620 \longrightarrow 01:03:36.002$  although not to the early very
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:03:36.002 \rightarrow 01:03:39.276$  early onset we see with the second
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- 01:03:39.276 --> 01:03:41.408 hypomorphic PICKITY 1 variant.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01{:}03{:}41{.}410 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}42{.}300$  And again,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01{:}03{:}42{.}300 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}45{.}860$  we're able to mimic this type of digenic NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- -----
- 01:03:45.947 --> 01:03:49.862 inheritance using Steve's Piketty 2 WS,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:03:49.862 \longrightarrow 01:03:54.868$  25 minus model and RP81 RC model.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:03:54.870 \longrightarrow 01:03:57.010$  Both of these by themselves
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:03:57.010 \rightarrow 01:03:58.722$  have rather mild disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:03:58.730 \longrightarrow 01:04:00.410$  but if we combine them together,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:04:00.410 \longrightarrow 01:04:02.462$  we see that we have this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:04:02.462 \longrightarrow 01:04:03.830$  much more severe disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01{:}04{:}03.830 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}06.550$  So we think that the.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01{:}04{:}06.550 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}08.374$  The the functional consequence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:04:08.374 \longrightarrow 01:04:11.110$  is of of of a.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:04:11.110 \longrightarrow 01:04:13.133$  The level of both of these genes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- 01:04:13.133 --> 01:04:15.192 is important to the to the severity
- NOTE Confidence: 0.67567700275
- $01:04:15.192 \longrightarrow 01:04:16.890$  of the disease that we see.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01{:}04{:}19{.}810 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}22{.}570$  And if we look at.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01{:}04{:}22.570 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}25.734$  Western blot of these animals with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01:04:25.734 \rightarrow 01:04:27.590$  the P-81 and Piketty 2 mutation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01:04:27.590 \longrightarrow 01:04:32.343$  If we look at and the situation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01:04:32.343 \longrightarrow 01:04:36.220$  normally this is the the the.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01:04:36.220 \longrightarrow 01:04:38.490$  This is the mature form
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01:04:38.490 \longrightarrow 01:04:40.760$  of of polycystin 1 here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01{:}04{:}40.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}43.680$  This is the immature form of photosystem one.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01{:}04{:}43.680 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}46.578$  We went for use and OH is cut down
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01{:}04{:}46.578 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}49.660$  to a smaller form and this is PNG's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01{:}04{:}49{.}660 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}52{.}460$  here removing all of the sugars and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01:04:52.460 \longrightarrow 01:04:55.457$  the see if we look at peak 82 now
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

 $01:04:55.457 \rightarrow 01:04:58.242$  sells or we see that we don't see

NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

 $01{:}04{:}58{.}242 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}00{.}760$  this mature form of of police system NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

 $01{:}05{:}00.760 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}03.640$  and one so police system one is not NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

 $01:05:03.720 \rightarrow 01:05:06.366$  able to traffic and mature properly. NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

01:05:06.370 --> 01:05:09.646 D2 is is not present and if we lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

01:05:09.646  $-\!\!>$  01:05:12.350 the level of P82 to half the level,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

 $01{:}05{:}12.350 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}14.968$  we see a reduced level by about

NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

01:05:14.970 --> 01:05:17.938 25% of the the mature form of

NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

 $01{:}05{:}17{.}938 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}20{.}869$  the the polycystin one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

01:05:20.870 --> 01:05:23.939 If we add in this RC Elio here we

NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

 $01{:}05{:}23{.}939 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}26{.}134$  further lower this mature level

NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

 $01{:}05{:}26.134 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}28.780$  and the situation is a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

 $01{:}05{:}28.870 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}30.870$  bit complicated here because

NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

 $01{:}05{:}30.870 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}33.870$  the RC allele also inhibits the

NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

 $01:05:33.870 \longrightarrow 01:05:36.048$  the the normal cleavage of the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376

 $01:05:36.050 \rightarrow 01:05:38.717$  Phone system protein at this point here,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01:05:38.720 \rightarrow 01:05:41.015$  so we see more of the full length,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01{:}05{:}41{.}020 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}43{.}524$  which we also think is is not a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01:05:43.524 \longrightarrow 01:05:45.365$  functional form of other polar
- NOTE Confidence: 0.91436376
- $01:05:45.365 \rightarrow 01:05:46.889$  system in this situation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363
- $01{:}05{:}50{.}050 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}52{.}684$  So we've used this interaction between
- NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363
- $01{:}05{:}52.684 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}55.544$  policies and one and policies and two
- NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363
- $01{:}05{:}55{.}544 \dashrightarrow 01{:}05{:}58{.}421$  to develop and and in vivo in vitro
- NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363
- $01:05:58.421 \rightarrow 01:06:01.235$  assay to assay different variants to see
- NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363
- $01:06:01.235 \dashrightarrow 01:06:05.160$  if they are likely to be pathogenic.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363
- $01{:}06{:}05{.}160 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}08{.}538$  So here was expressing these are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363
- $01{:}06{:}08.538 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}11.338$  expressing full length constructs which
- NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363
- $01{:}06{:}11{.}338 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}13{.}858$  are tagged full length policy system,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363
- $01:06:13.858 \dashrightarrow 01:06:16.660$  one for full length policy system two NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363
- $01:06:16.660 \rightarrow 01:06:18.865$  and then if we express them together
- NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363
- $01{:}06{:}18.865 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}21.277$  we can see we find this surface
- NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363

01:06:21.277 --> 01:06:23.339 localized form of a police system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363

 $01{:}06{:}23.339 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}26.131$  So if we measure this level of of

NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363

01:06:26.131 --> 01:06:28.856 surface policy system one it gives us

NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363

 $01{:}06{:}28.856 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}31.496$  an indication of whether the the variant

NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363

 $01{:}06{:}31.496 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}34.514$  we're looking at is able to fold and traffic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363

01:06:34.514 --> 01:06:37.010 That to the surface of the cell and

NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363

01:06:37.075 --> 01:06:39.467 we're kind of using the surface of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363

 $01{:}06{:}39{.}467 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}42{.}392$  cell as a surrogate here for for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.724874363

 $01{:}06{:}42.392 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}44.650$  ciliary localization of these proteins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125

 $01{:}06{:}46{.}810 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}50{.}154$  If we look at variants that are either NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125

 $01{:}06{:}50{.}154 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}52{.}847$  truncating or strongly predicted to

NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125

01:06:52.847 --> 01:06:56.015 be pathogenic changes, we don't see

NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125

 $01{:}06{:}56.015 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}58.805$  much as surplus police system one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125

 $01{:}06{:}58{.}810 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}01{.}130$  These are some of the weaker variants and

NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125

 $01{:}07{:}01{.}130 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}03{.}766$  I said right showed you earlier and they

NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125

01:07:03.766 --> 01:07:06.128 kind of dividing into two groups here,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01:07:06.130 \longrightarrow 01:07:09.007$  ones that seem to be fully inactivating
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01{:}07{:}09{.}007 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}11{.}907$  one and ones that seem to be much
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01{:}07{:}11{.}907 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}14{.}128$  weaker and have a a significant
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01:07:14.128 \rightarrow 01:07:16.898$  level of surface polycystin 1.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01:07:16.900 \rightarrow 01:07:18.856$  Some of these are splicing mutations,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01{:}07{:}18.860 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}22.289$  so this is a maybe explain it or explaining
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01:07:22.289 \longrightarrow 01:07:25.275$  why these don't seem to be altered.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01:07:25.280 \longrightarrow 01:07:29.762$  If we look at the some of the potential
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- 01:07:29.762 --> 01:07:32.314 hypomorphic alleles like the R3277C,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01{:}07{:}32{.}314 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}35{.}466$  we can see that the level of surface
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01:07:35.466 \rightarrow 01:07:38.795$  localization of that is is somewhere again
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01:07:38.795 \rightarrow 01:07:40.703$  intermediate between fully inactivating
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01:07:40.777 \rightarrow 01:07:43.059$  and and the wild type level here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01{:}07{:}43.060 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}44.980$  so that at a lower level we can
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125
- $01{:}07{:}44.980 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}46.600$  see that for some of these.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87055269125

 $01:07:46.600 \rightarrow 01:07:50.780$  Other hypomorphic marker variance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01:07:54.520 \longrightarrow 01:07:55.940$  If we so this is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01{:}07{:}55{.}940 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}58{.}766$  I think this data is showing that a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

01:07:58.766 --> 01:08:01.557 of polycystin one and two variants,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01:08:01.560 \longrightarrow 01:08:04.956$  even if they're even if they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

01:08:04.956 --> 01:08:08.059 missense changes are are actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01:08:08.059 \rightarrow 01:08:12.475$  folding and trafficking mutations and and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01:08:12.480 \longrightarrow 01:08:15.168$  and the reason that they're they're non

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

01:08:15.168 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:08:17.738 functional is because that they don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01{:}08{:}17.738 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}19.538$  fold and trafficker appropriately.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01{:}08{:}19.540 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}21.742$  Interestingly, if we treat the cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01:08:21.742 \rightarrow 01:08:24.751$  at a lower level at 30 degrees, so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

01:08:24.751 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:08:28.188 Give more chance for these the

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01{:}08{:}28{.}188 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}31{.}383$  protein to fold and traffic we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01{:}08{:}31{.}383 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}35{.}718$  see that for a start the level of a

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01:08:35.718 \rightarrow 01:08:38.780$  surplus polycystin one is a wild type.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01:08:38.780 \longrightarrow 01:08:42.092$  It is increased and you can see
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01:08:42.092 \longrightarrow 01:08:44.170$  for a lot of other variants that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01:08:44.170 \longrightarrow 01:08:45.705$  we see within the gene,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01{:}08{:}45{.}710 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}47{.}990$  including some that are strongly
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01:08:47.990 \longrightarrow 01:08:50.195$  predicted to be pathogenic.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01{:}08{:}50{.}195 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}55{.}205$  We see then some surface protein.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01{:}08{:}55{.}210 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}57{.}472$  From these and also the same
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01:08:57.472 \longrightarrow 01:08:59.770$  for policies in two variants,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- 01:08:59.770 --> 01:09:01.894 some maintain and completely
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01:09:01.894 \longrightarrow 01:09:03.487$  inactivated if we.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01{:}09{:}03{.}490 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}05{.}098$  If we use this lower temperature
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- 01:09:05.098 --> 01:09:07.121 for the level of police system two
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01:09:07.121 \longrightarrow 01:09:08.909$  is increased and the wild type,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01{:}09{:}08{.}910 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}10{.}640$  but also some other variants.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309
- $01:09:10.640 \longrightarrow 01:09:13.853$  So this suggests to us that a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

01:09:13.853 --> 01:09:16.233 chaperone type treatment that enables

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

01:09:16.233 --> 01:09:18.987 the policy system one in particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01:09:18.987 \longrightarrow 01:09:21.859$  to to fold more efficiently.

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01:09:21.860 \longrightarrow 01:09:25.024$  May be a useful therapy for some

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01:09:25.024 \rightarrow 01:09:27.140$  patients with missing changes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01:09:27.140 \longrightarrow 01:09:29.898$  and since the level of wild type

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

01:09:29.898 --> 01:09:32.437 polar system one is also increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01{:}09{:}32{.}437 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}34{.}895$  and I think that there's evidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01{:}09{:}34.895 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}37.774$  that wild type polar system one may NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

01:09:37.774 --> 01:09:40.084 be also important within the within

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01{:}09{:}40.084 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}42.901$  the kidney and the ad PKD kidney that NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

01:09:42.901 --> 01:09:45.435 this may be helpful even in patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.82312309

 $01{:}09{:}45{.}435 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}47{.}865$  with a with a truncating variant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01{:}09{:}51{.}140 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}54{.}388$  We can also get complex alleles in in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01{:}09{:}54{.}390 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}58{.}002$  This is a situation where we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01{:}09{:}58{.}002 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}00{.}295$  more more than one variant insist

 $01:10:00.295 \longrightarrow 01:10:03.029$  that is a that is generating the

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01{:}10{:}03.029 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}05.669$  the pathogenic allele and we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01:10:05.669 \rightarrow 01:10:08.478$  see three different variants here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

01:10:08.480 --> 01:10:12.414 including our favorite, our 3277C,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01{:}10{:}12{.}414 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}15{.}172$  and we can see that was found

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01:10:15.172 \longrightarrow 01:10:18.250$  in two different families here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01:10:18.250 \longrightarrow 01:10:20.510$  Conceived from the segregation that

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01:10:20.510 \longrightarrow 01:10:23.250$  they're insists rather than in trans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01:10:23.250 \longrightarrow 01:10:25.975$  and these patients have fairly

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

01:10:25.975 --> 01:10:27.610 typical AD PKD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01{:}10{:}27.610 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}29.698$  Although we know that this variant

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01:10:29.698 \longrightarrow 01:10:32.423$  by itself only leads to just a few

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01:10:32.423 \longrightarrow 01:10:34.003$  cents developing in the kidney.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

01:10:34.010 --> 01:10:36.166 Again, if we look at the level

NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125

 $01:10:36.166 \longrightarrow 01:10:37.769$  of surface policies to 1 here,

- $01:10:37.770 \longrightarrow 01:10:39.670$  you can see that that's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125
- $01:10:39.670 \longrightarrow 01:10:41.722$  significantly reduced to the R3277C.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125
- 01:10:41.722 --> 01:10:44.276 The other two variants reduced,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125
- $01:10:44.276 \longrightarrow 01:10:46.406$  but to a lesser extent.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125
- $01{:}10{:}46{.}410 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}48{.}080$  But if we look at.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125
- $01:10:48.080 \longrightarrow 01:10:49.885$  3 variants together or even
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125
- $01:10:49.885 \longrightarrow 01:10:51.329$  two of these variants.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125
- $01{:}10{:}51{.}330 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}53{.}754$  Together we can see this brings it down
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125
- $01:10:53.754 \rightarrow 01:10:56.158$  to pretty much an inactivating allele,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125
- $01:10:56.160 \rightarrow 01:10:59.088$  so that's why we feel that these patients NOTE Confidence: 0.80017193125
- 01:10:59.088 --> 01:11:02.190 have a a typical ADP KD presentation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- $01{:}11{:}04.890 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}09.228$  So this brings us to our thought that a NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- $01{:}11{:}09{.}228 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}13{.}542$  PKD is a a dosage related disorder that NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- 01:11:13.542 --> 01:11:16.358 the level of functional policies to one is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- $01{:}11{:}16.358 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}18.747$  important for the severity of the disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- 01:11:18.750 --> 01:11:20.715 If we have one inactivating

- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- 01:11:20.715 --> 01:11:22.858 allele about a 50% reduction,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- 01:11:22.858 --> 01:11:26.266 we get this adult onset disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- 01:11:26.270 --> 01:11:28.265 If we add on a hypomorphic allele,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- $01:11:28.270 \longrightarrow 01:11:30.310$  we can have more severe disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- 01:11:30.310 --> 01:11:33.660 The hypomorphic allele by itself.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- $01:11:33.660 \longrightarrow 01:11:35.276$  Results in milder disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- 01:11:35.276 01:11:37.700 Then we can have some variants
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- $01:11:37.779 \longrightarrow 01:11:39.199$  that fit in between,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- $01:11:39.200 \longrightarrow 01:11:40.720$  so although they're petty,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- 01:11:40.720 --> 01:11:42.620 one variance the disease can
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- 01:11:42.620 --> 01:11:44.398 be more like PKD 2.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- 01:11:44.398 --> 01:11:46.612 That doesn't mean that there's not
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- $01{:}11{:}46.612 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}49.503$  a lot of other stochastic germline
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- 01:11:49.503 --> 01:11:52.093 and somatic genetic variants that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265
- $01{:}11{:}52.093 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}55.192$  are in kidney damage that are also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265

 $01:11:55.192 \rightarrow 01:11:57.852$  modifying the way that the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.799546265

 $01:11:57.852 \rightarrow 01:11:59.836$  disease presents and progresses.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

 $01:12:03.500 \longrightarrow 01:12:07.196$  So there's other forms of a PKD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

01:12:07.200 --> 01:12:08.670 This is H and F1,

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

 $01{:}12{:}08.670 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}11.094$  beta associated kidney disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

 $01{:}12{:}11{.}094 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}15{.}301$  which can also result in an ADP

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

 $01:12:15.301 \longrightarrow 01:12:18.535$  KD phenotype with H and F1 beta.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

 $01:12:18.540 \longrightarrow 01:12:20.828$  We we see that we have a wide

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

 $01{:}12{:}20.828 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}23.070$  range of different phenotypes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

01:12:23.070 --> 01:12:26.706 so as a transcription factor modulating

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

 $01:12:26.706 \longrightarrow 01:12:29.336$  the expression of many genes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

 $01:12:29.340 \longrightarrow 01:12:31.164$  including ones associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

 $01{:}12{:}31{.}164 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}34{.}204$  with PKD one or with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

01:12:34.210 --> 01:12:36.954 A arpkd, but in some cases we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

 $01:12:36.954 \rightarrow 01:12:39.097$  find a presentation that really

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

 $01:12:39.097 \rightarrow 01:12:42.825$  mimics what we see in in 80P KD

 $01:12:42.825 \rightarrow 01:12:45.549$  with multiple cysts in the kidney,

NOTE Confidence: 0.707868942857143

 $01{:}12{:}45{.}550 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}49{.}590$  but are rather limited other phenotypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

 $01{:}12{:}52{.}440 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}56{.}436$  So a few years ago we published a paper NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

 $01{:}12{:}56{.}436 \dashrightarrow 01{:}12{:}59{.}052$  saying there was a number of paper

NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

01:12:59.052 --> 01:13:01.340 number of families that were published

NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

 $01:13:01.340 \longrightarrow 01:13:04.220$  in the 1990s that suggested that

NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

 $01:13:04.220 \longrightarrow 01:13:07.214$  there were unlinked to P-81 and P82.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

01:13:07.214 --> 01:13:10.280 So suggesting there may be other genes

NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

 $01:13:10.370 \rightarrow 01:13:13.490$  for for a PKD we found in four out of NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

 $01:13:13.575 \rightarrow 01:13:17.079$  five of these families that if we look

NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

 $01{:}13{:}17{.}079 \dashrightarrow 01{:}13{:}19{.}732$  carefully for the pathogenic variant and

NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

 $01{:}13{:}19.732 \dashrightarrow 01{:}13{:}22.850$  beginning one and Piketty 2 and also.

NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

01:13:22.850 --> 01:13:25.535 I revisited the linkage sometimes

NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

 $01{:}13{:}25{.}535 \dashrightarrow 01{:}13{:}27{.}683$  with newly collected samples,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315

 $01:13:27.690 \longrightarrow 01:13:30.230$  we could show that.

- 01:13:30.230 --> 01:13:31.847 And most of them were either Piketty,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315
- $01:13:31.850 \longrightarrow 01:13:33.482$  one or Piketty 2,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315
- $01:13:33.482 \longrightarrow 01:13:36.930$  although there was one that was unresolved.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315
- $01:13:36.930 \rightarrow 01:13:39.468$  We said maybe prep rather prematurely
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315
- $01:13:39.468 \rightarrow 01:13:42.507$  at that stage that this reanalysis does
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315
- $01{:}13{:}42.507 \dashrightarrow 01{:}13{:}45.468$  not support the the existence of a.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315
- $01{:}13{:}45{.}470 \dashrightarrow 01{:}13{:}47{.}510$  P-83 and and as we know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315
- $01{:}13{:}47{.}510 \dashrightarrow 01{:}13{:}50{.}107$  since that time there's been several genes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846094315
- $01:13:50.107 \rightarrow 01:13:53.538$  that are mimic the the AD PKD phenotype.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- 01:13:56.290 --> 01:13:59.104 So from work from Steve's group
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- $01{:}13{:}59{.}104 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}02{.}345$  and Josh Drents Group A different
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- $01{:}14{:}02{.}345 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}05{.}530$  disease that AutoZone will dominant
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- 01:14:05.530 --> 01:14:08.241 polycystic liver disease is due
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- 01:14:08.241 --> 01:14:10.350 to either PRK or the major LOCI,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- 01:14:10.350 --> 01:14:13.662 or PRK, CSH and sex 63.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- $01:14:13.662 \rightarrow 01:14:15.846$  We're going to see the presentation here.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- 01:14:15.850 --> 01:14:19.329 A very large liver but rather limited
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- $01:14:19.329 \rightarrow 01:14:22.609$  cyst within the within the kidney,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- $01{:}14{:}22.610 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}24.666$  and these proteins are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- 01:14:24.666 --> 01:14:26.208 involved in trafficking.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- 01:14:26.210 --> 01:14:29.390 Or glycosylation unfolding and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- $01:14:29.390 \longrightarrow 01:14:33.365$  quality control of a membrane
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- $01:14:33.365 \longrightarrow 01:14:35.330$  and and secreted proteins.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- $01:14:35.330 \longrightarrow 01:14:38.060$  And it seems like a polar system.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- 01:14:38.060 --> 01:14:39.792 One is particularly vulnerable
- NOTE Confidence: 0.753784392625
- 01:14:39.792 --> 01:14:42.390 to a defects in this pathway.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- 01:14:44.760 --> 01:14:46.800 We did some whole exome sequencing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01:14:46.800 \longrightarrow 01:14:49.631$  a number of years ago on a rather
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01:14:49.631 \longrightarrow 01:14:51.035$  limited number of families.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- 01:14:51.040 --> 01:14:53.168 I I was somewhat skeptical that there
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01:14:53.168 \rightarrow 01:14:55.460$  was other genes for 80 PKD at the time,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01:14:55.460 \longrightarrow 01:14:57.675$  but the postdoc during the

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}14{:}57{.}675 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}59{.}447$  study was very persistent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

01:14:59.450 --> 01:15:03.573 We found a missense change in Ghana

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01:15:03.573 \longrightarrow 01:15:07.369$  hub here in in one patient with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}15{:}07{.}369 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}10{.}050$  cyst within the kidney and also a

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01:15:10.132 \longrightarrow 01:15:13.205$  cyst within the liver in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01:15:13.205 \rightarrow 01:15:15.480$  two individuals within the family.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01:15:15.480 \longrightarrow 01:15:16.900$  She is a missense change.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}15{:}16{.}900 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}19{.}690$  It was difficult to know whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

01:15:19.690 --> 01:15:21.085 it was significant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}15{:}21.090 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}24.429$  but this was a great candidate because

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}15{:}24{.}430 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}26{.}626$  it was the binding partner here

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}15{:}26.626 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}29.413$  the glucose stays out for subunit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}15{:}29{.}413 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}32{.}779$  Here binding with the glycosidase fetus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}15{:}32{.}780 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}34{.}622$  So obviously a great candidate and

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01:15:34.622 \rightarrow 01:15:36.777$  by going on and doing sequencing

- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- 01:15:36.777 --> 01:15:38.067 of other families,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01:15:38.070 \rightarrow 01:15:41.382$  we were able to find other families with ADP,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- 01:15:41.390 --> 01:15:45.796 KD and AD. PLD has has Whitney.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01{:}15{:}45{.}796 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}51{.}610$  Let's see here in the associated with a PLD.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01{:}15{:}51{.}610 \dashrightarrow 01{:}15{:}53{.}998$  If we look at ourselves that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- 01:15:53.998 --> 01:15:56.530 don't have a again and again,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01:15:56.530 \longrightarrow 01:15:59.440$  we see that the policy system
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01:15:59.440 \longrightarrow 01:16:02.900$  mature form is not really a found
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01:16:02.900 \longrightarrow 01:16:05.301$  and this is kind of in contrast
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01:16:05.301 \longrightarrow 01:16:08.104$  what we see with some other control
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01{:}16{:}08{.}104 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}11{.}062$  proteins where we see the the the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01{:}16{:}11{.}062 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}13{.}228$  level that is that is not mature.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01{:}16{:}13.228 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}16.380$  It is only a small part of the total amount
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01{:}16{:}16{.}380 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}19{.}229$  of protein compared to to polar system one.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222
- $01:16:19.230 \rightarrow 01:16:22.026$  And even in the heterozygous phenotypes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01:16:22.030 \longrightarrow 01:16:23.980$  So the phenotype that we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01:16:23.980 \longrightarrow 01:16:25.540$  seeing here in patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}16{:}25{.}540 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}28{.}591$  we can see that the the level of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01:16:28.591 \rightarrow 01:16:31.814$  the mature form of the the policy

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}16{:}31{.}814 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}34{.}879$  system one is is already decreased.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

01:16:34.880 --> 01:16:38.080 And if we look at scanner negative cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}16{:}38{.}080 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}40{.}096$  we can see that police system two

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01:16:40.096 \rightarrow 01:16:41.860$  that's normally found on the stellium.

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}16{:}41.860 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}44.856$  We didn't find localised to the cilium

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01{:}16{:}44.856 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}47.844$  in these neural cells, so as I say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01:16:47.844 \rightarrow 01:16:49.274$  it seems that polar system,

NOTE Confidence: 0.863205862222222

 $01:16:49.280 \longrightarrow 01:16:51.408$  one in particular is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7716242876

01:16:53.430 --> 01:16:56.664 Is primed or is particularly susceptible

NOTE Confidence: 0.7716242876

 $01{:}16{:}56{.}664 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}58{.}820$  to folding defects associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.7716242876

 $01:16:58.904 \rightarrow 01:17:01.139$  with defects in this pathway?

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

 $01:17:03.180 \rightarrow 01:17:08.070$  So Whitney again published a couple

01:17:08.070 --> 01:17:10.100 of years ago or several years ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

 $01:17:10.100 \longrightarrow 01:17:14.572$  Now that LG eight was a also a

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

01:17:14.572 --> 01:17:18.088 form of polycystic liver disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

01:17:18.088 --> 01:17:20.776 and we think that the phenotype is

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

 $01:17:20.776 \longrightarrow 01:17:23.490$  not only a polycystic liver but

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

01:17:23.490 --> 01:17:25.740 also of polycystic kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

 $01:17:25.740 \longrightarrow 01:17:28.812$  This is a a family here with three

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

 $01{:}17{:}28.812 \dashrightarrow 01{:}17{:}30.639$  affected individuals who can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

01:17:30.639 - 01:17:32.935 that they have cysts in the kidney,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

 $01:17:32.940 \longrightarrow 01:17:36.190$  but interestingly. Are the few.

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

 $01:17:36.190 \longrightarrow 01:17:38.860$  This in the in the liver.

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

 $01{:}17{:}38{.}860 \dashrightarrow 01{:}17{:}40{.}798$  The cysts the interestingly a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

 $01{:}17{:}40.798 \dashrightarrow 01{:}17{:}43.462$  of the time seemed to be more in the NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

 $01:17:43.462 \rightarrow 01:17:45.639$  left kidney than the right kidney,

NOTE Confidence: 0.52897483

 $01:17:45.640 \longrightarrow 01:17:47.920$  and we're not sure completely

- $01:17:47.920 \longrightarrow 01:17:49.744$  sure why that is.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:17:52.290 \longrightarrow 01:17:55.918$  The one family from our and that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- 01:17:55.918 --> 01:17:58.282 reanalysis of of P-83 families.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- 01:17:58.282 --> 01:18:00.262 Hispanic or Spanish family that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- 01:18:00.262 --> 01:18:02.349 where we didn't find Piketty,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:02.350 \longrightarrow 01:18:03.730$  one of Piketty 2 variants,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:03.730 \longrightarrow 01:18:07.447$  interestingly has an LG 8 variant here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:07.450 \rightarrow 01:18:09.830$  which segregates with the disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- 01:18:09.830 --> 01:18:12.200 although it indicates that there's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:12.200 \longrightarrow 01:18:14.096$  another affected individual in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01{:}18{:}14.096 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}16.535$  the family and this individual on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01{:}18{:}16{.}535 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}19{.}242$  ultrasound has a a couple of cysts
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:19.242 \longrightarrow 01:18:21.107$  within the within the kidney.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01{:}18{:}21{.}110 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}23.096$  Interestingly, there's a couple of other.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:23.100 \rightarrow 01:18:25.695$  Variance but in in ciliopathy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:25.695 \rightarrow 01:18:29.455$  genes which also so these will be

- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:29.455 \longrightarrow 01:18:32.678$  recessive variants which are also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- 01:18:32.678 --> 01:18:35.366 segregating or partially segregating
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:35.370 \longrightarrow 01:18:37.350$  with the disease in the family.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:37.350 \longrightarrow 01:18:39.852$  So we think that these other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:39.852 \longrightarrow 01:18:42.348$  factors may be influencing the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:42.348 \rightarrow 01:18:46.062$  severity of the disease and maybe
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01{:}18{:}46.062 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}49.194$  determining whether single a LG 8
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:49.194 \rightarrow 01:18:51.888$  variants are shown to be pathogenic.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01{:}18{:}51{.}890 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}54{.}290$  If we look at the the families that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:18:54.290 \rightarrow 01:18:55.889$  we've collected with a LG eight,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- 01:18:55.890 01:18:59.193 we can see that on the whole they have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- 01:18:59.193 --> 01:19:01.972 fairly preserved renal function and a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01:19:01.972 \rightarrow 01:19:07.222$  milder than what we expect for PKD 2 and a,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- 01:19:07.222 --> 01:19:09.166 LGH LLG nine,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792
- $01{:}19{:}09{.}170 \dashrightarrow 01{:}19{:}11{.}925$  which Whitney also described as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792

01:19:11.925 --> 01:19:16.409 an AD PKD gene a few years ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792

 $01{:}19{:}16{.}410 \dashrightarrow 01{:}19{:}19{.}098$  We also found another number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792

01:19:19.098 --> 01:19:21.678 families with this change, and again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792

 $01:19:21.678 \longrightarrow 01:19:22.072$  the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792

01:19:22.072 --> 01:19:24.830 The the disease is maybe a

NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792

 $01:19:24.917 \longrightarrow 01:19:27.485$  little bit more severe on average

NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792

01:19:27.485 --> 01:19:30.399 than we see with with the LGH,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792

 $01:19:30.400 \longrightarrow 01:19:32.270$  although most of the patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792

 $01:19:32.270 \longrightarrow 01:19:33.766$  have preserved renal function,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792

 $01{:}19{:}33{.}770 \dashrightarrow 01{:}19{:}36{.}032$  but obviously some have a decline

NOTE Confidence: 0.837387792

 $01:19:36.032 \longrightarrow 01:19:37.960$  in in renal function here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01:19:40.190 \longrightarrow 01:19:45.291$  We did some work with John Sayer of the UK

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01:19:45.291 \rightarrow 01:19:49.066$  Biobank and the genome England 100,000.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

01:19:49.066 --> 01:19:51.064 Genome Project England.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01:19:51.064 \rightarrow 01:19:54.394 100,000$  genomes project and looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01{:}19{:}54{.}394 \dashrightarrow 01{:}19{:}58{.}446$  at the UK Biobank to start with here

- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01:19:58.446 \rightarrow 01:20:01.726$  we're looking at patients that have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- 01:20:01.726 --> 01:20:04.681 a rare variance with truncating
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01{:}20{:}04.681 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}07.007$  mutations in this particular gene,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01:20:07.007 \rightarrow 01:20:09.660$  and then we're looking at the ICD
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01:20:09.731 \longrightarrow 01:20:12.047$  codes here for either policy or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01:20:12.047 \longrightarrow 01:20:14.060$  cystic kidney disease or other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01:20:14.060 \rightarrow 01:20:16.420$  diseases of the kidney, which you,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01:20:16.420 \rightarrow 01:20:19.460$  which also includes some cysts of the kidney.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01{:}20{:}19{.}460 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}22{.}960$  And also you know. Proposed.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- 01:20:22.960 --> 01:20:24.484 Acquired cystic disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01:20:24.484 \longrightarrow 01:20:25.500$  For instance,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01{:}20{:}25{.}500 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}28{.}069$  we can see that there's an enrichment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01{:}20{:}28.069 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}30.322$  here in the the cases compared
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01{:}20{:}30{.}322 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}32{.}835$  to the controls for a LG 8IN.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01:20:32.840 \longrightarrow 01:20:35.678$  In both of these two populations,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01:20:35.680 \rightarrow 01:20:39.124$  although we can see there's a greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01:20:39.124 \longrightarrow 01:20:42.496$  enrichment here for a LG nine in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01{:}20{:}42.496 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}45.520$  the cases compared to the the controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01:20:45.520 \longrightarrow 01:20:48.656$  If we look at the Genome Genomics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

01:20:48.660 --> 01:20:51.204 England project and again look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

01:20:51.204 --> 01:20:53.358 loss of function variants compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01{:}20{:}53.358 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}55.638$  to the to the total alleles,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01{:}20{:}55.640 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}58.230$  we can see that these are again

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01:20:58.230 \longrightarrow 01:21:00.757$  enriched in the in the cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01:21:00.760 \longrightarrow 01:21:03.835$  The cystic kidney disease cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

01:21:03.835 --> 01:21:06.952 compared to the to the controls

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01:21:06.952 \longrightarrow 01:21:09.920$  here and likewise for a LG 9.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

01:21:09.920 --> 01:21:10.372 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01:21:10.372 \longrightarrow 01:21:12.180$  these variants are especially

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01{:}21{:}12{.}180 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}15{.}549$  for a OG eight are quite common.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889

 $01:21:15.550 \longrightarrow 01:21:17.342$  Within the population

- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- 01:21:17.342 --> 01:21:18.238 truncating variants,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01:21:18.240 \longrightarrow 01:21:20.956$  so I think that they don't always
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- 01:21:20.956 --> 01:21:24.107 result in a in a cystic phenotype,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01:21:24.110 \longrightarrow 01:21:27.670$  and that may be that we need other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01{:}21{:}27.670 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}30.209$  variants to before we these.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- 01:21:30.210 --> 01:21:32.890 These diseases are are manifested,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01:21:32.890 \longrightarrow 01:21:35.284$  so we might want to consider these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01:21:35.284 \rightarrow 01:21:38.716$  more like a maybe a riskily old than
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761560978888889
- $01{:}21{:}38.716 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}41.237$  a complete monogenic form of of a PKD.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.776174080909091
- $01{:}21{:}44.050 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}46.582$  We also described a few years
- NOTE Confidence: 0.776174080909091
- 01:21:46.582 --> 01:21:48.860 ago with Emily Kornak Gugel.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01{:}21{:}51{.}550 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}54{.}130$  Using whole exome sequencing again,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01{:}21{:}54{.}130 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}57{.}660$  a family which had a a DNA JB 11 variant.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01{:}21{:}57.660 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}00.444$  So this is a a coach chaperone protein
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01:22:00.444 \longrightarrow 01:22:03.944$  that works with deep in the in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01{:}22{:}03{.}944 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}06{.}581$  Plasmic reticulum and again plays a role

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:22:06.581 \rightarrow 01:22:09.430$  in the folding and trafficking of proteins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:22:09.430 \longrightarrow 01:22:12.790$  This time the phenotype is of smaller

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:22:12.790 \rightarrow 01:22:16.468$  kidneys with with multiple cysts in them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:22:16.470 \longrightarrow 01:22:18.282$  but in the older individuals we

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01{:}22{:}18{.}282 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}20{.}419$  can see we see a decline in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01{:}22{:}20{.}420 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}22{.}850$  In renal function this missense

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:22:22.850 \rightarrow 01:22:24.576$  change again missense change.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01{:}22{:}24.576 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}27.460$  It difficult to know whether it's pathogenic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:22:27.460 \longrightarrow 01:22:30.208$  but it wasn't a very preserved

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01{:}22{:}30{.}208 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}32{.}780$  conserved site within the protein.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:22:32.780 \longrightarrow 01:22:35.685$  Again, we're able to go on and

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01{:}22{:}35{.}685 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}37{.}810$  find additional families and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:22:37.810 \longrightarrow 01:22:39.810$  Emily recently has published a

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:22:39.810 \longrightarrow 01:22:42.416$  a wider range of 77 families,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

01:22:42.416 --> 01:22:44.806 77 patients from 27 pedigrees,

 $01{:}22{:}44.806 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}47.895$  and we can see that they have a rather

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:22:47.895 \rightarrow 01:22:50.445$  consistent phenotype where they have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

01:22:50.450 --> 01:22:52.682 Preserve renal function and maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01{:}22{:}52.682 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}55.379$  just a few cysts and without kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01{:}22{:}55{.}379$  -->  $01{:}22{:}58{.}393$  enlargement up until 50 years of age and NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:22:58.393 \rightarrow 01:23:00.994$  then we can see we see this decline in

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:23:01.000 \rightarrow 01:23:03.816$  renal function so that the age at end

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:23:03.816 \rightarrow 01:23:07.053$  stage is similar to what we see in PK 82.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01{:}23{:}07{.}060 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}09{.}482$  In this case the kidneys stay pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01:23:09.482 \rightarrow 01:23:11.975$  small and become fibrotic and so they

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01{:}23{:}11{.}975 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}14{.}580$  look somewhat similar to what we see in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

01:23:14.580 --> 01:23:17.130 AutoZone will dominant tubular interstitial

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01{:}23{:}17{.}130 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}20{.}498$  kidney disease due to you mod or or.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

01:23:20.500 --> 01:23:23.740 Mark one variance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088

 $01{:}23{:}23{.}740 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}26{.}820$  So we can see here where DNA

- $01:23:26.820 \longrightarrow 01:23:29.219$  JB 11 is in this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01:23:29.220 \longrightarrow 01:23:32.480$  In this pathway involved with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- 01:23:32.480 --> 01:23:35.080 folding and trafficking of protein.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- 01:23:35.080 --> 01:23:39.798 So this is PRK, CSH and ganap.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- 01:23:39.800 --> 01:23:43.922 Here we can see also a variance in a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01{:}23{:}43{.}922 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}47{.}715$  LG 8 and a LG nine. As I mentioned.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01{:}23{:}47.715 \dashrightarrow 01{:}23{:}50.830$  There's also a variance in PM two
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01:23:50.928 \longrightarrow 01:23:53.924$  that give rise to in a recessive.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- 01:23:53.930 --> 01:23:56.680 Way and associated with particular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01:23:56.680 \rightarrow 01:23:59.506$  a promoter. Mutations to an AR.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- 01:23:59.510 --> 01:24:00.360 PKD phenotype.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01:24:00.360 \longrightarrow 01:24:03.335$  So we're going to see that there's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01:24:03.335 \rightarrow 01:24:06.218$  plenty of variance within this pathway
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01{:}24{:}06{.}218$  -->  $01{:}24{:}10{.}849$  that are associated with a PKD or a PLD
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01:24:10.849 \longrightarrow 01:24:13.990$  phenotype which may be due to the to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.867299088
- $01:24:13.990 \rightarrow 01:24:16.150$  the susceptibility of of policy system,

 $01:24:16.150 \rightarrow 01:24:18.999$  one to to variance in this pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8689881

 $01:24:22.590 \longrightarrow 01:24:23.979$  So we also.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01:24:26.140 \rightarrow 01:24:29.868$  A recently there's been a couple of papers

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}24{:}29.868 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}33.036$  to do with biallelic disease associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}24{:}33.036 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}37.626$  with DNA JB 11 from a Turkish family

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}24{:}37.626 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}42.474$  here and also from a a French family.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01:24:42.480 \longrightarrow 01:24:46.264$  We can see that the phenotype in these

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}24{:}46{.}264 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}50{.}844$  cases is is a severe disease of in utero

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}24{:}50{.}844 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}54{.}129$  presentation with the cystic kidneys.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}24{:}54{.}130 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}57{.}220$  Here assistance also or disorganization

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01:24:57.220 \longrightarrow 01:25:00.310$  within the the pancreas of

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01:25:00.409 \longrightarrow 01:25:03.036$  fibrosis within the within,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01:25:03.036 \longrightarrow 01:25:06.420$  the within the liver.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}25{:}06{.}420 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}09{.}990$  And so we can see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}25{:}09{.}990 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}11{.}388$  And also they looked at the

 $01{:}25{:}11{.}388 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}13{.}011$  cilia in these cases and I don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

01:25:13.011 -> 01:25:14.502 know if you can really see this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01:25:14.510 \longrightarrow 01:25:16.750$  but this is the the normal size

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01:25:16.750 \rightarrow 01:25:18.569$  cilia here and they're suggesting

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01:25:18.569 \longrightarrow 01:25:21.299$  in the in the patients that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}25{:}21{.}299 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}23{.}650$  have longer and tor turous cilia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

01:25:23.650 --> 01:25:24.016 Obviously,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01:25:24.016 \longrightarrow 01:25:26.578$  it's a little difficult to tell if

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}25{:}26.578 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}29.048$  this is true from this analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}25{:}29.050 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}32.410$  but it does indicate that we get a

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}25{:}32{.}410 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}36{.}067$  a more syndromic type of ciliopathy

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01:25:36.067 \rightarrow 01:25:40.540$  phenotypes associated with the DNA JB 11.

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01{:}25{:}40{.}540 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}43{.}095$  Suggesting or asking the question

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01:25:43.095 \rightarrow 01:25:45.650$  of whether it's more generally

NOTE Confidence: 0.756328268571429

 $01:25:45.733 \rightarrow 01:25:48.209$  involved in asilia development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01{:}25{:}51{.}250 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}55{.}135$  Recently we identified 1 monoallelic

 $01:25:55.135 \longrightarrow 01:25:59.240$  variants in FT 140 as a cause

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

01:25:59.240 --> 01:26:03.360 of an ADP KD light phenotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

01:26:03.360 --> 01:26:04.848 As you know, I have T,

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01:26:04.850 \rightarrow 01:26:07.450$  as is intracellular transport process.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01:26:07.450 \rightarrow 01:26:10.831$  That's important for moving proteins in and

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01:26:10.831 \rightarrow 01:26:15.330$  out of the cilium and generating the cilium.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01:26:15.330 \longrightarrow 01:26:18.471$  This is the I FT140 as part of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

01:26:18.471 --> 01:26:22.530 IFA complex, which is a thought to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01{:}26{:}22.530 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}25.470$  associated particularly with the retrograde.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01:26:25.470 \longrightarrow 01:26:28.260$  IFT transport and by allelic

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01{:}26{:}28{.}260 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}31{.}776$  variants here are associated with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01:26:31.776 \rightarrow 01:26:34.296$  more severe ciliopathy phenotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

01:26:34.300 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:26:37.015 Short rib tho<br/>ratic displays Asia

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

01:26:37.015 --> 01:26:40.326 which also has a cystic kidneys

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01:26:40.326 \longrightarrow 01:26:43.314$  as as part of its phenotype.

 $01:26:43.320 \rightarrow 01:26:46.596$  We were able to identify rather large

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

01:26:46.600 --> 01:26:49.798 #38 families and 59 affected individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01:26:49.798 \longrightarrow 01:26:52.980$  that had variants in in FT 140.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01{:}26{:}52{.}980 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}55{.}710$  We know from work from Greg buzzer

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01{:}26{:}55{.}710 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}58{.}860$  that if this protein or this gene is

NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

 $01:26:58.860 \longrightarrow 01:27:02.414$  is knocked out in the kidney then we NOTE Confidence: 0.715435431428571

01:27:02.414 --> 01:27:04.739 get a polycystic kidney phenotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299264285715

 $01{:}27{:}07{.}010 \dashrightarrow 01{:}27{:}09{.}980$  We can see again that we have a fairly

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299264285715

 $01{:}27{:}09{.}980 \dashrightarrow 01{:}27{:}12{.}228$  distinctive phenotype in these patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299264285715

 $01{:}27{:}12{.}230 \dashrightarrow 01{:}27{:}15{.}494$  but this time it's just a small number

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299264285715

 $01{:}27{:}15{.}494 \dashrightarrow 01{:}27{:}18{.}520$  of rather large cities that we see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299264285715

01:27:18.520 --> 01:27:20.655 We can see that this can be

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299264285715

01:27:20.655 --> 01:27:22.220 seen segregating in families,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299264285715

 $01{:}27{:}22{.}220 \dashrightarrow 01{:}27{:}24{.}964$  so maybe behaving a little bit more like

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299264285715

01:27:24.964 --> 01:27:28.104 a a monogenic disease, although again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299264285715

 $01:27:28.104 \rightarrow 01:27:31.478$  it may not be a completely penetrant.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542
- 01:27:34.540 --> 01:27:36.540 Interestingly, I have two

 $01{:}27{:}36{.}540 \dashrightarrow 01{:}27{:}39{.}540$  140 lies right next to PKD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

01:27:39.540 --> 01:27:43.353 One just a half a mega base away from P-81.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

 $01{:}27{:}43.353 \dashrightarrow 01{:}27{:}47.137$  So some variants in PKD one like this

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

 $01:27:47.137 \rightarrow 01:27:50.214$  atypical splicing change here are also

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

 $01{:}27{:}50{.}214 \dashrightarrow 01{:}27{:}54{.}270$  found to set Co segregate within families.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

 $01:27:54.270 \longrightarrow 01:27:57.150$  With the with the IT 140 there and

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

 $01{:}27{:}57{.}150 \dashrightarrow 01{:}28{:}01{.}307$  so it could be that in in some cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

 $01:28:01.307 \rightarrow 01:28:04.099$  they're also modifying the phenotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

 $01:28:04.100 \longrightarrow 01:28:06.330$  I think sometimes get families

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

01:28:06.330 --> 01:28:09.210 have been linked to pick anyone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

01:28:09.210 --> 01:28:11.740 and missense variants have been

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

 $01{:}28{:}11.740 \dashrightarrow 01{:}28{:}14.270$  assigned as a pathogenic variant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

01:28:14.270 --> 01:28:16.808 but I think it's worth reconsidering

NOTE Confidence: 0.728367542

01:28:16.808 --> 01:28:19.758 them now and and maybe some of

 $01:28:19.758 \longrightarrow 01:28:22.495$  these are really I FT 140 families.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

 $01:28:25.800 \longrightarrow 01:28:28.190$  If we look at the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

 $01:28:28.190 \rightarrow 01:28:30.176$  Between the type and these families

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

 $01:28:30.176 \longrightarrow 01:28:32.447$  and see that they also have

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

 $01{:}28{:}32{.}447 \dashrightarrow 01{:}28{:}34{.}199$  rather preserved renal function.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

 $01:28:34.200 \longrightarrow 01:28:36.783$  Only one of the patients that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

 $01:28:36.783 \rightarrow 01:28:39.897$  looked at had end stage renal disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

01:28:39.900 --> 01:28:42.476 and they'd already had a a kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

 $01:28:42.476 \rightarrow 01:28:45.624$  removed at an early age because they had NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

 $01{:}28{:}45{.}624 \dashrightarrow 01{:}28{:}48{.}084$  a Wilms tumor and we can see that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

 $01:28:48.084 \rightarrow 01:28:49.989$  size of the kidneys is quite large here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

01:28:49.990 --> 01:28:55.246 Because of these few but very large cysts,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

 $01{:}28{:}55{.}250 \dashrightarrow 01{:}28{:}59{.}340$  so many of these will be given the kind of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

01:28:59.340 --> 01:29:01.336 A typical presentation defined

NOTE Confidence: 0.900705768

 $01:29:01.336 \longrightarrow 01:29:04.330$  by the by the imaging class.

