WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"01:00:47" NOTE recognizability:0.824

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.894668615882353

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:01.232 Good afternoon. Once again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.894668615882353

00:00:01.232 --> 00:00:03.416 it's a pleasure to welcome you here

NOTE Confidence: 0.894668615882353

 $00:00:03.416 \longrightarrow 00:00:05.054$ to Grand Rounds in the Cohen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894668615882353

 $00:00:05.060 \longrightarrow 00:00:09.160$ No, oh, there we go.

NOTE Confidence: 0.894668615882353

 $00:00:09.160 \longrightarrow 00:00:10.390$ Is that a little bit better?

NOTE Confidence: 0.78138117625

 $00:00:12.780 \longrightarrow 00:00:14.620$ Where is IT support when you need it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:00:16.660 --> 00:00:17.960 And good afternoon, everyone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}00{:}17.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}20.596$ I see some new faces in the audience

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}00{:}20.596 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}23.092$ and some new faces joining us on zoom.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:00:23.100 --> 00:00:24.396 And for those of you who don't know me,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:00:24.400 \dashrightarrow 00:00:26.386$ I'm Kieran O'Donnell and it's my

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}00{:}26.386 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}28.861$ pleasure to Co-chair the Grand Rounds

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:00:28.861 \longrightarrow 00:00:31.395$ committee here in the Child Study Center.

 $00:00:31.400 \longrightarrow 00:00:33.560$ And now just a little note about next

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}00{:}33.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}35.799$ week we'll be continuing our in person

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}00{:}35.799 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}37.830$ Grand Round series with Doctor Pasco

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:00:37.830 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.272$ Fearon will be joining us from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:00:40.272 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.248$ the University College London and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:00:42.248 --> 00:00:43.960 with sharing his perspective on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}00{:}43.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}45.760$ attachment theory with the rest

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}00{:}45.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}47.665$ Perspective analysis and then a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}00{:}47.665 \to 00{:}00{:}49.189$ forward-looking perspective on attachment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:00:49.190 --> 00:00:51.596 And so moving to our distinguished

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}00{:}51.596 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}52.799$ international scholar that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:00:52.799 \longrightarrow 00:00:53.769$ joining us today,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:00:53.770 --> 00:00:55.265 it's my pleasure to introduce

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:00:55.265 \longrightarrow 00:00:57.104$ and to welcome Doctor Liisa Galea

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:00:57.104 \longrightarrow 00:00:58.529$ to the Child Study Center.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:00:58.530 \longrightarrow 00:01:00.378$ We have tried to make this talk happen

00:01:00.378 --> 00:01:02.341 for over a year now through various

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:02.341 \longrightarrow 00:01:04.092$ different phases of the pandemic and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:01:04.092 --> 00:01:05.592 it really is wonderful that you've

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:05.592 \longrightarrow 00:01:07.506$ been able to join us in person.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:07.506 \dashrightarrow 00:01:09.754$ And today now when I was tasked

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:01:09.754 --> 00:01:11.530 with introducing Dr Galea,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:01:11.530 --> 00:01:13.474 I was planning to print out her bio,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:13.480 \longrightarrow 00:01:15.196$ but then I was worried about

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:15.196 \longrightarrow 00:01:16.054$ the environmental impact.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:16.060 \longrightarrow 00:01:17.940$ Printing such a large document.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:17.940 \longrightarrow 00:01:19.820$ And so I thought I would share just

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}01{:}19.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}22.299$ a few of the highlights and from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:01:22.299 --> 00:01:23.855 Doctor Galea's illustrious career.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:23.860 \longrightarrow 00:01:25.702$ She is a professor of psychology

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:01:25.702 --> 00:01:27.460 and University of British Columbia,

 $00:01:27.460 \longrightarrow 00:01:28.930$ where she also serves as a health

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:01:28.930 --> 00:01:30.213 adviser to the vice President

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}01{:}30.213 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}31.723$ for Research and Innovation and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:31.723 \longrightarrow 00:01:33.292$ the scientific advisor for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:33.292 \longrightarrow 00:01:34.520$ Women's Health Research Institute.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:34.520 \longrightarrow 00:01:36.100$ And also currently leads the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:01:36.100 --> 00:01:37.364 Women's Health Research cluster,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}01{:}37.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}39.650$ which has 280 members worldwide.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}01{:}39.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}41.498$ And I think maybe you'll share some

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:41.498 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.919$ information about how others perhaps

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:42.919 \longrightarrow 00:01:44.653$ join this initiative in the future.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:44.660 \longrightarrow 00:01:46.444$ And she is a fellow with the Cavalli.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:01:46.450 \longrightarrow 00:01:49.140$ Foundation and with the International

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:01:49.140 --> 00:01:51.292 Behavioral Neuroscience Society and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}01{:}51.292 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}54.406$ is the chief Editor of Frontiers in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:01:54.406 --> 00:01:56.720 your endocrinology and the incoming

 $00:01:56.720 \longrightarrow 00:01:58.244$ president-elect of the organization

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:01:58.244 --> 00:02:00.530 for the Study of sex differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:00.530 \longrightarrow 00:02:02.728$ which I think we'll hear a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:02.728 \longrightarrow 00:02:04.719$ bit more about later on today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:04.720 \longrightarrow 00:02:07.660$ But just to mention that Doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:07.660 \longrightarrow 00:02:11.260$ Galea as of the end of October,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:11.260 \longrightarrow 00:02:14.144$ I believe will be the incoming inaugural