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

 $01:29:07.250 \longrightarrow 01:29:10.682$  If again, we look at the

- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:29:10.682 \longrightarrow 01:29:14.080$  UK Biobank for IT140.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01{:}29{:}14.080 \dashrightarrow 01{:}29{:}16.534$  We can see that there's an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:29:16.534 \rightarrow 01:29:18.170$  enrichment of pathogenic variance
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:29:18.243 --> 01:29:19.812 in IFTTT 140 that's significant,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:29:19.812 --> 01:29:22.540 so pick any one pick any two
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:29:22.540 --> 01:29:24.560 obviously are significantly found,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:29:24.560 \longrightarrow 01:29:26.750$  and this is looking at the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:29:26.750 --> 01:29:27.845 cystic kidney phenotype.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:29:27.850 \longrightarrow 01:29:30.640$  There was about 1400 patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:29:30.640 \rightarrow 01:29:33.430$  within this population that were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01{:}29{:}33.526 \dashrightarrow 01{:}29{:}36.676$  defined as having a cystic kidneys,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01{:}29{:}36{.}680 \dashrightarrow 01{:}29{:}38{.}750$  and I have two 140 was found to be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01{:}29{:}38.750 \dashrightarrow 01{:}29{:}41.073$  there at the third most common variant
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:29:41.073 --> 01:29:42.780 associated with that being done,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:29:42.780 \longrightarrow 01:29:44.364$  and the only one the other
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

- $01:29:44.364 \rightarrow 01:29:45.420$  one that was significant.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:29:45.420 --> 01:29:46.830 You can see I have G9.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01{:}29{:}46.830 \dashrightarrow 01{:}29{:}50.592$  There is one other that was seen but
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:29:50.592 \rightarrow 01:29:54.169$  but not at a significant level.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01{:}29{:}54{.}170 \dashrightarrow 01{:}29{:}58{.}356$  And then again if we look at.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:29:58.360 --> 01:29:59.728 High impact variance,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:29:59.728 \longrightarrow 01:30:02.920$  so variants that are likely to be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:30:03.006 \rightarrow 01:30:05.450$  pathogenic in activating variants
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:30:05.450 --> 01:30:08.690 compared to synonymous or intronic variants.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01{:}30{:}08.690 \dashrightarrow 01{:}30{:}11.455$  We can see there's a Richmond here
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:30:11.455 --> 01:30:14.570 in the cystic kidneys different two
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:30:14.570 \rightarrow 01:30:17.215$  different defined cystic kidney phenotype.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:30:17.220 --> 01:30:17.786 Interestingly,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01{:}30{:}17.786 \dashrightarrow 01{:}30{:}20.616$  also in the CKD stage.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01{:}30{:}20.620 \dashrightarrow 01{:}30{:}22.264$ 4-5 although we didn't see renal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:30:22.264 \rightarrow 01:30:24.120$  failure in most of the patients,

 $01:30:24.120 \longrightarrow 01:30:28.600$  so we looked at but not other forms of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

01:30:28.600 --> 01:30:29.740 Kidney disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

 $01:30:29.740 \longrightarrow 01:30:32.590$  again suggesting that there's a

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

 $01:30:32.590 \rightarrow 01:30:34.381$  significant enrichment between

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

 $01:30:34.381 \rightarrow 01:30:37.221$  pathogenic variants in this gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

 $01{:}30{:}37{.}221 \dashrightarrow 01{:}30{:}42{.}480$  and PKD and the PKD phenotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

 $01{:}30{:}42{.}480 \dashrightarrow 01{:}30{:}45{.}224$  So I just want to follow up finish

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

 $01:30:45.224 \rightarrow 01:30:48.285$  up by just talking about a couple

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

 $01{:}30{:}48.285 \dashrightarrow 01{:}30{:}51.120$  of other dominant or mono allelic

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

 $01{:}30{:}51{.}120 \dashrightarrow 01{:}30{:}53{.}120$  diseases that are associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

01:30:53.120 --> 01:30:56.085 with the NADPKD like phenotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

 $01{:}30{:}56.085 \dashrightarrow 01{:}30{:}59.360$  so or facial digital one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

01:30:59.360 --> 01:31:01.658 This is an X linked dominant

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

01:31:01.658 --> 01:31:04.090 disease so we see this phenotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333

 $01{:}31{:}04.090 \dashrightarrow 01{:}31{:}06.946$  in in females where we just have

- 01:31:06.946 --> 01:31:09.520 a single pathogenic allele.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:31:09.520 \longrightarrow 01:31:12.817$  They also have a variety of facial.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:31:12.820 \longrightarrow 01:31:15.915$  World Digital and and central
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:31:15.915 \rightarrow 01:31:18.391$  nervous system phenotype associated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:31:18.391 \rightarrow 01:31:21.557$  as well as the cystic kidneys,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:31:21.560 --> 01:31:24.500 but it's sometimes we can see
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:31:24.500 --> 01:31:27.019 cystic kidney phenotype and and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- 01:31:27.019 --> 01:31:29.379 only mild other phenotypes and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.717122321333333
- $01:31:29.379 \longrightarrow 01:31:32.810$  they can be mistaken for a DPKD.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.945061954
- $01:31:35.100 \rightarrow 01:31:39.920$  Recently we've been looking at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.945061954
- 01:31:39.920 --> 01:31:41.804 specific variants in NEKADE.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.945061954
- $01{:}31{:}41{.}804 \dashrightarrow 01{:}31{:}45{.}697$  This is a a kinase that is thought
- NOTE Confidence: 0.945061954
- $01{:}31{:}45.697 \dashrightarrow 01{:}31{:}48.619$  to be associated with the cilia.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.945061954
- $01:31:48.620 \longrightarrow 01:31:50.540$  This is following up with an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.945061954
- $01:31:50.540 \longrightarrow 01:31:52.580$  abstract that was published last
- NOTE Confidence: 0.945061954
- $01:31:52.580 \longrightarrow 01:31:55.280$  year or presented last year.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.945061954
- $01:31:55.280 \longrightarrow 01:31:58.868$  The SN and in these cases
- NOTE Confidence: 0.945061954
- $01:31:58.868 \longrightarrow 01:32:01.730$  the disease is associated so.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- 01:32:03.810 --> 01:32:06.972 Bylica Neck 8 variants are again
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}32{:}06{.}972 \dashrightarrow 01{:}32{:}09{.}875$  associated with a a ciliopathy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- 01:32:09.875 --> 01:32:13.335 type phenotype and where some.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}32{:}13{.}340 \dashrightarrow 01{:}32{:}17{.}159$  Animal models are nice models JCK
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:32:17.159 \longrightarrow 01:32:20.153$  that are associated with neck height
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- 01:32:20.153 --> 01:32:23.199 variance or in a recessive way.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:32:23.200 \rightarrow 01:32:27.412$  But here we have a just a single allele.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:32:27.420 \longrightarrow 01:32:29.975$  This is associated with very severe disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}32{:}29{.}980 \dashrightarrow 01{:}32{:}32{.}436$  You can see end stage renal disease at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}32{:}32{.}436 \dashrightarrow 01{:}32{:}35{.}267$  one year of age here in the in the mother,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}32{:}35{.}270 \dashrightarrow 01{:}32{:}37{.}986$  but other she had the three transplants
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}32{:}37{.}986 \dashrightarrow 01{:}32{:}41{.}108$  and was able to give rise to a child
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:32:41.108 \longrightarrow 01:32:43.339$  that also had this very severe.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125

- $01:32:43.340 \longrightarrow 01:32:45.290$  Disease here you can see the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}32{:}45{.}290 \dashrightarrow 01{:}32{:}47{.}374$  light and large cystic kidneys.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- 01:32:47.374 --> 01:32:50.686 OK in large cystic kidneys here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:32:50.690 \rightarrow 01:32:51.965$  although interestingly made
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- 01:32:51.965 --> 01:32:54.090 up of rather larger cysts,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:32:54.090 \rightarrow 01:32:57.924$  and we typically see in the in the RPD.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- 01:32:57.930 --> 01:32:58.271 Interestingly,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:32:58.271 \longrightarrow 01:33:00.658$  the mother had end stage of 48
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- 01:33:00.658 --> 01:33:03.230 years of age of the consider the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- 01:33:03.230 --> 01:33:04.690 kidneys look fairly similar,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}33{:}04{.}690 \dashrightarrow 01{:}33{:}07{.}338$  and she was only a mosaic for the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}33{:}07{.}338 \dashrightarrow 01{:}33{:}10{.}321$  for the variant here you can see the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:33:10.321 \longrightarrow 01:33:13.349$  the the level of the the mutant.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- 01:33:13.350 --> 01:33:15.090 There was very low,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:33:15.090 \rightarrow 01:33:19.220$  so that's why she had much milder disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:33:19.220 \longrightarrow 01:33:20.980$  And this is second family.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:33:20.980 \rightarrow 01:33:24.652$  Here you can see that the these very
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- 01:33:24.652 --> 01:33:27.360 large cystic kidneys here where
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}33{:}27{.}360 \dashrightarrow 01{:}33{:}29{.}364$  birds started at seven years of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:33:29.364 \dashrightarrow 01:33:31.779$  age from from this parent patient.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}33{:}31{.}780 \dashrightarrow 01{:}33{:}34{.}078$  So the difference between the variance
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}33{:}34.078 \dashrightarrow 01{:}33{:}37.329$  here and in neck 8 compared to the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}33{:}37{.}329 \dashrightarrow 01{:}33{:}39{.}384$  recessive diseases of these variants
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:33:39.384 \rightarrow 01:33:42.237$  seem to be in the in the kinase domain,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01{:}33{:}42.240 \dashrightarrow 01{:}33{:}44.592$  so they're having a much more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.682606581125
- $01:33:44.592 \rightarrow 01:33:47.230$  severe form of the disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01:33:49.730 \longrightarrow 01:33:54.420$  And just finally we can see also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01:33:54.420 \rightarrow 01:33:56.430$  synergy synergistic interactions
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01{:}33{:}56{.}536$  -->  $01{:}33{:}59{.}690$  between the P-81 and the pH one.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01{:}33{:}59{.}690 \dashrightarrow 01{:}34{:}03{.}246$  So the gene associated with AARP KD
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01{:}34{:}03{.}246 \dashrightarrow 01{:}34{:}07{.}136$  that Steve is described and we've
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01:34:07.136 \longrightarrow 01:34:09.804$  confirmed this is looking at a a

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01{:}34{:}09{.}804 \dashrightarrow 01{:}34{:}13{.}455$  rat model of ARP KD that it has this

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01:34:13.455 \rightarrow 01:34:15.745$  slowly progressive disease PCK wrap.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01:34:15.750 \longrightarrow 01:34:19.607$  We made a heterozygous P-81.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

01:34:19.607 --> 01:34:22.589 Knockout a Leo which by itself

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01{:}34{:}22{.}589 \dashrightarrow 01{:}34{:}25{.}909$  has very few cysts developing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01{:}34{:}25{.}910 \dashrightarrow 01{:}34{:}28{.}900$  But then if we can see the the

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01{:}34{:}28{.}900 \dashrightarrow 01{:}34{:}31{.}870$  them together we have this much

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01:34:31.870 \rightarrow 01:34:34.760$  more severe synergistic phenotype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01:34:34.760 \longrightarrow 01:34:38.410$  indicating that the ARP,

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01{:}34{:}38{.}410 \dashrightarrow 01{:}34{:}40{.}470$  KD and AD PKD proteins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01:34:40.470 \longrightarrow 01:34:42.490$  Although we don't think they

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01:34:42.490 \longrightarrow 01:34:44.510$  interact and form a complex,

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01{:}34{:}44{.}510 \dashrightarrow 01{:}34{:}47{.}924$  have some type of related role

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01{:}34{:}47{.}924 \dashrightarrow 01{:}34{:}50{.}200$  in preventing system development.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01:34:50.200 \longrightarrow 01:34:51.811$  Within the kidney.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01:34:51.811 \rightarrow 01:34:52.348$  Interesting,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01{:}34{:}52{.}348 \dashrightarrow 01{:}34{:}57{.}549$  we did some RNA seek and in the in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01:34:57.549 \rightarrow 01:35:00.369$  three populations here the the.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01:35:00.370 \longrightarrow 01:35:03.382$  The Geo terms that were all
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01{:}35{:}03{.}382 \dashrightarrow 01{:}35{:}05{.}390$  associated with cilia development.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- 01:35:05.390 --> 01:35:08.911 We also saw a longer cilia here
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01:35:08.911 \rightarrow 01:35:11.874$  in these diegetic animals than we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01{:}35{:}11{.}874 \dashrightarrow 01{:}35{:}13{.}746$  saw in the the normal individual.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01{:}35{:}13.750 \dashrightarrow 01{:}35{:}17.002$  So whether this is directly associated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01{:}35{:}17.002 \dashrightarrow 01{:}35{:}20.405$  with these these mutations or is a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- 01:35:20.405 --> 01:35:23.770 response to lack of cilia signaling,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01{:}35{:}23.770 \dashrightarrow 01{:}35{:}27.347$  I think is a is a question.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01{:}35{:}27{.}350 \dashrightarrow 01{:}35{:}29{.}910$  So we can see as well as the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- $01{:}35{:}29{.}910 \dashrightarrow 01{:}35{:}33{.}546$  variance associated with the folding
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667
- 01:35:33.546 --> 01:35:34.778 of police system one,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

01:35:34.780 --> 01:35:37.370 giving rise to an 80 P80 phenotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01{:}35{:}37{.}370 \dashrightarrow 01{:}35{:}39{.}911$  We can see variance as well as

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01:35:39.911 \dashrightarrow 01:35:42.723$  the Piketty one and Piketty 2 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01:35:42.723 \rightarrow 01:35:45.183$  and five persistent on the cilium.

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01{:}35{:}45{.}190 \dashrightarrow 01{:}35{:}48{.}436$  We can see these other variants

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01{:}35{:}48.436 \dashrightarrow 01{:}35{:}50.600$  associated with different parts

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01{:}35{:}50.686 \dashrightarrow 01{:}35{:}53.391$  of which are associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.715550862166667

 $01{:}35{:}53{.}391 \dashrightarrow 01{:}35{:}56{.}440$  ciliopathies and are recessive way or.

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

 $01{:}35{:}58{.}840 \dashrightarrow 01{:}36{:}02{.}416$  The X linked OFT one here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:36:02.420 \longrightarrow 01:36:04.580$  resulting in in something

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:36:04.580 \dashrightarrow 01:36:07.280$  like an ad PKD phenotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:36:07.280 \longrightarrow 01:36:09.058$  So I think the question is here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:36:09.060 \rightarrow 01:36:11.751$  are these working and you can see that they

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:36:11.751 \dashrightarrow 01:36:14.236$  seem to be in different complexes here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

 $01{:}36{:}14.240 \dashrightarrow 01{:}36{:}18.560$  but may all all all be associated with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:36:18.560 \longrightarrow 01:36:20.380$  Determining the level of power

01:36:20.380 --> 01:36:22.613 system one policy system 2 maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:36:22.613 \rightarrow 01:36:24.318$  fibre system on the cilia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01{:}36{:}24{.}320 \dashrightarrow 01{:}36{:}28{.}208$  So is this a mechanism of disease or

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:36:28.208 \rightarrow 01:36:32.169$  is there other cilia related cisgenic

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01{:}36{:}32.169 \dashrightarrow 01{:}36{:}35.666$  pathways as Steve's work has suggested

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

 $01{:}36{:}35{.}666 \dashrightarrow 01{:}36{:}39{.}632$  that might be in important in the in

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:36:39.632 \dashrightarrow 01:36:43.216$  the in the formation of this disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

01:36:43.220 --> 01:36:47.725 So I just to summarize P-81 and Piketty

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01{:}36{:}47.725 \dashrightarrow 01{:}36{:}52.318$  2 are the the the common 80 PKD genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:36:52.320 \longrightarrow 01:36:54.480$  P-81 is more severe than P82.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:36:54.480 \longrightarrow 01:36:57.340$  Truncating and more severe

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

 $01{:}36{:}57{.}340 \dashrightarrow 01{:}36{:}59{.}485$  than non truncating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:36:59.490 \rightarrow 01:37:02.265$  There we see genetic complexity

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

01:37:02.265 --> 01:37:03.930 of biallelic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

 $01:37:03.930 \longrightarrow 01:37:05.382$  complex alleles,

01:37:05.382 --> 01:37:08.286 mosaicism and digenic disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

 $01:37:08.290 \longrightarrow 01:37:11.055$  a dosage model we feel fits the

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

01:37:11.055 --> 01:37:13.708 the data we see in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:37:13.710 \longrightarrow 01:37:16.140$  the genetic mechanism in in 80,

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

01:37:16.140 --> 01:37:17.334 PKD monogenic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

01:37:17.334 --> 01:37:20.319 pathogenic variance in ER proteins

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

 $01{:}37{:}20{.}319 \dashrightarrow 01{:}37{:}23{.}416$  that involved in these different

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01{:}37{:}23.416 \dashrightarrow 01{:}37{:}27.052$  processes for dealing with a membrane

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

 $01{:}37{:}27.052$  -->  $01{:}37{:}30.348$  and truncated and secreted proteins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

01:37:30.350 --> 01:37:31.930 Are associated with an ADP,

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01{:}37{:}31{.}930 \dashrightarrow 01{:}37{:}35{.}866$  KD or 80 PLD phenotype and maybe associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01{:}37{:}35{.}866 \dashrightarrow 01{:}37{:}38{.}948$  with Polar system one maturation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01{:}37{:}38.950 \dashrightarrow 01{:}37{:}42.022$  Now we're seeing increasing number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667

 $01:37:42.022 \rightarrow 01:37:44.900$  variants associated with cilia structure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

 $01:37:44.900 \longrightarrow 01:37:48.330$  Also associated with a ADP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667

 $01:37:48.330 \longrightarrow 01:37:50.526$  KD like phenotype and and is

- NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667
- $01:37:50.526 \longrightarrow 01:37:53.333$  this to do with the level of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667
- $01:37:53.333 \rightarrow 01:37:56.639$  ciliary power system one.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667
- $01:37:56.640 \rightarrow 01:37:59.016$  So you just want to thank the the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667
- $01{:}37{:}59.016 \dashrightarrow 01{:}38{:}01.266$  people in my lab over the last decade
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667
- $01{:}38{:}01{.}266 \dashrightarrow 01{:}38{:}03{.}152$  that have been involved with the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667
- $01{:}38{:}03{.}152 \dashrightarrow 01{:}38{:}05{.}448$  the works that we've been doing and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667
- $01{:}38{:}05{.}512 \dashrightarrow 01{:}38{:}08{.}620$  also John Sayer and Eric Hollinger
- NOTE Confidence: 0.559430941666667
- $01:38:08.620 \rightarrow 01:38:11.480$  in Newcastle for the collaborations
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667
- $01{:}38{:}11{.}572 \dashrightarrow 01{:}38{:}14{.}675$  on the the work associated with the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667
- 01:38:14.675 --> 01:38:18.168 UK Biobank and the 100,000 genome project.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5594309416666667
- 01:38:18.168 --> 01:38:19.120 Thank you.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.434000395
- 01:38:40.100 --> 01:38:40.830 Showing that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.66171044
- $01{:}38{:}47{.}380 \dashrightarrow 01{:}38{:}50{.}220$  Right? Those are one of the beach.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.0809772
- 01:38:55.760 --> 01:38:56.490 Yeah.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.782775972
- 01:39:05.060 --> 01:39:06.792 Yeah, I don't know.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.782775972

 $01:39:06.792 \rightarrow 01:39:10.342$  I guess in in our hands we also

NOTE Confidence: 0.782775972

 $01:39:10.342 \longrightarrow 01:39:13.198$  find that to be a trafficking

NOTE Confidence: 0.782775972

01:39:13.198 --> 01:39:16.439 mutation and we find less of that or

NOTE Confidence: 0.782775972

 $01:39:16.440 \rightarrow 01:39:18.160$  that it doesn't traffic properly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782775972

 $01{:}39{:}18.160 \dashrightarrow 01{:}39{:}22.740$  So yeah, I I'm I'm not sure about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782775972

 $01:39:22.740 \dashrightarrow 01:39:24.927$  I think it depends a little bit on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.782775972

01:39:24.927  $-\!\!>$  01:39:26.859 system that you're that you're using,

NOTE Confidence: 0.782775972

 $01:39:26.860 \rightarrow 01:39:27.680$  but certainly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.782775972

01:39:27.680 --> 01:39:31.692 We've also found that to be a trafficking

NOTE Confidence: 0.782775972

 $01{:}39{:}31{.}692 \dashrightarrow 01{:}39{:}36{.}405$  defect and and so I don't know exactly

NOTE Confidence: 0.782775972

 $01{:}39{:}36{.}405 \dashrightarrow 01{:}39{:}39{.}280$  how to to reconcile that data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.12792012

 $01:39:41.510 \longrightarrow 01:39:42.080$  Pardon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92989286

01:39:44.220 --> 01:39:46.100 Right, right exactly yeah, yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92989286

 $01{:}39{:}46.100 \dashrightarrow 01{:}39{:}50.008$  So over expressed tag protein.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92989286

 $01:39:50.010 \rightarrow 01:39:52.338$  Pressing policy system one and police

NOTE Confidence: 0.92989286

 $01:39:52.338 \rightarrow 01:39:55.170$  system two and we're looking at salary.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.92989286
- 01:39:55.170 --> 01:39:56.930 You know, surface localization here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92989286
- $01:39:56.930 \longrightarrow 01:39:58.157$  not ciliary localization.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92989286
- $01:39:58.157 \dashrightarrow 01:40:01.020$  And there could be a different layer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92989286
- $01{:}40{:}01{.}020 \dashrightarrow 01{:}40{:}03{.}282$  Reviews the surface as a kind
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92989286
- 01:40:03.282 --> 01:40:05.320 of surrogate for the cilia,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92989286
- 01:40:05.320 --> 01:40:07.108 but you know it may not
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92989286
- $01:40:07.108 \longrightarrow 01:40:08.890$  be a complete one to one.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.896562625
- $01{:}40{:}12.010 \dashrightarrow 01{:}40{:}13.110$  Similarity there.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7223654
- $01:40:17.490 \longrightarrow 01:40:21.138$  So the energy is staggering.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.556283
- $01:40:27.650 \longrightarrow 01:40:28.900$  We're able to develop there.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.19094557
- 01:40:33.930 --> 01:40:34.360 Interesting.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:40:50.660 \longrightarrow 01:40:53.096$  Yeah, I think it's a time where
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01{:}40{:}53.096 \dashrightarrow 01{:}40{:}55.621$  we can start thinking about more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01{:}40{:}55{.}621 \dashrightarrow 01{:}40{:}58{.}417$  tailored the rapies for for a PKD.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- 01:40:58.420 --> 01:41:01.132 As I mentioned, chaperones might be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01:41:01.132 \rightarrow 01:41:04.419$  useful for for some missense changes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01{:}41{:}04{.}420 \dashrightarrow 01{:}41{:}06{.}240$  We've been looking at nonsense.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01:41:06.240 \longrightarrow 01:41:09.318$  We through as a sa a possibility where you

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

01:41:09.318 --> 01:41:12.654 know a quarter of patients would pick anyone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01{:}41{:}12.660 \dashrightarrow 01{:}41{:}15.971$  have nonsense mutations and the and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01:41:15.971 \rightarrow 01:41:19.119$  read through of functional protein.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01:41:19.120 \longrightarrow 01:41:20.480$  Maybe helpful, you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01:41:20.480 \longrightarrow 01:41:22.879$  And this sort of dosage model is

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01:41:22.879 \rightarrow 01:41:24.655$  is making us think about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01:41:24.660 \rightarrow 01:41:28.296$  Even if we could increase the level by 10%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01:41:28.296 \longrightarrow 01:41:31.602$  that may be a significant effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

01:41:31.602 --> 01:41:33.922 I think Steve's work where

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

01:41:33.922 --> 01:41:36.488 you know you can re express.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01{:}41{:}36{.}490 \dashrightarrow 01{:}41{:}39{.}416$  Polar systems and and rescue the phenotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01:41:39.416 \longrightarrow 01:41:42.427$  is also very exciting in that area,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

 $01:41:42.430 \rightarrow 01:41:45.964$  suggesting that these types of are,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- 01:41:45.964 --> 01:41:46.672 you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:41:46.672 \rightarrow 01:41:48.796$  increasing the level of police system
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- 01:41:48.796 --> 01:41:50.922 and obviously you know going in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01{:}41{:}50{.}922 \dashrightarrow 01{:}41{:}53{.}070$  with crisper and trying to repair
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:41:53.070 \longrightarrow 01:41:55.681$  the the variant or maybe using a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- 01:41:55.681 --> 01:41:58.455 transgenic approach and re
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:41:58.455 \rightarrow 01:42:01.830$  expressing the protein or Michael.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:42:01.830 \rightarrow 01:42:05.156$  Things might be work just to re
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01{:}42{:}05{.}156 \dashrightarrow 01{:}42{:}07{.}764$  express the the part of the sea tail.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- 01:42:07.770 --> 01:42:11.893 I think all of these are exciting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:42:11.893 \longrightarrow 01:42:14.715$  possible therapies and some of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:42:14.715 \longrightarrow 01:42:17.198$  them you know would we would.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01{:}42{:}17.198 \dashrightarrow 01{:}42{:}19.256$  We would want to know the genotype
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01{:}42{:}19{.}256 \dashrightarrow 01{:}42{:}21{.}464$  of the of the patient and some
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:42:21.464 \rightarrow 01:42:23.450$  may be more generally applicable.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105

- $01:42:23.450 \longrightarrow 01:42:24.502$  But I think so.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- 01:42:24.502 --> 01:42:25.028 I mean,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- 01:42:25.030 --> 01:42:26.962 I think that you know targeting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:42:26.962 \rightarrow 01:42:27.928$  the downstream pathways.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:42:27.930 \longrightarrow 01:42:29.658$  Although we have a therapy right
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01{:}42{:}29.658 \dashrightarrow 01{:}42{:}31.449$  now that works to an extent.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:42:31.450 \longrightarrow 01:42:34.600$  I think it's not a cure for for any big D,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- 01:42:34.600 --> 01:42:36.706 and I think looking more approximately
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01{:}42{:}36.706 \dashrightarrow 01{:}42{:}39.215$  in the pathway and trying to correct
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:42:39.215 \longrightarrow 01:42:40.940$  the basic defect is something
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:42:40.940 \longrightarrow 01:42:43.177$  that the field should really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821957936842105
- $01:42:43.177 \rightarrow 01:42:45.027$  be concentrating on right now.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5874470866666667
- $01{:}43{:}00.670 \dashrightarrow 01{:}43{:}01.378$  I know that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.933828293571428
- 01:43:31.030 --> 01:43:33.534 Yeah, I don't know if those two things
- NOTE Confidence: 0.933828293571428
- $01:43:33.534 \rightarrow 01:43:36.067$  are are associated with each other.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.933828293571428
- $01:43:36.070 \longrightarrow 01:43:37.735$  I mean it. The association

 $01:43:37.735 \longrightarrow 01:43:40.489$  may be to do with folding and

NOTE Confidence: 0.933828293571428

 $01:43:40.489 \longrightarrow 01:43:42.509$  and trafficking of proteins.

NOTE Confidence: 0.933828293571428

01:43:42.510 -> 01:43:46.438 I think in a more more general way

NOTE Confidence: 0.933828293571428

 $01:43:46.438 \longrightarrow 01:43:49.331$  so but I don't know of any other

NOTE Confidence: 0.933828293571428

 $01{:}43{:}49{.}331 \dashrightarrow 01{:}43{:}50{.}820$  more direct association there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.641479343333333

01:43:53.000 --> 01:43:53.630 You're very nice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5400234825

 $01:43:56.900 \longrightarrow 01:43:57.948$  For quite some time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.537279

01:44:01.010 --> 01:44:01.540 ER

NOTE Confidence: 0.16779616

 $01:44:07.770 \longrightarrow 01:44:08.290$  predominant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.569693466

01:44:11.860 --> 01:44:13.380 Step back from our colleague.

NOTE Confidence: 0.716998752

 $01:44:15.690 \longrightarrow 01:44:16.820$  I would imagine that many.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64433514

 $01{:}44{:}20{.}110 \dashrightarrow 01{:}44{:}20{.}740$  More success.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78852565

01:44:24.030 --> 01:44:26.535 Thank you. Perceptor

NOTE Confidence: 0.78852565

 $01{:}44{:}26.535 \dashrightarrow 01{:}44{:}28.170$  complex finance channels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5401724

01:44:30.780 --> 01:44:34.338 That's. Has anyone looked at

 $01:44:34.338 \rightarrow 01:44:36.723$  patients with either the polycystic

NOTE Confidence: 0.5401724

01:44:36.723 --> 01:44:39.242 liver or published kidney protein

NOTE Confidence: 0.5401724

 $01:44:39.242 \longrightarrow 01:44:41.306$  folding associated with patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.5401724

 $01:44:41.306 \rightarrow 01:44:44.090$  to keep their phenotypic analysis?

NOTE Confidence: 0.5401724

01:44:44.090 --> 01:44:45.290 For example, T cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}44{:}48.030 \dashrightarrow 01{:}44{:}49.470$  Cardiac myocyte organization,

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}44{:}49{.}470 \dashrightarrow 01{:}44{:}52{.}830$  etcetera etcetera to try and get a

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}44{:}52{.}914 \dashrightarrow 01{:}44{:}55{.}842$  sense of this phenotype extension would

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}44{:}55{.}842 \dashrightarrow 01{:}44{:}58{.}699$  broadly to other proteins that might.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

01:44:58.700 --> 01:45:00.436 Yeah, I mean, I think you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:00.436 \longrightarrow 01:45:01.619$  we're certainly aware of that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:01.620 \longrightarrow 01:45:03.748$  and I think it is a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:03.748 \longrightarrow 01:45:05.689$  naive to say that these patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

01:45:05.689 --> 01:45:07.693 just have PKD or or PLMD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

01:45:07.700 --> 01:45:10.129 And you know, we've tried to look

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:10.129 \rightarrow 01:45:11.649$  for other associated phenotypes

 $01:45:11.649 \longrightarrow 01:45:13.704$  in the relatively small number

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:13.704 \rightarrow 01:45:15.740$  of patients that we've seen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:15.740 \longrightarrow 01:45:17.850$  And although there's some clues,

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:17.850 \rightarrow 01:45:21.339$  sometimes nothing really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:21.340 \longrightarrow 01:45:22.978$  Something that we can be certain of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}45{:}22{.}980 \dashrightarrow 01{:}45{:}24{.}580$  and I think that's to do with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}45{:}24{.}580 \dashrightarrow 01{:}45{:}26{.}197$  number of small number of patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

01:45:26.200 --> 01:45:28.370 I think the you know things like

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:28.370 \longrightarrow 01:45:31.084$  the UK Biobank and the you know 100

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:31.084 \rightarrow 01:45:33.232$  genomes projects are really the places

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}45{:}33{.}232 \dashrightarrow 01{:}45{:}35{.}773$  to look for these where there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

01:45:35.773 --> 01:45:38.640 especially for a LG eight you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}45{:}38.640 \dashrightarrow 01{:}45{:}41.474$  larger number of of patients and ask

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}45{:}41{.}474 \dashrightarrow 01{:}45{:}43{.}209$  questions about whether there's other

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}45{:}43.209 \dashrightarrow 01{:}45{:}44.540$  phenotypes associated with that.

 $01{:}45{:}44{.}540 \dashrightarrow 01{:}45{:}46{.}745$  I know that John and Eric have

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:46.745 \longrightarrow 01:45:49.117$  tried to do that a little bit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:49.120 \dashrightarrow 01:45:52.347$  I don't think maybe there's a definitive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:52.350 \longrightarrow 01:45:53.910$  Word on on that yet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}45{:}53{.}910 \dashrightarrow 01{:}45{:}55{.}373$  but I think that is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:45:55.373 \rightarrow 01:45:57.280$  way to to look at these and and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

01:45:57.280 --> 01:45:58.666 But I certainly agree with you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

01:45:58.670 --> 01:46:01.318 I think that you know just to say

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}46{:}01{.}318 \dashrightarrow 01{:}46{:}03{.}936$  that these are a PKD or PLD disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}46{:}03{.}940 \dashrightarrow 01{:}46{:}07{.}140$  When there's a lightly a lot of other

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:46:07.140 \longrightarrow 01:46:08.771$  proteins associated is probably

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}46{:}08.771 \dashrightarrow 01{:}46{:}11.033$  a bit naive and under estimate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}46{:}11.040 \dashrightarrow 01{:}46{:}13.056$  And obviously you know these patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:46:13.056 \rightarrow 01:46:15.835$  may be at risk for for other diseases

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01:46:15.835 \rightarrow 01:46:18.669$  that that we should be telling them about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818

 $01{:}46{:}18.670 \dashrightarrow 01{:}46{:}20.752$  If we could better understand what

- NOTE Confidence: 0.655201041181818
- $01:46:20.752 \longrightarrow 01:46:22.789$  what might be associated with that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5339132675
- 01:46:26.350 --> 01:46:27.978 Doctor Harris great talk
- NOTE Confidence: 0.5825527
- $01:46:30.720 \longrightarrow 01:46:31.090$  OK.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778395369
- $01:46:34.300 \rightarrow 01:46:36.386$  We'll reconvene in like 5 minutes for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.778395369
- $01:46:36.386 \rightarrow 01:46:38.388$  the next speaker, which will be virtual.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.808424124615385
- $01{:}46{:}40.550 \dashrightarrow 01{:}46{:}43.483$  All right, I think we'll reconvene our
- NOTE Confidence: 0.808424124615385
- 01:46:43.483 --> 01:46:46.369 next speaker is Doctor Sylvia Rosas,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.808424124615385
- 01:46:46.370 --> 01:46:49.412 who's going to be from Harbor
- NOTE Confidence: 0.808424124615385
- $01{:}46{:}49{.}412 \dashrightarrow 01{:}46{:}52{.}414$  Medical School and discussing non
- NOTE Confidence: 0.808424124615385
- $01:46:52.414 \rightarrow 01:46:55.060$  steroidal mineralocorticoid receptor.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.808424124615385
- 01:46:55.060 --> 01:46:56.440 Antagonists and individuals
- NOTE Confidence: 0.808424124615385
- $01:46:56.440 \rightarrow 01:46:59.200$  with CKD and Type 2 diabetes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:47:03.530 \longrightarrow 01:47:05.890$  Great, thank you very much.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}47{:}05{.}890 \dashrightarrow 01{:}47{:}08{.}428$  I hope every body can hear me and see me.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:47:08.430 --> 01:47:10.548 If not, please let me know.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

01:47:10.550 --> 01:47:13.970 And so it is a great honor to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}47{:}13.970 \dashrightarrow 01{:}47{:}16.669$  speaking today in this symposium,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

01:47:16.670 --> 01:47:18.952 and I want to thank the organizers

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

01:47:18.952 --> 01:47:20.776 for inviting me and I hope

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01:47:20.776 \longrightarrow 01:47:22.750$  that at the end of this talk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}47{:}22.750 \dashrightarrow 01{:}47{:}24.322$  you'll agree with me that it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}47{:}24{.}322 \dashrightarrow 01{:}47{:}25{.}950$  a great time to be doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

01:47:25.950 --> 01:47:27.414 Being in a prologistix,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}47{:}27{.}414 \dashrightarrow 01{:}47{:}30{.}023$  and it's a great time to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01:47:30.023 \longrightarrow 01:47:32.045$  in the Type 2 diabetes area.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

01:47:32.050 --> 01:47:34.992 So these are my disclosures I guess

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}47{:}34{.}992 \dashrightarrow 01{:}47{:}37{.}218$  for this talk the most important

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}47{:}37{.}218$  -->  $01{:}47{:}39{.}319$  disclosure is that I participated

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01:47:39.319 \longrightarrow 01:47:41.464$  in the Figuran Fidelio trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

01:47:41.470 --> 01:47:44.968 and I'm a fidelity investigator too,

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}47{:}44.970 \dashrightarrow 01{:}47{:}47.686$  so I think those are the most

- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:47:47.686 \rightarrow 01:47:49.291$  important for this presentation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:47:49.291 --> 01:47:49.732 Initially,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}47{:}49{.}732 \dashrightarrow 01{:}47{:}53{.}260$  I'll do a quick overview of the standard
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:47:53.335 --> 01:47:55.850 treatment of diabetic kidney disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}47{:}55.850 \dashrightarrow 01{:}47{:}58.776$  but I'm really going to focus on some
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}47{:}58.776 \dashrightarrow 01{:}48{:}01{.}338$  work that we've done using the combined
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}48{:}01{.}338 \dashrightarrow 01{:}48{:}03{.}938$  data set of the figure and Fidelio.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}48{:}03{.}940 \dashrightarrow 01{:}48{:}07{.}612$  Trials and at the end I'm going to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:48:07.612 --> 01:48:10.549 be presenting a case of a patient
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}48{:}10.549 \dashrightarrow 01{:}48{:}13.608$  that we have recruited for the kidney
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:48:13.608 --> 01:48:15.993 Precision Medicine project in Boston.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:48:16.000 --> 01:48:18.544 And so most of my time is actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:48:18.544 \longrightarrow 01:48:21.084$  spent doing the Apollo and the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:48:21.084 --> 01:48:22.916 kidney Precision Medicine project,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:48:22.920 \rightarrow 01:48:25.020$  but those two projects are mostly in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

- 01:48:25.020 --> 01:48:26.719 data gathering phase at this point,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}48{:}26.720 \dashrightarrow 01{:}48{:}29.100$  and so that would be for a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:48:29.100 \longrightarrow 01:48:29.780$  future presentation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}48{:}29.780 \dashrightarrow 01{:}48{:}32.433$  So this is the basically the standard
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:48:32.433 --> 01:48:34.600 treatment of diabetic kidney disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:48:34.600 \rightarrow 01:48:37.516$  It's blood pressure control trying to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:48:37.516 \longrightarrow 01:48:40.024$  lower albuminuria diet interventions as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:48:40.024 --> 01:48:42.489 smoking weight and treating complications.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:48:42.490 \longrightarrow 01:48:45.352$  And there had really not been
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:48:45.352 \rightarrow 01:48:47.690$  any new therapy since 2001.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:48:47.690 \rightarrow 01:48:50.270$  On these two landmark papers were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:48:50.270 \longrightarrow 01:48:52.031$  published side-by-side in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:48:52.031 --> 01:48:54.016 New England Journal of Medicine,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}48{:}54.020 \dashrightarrow 01{:}48{:}57.122$  and that those were the treatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:48:57.122 \rightarrow 01:48:58.957$  using angiotensin receptor blockers.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:48:58.957 --> 01:49:01.591 1 irbesartan 1 Losartan in patients

- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:49:01.591 \rightarrow 01:49:03.810$  with type 2 diabetes and that was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}49{:}03.810 \dashrightarrow 01{:}49{:}06.124$  the the last time that we really had
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:49:06.124 --> 01:49:08.280 a positive trial in Type 2 diabetes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:49:08.280 --> 01:49:09.720 Many medications followed,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:49:09.720 \longrightarrow 01:49:13.590$  all of which turned out to be negative.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}49{:}13.590 \dashrightarrow 01{:}49{:}17.150$  And so we had two decades of disappointment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:49:17.150 --> 01:49:19.446 And then I'm not going to go
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:49:19.446 \longrightarrow 01:49:21.508$  over the positive SGLT 2 trials.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:49:21.510 \longrightarrow 01:49:23.358$  But since then,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:49:23.358 \rightarrow 01:49:26.401$  we've got multiple SGLT 2 trials
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01:49:26.401 \longrightarrow 01:49:27.989$  that have been positive.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}49{:}27{.}990 \dashrightarrow 01{:}49{:}31{.}092$  And so our algorithm of treatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}49{:}31.092 \dashrightarrow 01{:}49{:}32.126$  has shifted.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- 01:49:32.130 --> 01:49:34.180 It's still lifestyle is the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758
- $01{:}49{:}34.180 \dashrightarrow 01{:}49{:}35.410$  cornerstone of treatment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01:49:35.410 \rightarrow 01:49:38.100$  But now you can see that the 2022 guide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}49{:}38.100 \dashrightarrow 01{:}49{:}40.822$  These are the Cadigal guidelines for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

01:49:40.822 --> 01:49:43.438 treatment of diabetic kidney disease have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}49{:}43{.}440 \dashrightarrow 01{:}49{:}45{.}462$  SGLT 2 inhibitors and Ras blockade

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01:49:45.462 \longrightarrow 01:49:47.765$  as first line of the rapy for

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}49{:}47.765 \dashrightarrow 01{:}49{:}49.980$  treatment for patients with diabetes

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01:49:49.980 \longrightarrow 01:49:52.008$  and chronic kidney disease and

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01:49:52.008 \rightarrow 01:49:54.220$  then in the top of the pyramid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}49{:}54{.}220 \dashrightarrow 01{:}49{:}56{.}806$  Let's say they have goal directed

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01:49:56.806 \longrightarrow 01:49:58.869$  therapy for individuals that

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}49{:}58.869 \dashrightarrow 01{:}50{:}01{.}391$  perhaps have residual albuminuria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01:50:01.391 \rightarrow 01:50:07.628$  Or are looking for better glycemic control?

NOTE Confidence: 0.936921758

 $01{:}50{:}07{.}630 \dashrightarrow 01{:}50{:}09{.}660$  Using a GLP one inhibitor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:50:11.770 \rightarrow 01:50:14.024$  Receptor agonist, so why do we care

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:50:14.024 \rightarrow 01:50:15.870$  about residual function or albuminuria?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:50:15.870 \longrightarrow 01:50:17.605$  And that's because we all

 $01:50:17.605 \rightarrow 01:50:19.690$  know that the lower your GFR,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:50:19.690 \longrightarrow 01:50:21.670$  whether you have diabetes or not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:50:21.670 \rightarrow 01:50:25.276$  you're more likely to have cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

01:50:25.276 --> 01:50:28.006 morbidity and all cost mortality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:50:28.010 \longrightarrow 01:50:30.971$  But it's also very important to note

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}50{:}30{.}971 \dashrightarrow 01{:}50{:}33{.}649$  that Albuminuria has a similar pattern,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:50:33.650 \longrightarrow 01:50:35.189$  so this year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.813438656666667

 $01:50:35.189 \rightarrow 01:50:38.267$  this last guidelines for the ADA,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}50{:}38{.}270 \dashrightarrow 01{:}50{:}41{.}330$  the standards of care which I'm happy to say.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:50:41.330 \rightarrow 01:50:42.610$  Also nephrology got upgraded.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:50:42.610 \longrightarrow 01:50:44.530$  Now we have our own chapter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.813438656666667

 $01:50:44.530 \rightarrow 01:50:47.073$  We're not mixed up with ophthalmology

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}50{:}47.073 \dashrightarrow 01{:}50{:}49.788$  and neuropathy of microvascular disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:50:49.790 \longrightarrow 01:50:51.686$  but it's been shown they have

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}50{:}51{.}686 \dashrightarrow 01{:}50{:}53{.}728$  as a the rapeutic target that if

 $01:50:53.728 \rightarrow 01:50:55.160$  you have severe albuminuria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}50{:}55{.}160 \dashrightarrow 01{:}50{:}57{.}272$  we should try at least to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:50:57.272 \rightarrow 01:50:59.030$  lower your albuminuria by 30%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}50{:}59{.}030 \dashrightarrow 01{:}51{:}03{.}006$  That's a based on the trials that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.813438656666667

 $01:51:03.006 \rightarrow 01:51:06.300$  been positive with SGLT 2 inhibitors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:51:06.300 \longrightarrow 01:51:09.436$  But even though in the data CKD study NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}51{:}09{.}436 \dashrightarrow 01{:}51{:}12{.}798$  and the Credence study which are the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

01:51:12.798 --> 01:51:16.350 two SGLT 2 inhibitor studies that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}51{:}16{.}350 \dashrightarrow 01{:}51{:}19{.}278$  the primary goal was kidney disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}51{:}19{.}278$  -->  $01{:}51{:}21{.}800$  and that's why I'm presenting those here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:51:21.800 \rightarrow 01:51:24.089$  some of the other studies were looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:51:24.089 \rightarrow 01:51:26.579$  really at a cardiovascular outcomes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:51:26.579 \rightarrow 01:51:29.459$  this the kidney disease was secondary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:51:29.460 \longrightarrow 01:51:32.252$  It was really like a finding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:51:32.252 \rightarrow 01:51:33.580$  It was a surprise.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

01:51:33.580 --> 01:51:35.204 I don't know that you know it

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:51:35.204 \longrightarrow 01:51:35.900$  wasn't thought that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:51:35.900 \rightarrow 01:51:37.646$  You would have such a big
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- 01:51:37.646 --> 01:51:38.810 impact in kidney disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01{:}51{:}38{.}810 \dashrightarrow 01{:}51{:}42{.}310$  and so both credence and a pathetic KD
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:51:42.310 \rightarrow 01:51:44.506$  still have a residual kidney function.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.813438656666667
- $01{:}51{:}44{.}510 \dashrightarrow 01{:}51{:}46{.}335$  Remember both credence and deposit
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:51:46.335 \longrightarrow 01:51:48.160$  KD to enter the study.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- 01:51:48.160 --> 01:51:50.505 You had to be on Ras blockade,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.813438656666667
- $01{:}51{:}50{.}510 \dashrightarrow 01{:}51{:}52{.}988$  whether it be an ACE inhibitor
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- 01:51:52.988 --> 01:51:55.150 or a or an ARB,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:51:55.150 \rightarrow 01:51:58.097$  and therefore we cannot say SGLT 2
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- 01:51:58.097 --> 01:52:00.676 inhibitors are better than race or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01{:}52{:}00.676 \dashrightarrow 01{:}52{:}03.154$  that somehow SGLT 2 inhibitor will
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01{:}52{:}03{.}154 \dashrightarrow 01{:}52{:}06{.}276$  replace rats because the studies were done.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- 01:52:06.280 --> 01:52:09.196 On a base of brass inhibition,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:52:09.200 \longrightarrow 01:52:12.170$  so there is still a significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

01:52:12.170 --> 01:52:13.160 residual risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:52:13.160 \rightarrow 01:52:15.145$  despite again the positive findings

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:52:15.145 \longrightarrow 01:52:18.330$  of these two studies and and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}52{:}18.330 \dashrightarrow 01{:}52{:}20.980$  there is an opportunity obviously

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}52{:}20{.}980 \dashrightarrow 01{:}52{:}24{.}890$  to improve kidney outcomes if we

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:52:24.890 \rightarrow 01:52:27.638$  have other the rapeutic medications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}52{:}27.640 \dashrightarrow 01{:}52{:}30.473$  And so we know that diabetic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

01:52:30.473 --> 01:52:32.538 kidney disease and chronic kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

01:52:32.538 --> 01:52:34.890 disease in general is associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}52{:}34{.}890 \dashrightarrow 01{:}52{:}36{.}780$  with increased inflammation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}52{:}36{.}780 \dashrightarrow 01{:}52{:}39{.}216$  This is data observational data from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:52:39.216 \rightarrow 01:52:41.520$  quick study using these three markers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}52{:}41{.}520 \dashrightarrow 01{:}52{:}43{.}794$ Fibrinogen TNF alpha and serum albumin

NOTE Confidence: 0.813438656666667

 $01{:}52{:}43.794 \dashrightarrow 01{:}52{:}46.228$  and basically you can see and I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}52{:}46{.}228 \dashrightarrow 01{:}52{:}48{.}669$  going to focus on the third model that

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:52:48.669 \rightarrow 01:52:50.594$  the higher your inflammatory markers
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:52:50.594 \rightarrow 01:52:53.082$  the more likely you are to progress
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01{:}52{:}53{.}082 \dashrightarrow 01{:}52{:}55{.}673$  in the future and you can see that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:52:55.673 \rightarrow 01:52:58.217$  in in all the markers and again Sir.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:52:58.220 \rightarrow 01:53:00.255$  Albumin has the opposite direction
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- 01:53:00.255 --> 01:53:02.290 because the lower serum albumin
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01{:}53{:}02{.}355 \dashrightarrow 01{:}53{:}04{.}327$  is associated with inflammation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:53:04.330 \rightarrow 01:53:05.539$  This is data,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.813438656666667
- 01:53:05.539 --> 01:53:07.151 a quick basically recruited
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:53:07.151 \rightarrow 01:53:08.360$  patients with CKD.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:53:08.360 \rightarrow 01:53:10.515$  This is the Framingham offspring
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:53:10.515 \rightarrow 01:53:12.670$  cohort which has community members
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01:53:12.742 \rightarrow 01:53:14.740$  also looking at the same thing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- $01{:}53{:}14.740 \dashrightarrow 01{:}53{:}16.895$  The relationship between GFR and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667
- 01:53:16.895 --> 01:53:19.050 inflammation and I'm going to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:53:19.122 \longrightarrow 01:53:21.551$  focus just on TNF receptor 2 which

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:53:21.551 \rightarrow 01:53:23.602$  has been highly associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

01:53:23.602 --> 01:53:25.466 diabetic kidney disease progression

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:53:25.466 \rightarrow 01:53:28.665$  and you can see the same thing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01{:}53{:}28.665 \dashrightarrow 01{:}53{:}31.335$  that the individuals that have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:53:31.335 \longrightarrow 01:53:33.820$  highest level it had the highest.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:53:33.820 \rightarrow 01:53:37.285$  You were also in the highest quartile.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

01:53:37.290 --> 01:53:38.970 First statin see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8134386566666667

 $01:53:38.970 \rightarrow 01:53:41.770$  So basically confirming what we've

NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444

 $01:53:41.770 \longrightarrow 01:53:43.414$  said before in CKD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444

 $01{:}53{:}43{.}414 \dashrightarrow 01{:}53{:}45{.}469$  Also in the general population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444

 $01:53:45.470 \longrightarrow 01:53:48.560$  So we know that a individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444

 $01{:}53{:}48{.}560 \dashrightarrow 01{:}53{:}51{.}312$  with diabetic kidney disease have

NOTE Confidence: 0.833850814444444

 $01{:}53{:}51{.}312 \dashrightarrow 01{:}53{:}53{.}692$  up regulation of the mineralocorticoid

NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444

 $01:53:53.692 \dashrightarrow 01:53:58.010$  receptor and in when you have a normal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444

 $01{:}53{:}58{.}010 \dashrightarrow 01{:}54{:}01{.}783$  That function, it works in the epithelial

- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01:54:01.783 \rightarrow 01:54:04.320$  cell causes electrolyte and water.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- 01:54:04.320 --> 01:54:07.148 Changes, but it overactivation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- 01:54:07.148 --> 01:54:09.269 It creates fibrosis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01:54:09.270 \longrightarrow 01:54:11.840$  increased oxidative stress and inflammation.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.833850814444444
- $01:54:11.840 \longrightarrow 01:54:14.120$  And this is another picture.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01:54:14.120 \longrightarrow 01:54:16.129$  Sort of depicting this not only in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01:54:16.129 \longrightarrow 01:54:18.280$  the kidney but also vascular damage.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- 01:54:18.280 --> 01:54:20.264 It causes vascular remodeling,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01:54:20.264 \rightarrow 01:54:21.256$  endothelial dysfunction,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- 01:54:21.260 --> 01:54:23.210 also myocardial injury,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01:54:23.210 \rightarrow 01:54:25.623$  and fibrosis hypertrophy, etcetera.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.833850814444444
- $01:54:25.623 \longrightarrow 01:54:28.401$  So this is an animal study
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01{:}54{:}28{.}401 \dashrightarrow 01{:}54{:}30{.}739$  that is used for this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01{:}54{:}30{.}740 \dashrightarrow 01{:}54{:}34{.}450$  Looking at inflammation and fibrosis in Iraq.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01:54:34.450 \longrightarrow 01:54:36.554$  Model of aldosterone and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444

- $01:54:36.554 \rightarrow 01:54:39.184$  hypertension and you can see
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01:54:39.184 \rightarrow 01:54:42.336$  here sort of the typical feature,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01:54:42.340 \longrightarrow 01:54:44.340$  some vascular and glomerular damage.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- 01:54:44.340 --> 01:54:45.740 Leukocyte infiltration,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- 01:54:45.740 --> 01:54:47.840 protein cast etcetera.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01{:}54{:}47{.}840 \dashrightarrow 01{:}54{:}49{.}328$  But also very important to note
- NOTE Confidence: 0.833850814444444
- $01:54:49.328 \longrightarrow 01:54:51.232$  that in the renal color text when
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01:54:51.232 \rightarrow 01:54:52.657$  they looked at messenger RNA,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01{:}54{:}52{.}660 \dashrightarrow 01{:}54{:}54{.}585$  the levels of the proinflam matory
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01:54:54.585 \longrightarrow 01:54:56.680$  genes in these animals was
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01{:}54{:}56{.}680 \dashrightarrow 01{:}54{:}59{.}030$  higher in those individuals that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83385081444444
- $01:54:59.030 \longrightarrow 01:55:01.460$  had the highest aldosterone.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01:55:03.630 \rightarrow 01:55:06.889$  And so when you have this, not when you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01:55:06.889 \dashrightarrow 01:55:09.069$  have knockout animals, then it went.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01{:}55{:}09{.}069 \dashrightarrow 01{:}55{:}11{.}510$  This is and feed them at Western diet.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01:55:11.510 \dashrightarrow 01:55:15.224$  That's what WD means. And these

 $01:55:15.224 \dashrightarrow 01:55:18.090$  animals have endothelial specific Mr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}55{:}18.090 \dashrightarrow 01{:}55{:}20.106$  Knockout when they looked at their

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:55:20.106 \rightarrow 01:55:22.185$  kidneys they could see even though

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:55:22.185 \longrightarrow 01:55:23.870$  they're in the Western diet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

01:55:23.870 --> 01:55:25.742 If you don't, this is Western

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:55:25.742 \longrightarrow 01:55:26.990$  diet without the knockout.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}55{:}26{.}990 \dashrightarrow 01{:}55{:}29{.}594$  This is Western diet with the knock out

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:55:29.594 \rightarrow 01:55:33.394$  and you can see that if you have the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}55{:}33{.}394 \dashrightarrow 01{:}55{:}36{.}917$  The Western diet with the knockout you

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}55{:}36{.}917 \dashrightarrow 01{:}55{:}40{.}298$  have the same findings of fibrosis as

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:55:40.298 \dashrightarrow 01:55:45.110$  if you were not on the Western diet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}55{:}45{.}110 \dashrightarrow 01{:}55{:}46{.}785$  And and here's this fibrosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

01:55:46.785 --> 01:55:47.790 in the interstitium.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

01:55:47.790 --> 01:55:51.408 Here's periarterial fibrosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}55{:}51{.}410 \dashrightarrow 01{:}55{:}53{.}150$  And this is now human data,

 $01:55:53.150 \longrightarrow 01:55:56.280$  so this is data from 2005 but

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:55:56.280 \rightarrow 01:55:58.380$  still relevant showing these

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:55:58.380 \rightarrow 01:56:01.295$  were 95 patients that had kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:56:01.295 \rightarrow 01:56:03.203$  biopsies and aldosterone measured.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

01:56:03.210 $\operatorname{-->}$ 01:56:06.100 And if you can see that in the X axis

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:56:06.182 \rightarrow 01:56:09.304$  they creatinine clearance in the Y axis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}56{:}09{.}310 \dashrightarrow 01{:}56{:}11{.}620$  the serum aldosterone level and

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:56:11.620 \longrightarrow 01:56:14.988$  you can see that the lower your

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}56{:}14.988 \dashrightarrow 01{:}56{:}17.868$  GFR your aldosterone was higher and

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:56:17.868 \rightarrow 01:56:21.060$  also in looking at the biopsies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}56{:}21.060 \dashrightarrow 01{:}56{:}23.664$  In the percent scarring in the X

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

01:56:23.664 --> 01:56:25.908 axis and aldosterone and the Y axis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:56:25.910 \longrightarrow 01:56:30.222$  you can see that the more higher your

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:56:30.222 \rightarrow 01:56:34.327$  fibrosis the higher your aldosterone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:56:34.330 \longrightarrow 01:56:35.725$  So in summary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}56{:}35{.}725 \dashrightarrow 01{:}56{:}38{.}515$  there again a multiple animal studies,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01:56:38.520 \longrightarrow 01:56:39.668$  but I'm going to focus on this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01{:}56{:}39{.}670 \dashrightarrow 01{:}56{:}41{.}596$  There's significant evidence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01:56:41.596 \longrightarrow 01:56:44.164$  that it creating Mr.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01{:}56{:}44{.}170 \dashrightarrow 01{:}56{:}46{.}960$  Knockouts basically spares the organs
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01:56:46.960 \longrightarrow 01:56:50.490$  either the heart or the kidney,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01{:}56{:}50{.}490 \dashrightarrow 01{:}56{:}53{.}328$  or the blood vessels from fibrosis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01:56:53.330 \longrightarrow 01:56:54.038$  inflammation, etcetera.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01:56:54.038 \rightarrow 01:56:57.490$  And we know that in the setting of diabetes,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- 01:56:57.490 --> 01:56:58.858 disease, kidney disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01{:}56{:}58.858 \dashrightarrow 01{:}57{:}00.898$  heart failure, cardiovascular disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01:57:00.898 \longrightarrow 01:57:03.718$  all of these diseases and.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01:57:03.720 \longrightarrow 01:57:04.736$  To be quite honest,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01:57:04.736 \longrightarrow 01:57:06.260$  in the patients that I see,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01{:}57{:}06.260 \dashrightarrow 01{:}57{:}07.996$  most of them have all of them.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333
- $01:57:08.000 \rightarrow 01:57:09.920$  They they're severe overactivation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:57:09.920 \longrightarrow 01:57:11.840$  of the MMR system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

01:57:11.840 --> 01:57:13.928 So in summary it is chronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:57:13.928 \rightarrow 01:57:15.320$  kidney disease associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:57:15.380 \longrightarrow 01:57:16.940$  inflammation and fibrosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:57:16.940 \longrightarrow 01:57:19.025$  The more advanced chronic kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}57{:}19.025 \dashrightarrow 01{:}57{:}21.110$  disease is associated with increased NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:57:21.178 \rightarrow 01:57:23.243$  inflammation and fibrosis and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}57{:}23{.}243 \dashrightarrow 01{:}57{:}24{.}755$  mineral mineral corticoid receptor

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:57:24.755 \longrightarrow 01:57:26.580$  is involved in the regulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

01:57:26.580 --> 01:57:28.019 of inflammation and fibrosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}57{:}28{.}020 \dashrightarrow 01{:}57{:}30{.}900$  and this overactivation is what causes

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

01:57:30.900 --> 01:57:32.820 kidney and cardiovascular damage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:57:32.820 \longrightarrow 01:57:34.830$  And here's where this molecule.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:57:34.830 \longrightarrow 01:57:37.300$  Comes along initially it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:57:37.300 \longrightarrow 01:57:39.247$  called Bay 9488 sixty two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:57:39.247 \rightarrow 01:57:41.480$  I'm assuming the Bay comes from Bayer,

 $01:57:41.480 \longrightarrow 01:57:44.000$  and the later was renamed as Finerenone

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}57{:}44.000 \dashrightarrow 01{:}57{:}46.463$  and this is the chemical structure

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}57{:}46{.}463 \dashrightarrow 01{:}57{:}48{.}648$  and the difference between this

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:57:48.648 \rightarrow 01:57:50.772$  and our previous mineral ocorticoid

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

01:57:50.772 --> 01:57:53.702 receptor antagonist is that FINERENONE

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}57{:}53.702 \dashrightarrow 01{:}57{:}56.772$  has a significant higher affinity

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}57{:}56{.}772 \dashrightarrow 01{:}57{:}59{.}396$  to the mineral ocorticoid receptor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}57{:}59{.}400 \dashrightarrow 01{:}58{:}01{.}920$  and the other difference is that it

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}58{:}01{.}920 \dashrightarrow 01{:}58{:}04{.}572$  it's not renally excreted, and those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}58{:}04{.}572 \dashrightarrow 01{:}58{:}08{.}060$  Qualities and made made it at the time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:58:08.060 \rightarrow 01:58:10.586$  Think that they would have less

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}58{:}10.586 \dashrightarrow 01{:}58{:}13.436$  of the known complications of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}58{:}13.436 \dashrightarrow 01{:}58{:}16.291$  other MRA which are gynecomastia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

01:58:16.291 --> 01:58:17.333 Hypogastrium mostly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}58{:}17.333 \dashrightarrow 01{:}58{:}20.459$  and so these are the initial

 $01:58:20.459 \rightarrow 01:58:22.987$  trials using the different doses,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:58:22.990 \longrightarrow 01:58:27.973$  the 1.125 and and 20 but just basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

01:58:27.973 - 01:58:31.138 showing you that there's really a

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:58:31.138 \rightarrow 01:58:35.478$  some change as soon as you give it on a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

01:58:35.480 --> 01:58:36.938 GFR very minimal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:58:36.938 \rightarrow 01:58:40.340$  and it doesn't really vary by dose

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}58{:}40{.}439 \dashrightarrow 01{:}58{:}43{.}504$  and the potassium level stayed

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01:58:43.504 \rightarrow 01:58:45.956$  relatively stable over time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.919110223333333

 $01{:}58{:}45{.}960 \dashrightarrow 01{:}58{:}48{.}000$  and the systolic blood pressure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:58:48.000 \rightarrow 01:58:50.724$  It really. It's not the best

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:58:50.724 \rightarrow 01:58:52.540$  systolic blood pressure medication,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:58:52.540 \longrightarrow 01:58:54.900$  so it it lowers it a little bit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:58:54.900 \rightarrow 01:58:58.170$  but not anything very impressive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01{:}58{:}58{.}170 \dashrightarrow 01{:}59{:}00{.}732$  Is so these are data from credence

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:59:00.732 \longrightarrow 01:59:03.045$  and I just want to mention

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:59:03.045 \rightarrow 01:59:05.670$  the year this is 2015 to 2018.

01:59:05.670 --> 01:59:09.163 So SGLT 2 inhibitor was available but

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:59:09.163 \rightarrow 01:59:12.926$  not as commonly used as it is nowadays.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:59:12.930 \longrightarrow 01:59:15.962$  So in the fidelity of study which was

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:59:15.962 \rightarrow 01:59:19.169$  the one that had the kidney outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01{:}59{:}19{.}170 \dashrightarrow 01{:}59{:}21{.}246$  the figural study was the sister

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01{:}59{:}21{.}246 \dashrightarrow 01{:}59{:}23{.}187$  study that had the cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01{:}59{:}23.187 \dashrightarrow 01{:}59{:}25.617$  outcome as the main outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:59:25.620 \longrightarrow 01:59:27.270$  You and then they switch

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:59:27.270 \longrightarrow 01:59:28.260$  for secondary outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

01:59:28.260 --> 01:59:32.640 but basically 13 almost 14,000 individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:59:32.640 \dashrightarrow 01:59:36.243$  were enrolled and 5700 were randomized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01{:}59{:}36{.}243 \dashrightarrow 01{:}59{:}38{.}598$  The randomization was to either

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01{:}59{:}38{.}598 \dashrightarrow 01{:}59{:}41{.}580$ 10 or funeral or 20 of fine<br/>renone

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01{:}59{:}41{.}580 \dashrightarrow 01{:}59{:}44{.}752$  based on your GFR and then you know

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01{:}59{:}44.752 \dashrightarrow 01{:}59{:}47.188$  you had your visits like this.

 $01:59:47.190 \longrightarrow 01:59:48.786$  And these are the final studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:59:48.790 \rightarrow 01:59:51.268$  This was published about two years ago

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:59:51.268 \rightarrow 01:59:54.747$  and you can see that it was a positive study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01:59:54.750 \rightarrow 01:59:56.652$  meaning that there was a decrease

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $01{:}59{:}56.652 \dashrightarrow 01{:}59{:}58.470$  in the primary composite outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

01:59:58.470 --> 02:00:02.390 And in this study the primary composite

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:00:02.390 \longrightarrow 02:00:06.609$  outcome was a decrease in GFR of 40%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:00:06.610 \rightarrow 02:00:11.218$  Going on dialysis or death from a renal cost.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:00:11.220 \longrightarrow 02:00:13.908$  And here you can see the primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:00:13.908 --> 02:00:15.889 kidney failure was end stage,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:00:15.890 - 02:00:18.620 kidney disease, or GFR less than 15.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}00{:}18.620 \dashrightarrow 02{:}00{:}22.634$  This is the 40% decrease death of renal cost.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}00{:}22.640 \dashrightarrow 02{:}00{:}25.064$  And so the this is the same picture

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:00:25.064 --> 02:00:26.917 just depicted in a different way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:00:26.920 \rightarrow 02:00:29.600$  But showing us the sort of the breakdown.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:00:29.600 \longrightarrow 02:00:34.001$  But you can see that all of them favored

- NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851
- $02:00:34.001 \rightarrow 02:00:37.664$  finerenone use and this the secondary

 $02{:}00{:}37.664 \dashrightarrow 02{:}00{:}41.220$  outcomes were cardiov ascular and they key.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:00:41.220 \rightarrow 02:00:43.430$  Secondary outcome was positive again.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:00:43.430 \longrightarrow 02:00:46.410$  Some of them because of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:00:46.410 --> 02:00:49.210 Numbers it did not reach

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:00:49.210 --> 02:00:50.890 individuals is significant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:00:50.890 \longrightarrow 02:00:54.370$  We can see that from early on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}00{:}54.370 \dashrightarrow 02{:}00{:}58.623$  decrease in Albuminuria was still quite a

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:00:58.623 \rightarrow 02:01:02.590$  substantial and leveled throughout the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:01:02.590 --> 02:01:05.056 And same as SGLT 2 inhibitors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:01:05.060 \rightarrow 02:01:07.600$  there's always that early decline

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}01{:}07{.}600 \dashrightarrow 02{:}01{:}11{.}288$  in GFR and by in using fine renone

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:01:11.288 \rightarrow 02:01:15.440$  in by month 24 or two years later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:01:15.440 \longrightarrow 02:01:19.310$  that's when you start really seeing

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:01:19.310 --> 02:01:21.301 the picture separate.

 $02:01:21.301 \longrightarrow 02:01:24.806$  So there's this early decline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}01{:}24{.}810 \dashrightarrow 02{:}01{:}27{.}449$  and then this sort of long slope

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:01:27.449 \longrightarrow 02:01:29.730$  that is shown a difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:01:29.730 --> 02:01:31.142 And then very importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:01:31.142 \longrightarrow 02:01:33.260$  this is what we're talking about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}01{:}33{.}260 \dashrightarrow 02{:}01{:}36{.}136$  This potassium in individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:01:36.136 \longrightarrow 02:01:39.731$  using fine renone did have higher

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:01:39.731 \rightarrow 02:01:41.734$  potassium than the placebo arm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}01{:}41.734 \dashrightarrow 02{:}01{:}44.550$  but it did not reach any significant NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:01:44.550 \rightarrow 02:01:47.010$  statistical significant difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:01:47.010 --> 02:01:49.607 But if you look at the supplement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:01:49.610 \longrightarrow 02:01:52.753$  you can see that they do discuss

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:01:52.753 --> 02:01:55.754 that five point you know 21% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}01{:}55{.}754 \dashrightarrow 02{:}01{:}57{.}764$  people on the fine renone group

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:01:57.764 \rightarrow 02:01:59.719$  had potassium greater than five.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:01:59.720 \longrightarrow 02:02:01.530$  And five compared to placebo,

 $02{:}02{:}01{.}530 \dashrightarrow 02{:}02{:}05{.}498$  which was almost 10% but that severe high

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}02{:}05{.}498 \dashrightarrow 02{:}02{:}08{.}600$  potassium greater than six was still seen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:02:08.600 --> 02:02:09.144 You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}02{:}09{.}144 \dashrightarrow 02{:}02{:}11{.}320$  an almost two to three times higher in

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:02:11.384 \longrightarrow 02:02:14.092$  the Finerenone Group 4.5 versus 1.4.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}02{:}14.092 \dashrightarrow 02{:}02{:}18.120$  So it's still important to monitor the

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:02:18.120 \rightarrow 02:02:21.640$  potassium after starting treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02:02:21.640 \longrightarrow 02:02:25.762$  So what we did is it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}02{:}25{.}762 \dashrightarrow 02{:}02{:}28{.}054$  It was a pre specified goal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:02:28.060 --> 02:02:30.130 We merge both the fidelity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

02:02:30.130 --> 02:02:32.098 And the Figaro trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}02{:}32{.}098 \dashrightarrow 02{:}02{:}35{.}575$  because they had exactly the same visit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850244851

 $02{:}02{:}35{.}575 \dashrightarrow 02{:}02{:}38{.}725$  and they have different entry criteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:02:38.730 --> 02:02:43.000 but. We combined the studies and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}02{:}43.000 \dashrightarrow 02{:}02{:}45.979$  now it becomes the largest study

02:02:45.979 --> 02:02:48.784 in patients with chronic kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:02:48.784 --> 02:02:51.484 disease because now there's 13,026

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}02{:}51{.}484 \dashrightarrow 02{:}02{:}53{.}754$  patients that were randomized and NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}02{:}53{.}754 \dashrightarrow 02{:}02{:}56{.}729$  a medium follow up of three years NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}02{:}56{.}730 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}00{.}522$  and you can see in this picture sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}03{:}00.522 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}04.056$  of what areas of CKD it covers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:03:04.060 --> 02:03:04.907 I don't know if you see it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}03{:}04{.}910 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}07{.}534$  it's a little bit sort of a blue

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:03:07.534 --> 02:03:09.390 darker color here, but basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}03{:}09{.}390 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}11{.}290$  all the individuals with severe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}03{:}11{.}290 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}14.668$  CKD, and here with moderate seeking

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}03{:}14.668 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}16.920$  and with moderate albuminuria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}03{:}16{.}920 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}19{.}026$  sorry and then these are the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:03:19.026 --> 02:03:20.882 key inclusion criteria and key

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02:03:20.882 \rightarrow 02:03:22.797$  exclusion criteria of the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:03:22.800 --> 02:03:24.120 Basically like I said,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272
- $02{:}03{:}24{.}120 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}26{.}578$  individuals had to be on the maximum

 $02{:}03{:}26.578 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}29.026$  tolerated those that's a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}03{:}29{.}026 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}31{.}406$  also different from the SGLT 2 trials

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02:03:31.406 \rightarrow 02:03:34.378$  where you just had to be on an ace or an ARB.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:03:34.380 --> 02:03:36.543 You did not have to be on

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}03{:}36{.}543 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}37{.}870$  the maximum tolerated dose.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:03:37.870 --> 02:03:40.440 And OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:03:40.440 --> 02:03:41.727 So in summary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02:03:41.727 \rightarrow 02:03:44.730$  I already discussed that funeral known it

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}03{:}44.816$  -->  $02{:}03{:}48.036$  was novel selective and non steroidal MRA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02:03:48.040 \longrightarrow 02:03:50.080$  That fidelity is approved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:03:50.080 --> 02:03:52.630 Specified pool analysis of both

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}03{:}52{.}630 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}54{.}891$  studies and when they combine

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}03{:}54{.}891 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}57{.}393$  the studies and you'll see this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}03{:}57{.}400 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}00{.}580$  This was also already published and

 $02:04:00.580 \longrightarrow 02:04:04.395$  they combined outcomes was 14% risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:04:04.395 --> 02:04:06.970 reduction in the cardiovascular composite

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}04{:}06{.}970$  -->  $02{:}04{:}10{.}270$  Antone and 23% in the kidney composite. NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:04:10.270 --> 02:04:11.270 Two point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}04{:}11{.}270 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}14{.}270$  but contrary to the previous publications,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}04{:}14{.}270$  -->  $02{:}04{:}17{.}230$  they had used 40% in the new publication, NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02:04:17.230 \longrightarrow 02:04:20.958$  merging the two data sets you can look

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}04{:}20{.}958 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}24{.}982$  at it a you know a less common outcome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02:04:24.982 \longrightarrow 02:04:27.238$  which was 57%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02:04:27.240 \rightarrow 02:04:29.616$  So I initially we obviously wanted

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:04:29.616 --> 02:04:32.565 to know if there was any improvement

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}04{:}32{.}565 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}35{.}554$  in those patients that were both on

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}04{:}35{.}638 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}38{.}516$  finer and SGLT 2 treatment and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:04:38.516 --> 02:04:41.512 it combining the two data sets that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}04{:}41{.}512 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}44{.}961$  allows us to do that and there is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}04{:}44{.}961 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}47{.}461$  some preclinical data showing and

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272
- $02:04:47.461 \rightarrow 02:04:51.789$  here you can see it that these were.

 $02{:}04{:}51.790 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}54.796$  And but these were animals on

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}04{:}54{.}796 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}57{.}268$  empaglifloz in finerenone and then a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}04{:}57{.}268 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}59{.}560$  group that were in combination and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}04{:}59{.}560 \dashrightarrow 02{:}05{:}02{.}460$  you can see and these are hearts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:05:02.460 --> 02:05:05.012 They looked at cardiac fibrosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02:05:05.012 \rightarrow 02:05:08.220$  but you can see this is the scoring

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02:05:08.304 \rightarrow 02:05:09.290$  for fibrosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}05{:}09{.}290 \dashrightarrow 02{:}05{:}12{.}020$  But you can see that there was

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02:05:12.020 \longrightarrow 02:05:14.171$  some preliminary data that in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:05:14.171 -> 02:05:16.421 the combination of both perhaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}05{:}16{.}421 \dashrightarrow 02{:}05{:}18{.}530$  would have decreased fibrosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:05:18.530 --> 02:05:20.861 And there was also great a survival

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:05:20.861 --> 02:05:23.438 benefit in the in the animals that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}05{:}23{.}438 \dashrightarrow 02{:}05{:}25{.}323$  had both empire and fine renone,

 $02{:}05{:}25{.}330 \dashrightarrow 02{:}05{:}29{.}137$  and that is this the survival a graph.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}05{:}29{.}140 \dashrightarrow 02{:}05{:}31{.}642$  OK the green is the combination

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02:05:31.642 \longrightarrow 02:05:34.040$  therapy and black is placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}05{:}34{.}040 \dashrightarrow 02{:}05{:}36{.}374$  So fine renone and empower about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

 $02{:}05{:}36{.}374 \dashrightarrow 02{:}05{:}38{.}700$  same and then combination was better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9233272

02:05:38.700 --> 02:05:39.720 Placebo was worse.

NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509

 $02{:}05{:}41.850 \dashrightarrow 02{:}05{:}45.186$  And so this is the trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509

 $02:05:45.190 \longrightarrow 02:05:48.310$  from all those patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509

 $02{:}05{:}48{.}310 \dashrightarrow 02{:}05{:}51{.}970$  Only 877 participants, where on an

NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509

 $02{:}05{:}51{.}970 \dashrightarrow 02{:}05{:}55{.}925$  SGLT 2 inhibitor during the trial and

NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509

 $02{:}05{:}55{.}925 \dashrightarrow 02{:}05{:}59{.}306$  and so that is important to note.

NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509

 $02{:}05{:}59{.}310 \dashrightarrow 02{:}06{:}02{.}054$  So I remember. I told you that

NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509

 $02:06:02.054 \rightarrow 02:06:03.950$  the study finished in 2018.

NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509

 $02{:}06{:}03{.}950 \dashrightarrow 02{:}06{:}07{.}334$  So at that time is some of the SGLT

NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509

 $02:06:07.334 \longrightarrow 02:06:11.378$  2 trials had not come out yet and so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509

 $02:06:11.380 \longrightarrow 02:06:12.488$  That's probably why not

- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- $02:06:12.488 \longrightarrow 02:06:13.873$  more people were on it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- $02{:}06{:}13.880 \dashrightarrow 02{:}06{:}15.725$  But there are other important
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- $02{:}06{:}15.725 \dashrightarrow 02{:}06{:}17.942$  difference are that people that were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- $02:06:17.942 \longrightarrow 02:06:20.063$  on SGLT 2 inhibitors were also more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- $02:06:20.063 \longrightarrow 02:06:22.151$  likely to be on statins and they
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- 02:06:22.151 --> 02:06:25.026 were also more likely to be on GLP.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- 02:06:25.026 --> 02:06:27.436 One receptor agonist so GLP
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- 02:06:27.436 --> 02:06:29.884 one receptor agonist required
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- $02{:}06{:}29{.}884 \dashrightarrow 02{:}06{:}33{.}216$  injections and therefore it poses
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- $02{:}06{:}33.216 \dashrightarrow 02{:}06{:}35.996$  the theoretical option that perhaps
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- $02:06:35.996 \rightarrow 02:06:39.245$  this is these patients with SLE
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- 02:06:39.245 --> 02:06:42.047 on SGLT 2 inhibitors were perhaps.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- $02:06:42.050 \longrightarrow 02:06:44.935$  Either more difficult to control
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- $02:06:44.935 \longrightarrow 02:06:47.243$  individuals or individuals that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509
- $02:06:47.243 \rightarrow 02:06:50.088$  were with physicians that were,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509

 $02{:}06{:}50{.}090 \dashrightarrow 02{:}06{:}54{.}728$  let's say, more aggressive or more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.687284509

 $02:06:54.730 \longrightarrow 02:06:55.820$  Willing to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893456377272727

 $02{:}06{:}57{.}840 \dashrightarrow 02{:}07{:}00{.}070$  Give this medications that perhaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.893456377272727

 $02:07:00.070 \rightarrow 02:07:02.740$  we're not mainstream at the time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893456377272727

 $02{:}07{:}02{.}740 \dashrightarrow 02{:}07{:}04{.}940$  so anyway, so the the GFR was a

NOTE Confidence: 0.893456377272727

 $02{:}07{:}04{.}940 \dashrightarrow 02{:}07{:}07{.}073$  little bit higher in those individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.893456377272727

02:07:07<br/>.073 --> 02:07:09.347 that were on SGLT 2 inhibitors

NOTE Confidence: 0.893456377272727

 $02:07:09.422 \rightarrow 02:07:11.774$  compared to the others that you ACR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893456377272727

02:07:11.780 --> 02:07:13.544 I don't really think that there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.893456377272727

 $02:07:13.544 \rightarrow 02:07:15.400$  a big difference here. And.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857

02:07:17.550 --> 02:07:21.085 And but we we found out again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857

 $02:07:21.090 \rightarrow 02:07:24.167$  just highlighting that only six point 7% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857

 $02{:}07{:}24.167 \dashrightarrow 02{:}07{:}26.863$  the individuals it were an SGLT 2 inhibitor.

NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857

 $02:07:26.870 \longrightarrow 02:07:32.032$  So the power of this is not the best,

NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857

 $02{:}07{:}32{.}032 \dashrightarrow 02{:}07{:}35{.}560$  but we can see that there was significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857

 $02{:}07{:}35{.}653 \dashrightarrow 02{:}07{:}38{.}767$  reduction in a in those individuals.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02{:}07{:}38.770 \dashrightarrow 02{:}07{:}42.950$  Those that were on SGLT 2 or not SGLT 2
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02{:}07{:}43.061 \dashrightarrow 02{:}07{:}47.027$  they had the same similar reductions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:07:47.030 \longrightarrow 02:07:48.506$  If you were not an SGLT.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:07:48.510 \longrightarrow 02:07:50.310$  To inhibitors with 32%.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:07:50.310 \longrightarrow 02:07:55.860$  If you were on SGLT 2 inhibitor of 37%.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02{:}07{:}55{.}860 \dashrightarrow 02{:}08{:}01{.}870$  This data was presented at ADA last year.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02{:}08{:}01{.}870 \dashrightarrow 02{:}08{:}05{.}372$  And then we looked at cardiov ascular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:08:05.372 \longrightarrow 02:08:07.520$  benefit and you can see that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02{:}08{:}07{.}584 \dashrightarrow 02{:}08{:}09{.}309$  the cardiovascular benefit.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- 02:08:09.310 --> 02:08:12.120 Again, the hazard ratio had
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- 02:08:12.120 --> 02:08:13.806 wider confidence intervals,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:08:13.810 \rightarrow 02:08:17.248$  but you can see that it was positive whether
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02{:}08{:}17{.}248 \dashrightarrow 02{:}08{:}20{.}260$  you wear an SGLT 2 inhibitor or not.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02{:}08{:}20{.}260 \dashrightarrow 02{:}08{:}22{.}738$  And there was no interaction about.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:08:22.740 \longrightarrow 02:08:24.420$  You know whether you were an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857

- 02:08:24.420 --> 02:08:25.840 SGLT 2 inhibitor or not,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:08:25.840 \rightarrow 02:08:27.040$  and then more specifically,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- 02:08:27.040 --> 02:08:29.284 as as you know, our patients are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:08:29.284 \rightarrow 02:08:31.372$  more likely to develop heart failure.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02{:}08{:}31{.}380 \dashrightarrow 02{:}08{:}34{.}060$  So we looked at that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- 02:08:34.060 --> 02:08:36.765 Individually and you can see
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:08:36.765 \dashrightarrow 02:08:40.310$  similarly that there wasn't a benefit.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:08:40.310 \longrightarrow 02:08:43.595$  The interaction did not reach
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- 02:08:43.595 --> 02:08:44.909 significance either,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:08:44.910 \longrightarrow 02:08:46.410$  so there was no difference.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02{:}08{:}46{.}410 \dashrightarrow 02{:}08{:}48{.}307$  We never known work the same whether
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- 02:08:48.307 --> 02:08:50.706 you were on an SGLT 2 inhibitor or not.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:08:50.710 \longrightarrow 02:08:53.153$  They we were unable to find that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.730639867142857
- $02:08:53.153 \rightarrow 02:08:55.288$  it was superior to be on both.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8501126746666667
- $02:08:57.340 \longrightarrow 02:08:58.840$  And again, this is what
- NOTE Confidence: 0.850112674666667
- 02:08:58.840 --> 02:09:00.040 I had mentioned before.

 $02:09:00.040 \longrightarrow 02:09:03.990$  The 57% composite outcome versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.850112674666667

 $02:09:03.990 \rightarrow 02:09:07.124$  the 40% kidney composite outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850112674666667

 $02:09:07.124 \longrightarrow 02:09:10.054$  And again there are more

NOTE Confidence: 0.850112674666667

 $02:09:10.054 \rightarrow 02:09:12.658$  people in this lower group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8501126746666667

 $02:09:12.660 \longrightarrow 02:09:14.018$  so I'm going to focus on that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.850112674666667

02:09:14.020 --> 02:09:15.640 But basically if you were

NOTE Confidence: 0.8501126746666667

02:09:15.640 --> 02:09:17.260 not an SGLT 2 inhibitor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.850112674666667

 $02:09:17.260 \rightarrow 02:09:19.868$  you did well and really you cannot

NOTE Confidence: 0.850112674666667

 $02{:}09{:}19.868 \dashrightarrow 02{:}09{:}22.219$  really tell that this one and this

NOTE Confidence: 0.850112674666667

 $02{:}09{:}22{.}219 \dashrightarrow 02{:}09{:}24{.}310$  one are different from each other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

02:09:26.850 --> 02:09:29.244 And so more importantly, is it safe?

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}09{:}29{.}250 \dashrightarrow 02{:}09{:}31{.}402$  Because that's also important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}09{:}31{.}402 \dashrightarrow 02{:}09{:}34{.}630$  And looking at any adverse events,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}09{:}34{.}630 \dashrightarrow 02{:}09{:}37{.}262$  those that were on SGLT 2 inhibitor

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}09{:}37{.}262 \dashrightarrow 02{:}09{:}40{.}286$  versus not an SGLT 2 inhibitor had

 $02{:}09{:}40{.}286 \dashrightarrow 02{:}09{:}43{.}004$  about similar number of adverse events

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

02:09:43.010 - > 02:09:45.360 and significantly those that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}09{:}45{.}360 \dashrightarrow 02{:}09{:}48{.}317$  an SGLT 2 inhibitor and fine renone

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

02:09:48.317 --> 02:09:51.957 perhaps had even a lower levels of

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}09{:}51{.}957 \dashrightarrow 02{:}09{:}54{.}727$  hyperkalemia than those that were not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}09{:}54{.}730 \dashrightarrow 02{:}09{:}56{.}956$  So you can compare the 14 versus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}09{:}56{.}960 \dashrightarrow 02{:}10{:}00{.}117$  And and the place bo was seven versus

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02:10:00.120 \rightarrow 02:10:03.558 2.7$  so so that's quite important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

02:10:03.560 --> 02:10:05.870 because we obviously do not want

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02:10:05.870 \longrightarrow 02:10:08.330$  to provide a medication that will

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}10{:}08{.}330 \dashrightarrow 02{:}10{:}10{.}980$  have a more serious adverse events.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

02:10:10.980 --> 02:10:12.105 So in summary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02:10:12.105 \longrightarrow 02:10:13.980$  the patients treated with an

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

02:10:13.980 --> 02:10:16.481 SGLT 2 inhibitor at baseline had

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02:10:16.481 \rightarrow 02:10:18.566$  higher mean E GFR lower.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}10{:}18.570 \dashrightarrow 02{:}10{:}20.789$  You're now going into creatinine ratio and

02:10:20.789 --> 02:10:23.079 how you're use of statins and GLP one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

02:10:23.080 - 02:10:25.504 but there was a consistent kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}10{:}25{.}504 \dashrightarrow 02{:}10{:}26{.}716$  and cardiovascular benefit

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

02:10:26.716 --> 02:10:28.800 from finerenone versus placebo.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

02:10:28.800 --> 02:10:31.959 Whether you were on SGLT 2 inhibitors or not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02:10:31.960 \rightarrow 02:10:35.187$  and it looked like the safety outcomes

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02:10:35.187 \longrightarrow 02:10:37.336$  were consistent irrespective of whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

02:10:37.336 --> 02:10:39.744 you used SGLT 2 inhibitors or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02:10:39.750 \longrightarrow 02:10:41.750$  And so we need obviously.

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02:10:41.750 \rightarrow 02:10:46.047$  Now the more people use SGLT 2 inhibitors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}10{:}46.050 \dashrightarrow 02{:}10{:}48.858$  but it would be a fantastic to do a

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

02:10:48.858 --> 02:10:51.815 study where we can do maybe a factor

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}10{:}51{.}815 \dashrightarrow 02{:}10{:}54{.}589$  design or combine them with or without,

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02{:}10{:}54{.}590 \dashrightarrow 02{:}10{:}56{.}872$  et cetera to really see if there

NOTE Confidence: 0.759999501428571

 $02:10:56.872 \longrightarrow 02:10:58.490$  is a combined benefit.

02:11:01.170 --> 02:11:02.502 Next I was going to discuss

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:11:02.502 \longrightarrow 02:11:03.710$  as many of you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:11:03.710 \longrightarrow 02:11:05.525$  I'm very interested in health

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:11:05.525 --> 02:11:08.332 disparities, and surprisingly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02{:}11{:}08{.}332 \dashrightarrow 02{:}11{:}11{.}286$  this will be the largest or this

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:11:11.286 \longrightarrow 02:11:13.699$  is the largest clinical trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:11:13.699 --> 02:11:15.650 that has Hispanic patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:11:15.650 --> 02:11:19.010 so I thought it would be very

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:11:19.010 \longrightarrow 02:11:21.855$  important to look and see if there

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02{:}11{:}21{.}855 \dashrightarrow 02{:}11{:}24{.}708$  was any difference in outcomes between

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02{:}11{:}24.708 \dashrightarrow 02{:}11{:}27.750$  patients that were Hispanic or not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02{:}11{:}27{.}750 \dashrightarrow 02{:}11{:}30{.}370$  and so this is that trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:11:30.370 \rightarrow 02:11:33.650$  This was presented this year as an abstract

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:11:33.731 --> 02:11:37.083 in the NKS Spring clinical meeting in Boston.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:11:37.090 --> 02:11:38.374 And as you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:11:38.374 \rightarrow 02:11:40.950$  Hispanics are more likely to have diabetes,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- $02:11:40.950 \longrightarrow 02:11:42.415$  and they're more likely to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- 02:11:42.415 --> 02:11:43.587 have chronic kidney disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- $02:11:43.590 \rightarrow 02:11:45.330$  This is data from the CDC,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- $02:11:45.330 \longrightarrow 02:11:47.766$  the latest data, which is available,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- $02{:}11{:}47.770 \dashrightarrow 02{:}11{:}50.860$  and you can see that they're more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- $02{:}11{:}50.860 \dashrightarrow 02{:}11{:}53.785$  likely to have undiagnosed diabetes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- 02:11:53.790 --> 02:11:56.310 So while it's in white,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- $02:11:56.310 \longrightarrow 02:11:59.472$  non Hispanic whites is about 2.7% and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- $02:11:59.472 \longrightarrow 02:12:02.538$  Hispanics is about four point 4%,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- $02:12:02.540 \longrightarrow 02:12:05.370$  so that's quite a difference.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- 02:12:05.370 --> 02:12:06.398 And Hispanics.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- 02:12:06.398 --> 02:12:07.940 As well as,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- 02:12:07.940 --> 02:12:09.460 A<br/>frican Americans are more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- $02{:}12{:}09{.}460 \dashrightarrow 02{:}12{:}10{.}600$  likely to progress.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727
- 02:12:10.600 --> 02:12:12.410 This is Melissa data showing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:12:12.410 \longrightarrow 02:12:14.860$  that in a short period of time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:12:14.860 --> 02:12:17.566 which was five years Black and

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:12:17.566 \longrightarrow 02:12:19.831$  Hispanics were more likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:12:19.831 --> 02:12:22.708 progress to it's severe category

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:12:22.708 --> 02:12:27.078 of of chronic kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:12:27.080 --> 02:12:28.858 And you can see that over time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02{:}12{:}28.860 \dashrightarrow 02{:}12{:}31.480$  the incidence of diabetes related

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:12:31.480 \longrightarrow 02:12:33.928$  in stage renal disease has

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:12:33.928 --> 02:12:35.320 declined a little bit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:12:35.320 \rightarrow 02:12:38.029$  If you look over the 20 years a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02{:}12{:}38{.}029 \dashrightarrow 02{:}12{:}41{.}162$  bit on in blacks a little bit in

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:12:41.162 \rightarrow 02:12:43.154$  Hispanics significantly as we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02{:}12{:}43.154 \dashrightarrow 02{:}12{:}45.356$  what we know in Native Americans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:12:45.360 --> 02:12:46.326 But still,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:12:46.326 \rightarrow 02:12:50.190$  that rate is much higher than other groups.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:12:50.190 \rightarrow 02:12:52.850$  So like I told you,

 $02:12:52.850 \longrightarrow 02:12:54.998$  this is the largest clinical trial

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:12:54.998 \longrightarrow 02:12:56.670$  that involves Hispanics and it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:12:56.670 --> 02:12:58.480 Basically it's because it was

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02{:}12{:}58{.}480 \dashrightarrow 02{:}12{:}59{.}566$  an international trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02{:}12{:}59{.}570 \dashrightarrow 02{:}13{:}03{.}802$  So a third of these 2100 were in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02{:}13{:}03{.}802 \dashrightarrow 02{:}13{:}08{.}190$  US and the others are from Mexico,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:13:08.190 --> 02:13:09.514 Colombia, Brazil,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:13:09.514 \rightarrow 02:13:13.486$  where the study was also done.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:13:13.490 \longrightarrow 02:13:15.026$  They're a little bit in Asia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:13:15.030 \longrightarrow 02:13:16.884$  I think there were five participants

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:13:16.884 --> 02:13:19.352 in Asia and like 30 or so in

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:13:19.352 \longrightarrow 02:13:20.520$  Europe that identified that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:13:20.520 --> 02:13:21.358 That's Hispanic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:13:21.358 --> 02:13:24.710 but you can see and this has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02{:}13{:}24.801 \dashrightarrow 02{:}13{:}27.921$  reported in by others and including

 $02{:}13{:}27{.}921 \dashrightarrow 02{:}13{:}31{.}053$  ourselves that A1C control is worse

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:13:31.053 --> 02:13:33.945 in Hispanics and also very important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02{:}13{:}33{.}950 \dashrightarrow 02{:}13{:}37{.}742$  that they're less likely to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:13:37.742 \longrightarrow 02:13:40.702$  on medications to improve their

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:13:40.702 --> 02:13:41.764 diabetic control.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:13:41.764 --> 02:13:43.357 Their glycemic control,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:13:43.360 - 02:13:45.979 so they were less likely to be on GLP.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:13:45.980 \longrightarrow 02:13:47.531$  One receptor agonist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:13:47.531 \longrightarrow 02:13:51.176$  so 3.6 compared to 8, and they were less.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:13:51.176 --> 02:13:53.520 Likely to be an SGLT 2 inhibitors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:13:53.520 \longrightarrow 02:13:55.1585\%$  five point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:13:55.158 --> 02:13:58.690 1% versus 7% the rest of it is

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:13:58.690 \longrightarrow 02:14:00.580$  about what one would expect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:14:00.580 \longrightarrow 02:14:02.180$  The GFR is very similar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

02:14:02.180 --> 02:14:04.045 The year noblemen to creatinine

NOTE Confidence: 0.911432057272727

 $02:14:04.045 \longrightarrow 02:14:06.230$  ratio was very similar, etcetera.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477
- $02:14:08.980 \longrightarrow 02:14:12.908$  And so this is the very similar as

02:14:12.908 --> 02:14:16.073 what I showed you before the top

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02:14:16.073 \rightarrow 02:14:18.449$  is cardiovascular composite outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02:14:18.450 \longrightarrow 02:14:20.796$  The bottom is the kidney outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02:14:20.800 \longrightarrow 02:14:22.456$  The blue section here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02:14:22.456 \longrightarrow 02:14:24.526$  and is the Venera known.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02:14:24.530 \rightarrow 02:14:28.042$  This is placebo and anything on this side

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02{:}14{:}28{.}042 \dashrightarrow 02{:}14{:}31{.}048$  favors funeral or anything less than one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02{:}14{:}31{.}050 \dashrightarrow 02{:}14{:}33{.}000$  and you can see that for

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

02:14:33.000 - 02:14:33.975 the cardiovascular outcomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

02:14:33.980 --> 02:14:35.186 and again similar,

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02{:}14{:}35{.}186 \dashrightarrow 02{:}14{:}38{.}000$  the Hispanic group is the smallest group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

02:14:38.000 - 02:14:39.477 So obviously it's going to have the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

02:14:39.480 --> 02:14:40.174 Confident interval,

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02{:}14{:}40{.}174 \dashrightarrow 02{:}14{:}42{.}603$  but we can safely say that definitely

02:14:42.603 - 02:14:44.600 for the cardiovascular outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

02:14:44.600 --> 02:14:46.430 The outcomes are very similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02{:}14{:}46{.}430 \dashrightarrow 02{:}14{:}48{.}644$  and there was no interaction and

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02{:}14{:}48{.}644 \dashrightarrow 02{:}14{:}50{.}249$  for the kidney composite outcome

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

02:14:50.249 --> 02:14:52.512 I have to tell you that I saw

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02{:}14{:}52{.}512 \dashrightarrow 02{:}14{:}55{.}970$  the 69 this 6.5 versus 6.6.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

02:14:55.970 --> 02:14:57.440 I was like oh I don't know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02:14:57.440 \rightarrow 02:14:59.860$  but it's statistically they're not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

02:14:59.860 --> 02:15:01.738 is significantly different and you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02{:}15{:}01.738 \dashrightarrow 02{:}15{:}04.110$  see that because the numbers are smaller.