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:02:14.144 --> 00:02:16.469 chair in women's mental health.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:16.470 \longrightarrow 00:02:18.130$ This interfere addiction and mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:18.130 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.788$ health and also known as Cam H in Toronto,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:20.790 \longrightarrow 00:02:22.834$ which is one of the world's leading

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}02{:}22.834 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}24.481$ mental health research centres and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}02{:}24.481 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}25.913$ indeed Canada's largest teaching

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}02{:}25.913 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}27.850$ hospital for mental health research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:27.850 \longrightarrow 00:02:29.776$ And I think these leadership positions,

00:02:29.780 --> 00:02:32.054 these honors are just a testament

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:32.054 \longrightarrow 00:02:33.908$ to the tremendous contribution that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00{:}02{:}33.908 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}35.854$ doctor Gillian her lab has made to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:35.854 \longrightarrow 00:02:38.188$ sex and gender based health research,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:38.190 \longrightarrow 00:02:40.350$ which we're very excited to learn

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:40.350 \longrightarrow 00:02:41.430$ more about today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

 $00:02:41.430 \longrightarrow 00:02:43.614$ So please join me in thanking Dr Galea

NOTE Confidence: 0.8925019965

00:02:43.614 --> 00:02:45.669 for joining us today for Grand Rounds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}02{:}52.690 --> 00{:}02{:}54.862$ Well, thank you so much for

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:02:54.862 \longrightarrow 00:02:55.948$ that kind introduction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:02:55.950 \longrightarrow 00:02:57.366$ My bio is not that big.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:02:57.370 --> 00:02:59.570 It's 250 words, so it's not that bad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:02:59.570 \longrightarrow 00:03:01.470$ But, but thank you nonetheless.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:03:01.470 --> 00:03:03.118 So I also thank you for the opportunity

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:03.118 \longrightarrow 00:03:04.550$ to talk about what I'm really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:04.550 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.862$ really passionate about saying,

 $00{:}03{:}05.862 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}08.272$ to talk for the first half about

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:08.272 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.167$ sex and mostly sex differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:03:10.167 --> 00:03:11.683 and major depressive disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:03:11.690 --> 00:03:14.034 And then I'm going to pivot to talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:14.034 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.295$ about Women's Health and how that

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:15.295 \longrightarrow 00:03:16.620$ should play a role in forming.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:03:16.620 --> 00:03:19.500 About perinatal depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:03:19.500 --> 00:03:20.988 I want to begin by just

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:03:20.988 --> 00:03:21.980 acknowledging that I live,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:21.980 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.340$ work and play in Vancouver,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:23.340 \longrightarrow 00:03:25.713$ which is part of the unseated traditional

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}03{:}25.713 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}27.376$ and ancestral territories of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}03{:}27.376 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}28.856$ Coast Salish peoples and Musqueam,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}03{:}28.860 \longrightarrow 00{:}03{:}31.695$ Squamish and Suela 2 the First Nations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:03:31.700 --> 00:03:33.982 I always start my talk by giving

 $00:03:33.982 \longrightarrow 00:03:36.259$ a definition of sex versus gender.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}03{:}36.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}38.234$ So when I'm talking about sex differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:38.240 \longrightarrow 00:03:41.048$ I'm referring to the biological and

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:41.048 \longrightarrow 00:03:43.380$ physiological mechanisms that define males,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:43.380 \longrightarrow 00:03:46.284$ females, and intersex individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889 00:03:46.284 --> 00:03:47.010 Gender. NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:47.010 \longrightarrow 00:03:48.837$ Some people think of as sexual orientation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:48.840 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.953$ as gender identity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:49.953 \longrightarrow 00:03:52.179$ and it's much more than that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:52.180 \longrightarrow 00:03:55.612$ It's how a society has expectations

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}03{:}55.612 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}57.849$ and attribute has attributes for

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:03:57.849 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.027$ you based on your gender identity

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:00.027 \longrightarrow 00:04:02.277$ and that society at every level.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}04{:}02.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}05.780$ Home life, education, work life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:04:05.780 --> 00:04:07.999 And here is my spouse who identifies

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}04{:}07.999 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}10.860$ as a man showing what's appropriate in

 $00:04:10.860 \longrightarrow 00:04:13.608$ terms of the household and expected

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:13.688 \longrightarrow 00:04:16.229$ of him based on his gender identity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:16.230 \longrightarrow 00:04:17.808$ Neither of these terms are binary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:17.810 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.610$ as you can well imagine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:19.610 \longrightarrow 00:04:22.290$ and I'll be talking about more the sex

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:22.290 \longrightarrow 00:04:23.914$ differences and biomedical differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:23.914 \longrightarrow 00:04:27.008$ that we see in major depressive disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:04:27.010 --> 00:04:28.866 But I want to make it really clear

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}04{:}28.866 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}30.768$ that all the disparities that I'm

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:30.768 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.493$ talking about between females and

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:32.493 \longrightarrow 00:04:34.750$ males and women and men are many fold

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:04:34.750 --> 00:04:37.131 greater in people of color, indigenous,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}04{:}37.131 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}39.766$ trans and non binary individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:39.770 \longrightarrow 00:04:42.686$ And all of that work deserves

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:42.686 \longrightarrow 00:04:44.144$ attention and acknowledgement.

00:04:44.150 --> 00:04:46.509 And I put some people mostly Canadian.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}04{:}46.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}48.075$ Researchers there that I do

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:48.075 \longrightarrow 00:04:50.239$ quite a bit of that work so,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:50.240 \longrightarrow 00:04:52.262$ but I'm happy to maybe answer

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:04:52.262 \longrightarrow 00:04:54.379$ questions about some of that later.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:04:54.380 --> 00:04:57.420 So using my own family as an example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:04:57.420 --> 00:04:58.635 I think it's really obvious

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}04{:}58.635 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}00.520$ that there are a number of sex

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:00.520 \longrightarrow 00:05:01.760$ differences across the lifespan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:01.760 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.671$ and probably many of you are very

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}05{:}03.671 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}05.456$ well aware that females are more

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:05.456 \longrightarrow 00:05:07.563$ likely to live longer than males are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:07.570 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.631$ But what you might not be aware of is

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

00:05:09.631 --> 00:05:11.796 that females are also more likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:11.796 \longrightarrow 00:05:13.918$ deal with chronic illness than males are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}05{:}13.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}15.313$ And this is my mom who suffered

 $00:05:15.313 \longrightarrow 00:05:16.519$ from a very severe form.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:16.520 \longrightarrow 00:05:19.327$ Parkinson's disease towards the end of life,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:19.330 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.350$ and this paper came out a few years ago now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:22.350 \longrightarrow 00:05:24.390$ showing that on average for

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:24.390 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.022$ a variety of diseases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:26.030 \longrightarrow 00:05:28.214$ females were diagnosed 2 years later

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:28.214 \longrightarrow 00:05:30.839$ than males were for the very for

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:30.839 \longrightarrow 00:05:32.669$ obviously the very same disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:32.670 \longrightarrow 00:05:35.406$ And this is true for diseases even in

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}05{:}35.406 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}37.907$ which females show a greater prevalence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:37.910 \longrightarrow 00:05:40.262$ Now there are many reasons for

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:40.262 \longrightarrow 00:05:41.046$ this disparity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00{:}05{:}41.050 \longrightarrow 00{:}05{:}43.885$ both on the sex and on the gender side,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:43.890 \longrightarrow 00:05:45.630$ but I would argue her,

NOTE Confidence: 0.852982068888889

 $00:05:45.630 \longrightarrow 00:05:46.908$ I'd hesitate to say not hesitate.

 $00:05:46.910 \longrightarrow 00:05:48.110$ I'm not hesitating at all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00{:}05{:}48.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}50.062$ I would imagine that a lot of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:05:50.062 --> 00:05:52.150 has to do with the fact that a

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:05:52.150 \longrightarrow 00:05:54.108$ much of our medical knowledge and

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:05:54.108 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.283$ scientific knowledge has come from

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:05:56.283 \longrightarrow 00:05:58.310$ male Physiology studying the male.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:05:58.310 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.190$ And our playbook seems to be more in

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:06:01.276 --> 00:06:04.116 terms of the male Physiology, in fact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00{:}06{:}04.116 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}06.380$ so much so that even in diseases where

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:06.441 \longrightarrow 00:06:08.849$ you see a greater prevalence in females.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00{:}06{:}08.850 \to 00{:}06{:}12.294$ Females are said to have a typical symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:12.300 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.540$ Like, let's just think about

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:13.540 \longrightarrow 00:06:14.780$ that just for a second.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:14.780 \longrightarrow 00:06:16.766$ If there's more females that present

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:16.766 \longrightarrow 00:06:18.980$ with the disorder and yet they're

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:18.980 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.060$ classified as having atypical symptoms,

 $00:06:21.060 \longrightarrow 00:06:23.370$ that suggests we are using

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:23.370 \longrightarrow 00:06:24.756$ the wrong playbook.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:24.760 \longrightarrow 00:06:26.216$ And so this might take a message.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:06:26.220 --> 00:06:27.724 If none of you want to pay any

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:27.724 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.808$ more attention after the slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:28.810 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.318$ this is totally fine because basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:31.318 \longrightarrow 00:06:34.234$ my message is that males cannot serve

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:34.234 \longrightarrow 00:06:36.957$ as a default for females that much

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:37.031 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.600$ of our knowledge has been based on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:06:39.600 --> 00:06:41.854 Out the male playbook, which is fine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:41.860 \longrightarrow 00:06:44.074$ but it's like if you're trying

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:44.074 \longrightarrow 00:06:45.550$ to fix a refrigerator.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00{:}06{:}45.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}49.210$ It's like using an oven manual.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:49.210 \longrightarrow 00:06:50.718$ So as a neuroscientist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:50.718 \longrightarrow 00:06:52.603$ I'm interested in sex differences

 $00:06:52.603 \longrightarrow 00:06:54.307$ in the brain of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:54.310 \longrightarrow 00:06:55.969$ and there are a number of them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:55.970 \longrightarrow 00:06:57.434$ and it's not one sex that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:57.434 \longrightarrow 00:06:58.166$ predominating the other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:06:58.170 --> 00:06:59.430 This is in terms of Gray matter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:06:59.430 \longrightarrow 00:07:02.230$ You can see a lot of different

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:02.230 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.030$ variation there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:03.030 \longrightarrow 00:07:06.070$ and also you see differences in white matter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00{:}07{:}06.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}08.302$ So females are more likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:08.302 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.418$ have interhemispheric connections

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:09.418 \longrightarrow 00:07:12.073$ and males are more likely to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00{:}07{:}12.073 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}13.183$ intra hemispheric connections.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:07:13.190 --> 00:07:15.710 And this may or may not lead to sex

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00{:}07{:}15.710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}17.698$ differences in the prevalence of brain