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02:15:04.110 \longrightarrow 02:15:05.860$  That's confidence intervals are wider,

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02:15:05.860 \longrightarrow 02:15:06.570$  and again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.70573477

 $02{:}15{:}06{.}570 \dashrightarrow 02{:}15{:}09{.}055$  the test for interaction was also negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

02:15:11.580 - 02:15:14.380 And it's very important to note and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02{:}15{:}14{.}380 \dashrightarrow 02{:}15{:}17{.}166$  and this is known that Hispanics again

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02{:}15{:}17{.}166 \dashrightarrow 02{:}15{:}19{.}899$  lose kidney function at a much higher

- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- 02:15:19.899 --> 02:15:21.734 rate than non Hispanic patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- $02:15:21.740 \longrightarrow 02:15:24.392$  So the while the difference is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- $02{:}15{:}24{.}392 \dashrightarrow 02{:}15{:}26{.}800$  very similar between both groups,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- $02:15:26.800 \rightarrow 02:15:30.559$  the Hispanics lost about 1.2 a year.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- 02:15:30.560 02:15:33.456 Here this is one you can see that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- $02:15:33.456 \rightarrow 02:15:36.302$  in reality they they were losing 4.5
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- $02:15:36.302 \rightarrow 02:15:38.416$  a year compared to the plus.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- $02:15:38.420 \longrightarrow 02:15:39.680$  This is the finerenone group.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- $02{:}15{:}39{.}680 \dashrightarrow 02{:}15{:}41{.}376$  This is the place bo group, finerenone.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- $02{:}15{:}41{.}376 \dashrightarrow 02{:}15{:}44{.}500$  Placebo and you can see that there
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- $02:15:44.500 \rightarrow 02:15:46.420$  was a you know significant difference,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- $02:15:46.420 \longrightarrow 02:15:49.801$  but that 4.5 is very similar to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- $02{:}15{:}49{.}801 \dashrightarrow 02{:}15{:}51{.}580$  what we have a.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- 02:15:51.580 --> 02:15:53.350 Published before this is data from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714
- $02{:}15{:}53{.}350 \dashrightarrow 02{:}15{:}55{.}354$  the Jocelyn and you can see remember
- NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02:15:55.354 \rightarrow 02:15:57.503$  for this study you had to have severe

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02:15:57.503 \rightarrow 02:15:59.554$  albuminuria to be part of the study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02:15:59.560 \rightarrow 02:16:01.680$  so that's why if you look at it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02:16:01.680 \rightarrow 02:16:03.858$  we have published that they almost

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02:16:03.858 \longrightarrow 02:16:06.518$  lose 5 amounts a year every year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02:16:06.520 \rightarrow 02:16:08.000$  If you have severe albuminuria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02:16:08.000 \longrightarrow 02:16:10.655$  so that's very consistent with

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

02:16:10.655 --> 02:16:12.248 our finding too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02:16:12.250 \longrightarrow 02:16:14.420$  And looking at adverse events

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02:16:14.420 \rightarrow 02:16:16.156$  which are quite important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02{:}16{:}16{.}160 \dashrightarrow 02{:}16{:}18{.}624$  if you can see that the Hispanic

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02{:}16{:}18{.}624 \dashrightarrow 02{:}16{:}21{.}360$  group had less adverse events and

NOTE Confidence: 0.646811821285714

 $02{:}16{:}21{.}360 \dashrightarrow 02{:}16{:}23{.}500$  less outcomes for hyperkalemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}16{:}25{.}520 \dashrightarrow 02{:}16{:}27{.}410$  So in conclusion, the efficacy and

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:16:27.410 \longrightarrow 02:16:29.445$  safety of reneuron known observed in

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

02:16:29.445 --> 02:16:31.240 the overall population of Fidelity,

02:16:31.240 --> 02:16:34.502 did not have any difference between Hispanic

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}16{:}34{.}502 \dashrightarrow 02{:}16{:}37{.}784$  and non Hispanic patients and the data

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:16:37.784 \rightarrow 02:16:40.490$  support the use in Hispanic patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:16:40.490 \longrightarrow 02:16:44.288$  I wanted to show now a case from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

02:16:44.288 --> 02:16:46.888 kidney Precision Medicine project and

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

02:16:46.888 --> 02:16:51.580 I I hope that you find it interesting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

02:16:51.580 --> 02:16:54.868 I am as I said before,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:16:54.870 \longrightarrow 02:16:56.820$  I spend a significant amount of

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}16{:}56{.}820 \dashrightarrow 02{:}16{:}59{.}050$  time within these two projects that

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:16:59.050 \rightarrow 02:17:00.770$  which are collaborative projects

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

02:17:00.770 --> 02:17:02.943 in the kidney Precision Medicine

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

02:17:02.943 --> 02:17:04.888 project and the Apollo study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

02:17:04.890 --> 02:17:05.896 But again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}17{:}05{.}896 \dashrightarrow 02{:}17{:}09{.}920$  we are in the data gathering phase and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

02:17:09.920 --> 02:17:11.504 I don't, I don't.

 $02:17:11.504 \rightarrow 02:17:14.320$  I'm unable to represent more precise data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:17:14.320 \longrightarrow 02:17:15.979$  but this is the key PMP study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:17:15.980 \longrightarrow 02:17:18.212$  I know you're all familiar with

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:17:18.212 \longrightarrow 02:17:20.418$  it because Doctor Wilson is an

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}17{:}20{.}418 \dashrightarrow 02{:}17{:}22{.}368$  investigator on the study and GAIL

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:17:22.368 \rightarrow 02:17:25.004$  has been a Ki site at the jostling

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}17{:}25{.}004 \dashrightarrow 02{:}17{:}26{.}788$  where a chronic kidney disease site.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}17{:}26.788 \dashrightarrow 02{:}17{:}28.312$  And obviously because we see a

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}17{:}28{.}312 \dashrightarrow 02{:}17{:}30{.}019$  lot of patients with diabetes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:17:30.020 \rightarrow 02:17:32.045$  we mostly recruit patients with

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}17{:}32.045 \dashrightarrow 02{:}17{:}34.070$  diabetes and chronic kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}17{:}34.070 \dashrightarrow 02{:}17{:}38.061$  And these are the sites and we recruit

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:17:38.061 \rightarrow 02:17:40.946$  patients with diabetic kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:17:40.950 \longrightarrow 02:17:43.550$  Whether it be type one or type 2,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}17{:}43.550 \dashrightarrow 02{:}17{:}47.288$  chronic kidney disease or a proteinuria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}17{:}47{.}290 \dashrightarrow 02{:}17{:}49{.}030$  And of the patients that we

- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02:17:49.030 \longrightarrow 02:17:50.670$  have recruited at the Joslin,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02:17:50.670 \longrightarrow 02:17:53.106$  which we have 33 patients so far
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02{:}17{:}53{.}106 \dashrightarrow 02{:}17{:}55{.}509$  and the study you know every
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- 02:17:55.509 02:17:57.639 time there's a COVID pandemic,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02{:}17{:}57{.}640 \dashrightarrow 02{:}17{:}59{.}696$  we have to a COVID wave we have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02{:}17{:}59.696 \dashrightarrow 02{:}18{:}01.669$  to stop recruitment etcetera.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- 02:18:01.670 02:18:03.770 But we have obviously found
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- 02:18:03.770 --> 02:18:05.870 mostly in diabetic kidney disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02:18:05.870 \longrightarrow 02:18:11.720$  but we've had four cases of the 23.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02:18:11.720 \longrightarrow 02:18:14.294$  21 are patients with diabetes and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02:18:14.294 \rightarrow 02:18:16.966$  chronic kidney disease and four cases
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02{:}18{:}16{.}966 \dashrightarrow 02{:}18{:}19{.}594$  have been non diabetic kidney disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02:18:19.600 \longrightarrow 02:18:22.824$  So we have an average 19% of our
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02{:}18{:}22{.}824 \dashrightarrow 02{:}18{:}25{.}152$  patients that we think have diabetic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02:18:25.152 \rightarrow 02:18:27.386$  kidney disease really don't have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

02:18:27.386 --> 02:18:29.496 diabetic kidney disease and they

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

02:18:29.496 --> 02:18:31.768 have something else and so I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:18:31.768 \longrightarrow 02:18:33.980$  this this study for at least for

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:18:33.980 \rightarrow 02:18:36.314$  me has highlighted that it perhaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

02:18:36.314 --> 02:18:39.180 biopsies should be more normal than

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}18{:}39{.}180 \dashrightarrow 02{:}18{:}42{.}300$  the exception which I think was.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:18:42.300 \rightarrow 02:18:45.884$  They really are thought before in this group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

02:18:45.890 --> 02:18:47.835 The reason why the denominator

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}18{:}47{.}835 \dashrightarrow 02{:}18{:}50{.}874$  was on 21 is because there's two

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:18:50.874 \rightarrow 02:18:52.906$  patients that are resistors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:18:52.910 \longrightarrow 02:18:54.885$  so these are truly the

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:18:54.885 \rightarrow 02:18:56.070$  most altruistic patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02{:}18{:}56{.}070 \dashrightarrow 02{:}18{:}58{.}065$  These are patients that have type one

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:18:58.065 \rightarrow 02:19:00.270$  diabetes and do not have kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:19:00.270 \longrightarrow 02:19:02.218$  They have normal GFR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176

 $02:19:02.218 \rightarrow 02:19:04.166$  They have no albuminuria,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02:19:04.170 \rightarrow 02:19:07.642$  and they still volunteer to have a kidney
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02{:}19{:}07{.}642 \dashrightarrow 02{:}19{:}10{.}900$  biopsy so they can help us determine.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- 02:19:10.900 --> 02:19:12.575 You know what causes kidney
- NOTE Confidence: 0.838176400941176
- $02:19:12.575 \rightarrow 02:19:14.250$  disease in patients with diabetes?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:19:16.260 \longrightarrow 02:19:19.036$  So this is a one of our cases,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:19:19.040 \rightarrow 02:19:23.430$  and as you can see here, this is.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:19:23.430 \rightarrow 02:19:26.559$  Just what we would normally call diabetic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02{:}19{:}26{.}559 \dashrightarrow 02{:}19{:}29{.}720$  kidney disease or Miss Stangel expansion.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:19:29.720 \longrightarrow 02:19:31.160$  But the tubules are OK.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- 02:19:31.160 --> 02:19:34.680 Perhaps some in beginnings of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:19:34.680 \longrightarrow 02:19:37.496$  increased tubular basement membrane
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:19:37.500 \longrightarrow 02:19:41.980$  and we have the benefit at jostling
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:19:41.980 \longrightarrow 02:19:45.380$  that we're we're also doing it and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- 02:19:45.380 --> 02:19:47.500 ancillary study looking at retina.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:19:47.500 \longrightarrow 02:19:50.008$  So this patient had her eyes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:19:50.008 \longrightarrow 02:19:52.220$  had studies in her eyes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:19:52.220 \longrightarrow 02:19:55.700$  and you can see all these dots are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:19:55.700 \rightarrow 02:20:00.668$  really burns right from laser treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:20:00.670 \longrightarrow 02:20:02.896$  Because she had diabetic retinopathy and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:20:02.896 \longrightarrow 02:20:05.700$  can see here she has a little hemorrhage too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}20{:}05{.}700 \dashrightarrow 02{:}20{:}07{.}012$  That was her left.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:20:07.012 \longrightarrow 02:20:08.980$  That previous one was her right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:20:08.980 \longrightarrow 02:20:11.308$  This is her left eye and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:20:11.308 \longrightarrow 02:20:13.979$  when we looked at her biopsy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}20{:}13.980 \dashrightarrow 02{:}20{:}17.028$  this is confocal analysis and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}20{:}17{.}028 \dashrightarrow 02{:}20{:}21{.}510$  can see her glomeruli in in green.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}20{:}21{.}510 \dashrightarrow 02{:}20{:}23{.}446$  Right here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:20:23.446 \longrightarrow 02:20:29.539$  And this is highlighted the medolla.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:20:29.540 \longrightarrow 02:20:32.688$  And here on the left, what showed up?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:20:32.688 \longrightarrow 02:20:36.120$  We have some kidneys that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:20:36.120 \rightarrow 02:20:39.120$  coming from nephrectomy for cancer,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:20:39.120 \longrightarrow 02:20:40.684$  or for other reasons,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:20:40.684 \rightarrow 02:20:43.615$  and so this we we call it normal.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:20:43.615 \longrightarrow 02:20:45.820$  So this is supposed to be the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- 02:20:45.820 --> 02:20:47.677 normal side of that kidney,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02{:}20{:}47.680 \dashrightarrow 02{:}20{:}51.360$  and we it's used sort of to compare
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:20:51.360 \rightarrow 02:20:54.490$  our biopsies to sort of the normal.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- 02:20:54.490 --> 02:20:57.381 And using this CD 31 staining which
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:20:57.381 \rightarrow 02:21:00.169$  is staining for endothelium cells,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:21:00.170 \longrightarrow 02:21:02.186$  you can see that in the normal,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:21:02.190 \rightarrow 02:21:08.454$  then the glomeruli not quite small and very.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- 02:21:08.460 --> 02:21:10.650 Him.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- 02:21:10.650 --> 02:21:11.930 Like fixed in here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02:21:11.930 \longrightarrow 02:21:14.610$  you can see that our little glomeruli,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02{:}21{:}14.610 \dashrightarrow 02{:}21{:}17.610$  kind of hairy, and I'll show you bigger
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975
- $02{:}21{:}17.610 \dashrightarrow 02{:}21{:}19.979$  picture and more fuzzy let's say.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

02:21:19.980 --> 02:21:21.174 I don't know if that's the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

02:21:21.174 --> 02:21:22.456 scientific term for it, but anyway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:21:22.456 \rightarrow 02:21:24.744$  and you can see, here's the glomerella.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:21:24.744 \longrightarrow 02:21:26.496$  Here's the vascular poll.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}21{:}26{.}500 \dashrightarrow 02{:}21{:}29{.}636$  And here are our glomeruli from our patient,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}21{:}29{.}640 \dashrightarrow 02{:}21{:}31{.}978$  and you can see that the Vascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

02:21:31.978 --> 02:21:34.170 poll is thickened compared to here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:21:34.170 \longrightarrow 02:21:36.480$  and that it looks like there's

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

02:21:36.480 --> 02:21:37.250 a communication.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}21{:}37{.}250 \dashrightarrow 02{:}21{:}38{.}474$  You can see it a little bit here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}21{:}38{.}480 \dashrightarrow 02{:}21{:}41{.}152$  better with the CD 31 that I'll have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}21{:}41{.}152 \dashrightarrow 02{:}21{:}43{.}492$  all these hairs of blood vessels

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:21:43.492 \rightarrow 02:21:46.330$  coming and talking to each other here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}21{:}46{.}330 \dashrightarrow 02{:}21{:}49{.}610$  And and that for us was a surprise.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:21:49.610 \longrightarrow 02:21:52.474$  Remember I I just talked told you that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:21:52.474 \rightarrow 02:21:55.689$  we need as a group to discuss the case,

 $02:21:55.690 \rightarrow 02:21:58.594$  cases and sometimes we're lucky that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

02:21:58.594 --> 02:22:00.964 the tissue interrogation side have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:22:00.964 \longrightarrow 02:22:03.118$  processed the the tissue and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}22{:}03.118 \dashrightarrow 02{:}22{:}05.957$  are able to add to our discussions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}22{:}05{.}960 \dashrightarrow 02{:}22{:}08{.}672$  And that's how we were discussing

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}22{:}08.672 \dashrightarrow 02{:}22{:}11.041$  this case because of against her

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:22:11.041 \rightarrow 02:22:12.726$  participation in the retina study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:22:12.730 \rightarrow 02:22:15.634$  And here are some more images of these,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

02:22:15.640 --> 02:22:16.496 you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

02:22:16.496 --> 02:22:18.636 Cherry like structures that turned

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}22{:}18.636 \dashrightarrow 02{:}22{:}21.844$  out to be endothelium coming out

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:22:21.844 \rightarrow 02:22:23.290$  of the glomerulus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}22{:}23{.}290 \dashrightarrow 02{:}22{:}23{.}682$  And.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

02:22:23.682 --> 02:22:26.426 So here you can see again a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}22{:}26{.}426 \dashrightarrow 02{:}22{:}29{.}038$  depiction of the Bowmans capsule,

 $02:22:29.040 \rightarrow 02:22:32.955$  and here again the blood vessels

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}22{:}32{.}955 \dashrightarrow 02{:}22{:}35{.}770$  that are outside the Bowman capsule.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

02:22:35.770 --> 02:22:40.546 And to me that was new and surprising,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:22:40.550 \rightarrow 02:22:43.486$  but so we went back to the biopsy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:22:43.490 \longrightarrow 02:22:45.070$  And so we started looking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}22{:}45{.}070 \dashrightarrow 02{:}22{:}47{.}331$  And then once once you see the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

02:22:47.331 -> 02:22:49.510 other one then you can easily

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:22:49.510 \longrightarrow 02:22:51.026$  recognize it here too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02{:}22{:}51{.}030 \dashrightarrow 02{:}22{:}53{.}415$  So these are endothelial cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.9207781975

 $02:22:53.415 \longrightarrow 02:22:55.800$  that we're seeing in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

02:22:55.889 --> 02:22:57.189 other staining,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}22{:}57{.}190 \dashrightarrow 02{:}22{:}59{.}948$  and you can see that here too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:22:59.950 \rightarrow 02:23:03.370$  Again, here's the Vascular poll thickness

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:23:03.370 \longrightarrow 02:23:08.236$  and again more endothelial cells here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}23{:}08{.}240 \dashrightarrow 02{:}23{:}10{.}907$  And also here in this sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:23:10.907 \rightarrow 02:23:13.955$  Broken Arrow you can see that even

- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02:23:13.955 \longrightarrow 02:23:16.230$  in the endothelial cells there's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}23{:}16{.}230 \dashrightarrow 02{:}23{:}18{.}760$  this increase based on membrane.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- 02:23:18.760 02:23:21.400 And again this is all endothelium
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02:23:21.400 \longrightarrow 02:23:23.962$  and all the glomeruli had this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02:23:23.962 \rightarrow 02:23:26.640$  sort of structure in this biopsy.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}23{:}26{.}640 \dashrightarrow 02{:}23{:}29{.}259$  And so of course we thought this was new
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}23{:}29{.}259 \dashrightarrow 02{:}23{:}31{.}933$  and then we found out that it's not so.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}23{:}31{.}940 \dashrightarrow 02{:}23{:}34{.}813$  It turns out that this investigator
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- 02:23:34.813 --> 02:23:38.731 1985 published in the Archives of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02:23:38.731 \longrightarrow 02:23:42.687$  Histology in Japan that he looked at
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- 02:23:42.687 --> 02:23:46.069 3000 glomeruli using a what I assume
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- 02:23:46.069 --> 02:23:48.874 at the time was novel technology
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}23{:}48.874 \dashrightarrow 02{:}23{:}51.459$  which was electron microscopy and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}23{:}51{.}459 \dashrightarrow 02{:}23{:}54{.}700$  he created this vascular cast and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- 02:23:54.700 02:23:56.848 then he painstakingly counted.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

02:23:56.850 --> 02:23:58.438 In the 3000 glomeruli,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:23:58.438 \longrightarrow 02:24:00.820$  how many blood vessels came in

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:00.897 \rightarrow 02:24:03.069$  and out of the blood vessels?

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:03.070 \rightarrow 02:24:04.630$  I show you a picture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:04.630 \longrightarrow 02:24:06.166$  This is one of this picture.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}24{:}06{.}170 \dashrightarrow 02{:}24{:}09{.}290$  So this is the single a ferrant arterial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:09.290 \longrightarrow 02:24:12.466$  and then this is again he only found

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:12.466 \rightarrow 02:24:15.366$  two in this nephrectomy that he had.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

02:24:15.370 --> 02:24:16.990 He found two glomeruli,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:16.990 \rightarrow 02:24:19.705$  one with five blood, efferin blood vessels,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}24{:}19.705 \dashrightarrow 02{:}24{:}21.165$  and one with three.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:21.170 \longrightarrow 02:24:22.750$  Both pictures are here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:22.750 \longrightarrow 02:24:25.120$  but I only presented the one

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}24{:}25{.}201 \dashrightarrow 02{:}24{:}26{.}878$  with the 5E ferrant arterials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}24{:}26.878 \dashrightarrow 02{:}24{:}30.259$  And here he had to cut E5 and E4

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}24{:}30{.}259 \dashrightarrow 02{:}24{:}32{.}269$  are cut because otherwise you

 $02:24:32.269 \rightarrow 02:24:35.498$  couldn't see the other ones, he said.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:35.498 \longrightarrow 02:24:36.052$  And.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

02:24:36.052 --> 02:24:39.930 And then what we weren't sure is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:39.930 \longrightarrow 02:24:42.040$  had this been described in

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:42.040 \longrightarrow 02:24:43.728$  diabetic kidney disease and

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:43.728 \longrightarrow 02:24:45.950$  then we found this one again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:45.950 \longrightarrow 02:24:49.730$  another investigator again in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}24{:}49{.}730 \dashrightarrow 02{:}24{:}55{.}980$ 80s that also said that one to 5% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}24{:}55{.}980 \dashrightarrow 02{:}24{:}59{.}610$  the glomeruli in this diabetes and

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:24:59.610 \longrightarrow 02:25:03.727$  kidney that he saw in 12 individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:25:03.730 \rightarrow 02:25:08.240$  and have this capillary profiles.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

02:25:08.240 --> 02:25:11.552 We called it outside the glomerella

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:25:11.552 \rightarrow 02:25:15.487$  tough and to be honest we had four NOTE Confidence: 0.8700408191666667

 $02:25:15.487 \rightarrow 02:25:18.616$  or five pathologists in in our group

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}25{:}18.616 \dashrightarrow 02{:}25{:}22.402$  and it it seemed like this didn't

 $02:25:22.402 \rightarrow 02:25:25.197$  really move outside this journal,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:25:25.200 \dashrightarrow 02:25:26.610$  which now forget what it's called.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}25{:}26.610 \dashrightarrow 02{:}25{:}28.825$  Journal of diabetic complications because

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:25:28.825 \rightarrow 02:25:32.038$  it was also news and to the group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

02:25:32.040 --> 02:25:35.127 So now we're going back and looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}25{:}35{.}127 \dashrightarrow 02{:}25{:}38{.}202$  at all our other diabetic biopsies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}25{:}38{.}202 \dashrightarrow 02{:}25{:}40{.}618$  To see if we have the same finding.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:25:40.620 \rightarrow 02:25:42.642$  Because right now we actually don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}25{:}42.642 \dashrightarrow 02{:}25{:}45.189$  know if this is important or not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:25:45.190 \rightarrow 02:25:49.590$  or is this significant in any way clinically?

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}25{:}49{.}590 \dashrightarrow 02{:}25{:}52{.}847$  Because other than that we have not it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

02:25:52.847 --> 02:25:53.618 We're looking still,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

02:25:53.618 --> 02:25:54.646 and through the literature,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02{:}25{:}54{.}650 \dashrightarrow 02{:}25{:}57{.}009$  but we haven't found anything that has

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:25:57.009 \rightarrow 02:25:59.484$  looked at what disease hairy glomeruli

NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667

 $02:25:59.484 \rightarrow 02:26:02.346$  really mean clinically for the patient,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02:26:02.350 \longrightarrow 02:26:05.380$  so I thought I would give
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02:26:05.380 \longrightarrow 02:26:08.320$  this sort of little.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}26{:}08{.}320 \dashrightarrow 02{:}26{:}11{.}428$  Shout out to KPMP and thank you
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02:26:11.428 \longrightarrow 02:26:14.239$  for your support of the project.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}26{:}14{.}240 \dashrightarrow 02{:}26{:}16{.}848$  This is I want to thank all of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}26{:}16.848 \dashrightarrow 02{:}26{:}18.738$  the individuals that are involved
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02:26:18.738 \longrightarrow 02:26:20.449$  in the fidelity trials.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}26{:}20{.}449 \dashrightarrow 02{:}26{:}24{.}761$  And and this is the conclusion I let
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}26{:}24.761 \dashrightarrow 02{:}26{:}29.006$  you read that I also wanted to thank
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- 02:26:29.010 --> 02:26:31.810 my collaborators and all my other projects,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02:26:31.810 \longrightarrow 02:26:35.790$  my staff and my colleagues,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}26{:}35{.}790 \dashrightarrow 02{:}26{:}38{.}640$  and the funders obviously of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02:26:38.640 \longrightarrow 02:26:41.490$  the projects for their support,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}26{:}41{.}490 \dashrightarrow 02{:}26{:}45{.}030$  and I'm happy to stop sharing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.870040819166667
- $02{:}26{:}45{.}030 \dashrightarrow 02{:}26{:}47{.}240$  If you have any questions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.738110112

 $02:26:57.520 \longrightarrow 02:26:58.880$  Thanks for a great talk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.738110112

02:26:58.880 --> 02:27:01.600 Sylvia. Any questions Jeff.

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

 $02{:}27{:}03.670 \dashrightarrow 02{:}27{:}06.370$  Just a question about Panera.

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

 $02:27:06.370 \rightarrow 02:27:09.317$  There were no type 1 diabetics in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

02:27:09.320 --> 02:27:10.376 Infidelity or Figaro,

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

 $02{:}27{:}10.376 \dashrightarrow 02{:}27{:}12.488$  and that's not the the non

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

02:27:12.488 --> 02:27:14.390 diabetic pilot starting is there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

 $02{:}27{:}14{.}390 \dashrightarrow 02{:}27{:}16{.}846$  Is there any concern or reason why it

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

02:27:16.846 --> 02:27:19.527 would be beneficial in that population?

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

02:27:19.530 --> 02:27:22.716 OK so I I have to repeat the question

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

 $02{:}27{:}22{.}716 \dashrightarrow 02{:}27{:}25{.}461$  so the question is that there

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

02:27:25.461 --> 02:27:28.842 were no type one patients in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

 $02:27:28.842 \longrightarrow 02:27:31.307$  Fidelio trials or Figaro trials,

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

 $02:27:31.310 \rightarrow 02:27:33.790$  and if there is any concern of using

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

 $02:27:33.790 \longrightarrow 02:27:35.589$  finerenone in type one patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

 $02:27:35.590 \rightarrow 02:27:38.590$  is that the question?

- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:27:38.590 \rightarrow 02:27:40.534$  Right, so you're correct.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02{:}27{:}40.534 \dashrightarrow 02{:}27{:}42.964$  So right now these medications
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:27:42.964 \rightarrow 02:27:46.134$  are approved for patients with or.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:27:46.134 \rightarrow 02:27:48.816$  The studies were done in patients
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:27:48.816 \longrightarrow 02:27:51.848$  with type 2 diabetes and a I.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- 02:27:51.848 --> 02:27:54.224 I don't see why you couldn't
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:27:54.224 \rightarrow 02:27:56.358$  use them in type one,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:27:56.360 \longrightarrow 02:27:57.921$  and actually now that you said that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02{:}27{:}57{.}921 \dashrightarrow 02{:}27{:}59{.}496$  I'm going to read out the label
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- 02:27:59.496 --> 02:28:01.465 because I don't know if the label says
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02{:}28{:}01{.}465 \dashrightarrow 02{:}28{:}03{.}060$  chronic kidney disease with diabetes,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:28:03.060 \rightarrow 02:28:05.160$  or does it specifically say type two?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:28:05.160 \longrightarrow 02:28:07.068$  I would have to guess that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:28:07.068 \longrightarrow 02:28:08.530$  it specifically says Type 2.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02{:}28{:}08{.}530 \dashrightarrow 02{:}28{:}11.610$  But once the medication is FDA approved,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572

- $02:28:11.610 \longrightarrow 02:28:12.750$  it can be used.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- 02:28:12.750 --> 02:28:13.890 I guess off label,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- 02:28:13.890 --> 02:28:18.012 but I I don't see why it wouldn't work.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:28:18.020 \rightarrow 02:28:20.852$  I mean it doesn't alter any
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:28:20.852 \longrightarrow 02:28:21.640$  glycemic pathways.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- 02:28:21.640 --> 02:28:24.120 Kind of like SGLT 2 that was done
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:28:24.120 \longrightarrow 02:28:26.572$  in in type twos and the the reason
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:28:26.572 \rightarrow 02:28:29.320$  we don't use them in type ones is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02{:}28{:}29{.}320 \dashrightarrow 02{:}28{:}31{.}627$  because they're already prone to DKA,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02{:}28{:}31{.}627 \dashrightarrow 02{:}28{:}35{.}763$  and we don't want to give them another
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- 02:28:35.763 --> 02:28:38.799 medication that it will do harm, right?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:28:38.799 \longrightarrow 02:28:39.617$  That will.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- 02:28:39.617 --> 02:28:42.480 Increase the risk of a serious complication,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:28:42.480 \longrightarrow 02:28:44.940$  so, but it's a good question.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- 02:28:44.940 --> 02:28:46.128 I would say right now they're
- NOTE Confidence: 0.75177572
- $02:28:46.128 \rightarrow 02:28:46.920$  approved for Type 2,

 $02{:}28{:}46{.}920 \dashrightarrow 02{:}28{:}48{.}963$  but I don't see why it couldn't be used.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9493556166666667

 $02:28:55.430 \longrightarrow 02:28:56.558$  Any other questions?

NOTE Confidence: 0.62396264

02:28:58.640 --> 02:29:01.060 It. So Sylvia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.20090899

 $02:29:05.120 \longrightarrow 02:29:07.510$  More. OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.47424413875

 $02{:}29{:}10.990 \dashrightarrow 02{:}29{:}13.718$  So the group of Mount Sinai has decided.

NOTE Confidence: 0.4398898

 $02{:}29{:}21.040 \dashrightarrow 02{:}29{:}25.390$  To distinguish this city from Janet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.16118315

 $02{:}29{:}28{.}450 \dashrightarrow 02{:}29{:}28{.}980$  I.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785689187777778

 $02:29:31.470 \rightarrow 02:29:33.927$  Doctor Shiva can you repeat that question

NOTE Confidence: 0.785689187777778

02:29:33.927 --> 02:29:37.039 because I I heard something about my

NOTE Confidence: 0.785689187777778

02:29:37.039 --> 02:29:39.027 Sinai and distinguishing ethnicity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785689187777778

02:29:39.030 --> 02:29:40.700 but I can't hear it, sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.808509414166667

02:29:43.340 --> 02:29:45.412 Genetic ancestry versus ethnicity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.808509414166667

02:29:45.412 --> 02:29:48.954 So I think at Mount Sinai they

NOTE Confidence: 0.808509414166667

 $02{:}29{:}48{.}954 \dashrightarrow 02{:}29{:}50{.}640$  had stated that they might be

NOTE Confidence: 0.808509414166667

 $02:29:50.640 \longrightarrow 02:29:51.980$  able to tell the difference,

 $02:29:51.980 \longrightarrow 02:29:53.527$  and are you able to tell the

NOTE Confidence: 0.808509414166667

02:29:53.527 --> 02:29:54.530 difference in your study?

NOTE Confidence: 0.6799378995

 $02{:}29{:}56{.}740 \dashrightarrow 02{:}30{:}01{.}045$  And so, in in Hispanics, no.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6799378995

02:30:01.045 --> 02:30:05.140 We you know, as a Hispanic myself,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6799378995

02:30:05.140 --> 02:30:06.622 I can tell you that before

NOTE Confidence: 0.6799378995

02:30:06.622 --> 02:30:08.160 I came to this country,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6799378995

 $02{:}30{:}08{.}160 \dashrightarrow 02{:}30{:}11{.}216$  I had never heard that we were different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6799378995

 $02:30:11.220 \longrightarrow 02:30:13.350$  So I think it's like something

NOTE Confidence: 0.6799378995

02:30:13.350 - 02:30:15.838 that when you cross the US border,

NOTE Confidence: 0.6799378995

02:30:15.840 --> 02:30:18.528 you're no longer Colombian like I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.6799378995

02:30:18.528 --> 02:30:20.320 from Colombia background you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.6799378995

 $02{:}30{:}20{.}390 \dashrightarrow 02{:}30{:}24{.}350$  now Hispanic, but in Colombia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6799378995

 $02:30:24.350 \rightarrow 02:30:29.230$  We know that we're a mix of different people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.875163685454545

 $02:30:31.300 \longrightarrow 02:30:33.799$  So I don't know that we don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.875163685454545

 $02:30:33.799 \longrightarrow 02:30:35.350$  have that distinguished there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

 $02{:}30{:}37{.}580 \dashrightarrow 02{:}30{:}41{.}156$  So I I we only know where the

 $02:30:41.156 \longrightarrow 02:30:43.578$  the country of origin is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

02:30:43.580 --> 02:30:44.644 And like I said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

02:30:44.644 --> 02:30:46.700 most of the patients were from Mexico,

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

02:30:46.700 --> 02:30:48.878 Colombia, Brazil and the United States.

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

 $02:30:48.880 \longrightarrow 02:30:50.360$  That's that we do know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

 $02:30:50.360 \longrightarrow 02:30:52.820$  and we did look by country.

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

 $02:30:52.820 \longrightarrow 02:30:54.945$  If there were any differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

 $02{:}30{:}54{.}945 \dashrightarrow 02{:}30{:}57{.}104$  in results that we do do,

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

 $02:30:57.104 \rightarrow 02:30:59.060$  and in fact we were particularly

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

02:30:59.137 - > 02:31:00.805 interested because they have

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

 $02{:}31{:}00.805 \dashrightarrow 02{:}31{:}03.307$  less adverse events and we were

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

 $02:31:03.379 \rightarrow 02:31:05.923$  wondering if is it because reporting

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

 $02:31:05.923 \rightarrow 02:31:08.426$  was different by country and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

 $02:31:08.426 \longrightarrow 02:31:10.038$  looked particularly by that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

 $02{:}31{:}10.040 \dashrightarrow 02{:}31{:}12.866$  And that was the same everywhere.

 $02:31:12.870 \longrightarrow 02:31:17.740$  And. But that's it there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.808749158461539

 $02:31:17.740 \longrightarrow 02:31:19.628$  That's all the information I have about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889313892

02:31:23.480 --> 02:31:25.600 Alright, there's no other questions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889313892

02:31:25.600 --> 02:31:26.636 Thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.889313892

02:31:26.636 --> 02:31:28.190 Doctor Roses for our wonderful talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.75252142

02:31:40.640 --> 02:31:42.352 I docked emberg alright,

NOTE Confidence: 0.75252142

 $02{:}31{:}42{.}352 \dashrightarrow 02{:}31{:}44{.}920$  so I'll introduce the next speaker.

NOTE Confidence: 0.75252142

 $02:31:44.920 \rightarrow 02:31:48.220$  Are you able to share your? Let me just.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673251166666667

02:32:01.700 --> 02:32:03.740 OK, are you seeing my slides?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673251166666667

 $02:32:03.740 \longrightarrow 02:32:05.918$  That looks great.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673251166666667

 $02{:}32{:}05{.}920 \dashrightarrow 02{:}32{:}08{.}362$  So like to introduce saw Doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673251166666667

 $02:32:08.362 \rightarrow 02:32:10.624$  Denberg from the Children's Hospital

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673251166666667

02:32:10.624 --> 02:32:12.860 of Philadelphia Permanent School

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673251166666667

02:32:12.860 --> 02:32:15.655 Medicine at University of Pennsylvania,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673251166666667

 $02:32:15.660 \rightarrow 02:32:17.560$  and she'll discuss the epidemiology

NOTE Confidence: 0.8673251166666667

 $02:32:17.560 \longrightarrow 02:32:19.460$  of kidney stone disease from

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8673251166666667
- 02:32:19.524 --> 02:32:21.009 origins to complications.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.93303324125
- $02{:}32{:}23{.}110 \dashrightarrow 02{:}32{:}26{.}134$  Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8808399
- 02:32:29.610 02:32:32.210 These are my disclosures,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8808399
- 02:32:32.210 --> 02:32:33.870 not relevant to what I'm
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8808399
- $02:32:33.870 \longrightarrow 02:32:35.530$  going to talk about today.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8808399
- 02:32:35.530 --> 02:32:37.238 Except the NIH funding.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765
- $02{:}32{:}39{.}650 \dashrightarrow 02{:}32{:}42{.}810$  So by way of an outline I'm going to 1st
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765
- 02:32:42.897 --> 02:32:46.460 talk about some of the changing epidemiology.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765
- 02:32:46.460 --> 02:32:48.938 In terms of incidence of kidney stone
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765
- $02:32:48.938 \longrightarrow 02:32:51.607$  disease and and that the impact of that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765
- $02:32:51.610 \rightarrow 02:32:55.526$  when we talk about origins of kidney stone
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765
- $02:32:55.526 \rightarrow 02:32:57.705$  disease focusing on emerging evidence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765
- $02:32:57.705 \rightarrow 02:33:01.010$  for the role of the gut kidney access,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765
- $02{:}33{:}01{.}010 \dashrightarrow 02{:}33{:}04{.}106$  and then I want to touch on complications,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765
- $02:33:04.110 \longrightarrow 02:33:06.840$  particularly in terms of kidney bone
- NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

 $02:33:06.840 \rightarrow 02:33:09.230$  vascular access and in making this talk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

 $02:33:09.230 \longrightarrow 02:33:11.680$  I've tried to highlight key themes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

 $02:33:11.680 \rightarrow 02:33:14.208$  have been central to my research program,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

 $02:33:14.210 \longrightarrow 02:33:15.932$  so the work that I'm going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

 $02{:}33{:}15{.}932 \dashrightarrow 02{:}33{:}16{.}670$  talk about integrates.

NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

02:33:16.670 --> 02:33:19.780 Epidemiology and patient oriented research,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

02:33:19.780 --> 02:33:22.060 including analysis of large electronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

02:33:22.060 --> 02:33:24.340 health record and claims data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

 $02{:}33{:}24{.}340 \dashrightarrow 02{:}33{:}26{.}305$  as well as observational and

NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

 $02:33:26.305 \rightarrow 02:33:27.877$  translational patient oriented studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

 $02:33:27.880 \longrightarrow 02:33:30.100$  and we've really tried to approach

NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

02:33:30.100 --> 02:33:31.580 questions and evidence gaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.837377261411765

 $02{:}33{:}31{.}640 \dashrightarrow 02{:}33{:}33{.}490$  from a life course perspective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154

 $02{:}33{:}37{.}130 \dashrightarrow 02{:}33{:}39{.}202$  So we know that kidney stones result

NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154

 $02{:}33{:}39{.}202 \dashrightarrow 02{:}33{:}41{.}409$  from a disorder of minimum metabolism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154

 $02{:}33{:}41{.}410 \dashrightarrow 02{:}33{:}43{.}156$  the risk of which is determined

- NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154
- $02:33:43.156 \rightarrow 02:33:44.870$  by the interaction of genetics,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154
- 02:33:44.870 --> 02:33:47.758 diet, and environmental exposures.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154
- 02:33:47.760 --> 02:33:49.878 The prevalence of kidney stones has
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154
- $02{:}33{:}49{.}878 \dashrightarrow 02{:}33{:}52{.}510$  increased 70% over the last three decades.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154
- 02:33:52.510 --> 02:33:54.658 And kidney stones are increasingly common
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154
- $02{:}33{:}54{.}658 \dashrightarrow 02{:}33{:}56{.}914$  with an estimated prevalence of 1 and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154
- $02:33:56.914 \rightarrow 02:33:58.450$  11 individuals in the United States.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154
- $02:33:58.450 \rightarrow 02:34:02.468$  So comparable to the prevalence of diabetes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154
- $02:34:02.470 \longrightarrow 02:34:04.220$  Total annual charges exceed \$10
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154
- $02:34:04.220 \longrightarrow 02:34:06.451$  billion and that does not account
- NOTE Confidence: 0.858440193846154
- $02:34:06.451 \longrightarrow 02:34:08.546$  for medication or indirect costs.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846186342
- $02{:}34{:}12{.}030 \dashrightarrow 02{:}34{:}14{.}070$  In terms of stone composition,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846186342
- $02{:}34{:}14.070 \dashrightarrow 02{:}34{:}16.140$  calcium oxalate stones remain the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846186342
- $02{:}34{:}16{.}140 \dashrightarrow 02{:}34{:}18{.}850$  most common type of stone overall.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846186342
- $02:34:18.850 \longrightarrow 02:34:20.930$  Although hydroxy apatite stones were
- NOTE Confidence: 0.846186342

 $02:34:20.930 \longrightarrow 02:34:23.778$  the second most common for each 555

NOTE Confidence: 0.846186342

02:34:23.778 --> 02:34:26.844 in this analysis and in this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.846186342

 $02{:}34{:}26.850 \dashrightarrow 02{:}34{:}28.815$  women submitted more stones than

NOTE Confidence: 0.846186342

 $02:34:28.815 \longrightarrow 02:34:31.299$  men between the ages of 10 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.846186342

 $02:34:31.299 \longrightarrow 02:34:33.578$  19 and 20 to 29 years of age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02:34:36.990 \dashrightarrow 02:34:38.822$  This leads to one of the main points

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

02:34:38.822 --> 02:34:40.348 I wanted to talk about today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02:34:40.350 \longrightarrow 02:34:42.252$  which is the rising incidence of

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

02:34:42.252 --> 02:34:43.906 kidney stones, particularly in

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02{:}34{:}43.906 \dashrightarrow 02{:}34{:}46.446$  younger individuals and among women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

02:34:46.450 --> 02:34:48.680 So several studies have shown

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02:34:48.680 \longrightarrow 02:34:50.018$  this disproportionate rise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02{:}34{:}50{.}020 \dashrightarrow 02{:}34{:}52{.}029$  and this is data from our population

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02:34:52.029 \rightarrow 02:34:53.762$  based study of temporal trends

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02:34:53.762 \longrightarrow 02:34:55.378$  and kidney stone incidents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02:34:55.380 \longrightarrow 02:34:59.174$  From 1997 to 2012 in South Carolina,

 $02:34:59.180 \longrightarrow 02:35:01.154$  you could see the cumulative risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

02:35:01.154 --> 02:35:02.687 kidney stones doubled during childhood

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02{:}35{:}02{.}687 \dashrightarrow 02{:}35{:}04{.}583$  and the greatest increase in incidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02:35:04.583 \rightarrow 02:35:06.490$  was found among 15 to 19 year olds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02:35:06.490 \longrightarrow 02:35:10.706$  With the 26% increased risk for five years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

02:35:10.710 -> 02:35:12.603 In multivariable analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

02:35:12.603 --> 02:35:15.127 it incidents increased 15%

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

02:35:15.130 - 02:35:16.550 per five years among females,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

02:35:16.550 - 02:35:18.230 but remains stable for males,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

02:35:18.230 --> 02:35:20.318 resulting in a 45% increase in

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02{:}35{:}20{.}318 \dashrightarrow 02{:}35{:}22{.}571$  the lifetime risk of kidney stones

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02{:}35{:}22{.}571 \dashrightarrow 02{:}35{:}24{.}929$  for women over the study period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02:35:24.930 \longrightarrow 02:35:25.466$  And importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02{:}35{:}25{.}466 \dashrightarrow 02{:}35{:}27{.}342$  this shift in kidney stones to a

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02{:}35{:}27{.}342 \dashrightarrow 02{:}35{:}29{.}429$  younger age of onset has caused

 $02:35:29.429 \rightarrow 02:35:30.488$  increasing hospitalization surgeries

NOTE Confidence: 0.902314795714286

 $02:35:30.488 \rightarrow 02:35:31.860$  and healthcare expenditures.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299123846154

 $02:35:35.930 \rightarrow 02:35:38.084$  Also reflecting the more severe phenotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299123846154

 $02:35:38.084 \rightarrow 02:35:40.808$  of a disease that starts in childhood,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299123846154

 $02{:}35{:}40{.}810 \dashrightarrow 02{:}35{:}43{.}170$  the probability of a symptomatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299123846154

 $02:35:43.170 \longrightarrow 02:35:46.003$  recurrence within three years of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299123846154

 $02:35:46.003 \rightarrow 02:35:48.740$  index stone and childhood is about 50%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299123846154

 $02:35:48.740 \longrightarrow 02:35:50.910$  Also, reflecting the rapid shift in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299123846154

 $02:35:50.910 \rightarrow 02:35:52.600$  epidemiology of kidney stone disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299123846154

 $02{:}35{:}52{.}600 \dashrightarrow 02{:}35{:}54{.}373$  our knowledge base of how to reduce the risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.903299123846154

 $02{:}35{:}54{.}373 \dashrightarrow 02{:}35{:}56{.}210$  of this recurrence remains quite limited.