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:17.698 \longrightarrow 00:07:20.238$ disease that put some common ones up there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:20.240 \longrightarrow 00:07:21.983$ What I think is even more fascinating

 $00:07:21.983 \longrightarrow 00:07:23.793$ is that we see sex differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:23.793 \longrightarrow 00:07:25.478$ in the manifestation of disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:25.480 \longrightarrow 00:07:26.842$ And that's true even in diseases

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:26.842 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.535$ where you don't see a sex difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:28.535 \longrightarrow 00:07:30.017$ in the prevalence of the disorder,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:30.020 \longrightarrow 00:07:30.668$ like schizophrenia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:07:30.668 --> 00:07:33.260 And in my lab and in my work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:33.260 \longrightarrow 00:07:36.319$ I've been looking more at diseases that

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:07:36.319 --> 00:07:39.418 show a greater lifetime risk for it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:39.420 \longrightarrow 00:07:40.156$ for females,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:40.156 \longrightarrow 00:07:41.996$ so Alzheimer's disease and depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:07:42.000 --> 00:07:43.992 And today I'll be talking more

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:07:43.992 --> 00:07:45.320 about the depression work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:07:45.320 --> 00:07:47.190 So hopefully I've started to

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:47.190 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.490$ convince you that it's important to

00:07:49.490 --> 00:07:51.330 study sex differences in disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00{:}07{:}51.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}53.058$ Because it can give us clues

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:53.058 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.850$ on how a disease develops,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:54.850 \longrightarrow 00:07:57.142$ the manifestation of that disease and

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:07:57.142 \longrightarrow 00:07:59.448$ also the treatment aspect and that

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00{:}07{:}59.448 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}01.584$ treatment part is very rarely studied,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:08:01.590 \longrightarrow 00:08:03.515$ but it also allows us to build

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:08:03.515 --> 00:08:05.330 better models of disease and that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:08:05.330 \longrightarrow 00:08:06.880$ true from both a preclinical

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:08:06.880 \longrightarrow 00:08:08.789$ and a clinical perspective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:08:08.790 \longrightarrow 00:08:11.198$ And of course better models with just

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:08:11.198 \longrightarrow 00:08:13.243$ give us better precision therapeutics

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:08:13.243 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.593$ and obviously if that doesn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00{:}08{:}15.593 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}18.247$ convincing you are federal funding

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:08:18.247 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.587$ agencies are mandating incorporation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00{:}08{:}20.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}22.543$ So any time you see a sex difference

 $00:08:22.543 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.509$ in the work that you're doing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00{:}08{:}24.510 \longrightarrow 00{:}08{:}25.860$ that should automatically queue you to

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:08:25.860 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.768$ think that one of two things are involved,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:08:27.770 \longrightarrow 00:08:29.730$ or a combination of the two of them.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:08:29.730 --> 00:08:31.221 One, sex chromosomes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:08:31.221 \longrightarrow 00:08:33.209$ the second sex hormones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:08:33.210 --> 00:08:35.235 And I'll be talking mostly

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:08:35.235 \longrightarrow 00:08:36.450$ about hormones today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

00:08:36.450 --> 00:08:37.635 And just because this gives

NOTE Confidence: 0.835655182

 $00:08:37.635 \longrightarrow 00:08:38.820$ me another excuse to put

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:08:38.871 --> 00:08:39.863 my adorable adult children

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:08:39.863 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.103$ back up on the screen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00{:}08{:}41.110 \longrightarrow 00{:}08{:}43.126$ And so they were all on the same page.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00{:}08{:}43.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}45.098$ I'm talking about ovarian hormones like

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:08:45.098 \longrightarrow 00:08:46.869$ estrogens and females and testicular

 $00:08:46.869 \longrightarrow 00:08:48.889$ hormones like testosterone and males.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:08:48.890 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.290$ And of course we.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:08:50.290 \longrightarrow 00:08:51.690$ Have each other's hormones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:08:51.690 \longrightarrow 00:08:53.640$ or just at different concentrations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:08:53.640 \longrightarrow 00:08:55.968$ and these act on hormone receptors

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:08:55.968 \longrightarrow 00:08:58.200$ that are located across the body,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:08:58.200 \longrightarrow 00:08:59.680$ not just in the reproductive

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:08:59.680 \longrightarrow 00:09:00.864$ tract across the brain,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:00.870 \longrightarrow 00:09:02.679$ across the body.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:09:02.680 --> 00:09:04.360 It gets more complicated than that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:04.360 \longrightarrow 00:09:06.904$ because testosterone itself can get converted

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:06.904 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.399$ to a very powerful estrogen called estradiol,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:10.400 \longrightarrow 00:09:13.940$ or a very potent and rogen called

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:13.940 --> 00:09:14.530 \ dihydrotestosterone.$

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:14.530 \longrightarrow 00:09:17.029$ And sex hormones themselves can affect risk,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:17.030 \longrightarrow 00:09:18.092$ symptomology and treatment.

 $00{:}09{:}18.092 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}20.570$ I'll give you an example from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:20.628 \longrightarrow 00:09:22.119$ schizophrenia literature showing

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:22.119 \longrightarrow 00:09:24.107$ across the menstrual cycle,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:24.110 \longrightarrow 00:09:27.098$ as estradiol levels decline,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:09:27.098 --> 00:09:29.339 psychotic symptoms increase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00{:}09{:}29.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}32.013$ I thought I'd spent a couple of minutes just

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:32.013 \longrightarrow 00:09:34.318$ talking about what sex differences is not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:09:34.320 --> 00:09:36.648 It's not sexist, it's not more

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:36.648 \longrightarrow 00:09:39.520$ complicated in one sex versus the other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00{:}09{:}39.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}42.536$ It's not believing that males and females are

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:09:42.536 --> 00:09:45.116 polar opposite and it's not the final step.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:45.120 \longrightarrow 00:09:47.289$ So what do I mean by all of that?