NOTE Confidence: 0.909669316

 $02:36:00.900 \rightarrow 02:36:03.186$  So one of the key questions I'm going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.909669316

 $02:36:03.186 \rightarrow 02:36:05.486$  spend some time talking about is the why,

NOTE Confidence: 0.909669316

 $02:36:05.486 \rightarrow 02:36:07.397$  why are we starting to form stones

NOTE Confidence: 0.909669316

02:36:07.397 --> 02:36:08.980 kidney stones earlier in life?

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02:36:12.830 \rightarrow 02:36:15.755$  So this brings me to the gut kidney access

 $02{:}36{:}15.755 \dashrightarrow 02{:}36{:}18.136$  and kidney stone disease discovering

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02{:}36{:}18{.}136 \dashrightarrow 02{:}36{:}20{.}611$  the causes of the epidemiologic

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02:36:20.611 \rightarrow 02:36:23.020$  shift in kidney stone disease could

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02:36:23.020 \rightarrow 02:36:24.548$  reveal new therapeutic targets,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02:36:24.550 \longrightarrow 02:36:27.252$  and the rapidity of the change in

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02{:}36{:}27{.}252 \dashrightarrow 02{:}36{:}29{.}312$  epidemiology suggests that the driving

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02{:}36{:}29{.}312 \dashrightarrow 02{:}36{:}31{.}402$  forces are external exposures such

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

02:36:31.402 --> 02:36:33.689 as dietary factors or medications,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02:36:33.690 \longrightarrow 02:36:34.504$  namely antibiotics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02:36:34.504 \rightarrow 02:36:36.539$  When we're thinking about disruption

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02:36:36.539 \longrightarrow 02:36:38.490$  of the gut microbiome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02:36:38.490 \longrightarrow 02:36:40.010$  so many of these exposures

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02:36:40.010 \longrightarrow 02:36:41.226$  could impact the gut.

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02:36:41.230 \longrightarrow 02:36:41.930$  Many access,

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02:36:41.930 \longrightarrow 02:36:43.680$  which is that complex interplay

 $02:36:43.680 \rightarrow 02:36:45.404$  between the intestinal and urinary

NOTE Confidence: 0.803083111

 $02{:}36{:}45{.}404 \dashrightarrow 02{:}36{:}47{.}246$  tracts in human health and disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86000298

 $02{:}36{:}51{.}210 \dashrightarrow 02{:}36{:}53{.}044$  So the first thing I want to

NOTE Confidence: 0.86000298

 $02:36:53.044 \rightarrow 02:36:55.010$  show is from a study we did,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86000298

 $02{:}36{:}55{.}010 \dashrightarrow 02{:}36{:}57{.}320$  it was designed to examine the association

NOTE Confidence: 0.86000298

 $02{:}36{:}57{.}320 \dashrightarrow 02{:}36{:}58{.}970$  between oral antibiotic exposure

NOTE Confidence: 0.86000298

 $02:36:58.970 \dashrightarrow 02:37:01.070$  and incident kidney stone disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86000298

 $02{:}37{:}01{.}070 \dashrightarrow 02{:}37{:}02{.}702$  We sought to assess the strength

NOTE Confidence: 0.86000298

02:37:02.702 --> 02:37:04.151 and temporality of the association

NOTE Confidence: 0.86000298

 $02{:}37{:}04{.}151 \dashrightarrow 02{:}37{:}06{.}328$  by antibiotic class and to test the

NOTE Confidence: 0.86000298

02:37:06.328 --> 02:37:07.983 hypothesis that earlier life exposure

NOTE Confidence: 0.86000298

02:37:07.983 --> 02:37:09.939 to oral antibiotics would be associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.86000298

 $02{:}37{:}09{.}939 \dashrightarrow 02{:}37{:}11{.}938$  with the greater risk of kidney stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02{:}37{:}15{.}970 \dashrightarrow 02{:}37{:}18{.}959$  We conducted this study in the health

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02{:}37{:}18{.}959 \dashrightarrow 02{:}37{:}21{.}812$  Improvement Network database and this was a NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02:37:21.812 \rightarrow 02:37:24.062$  population based nested case control study.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055
- $02{:}37{:}24.070 \dashrightarrow 02{:}37{:}26.950$  The Health improvement network within

02:37:26.950 --> 02:37:29.278 database is representative of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

02:37:29.278 --> 02:37:31.861 United Kingdom population by age, sex,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02:37:31.861 \rightarrow 02:37:33.816$  medical conditions and mortality rates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02{:}37{:}33{.}820 \dashrightarrow 02{:}37{:}36{.}365$  and contains patient level electronic

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02:37:36.365 \longrightarrow 02:37:39.445$  health record data for more than

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02:37:39.445 \longrightarrow 02:37:41.715$  13 individuals among over 600

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

02:37:41.715 --> 02:37:44.240 practices in the United Kingdom.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02{:}37{:}44{.}240 \dashrightarrow 02{:}37{:}45{.}885$  This database has been used to characterize

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02:37:45.885 \rightarrow 02:37:47.160$  outcomes and kidney stone disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

02:37:47.160 --> 02:37:49.560 I'll show you some data later as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02{:}37{:}49{.}560 \dashrightarrow 02{:}37{:}52{.}044$  as the association between antibiotic

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02{:}37{:}52{.}044 \dashrightarrow 02{:}37{:}55{.}069$  exposure and inflammatory bowel disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02:37:55.070 \rightarrow 02:37:55.901$  In this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055

 $02:37:55.901 \rightarrow 02:37:58.069$  we looked at nearly 26,000 individuals who

 $02:37:58.069 \rightarrow 02:38:00.964$  had instant kidney stone disease and to be NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:00.964 \rightarrow 02:38:03.160$  considered a patient with incident stones, NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:03.160 \longrightarrow 02:38:05.038$  an individual had to be registered NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:05.038 \rightarrow 02:38:06.555$  with their general practice for NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:06.555 \longrightarrow 02:38:08.251$  at least six months at the time of NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:08.251 \rightarrow 02:38:09.928$  the initial qualified diagnosis. NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055 02:38:09.930 --> 02:38:11.250 Code for kidney stones, NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:11.250 \rightarrow 02:38:13.230$  and this has been a validated NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055 02:38:13.301 --> 02:38:15.129 approach for ascertainment of NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:15.129 \rightarrow 02:38:17.414$  incident diagnosis in this database. NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:17.420 \rightarrow 02:38:18.854$  To increase precision, NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:18.854 \rightarrow 02:38:21.244$  we included 10 controls for NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:21.244 \rightarrow 02:38:23.478$  each case matched on age, NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:23.480 \longrightarrow 02:38:23.846 \text{ sex},$ NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:23.846 \rightarrow 02:38:26.042$  and general practice to each case NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055  $02:38:26.042 \rightarrow 02:38:28.080$  that their index date of their 248

- NOTE Confidence: 0.83406055
- $02:38:28.080 \longrightarrow 02:38:29.600$  first of their kidney stone.

 $02{:}38{:}34{.}040 \dashrightarrow 02{:}38{:}37{.}960$  So this is the main output of this paper.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02:38:37.960 \longrightarrow 02:38:39.880$  It's a busy table,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02:38:39.880 \rightarrow 02:38:43.824$  so each column represents a series of models.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02:38:43.830 \rightarrow 02:38:45.864$  And what we found is that exposure

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02:38:45.864 \rightarrow 02:38:48.108$  to five classes of oral antibiotics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

02:38:48.110 - 02:38:49.254 sulfa cephalosporins,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

02:38:49.254 --> 02:38:50.398 fluoroquinolones nitrofurantoin,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02{:}38{:}50{.}398 \dashrightarrow 02{:}38{:}53{.}258$  methenamine and broad spectrum penicillins

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02{:}38{:}53{.}258 \dashrightarrow 02{:}38{:}55{.}820$  were associated with increased odds of

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02:38:55.820 \rightarrow 02:38:57.630$  instant kidney stone disease within

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

02:38:57.630 --> 02:38:59.450 a 3 to 12 month exposure window,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02{:}38{:}59{.}450 \dashrightarrow 02{:}39{:}01{.}290$  which was our primary exposure

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02:39:01.290 \longrightarrow 02:39:02.762$  window for this analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02{:}39{:}02{.}770 \dashrightarrow 02{:}39{:}05{.}038$  And all of these models were adjusted

 $02:39:05.038 \longrightarrow 02:39:07.279$  for for numerous comorbid conditions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02{:}39{:}07{.}280 \dashrightarrow 02{:}39{:}09{.}662$  Urinary tract infection within the same NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02{:}39{:}09{.}662 \dashrightarrow 02{:}39{:}12{.}030$  exposure window and exposure to other NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02:39:12.030 \rightarrow 02:39:13.454$  potential confounding medications as NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02{:}39{:}13{.}454 \dashrightarrow 02{:}39{:}16{.}350$  well as rate of healthcare and counters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

02:39:16.350 --> 02:39:18.688 The models in column A made no NOTE Confidence: 0.92622917

 $02{:}39{:}18.688 \dashrightarrow 02{:}39{:}20.749$  adjustment for other antibiotic use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965

 $02{:}39{:}22{.}790 \dashrightarrow 02{:}39{:}25{.}107$  The models in column B adjusted for

NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965

02:39:25.107 --> 02:39:27.133 any other antibiotic use within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965

 $02{:}39{:}27{.}133 \dashrightarrow 02{:}39{:}29{.}065$  three to 12 month exposure window.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965

 $02:39:29.070 \longrightarrow 02:39:30.658$  And it model C.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965

 $02{:}39{:}30{.}658 \dashrightarrow 02{:}39{:}33{.}040$  Each model was adjusted for every

NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965

 $02:39:33.122 \longrightarrow 02:39:35.712$  other antibiotic as 11 separate

NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965

 $02:39:35.712 \longrightarrow 02:39:38.302$  indicator variables in the model

NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965

 $02:39:38.390 \longrightarrow 02:39:40.735$  and Model C had the best fit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965

 $02{:}39{:}40{.}740 \dashrightarrow 02{:}39{:}42{.}692$  So the take home was that these 5

- NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965
- 02:39:42.692 --> 02:39:44.030 broad spectrum antibiotic classes

 $02:39:44.030 \longrightarrow 02:39:45.227$  were independently associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965

 $02{:}39{:}45{.}227 \dashrightarrow 02{:}39{:}47{.}920$  with a 1.3 to 2.3 fold increase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965

 $02{:}39{:}47{.}920 \dashrightarrow 02{:}39{:}50{.}152$  The odds of kidney stones at a bumper

NOTE Confidence: 0.78934965

 $02:39:50.152 \rightarrow 02:39:52.030$  only adjusted significance threshold.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02:39:56.110 \longrightarrow 02:39:57.412$  An exploratory analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02{:}39{:}57{.}412 \dashrightarrow 02{:}40{:}00{.}016$  we also looked for effect modification

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02:40:00.016 \rightarrow 02:40:03.201$  by age and you can see here that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02:40:03.201 \longrightarrow 02:40:05.232$  found interactions with age for for

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02{:}40{:}05{.}232 \dashrightarrow 02{:}40{:}07{.}164$  all 5 classes and a bilities that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02:40:07.170 \longrightarrow 02:40:09.462$  were significantly associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02{:}40{:}09{.}462 \dashrightarrow 02{:}40{:}12{.}102$  kidney stones on the prior slide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02:40:12.102 \longrightarrow 02:40:14.340$  So the odds of incident kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02{:}40{:}14{.}419 \dashrightarrow 02{:}40{:}16{.}989$  stones were greater for earlier

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02{:}40{:}16.989 \dashrightarrow 02{:}40{:}19.045$  life exposures to antibiotics.

02:40:19.050 --> 02:40:20.682 An exponential increase in the odds

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

02:40:20.682 --> 02:40:22.355 of kidney stones was estimated for

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

02:40:22.355 --> 02:40:24.210 patients less than 20 years of age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02{:}40{:}24{.}210 \dashrightarrow 02{:}40{:}26{.}345$  exposed to self a drugs and broad

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02{:}40{:}26{.}345 \dashrightarrow 02{:}40{:}27{.}901$  spectrum penicillins and a more

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02{:}40{:}27{.}901$ --> $02{:}40{:}29{.}371$  linear relationship was seen across NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02:40:29.371 \rightarrow 02:40:31.309$  the age range for cephalosporins,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7940064199

 $02:40:31.310 \longrightarrow 02:40:33.149$  fluoroquinolones and nitrofurantoin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02:40:37.690 \longrightarrow 02:40:40.354$  We also examined the magnitude of NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

02:40:40.354 --> 02:40:42.724 the association based on proximity

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02{:}40{:}42.724 \dashrightarrow 02{:}40{:}45.279$  of exposure to Orlando Vedics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02{:}40{:}45{.}280 \dashrightarrow 02{:}40{:}47{.}302$  This figure highlights that the odds

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02{:}40{:}47{.}302 \dashrightarrow 02{:}40{:}49{.}323$  were greatest for exposure to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

02:40:49.323 --> 02:40:50.873 five antibiotic classes of interest

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02{:}40{:}50{.}873 \dashrightarrow 02{:}40{:}52{.}907$  within three to six months of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02:40:52.907 \longrightarrow 02:40:54.479$  index date of the kidney stone.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375
- $02:40:54.480 \longrightarrow 02:40:56.142$  The magnitude of the increased ads

 $02:40:56.142 \rightarrow 02:40:58.180$  was lower with more distant exposure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02:40:58.180 \rightarrow 02:40:59.460$  but remains statistically significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02:40:59.460 \longrightarrow 02:41:01.751$  from three to five years from exposure

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

02:41:01.751 --> 02:41:03.635 for all classes except Buzz Spectrum,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

02:41:03.640 --> 02:41:04.912 penicillins, and again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02{:}41{:}04{.}912 \dashrightarrow 02{:}41{:}07{.}032$  all of these conditional logistic

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02:41:07.032 \longrightarrow 02:41:08.847$  regression models were adjusted

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02:41:08.847 \longrightarrow 02:41:10.655$  for prevalent comorbid conditions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02{:}41{:}10.660 \dashrightarrow 02{:}41{:}13.606$  UTI within the exposure window and

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02:41:13.606 \rightarrow 02:41:15.900$  exposure to other potential confounding

NOTE Confidence: 0.857743494375

 $02{:}41{:}15{.}900 \dashrightarrow 02{:}41{:}17{.}950$  medications within the exposure window.

NOTE Confidence: 0.858482602

 $02:41:21.380 \longrightarrow 02:41:22.680$  So to summarize this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858482602

 $02{:}41{:}22{.}680 \dashrightarrow 02{:}41{:}24{.}934$  we found that exposure to broad spectrum

NOTE Confidence: 0.858482602

 $02{:}41{:}24{.}934 \dashrightarrow 02{:}41{:}26{.}754$  or al antibiotics were associated increased

02:41:26.754 --> 02:41:28.754 odds of developing kidney stones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858482602

 $02{:}41{:}28.760 \dashrightarrow 02{:}41{:}30.880$  and that there appear to be greater risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.858482602

 $02{:}41{:}30{.}880 \dashrightarrow 02{:}41{:}33{.}197$  for more recent and early life exposures. NOTE Confidence: 0.858482602

 $02:41:33.200 \rightarrow 02:41:35.980$  This data provides additional rationale,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858482602

02:41:35.980 --> 02:41:38.015 rationale to limit in appropriate antibiotic

NOTE Confidence: 0.858482602

 $02{:}41{:}38.015 \dashrightarrow 02{:}41{:}40.728$  prescribing and may help explain some of NOTE Confidence: 0.858482602

 $02:41:40.728 \longrightarrow 02:41:42.576$  the rising incidents of kidney stones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.858482602

02:41:42.580 --> 02:41:43.849 particularly among children.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79609846175

02:41:46.600 --> 02:41:48.415 To highlight that this slide

NOTE Confidence: 0.79609846175

 $02{:}41{:}48{.}415 \dashrightarrow 02{:}41{:}49{.}867$  shows antibiotic prescribing and

NOTE Confidence: 0.79609846175

02:41:49.867 --> 02:41:51.411 this is actually data that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.79609846175

 $02{:}41{:}51{.}411 \dashrightarrow 02{:}41{:}53{.}091$  a decade old at this point.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79609846175

02:41:53.100 --> 02:41:54.738 But antibiotic prescribing

NOTE Confidence: 0.79609846175

 $02{:}41{:}54{.}738 \dashrightarrow 02{:}41{:}57{.}468$  for 1000 persons by state.

NOTE Confidence: 0.79609846175

 $02{:}41{:}57{.}470 \dashrightarrow 02{:}42{:}00{.}270$  And so, in 2011 there were over

NOTE Confidence: 0.79609846175

 $02:42:00.270 \longrightarrow 02:42:01.820$  260 million courses of antibiotics

 $02:42:01.820 \longrightarrow 02:42:03.678$  prescribed with the highest rates of

NOTE Confidence: 0.79609846175

02:42:03.678 --> 02:42:04.718 prescription for children younger

NOTE Confidence: 0.79609846175

 $02:42:04.718 \longrightarrow 02:42:06.520$  than 10 years of age and women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

02:42:10.860 --> 02:42:12.087 Corroborating our findings,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02:42:12.087 \longrightarrow 02:42:14.541$  this study of over 5000 women

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02:42:14.541 \longrightarrow 02:42:16.818$  in the nurses health studies one

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02{:}42{:}16.818 \dashrightarrow 02{:}42{:}18.980$  and two showed that the use of

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02{:}42{:}18{.}980 \dashrightarrow 02{:}42{:}20{.}809$  antibiotics for more than two months

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02{:}42{:}20.809 \dashrightarrow 02{:}42{:}22.801$  in early a dulthood and middle age

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02{:}42{:}22{.}801 \dashrightarrow 02{:}42{:}24{.}688$  was associated with a higher risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02:42:24.688 \longrightarrow 02:42:26.350$  of kidney stones later in life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02{:}42{:}26{.}350 \dashrightarrow 02{:}42{:}27{.}910$  These are the adjusted hazard

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02{:}42{:}27{.}910 \dashrightarrow 02{:}42{:}29{.}812$  ratios from cause specific heads or

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02{:}42{:}29.812 \dashrightarrow 02{:}42{:}31.540$  regression that was adjusted for age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02:42:31.540 \longrightarrow 02:42:33.750$  body mass index, comorbid conditions,

02:42:33.750 --> 02:42:36.170 thiazide use, and dietary factors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02{:}42{:}36{.}170 \dashrightarrow 02{:}42{:}39{.}130$  and importantly, this study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02:42:39.130 \longrightarrow 02:42:41.512$  Actually was able to do medical

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02:42:41.512 \rightarrow 02:42:44.826$  record review to to confirm the stone

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

02:42:44.826 --> 02:42:47.370 composition and 80% of the subset of

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02{:}42{:}47{.}370 \dashrightarrow 02{:}42{:}48{.}720$  stones that were confirmed by this

NOTE Confidence: 0.812732084117647

 $02:42:48.770 \rightarrow 02:42:50.540$  review were composed of calcium oxalate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857556686

 $02:42:54.230 \rightarrow 02:42:56.750$  So what's mediating this association?

NOTE Confidence: 0.857556686

 $02{:}42{:}56{.}750 \dashrightarrow 02{:}43{:}00{.}246$  Well, we know that we are 10% human,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857556686

 $02:43:00.246 \longrightarrow 02:43:03.054$  and we cohabit with 100 trillion

NOTE Confidence: 0.857556686

 $02:43:03.054 \rightarrow 02:43:05.967$  microbes that make up our microbiome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857556686

02:43:05.970 --> 02:43:07.618 particularly inhabiting our mouth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857556686

 $02:43:07.618 \rightarrow 02:43:10.340$  skin, and intestine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857556686

 $02:43:10.340 \longrightarrow 02:43:12.332$  And we know that this community

NOTE Confidence: 0.857556686

 $02:43:12.332 \longrightarrow 02:43:14.150$  is really essential for health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860318715

 $02:43:18.570 \longrightarrow 02:43:22.426$  So this is a figure from an article

02:43:22.426 --> 02:43:25.722 written by Doctor Blazer just highlighting

NOTE Confidence: 0.860318715

 $02{:}43{:}25{.}722 \dashrightarrow 02{:}43{:}29{.}220$  the loss of biodiversity over time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860318715

02:43:29.220 --> 02:43:31.704 And highlighting in the United States

NOTE Confidence: 0.860318715

 $02:43:31.704 \rightarrow 02:43:34.420$  how this has happened simultaneously

NOTE Confidence: 0.860318715

 $02{:}43{:}34{.}420 \dashrightarrow 02{:}43{:}36{.}212$  with early introduction of

NOTE Confidence: 0.860318715

 $02{:}43{:}36{.}212 \dashrightarrow 02{:}43{:}38{.}452$  sanitation and early antibiotic use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893314749285714

 $02{:}43{:}42.720 \dashrightarrow 02{:}43{:}45.366$  There have been several studies that

NOTE Confidence: 0.893314749285714

 $02{:}43{:}45{.}366 \dashrightarrow 02{:}43{:}48{.}777$  have begun to look at the microbial

NOTE Confidence: 0.893314749285714

 $02:43:48.777 \longrightarrow 02:43:50.964$  diversity of the intestinal microbiome

NOTE Confidence: 0.893314749285714

 $02:43:50.964 \rightarrow 02:43:53.044$  in patients with kidney stones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.893314749285714

 $02:43:53.050 \longrightarrow 02:43:56.356$  so this is data from adult.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893314749285714

 $02{:}43{:}56{.}360 \dashrightarrow 02{:}43{:}58{.}164$  Individuals who formed calcium

NOTE Confidence: 0.893314749285714

 $02{:}43{:}58{.}164 \dashrightarrow 02{:}44{:}00{.}419$  based stones and had recurrent

NOTE Confidence: 0.893314749285714

 $02{:}44{:}00{.}419 \dashrightarrow 02{:}44{:}02{.}329$  stones compared to controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.893314749285714

02:44:02.330 --> 02:44:05.942 And you can see lower alpha

 $02:44:05.942 \longrightarrow 02:44:07.794$  diversity in the stone formers

NOTE Confidence: 0.893314749285714

 $02:44:07.794 \longrightarrow 02:44:09.038$  compared to healthy controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.799633815

 $02{:}44{:}12{.}100 \dashrightarrow 02{:}44{:}15{.}150$  In addition to demonstrating reduced

NOTE Confidence: 0.799633815

 $02:44:15.150 \rightarrow 02:44:18.200$  diversity of the fecal microbiome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.799633815

 $02{:}44{:}18{.}200 \dashrightarrow 02{:}44{:}20{.}426$  so some farmers also had lower

NOTE Confidence: 0.799633815

02:44:20.426 --> 02:44:21.910 representation of bacterial taxa

NOTE Confidence: 0.799633815

02:44:21.970 --> 02:44:24.370 predicted to be involved in Oxley

NOTE Confidence: 0.799633815

 $02{:}44{:}24{.}370 \dashrightarrow 02{:}44{:}26{.}455$  degradation and reduced expression of

NOTE Confidence: 0.799633815

 $02{:}44{:}26{.}455 \dashrightarrow 02{:}44{:}28{.}555$  genes belonging to oxalate degradation NOTE Confidence: 0.799633815

02:44:28.555 --> 02:44:30.108 pathways and which shown here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.799633815

 $02{:}44{:}30{.}108 \dashrightarrow 02{:}44{:}31{.}800$  is that the relative abundance of

NOTE Confidence: 0.799633815

02:44:31.854 --> 02:44:33.793 five tax that was also correlated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.799633815

02:44:33.793 --> 02:44:35.600 24 hour urinary oxalate excretion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.866191474

02:44:39.710 --> 02:44:42.304 This is data from a study that

NOTE Confidence: 0.866191474

 $02:44:42.304 \rightarrow 02:44:44.612$  systematically reviewed six articles

NOTE Confidence: 0.866191474

 $02:44:44.612 \longrightarrow 02:44:47.586$  that was contained 170 adults with

- NOTE Confidence: 0.866191474
- $02:44:47.586 \rightarrow 02:44:49.646$  kidney stones showing lower abundance

 $02{:}44{:}49.646 \dashrightarrow 02{:}44{:}52.696$  of several bacterial taxa as well as

NOTE Confidence: 0.866191474

02:44:52.696 --> 02:44:54.851 greater abundance of Bacteroides species.

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02{:}44{:}58{.}290 \dashrightarrow 02{:}45{:}01{.}427$  More recently, this meta analysis looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

02:45:01.427 --> 02:45:04.906 at 6 meta Genome Wide association studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02{:}45{:}04{.}910 \dashrightarrow 02{:}45{:}07{.}626$  That evaluated the microbiome of the stool,

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02:45:07.630 \rightarrow 02:45:09.070$  and in some cases urine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02{:}45{:}09{.}070 \dashrightarrow 02{:}45{:}12{.}849$  as well as kidney stones themselves and

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02{:}45{:}12{.}849 \dashrightarrow 02{:}45{:}15{.}401$  the take home was that prevotella in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02:45:15.401 \rightarrow 02:45:18.140$  gut and lack the bacillus and urinary

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02:45:18.140 \rightarrow 02:45:20.310$  tract was associated with healthy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02{:}45{:}20{.}310$  -->  $02{:}45{:}21{.}453$  Individuals, while Enterobacteriaceae,

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02:45:21.453 \rightarrow 02:45:23.739$  were associated with kidney stone disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02{:}45{:}23.740 \dashrightarrow 02{:}45{:}25.540$  both in the urine and in

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02:45:25.540 \longrightarrow 02:45:26.440$  kidney stones themselves,

 $02{:}45{:}26{.}440 \dashrightarrow 02{:}45{:}28{.}330$  and the predominant factors that

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02{:}45{:}28{.}330 \dashrightarrow 02{:}45{:}29{.}842$  were associated with microbiome

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02:45:29.842 \rightarrow 02:45:31.519$  composition were kidney stone status,

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02:45:31.520 \longrightarrow 02:45:33.089$  stone composition, age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.828875238

 $02{:}45{:}33.089 \dashrightarrow 02{:}45{:}34.658$  and study location.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8792779

 $02{:}45{:}37{.}280 \dashrightarrow 02{:}45{:}38{.}448$  So what about children?

NOTE Confidence: 0.894390648636364

 $02{:}45{:}40.710 \dashrightarrow 02{:}45{:}43.095$  So I'm going to share some of our work

NOTE Confidence: 0.894390648636364

 $02:45:43.095 \rightarrow 02:45:45.488$  looking at the microbiome of children with

NOTE Confidence: 0.894390648636364

 $02:45:45.488 \rightarrow 02:45:47.739$  kidney stones compared to healthy peers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

 $02:45:50.510 \longrightarrow 02:45:52.322$  So this was a case control

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

 $02{:}45{:}52{.}322 \dashrightarrow 02{:}45{:}54{.}463$  study that we conducted at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

02:45:54.463 --> 02:45:56.195 Children's Hospital of Philadelphia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

 $02{:}45{:}56{.}200 \dashrightarrow 02{:}45{:}57{.}850$  and we enrolled cases who were

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

 $02{:}45{:}57{.}850 \dashrightarrow 02{:}46{:}00{.}011$  between 4 and 18 years of age

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

 $02:46:00.011 \longrightarrow 02:46:01.347$  with calcium kidney stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

 $02:46:01.350 \longrightarrow 02:46:03.499$  So they had to have had either

 $02:46:03.499 \longrightarrow 02:46:04.819$  a spontaneously passed or

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

02:46:04.819 $\operatorname{-->}$ 02:46:06.499 surgically removed stone that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

 $02:46:06.499 \rightarrow 02:46:09.890$  comprised of at least 80% calcium.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

 $02:46:09.890 \rightarrow 02:46:13.766$  And 44 agent sex matched controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

02:46:13.770 --> 02:46:15.680 Participants did 324 hour dietary

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

 $02{:}46{:}15.680 \dashrightarrow 02{:}46{:}18.198$  recalls and provided a stool sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

02:46:18.198 --> 02:46:20.386 for shotgun metagenomic sequencing

NOTE Confidence: 0.88337490625

 $02:46:20.386 \rightarrow 02:46:22.574$  and untargeted metabolomics profiling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.736762132666667

 $02:46:25.720 \longrightarrow 02:46:28.976$  Just a brief word on the hold that

NOTE Confidence: 0.736762132666667

 $02:46:28.976 \longrightarrow 02:46:31.631$  hold genome shotgun sequencing as

NOTE Confidence: 0.736762132666667

02:46:31.631 --> 02:46:34.024 compared to 16 Sr RNA sequencing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.736762132666667

 $02{:}46{:}34{.}024 \dashrightarrow 02{:}46{:}36{.}614$  which was used in the majority of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.736762132666667

02:46:36.614 --> 02:46:38.339 microbiome work and kidney stones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.736762132666667

 $02{:}46{:}38{.}340 \dashrightarrow 02{:}46{:}40{.}254$  which sequence is only a single

NOTE Confidence: 0.736762132666667

 $02{:}46{:}40.254 \dashrightarrow 02{:}46{:}41.940$  region of the bacterial genome

 $02:46:41.940 \rightarrow 02:46:45.468$  called genome shotgun sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.736762132666667

 $02:46:45.470 \longrightarrow 02:46:47.210$  Sequences several random fragments of

NOTE Confidence: 0.736762132666667

 $02:46:47.210 \longrightarrow 02:46:49.350$  the genome and the major advantages NOTE Confidence: 0.7367621326666667

 $02:46:49.350 \longrightarrow 02:46:51.744$  that tax that can be more accurately

NOTE Confidence: 0.736762132666667

 $02:46:51.744 \longrightarrow 02:46:53.500$  identified at the species level.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02:46:57.090 \longrightarrow 02:46:59.568$  So this is data from that study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02{:}46{:}59{.}570 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}01{.}600$  This shows a heat map of bacterial

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02:47:01.600 \rightarrow 02:47:03.663$  taxa and children with kidney stones

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02{:}47{:}03.663 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}05.548$  and their matched healthy controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02{:}47{:}05{.}550 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}07{.}908$  Each column represents 1 fecal sample,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02:47:07.910 \longrightarrow 02:47:11.767$  and each row represents 1 bacterial taxon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02{:}47{:}11.770 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}14.108$  The tax were included if the abundance

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02:47:14.108 \longrightarrow 02:47:16.339$  in any sample exceeded point 1%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02{:}47{:}16{.}340 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}18{.}212$  with the exception of axle bacteria

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02:47:18.212 \longrightarrow 02:47:19.970$  and axial vector for migenes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02{:}47{:}19{.}970 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}21{.}875$  which were included despite their

 $02:47:21.875 \longrightarrow 02:47:23.780$  lower abundance due to their

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02{:}47{:}23.851 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}26.126$  presumed role in oxalate degradation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02:47:26.130 \longrightarrow 02:47:28.260$  The overall taxonomic profile of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02:47:28.260 \longrightarrow 02:47:30.040$  gut microbiome among participants with

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02{:}47{:}30{.}040 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}31{.}864$  kidney stones and controls was similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

02:47:31.864 - 02:47:33.848 to that observed in previous studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02{:}47{:}33{.}850 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}35{.}835$  where the Bacteroidetes and Clostridia

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02{:}47{:}35{.}835 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}37{.}820$  species accounted for most of

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02{:}47{:}37{.}887 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}39{.}582$  the bacterial population and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02:47:39.582 \rightarrow 02:47:41.623$  can see the very abundant species

NOTE Confidence: 0.845313565714286

 $02:47:41.623 \rightarrow 02:47:43.618$  are the ones in orange and red.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02{:}47{:}49{.}400 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}51{.}175$  So to compare the taxonomic

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02{:}47{:}51{.}175 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}52{.}595$  composition of all participants,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02{:}47{:}52.600 \dashrightarrow 02{:}47{:}54.574$  we tested 91 bacterial techs of

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02{:}47{:}54{.}574$  -->  $02{:}47{:}56{.}760$  that had that greater than point 1%

 $02:47:56.760 \rightarrow 02:47:59.987$  abundance and at least one stool sample.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02{:}47{:}59{.}990 \dashrightarrow 02{:}48{:}01{.}970$  And we found that 31 bacterial

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02:48:01.970 \longrightarrow 02:48:03.773$  techs are different in abundance

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02:48:03.773 \rightarrow 02:48:05.441$  between participants with kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02{:}48{:}05{.}441 \dashrightarrow 02{:}48{:}07{.}983$  stones and controls at a predefined

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02:48:07.983 \rightarrow 02:48:10.317$  FDR adjusted threshold of less than

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02{:}48{:}10{.}317 \dashrightarrow 02{:}48{:}12{.}410$  .05 of the tax that identified,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02:48:12.410 \rightarrow 02:48:15.200$  all were less abundant among participants

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02:48:15.200 \rightarrow 02:48:18.119$  who formed kidney stones than controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02{:}48{:}18{.}120 \dashrightarrow 02{:}48{:}19{.}315$  And these included seven tasks

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02{:}48{:}19{.}315 \dashrightarrow 02{:}48{:}20{.}800$  that the produced the short chain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

02:48:20.800 --> 02:48:22.160 Fatty acid butyrate including

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

02:48:22.160 --> 02:48:23.180 several rose buria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02{:}48{:}23.180 \dashrightarrow 02{:}48{:}25.050$  and Clostridium species and those

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02:48:25.050 \rightarrow 02:48:28.740$  are highlighted with the red squares

NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222

 $02{:}48{:}28{.}740 \dashrightarrow 02{:}48{:}31{.}148$  as well as lower abundance of three

- NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222
- 02:48:31.148 --> 02:48:32.672 oxalate degrading bacterial taxa
- NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222
- 02:48:32.672 --> 02:48:34.420 attacks that Enterococcus vocalist,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222
- $02{:}48{:}34{.}420 \dashrightarrow 02{:}48{:}37{.}252$  Enterococcus PCM and Bifidobacterium
- NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222
- $02{:}48{:}37{.}252 \dashrightarrow 02{:}48{:}40{.}792$  Animalis the the lavender boxes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222
- $02{:}48{:}40.800 \dashrightarrow 02{:}48{:}41.116$  Correspondingly,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222
- $02:48:41.116 \longrightarrow 02:48:43.012$  the figure on the right shows
- NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222
- $02:48:43.012 \rightarrow 02:48:44.550$  that the gene abundance,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222
- 02:48:44.550 02:48:45.597 beautiful Cohen dehydrogenase,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222
- 02:48:45.597 -> 02:48:47.691 the key bacterial enzyme in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222
- 02:48:47.691 --> 02:48:49.029 butyrate production pathway,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222
- $02:48:49.030 \longrightarrow 02:48:50.860$  was also lower among the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.860787762222222
- $02{:}48{:}50.860 \dashrightarrow 02{:}48{:}52.324$  stone formers than controls.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625
- $02:48:56.320 \longrightarrow 02:48:59.812$  So looking at the fecal sorry
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625
- 02:48:59.812 --> 02:49:01.339 fecal metabolome, overall,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625
- $02{:}49{:}01{.}339 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}03{.}134$  the profile of fecal metabolites
- NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02:49:03.134 \rightarrow 02:49:04.570$  was similar between participants

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02{:}49{:}04.625 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}06.180$  with kidney stones and controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

02:49:06.180 --> 02:49:08.259 But we carried out a linear discriminant

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02:49:08.259 \rightarrow 02:49:09.882$  analysis to determine if a subset

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02{:}49{:}09{.}882 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}11{.}232$  of the metabolites could be used

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02{:}49{:}11{.}232 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}13{.}023$  to distinguish the two groups and NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02:49:13.023 \rightarrow 02:49:14.533$  found that a linear discriminant

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02:49:14.540 \rightarrow 02:49:16.340$  separated those with kidney stones

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02:49:16.340 \longrightarrow 02:49:18.204$  from controls with 77% accuracy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02{:}49{:}18{.}204 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}20{.}556$  There were 18 metabolites that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02{:}49{:}20.556 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}21.727$  significantly different between

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02:49:21.727 \rightarrow 02:49:23.039$  participants with kidney stones

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02{:}49{:}23.039 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}25.270$  and controls at a pre specified.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02{:}49{:}25{.}270 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}27{.}478$  Nominal P value of less than .01 ten,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02:49:27.480 \longrightarrow 02:49:30.120$  being higher among cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

02:49:30.120 --> 02:49:31.996 Sorry to think it 10 being higher,

 $02:49:32.000 \rightarrow 02:49:34.232$  my cases and eight metabolites being

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02:49:34.232 \longrightarrow 02:49:36.380$  lower one cases than controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

02:49:36.380 --> 02:49:37.434 And importantly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02{:}49{:}37{.}434 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}40{.}069$  these differences in fecal metabolites

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02:49:40.069 \rightarrow 02:49:42.370$  associated with bacterial abundance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

02:49:42.370 - 02:49:43.858 So you can see in the right hand

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02{:}49{:}43{.}858 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}45{.}857$  side of the figure that we computed

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

02:49:45.857 --> 02:49:47.121 a correlation matrix between

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02{:}49{:}47{.}121 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}48{.}510$  metabolites and species abundance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02{:}49{:}48{.}510 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}50{.}105$  which revealed strong correlations for

NOTE Confidence: 0.61577540625

 $02{:}49{:}50{.}105 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}52{.}679$  many of the texts on metabolite pairs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

 $02{:}49{:}57{.}540 \dashrightarrow 02{:}49{:}59{.}780$  So, following this untargeted analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

 $02{:}49{:}59{.}780 \dashrightarrow 02{:}50{:}03{.}218$  we focused on oxalate degrading bacteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

 $02{:}50{:}03{.}220 \dashrightarrow 02{:}50{:}05{.}460$  and we constructed an abundance

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

 $02:50:05.460 \rightarrow 02:50:08.200$  correlation network on the left panel,

 $02:50:08.200 \longrightarrow 02:50:10.088$  a proxy degrading bacteria

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

 $02{:}50{:}10.088 \dashrightarrow 02{:}50{:}11.976$  detected in this study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

 $02{:}50{:}11{.}980 \dashrightarrow 02{:}50{:}14{.}458$  and we found that it consisted of

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

 $02:50:14.458 \longrightarrow 02:50:16.290$  positive correlations among the isolated

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

02:50:16.290 --> 02:50:18.414 degrade oxalate degrading tax set and

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

 $02:50:18.414 \rightarrow 02:50:20.868$  lacked any strong negative correlations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

 $02{:}50{:}20{.}870 \dashrightarrow 02{:}50{:}22{.}865$  The network really consisted of two modules,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

02:50:22.870 --> 02:50:25.370 1 populated by relatively high

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

02:50:25.370 --> 02:50:27.370 abundance oxalate degrading taxa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

 $02{:}50{:}27{.}370 \dashrightarrow 02{:}50{:}29{.}018$  And this is panel B and the other

NOTE Confidence: 0.81725593

 $02{:}50{:}29{.}018 \dashrightarrow 02{:}50{:}30{.}680$  by low abundance lactobacilli.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:50:34.950 \rightarrow 02:50:37.386$  So importantly, what's shown here is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02{:}50{:}37{.}386 \dashrightarrow 02{:}50{:}39{.}608$  alpha diversity of the gut microbiome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02{:}50{:}39{.}610 \dashrightarrow 02{:}50{:}41{.}394$  So in the left hand figure you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:50:41.394 \rightarrow 02:50:43.449$  see that we corroborated findings in

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:50:43.449 \rightarrow 02:50:45.394$  adults showing lower diversity and

02:50:45.394 --> 02:50:47.081 participants with kidney stones compared

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:50:47.081 \rightarrow 02:50:48.947$  to controls assessed both by the

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

02:50:48.950 --> 02:50:52.850 richness and Shannon's diversity index.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:50:52.850 \rightarrow 02:50:54.760$  And strikingly, the alpha diversity

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02{:}50{:}54{.}760 \dashrightarrow 02{:}50{:}56{.}670$  exhibited an age dependent association

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:50:56.724 \rightarrow 02:50:58.169$  in those with kidney stones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:50:58.170 \longrightarrow 02:50:59.018$  but not in control.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02{:}50{:}59{.}018 \dashrightarrow 02{:}51{:}01{.}391$  So as you can see in the right hand

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

02:51:01.391 --> 02:51:03.136 figure bacterial diversity first decreased

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:51:03.136 \rightarrow 02:51:05.188$  and then increased with age among

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:51:05.188 \rightarrow 02:51:07.126$  those who were kidney stone formers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:51:07.130 \longrightarrow 02:51:09.308$  with the lowest diversity found among

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:51:09.308 \rightarrow 02:51:11.108$  individuals who first formed kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:51:11.108 \longrightarrow 02:51:13.404$  stones between 9:00 and 14 years of age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:51:13.410 \longrightarrow 02:51:14.052$  In contrast,

 $02:51:14.052 \rightarrow 02:51:15.978$  the alpha diversity of the microbiome

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:51:15.978 \longrightarrow 02:51:17.539$  of participants who are controls

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02{:}51{:}17{.}539 \dashrightarrow 02{:}51{:}18{.}974$  with similar across the spectrum

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:51:18.974 \rightarrow 02:51:20.555$  and there were no significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.831588171538462

 $02:51:20.555 \dashrightarrow 02:51:22.140$  associations found with the age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871142304545454

 $02:51:25.760 \longrightarrow 02:51:27.085$  So to summarize, this study

NOTE Confidence: 0.871142304545454

 $02:51:27.085 \rightarrow 02:51:28.940$  showed the loss of gut bacteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871142304545454

 $02:51:28.940 \longrightarrow 02:51:30.468$  particularly those that produce

NOTE Confidence: 0.871142304545454

02:51:30.468 --> 02:51:31.996 butyrate and degrade oxalate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871142304545454

 $02:51:32.000 \rightarrow 02:51:33.544$  were associated with perturbations

NOTE Confidence: 0.871142304545454

 $02:51:33.544 \rightarrow 02:51:35.430$  of the metabolome that may

NOTE Confidence: 0.871142304545454

 $02:51:35.430 \longrightarrow 02:51:36.910$  be upstream determinants of

NOTE Confidence: 0.871142304545454

02:51:36.910 --> 02:51:38.520 early onset calcium oxalate,

NOTE Confidence: 0.871142304545454

 $02:51:38.520 \longrightarrow 02:51:39.579$  kidney stone disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316

 $02:51:42.350 \rightarrow 02:51:45.158$  So I just want to shift to highlight

NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316

 $02:51:45.158 \rightarrow 02:51:47.060$  some current work we're doing

- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- $02:51:47.060 \longrightarrow 02:51:49.304$  to follow up on these signals.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- $02{:}51{:}49{.}310 \dashrightarrow 02{:}51{:}51{.}370$  So our active investigations are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- $02:51:51.370 \rightarrow 02:51:53.430$  really seeking to further characterize
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- $02{:}51{:}53{.}492 \dashrightarrow 02{:}51{:}55{.}544$  the microbiome and determine how the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- $02:51:55.544 \rightarrow 02:51:57.498$  composition of the gut microbiome
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- $02:51:57.498 \longrightarrow 02:51:59.586$  affects urinary mineral excretion.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- $02:51:59.590 \rightarrow 02:52:01.662$  The goal is that ultimately we can
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- $02:52:01.662 \longrightarrow 02:52:03.663$  identify how we can restore the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- 02:52:03.663 --> 02:52:05.403 gut microbiome or its function,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- $02{:}52{:}05{.}410 \dashrightarrow 02{:}52{:}07{.}270$  and our hypothesis is that understanding
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- $02:52:07.270 \rightarrow 02:52:09.180$  the gut kidney access will introduce
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- $02{:}52{:}09{.}180 \dashrightarrow 02{:}52{:}11{.}040$  a new paradigm for primary and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.848577370526316
- $02{:}52{:}11{.}040 \dashrightarrow 02{:}52{:}12{.}560$  secondary kidney stone prevention.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- $02:52:15.950 \rightarrow 02:52:19.166$  So the active study that we were conducting,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- $02:52:19.170 \longrightarrow 02:52:20.774$  called the pursuing optimal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

 $02:52:20.774 \rightarrow 02:52:22.779$  organisms and people with stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

02:52:22.780 --> 02:52:24.928 Consists of a patient oriented study

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

 $02{:}52{:}24{.}928 \dashrightarrow 02{:}52{:}27{.}756$  as well as a A data analysis study

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

 $02:52:27.756 \longrightarrow 02:52:30.320$  that I'll show you in a moment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

 $02{:}52{:}30{.}320 \dashrightarrow 02{:}52{:}32{.}576$  This is really an expansion of

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

02:52:32.576 --> 02:52:34.560 our earlier case control study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

02:52:34.560 --> 02:52:37.626 We're enrolling 300 children and adults,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

 $02:52:37.630 \longrightarrow 02:52:41.260$  150 cases and 150 controls,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

 $02:52:41.260 \longrightarrow 02:52:43.595$  and this study is using

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

02:52:43.595 --> 02:52:44.996 comprehensive nutritional profiling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

02:52:45.000 --> 02:52:46.371 high throughput microbiome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

02:52:46.371 -> 02:52:48.199 and metabolomic data analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

 $02{:}52{:}48{.}200 \dashrightarrow 02{:}52{:}49{.}928$  as well as large database analytics

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

 $02:52:49.928 \longrightarrow 02:52:52.489$  really to try and define how diet and

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

 $02:52:52.489 \longrightarrow 02:52:54.174$  antibiotics perturb the gut microbiome

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

 $02:52:54.174 \rightarrow 02:52:56.503$  and how the resulting changes in

- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- $02{:}52{:}56{.}503 \dashrightarrow 02{:}52{:}58{.}047$  downstream metabolites and chemistries
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- $02{:}52{:}58{.}047 \dashrightarrow 02{:}52{:}59{.}940$  and intestinal and urinary tracts
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- $02:52:59.940 \rightarrow 02:53:01.815$  contribute to kidney stone disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- 02:53:01.820 --> 02:53:03.656 So, in this patient oriented study,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- $02{:}53{:}03.660 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}04.386$  individuals.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- 02:53:04.386 --> 02:53:06.564 Undergoing nutritional profiling
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- $02:53:06.564 \rightarrow 02:53:08.886$  with 24 hour diet recalls
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- $02:53:08.886 \rightarrow 02:53:10.083$  shotgun metagenomic sequencing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- $02:53:10.083 \rightarrow 02:53:12.124$  of stool targeted and untargeted
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- $02:53:12.124 \rightarrow 02:53:14.069$  metabolomics of stool and urine.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- 02:53:14.070 --> 02:53:15.825 24 hour urine chemistries and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- $02{:}53{:}15{.}825 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}17{.}580$  then we will perform compositional
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- 02:53:17.635 --> 02:53:18.971 mediation analysis to discover
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- 02:53:18.971 > 02:53:20.975 how the gut microbiome and its
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125
- $02{:}53{:}21.036 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}22.203$  downstream metabolites mediates
- NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

 $02{:}53{:}22{.}203 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}24{.}148$  the direct and indirect effects

NOTE Confidence: 0.86301888125

02:53:24.148 --> 02:53:25.989 of diet on kidney stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

02:53:28.110 --> 02:53:30.995 Complementary to this approach,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

02:53:30.995 - 02:53:32.720 we are partnering with health

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}53{:}32{.}720 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}34{.}706$  core and leveraging the healthcare

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}53{:}34{.}706 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}36{.}350$  integrated research database,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}53{:}36{.}350 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}38{.}250$  which is a longitudinally integrated

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:53:38.250 \rightarrow 02:53:40.150$  medical and pharmacy claims database.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}53{:}40{.}150 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}42{.}748$  Drawn from healthcare encounters of members

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}53{:}42.748 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}45.299$  enrolled in several commercial health plans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}53{:}45{.}300 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}47{.}796$  This is a extension of our work in

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}53{:}47.796 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}50.020$  the United Kingdom thin database.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}53{:}50{.}020 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}52{.}428$  You can see we have a much larger

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:53:52.428 \rightarrow 02:53:54.276$  sample size of over 600,000 individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:53:54.276 \rightarrow 02:53:57.100$  who were four to 65 years of age

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}53{:}57{.}175 \dashrightarrow 02{:}53{:}59{.}415$  at the time of their first stone.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- $02:53:59.420 \longrightarrow 02:54:02.900$  We've cut off at 65 because of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- $02:54:02.900 \longrightarrow 02:54:04.960$  introduction of Medicare at 65.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- $02{:}54{:}04{.}960 \dashrightarrow 02{:}54{:}07{.}800$  So the.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- $02:54:07.800 \longrightarrow 02:54:09.708$  With the data in this database,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- $02{:}54{:}09{.}710 \dashrightarrow 02{:}54{:}13{.}215$  then becomes less complete and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- $02{:}54{:}13{.}215 \dashrightarrow 02{:}54{:}17{.}240$  then we have matched 5 to one
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- 02:54:17.240 --> 02:54:19.432 for controls using incidence,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- 02:54:19.432 --> 02:54:21.560 density, sampling, match and age,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- $02:54:21.560 \longrightarrow 02:54:23.140$  sex and geographic region.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- $02:54:23.140 \longrightarrow 02:54:26.200$  So over 3,000,000 controls.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- $02:54:26.200 \longrightarrow 02:54:28.072$  So we'll be doing a nested
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- $02:54:28.072 \longrightarrow 02:54:29.008$  case control study,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- $02:54:29.010 \longrightarrow 02:54:30.378$  determine the dose response
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- $02{:}54{:}30{.}378 \dashrightarrow 02{:}54{:}31{.}404$  relationship between antibiotic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333
- 02:54:31.404 --> 02:54:32.780 exposure and kidney stones,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:54:32.780 \rightarrow 02:54:34.684$  and to really try and identify subgroups

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:54:34.684 \rightarrow 02:54:36.615$  at greatest risk for development of

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}54{:}36{.}615 \dashrightarrow 02{:}54{:}38{.}380$  kidney stones after antibiotic exposure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:54:38.380 \rightarrow 02:54:41.320$  and delve more into the age specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

02:54:41.320 --> 02:54:44.720 patterns in kidney stone risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}54{:}44{.}720 \dashrightarrow 02{:}54{:}47{.}506$  We will then also use a subset

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

02:54:47.506 --> 02:54:49.315 of of this population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:54:49.315 \rightarrow 02:54:53.620$  so focusing on the kidney stone population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}54{:}53{.}620 \dashrightarrow 02{:}54{:}55{.}850$  linking with LabCorp to link

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:54:55.850 \longrightarrow 02:54:58.080$  to their Litho link analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}54{:}58{.}080 \dashrightarrow 02{:}54{:}59{.}412$  So we estimate this is going

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:54:59.412 \longrightarrow 02:55:01.092$  to be over 200,000 individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:55:01.092 \rightarrow 02:55:03.622$  We've linked using privacy preserving

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02{:}55{:}03{.}622 \dashrightarrow 02{:}55{:}05{.}859$  record linkage with their lethal

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:55:05.859 \rightarrow 02:55:08.451$  link data and the goal of this second

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:55:08.523 \rightarrow 02:55:11.169$  analysis is to identify how oral

 $02:55:11.169 \rightarrow 02:55:12.933$  antibiotics alter urine chemistries

NOTE Confidence: 0.887367943333333

 $02:55:12.940 \longrightarrow 02:55:14.790$  among individuals with kidney stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02{:}55{:}17.670 \dashrightarrow 02{:}55{:}19.315$  Just want to highlight several

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02:55:19.315 \longrightarrow 02:55:21.310$  areas of innovation in this work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02{:}55{:}21{.}310 \dashrightarrow 02{:}55{:}24{.}026$  which is again the use of shotgun

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02{:}55{:}24.026 \dashrightarrow 02{:}55{:}26.037$  metagenomic sequencing of the gut

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

02:55:26.037 --> 02:55:28.365 microbiome and contrast to most prior

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

02:55:28.365 --> 02:55:30.529 studies using 16 S RNA sequencing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

02:55:30.530 --> 02:55:32.498 Leveraging untargeted, untargeted,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02:55:32.498 \rightarrow 02:55:36.434$  metabolomic profiling of stool and urine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

02:55:36.440 --> 02:55:38.080 Examining kidney stone disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02{:}55{:}38{.}080 \dashrightarrow 02{:}55{:}39{.}720$  Really across the lifespan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02{:}55{:}39{.}720 \dashrightarrow 02{:}55{:}41{.}604$  so including children and a dults so

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02{:}55{:}41.604 \dashrightarrow 02{:}55{:}43.610$  that we can understand each specific

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02{:}55{:}43.610 \dashrightarrow 02{:}55{:}45.686$  perturbations of the gut kidney access

 $02:55:45.686 \rightarrow 02:55:47.579$  and calcium kidney stone disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02:55:47.580 \longrightarrow 02:55:50.485$  And this novel linkage of 24 year

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02:55:50.485 \longrightarrow 02:55:52.293$  old chemistries with pharmaceutical

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02{:}55{:}52{.}293 \dashrightarrow 02{:}55{.}55{.}660$  claims data which will allow us to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02:55:55.660 \rightarrow 02:55:57.672$  Really evaluate how antibiotic

NOTE Confidence: 0.862448218181818

 $02{:}55{:}57{.}672 \dashrightarrow 02{:}55{:}59{.}718$  exposure impacts your own chemistries.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550244605

 $02{:}56{:}04{.}250 \dashrightarrow 02{:}56{:}06{.}797$  So now I want to shift from origins to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550244605

 $02{:}56{:}06{.}797 \dashrightarrow 02{:}56{:}08{.}742$  complications and talk about a different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550244605

02:56:08.742 --> 02:56:10.347 access and kidney stone disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550244605

 $02{:}56{:}10.350 \dashrightarrow 02{:}56{:}14.388$  and that's the bone vascular access.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550244605

 $02:56:14.390 \rightarrow 02:56:16.320$  More than the episodic occurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550244605

02:56:16.320 --> 02:56:17.864 of debilitating stone events,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550244605

02:56:17.870 --> 02:56:19.715 kidney stone disease is increasingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550244605

 $02{:}56{:}19.715 \dashrightarrow 02{:}56{:}21.560$  recognized as a chronic systemic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550244605

 $02:56:21.614 \rightarrow 02:56:23.864$  disorder of mineral homeostasis with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550244605

02:56:23.864 --> 02:56:25.466 considerable morbidity including increased

02:56:25.466 --> 02:56:27.206 risk for chronic kidney disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8550244605

 $02:56:27.210 \longrightarrow 02:56:29.360$  bone fracture, and cardiovascular disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851555221666667

 $02{:}56{:}32{.}680 \dashrightarrow 02{:}56{:}37{.}160$  So we and others have shown increased risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.851555221666667

 $02:56:37.160 \rightarrow 02:56:40.100$  of impaired bone health in individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515552216666667

 $02:56:40.100 \longrightarrow 02:56:43.404$  Kidney stone with an increased risk of

NOTE Confidence: 0.851555221666667

 $02:56:43.404 \rightarrow 02:56:45.600$  fracture, increased risk of hypertension,

NOTE Confidence: 0.851555221666667

 $02:56:45.600 \rightarrow 02:56:48.180$  increased risk of coronary disease as

NOTE Confidence: 0.851555221666667

 $02:56:48.251 \rightarrow 02:56:50.495$  well as kidney function decline and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515552216666667

 $02{:}56{:}50{.}495 \dashrightarrow 02{:}56{:}52{.}771$  progression to end stage kidney disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.851555221666667

 $02{:}56{:}52{.}771 \dashrightarrow 02{:}56{:}55{.}611$  and what's striking from this body of work

NOTE Confidence: 0.851555221666667

 $02:56:55.620 \rightarrow 02:56:59.484$  is the signal of a increased magnitude.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851555221666667

 $02:56:59.490 \dashrightarrow 02:57:01.545$  Of risk observed in younger

NOTE Confidence: 0.8515552216666667

02:57:01.545 --> 02:57:03.189 individuals and among women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.851555221666667

02:57:03.190 --> 02:57:05.598 So what does that mean for the risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.851555221666667

 $02{:}57{:}05{.}598 \dashrightarrow 02{:}57{:}07{.}404$  of individuals who start forming

 $02:57:07.404 \longrightarrow 02:57:08.547$  stones in childhood?

NOTE Confidence: 0.851555221666667

 $02:57:08.550 \rightarrow 02:57:10.428$  Because this is largely adult data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

02:57:13.700 --> 02:57:15.830 This picture highlights full and

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

 $02:57:15.830 \longrightarrow 02:57:17.534$  mineral accrual and childhood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

 $02{:}57{:}17{.}540 \dashrightarrow 02{:}57{:}19{.}364$  It's important to recognize that peak

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

02:57:19.364 --> 02:57:21.502 bone mass is a lifelong determinant

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

 $02{:}57{:}21{.}502 \dashrightarrow 02{:}57{:}24{.}174$  of osteoporosis and 90% of that peak

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

 $02:57:24.174 \longrightarrow 02:57:26.400$  bone mass is established by age 18.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

 $02:57:26.400 \longrightarrow 02:57:28.695$  Although we do continue to

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

 $02:57:28.695 \rightarrow 02:57:31.320$  cortical density up until age 30.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

 $02:57:31.320 \longrightarrow 02:57:33.581$  And about 1/4 of the adult skeletal

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

02:57:33.581 --> 02:57:35.479 mass is actually laid down in

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

 $02:57:35.479 \longrightarrow 02:57:37.195$  the two year period of around

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

 $02{:}57{:}37{.}195 \dashrightarrow 02{:}57{:}39{.}228$  the time of peak linear growth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

 $02:57:39.230 \longrightarrow 02:57:40.622$  In the growing skeleton,

NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889

 $02:57:40.622 \rightarrow 02:57:42.014$  positive calcium balance is

- NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889
- $02:57:42.014 \longrightarrow 02:57:43.810$  favored in order to achieve
- NOTE Confidence: 0.651837518888889
- $02{:}57{:}43{.}810 \dashrightarrow 02{:}57{:}45{.}540$  calcium retention and build bone.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- $02:57:49.660 \rightarrow 02:57:52.140$  Again, what I want to highlight here is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- $02:57:52.140 \rightarrow 02:57:53.830$  fracture epidemiology in healthy children,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- $02{:}57{:}53{.}830 \dashrightarrow 02{:}57{:}56{.}098$  so fractures are not rare events in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- $02{:}57{:}56{.}098 \dashrightarrow 02{:}57{:}58{.}089$  childhood and this is Seminole work
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- $02:57:58.089 \rightarrow 02:58:00.315$  done nearly two two decades ago now,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- $02{:}58{:}00{.}320 \dashrightarrow 02{:}58{:}02{.}846$  but has been reproduced in several
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- $02{:}58{:}02{.}846 \dashrightarrow 02{:}58{:}05{.}889$  studies since showing distinct age and sex
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- 02:58:05.889 --> 02:58:08.034 specific patterns and fracture incidents.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- $02:58:08.040 \rightarrow 02:58:10.461$  With a peak age of about 14 in males
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- $02:58:10.461 \longrightarrow 02:58:12.581$  and 11 years in females and this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- $02:58:12.581 \longrightarrow 02:58:15.119$  peak in 14 year old males are about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- $02{:}58{:}15{.}120 \dashrightarrow 02{:}58{:}17{.}260$ 280 fractures per 10,000 person.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923
- $02:58:17.260 \longrightarrow 02:58:19.136$  Years is only surpassed at age 85
- NOTE Confidence: 0.834328233076923

 $02:58:19.136 \rightarrow 02:58:21.088$  and women and never again in men.

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02:58:24.160 \longrightarrow 02:58:26.488$  So wanna spend just the most of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02{:}58{:}26{.}488 \dashrightarrow 02{:}58{:}29{.}136$  rest of the time talking about impaired NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02:58:29.136 \rightarrow 02:58:32.174$  bone health in kidney stone disease and

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02{:}58{:}32{.}174 \dashrightarrow 02{:}58{:}35{.}138$  thinking about mineral and bone disorder?

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02{:}58{:}35{.}140 \dashrightarrow 02{:}58{:}38{.}668$  MD in the context of kidney stone disease. NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02{:}58{:}38{.}670 \dashrightarrow 02{:}58{:}40{.}998$  So again, as a chronic systemic disorder of

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02:58:40.998 \rightarrow 02:58:42.660$  mental homeostasis that's disproportionately

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

02:58:42.660 --> 02:58:44.208 increasing among adolescents,

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02:58:44.210 \rightarrow 02:58:46.429$  we really need to think about how

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02:58:46.429 \rightarrow 02:58:48.583$  this may impact long term bone

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02:58:48.583 \rightarrow 02:58:50.099$  health in this population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

02:58:50.100 --> 02:58:52.608 There have been many decks of

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02:58:52.608 \rightarrow 02:58:54.700$  studies showing produced aerial bomb,

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02:58:54.700 \rightarrow 02:58:56.830$  mineral density and children and adults,

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02{:}58{:}56{.}830 \dashrightarrow 02{:}58{:}58{.}948$  and actually now more than four

 $02:58:58.948 \rightarrow 02:59:00.360$  population based cohort studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02:59:00.416 \longrightarrow 02:59:01.709$  demonstrating increased fracture

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02:59:01.709 \rightarrow 02:59:04.295$  incidence with the hazard ratio ranging

NOTE Confidence: 0.811315408095238

 $02:59:04.295 \longrightarrow 02:59:06.500$  from 1.08 to 1.2 and older adults.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856997096190476

 $02{:}59{:}08{.}770 \dashrightarrow 02{:}59{:}11{.}182$  What I want to show you here is data

NOTE Confidence: 0.856997096190476

 $02{:}59{:}11{.}182 \dashrightarrow 02{:}59{:}14{.}092$  from work that we did again in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.856997096190476

 $02:59:14.092 \dashrightarrow 02:59:15.850$  health Improvement Network database.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856997096190476

 $02:59:15.850 \longrightarrow 02:59:18.658$  Where we looked at over 50,000

NOTE Confidence: 0.856997096190476

 $02:59:18.658 \rightarrow 02:59:21.044$  individuals with kidney stones and

NOTE Confidence: 0.856997096190476

 $02:59:21.044 \rightarrow 02:59:23.666$  compared them in a retrospective cohort

NOTE Confidence: 0.856997096190476

 $02:59:23.666 \rightarrow 02:59:26.116$  study to over 500,000 individuals

NOTE Confidence: 0.856997096190476

 $02:59:26.116 \rightarrow 02:59:29.524$  who did not have kidney stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856997096190476

 $02{:}59{:}29{.}530 \dashrightarrow 02{:}59{:}32{.}379$  And what's shown here is the age

NOTE Confidence: 0.856997096190476

 $02:59:32.379 \dashrightarrow 02:59:35.190$  and sex specific fracture incidence

NOTE Confidence: 0.856997096190476

 $02{:}59{:}35{.}190 \dashrightarrow 02{:}59{:}37{.}440$  by decile of age in participants

 $02:59:37.440 \rightarrow 02:59:39.480$  with and without kidney stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $02:59:42.330 \longrightarrow 02:59:44.026$  This figure highlights it a little bit more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $02:59:44.030 \dashrightarrow 02:59:47.400$  The magnitude of this association.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $02{:}59{:}47{.}400 \dashrightarrow 02{:}59{:}49{.}692$  So in emails there was an

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

02:59:49.692 --> 02:59:51.506 overall hazard ratio of 1.13,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $02{:}59{:}51{.}506 \dashrightarrow 02{:}59{:}53{.}508$  but I want to call your attention

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $02:59:53.510 \longrightarrow 02:59:56.354$  to the 10 to 19 year old age window

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $02{:}59{:}56{.}354 \dashrightarrow 02{:}59{:}59{.}192$  in males where the hazard ratio

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $02{:}59{:}59{.}192 \dashrightarrow 03{:}00{:}02{.}378$  was actually 1.51 and females,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

03:00:02.378 - 03:00:03.834 there was a statistically

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $03{:}00{:}03{.}834 \dashrightarrow 03{:}00{:}05{.}290$  significant interaction with age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $03:00:05.290 \rightarrow 03:00:07.034$  so we can't report an overall hazard ratio.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $03{:}00{:}07{.}040 \dashrightarrow 03{:}00{:}08{.}762$  But you can see that the magnitude

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $03{:}00{:}08.762 \dashrightarrow 03{:}00{:}10.326$  of the hazard ratio was greatest

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $03:00:10.326 \longrightarrow 03:00:11.862$  in the 4th decade of Life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

03:00:11.870 -> 03:00:15.011 so 30 to 39 year old women and then

- NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875
- 03:00:15.011 03:00:17.899 decreased to a hazard ratio of 1.21 and 8.

 $03:00:17.899 \longrightarrow 03:00:18.808$  Decade of life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

03:00:18.810 --> 03:00:20.790 It's important to note, however,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $03:00:20.790 \longrightarrow 03:00:23.198$  that with the with the rate of

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $03{:}00{:}23.198 \dashrightarrow 03{:}00{:}24.589$  oste<br/>oporotic fractures in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

03:00:24.589 --> 03:00:26.329 8th decade of life and women,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $03:00:26.330 \longrightarrow 03:00:28.826$  this hazard ratio of 1.21 represents

NOTE Confidence: 0.83141748875

 $03:00:28.826 \rightarrow 03:00:31.020$  a significant public health burden.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03{:}00{:}33{.}840 \dashrightarrow 03{:}00{:}36{.}336$  So what is behind the increased

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03{:}00{:}36{.}336$  -->  $03{:}00{:}39{.}047$  fracture risk and reduce both mineral

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03:00:39.047 \rightarrow 03:00:41.945$  density in patients with kidney stones?

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

03:00:41.950 --> 03:00:45.109 And I think part of the issue with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03{:}00{:}45{.}109 \dashrightarrow 03{:}00{:}47{.}403$  existing literature is that there was

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03{:}00{:}47{.}403 \dashrightarrow 03{:}00{:}50{.}580$  a focus primarily on hypercalciuria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03{:}00{:}50{.}580 \dashrightarrow 03{:}00{:}54{.}751$  so this summarizes the literature on bone

 $03:00:54.751 \rightarrow 03:00:57.493$  density in children with kidney stones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03:00:57.500 \rightarrow 03:00:59.888$  and you can see that overwhelmingly

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03{:}00{:}59{.}888 \dashrightarrow 03{:}01{:}01{.}890$  these studies looked at children

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03:01:01.890 \rightarrow 03:01:03.120$  with idiopathic hypercalciuria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

03:01:03.120 --> 03:01:05.170 With or without kidney stones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03:01:05.170 \longrightarrow 03:01:07.440$  rather than looking at kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03:01:07.440 \longrightarrow 03:01:10.463$  kidney stones from a more agnostic

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

03:01:10.463 --> 03:01:13.107 perspective of underlying risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03{:}01{:}13{.}110 \dashrightarrow 03{:}01{:}14.965$  The studies were cross sectional

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03:01:14.965 \rightarrow 03:01:17.238$  and again largely limited to aerial

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03{:}01{:}17{.}238 \dashrightarrow 03{:}01{:}19{.}356$  bone mineral density of the lumbar

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03{:}01{:}19{.}356 \dashrightarrow 03{:}01{:}22{.}182$  spine and Dexter does not allow to

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03:01:22.182 \rightarrow 03:01:23.886$  distinguish compartment density and

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

03:01:23.886 --> 03:01:26.201 particularly the lumbar spine prevents

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03:01:26.201 \rightarrow 03:01:28.149$  insights into cortical structure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03:01:28.150 \longrightarrow 03:01:30.052$  Most of these studies did not

- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- $03:01:30.052 \rightarrow 03:01:31.003$  include healthy controls,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- 03:01:31.010 -> 03:01:33.906 but you can see that the range of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- $03:01:33.906 \rightarrow 03:01:35.950$  osteopenia was 22 to 54% across
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- $03{:}01{:}35{.}950 \dashrightarrow 03{:}01{:}38{.}530$  these studies and there were more
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- $03:01:38.530 \longrightarrow 03:01:40.275$  pronounced deficits in stone
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- $03{:}01{:}40{.}275 \dashrightarrow 03{:}01{:}42{.}729$  formers than in children who had
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- $03:01:42.729 \rightarrow 03:01:44.630$  isolated idiopathic hypercalciuria.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- $03{:}01{:}44{.}630 \dashrightarrow 03{:}01{:}46{.}994$  This table summarizes a review of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- $03:01:46.994 \rightarrow 03:01:49.306$  preclinical and clinical data that really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- 03:01:49.306 03:01:51.470 just drives home the point that it's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- $03:01:51.470 \rightarrow 03:01:53.600$  probably not all about hypercalciuria,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- $03:01:53.600 \rightarrow 03:01:55.658$  and that there's multiple potential factors,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- $03:01:55.660 \longrightarrow 03:01:59.139$  both in terms of urinary mineral excretion,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- 03:01:59.140 --> 03:01:59.990 dietary intake,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556
- $03:01:59.990 \longrightarrow 03:02:02.115$  and also vitamin D related.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03{:}02{:}02{.}120 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}03{.}585$  Minimum metabolism that play a

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03{:}02{:}03{.}585 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}05{.}446$  role in the impaired bone quality

NOTE Confidence: 0.733827145555556

 $03:02:05.446 \longrightarrow 03:02:06.786$  in kidney stone disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

03:02:11.240 --> 03:02:14.210 Finally, just I wanted to discuss

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03:02:14.210 \rightarrow 03:02:16.190$  cardiovascular complications of kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}02{:}16{.}262 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}18{.}932$  stone disease and highlight what is

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03:02:18.932 \rightarrow 03:02:21.774$  currently a lack of data in children.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}02{:}21.780 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}24.065$  So independent of other cardiovascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

03:02:24.065 --> 03:02:26.600 risk factors, several studies in

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}02{:}26.600 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}28.990$  adults have demonstrated kidney stones

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}02{:}28{.}990 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}30{.}915$  to be associated with hypertension.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03:02:30.920 \longrightarrow 03:02:33.530$  Arterial stiffness in the order

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}02{:}33{.}530 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}35{.}096$  calcification coronary disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

03:02:35.100 --> 03:02:36.345 including myocardial infarction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}02{:}36{.}345 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}38{.}005$  stroke, and subclinical caretta

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03:02:38.005 \rightarrow 03:02:39.789$  that their sclerosis and young.

 $03:02:39.790 \longrightarrow 03:02:41.282$  Deals with kidney stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}02{:}41.282 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}43.558$  And again, this excess myocardial infarction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}02{:}43.558 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}45.850$  which seemed to be more pronounced

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03:02:45.912 \rightarrow 03:02:46.908$  in younger adults.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

03:02:46.910 --> 03:02:47.960 To my knowledge,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03:02:47.960 \longrightarrow 03:02:50.060$  there's still only one pediatric study

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}02{:}50{.}060 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}52{.}461$  that was done by Kirsten Kusumi looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03:02:52.461 \rightarrow 03:02:54.669$  at 15 adolescence with kidney stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}02{:}54.670 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}55.975$  That showed that they had

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}02{:}55{.}975 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{:}57{.}019$  higher carotid intimal medial

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

03:02:57.019 --> 03:02:58.575 thickness compared to age, sex,

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}02{:}58{.}575 \dashrightarrow 03{:}02{.}205$  and body mass index matched controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}03{:}02{.}210 \dashrightarrow 03{:}03{:}04{.}365$  So understanding the bone and

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

03:03:04.365 --> 03:03:05.658 vascular morbidity associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03{:}03{:}05{.}658 \dashrightarrow 03{:}03{:}07{.}769$  kidney stones is really important,

03:03:07.770 --> 03:03:09.840 particularly in our in our

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

 $03:03:09.840 \longrightarrow 03:03:11.496$  patient population that develops

NOTE Confidence: 0.779104722857143

03:03:11.496 - 03:03:13.289 kidney stones early in life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03:03:16.590 \rightarrow 03:03:19.158$  So this brings me to another active study

NOTE Confidence: 0.874584774666667

 $03{:}03{:}19{.}158 \dashrightarrow 03{:}03{:}22{.}167$  that we are close to completing enrollment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874584774666667

 $03{:}03{:}22.170 \dashrightarrow 03{:}03{:}25.386$  So target this is a prospective cohort study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874584774666667

 $03{:}03{:}25{.}390 \dashrightarrow 03{:}03{:}27{.}707$  just funded by our pediatric Center of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03:03:27.707 \rightarrow 03:03:29.392$  Excellence and nephrology and target

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03{:}03{:}29{.}392 \dashrightarrow 03{:}03{:}31{.}312$  enrollment is 100 children and young

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03{:}03{:}31{.}312 \dashrightarrow 03{:}03{:}33{.}070$  adults between the ages of five and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

03:03:33.070 - 03:03:35.574 21 years of age with kidney stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03:03:35.574 \rightarrow 03:03:38.396$  Primary outcomes are bone measures

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03:03:38.396 \rightarrow 03:03:40.036$  assessed by high resolution peripheral,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03:03:40.040 \longrightarrow 03:03:42.260$  quantitative computed tomography

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03{:}03{:}42{.}260 \dashrightarrow 03{:}03{:}46{.}500$  or HRCT as well as dexa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03:03:46.500 \rightarrow 03:03:49.182$  And participants are having these measures

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667
- $03:03:49.182 \longrightarrow 03:03:52.180$  done at baseline and 12 to 24 months.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667
- $03:03:52.180 \rightarrow 03:03:55.836$  We extended to 24 months because of COVID.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667
- $03:03:55.840 \rightarrow 03:03:57.808$  They are also having 24 year,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667
- $03{:}03{:}57{.}810 \dashrightarrow 03{:}04{:}01{.}324$  24 hour urine profiling and completing 324
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667
- $03:04:01.324 \rightarrow 03:04:05.356$  hour diet recalls at baseline and follow up.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874584774666667
- $03:04:05.360 \rightarrow 03:04:07.530$  We were enrolling healthy controls
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667
- 03:04:07.530 -> 03:04:09.700 and then because of COVID,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874584774666667
- 03:04:09.700 --> 03:04:10.930 I'm fortunate to be partnering
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667
- 03:04:10.930 --> 03:04:12.500 with my mentor, Mary Leonard,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667
- $03:04:12.500 \longrightarrow 03:04:14.575$  who's been rolled over 200
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667
- 03:04:14.580 --> 03:04:18.220 healthy participants at Stanford.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874584774666667
- $03:04:18.220 \rightarrow 03:04:20.430$  Using the same second generation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667
- 03:04:20.430 --> 03:04:21.314 HRPC technology,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667
- $03:04:21.320 \longrightarrow 03:04:24.840$  so we are going to be comparing our
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874584774666667
- $03:04:24.840 \rightarrow 03:04:26.920$  population to that reference cohort
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03{:}04{:}26{.}920 \dashrightarrow 03{:}04{:}29{.}507$  because there are no normative values for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03{:}04{:}29{.}507 \dashrightarrow 03{:}04{:}31{.}810$  HRPT and children as compared to Texas,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03{:}04{:}31{.}810 \dashrightarrow 03{:}04{:}33{.}760$  where there are normative values

NOTE Confidence: 0.8745847746666667

 $03{:}04{:}33.760 \dashrightarrow 03{:}04{:}36.080$  and we can calculate Z scores.

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

03:04:39.140 --> 03:04:43.316 So just a word on HPCT.

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:04:43.320 \rightarrow 03:04:45.469$  If this is a low radiation technology

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:04:45.469 \longrightarrow 03:04:47.326$  that provides measures of trabecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:04:47.326 \longrightarrow 03:04:48.640$  microarchitecture and cortical

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:04:48.640 \rightarrow 03:04:50.392$  volumetric bone mineral density,

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:04:50.400 \longrightarrow 03:04:51.510$  porosity and structure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03{:}04{:}51{.}510 \dashrightarrow 03{:}04{:}53{.}730$  and therefore can really provide insight

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:04:53.730 \longrightarrow 03:04:56.092$  into the impact of disease effects on

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03{:}04{:}56{.}092 \dashrightarrow 03{:}04{:}57{.}920$  discrete components of bone strength.

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:04:57.920 \rightarrow 03:05:00.564$  Additionally, HPCT through microfinance

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:05:00.564 \rightarrow 03:05:03.208$  element analysis can actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:05:03.208 \rightarrow 03:05:05.939$  provide indices of bone strength,

 $03{:}05{:}05{.}940 \dashrightarrow 03{:}05{:}07{.}851$  and that one of those indices failure

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:05:07.851 \rightarrow 03:05:09.420$  loads correlates well with xevil bio.

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:05:09.420 \rightarrow 03:05:11.100$  Mechanical compression testing

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:05:11.100 \longrightarrow 03:05:13.340$  has provided good fracture

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03{:}05{:}13{.}340 \dashrightarrow 03{:}05{:}15{.}819$  discrimination in children and adults.

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:05:15.820 \rightarrow 03:05:16.153$  Additionally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:05:16.153 \longrightarrow 03:05:17.818$  there's the potential to pick

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

03:05:17.818 --> 03:05:18.817 up vascular calcification,

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:05:18.820 \longrightarrow 03:05:20.710$  although we don't know if that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03:05:20.710 \longrightarrow 03:05:22.786$  going to be possible in our

NOTE Confidence: 0.613468171

 $03{:}05{:}22.786 \dashrightarrow 03{:}05{:}24.656$  pediatric and young adult population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03{:}05{:}30{.}300 \dashrightarrow 03{:}05{:}31{.}410$  So to summarize,

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03:05:31.410 \rightarrow 03:05:33.630$  kidney stone disease is highly prevalent,

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03{:}05{:}33{.}630 \dashrightarrow 03{:}05{:}36{.}472$  and on the rise and the rising

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03:05:36.472 \rightarrow 03:05:37.690$  incidence is disproportionately

 $03:05:37.761 \rightarrow 03:05:39.857$  affecting adolescents and women.

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

03:05:39.860 --> 03:05:41.540 There's growing evidence for display.

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

03:05:41.540 --> 03:05:43.640 Osis is a potential mediator

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03:05:43.640 \rightarrow 03:05:46.268$  for this changing incidents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

03:05:46.270 --> 03:05:48.230 An increasing recognition of associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03:05:48.230 \rightarrow 03:05:50.190$  morbidity and long-term renal and

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03:05:50.251 \rightarrow 03:05:52.506$  extrarenal complications of kidney stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03{:}05{:}52{.}510 \dashrightarrow 03{:}05{:}55{.}184$  And again, this is a particular concern

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03{:}05{:}55{.}184 \dashrightarrow 03{:}05{:}57{.}474$  with earlier onset disease and what

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03{:}05{:}57{.}474 \dashrightarrow 03{:}05{:}59{.}622$  this means over the life course.

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03{:}05{:}59{.}630 \dashrightarrow 03{:}06{:}03{.}174$  So our current work is really focused on

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03:06:03.174 \rightarrow 03:06:05.100$  delineating mechanistic underpinnings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03{:}06{:}05{.}100 \dashrightarrow 03{:}06{:}07{.}242$  About the about the origins and

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03:06:07.242 \rightarrow 03:06:09.073$  complications of kidney stones so

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03:06:09.073 \rightarrow 03:06:11.143$  that we can improve both primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03:06:11.143 \rightarrow 03:06:12.997$  and secondary prevention of kidney

 $03:06:12.997 \rightarrow 03:06:14.887$  stone disease and its complications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03{:}06{:}14.890 \dashrightarrow 03{:}06{:}17.794$  I just want to thank all of the members

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03{:}06{:}17.794 \dashrightarrow 03{:}06{:}19.978$  of the research teams that worked

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03{:}06{:}19{.}978 \dashrightarrow 03{:}06{:}22{.}686$  on the the settings that are that

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03{:}06{:}22.686 \dashrightarrow 03{:}06{:}25.458$  I presented that are ongoing and my

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

03:06:25.458 --> 03:06:27.768 partner Greg Tatian in urology Tub

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03:06:27.768 \longrightarrow 03:06:30.778$  who's really been my Co Pi in all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03:06:30.778 \rightarrow 03:06:33.469$  this work and our funding sources.

NOTE Confidence: 0.791374275111111

 $03{:}06{:}33{.}470 \dashrightarrow 03{:}06{:}34{.}590$  Thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767553482

 $03:06:48.300 \longrightarrow 03:06:49.740$  Thanks for a wonderful talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767553482

 $03{:}06{:}49{.}740 \dashrightarrow 03{:}06{:}51{.}430$  Any questions for doctor Denver?

NOTE Confidence: 0.22355655

 $03:06:54.590 \rightarrow 03:06:54.860$  Ever.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03:07:16.000 \longrightarrow 03:07:17.827$  Are you able to hear that or?

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03{:}07{:}17{.}830 \dashrightarrow 03{:}07{:}21{.}154$  I did not. I'm so sorry to repeat it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03:07:21.154 \longrightarrow 03:07:22.706$  I think she's on.

03:07:22.710 --> 03:07:25.658 Julie Goodwin sees babies later

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03{:}07{:}25{.}658 \dashrightarrow 03{:}07{:}28{.}022$  six months old with the kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03:07:28.022 \rightarrow 03:07:30.924$  stones and is it due to potentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03:07:30.924 \longrightarrow 03:07:32.964$  from formula or antibiotic use?

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03:07:32.970 \dashrightarrow 03:07:36.230$  Or what's the potential ideology?

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03:07:36.230 \rightarrow 03:07:37.854$  That's I think that's a great question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

03:07:37.860 --> 03:07:41.100 I think the work that we're doing right now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

03:07:41.100 --> 03:07:42.556 you know, we we are not enrolling

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03:07:42.556 \longrightarrow 03:07:43.796$  anybody that young, but it's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03:07:43.796 \longrightarrow 03:07:45.644$  It's a good question whether we

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03{:}07{:}45{.}644 \dashrightarrow 03{:}07{:}47{.}397$  should consider it a new direction

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

03:07:47.397 --> 03:07:50.690 and because you know, I think.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03{:}07{:}50.690 \dashrightarrow 03{:}07{:}52.610$  Particularly for some of the kidney

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03:07:52.610 \rightarrow 03:07:54.420$  stones we see early in life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

03:07:54.420 - 03:07:56.898 You know, particularly in the NICU.

NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286

 $03{:}07{:}56{.}900 \dashrightarrow 03{:}07{:}58{.}300$  So I think it's a great question

- NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286
- 03:07:58.300 --> 03:07:59.719 and a great future direction,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286
- $03:07:59.720 \longrightarrow 03:08:02.426$  and we are really hoping to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286
- $03:08:02.426 \rightarrow 03:08:04.878$  delve into the dietary influences
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286
- $03:08:04.878 \rightarrow 03:08:07.658$  in the ongoing poop study.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286
- $03:08:07.660 \rightarrow 03:08:10.824$  But we don't have anybody that young.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.888344195714286
- 03:08:10.830 --> 03:08:11.140 Alright.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.45955837
- $03:08:25.880 \longrightarrow 03:08:26.380$  More more.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.3744582
- $03:08:30.370 \longrightarrow 03:08:30.740$  However.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552
- $03:08:44.560 \longrightarrow 03:08:48.865$  So can you modulate the aux light content
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552
- $03:08:48.865 \rightarrow 03:08:53.600$  by the diet or increasing your calcium
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552
- 03:08:53.600 03:08:57.296 to change also the microbiome?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552
- 03:08:57.300 --> 03:08:58.800 Yeah, I think we don't know.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552
- 03:08:58.800 --> 03:09:00.968 We don't know yet, but I think that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552
- $03{:}09{:}00{.}968 \dashrightarrow 03{:}09{:}03{.}259$  is the idea that you know can we?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552
- $03{:}09{:}03{.}260 \dashrightarrow 03{:}09{:}06{.}725$  What can we learn that can help both with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03{:}09{:}06{.}725 \dashrightarrow 03{:}09{:}09{.}926$  primary but even secondary prevention for

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03{:}09{:}09{.}926$  -->  $03{:}09{:}13.436$  recurrent stone farmers by manipulating?

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03:09:13.440 \longrightarrow 03:09:15.508$  Might be manipulating diet

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03:09:15.508 \rightarrow 03:09:17.576$  to change the microbiome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03:09:17.580 \longrightarrow 03:09:19.422$  I think that is where, where,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03{:}09{:}19{.}422 \dashrightarrow 03{:}09{:}22{.}194$  where this work is hopefully heading.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03{:}09{:}22.200 \dashrightarrow 03{:}09{:}25.216$  Is this also like important in like uric

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03{:}09{:}25{.}216 \dashrightarrow 03{:}09{:}27{.}856$  acid stones or other forms of stones?

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03{:}09{:}27.860 \dashrightarrow 03{:}09{:}30.555$  Or is it just for calcium oxalate?

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03:09:30.560 \dashrightarrow 03:09:31.876$  That's a good question. I mean I'm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03:09:31.880 \longrightarrow 03:09:33.698$  I mean it, it could be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03{:}09{:}33{.}700$  -->  $03{:}09{:}37{.}040$  I mean the our work and the body of NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

03:09:37.130 --> 03:09:40.847 literature that I'm familiar with is really

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03{:}09{:}40.847 \dashrightarrow 03{:}09{:}43.656$  focused on calcium based kidney stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

03:09:43.656 --> 03:09:44.700 And you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03:09:44.700 \longrightarrow 03:09:48.020$  there's been a lot of attention to oxalate

 $03:09:48.020 \rightarrow 03:09:51.646$  and the effect of the microbiome on Oxley,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

03:09:51.646 --> 03:09:55.354 but I think that's why we really wanted to

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03{:}09{:}55{.}354 \dashrightarrow 03{:}09{:}57{.}960$  take a more agnostic approach to looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03:09:57.960 \rightarrow 03:10:00.360$  at the urine chemistries more broadly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

03:10:00.360 --> 03:10:01.400 the interaction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03{:}10{:}01{.}400 \dashrightarrow 03{:}10{:}04{.}000$  Between external exposures and microbiome

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03:10:04.000 \rightarrow 03:10:05.992$  and urine chemistries more broadly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03:10:05.992 \longrightarrow 03:10:07.288$  but we we are not looking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03:10:07.290 \rightarrow 03:10:09.070$  we we have specifically excluded

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

03:10:09.070 - 03:10:11.340 your against the uric acid stones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

 $03{:}10{:}11{.}340 \dashrightarrow 03{:}10{:}12{.}575$  From our analysis and they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.92033552

03:10:12.575 --> 03:10:13.563 very rare in childhood.

NOTE Confidence: 0.920246833333333

 $03:10:18.240 \longrightarrow 03:10:19.320$  Any other questions?