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:47.290 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.073$ One is that I see this idea that when

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:51.073 \longrightarrow 00:09:53.180$ you see a Gray matter volume difference,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:53.180 \longrightarrow 00:09:55.106$ that that somehow means that one

 $00:09:55.106 \longrightarrow 00:09:57.089$ sex is inferior to the other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00{:}09{:}57.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}58.850$ I'm not sure really where that comes from.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:09:58.850 \longrightarrow 00:10:00.274$ That's an empirical question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105 00:10:00.274 --> 00:10:00.630 right? NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:00.630 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.275$ It just means that the two brains

NOTE Confidence: 0.86755879684210500:10:02.275 --> 00:10:02.745 are different. NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:02.750 \longrightarrow 00:10:04.846$ It doesn't mean that one sex is inferior.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:10:04.850 --> 00:10:06.994 And in fact I'll give you some examples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00{:}10{:}07.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}08.503$ I might forget to give you one of them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:10:08.510 --> 00:10:09.620 but I'll give you some examples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:10:09.620 --> 00:10:11.627 You can ask me at the end of where

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:11.627 \longrightarrow 00:10:14.205$ you might see a Gray matter volume

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:14.205 \longrightarrow 00:10:15.733$ difference actually has beneficial

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:10:15.793 --> 00:10:17.907 effects to one sex versus the other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:17.910 \longrightarrow 00:10:19.142$ So that's a notion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:19.142 \longrightarrow 00:10:20.682$ So we should dispel ourselves

 $00:10:20.682 \longrightarrow 00:10:21.890$ of these notions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:21.890 \longrightarrow 00:10:23.520$ Another notions is is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:23.520 \longrightarrow 00:10:25.150$ females are more complicated to

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:25.210 \longrightarrow 00:10:27.010$ study because of their hormones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:10:27.010 --> 00:10:30.349 And Rebecca Shansky did a great editorial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:30.350 \longrightarrow 00:10:31.650$ not editorial, but a commentary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:31.650 \longrightarrow 00:10:35.124$ on this in science a couple of years ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:35.130 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.615$ And these papers have come

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:10:36.615 --> 00:10:38.100 out and rats versus mice,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:38.100 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.905$ and there's another one coming

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:10:39.905 --> 00:10:42.137 out in humans showing that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:10:42.137 --> 00:10:44.309 variability for a variety of traits,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00{:}10{:}44.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}45.852$ physiological and behavioral,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:45.852 \longrightarrow 00:10:47.908$ there's no sex difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:47.910 \longrightarrow 00:10:50.773$ So there's not one sex that's more

 $00:10:50.773 \longrightarrow 00:10:53.050$ inherently variable than the other sex.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:10:53.050 --> 00:10:53.413 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:53.413 \longrightarrow 00:10:55.954$ what this doesn't mean is that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:55.954 \longrightarrow 00:10:57.874$ variability within each sex might not

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:10:57.874 \longrightarrow 00:11:00.380$ be driven at least in part by hormones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:11:00.380 --> 00:11:02.515 I thought I'd give you this example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:11:02.520 \longrightarrow 00:11:04.475$ These are testosterone levels and

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00{:}11{:}04.475 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}06.818$ human males and this should indicate

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:11:06.818 --> 00:11:09.378 to you that you see a dramatic decline

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:11:09.378 \longrightarrow 00:11:11.531$ in testosterone levels on diurnal on

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:11:11.531 --> 00:11:14.509 a daily fashion by as much as 50%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:11:14.509 \longrightarrow 00:11:17.330$ So given that males have a diurnal

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:11:17.420 \longrightarrow 00:11:20.205$ fluctuation in hormones and females

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:11:20.205 --> 00:11:23.719 have a monthly fluctuation in their

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

00:11:23.719 --> 00:11:26.259 astral and progesterone levels,

NOTE Confidence: 0.867558796842105

 $00:11:26.260 \longrightarrow 00:11:28.794$ I have one question for you which

 $00:11:28.794 \longrightarrow 00:11:31.360$ is who's more hormonal? Now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00{:}11{:}33.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}36.065$ The other point I want to make is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:11:36.065 --> 00:11:38.528 there are many types of sex differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:11:38.530 \longrightarrow 00:11:39.928$ and I see this a lot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:11:39.930 \longrightarrow 00:11:40.756$ Sexual dimorphism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:11:40.756 --> 00:11:43.647 Sexual dimorphism just refers to one thing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:11:43.650 \longrightarrow 00:11:45.054$ which is very different,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:11:45.054 --> 00:11:47.182 polar opposites, if you will,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:11:47.182 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.026$ different morphs of the same trait.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:11:50.030 \longrightarrow 00:11:51.966$ But there are many kinds of sex differences,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:11:51.970 \longrightarrow 00:11:54.050$ and the 1:00 today that I'll talk about

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:11:54.050 \longrightarrow 00:11:55.877$ first at least, is mechanistic differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:11:55.877 --> 00:11:58.363 And this is what I really want people

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:11:58.363 \longrightarrow 00:12:00.225$ to think about in their own data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:00.230 \longrightarrow 00:12:01.525$ And that might be where you don't

 $00:12:01.525 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.940$ see a sex difference in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:02.940 \longrightarrow 00:12:04.290$ trait that you're interested in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:12:04.290 --> 00:12:06.019 As a matter what trade it is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:06.020 \longrightarrow 00:12:08.748$ but that doesn't mean that the neural or

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:08.748 \longrightarrow 00:12:10.695$ molecular mechanisms underlying that trait

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:10.695 \longrightarrow 00:12:13.113$ are completely different between the sexes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:12:13.120 --> 00:12:14.602 Another might be that you don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:14.602 \longrightarrow 00:12:16.393$ see a sex difference in a trait

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:12:16.393 --> 00:12:17.397 that you're interested in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:12:17.400 --> 00:12:19.656 but that doesn't mean with stress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:12:19.660 --> 00:12:20.416 disease, age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:12:20.416 --> 00:12:21.172 hormones, genotype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00{:}12{:}21.172 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}23.821$ that that doesn't elicit a sex difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:23.821 \longrightarrow 00:12:26.373$ either in the trait or in the molecular

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:26.373 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.938$ and neural mechanisms guiding that trait.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:12:28.940 --> 00:12:31.860 So keep looking sounds weird,

 $00:12:31.860 \longrightarrow 00:12:34.119$ but keep looking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:34.120 \longrightarrow 00:12:35.200$ And I'll come back to that

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:35.200 \longrightarrow 00:12:36.130$ point at the very end.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:36.130 \longrightarrow 00:12:38.559$ The last point I want to make

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:38.559 \longrightarrow 00:12:40.734$ about this is that studying sex

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:40.734 \longrightarrow 00:12:42.544$ differences isn't the final step.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:42.550 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.119$ There are a number of female unique

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:45.119 \longrightarrow 00:12:47.596$ experiences that we already know drive

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:47.596 \longrightarrow 00:12:49.766$ health outcomes and disease risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:12:49.770 --> 00:12:51.738 And I'll be talking about pregnancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:51.738 \longrightarrow 00:12:53.626$ and the postpartum at the at

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:53.626 \longrightarrow 00:12:55.180$ the latter half of this talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:55.180 \longrightarrow 00:12:57.049$ I really do think we can improve

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:12:57.049 --> 00:12:58.826 our knowledge of pretty much any

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:12:58.826 \longrightarrow 00:13:00.656$ disease if we give full consideration

 $00:13:00.656 \longrightarrow 00:13:02.497$ to sex and gender differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:02.500 \longrightarrow 00:13:04.780$ And so I'd like to use the term like we

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:04.841 \longrightarrow 00:13:07.298$ can harness that power of sex differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:13:07.300 --> 00:13:09.442 So today I'll talk to you a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:09.442 \longrightarrow 00:13:11.410$ about some sex differences and major

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:11.410 \longrightarrow 00:13:13.740$ depressive disorder that we see clinically.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:13.740 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.434$ I'll talk about a new preclinical model

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:15.434 \longrightarrow 00:13:17.327$ that we have that's not fully formed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:17.330 \longrightarrow 00:13:19.026$ but I'm going to tell you about it

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:19.026 \longrightarrow 00:13:20.858$ anyway on the negative cognitive bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:13:20.860 --> 00:13:23.461 And then I'm going to pivot to talk about

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:23.461 \longrightarrow 00:13:26.267$ the heterogeneity of perinatal depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:26.270 \longrightarrow 00:13:28.090$ So I think it's always useful to

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:28.090 \longrightarrow 00:13:29.962$ look at whatever disease that you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:13:29.962 --> 00:13:31.687 interested in across a lifespan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:13:31.690 --> 00:13:34.105 And here's the female to male ratio

00:13:34.110 --> 00:13:35.770 have a major depressive disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:35.770 \longrightarrow 00:13:38.248$ And I think what pops out immediately

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:38.248 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.424$ is that where you see that twice more

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:41.424 \longrightarrow 00:13:43.960$ likely is during those reproductive years.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00{:}13{:}43.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}46.420$ So suggesting that females have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:46.420 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.994$ unique Physiology that results in these

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:13:48.994 --> 00:13:50.734 specific periods of susceptibility

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00{:}13{:}50.734 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}53.120$ to depression across the lifespan.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:53.120 \longrightarrow 00:13:55.682$ It also lends itself to two

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:55.682 \longrightarrow 00:13:56.963$ alternative biological explanations

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:13:56.963 --> 00:13:59.437 for sex differences and depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:13:59.440 \longrightarrow 00:14:01.276$ One being that females are more

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00{:}14{:}01.276 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}03.510$ susceptible and I'm and are an ecologist,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00{:}14{:}03.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}04.896$ so I'm always going to think it

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:14:04.896 \longrightarrow 00:14:06.239$ has something to do with hormones.

 $00:14:06.240 \longrightarrow 00:14:08.208$ But the other is that males are more

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:14:08.208 \longrightarrow 00:14:10.540$ resistant, again due to their hormones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:14:10.540 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.340$ And we've created a number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:14:12.340 \longrightarrow 00:14:14.080$ animal models to look at this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

 $00:14:14.080 \longrightarrow 00:14:16.295$ Another question that we've been

NOTE Confidence: 0.90279232625

00:14:16.295 --> 00:14:18.510 interested in is does antidepressant

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:14:18.579 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.099$ efficacy is it varied based on hormonal

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:14:21.099 \longrightarrow 00:14:23.377$ status in either males or females

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}14{:}23.377 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}25.645$ under an animal model of depression?