NOTE Confidence: 0.758471814375

 $03{:}10{:}22{.}260 \dashrightarrow 03{:}10{:}23{.}900$  Thank you Doctor Dembrow for a great talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

 $03{:}10{:}29{.}050 \dashrightarrow 03{:}10{:}33{.}910$  So we'll reconvene after lunch at 1:00 PM,

03:10:33.910 -> 03:10:36.764 thanks. All right, I think we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

03:10:36.764 --> 03:10:38.729 get started with our last speaker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

 $03:10:38.730 \longrightarrow 03:10:43.110$  doctor Opeyemi Olabisi from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

 $03:10:43.110 \rightarrow 03:10:45.990$  Duke Health who's going to talk to us about

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

 $03{:}10{:}45{.}990 \dashrightarrow 03{:}10{:}47{.}668$  translational insights from patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

03:10:47.670 -> 03:10:51.336 Stem cell derived model of April

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

 $03:10:51.336 \rightarrow 03:10:54.840$  1 nephropathy. Thank you Amy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

03:10:54.840 --> 03:10:56.584 Thank you very much,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

 $03{:}10{:}56{.}584 \dashrightarrow 03{:}10{:}59{.}195$  Doctor Ishibe and thank you to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

03:10:59.195 --> 03:11:01.799 organizer and Doctor Shebib for inviting me.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

 $03:11:01.800 \longrightarrow 03:11:06.070$  I'm quite honored to this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

 $03{:}11{:}06{.}070 \dashrightarrow 03{:}11{:}08{.}563$  Symposium I wish I could be there in person,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

 $03:11:08.570 \longrightarrow 03:11:10.076$  but different scheduling

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

03:11:10.076 - 03:11:12.084 issues that prevents me,

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

 $03{:}11{:}12.090 \dashrightarrow 03{:}11{:}14.295$  so I'm quite excited to be here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333

 $03:11:14.300 \rightarrow 03:11:16.430$  The morning session was quite enjoyable

- NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333
- $03:11:16.430 \longrightarrow 03:11:18.450$  listening to all the speakers,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333
- 03:11:18.450 --> 03:11:20.988 including Doctor, Babbitt and Doctor Roses,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333
- $03:11:20.990 \rightarrow 03:11:24.110$  and all, so it's been very exciting day,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333
- $03:11:24.110 \longrightarrow 03:11:25.606$  and I know this is the last talk,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.874213148333333
- $03:11:25.610 \rightarrow 03:11:28.634$  so I hope you actually will enjoy it also.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03:11:32.040 \rightarrow 03:11:34.735$  So none of the conflict is really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- 03:11:34.735 03:11:37.857 relevant to the talk I'm be given today,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- 03:11:37.860 --> 03:11:40.440 and I usually do not forget.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- 03:11:40.440 --> 03:11:43.416 I want to kind of give credit to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- 03:11:43.416 --> 03:11:46.409 people who actually did all the work
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03{:}11{:}46{.}409 \dashrightarrow 03{:}11{:}49{.}734$  and Doctor George Lee is a postdoc in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03{:}11{:}49{.}734 \dashrightarrow 03{:}11{:}52{.}900$  the lab to the left, Sarah Nystrom.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03{:}11{:}52{.}900 \dashrightarrow 03{:}11{:}58{.}420$  Is nephrology rising star fellow in the lab.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- 03:11:58.420 --> 03:11:59.806 Is the first author of the paper
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03{:}11{:}59{.}806 \dashrightarrow 03{:}12{:}01{.}149$  that they'll be presenting later.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:12:01.150 \longrightarrow 03:12:05.210$  Deraya minor is my clinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:12:05.210 \longrightarrow 03:12:06.834$  research coordinator.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:12:06.840 \longrightarrow 03:12:08.568$  With the subnet data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}12{:}08{.}568 \dashrightarrow 03{:}12{:}11{.}925$  I suppose duck Daniel Silers is the research

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}12{:}11{.}925 \dashrightarrow 03{:}12{:}15{.}409$  tech in the lab and carries sold ano.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

03:12:15.410 - 03:12:17.444 Is my lab manager without them

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:12:17.444 \longrightarrow 03:12:19.650$  all this stuff I'll be talking

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:12:19.650 \dashrightarrow 03:12:21.590$  about today would not happen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}12{:}21{.}590 \dashrightarrow 03{:}12{:}24{.}166$  so they get the front row seat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:12:24.170 \longrightarrow 03:12:28.460$  So my goal today is to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:12:28.460 \longrightarrow 03:12:30.136$  Go through this overview.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:12:30.136 \longrightarrow 03:12:32.650$  Some of them are familiar but

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}12{:}32{.}734 \dashrightarrow 03{:}12{:}35{.}098$  also couch this in two stories.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:12:35.100 \rightarrow 03:12:37.242$  One of them just recently published

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}12{:}37{.}242 \dashrightarrow 03{:}12{:}39{.}960$  and the other one is still emerging.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:12:39.960 \rightarrow 03:12:41.259$  To highlight this,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- 03:12:41.259 --> 03:12:43.857 the use of patient derived IPS
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03:12:43.857 \rightarrow 03:12:46.660 \mod as a way of studying disease.$
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- 03:12:46.660 03:12:49.588 I will go over the high burden of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03{:}12{:}49{.}588 \dashrightarrow 03{:}12{:}52{.}238$ kidney disease among African Americans.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03:12:52.240 \rightarrow 03:12:54.160$  Factors that contribute especially
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03:12:54.160 \longrightarrow 03:12:56.560$  biological factors that will be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03:12:56.560 \rightarrow 03:12:59.320$  discussing today the role of experimental.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03:12:59.320 \rightarrow 03:13:02.170$  Models in understanding the role of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03:13:02.249 \longrightarrow 03:13:05.325$  equal 1 and also I will be ending by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03:13:05.325 \rightarrow 03:13:07.850$  transitioning to once we actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03{:}13{:}07{.}850 \dashrightarrow 03{:}13{:}11{.}200$  understand the the mechanism and and what not.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03:13:11.200 \rightarrow 03:13:13.376$  How do we translate this to the community?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- 03:13:13.380 --> 03:13:16.402 How do we overcome barriers that have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03{:}13{:}16{.}402 \dashrightarrow 03{:}13{:}18{.}457$  prevented translations in the past,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333
- $03{:}13{:}18{.}460 \dashrightarrow 03{:}13{:}20{.}764$  and I'll be introducing a care
- NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

03:13:20.764 --> 03:13:23.228 and justice and NIH funded program

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}13{:}23{.}228 \dashrightarrow 03{:}13{:}24{.}920$  that we are doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:13:24.920 \rightarrow 03:13:28.016$  Many of you may be familiar with this book.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:13:28.020 \longrightarrow 03:13:29.970$  It it's called the warmth of

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}13{:}29{.}970 \dashrightarrow 03{:}13{:}32{.}000$  other Suns by Isabel Wilkerson.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

03:13:32.000 --> 03:13:32.732 I really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:13:32.732 \rightarrow 03:13:35.294$  really enjoyed the book on many level.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:13:35.300 \rightarrow 03:13:37.400$  It chronicled the great Migration,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}13{:}37{.}400 \dashrightarrow 03{:}13{:}40{.}640$  the migration of about 6 million

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

03:13:40.640 --> 03:13:43.296 A<br/>frican Americans between 1915 to

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:13:43.296 \longrightarrow 03:13:46.922$  1970 from the South to the north

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}13{:}46{.}922 \dashrightarrow 03{:}13{:}49{.}558$  and also to the West.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}13{:}49{.}560 \dashrightarrow 03{:}13{:}53{.}130$  The book is the author interview

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:13:53.130 \longrightarrow 03:13:55.510$  like maybe 1000 individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

03:13:55.510 - 03:13:58.546 Pretty much is very nice book.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:13:58.550 \rightarrow 03:14:00.066$  But in the subtext,

 $03:14:00.066 \rightarrow 03:14:03.419$  or let me say she followed 3 characters

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:03.420 \longrightarrow 03:14:05.065$  as a way of telling this story,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

03:14:05.070 -> 03:14:06.790 throw you real human characters,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:06.790 \longrightarrow 03:14:07.492$  African Americans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:07.492 \rightarrow 03:14:09.949$  This is the movement of African Americans

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}14{:}09{.}949 \dashrightarrow 03{:}14{:}12{.}088$  from the South to the north and West.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

03:14:12.090 --> 03:14:13.308 Three of them, one of them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:13.310 \longrightarrow 03:14:15.230$  actually ended up going West.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}14{:}15{.}230 \dashrightarrow 03{:}14{:}18{.}044$  He became the the personal physician

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:18.044 \rightarrow 03:14:21.030$  to to the musician Ray Charles,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:21.030 \longrightarrow 03:14:22.470$  of the three characters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}14{:}22{.}470 \dashrightarrow 03{:}14{:}23{.}190$  She followed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}14{:}23{.}190 \dashrightarrow 03{:}14{:}26{.}179$  Two of them died with kidney failure.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:26.180 \longrightarrow 03:14:26.411$  So,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}14{:}26{.}411 \dashrightarrow 03{:}14{:}28{.}259$  and this is where I'm going with this.

 $03:14:28.260 \rightarrow 03:14:30.852$  Even when you look historically into

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:30.852 \rightarrow 03:14:33.298$  the African American history here you

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:33.298 \rightarrow 03:14:35.573$  see that the higher burden of

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:35.573 \rightarrow 03:14:38.410$  kidney failure is not something new, it's a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:38.410 \longrightarrow 03:14:39.940$  It's a kidney failure that's been.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:39.940 \rightarrow 03:14:43.414$  And it's not a new problem in this community.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

03:14:43.420 --> 03:14:45.555 And as you many of you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:45.560 \rightarrow 03:14:48.368$  in the audience that African American

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

03:14:48.368 --> 03:14:51.288 constitute 13% of US population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:51.288 \rightarrow 03:14:54.080$  but 35% of patients on dialysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}14{:}54{.}080 \dashrightarrow 03{:}14{:}55{.}718$  And we know that the burden

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03{:}14{:}55{.}718 \dashrightarrow 03{:}14{:}56{.}537$  of kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

 $03:14:56.540 \longrightarrow 03:14:58.575$  The incidence of end stage

NOTE Confidence: 0.821564489333333

03:14:58.575 --> 03:15:00.610 kidney disease among blacks is

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:15:00.685 \rightarrow 03:15:03.394$  at four times higher than among white.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:15:03.400 \rightarrow 03:15:05.812$  The risk is higher in other groups as well.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}15{:}05{.}820 \dashrightarrow 03{:}15{:}08{.}361$  You see the Spanish and the Native
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}15{:}08{.}361 \dashrightarrow 03{:}15{:}10{.}316$  American Hispanics and the Asian
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:15:10.316 \longrightarrow 03:15:12.316$  relative to to European Americans.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}15{:}12{.}320 \dashrightarrow 03{:}15{:}16{.}352$  But focusing on African American this in this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:15:16.352 \rightarrow 03:15:19.476$  conversation the risk is full fold higher,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:15:19.480 \longrightarrow 03:15:22.618$  and this risk actually has consequences.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:15:22.620 \longrightarrow 03:15:24.853$  Here I listed some of the the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- 03:15:24.853 03:15:27.119 the reason why this problem.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- 03:15:27.120 --> 03:15:29.676 OK, kidney disease is very care.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- 03:15:29.680 --> 03:15:31.072 Failure is very deadly.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- 03:15:31.072 --> 03:15:32.812 I'm talking to many nephrologists
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:15:32.812 \longrightarrow 03:15:33.840$  this is no news.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:15:33.840 \longrightarrow 03:15:36.042$  I mentioned it's an equal opportunity
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}15{:}36{.}042 \dashrightarrow 03{:}15{:}38{.}569$  offender and it cost a lot of money
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}15{:}38{.}569 \dashrightarrow 03{:}15{:}40{.}915$  and one of the fact that I found that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03{:}15{:}40{.}915 \dashrightarrow 03{:}15{:}43{.}554$  just in my mind study is when you look

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:15:43.554 \rightarrow 03:15:45.876$  at the epidemiology of kidney failure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

03:15:45.880 --> 03:15:46.951 black men's life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

03:15:46.951 - > 03:15:49.093 lost to kidney failure is similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03{:}15{:}49{.}093 \dashrightarrow 03{:}15{:}51{.}507$  to life lost to colon cancer and

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03{:}15{:}51{.}507 \dashrightarrow 03{:}15{:}53{.}301$  for black women it's similar to

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:15:53.301 \longrightarrow 03:15:54.636$  life loss to breast cancer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:15:54.640 \rightarrow 03:15:56.878$  So a lot is quite deadly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:15:56.880 \longrightarrow 03:15:58.130$  And what causes this is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:15:58.130 \longrightarrow 03:15:59.898$  you know many factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

03:15:59.898 --> 03:16:02.920 I think I believe the last two

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:16:02.920 \longrightarrow 03:16:05.643$  two year plus as I lighted the

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03{:}16{:}05{.}643 \dashrightarrow 03{:}16{:}07{.}612$  contribution of non biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

03:16:07.612 --> 03:16:10.480 factor including structural racism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:16:10.480 \rightarrow 03:16:12.256$  socioeconomic factors and environment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03{:}16{:}12.256 \dashrightarrow 03{:}16{:}15.301$  But then there's also biology which is

- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:16:15.301 \rightarrow 03:16:17.485$  indisputable and this is where it will
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:16:17.485 \longrightarrow 03:16:20.156$  won't fall in that I'll be discussing today.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- 03:16:20.160 --> 03:16:23.286 Many of you know that in 2010 Doctor
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- 03:16:23.286 --> 03:16:26.724 Pollack my my mentor in Boston.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- 03:16:26.730 --> 03:16:30.054 By Chinese group and many others
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}16{:}30.054 \dashrightarrow 03{:}16{:}32.270$  collaborating together identify that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- 03:16:32.357 -> 03:16:35.087 polymorphisms in the equal 1 gene,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}16{:}35{.}090 \dashrightarrow 03{:}16{:}37{.}866$  illustrated as a cartoon here account
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}16{:}37{.}866 \dashrightarrow 03{:}16{:}40{.}568$  for a high burden of kidney disease
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- 03:16:40.568 --> 03:16:42.611 among people of recent African
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:16:42.611 \rightarrow 03:16:45.011$  ancestry and the story that unfolded
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:16:45.011 \longrightarrow 03:16:47.292$  was that the reference, if well,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:16:47.292 \longrightarrow 03:16:49.049$  when the wild type is the G0,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:16:49.050 \longrightarrow 03:16:50.028$  shown here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}16{:}50{.}028 \dashrightarrow 03{:}16{:}53{.}451$  G1 and G2 evolve around 4 to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

03:16:53.451 - > 03:16:56.778 6000 years ago in West Africa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

03:16:56.780 --> 03:16:59.642 Where G1 I resulted from serine

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:16:59.642 \rightarrow 03:17:01.073$  to glycine substitution,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03{:}17{:}01.080 \dashrightarrow 03{:}17{:}03.296$  isoleucine to methionine substitution.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:17:03.296 \rightarrow 03:17:06.620$  This mutation almost always occurs together

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03{:}17{:}06.696 \dashrightarrow 03{:}17{:}09.200$  and then G2 is 2 amino acid deletion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:17:09.200 \longrightarrow 03:17:12.455$  In this Sr a domain and it appears

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:17:12.455 \longrightarrow 03:17:14.235$  that the evolutionary benefits

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:17:14.235 \longrightarrow 03:17:17.489$  of having G1 or G2 is protection

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:17:17.489 \longrightarrow 03:17:19.329$  from the African trypanosome

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03{:}17{:}19{.}329 \dashrightarrow 03{:}17{:}22{.}020$  parasite in Ethereum zygote state.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:17:22.020 \rightarrow 03:17:25.420$  But when you have two copies in homozygous

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:17:25.420 \rightarrow 03:17:27.929$  or compound that they're almost.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03{:}17{:}27{.}930 \dashrightarrow 03{:}17{:}31{.}170$  IG1G1 or G1G2 or G2G2.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:17:31.170 \rightarrow 03:17:33.508$  It increases the risk of kidney disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:17:33.510 \rightarrow 03:17:35.911$  So what nature gave with one hand

- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- 03:17:35.911 -> 03:17:38.667 he took away with the other and we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:17:38.667 \longrightarrow 03:17:41.370$  know that 400 years ago with the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:17:41.370 \longrightarrow 03:17:43.410$  with the transatlantic slave trade,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:17:43.410 \longrightarrow 03:17:45.150$  this gene came to the Americas,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}17{:}45{.}150 \dashrightarrow 03{:}17{:}47{.}870$  not just the United States but also to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}17{:}47.870 \dashrightarrow 03{:}17{:}49.988$  South America and to the Caribbean.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:17:49.990 \rightarrow 03:17:52.510$  Why is this genome present in European?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}17{:}52{.}510 \dashrightarrow 03{:}17{:}54{.}544$  Because the out of Africa migration
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:17:54.544 \longrightarrow 03:17:56.270$  to Europe are called long,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:17:56.270 \rightarrow 03:17:58.302$  long before 2200 thousand.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- 03:17:58.302 --> 03:18:00.842 Musical before April 1 emerge
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03:18:00.842 \longrightarrow 03:18:02.240$  around 4 to 6000.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}18{:}02{.}240 \dashrightarrow 03{:}18{:}07{.}092$  Years before so we now know that among
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- 03:18:07.092 --> 03:18:09.000 African Americans anywhere between
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294
- $03{:}18{:}09{.}082 \dashrightarrow 03{:}18{:}12{.}786$ 10 to 15% of blacks have to risk
- NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:18:12.786 \longrightarrow 03:18:14.721$  halilovic poelma that's shown here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

03:18:14.721 --> 03:18:16.383 So I'll be referring to this

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:18:16.383 \rightarrow 03:18:17.887$  as high as the genotype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03{:}18{:}17{.}890 \dashrightarrow 03{:}18{:}20{.}422$  but there have been cases where

NOTE Confidence: 0.857563268235294

 $03:18:20.422 \rightarrow 03:18:22.110$  impatient with kidney disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:18:22.110 \rightarrow 03:18:25.230$  when we biopsy them and we genotype them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}18{:}25{.}230 \dashrightarrow 03{:}18{:}27{.}438$  there are some self identified white

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

03:18:27.438 --> 03:18:29.241 individual, especially some self.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}18{:}29{.}241 \dashrightarrow 03{:}18{:}31{.}804$  Identify why this panics that also

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:18:31.804 \rightarrow 03:18:33.439$  carry this high risk genotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:18:33.440 \longrightarrow 03:18:34.756$  What does that mean?

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}18{:}34.756 \dashrightarrow 03{:}18{:}37.810$  It means that in the lineage of that person,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:18:37.810 \rightarrow 03:18:40.330$  that person have recent African ancestry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:18:40.330 \longrightarrow 03:18:42.990$  so it's not totally accurate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:18:42.990 \longrightarrow 03:18:44.856$  In fact, it may be misleading

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:18:44.856 \longrightarrow 03:18:47.114$  to think of high risk of well

- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:18:47.114 \rightarrow 03:18:49.004$  one genotype as a race issue.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- 03:18:49.010 -> 03:18:50.900 In fact, it's an ancestry issue.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}18{:}50{.}900 \dashrightarrow 03{:}18{:}52{.}010$  There was a question before.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- 03:18:52.010 --> 03:18:53.338 How do you distinguish
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:18:53.338 \longrightarrow 03:18:54.666$  between ancestry and race?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:18:54.670 \rightarrow 03:18:57.030$  The best way to think of this risk
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}18{:}57{.}030 \dashrightarrow 03{:}18{:}59{.}427$  allele is it reflect recent African.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:18:59.430 \longrightarrow 03:19:02.685$  Necessary now is it just a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- 03:19:02.685 --> 03:19:04.700 risk factor or is it causal?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:19:04.700 \longrightarrow 03:19:06.360$  Driver of disease work
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- 03:19:06.360 --> 03:19:08.020 from Catalan zuster club.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}19{:}08{.}020 \dashrightarrow 03{:}19{:}10{.}612$  I think she she was the first to make
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:19:10.612 \rightarrow 03:19:13.053$  a mouse model that actually depicted
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}19{:}13{.}053 \dashrightarrow 03{:}19{:}16{.}205$  this where she made a mouse model that NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- 03:19:16.205 --> 03:19:19.172 X Ray said that Jezero G1 or G2 equal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:19:19.172 \rightarrow 03:19:21.700 1$  you recall that G0 is a reference,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:19:21.700 \longrightarrow 03:19:24.136$  the wildtype G1 and G2 at

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:19:24.136 \longrightarrow 03:19:26.380$  the risk alleles now miles.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:19:26.380 \longrightarrow 03:19:28.222$  I'm pretty much all of all

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}19{:}28{.}222 \dashrightarrow 03{:}19{:}29{.}450$  of our experimental animal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:19:29.450 \rightarrow 03:19:32.422$  There's like a poor one normally,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}19{:}32{.}422 \dashrightarrow 03{:}19{:}34{.}326$  so mouse doesn't have a Powell one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:19:34.330 \longrightarrow 03:19:36.866$  So to study it you have to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}19{:}36.866 \dashrightarrow 03{:}19{:}38.589$  transition generated transgenic mice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}19{:}38{.}590 \dashrightarrow 03{:}19{:}40{.}165$  She demonstrated that these mice

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

03:19:40.165 -> 03:19:41.425 actually have kidney disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:19:41.430 \longrightarrow 03:19:43.954$  as indicated by proteinuria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

03:19:43.954 --> 03:19:45.847 elevated BUN creatinine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}19{:}45{.}850 \dashrightarrow 03{:}19{:}47{.}314$  and when you look at their

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:19:47.314 \longrightarrow 03:19:48.290$  kidney they also has.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:19:48.290 \longrightarrow 03:19:50.680$  They also have sclerosis that

- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:19:50.680 \rightarrow 03:19:53.670$  phenocopies what we see in human.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- 03:19:53.670 --> 03:19:56.295 My mentor in Boston doctor Pollack I
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}19{:}56{.}295 \dashrightarrow 03{:}19{:}58{.}504$  wasn't involved in in this work but
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- 03:19:58.504 --> 03:20:00.980 I know it took a lot of hard work.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}20{:}00.980 \dashrightarrow 03{:}20{:}02.495$  Diligence are demonstrated.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:20:02.495 \longrightarrow 03:20:04.515$  Essentially the same thing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:20:04.520 \longrightarrow 03:20:05.892$  The difference between these
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:20:05.892 \longrightarrow 03:20:08.139$  two mouse model is that this is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}20{:}08{.}139 \dashrightarrow 03{:}20{:}09{.}832$  a podocyte specific expression,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}20{:}09{.}832 \dashrightarrow 03{:}20{:}12{.}976$  whereas this is a back transgenic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:20:12.976 \longrightarrow 03:20:14.580$  mice that if well,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}20{:}14.580 \dashrightarrow 03{:}20{:}16.930$  one expression is induced under
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}20{:}16{.}930 \dashrightarrow 03{:}20{:}18{.}964$  the human promoter here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- 03:20:18.964 --> 03:20:22.480 So this may probably mimic more of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:20:22.480 \rightarrow 03:20:24.860$  the Physiology that we see in humans,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:20:24.860 \longrightarrow 03:20:27.050$  but the picture is the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}20{:}27.050 \dashrightarrow 03{:}20{:}29.736$  where ver there is the G1 and G2

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:20:29.736 \longrightarrow 03:20:31.268$  you have high proteinuria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

03:20:31.270 --> 03:20:32.332 And kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}20{:}32{.}332 \dashrightarrow 03{:}20{:}34{.}102$  So these studies establishes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:20:34.102 \rightarrow 03:20:36.319$  April 1 the risk are really well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}20{:}36{.}320 \dashrightarrow 03{:}20{:}36{.}693$  one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

03:20:36.693 --> 03:20:38.931 They are not just risk factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:20:38.931 \longrightarrow 03:20:40.730$  but drivers of disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}20{:}40.730 \dashrightarrow 03{:}20{:}43.446$  working cell culture in my lab and

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}20{:}43{.}446 \dashrightarrow 03{:}20{:}46{.}277$  other groups then show further that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:20:46.277 \rightarrow 03:20:49.146$  degree of toxicity that you see with

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:20:49.146 \rightarrow 03:20:52.466$  this equal 1 depends on the expression level.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}20{:}52{.}470 \dashrightarrow 03{:}20{:}55{.}445$  So it's not just a variant dependent

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03{:}20{:}55{.}445 \dashrightarrow 03{:}20{:}57{.}910$  toxicity but also a dose effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625

 $03:20:57.910 \longrightarrow 03:20:59.722$  So the more important one G1

- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}20{:}59{.}722 \dashrightarrow 03{:}21{:}00{.}930$  and G2 you express,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:21:00.930 \longrightarrow 03:21:03.200$  the more toxicity you see.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- 03:21:03.200 -> 03:21:05.216 The mechanism by which a poor one
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- 03:21:05.216 -> 03:21:07.238 causes injury is still under debate,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}21{:}07{.}240 \dashrightarrow 03{:}21{:}09{.}704$  but a lot of the work that we've
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:21:09.704 \longrightarrow 03:21:11.653$  done showing that one of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- 03:21:11.653 --> 03:21:14.067 proximal factor or effect is a loss
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}21{:}14.067 \dashrightarrow 03{:}21{:}16.327$  of intracellular potassium if one
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}21{:}16{.}327 \dashrightarrow 03{:}21{:}18{.}516$  itself might generalizes to the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}21{:}18{.}516$  -->  $03{:}21{:}20{.}396$  membrane to the plasma membrane
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:21:20.396 \rightarrow 03:21:22.640$  and causes efflux of potassium.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- 03:21:22.640 --> 03:21:26.198 Here I tried to summarize many
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03:21:26.200 \longrightarrow 03:21:28.475$  studies from many groups about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}21{:}28{.}475 \dashrightarrow 03{:}21{:}30{.}295$  the effect of equipment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.80177862625
- $03{:}21{:}30{.}300 \dashrightarrow 03{:}21{:}33{.}168$  kind of wrapping down the introduction.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.859665591764706

 $03:21:33.170 \longrightarrow 03:21:35.339$  What does what is the effect of equal 1

NOTE Confidence: 0.859665591764706

 $03:21:35.339 \rightarrow 03:21:37.828$  on the spectrum of diseases that we know?

NOTE Confidence: 0.859665591764706

 $03{:}21{:}37{.}830 \dashrightarrow 03{:}21{:}39{.}948$  So these are diseases that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.859665591764706

 $03:21:39.948 \longrightarrow 03:21:41.672$  been associated with equal 1

NOTE Confidence: 0.859665591764706

 $03:21:41.672 \rightarrow 03:21:43.429$  FSGS all the way down to lupus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859665591764706

 $03{:}21{:}43{.}430 \dashrightarrow 03{:}21{:}45{.}662$  So if you imagine that at the train

NOTE Confidence: 0.859665591764706

 $03:21:45.662 \rightarrow 03:21:47.697$  station there are two groups of people.

NOTE Confidence: 0.859665591764706

 $03{:}21{:}47.700 \dashrightarrow 03{:}21{:}49.965$  Groups that have normal variant

NOTE Confidence: 0.859665591764706

03:21:49.965 --> 03:21:52.934 did 0G0 and it group that carry

NOTE Confidence: 0.859665591764706

 $03:21:52.934 \rightarrow 03:21:55.680$  higher risk of poelman. Genotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:21:58.150 --> 03:21:59.678 G1G1G2G2G1G2 those individuals at

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}21{:}59{.}678 \dashrightarrow 03{:}22{:}02{.}310$  the train station are the ones that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:22:02.310 \longrightarrow 03:22:04.486$  are more likely to get on the train.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:22:04.490 --> 03:22:07.856 For example, if I see 10 black patient that

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}22{:}07.856 \dashrightarrow 03{:}22{:}11.047$  have idiopathic FSGS in my in my clinic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:22:11.050 \longrightarrow 03:22:13.948$  7 out of the 10 would have Iris

- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- $03:22:13.948 \rightarrow 03:22:16.782$  Campbell and genotype that is quite

 $03:22:16.782 \longrightarrow 03:22:18.004$  outstanding, right? Remember,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:22:18.004 \rightarrow 03:22:20.206$  in the general for black population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:22:20.210 \longrightarrow 03:22:22.863$  only 10 to 15% of the black

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:22:22.863 \longrightarrow 03:22:24.000$  population carried this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}22{:}24.000 \dashrightarrow 03{:}22{:}28.515$  There is genotype but among FSGS group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:22:28.520 \longrightarrow 03:22:31.080$  70% I do, and if you look down

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:22:31.080 \longrightarrow 03:22:33.200$  the list hypertension now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}22{:}33{.}200 \dashrightarrow 03{:}22{:}35{.}461$  we found that COVID I will talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:22:35.461 -> 03:22:37.557 more about this in many cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:22:37.557 \rightarrow 03:22:39.317$  in the largest group study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}22{:}39{.}320 \dashrightarrow 03{:}22{:}42{.}452$ 90% of people that develop COVID

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}22{:}42{.}452 \dashrightarrow 03{:}22{:}44{.}018$  associated nephropathy karidis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:22:44.020 \longrightarrow 03:22:47.110$  So if well one genotype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}22{:}47{.}110 \dashrightarrow 03{:}22{:}50{.}780$  hiris genotype increases the likelihood

 $03:22:50.780 \longrightarrow 03:22:54.218$  of developing this spectrum of disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}22{:}54{.}220 \dashrightarrow 03{:}22{:}56{.}326$  The second effect is that once

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:22:56.326 \longrightarrow 03:22:58.609$  the patient is on this train.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:22:58.610 - 03:23:00.710 Well, one is also an accelerant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:23:00.710 \longrightarrow 03:23:03.536$  it it it accelerate the progression

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:23:03.536 \longrightarrow 03:23:04.949$  to to dialysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:23:04.950 \longrightarrow 03:23:08.222$  So if you ought to ESRD more specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}23{:}08{.}222 \dashrightarrow 03{:}23{:}11{.}386$  so this is a non equal 1 CKD train,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}23{:}11{.}390 \dashrightarrow 03{:}23{:}13{.}702$  this is the April 1 CKD train work NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:23:13.702 --> 03:23:15.715 from Ask Group and others shows NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:23:15.715 --> 03:23:18.156 that people that have a poor one NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:23:18.156 --> 03:23:20.361 in addition or in context of their

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:23:20.361 --> 03:23:22.194 CKD that their disease progressed

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:23:22.194 \longrightarrow 03:23:24.582$  to dialysis about 10 years on

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}23{:}24{.}582 \dashrightarrow 03{:}23{:}26{.}660$  average earlier than regular CKD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:23:26.660 \rightarrow 03:23:28.310$  And there's no known intervention.

03:23:28.310 --> 03:23:29.186 So far,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}23{:}29{.}186 \dashrightarrow 03{:}23{:}32{.}690$  so it's in this context that Kovid came

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:23:32.785 --> 03:23:36.978 and Kovid became essentially a perfect storm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:23:36.980 \rightarrow 03:23:39.325$  because once COVID happened we

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:23:39.325 --> 03:23:41.201 it's quickly becoming apparent

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:23:41.201 \longrightarrow 03:23:44.268$  that some individuals who are

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:23:44.268 --> 03:23:46.158 developing collapsing glomerulopathy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}23{:}46{.}160 \dashrightarrow 03{:}23{:}48{.}509$  but they I put this as a triangle here

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}23{:}48{.}509 \dashrightarrow 03{:}23{:}50{.}838$  over 3 overlapping circle if you will.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:23:50.840 --> 03:23:53.702 High risk equal 1 genotype covian

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}23{:}53{.}702 \dashrightarrow 03{:}23{:}56{.}512$  infection and situations that cause people

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}23{:}56{.}512 \dashrightarrow 03{:}23{:}59{.}396$  to develop COVID in the first place.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}23{:}59{.}400 \dashrightarrow 03{:}24{:}02{.}574$  The evidence that came from earlier

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}24{:}02{.}574 \dashrightarrow 03{:}24{:}05{.}307$  studies from across the country

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:24:05.307 \rightarrow 03:24:08.457$  shows that people that have COVID

 $03:24:08.460 \rightarrow 03:24:10.040$  if you look at hospitalization,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:24:10.040 \rightarrow 03:24:11.876$  people inpatient hospitalization

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}24{:}11.876 \dashrightarrow 03{:}24{:}14.936$  with complication with a Ki.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:24:14.940 \longrightarrow 03:24:16.910$  Let me put it differently.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:24:16.910 --> 03:24:19.086 I could clean jury,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:24:19.086 --> 03:24:20.718 complicate COVID infection

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}24{:}20.718 \dashrightarrow 03{:}24{:}23.088$  in about 46% of cases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:24:23.088 \rightarrow 03:24:26.070$  meaning that almost half of patient but

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}24{:}26{.}153 \dashrightarrow 03{:}24{:}29{.}447$  developed acute kidney injury from COVID.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:24:29.450 \longrightarrow 03:24:33.077$  And if you look at patient in the ICU.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}24{:}33{.}080 \dashrightarrow 03{:}24{:}34{.}950$  Pretty much about three quarter

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:24:34.950 \longrightarrow 03:24:36.446$  of them developing care,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}24{:}36{.}450 \dashrightarrow 03{:}24{:}38{.}625$  and this actually has a

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}24{:}38.625 \dashrightarrow 03{:}24{:}40.365$  significant effect on mortality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:24:40.370 \rightarrow 03:24:42.426$  This is in this some of these early

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:24:42.426 \rightarrow 03:24:44.684$  studies showing up to 50% mortality among

- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- $03:24:44.684 \rightarrow 03:24:49.003$  patients with a Ki with kidney disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- 03:24:49.010 --> 03:24:51.586 Then they begin to biopsy this patient in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- $03:24:51.586 \rightarrow 03:24:54.449$  the first aggregate study that was reported.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- $03:24:54.450 \rightarrow 03:24:56.963$  This is an aggregate of 159
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- $03{:}24{:}56{.}963 \dashrightarrow 03{:}24{:}59{.}128$  patients from across the country.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- $03:24:59.130 \longrightarrow 03:25:00.890$  One of the four.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- $03:25:00.890 \rightarrow 03:25:03.090$  Striking thing is the pathology.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- $03{:}25{:}03{.}090 \dashrightarrow 03{:}25{:}05{.}510$  Shows that collapsing glomerulo pathy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- $03:25:05.510 \longrightarrow 03:25:08.535$  is actually the most common
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- 03:25:08.535 --> 03:25:10.138 histopathology in this API.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- $03{:}25{:}10{.}140 \dashrightarrow 03{:}25{:}12{.}284$  In the first thirty.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- 03:25:12.284 --> 03:25:14.964 Then I kind of lab.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- $03:25:14.970 \longrightarrow 03:25:17.354$  In cancer is also did a study following
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- 03:25:17.354 $\operatorname{-->}$ 03:25:20.008 up on this and to actually put the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534
- $03{:}25{:}20.008 \dashrightarrow 03{:}25{:}22.620$  specific number on it anywhere between
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03:25:22.620 \rightarrow 03:25:27.092$  25 to 35% to 6% of histopathology

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

 $03{:}25{:}27.092 \dashrightarrow 03{:}25{:}30.524$  from AK from COVID were covan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87522534

03:25:30.524 --> 03:25:33.146 Now if you look before COVID,

NOTE Confidence: 0.755499288

 $03:25:33.150 \longrightarrow 03:25:35.262$  how many was a fraction of

NOTE Confidence: 0.755499288

 $03:25:35.262 \rightarrow 03:25:36.670$  pathology that shows COVID?

NOTE Confidence: 0.755499288

 $03{:}25{:}36{.}670 \dashrightarrow 03{:}25{:}39{.}687$  It's like 1.8 so this is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.755499288

 $03:25:39.687 \rightarrow 03:25:42.514$  robust increase in in collapsing

NOTE Confidence: 0.755499288

 $03:25:42.514 \rightarrow 03:25:45.386$  glomerulopathy from from COVID.

NOTE Confidence: 0.755499288

 $03{:}25{:}45{.}390 \dashrightarrow 03{:}25{:}47{.}588$  And here is the here's the punch.

NOTE Confidence: 0.755499288

 $03:25:47.590 \longrightarrow 03:25:50.656$  If you look at this chain that

NOTE Confidence: 0.755499288

 $03{:}25{:}50.656 \dashrightarrow 03{:}25{:}51.970$  had collapsing glomerulo pathy

NOTE Confidence: 0.755499288

 $03:25:52.043 \rightarrow 03:25:54.158$  from COVID and genotype them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}25{:}56{.}440 \dashrightarrow 03{:}25{:}59{.}254$ 91.7% of them carry high risk genotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:25:59.254 --> 03:26:02.833 compared to 10 to 15% of general population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:26:02.833 \rightarrow 03:26:06.062$  so this almost completes almost unity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}26{:}06.062 \dashrightarrow 03{:}26{:}08.799$  showing that having high risk Capital One

 $03:26:08.799 \rightarrow 03:26:11.130$  and developing collapsing glomerulopathy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}26{:}11{.}130 \dashrightarrow 03{:}26{:}13{.}840$  from COVID almost one and the same.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:26:13.840 \rightarrow 03:26:16.332$  In this setting these are images from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:26:16.332 --> 03:26:18.299 our recently published study showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:26:18.299 --> 03:26:19.963 collapsing glomerul<br/>opathy where you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}26{:}19{.}963 \dashrightarrow 03{:}26{:}22{.}580$  have the collapse of the glomerular.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:26:22.580 \rightarrow 03:26:25.429$  Though you have injury of the usually.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:26:25.430 \rightarrow 03:26:28.664$  Petrophile and hypoplasia of the put aside,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}26{:}28.670 \dashrightarrow 03{:}26{:}31.130$  and ultimately resulting in podocyte

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:26:31.130 \longrightarrow 03:26:33.590$  loss and loss of filtration.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:26:33.590 \longrightarrow 03:26:36.050$  The question came forward.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}26{:}36{.}050 \dashrightarrow 03{:}26{:}38{.}720$  What is the mechanism by which

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:26:38.720 \longrightarrow 03:26:40.950$  COVID causes a poor one?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}26{:}40.950 \dashrightarrow 03{:}26{:}42.646$  Associate their collapsing glomerulo pathy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:26:42.646 \longrightarrow 03:26:44.766$  so there were two theories.

 $03:26:44.770 \longrightarrow 03:26:47.416$  One theory was that when I

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:26:47.416 --> 03:26:50.248 prothes<br/>is was that there's a direct

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:26:50.248 --> 03:26:52.688 viral infection of kidney cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:26:52.690 \rightarrow 03:26:53.962$  The evidence that supports

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:26:53.962 \longrightarrow 03:26:55.552$  this in part was that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}26{:}55{.}560 \dashrightarrow 03{:}26{:}58{.}200$  And biopsy in autopsy study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}26{:}58{.}200 \dashrightarrow 03{:}27{:}00{.}490$  There were reports initially that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:27:00.490 \longrightarrow 03:27:02.780$  they were testicle that looked

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:27:02.852 --> 03:27:05.835 like viral vesical but in almost

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:27:05.835 - 03:27:08.660 all biopsy from living patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:27:08.660 \longrightarrow 03:27:11.340$  they're really not being compelling

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:27:11.340 \longrightarrow 03:27:15.095$  evidence that is direct viral infection of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:27:15.095 --> 03:27:18.560 podocyte or or or kidney cell parenchyma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:27:18.560 \longrightarrow 03:27:21.302$  so that that sort of weakens

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:27:21.302 \longrightarrow 03:27:22.673$  the argument somewhat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}27{:}22.680 \dashrightarrow 03{:}27{:}25.116$  Then there's the second equal thesis

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- $03:27:25.116 \rightarrow 03:27:27.140$  that perhaps the cytokine storm
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- $03:27:27.140 \longrightarrow 03:27:30.811$  provoked by COVID triggered by COVID.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- 03:27:30.811 --> 03:27:31.188 Actually,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- $03:27:31.188 \rightarrow 03:27:34.210$  homes on the kidney and causes glomerular.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- $03{:}27{:}34{.}210 \dashrightarrow 03{:}27{:}36{.}484$  Collapse either by April one through
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- $03{:}27{:}36{.}484 \dashrightarrow 03{:}27{:}39{.}411$  April one or that means this hypothesis
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- 03:27:39.411 > 03:27:41.646 is actually what we explored,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- 03:27:41.650 --> 03:27:44.274 and the paper that came from it is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- 03:27:44.274 --> 03:27:46.547 actually currently impressed in JCI insight,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- $03{:}27{:}46.550 \dashrightarrow 03{:}27{:}48.926$  so I encourage you to take a look and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- $03:27:48.926 \rightarrow 03:27:51.559$  it was led by the nephrology fellow
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- $03{:}27{:}51{.}559 \dashrightarrow 03{:}27{:}53{.}889$  that Doctor Serene stream in the lab.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- $03{:}27{:}53{.}890 \dashrightarrow 03{:}27{:}56{.}571$  So what we did essentially was to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- $03{:}27{:}56{.}571 \dashrightarrow 03{:}27{:}59{.}279$  collaborate with our network pathologists.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375
- $03{:}27{:}59{.}280 \dashrightarrow 03{:}28{:}02{.}436$  Baby Thomas Astrid wine at Harvard
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}28{:}02{.}436 \dashrightarrow 03{:}28{:}05{.}111$  and David Thomas at Netherhall

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:28:05.111 --> 03:28:07.949 and what we did was OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:28:07.950 \longrightarrow 03:28:09.912$  When you have patience that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:28:09.912 \rightarrow 03:28:12.431$  sent to you or biopsy that was

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:28:12.431 --> 03:28:14.705 sent to you for collapsing FSGS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:28:14.710 --> 03:28:17.806 let's genotype them so we have 9 cases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}28{:}17{.}810 \dashrightarrow 03{:}28{:}19{.}858$  What we found that of the nine cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:28:19.858 --> 03:28:21.870 7 actually have high risk of where

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}28{:}21.870 \dashrightarrow 03{:}28{:}24.498$  one genotype. So that's 77 point.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:28:24.498 \longrightarrow 03:28:26.034$  You know 8%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}28{:}26{.}040 \dashrightarrow 03{:}28{:}28{.}665$  And even in this small sample set.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:28:28.670 --> 03:28:29.496 But interestingly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:28:29.496 --> 03:28:30.322 Of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}28{:}30{.}322 \dashrightarrow 03{:}28{:}32{.}800$  all of them were African Americans

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}28{:}32{.}869 \dashrightarrow 03{:}28{:}35{.}172$  except one person that is self described

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:28:35.172 \rightarrow 03:28:37.897$  as a white Hispanic and she has G1G1.

03:28:37.897 --> 03:28:38.274 Also,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}28{:}38{.}274 \dashrightarrow 03{:}28{:}40{.}536$  this betrays the point that I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:28:40.536 \rightarrow 03:28:42.398$  saying before that the suspicion

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:28:42.398 \longrightarrow 03:28:45.278$  should be there even for non

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:28:45.278 --> 03:28:49.110 survey notified black individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:28:49.110 --> 03:28:51.065 All of them have proteinuria

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:28:51.065 --> 03:28:52.629 and progressive kidney disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:28:52.630 \longrightarrow 03:28:54.190$  and then we did immunity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:28:54.190 --> 03:28:55.168 Immunohistochemistry for equal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:28:55.168 \rightarrow 03:28:57.450$  1 to ask the question is equal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:28:57.507 --> 03:28:58.811 1 expression actually elevated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}28{:}58{.}811 \dashrightarrow 03{:}29{:}00{.}767$  in the kidney of this patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:29:00.770 - 03:29:03.830 So this is a biopsy reference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}29{:}03{.}830 \dashrightarrow 03{:}29{:}06{.}196$  No, no kidney disease in this patient.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:29:06.200 \rightarrow 03:29:07.289$  There's no equal.

 $03:29:07.289 \longrightarrow 03:29:10.134$  1 This was a patient with 0G0 who

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}29{:}10{.}134 \dashrightarrow 03{:}29{:}12{.}126$  had COVID but no kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:29:12.130 --> 03:29:12.636 Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:29:12.636 \rightarrow 03:29:14.660$  there's no equivalent expression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

03:29:14.660 --> 03:29:17.180 but when we look at the kidney of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03{:}29{:}17.180 \dashrightarrow 03{:}29{:}19.359$  patients that had collapsed in FSGS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:29:19.360 \longrightarrow 03:29:21.586$  This is a case of case six.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8297628375

 $03:29:21.590 \rightarrow 03:29:24.414$  We saw robust expression in the portal site,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:29:24.420 \rightarrow 03:29:27.864$  but also in the glomerular endothelial cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}29{:}27.870 \dashrightarrow 03{:}29{:}30.418$  and this is uniform from across all

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}29{:}30{.}418 \dashrightarrow 03{:}29{:}32{.}619$  the patients that we we examined.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:29:32.620 \longrightarrow 03:29:34.582$  And this is just another view

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}29{:}34{.}582 \dashrightarrow 03{:}29{:}36{.}781$  showing that we also saw staining

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}29{:}36{.}781 \dashrightarrow 03{:}29{:}38{.}836$  in the period epithelial cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}29{:}38{.}840 \dashrightarrow 03{:}29{:}41{.}682$  But by and large it's podocyte and

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:29:41.682 \rightarrow 03:29:44.399$  endothelial cells that had this expression.

 $03:29:44.400 \rightarrow 03:29:47.680$  So what drives this expression of a poelman?

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}29{:}47.680 \dashrightarrow 03{:}29{:}49.610$  Sarah looked at all the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}29{:}49.610 \dashrightarrow 03{:}29{:}52.660$  Reported cytokines and chemokines that

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:29:52.660 \rightarrow 03:29:56.629$  were reported to be elevated by COVID.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:29:56.630 \longrightarrow 03:29:58.550$  And so we took each of them and

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}29{:}58{.}550 \dashrightarrow 03{:}30{:}00{.}706$  sort of did a reductionist to see

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:30:00.706 \rightarrow 03:30:03.258$  which one actually have an impact on

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:30:03.258 \rightarrow 03:30:05.026$  increasingly poor one expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:30:05.030 \longrightarrow 03:30:06.770$  As you can see here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}30{:}06.770 \dashrightarrow 03{:}30{:}09.808$  I also I want better interferon alpha,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:30:09.810 \rightarrow 03:30:11.835$  beta gamma disturbing previously known

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

03:30:11.835 --> 03:30:15.149 to induce a poor one drive a poor

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

03:30:15.149 --> 03:30:17.174 one expression here for interferon

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

03:30:17.174 --> 03:30:19.112 gamma about 250 fold however.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}30{:}19{.}112 \dashrightarrow 03{:}30{:}21{.}356$  The interesting thing is when you

03:30:21.356 - 03:30:23.884 have all the cytokines and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:30:23.884 \longrightarrow 03:30:25.135$  remove the interference,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:30:25.140 \longrightarrow 03:30:27.190$  the known trigger you still

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:30:27.190 \longrightarrow 03:30:29.240$  have about 100 fold induction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

03:30:29.240 --> 03:30:31.620 meaning that even noninterference cytokines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:30:31.620 \longrightarrow 03:30:32.640$  especially in combination,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}30{:}32{.}640 \dashrightarrow 03{:}30{:}35{.}020$  have a robust effect on April 1

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:30:35.087 \dashrightarrow 03:30:37.025$  expression and the second fact is

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}30{:}37{.}025 \dashrightarrow 03{:}30{:}39{.}105$  that when you combine all these

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}30{:}39{.}105 \dashrightarrow 03{:}30{:}40{.}925$  sy cophants together that were released

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}30{:}40.925 \dashrightarrow 03{:}30{:}43.472$  in context of COVID about more than

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:30:43.472 \longrightarrow 03:30:46.060$  6000 fold equal 1 expression was sent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:30:46.060 \rightarrow 03:30:48.258$  This is an in glomerular endothelial cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}30{:}48{.}260 \dashrightarrow 03{:}30{:}50{.}535$  We saw the same pattern in primary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}30{:}50{.}540 \dashrightarrow 03{:}30{:}53{.}652$  Photo site and then when we look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:30:53.652 \rightarrow 03:30:55.608$  signaling pathway that potentially

- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03:30:55.608 \rightarrow 03:30:56.710$  mediate this,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03:30:56.710 \longrightarrow 03:30:59.338$  the state 1/2 and three mediate
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03:30:59.338 \longrightarrow 03:31:02.490$  the effect of the of the eight
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03:31:02.490 \rightarrow 03:31:04.670$  key cytokines that we see,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03{:}31{:}04.670 \dashrightarrow 03{:}31{:}07.050$  and we use various city name which
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03:31:07.050 \longrightarrow 03:31:09.416$  is an inhibitor of the Jack one
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03{:}31{:}09{.}416 \dashrightarrow 03{:}31{:}11{.}796$  Jack two which are necessary to to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03{:}31{:}11.796 \dashrightarrow 03{:}31{:}13.642$  activate these three stacks and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- 03:31:13.642 --> 03:31:15.994 you can see both in the glomerular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03:31:15.994 \rightarrow 03:31:17.509$  endothelial cells and podocyte.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03:31:17.510 \longrightarrow 03:31:19.440$  It totally abrogate the expression
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03:31:19.440 \longrightarrow 03:31:21.770$  of equal 1 so suggesting that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03:31:21.770 \longrightarrow 03:31:24.470$  This site outlines converges through the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03{:}31{:}24{.}470 \dashrightarrow 03{:}31{:}28{.}118$  same Jack stat pathway to induce a power.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143
- $03{:}31{:}28{.}118 \dashrightarrow 03{:}31{:}29{.}966$  One expression summarized here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

03:31:29.970 --> 03:31:33.870 So again, cytokine storm from COVID.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

03:31:33.870 --> 03:31:35.018 Interacting with their ligand

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:31:35.018 \longrightarrow 03:31:37.108$  in photo site and in the philia

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}31{:}37{.}108 \dashrightarrow 03{:}31{:}39{.}299$  cell and driving it well when the

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:31:39.299 \dashrightarrow 03:31:40.889$  expression through a common pathway.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:31:40.890 \dashrightarrow 03:31:41.181$  Here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}31{:}41{.}181 \dashrightarrow 03{:}31{:}42{.}927$  showing that that one and that

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

03:31:42.927 --> 03:31:44.410 Barry sitting it blocks it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}31{:}44{.}410 \dashrightarrow 03{:}31{:}46{.}390$  So to drive this home further.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:31:46.390 \dashrightarrow 03:31:51.348$  So what if we get I PST we we make I

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:31:51.350 \dashrightarrow 03:31:54.068$  PSC's from individual that has G1G2,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}31{:}54{.}068 \dashrightarrow 03{:}31{:}55{.}958$  and then we differentiated those

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}31{:}55{.}958 \dashrightarrow 03{:}31{:}57{.}470$  using the standard protocol.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

03:31:57.470 --> 03:31:59.305 This was from Melissa Little

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:31:59.305 \dashrightarrow 03:32:01.589$  Protocol to make micro kidney micro

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:32:01.589 \longrightarrow 03:32:03.869$  organoid that had what they produce.

03:32:03.870 - 03:32:05.796 Like a lot of endothelial cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}32{:}05{.}800 \dashrightarrow 03{:}32{:}08{.}680$  but a lot of producers that Chevrolet cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}32{:}08{.}680 \dashrightarrow 03{:}32{:}10{.}984$  And then what we did was to treat

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:32:10.984 \rightarrow 03:32:13.178$  them or not with interference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:32:13.180 \longrightarrow 03:32:15.058$  So in the absence of interference,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:32:15.060 \rightarrow 03:32:17.210$  there's really not much equipment

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:32:17.210 \rightarrow 03:32:18.380$  expression with interference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

03:32:18.380 --> 03:32:20.600 You see robust equal 1 induction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}32{:}20.600 \dashrightarrow 03{:}32{:}23.888$  especially in the part that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:32:23.888 \longrightarrow 03:32:25.532$  positive for podocalyxin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

03:32:25.540 --> 03:32:25.918 Again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}32{:}25{.}918 \dashrightarrow 03{:}32{:}27{.}808$  the part that is consistent

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:32:27.808 \rightarrow 03:32:30.199$  with podocyte when we applied by

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:32:30.199 \longrightarrow 03:32:31.819$  reciting name the blocks,

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:32:31.820 \longrightarrow 03:32:33.288$  the expression when we

 $03:32:33.288 \longrightarrow 03:32:34.756$  applied all the cytokines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

03:32:34.760 --> 03:32:36.638 That I should before it gained

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03{:}32{:}36{.}638 \dashrightarrow 03{:}32{:}38{.}652$  robust induction and the effect of

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

 $03:32:38.652 \rightarrow 03:32:40.392$  all those cytokines were similarly

NOTE Confidence: 0.767181972857143

03:32:40.392 --> 03:32:41.436 blocked by Barry

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:32:41.494 \longrightarrow 03:32:42.748$  sitting in consistent.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:32:42.750 \longrightarrow 03:32:45.228$  That even in this patient derived

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:32:45.230 \longrightarrow 03:32:47.685$  kidney organoid that these cytokines

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:32:47.685 \rightarrow 03:32:50.770$  work through the Jack stat pathway

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:32:50.770 \longrightarrow 03:32:52.805$  functionally do do this have

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03{:}32{:}52{.}805 \dashrightarrow 03{:}32{:}55{.}550$  functional effect in terms of toxicity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

03:32:55.550 --> 03:32:57.530 We confirm the equivalent expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03{:}32{:}57{.}530 \dashrightarrow 03{:}33{:}00{.}741$  here at 96 hours and we look at

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

03:33:00.741 --> 03:33:02.289 viability so viability wise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:02.290 \rightarrow 03:33:05.418$  as you had interferon or all the cytokines.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:05.420 \rightarrow 03:33:07.793$  You see a reduction in the viability

 $03:33:07.793 \rightarrow 03:33:10.677$  when you add baricitinib it rescued it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

03:33:10.680 - 03:33:12.976 We look at ATP as just another

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

03:33:12.976 --> 03:33:15.319 measure of cell that is viability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:15.320 \longrightarrow 03:33:17.702$  So this data suggests that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:17.702 \longrightarrow 03:33:20.174$  expression of equal 1 at least

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

03:33:20.174 --> 03:33:22.598 downstream of the Jack stat pathway

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03{:}33{:}22{.}598 \dashrightarrow 03{:}33{:}26{.}107$  might be a mediator of what we see with

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:26.107 \rightarrow 03:33:28.338$  collapsing FSGS as shown in this model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

03:33:28.338 --> 03:33:30.782 So I went over that kind of quickly

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:30.782 \longrightarrow 03:33:32.567$  because the the manuscript is

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

03:33:32.567 --> 03:33:34.660 now submitted and and it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03{:}33{:}34{.}660 \dashrightarrow 03{:}33{:}35{.}928$  online and JCI insight.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:35.930 \longrightarrow 03:33:39.098$  Encourage us to look at it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

03:33:39.100 --> 03:33:40.665 How do we translate this

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:40.665 \rightarrow 03:33:41.917$  now by reciting name?

 $03:33:41.920 \rightarrow 03:33:44.164$  Actually I believe yesterday or two

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:44.164 \rightarrow 03:33:47.034$  days ago received a full FDA approval

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:47.034 \longrightarrow 03:33:49.209$  for treatment of COVID infection

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:49.209 \rightarrow 03:33:51.807$  that requires that oxygenation in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:51.807 \rightarrow 03:33:54.291$  hospital it's not approved for COVAN,

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:54.300 \rightarrow 03:33:56.540$  which is a complication,

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:56.540 \rightarrow 03:33:59.152$  but this study suggests a couple of

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:33:59.152 \rightarrow 03:34:01.940$  things that the use of various citizens,

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03{:}34{:}01{.}940 \dashrightarrow 03{:}34{:}04{.}130$  at least for treatment of COVID

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:34:04.130 \longrightarrow 03:34:05.996$  should be explored as people

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:34:05.996 \dashrightarrow 03:34:08.692$  were using this now is is now FDA

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

03:34:08.692 --> 03:34:10.479 approved for COVID in itself.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

03:34:10.480 --> 03:34:12.784 The role of equal 1 genotyping

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:34:12.784 \longrightarrow 03:34:14.760$  I think is underscored here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:34:14.760 \longrightarrow 03:34:16.734$  especially in the context of people that

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:34:16.734 \rightarrow 03:34:19.099$  have a poor one related kidney disease.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03:34:19.100 \dashrightarrow 03:34:21.420$  I put a question mark on the trial.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03:34:21.420 \longrightarrow 03:34:23.800$  This would be the study the use
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03:34:23.800 \longrightarrow 03:34:25.708$  of various citizen for treating
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03:34:25.708 \rightarrow 03:34:28.156$  disease need to be tested properly.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03:34:28.160 \rightarrow 03:34:31.055$  There was suggestion initially that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03{:}34{:}31{.}055 \dashrightarrow 03{:}34{:}33{.}371$  perhaps exogenous interference could
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03{:}34{:}33{.}371 \dashrightarrow 03{:}34{:}37.085$  be used as part of treatment for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03:34:37.085 \dashrightarrow 03:34:39.121$  COVID because interferon deficiency.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03:34:39.130 \longrightarrow 03:34:42.370$  Seems to increase the risk of.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03:34:42.370 \rightarrow 03:34:45.160$  Contracting kovid and having severe COVID.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03:34:45.160 \rightarrow 03:34:47.512$  Our study here suggests that maybe for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03{:}34{:}47{.}512 \dashrightarrow 03{:}34{:}50{.}138$  patient that at risk I have high risk of,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03:34:50.140 \longrightarrow 03:34:51.920$  well, one genotype given them,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- $03:34:51.920 \rightarrow 03:34:54.570$  interferon could actually be heading
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913
- 03:34:54.570 03:34:58.139 flame or hiding gasoline to the flame,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:34:58.140 \longrightarrow 03:35:01.000$  and probably should be avoided.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:01.000 \rightarrow 03:35:04.017$  Our transition quickly to the second story,

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:04.020 \longrightarrow 03:35:06.610$  but this one I not much time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:06.610 \rightarrow 03:35:08.920$  Not everyone at the train station

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:08.920 \longrightarrow 03:35:10.075$  developed kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:10.080 \longrightarrow 03:35:11.616$  Not everyone get on the train.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:11.620 \rightarrow 03:35:13.012$  That's going to dialysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:13.012 \rightarrow 03:35:15.963$  So one of the question of interest in

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:15.963 \rightarrow 03:35:18.339$  my lab is what differentiates people

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:18.339 \rightarrow 03:35:20.767$  that have the high risk genotype.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:20.770 \dashrightarrow 03:35:22.492$  And people who have the high risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:22.492 \rightarrow 03:35:23.970$  genotype and develop kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:23.970 \longrightarrow 03:35:26.448$  We think there's a three hit necessary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

03:35:26.450 --> 03:35:28.580 First hit mainly high risk equals

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:28.580 \longrightarrow 03:35:29.992$  one genotype. Second hidden.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03{:}35{:}29{.}992 \dashrightarrow 03{:}35{:}32{.}098$  In this case we use interferon

 $03:35:32.098 \rightarrow 03:35:34.399$  but other cytokines as our COVID

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:34.399 \rightarrow 03:35:35.548$  studies have shown.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:35.550 \dashrightarrow 03:35:38.630$  But even when these two hits are present,

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:38.630 \dashrightarrow 03:35:41.414$  we know from HIV that not all those

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:41.414 \dashrightarrow 03:35:43.229$  people develop kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:43.230 \longrightarrow 03:35:45.510$  Only 20% of them do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03{:}35{:}45{.}510 \dashrightarrow 03{:}35{:}47{.}466$  Then there must be some intrinsic

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:47.466 \longrightarrow 03:35:49.566$  factor that is unique to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03{:}35{:}49{.}566 \dashrightarrow 03{:}35{:}51{.}030$  patients that develop disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03:35:51.030 \longrightarrow 03:35:52.530$  That could be teased out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03{:}35{:}52{.}530 \dashrightarrow 03{:}35{:}56{.}962$  so we took a I PSC's approach

NOTE Confidence: 0.695061666173913

 $03{:}35{:}56{.}962 \dashrightarrow 03{:}35{:}58{.}636$  to to circulate.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}35{:}58.640 \dashrightarrow 03{:}35{:}59.976$  We identify patient with

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:35:59.976 \dashrightarrow 03:36:01.646$  FSGS that have virus deep.

NOTE Confidence: 0.640947831111111

 $03:36:01.650 \longrightarrow 03:36:03.105$  Well one genotype.

03:36:03.105 - 03:36:05.045 We identify healthy controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}36{:}05{.}050 \dashrightarrow 03{:}36{:}06{.}890$  We make IPS from them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:36:06.890 --> 03:36:09.098 We differentiate these two photo sites

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:36:09.098 \rightarrow 03:36:10.999$  and then we perform transcriptomic

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:36:10.999 $\operatorname{-->}$ 03:36:13.533 analysis to sort of try and glean

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}36{:}13{.}533 \dashrightarrow 03{:}36{:}16{.}145$  out what could be the effect of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}36{:}16.145 \dashrightarrow 03{:}36{:}18.492$  modifier and how can we understand it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:36:18.492 \longrightarrow 03:36:21.110$  What we did in a nutshell here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:36:21.110 \longrightarrow 03:36:22.905$  Was to compare high risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:36:22.905 \longrightarrow 03:36:24.700$  cases and high risk control.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}36{:}24.700 \dashrightarrow 03{:}36{:}26.919$  These were limited number of of controls

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:36:26.919 \rightarrow 03:36:28.979$  and we did a transcriptomic analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.640947831111111

 $03{:}36{:}28{.}979 \dashrightarrow 03{:}36{:}31{.}872$  to see what are the genes that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}36{:}31{.}872 \dashrightarrow 03{:}36{:}33{.}436$  differentially more upregulated in

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:36:33.436 \longrightarrow 03:36:35.831$  the high risk cases than control.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:36:35.831 \dashrightarrow 03:36:38.848$  And many of those genes are downstream

03:36:38.848 --> 03:36:41.479 again of the Jack stat pathway,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}36{:}41{.}480 \dashrightarrow 03{:}36{:}44{.}426$  suggesting that the Jack stat pathway

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:36:44.426 \rightarrow 03:36:47.200$  is more potentiated in the podocyte of

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:36:47.200 \rightarrow 03:36:50.040$  people who are at risk of developing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}36{:}50{.}040 \dashrightarrow 03{:}36{:}51{.}600$  If well, one related.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}36{:}51{.}600 \dashrightarrow 03{:}36{:}54{.}452$  FSGS we went further to actually validate

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:36:54.452 \rightarrow 03:36:57.490$  this to see when we applied interferon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:36:57.490 \rightarrow 03:37:00.710$  What is the equal 1 expression level

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:37:00.710 \longrightarrow 03:37:02.852$  in podocyte from cases than control

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:37:02.852 \rightarrow 03:37:05.229$  we saw more equal 1 expression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:37:05.230 \rightarrow 03:37:07.612$  We saw more upregulation of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:37:07.612 --> 03:37:10.510 Jack stat pathway and all this can

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}37{:}10{.}510 \dashrightarrow 03{:}37{:}12{.}570$  be blocked actually by various.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}37{:}12.570 \dashrightarrow 03{:}37{:}14.988$  We confirm this by Western blot

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:37:14.990 \longrightarrow 03:37:17.010$  and downstream of April 1.

03:37:17.010 -> 03:37:18.630 Given the work in my lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:37:18.630 --> 03:37:20.892 we know that April 1 mediate

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:37:20.892 \longrightarrow 03:37:21.646$  potassium efflux,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:37:21.650 \rightarrow 03:37:23.687$  so we did use a potassium tracer,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}37{:}23.690 \dashrightarrow 03{:}37{:}25.550$  which is rubidium to see what

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:37:25.550 --> 03:37:27.851 happened in a case when we induce

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:37:27.851 $\operatorname{-->}$ 03:37:30.161 the puelo one with interferon to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:37:30.225 --> 03:37:32.487 rubidium with loaded into the cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:37:32.490 \rightarrow 03:37:35.166$  you see significant reduction in rubidium,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}37{:}35{.}170 \dashrightarrow 03{:}37{:}37{.}620$  and there are some rescue with Barry

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}37{:}37{.}620 \dashrightarrow 03{:}37{:}39{.}399$  sitting them against showing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:37:39.399 \longrightarrow 03:37:41.737$  even in these I PSC photosite model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.640947831111111

 $03:37:41.740 \dashrightarrow 03:37:44.620$  It's recapitulating what we see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.640947831111111

 $03:37:44.620 \longrightarrow 03:37:46.240$  We did a knockout of April,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:37:46.240 \longrightarrow 03:37:47.740$  one in one of the line,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:37:47.740 \dashrightarrow 03:37:50.758$  and the potassium efflux was abrogated.

 $03:37:50.760 \longrightarrow 03:37:53.415$  So this led us to to to to to

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:37:53.415 \longrightarrow 03:37:55.320$  write a proposal to say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:37:55.320 \longrightarrow 03:37:57.636$  well maybe we should try baricitinib

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:37:57.636 - 03:38:00.039 as a potential therapy for it well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:00.040 \rightarrow 03:38:03.260$  but having the drug and the treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:03.260 \dashrightarrow 03:38:05.735$  is one thing helping people who

NOTE Confidence: 0.640947831111111

03:38:05.735 --> 03:38:07.560 actually need those drug and

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:07.560 \dashrightarrow 03:38:09.568$  treatment to accept it to use it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.640947831111111

 $03:38:09.570 \longrightarrow 03:38:10.851$  It's another entirely.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:10.851 \longrightarrow 03:38:12.559$  There's a lack of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:38:12.560 --> 03:38:14.532 Awareness about kidney disease

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:14.532 \longrightarrow 03:38:16.504$  in the black community.

NOTE Confidence: 0.640947831111111

 $03{:}38{:}16{.}510 \dashrightarrow 03{:}38{:}18{.}000$  This lack of specific people,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}38{:}18{.}000 \dashrightarrow 03{:}38{:}19{.}275$  one treatment which is part

NOTE Confidence: 0.640947831111111

 $03:38:19.275 \rightarrow 03:38:20.550$  of what we're working on.

03:38:20.550 --> 03:38:23.043 And if you look at clinical trials as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}38{:}23{.}050 \dashrightarrow 03{:}38{:}25{.}690$  one of kidney disease in general,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:25.690 \longrightarrow 03:38:28.190$  black represent less than 5%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:28.190 \rightarrow 03:38:30.774$  So to really translate some of this work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:30.780 \longrightarrow 03:38:33.209$  we really need to address this issue,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:38:33.210 - 03:38:36.720 and that's what led us to the study

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:36.720 \rightarrow 03:38:41.910$  that we we is now funded by Nida by NIMH D.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}38{:}41{.}910 \dashrightarrow 03{:}38{:}42{.}920$  We call it the care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}38{:}42{.}920 \dashrightarrow 03{:}38{:}44{.}138$  And justice study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:44.138 \longrightarrow 03:38:46.168$  The study has three aims.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:38:46.170 --> 03:38:48.450 The aim first aim is community

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}38{:}48{.}450 \dashrightarrow 03{:}38{:}50{.}469$  engagement and and registry and

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:50.469 \longrightarrow 03:38:52.197$  screening for kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:52.200 \rightarrow 03:38:54.584$  So here we screen people for kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03{:}38{:}54{.}590 \dashrightarrow 03{:}38{:}56{.}750$  We screen them we we genotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:38:56.750 \rightarrow 03:38:59.439$  them and people who are eligible

 $03:38:59.439 \rightarrow 03:39:01.787$  who have clinically significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:39:01.787 \rightarrow 03:39:03.792$  proteinuria and kidney disease will

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:39:03.792 \rightarrow 03:39:05.910$  be eligible to participate in justice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

 $03:39:05.910 \longrightarrow 03:39:07.176$  trial and justice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:39:07.176 --> 03:39:08.864 Essentially stand for Janus

NOTE Confidence: 0.64094783111111

03:39:08.864 --> 03:39:10.130 kinase that inhibition

NOTE Confidence: 0.658159801428571

 $03:39:10.130 \rightarrow 03:39:12.937$  to reduce equal 1 associated kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.658159801428571

 $03:39:12.940 \rightarrow 03:39:15.874$  So we kind of pursuing care to do justice.

NOTE Confidence: 0.658159801428571

 $03:39:15.880 \longrightarrow 03:39:17.560$  The third part is to actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.658159801428571

03:39:17.560 - 03:39:19.060 do justice in a dish.

NOTE Confidence: 0.658159801428571

03:39:19.060 - 03:39:20.996 I will not talk much about this here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.658159801428571

 $03{:}39{:}21.000 \dashrightarrow 03{:}39{:}22.470$  and we've sort of with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.658159801428571

 $03:39:22.470 \longrightarrow 03:39:23.940$  lot of work and effort.

NOTE Confidence: 0.658159801428571

03:39:23.940 --> 03:39:25.500 I encourage you to check out

NOTE Confidence: 0.658159801428571

 $03{:}39{:}25{.}500 \dashrightarrow 03{:}39{:}27{.}070$  this study website as well. It's

 $03:39:30.140 \rightarrow 03:39:30.555$  www.kidneycareandjustice.com.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

03:39:30.555 --> 03:39:33.460 The goal here is to engage the

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

03:39:33.460 --> 03:39:34.890 African American community.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

 $03:39:34.890 \rightarrow 03:39:37.354$  We are starting small here in North Carolina,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

03:39:37.360 --> 03:39:38.600 but we're getting a lot

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

03:39:38.600 - 03:39:39.592 of interest from outside,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

 $03{:}39{:}39{.}600 \dashrightarrow 03{:}39{:}41{.}502$  but we have to find resources

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

03:39:41.502 -> 03:39:43.310 to actually expand this further.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

 $03:39:43.310 \longrightarrow 03:39:46.705$  To provide free screening for kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

 $03:39:46.710 \rightarrow 03:39:49.216$  To provide free equal 1 genotyping research

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

 $03:39:49.216 \rightarrow 03:39:51.868$  based and for people who are eligible,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

 $03{:}39{:}51{.}870 \dashrightarrow 03{:}39{:}55{.}100$  especially people with FSGS or

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

 $03:39:55.100 \dashrightarrow 03:39:56.106$  hypertensive nephrosclerosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

03:39:56.106 - 03:39:58.242 they will be eligible to enroll

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

 $03:39:58.242 \longrightarrow 03:40:00.688$  in a six month clinical trial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

03:40:00.690 - 03:40:02.850 baricitinib of which primary end

- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03:40:02.850 \rightarrow 03:40:05.010$  point is reduction of proteinuria.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03{:}40{:}05{.}010 \dashrightarrow 03{:}40{:}07{.}290$  So because in the interest of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03:40:07.290 \longrightarrow 03:40:09.270$  time I'll I'll pause here,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03:40:09.270 \rightarrow 03:40:11.446$  I know I've gone through this a little
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03:40:11.446 \rightarrow 03:40:13.486$  quickly to to engage question and to.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03{:}40{:}13{.}490 \dashrightarrow 03{:}40{:}16{.}736$  Leave room for some back and forth again.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03:40:16.736 \longrightarrow 03:40:19.584$  I want to thank people in my lab.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03:40:19.590 \longrightarrow 03:40:21.765$  Who basically have done all
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03:40:21.765 \longrightarrow 03:40:23.505$  the work my collaborator,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03:40:23.510 \rightarrow 03:40:26.426$  especially on the COVID covan project
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03{:}40{:}26{.}426 \dashrightarrow 03{:}40{:}28{.}370$  at Doctor Thomas Neuropathologist.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- 03:40:28.370 --> 03:40:30.209 Doctor Wayne Nephro,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03{:}40{:}30{.}209 \dashrightarrow 03{:}40{:}32{.}048$  pathologist at Harvard,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03:40:32.050 \longrightarrow 03:40:33.886$  and our funding agencies,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091
- $03{:}40{:}33{.}886 \dashrightarrow 03{:}40{:}38{.}109$  so I'll pause here to to take questions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.910948620909091

- $03:40:38.110 \longrightarrow 03:40:38.680$  Thank you.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.864947603333333
- $03{:}40{:}48{.}980 \dashrightarrow 03{:}40{:}49{.}748$  That was great.

03:40:52.350 --> 03:40:54.930 Doctor garashi so thank

NOTE Confidence: 0.6203507

 $03:40:54.930 \longrightarrow 03:40:56.105$  you for that great talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.43108156

 $03:41:04.470 \longrightarrow 03:41:04.810$  These

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:41:14.490 \rightarrow 03:41:19.128$  are these are organoids purified podocytes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

03:41:19.130 --> 03:41:23.156 Or are they just standard organoids?

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:41:23.160 \longrightarrow 03:41:27.020$  So for the COVID project these

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:41:27.020 \longrightarrow 03:41:30.300$  are derived micro organoids,

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:41:30.300 \longrightarrow 03:41:32.120$  so they were differentiated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03{:}41{:}32{.}120 \dashrightarrow 03{:}41{:}34{.}395$  so these were not isolated

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:41:34.395 \longrightarrow 03:41:36.220$  from patients kidneys.

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:41:36.220 \longrightarrow 03:41:38.620$  What we did was essentially to

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:41:38.620 \longrightarrow 03:41:41.020$  take the blood from patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03{:}41{:}41{.}020 \dashrightarrow 03{:}41{:}44{.}300$  We isolate peripheral blood monocytes

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03{:}41{:}44{.}300 \dashrightarrow 03{:}41{:}46{.}315$  and then we transduce peripheral

- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03{:}41{:}46{.}315 \dashrightarrow 03{:}41{:}48{.}875$  blood monocyte with the four Yamanaka
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03{:}41{:}48.875 \dashrightarrow 03{:}41{:}51.695$  factors to reprogram them to become
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03:41:51.695 \rightarrow 03:41:53.570$  inducible pluripotent stem cells.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03:41:53.570 \rightarrow 03:41:55.964$  One is it become pluripotent stem cells,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03{:}41{:}55{.}970 \dashrightarrow 03{:}41{:}57{.}558$  then we differentiate them
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03:41:57.558 \rightarrow 03:41:58.749$  using established protocol.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- 03:41:58.750 --> 03:42:00.086 A lot of folks,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03{:}42{:}00{.}086 \dashrightarrow 03{:}42{:}02{.}590$  both at Harvard and and Melissa
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03{:}42{:}02{.}590 \dashrightarrow 03{:}42{:}05{.}523$ Little at the entry and Melissa Little
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03:42:05.523 \rightarrow 03:42:08.390$  Lab did the pioneering work here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03{:}42{:}08{.}390 \dashrightarrow 03{:}42{:}11{.}029$  So the protocol is actually now standard,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- 03:42:11.030 --> 03:42:13.958 where you can coax this IPSC to become
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03:42:13.958 \rightarrow 03:42:16.405$  organoid in the organoid you have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03{:}42{:}16{.}405 \dashrightarrow 03{:}42{:}18{.}865$  podocyte you have tubular cell and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775
- $03{:}42{:}18{.}940 \dashrightarrow 03{:}42{:}21{.}577$  so on and so the first part of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:42:21.577 \rightarrow 03:42:23.480$  study that I showed you with the code.

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:42:23.480 \longrightarrow 03:42:26.576$  And the COVID was dependent on the organized.

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:42:26.580 \longrightarrow 03:42:28.089$  The second part,

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

03:42:28.089 --> 03:42:29.598 the GEOPATHIC FSGS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:42:29.600 \rightarrow 03:42:32.295$  Those IPS were directly differentiated

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03{:}42{:}32{.}295 \dashrightarrow 03{:}42{:}35{.}760$  to photosite using Samira Moser protocol.

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:42:35.760 \longrightarrow 03:42:38.518$  So in both cases these were not

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:42:38.518 \longrightarrow 03:42:39.700$  from the kidney,

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:42:39.700 \longrightarrow 03:42:42.330$  but these were already programmed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.607870775

 $03:42:42.330 \longrightarrow 03:42:43.770$  I hope that answers a question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075

 $03{:}42{:}51{.}210 \dashrightarrow 03{:}42{:}54{.}252$  How do you deal with like

NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075

 $03:42:54.252 \rightarrow 03:42:55.266$  neuronal contamination?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075

 $03:42:55.270 \longrightarrow 03:42:57.410$  So that's a good question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075

 $03:42:57.410 \longrightarrow 03:42:59.456$  So when we actually take this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075

 $03:42:59.456 \longrightarrow 03:43:01.232$  kidney organized and you look

NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075

 $03:43:01.232 \rightarrow 03:43:02.967$  at the single cell analysis,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- 03:43:02.970 -> 03:43:06.786 you have about 20 sub population.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:06.790 \longrightarrow 03:43:08.776$  Think because the role or the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:08.776 \longrightarrow 03:43:11.154$  goal of using these I PSC's is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:11.154 \rightarrow 03:43:13.439$  not to transplant into patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03{:}43{:}13{.}440 \dashrightarrow 03{:}43{:}16{.}320$  The goal is for us to actually use a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03{:}43{:}16{.}320 \dashrightarrow 03{:}43{:}18{.}844$  subset of them, which means the podocyte,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:18.844 \longrightarrow 03:43:19.987$  the endothelial cells.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:19.990 \rightarrow 03:43:22.540$  Yes, there is neuronal contamination there,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03{:}43{:}22{.}540 \dashrightarrow 03{:}43{:}24{.}577$  but it's across from all the patients,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:24.580 \longrightarrow 03:43:26.596$  so it's not a perfect tool,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:26.600 \longrightarrow 03:43:28.658$  but it's actually, in my view,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- 03:43:28.660 $\operatorname{-->}$ 03:43:31.410 actually outperform some of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:31.410 \rightarrow 03:43:34.160$  immortalized procycling we've been using,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03{:}43{:}34{.}160 \dashrightarrow 03{:}43{:}38{.}127$  so it's because of the fact that it it
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:38.127 \rightarrow 03:43:41.956$  retains the genetic endowment of the patient.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075

- $03:43:41.960 \longrightarrow 03:43:42.947$  It allows us.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:42.947 \rightarrow 03:43:47.017$  To be able to capture that in a way that we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:47.017 \longrightarrow 03:43:49.543$  cannot capture it with immortalized line.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:49.550 \longrightarrow 03:43:52.140$  So we actually didn't have to do
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03{:}43{:}52{.}140 \dashrightarrow 03{:}43{:}54{.}370$  with the neuronal contamination,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- $03:43:54.370 \longrightarrow 03:43:55.135$  because that, really,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- 03:43:55.135 --> 03:43:56.920 I don't think that helped with the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7657877075
- 03:43:56.967 --> 03:43:58.467 question we are trying to answer.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.54355174
- $03{:}44{:}00.520 \dashrightarrow 03{:}44{:}00.940$  So.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8398067
- $03:44:02.980 \longrightarrow 03:44:03.370$  Don't.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.551276974285714
- 03:44:07.110 --> 03:44:11.387 Really enjoyed it so. You are HIV.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683984595055556
- $03:44:13.740 \rightarrow 03:44:15.846$  The patient sample you showed that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683984595055556
- $03{:}44{:}15{.}846 \dashrightarrow 03{:}44{:}18{.}114$  the April one is expressed both
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683984595055556
- $03:44:18.114 \rightarrow 03:44:20.490$  in the prototypes of the cells.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683984595055556
- $03:44:20.490 \longrightarrow 03:44:21.585$  Is that something you see
- NOTE Confidence: 0.683984595055556
- $03:44:21.585 \longrightarrow 03:44:23.020$  in all of the models where.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.626974818571428
- $03:44:29.450 \longrightarrow 03:44:30.890$  Genesis The thing is related
- NOTE Confidence: 0.626974818571428
- $03:44:30.890 \longrightarrow 03:44:32.430$  to the support sites versus.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7419567
- 03:44:34.590 --> 03:44:38.438 Mechanism. Yeah. Did you hear
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7419567
- $03:44:38.438 \longrightarrow 03:44:40.890$  that or I heard the first part?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7419567
- 03:44:40.890 --> 03:44:42.936 So the employment expression is in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7419567
- $03{:}44{:}42.936 \dashrightarrow 03{:}44{:}45.469$  the photo site and endothelial cell.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7419567
- $03{:}44{:}45{.}470 \dashrightarrow 03{:}44{:}47{.}942$  How is that? Is that a universal thing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7419567
- 03:44:47.942 --> 03:44:50.308 for April 1 mediated kidney disease?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.7419567
- $03:44:50.310 \longrightarrow 03:44:51.000$  Is that correct?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- $03{:}44{:}53{.}160 \dashrightarrow 03{:}44{:}57{.}907$  Yes, OK, so we've looked in COVID and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- 03:44:57.907 -> 03:45:00.523 I will say that in the COVID tissue
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- $03{:}45{:}00{.}523 \dashrightarrow 03{:}45{:}03{.}119$  of the nine cases we looked at,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- $03{:}45{:}03{.}120 \dashrightarrow 03{:}45{:}05{.}878$  the answer is the same robust expression
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- 03:45:05.878 --> 03:45:09.021 in the podocyte robust expression in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- 03:45:09.021 -> 03:45:12.048 CD 31 positive and the failure cells.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03:45:12.050 \rightarrow 03:45:14.722$  We are in the process of actually doing

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03:45:14.722 \rightarrow 03:45:17.347$  the same thing with idiopathic FSGS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03{:}45{:}17{.}350 \dashrightarrow 03{:}45{:}19{.}732$  To see. Whether it's also in

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03:45:19.732 \longrightarrow 03:45:21.780$  those two compartment as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03:45:21.780 \rightarrow 03:45:24.476$  I can tell it's robustly in the podocyte,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03{:}45{:}24{.}480 \dashrightarrow 03{:}45{:}25{.}296$  but we want to do it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03{:}45{:}25{.}300 \dashrightarrow 03{:}45{:}27{.}136$  Careful work to see whether it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03:45:27.136 \longrightarrow 03:45:28.760$  also in in bethelehem cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03{:}45{:}28.760 \dashrightarrow 03{:}45{:}31.264$  but in the COVID for all the cases

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03:45:31.264 \rightarrow 03:45:33.972$  we've looked at, the answer is yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03:45:33.972 \longrightarrow 03:45:36.237$  For the endothelial cells and,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03:45:36.240 \longrightarrow 03:45:37.794$  and I think that question from Doctor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

03:45:37.800 - 03:45:39.672 Babbitt, and that actually

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03{:}45{:}39{.}672 \dashrightarrow 03{:}45{:}42{.}012$  under score is second question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

 $03:45:42.020 \rightarrow 03:45:44.080$  the the understanding of collapsing

NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143

03:45:44.080 - 03:45:46.140 FSGS has been very produced,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- $03:45:46.140 \longrightarrow 03:45:48.396$  centric, and rightly so.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- $03{:}45{:}48{.}396 \dashrightarrow 03{:}45{:}51{.}780$  But I'm not sure that endothelial
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- 03:45:51.877 03:45:54.597 cells are entirely innocent.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- $03:45:54.600 \rightarrow 03:45:56.130$  So hopefully for that work
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- $03:45:56.130 \longrightarrow 03:45:58.319$  will try to to tease that out,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- $03{:}45{:}58{.}320 \dashrightarrow 03{:}46{:}00{.}474$  but I'm not sure whether endothelial
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- 03:46:00.474 --> 03:46:02.369 cells is involving all equal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- 03:46:02.369 --> 03:46:03.929 1 mediated kidney disease,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- $03:46:03.930 \longrightarrow 03:46:06.138$  but it appears to be involved
- NOTE Confidence: 0.805439472857143
- 03:46:06.138 --> 03:46:07.870 in COVID in COVID.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- 03:46:10.110 --> 03:46:13.462 So one question I have is how how
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- 03:46:13.462 --> 03:46:16.672 does increase in April 1 cause
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03:46:16.672 \rightarrow 03:46:18.948$  the toxicity like mechanistically?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03{:}46{:}18{.}950 \dashrightarrow 03{:}46{:}20{.}440$  So that's a great question.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03:46:20.440 \longrightarrow 03:46:25.288$  So in our hands we've done a lot
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

03:46:25.288 --> 03:46:27.616 of overexpression in HK cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03{:}46{:}27.616 \dashrightarrow 03{:}46{:}31.287$  One of the first thing we saw was

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03:46:31.287 \longrightarrow 03:46:33.807$  that the most proximal phenotype

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03{:}46{:}33.807 \dashrightarrow 03{:}46{:}35.980$  was potassium efflux itself.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03{:}46{:}35{.}980 \dashrightarrow 03{:}46{:}41{.}750$  I believe that's the gateway upstream.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03:46:41.750 \longrightarrow 03:46:42.830$  Mediator of toxicity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03:46:42.830 \rightarrow 03:46:44.990$  There's a lot of controversy here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03:46:44.990 \longrightarrow 03:46:48.722$  so there's been about 7 different

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

03:46:48.722 --> 03:46:51.122 mechanism proposed as to how,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03:46:51.122 \rightarrow 03:46:53.426$  if everybody agree that it's toxic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03{:}46{:}53{.}430 \dashrightarrow 03{:}46{:}55{.}560$  but there are at least seven

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03:46:55.560 \rightarrow 03:46:56.625$  different mechanism proposed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03:46:56.630 \rightarrow 03:46:59.507$  My view is that the potassium efflux,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03:46:59.510 \rightarrow 03:47:01.827$  and in this case also sodium influx,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

 $03:47:01.830 \longrightarrow 03:47:03.864$  is actually central to that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222

03:47:03.864 --> 03:47:06.388 are working on trying to to see if

- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03:47:06.388 \longrightarrow 03:47:08.407$  that if this models will help us
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03:47:08.407 \longrightarrow 03:47:10.249$  to clarify that in the knockout
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03:47:10.249 \longrightarrow 03:47:12.055$  model I show when we knock.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- 03:47:12.055 --> 03:47:13.235 Without the fuel one,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03:47:13.240 \longrightarrow 03:47:14.500$  the potassium influx stopped,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03{:}47{:}14.500 \dashrightarrow 03{:}47{:}16.390$  so it's telling us that if
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03:47:16.449 \rightarrow 03:47:18.419$  everyone is self doesn't mediation,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03:47:18.420 \rightarrow 03:47:21.598$  but they're still contentious at this point.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03:47:21.600 \longrightarrow 03:47:23.120$  So I I think we have to wait.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03:47:23.120 \longrightarrow 03:47:24.645$  There's really not been compelling
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03:47:24.645 \longrightarrow 03:47:27.009$  evidence one way or the other that one
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03:47:27.009 \rightarrow 03:47:29.220$  mechanism is superior to the to the other,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.842654742222222
- $03{:}47{:}29{.}220 \dashrightarrow 03{:}47{:}31{.}428$  but it's unresolved question.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.933717325
- $03{:}47{:}34{.}920 \dashrightarrow 03{:}47{:}36{.}336$  I hope that answers your question.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.933717325
- $03:47:36.340 \longrightarrow 03:47:38.320$  Doctor Shiva that's great.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.933647143333333

- $03:47:44.730 \longrightarrow 03:47:45.810$  Any other questions?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- 03:47:58.130 --> 03:48:01.014 Have have you compared like interferon alpha,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- 03:48:01.020 --> 03:48:03.685 gamma and beta in viral
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- 03:48:03.685 -> 03:48:06.920 induced kidney disease? Yeah.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- $03:48:06.920 \longrightarrow 03:48:10.890$  Yes, so when in that in that graph
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- $03:48:10.890 \longrightarrow 03:48:13.690$  that I showed when you look at the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- 03:48:13.690 03:48:15.592 effect of the three interference,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- $03:48:15.592 \rightarrow 03:48:18.452$  it's actually very convincing that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- $03:48:18.452 \rightarrow 03:48:22.160$  interferon gamma has the strongest effect,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- $03:48:22.160 \longrightarrow 03:48:25.360$  so you see alpha, beta,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- $03{:}48{:}25{.}360 \dashrightarrow 03{:}48{:}28{.}656$  and gamma at least looking both in glomerular
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- $03:48:28.656 \rightarrow 03:48:32.650$  endothelial cells as well as in podocyte.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- 03:48:32.650 --> 03:48:36.689 Gamma has the strongest effect in induction,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- 03:48:36.690 --> 03:48:39.648 followed by beta, followed by Alfred,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- $03:48:39.650 \rightarrow 03:48:42.534$  and I should say that this actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429
- $03:48:42.534 \rightarrow 03:48:47.470$  mimics or confirms what David Friedman

 $03:48:47.470 \longrightarrow 03:48:51.145$  shown several years ago when he used

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

 $03{:}48{:}51{.}145 \dashrightarrow 03{:}48{:}53{.}357$  immortalized podocytes that interferon

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

03:48:53.357 --> 03:48:56.639 gamma for whatever reason has a

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

 $03:48:56.639 \rightarrow 03:48:57.733$  strongest effect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

 $03:48:57.740 \rightarrow 03:49:01.058$  In in driving the April 1 expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

 $03:49:01.060 \rightarrow 03:49:03.540$  and I also see a question about is

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

 $03:49:03.540 \longrightarrow 03:49:05.888$  there on the on the chat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

 $03{:}49{:}05{.}890 \dashrightarrow 03{:}49{:}09{.}265$  Is there a well established

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

 $03:49:09.265 \longrightarrow 03:49:11.821$  protocol to organize culture

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

03:49:11.821 --> 03:49:14.329 directly from kidney tissues?

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

 $03:49:14.330 \longrightarrow 03:49:17.468$  Just like the way used in

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

 $03:49:17.468 \longrightarrow 03:49:19.560$  organic culture and cancer?

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

03:49:19.560 --> 03:49:21.240 Not that I know of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

 $03:49:21.240 \longrightarrow 03:49:23.864$  The organoid kidney organoid

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

 $03{:}49{:}23{.}864 \dashrightarrow 03{:}49{:}27{.}144$  protocols have been more developed

 $03:49:27.144 \rightarrow 03:49:30.184$  to go from I PSC's to the organoid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

03:49:30.184 --> 03:49:33.704 I'm not aware of a lot of robust protocol

NOTE Confidence: 0.810842718571429

03:49:33.704 --> 03:49:36.422 for from going from kidney proper.

NOTE Confidence: 0.829307853333333

 $03:49:38.890 \longrightarrow 03:49:39.859$  To the online.

NOTE Confidence: 0.560273265

 $03:49:52.770 \longrightarrow 03:49:54.830$  They identified with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.5956295316666667

 $03:49:56.850 \rightarrow 03:49:58.368$  Don't have yet have to do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03:50:06.650 \rightarrow 03:50:09.272$  In in your justice trial is

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03{:}50{:}09{.}272 \dashrightarrow 03{:}50{:}11{.}510$  there screening for asymptomatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03:50:11.510 \rightarrow 03:50:15.110$  people who may happen to have?

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03:50:15.110 \longrightarrow 03:50:19.156$  These these risk allele high risk alleles.

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03{:}50{:}19{.}160 \dashrightarrow 03{:}50{:}21{.}610$  So the the the justice trial is

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03:50:21.610 \longrightarrow 03:50:24.056$  only focusing on people who have

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03{:}50{:}24.056 \dashrightarrow 03{:}50{:}26.246$  disease who have kidney disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

03:50:26.250 --> 03:50:28.080 But we have a preceding study,

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03{:}50{:}28.080 \dashrightarrow 03{:}50{:}29.600$  we call it darab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

03:50:29.600 --> 03:50:31.880 Duke April 1 research by repository

- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- 03:50:31.961 -> 03:50:33.829 where we actually recruit.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- $03:50:33.830 \rightarrow 03:50:36.404$  Both people with disease as well
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- $03:50:36.404 \rightarrow 03:50:38.735$  as healthy volunteers and among
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- $03:50:38.735 \longrightarrow 03:50:40.867$  the edible healthy volunteers.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- $03:50:40.870 \longrightarrow 03:50:43.030$  We identify people without kidney
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- 03:50:43.030 --> 03:50:44.758 disease with no proteinuria
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- $03:50:44.758 \longrightarrow 03:50:46.927$  and who are age 50 and older.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- $03:50:46.930 \longrightarrow 03:50:47.914$  What we are doing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- $03:50:47.914 \longrightarrow 03:50:49.827$  The goal of that is to actually
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- $03:50:49.827 \rightarrow 03:50:52.089$  answer the question you are asking.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- 03:50:52.090 03:50:54.448 If we identify people who are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- $03:50:54.448 \rightarrow 03:50:57.430$  healthy carriers and the preliminary
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- 03:50:57.430 --> 03:51:00.350 data from earlier studies,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- $03{:}51{:}00{.}350 \dashrightarrow 03{:}51{:}03{.}758$  what type I showed in the.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714
- $03:51:03.760 \longrightarrow 03:51:05.264$  In the heat map,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03:51:05.264 \rightarrow 03:51:08.173$  we hope to identify enough number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

03:51:08.173 --> 03:51:11.033 healthy carriers and compare their

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03{:}51{:}11{.}033 \dashrightarrow 03{:}51{:}13{.}321$  transcriptomic and genomic information

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03:51:13.400 \rightarrow 03:51:15.808$  to identify potential modifiers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03{:}51{:}15{.}810 \dashrightarrow 03{:}51{:}16{.}800$  So that's a great question

NOTE Confidence: 0.722631994285714

 $03:51:16.800 \rightarrow 03:51:17.960$  and we are working on it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.929415343333333

 $03:51:22.760 \longrightarrow 03:51:23.819$  Any other questions?

NOTE Confidence: 0.871665032

03:51:27.140 --> 03:51:28.240 Alright, thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.871665032

03:51:28.240 --> 03:51:30.808 Doctor would be here for a

NOTE Confidence: 0.871665032

 $03{:}51{:}30{.}808 \dashrightarrow 03{:}51{:}32{.}420$  wonderful talk. I got it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03{:}51{:}43{.}440 \dashrightarrow 03{:}51{:}45{.}491$  Well, just wanted to thank all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03:51:45.491 \rightarrow 03:51:47.051$  speakers for really a wonderful

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03{:}51{:}47.051 \dashrightarrow 03{:}51{:}48.911$  set of talks today and especially

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

03:51:48.911 --> 03:51:50.510 thank shuda for organizing and

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03:51:50.510 \rightarrow 03:51:52.358$  and knowing about who to invite.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03:51:52.360 \rightarrow 03:51:54.080$  If you've been left to me we would

 $03:51:54.080 \rightarrow 03:51:56.091$  have had five talks on proximal tubule

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

03:51:56.091 --> 03:51:57.616 acidification and I don't think

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03:51:57.675 \rightarrow 03:51:59.577$  anybody would been interested in that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03:51:59.580 \longrightarrow 03:52:01.698$  So thank you. Should a thanked and

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03:52:01.698 \rightarrow 03:52:03.790$  prodotti for helping organize everything.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03:52:03.790 \longrightarrow 03:52:05.535$  Kyle for the Technical Support

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03{:}52{:}05{.}535 \dashrightarrow 03{:}52{:}07{.}837$  and thank the audience for their

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03{:}52{:}07.837 \dashrightarrow 03{:}52{:}09.797$  attention and excellent questions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03:52:09.800 \rightarrow 03:52:12.660$  and see everybody next year, hopefully.

NOTE Confidence: 0.870922644482758

 $03:52:12.660 \rightarrow 03:52:14.000$  Bye bye.