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:14:25.650 --> 00:14:27.008 Now, I always get asked this question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:14:27.010 --> 00:14:29.226 so it's better to put it up front

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:14:29.226 \longrightarrow 00:14:31.398$ and that is, do males and females

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:14:31.398 --> 00:14:32.746 just show depressant differently?

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:14:32.750 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.575$ So to be diagnosed with

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:14:34.575 \longrightarrow 00:14:35.670$ major depressive disorder,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:14:35.670 --> 00:14:38.361 you have to one of the two blue symptoms

 $00:14:38.361 \longrightarrow 00:14:41.245$ and five out of the other seven symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}14{:}41.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}43.200$ And I think somebody that's studying

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:14:43.200 \longrightarrow 00:14:45.448$ this with the best last name ever,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:14:45.450 --> 00:14:46.786 I don't know if you can see that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:14:46.790 \longrightarrow 00:14:49.718$ but and you can't really argue with that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:14:49.720 --> 00:14:51.976 And it's a very large end and these

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:14:51.976 --> 00:14:54.788 are in person interviews and this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:14:54.788 \longrightarrow 00:14:56.864$ door to door 5 different countries

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:14:56.864 --> 00:14:59.051 in Europe and it wasn't until

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:14:59.051 \longrightarrow 00:15:01.530$ there were five or more symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:15:01.530 --> 00:15:02.699 Maybe I have to use this, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:02.699 \longrightarrow 00:15:04.211$ Yeah, it wasn't until there were five or

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}15{:}04.211 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}05.645$ more symptoms that you saw that shift.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:15:05.650 --> 00:15:06.922 And the ratio,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:06.922 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.042$ the DSM five also recognizes

 $00:15:09.042 \longrightarrow 00:15:11.439$ a number of other symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:15:11.440 --> 00:15:13.596 You can have with major depressive disorder,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:13.600 \longrightarrow 00:15:15.992$ but some of the common ones there and

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:15.992 \longrightarrow 00:15:18.448$ they recognize that there's actually 250

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:18.448 \longrightarrow 00:15:20.800$ unique symptom control combinations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:15:20.800 --> 00:15:23.218 So it's a very heterogeneous disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:23.220 \longrightarrow 00:15:24.876$ It makes it difficult to model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:15:24.880 --> 00:15:26.338 Like I know I'm going to try to sell

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}15{:}26.338 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}27.628$ you a story because I'm modeling

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:27.628 \longrightarrow 00:15:28.492$ this in in animals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}15{:}28.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}29.886$ I actually think it's really hard

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:29.886 \longrightarrow 00:15:31.566$ to model in humans as well, right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}15{:}31.566 \rightarrow 00{:}15{:}33.988$ because you can have weight gain or

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}15{:}33.988 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}36.244$ weight loss, you can have insomnia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:36.244 \longrightarrow 00:15:37.417$ you can oversleep,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:37.420 \longrightarrow 00:15:39.442$ and you can have second order

00:15:39.442 --> 00:15:40.453 agitation or retardation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:40.460 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.510$ So there's a lot of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:15:41.510 --> 00:15:44.970 Heterogeneity even within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:44.970 \longrightarrow 00:15:46.700$ clinical presentation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:15:46.700 --> 00:15:48.572 Not a ton of studies and I'm gonna

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:48.572 \longrightarrow 00:15:50.499$ end off with this particular now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:50.500 \longrightarrow 00:15:51.490$ but not a ton of studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}15{:}51.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}53.611$ Look at sex differences even now even

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:53.611 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.760$ though it's been mandated for a while.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}15{:}55.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}57.874$ But there are some studies that show

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:15:57.874 \longrightarrow 00:15:59.515$ some sex differences in symptoms

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}15{:}59.515 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}01.215$ for of major depressive disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:01.220 \longrightarrow 00:16:04.279$ So females are more likely to present

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}16{:}04.279 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}05.976$ with hypersomnia, hyperphagia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:05.976 \longrightarrow 00:16:09.240$ those a atypical symptoms,

 $00:16:09.240 \longrightarrow 00:16:13.112$ which I really don't like that term and

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}16{:}13.112 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}15.589$ possibly cognitive symptoms as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:16:15.590 --> 00:16:17.910 What about biomarkers of depression?

NOTE Confidence: 0.78302573379310300:16:17.910 --> 00:16:18.275 Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:16:18.275 --> 00:16:20.100 the Olympics systems very much

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:20.100 \longrightarrow 00:16:22.270$ involved in terms of integrity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:16:22.270 --> 00:16:24.664 I tend to fixate on the hippocampus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:24.670 \longrightarrow 00:16:25.950$ so I have to get this up there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:25.950 \longrightarrow 00:16:28.350$ But you can just use a limbic system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:28.350 \longrightarrow 00:16:30.750$ There are a number of meta analysis show

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:30.750 \longrightarrow 00:16:33.276$ that it's related to duration of illness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:33.280 \longrightarrow 00:16:34.704$ In terms of volume?

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:34.704 \longrightarrow 00:16:36.840$ The stress system is obviously perturbed

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:36.908 \longrightarrow 00:16:38.928$ also in major depressive disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:16:38.930 --> 00:16:41.730 Meta analysis show increased levels

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:41.730 \longrightarrow 00:16:44.530$ of cortisol impairments in negative

 $00:16:44.618 \longrightarrow 00:16:47.600$ feedback of the HP or hypothalamic

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}16{:}47.600 \to 00{:}16{:}51.035$ pituitary adrenal system and we see Pro

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:51.035 \longrightarrow 00:16:54.330$ inflammatory immune system is also perturbed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

00:16:54.330 --> 00:16:56.555 You see more pro inflammatory

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:56.555 \longrightarrow 00:16:57.890$ markers and metabolomics,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:16:57.890 \longrightarrow 00:17:00.315$ so we see higher levels

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:17:00.315 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.770$ of tryptophan metabolism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}17{:}01.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}03.798$ And again few studies out there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:17:03.800 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.108$ but there are some,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}17{:}05.108 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}07.070$ there's some evidence of sex differences

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:17:07.124 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.649$ in some of these biomarkers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:17:08.650 \longrightarrow 00:17:10.698$ But because they're so few and far between,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00{:}17{:}10.700 --> 00{:}17{:}11.650$ it's hard to make a,

NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103 00:17:11.650 --> 00:17:12.396 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.783025733793103

 $00:17:12.396 \longrightarrow 00:17:13.515$ definitive knowledge about

 $00:17:13.515 \longrightarrow 00:17:15.380$ all of this or definitive

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:17:15.444 --> 00:17:16.949 statement of all of this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:16.950 \longrightarrow 00:17:19.190$ So I want to say we really need to start

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:17:19.248 --> 00:17:21.768 using sex as a variable because if we're not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:17:21.770 --> 00:17:23.910 it's hampering our understanding, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:23.910 \longrightarrow 00:17:25.226$ So a lot of these, sometimes you'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:17:25.226 --> 00:17:26.822 see one study will show one thing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:26.830 \longrightarrow 00:17:28.240$ sometimes we'll say another thing

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:28.240 \longrightarrow 00:17:29.930$ in terms of sex differences that

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:29.930 \longrightarrow 00:17:31.547$ few studies that are out there but.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:17:31.550 --> 00:17:32.965 They don't always pay attention

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:32.965 \longrightarrow 00:17:34.380$ to age or treatment remission,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:34.380 \longrightarrow 00:17:35.530$ or whether they're treatment naive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:35.530 \longrightarrow 00:17:37.760$ And all of these things

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:37.760 \longrightarrow 00:17:39.098$ obviously will matter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00{:}17{:}39.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}40.584$ I would be remiss if I didn't

 $00:17:40.584 \longrightarrow 00:17:41.660$ show these two studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:41.660 \longrightarrow 00:17:44.522$ both fantastic studies looking at the

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:44.522 \longrightarrow 00:17:46.430$ transcriptomic signatures of major

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:46.502 \longrightarrow 00:17:49.418$ depressive disorder in males versus females.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:17:49.420 --> 00:17:50.056 Obviously humans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:50.056 \longrightarrow 00:17:52.600$ and you can see in their Venn diagrams

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:17:52.665 --> 00:17:54.597 across a variety of brain regions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:54.600 \longrightarrow 00:17:56.260$ not a lot of overlap.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:17:56.260 --> 00:17:58.930 So the genes that are differentially

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:17:58.930 \longrightarrow 00:18:00.300$ upregulated, downregulated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:00.300 \longrightarrow 00:18:03.060$ do not overlap.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667 00:18:03.060 --> 00:18:03.980 However, NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:03.980 \longrightarrow 00:18:05.460$ in the small little sliver,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:05.460 \longrightarrow 00:18:06.730$ this comes from Marianne Stanley's

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:06.730 \longrightarrow 00:18:08.301$ work and the small little sliver

 $00:18:08.301 \longrightarrow 00:18:09.317$ here that does overlap.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00{:}18{:}09.320 --> 00{:}18{:}11.270$ You can see that the gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:11.270 \longrightarrow 00:18:12.570$ expression patterns are opposite,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:12.570 \longrightarrow 00:18:14.950$ so genes that are down regulated and

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:14.950 \longrightarrow 00:18:17.487$ females are updated in males and vice versa.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:17.490 \longrightarrow 00:18:19.824$ So this suggests that the representation

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:18:19.824 --> 00:18:22.312 of this disorder is quite different

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:22.312 \longrightarrow 00:18:24.916$ in males versus females and likely

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:24.916 \longrightarrow 00:18:26.760$ has implications for treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00{:}18{:}26.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}28.734$ So what are the common risk factors

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:28.734 \longrightarrow 00:18:30.090$ for major depressive disorder?

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:30.090 \longrightarrow 00:18:31.502$ Female sex being one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:31.502 \longrightarrow 00:18:32.914$ I've talked about that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:32.920 \longrightarrow 00:18:35.104$ Another is chronic illness.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:18:35.104 --> 00:18:37.834 Family history and chronic stress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:37.840 \longrightarrow 00:18:40.276$ and I would argue as mostly an

 $00:18:40.276 \longrightarrow 00:18:42.159$ animal research that we can lump

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:42.159 \longrightarrow 00:18:44.026$ a lot of this into chronic stress

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:18:44.026 --> 00:18:45.198 or chronic stress category.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:45.200 \longrightarrow 00:18:47.300$ So we've been looking at that

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:47.300 \longrightarrow 00:18:49.024$ intersection between female sex and

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:49.024 \longrightarrow 00:18:51.088$ chronic stress and our work and we do

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:51.088 \longrightarrow 00:18:53.540$ use a lot of animal models of depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:18:53.540 \longrightarrow 00:18:55.703$ And I know that's a tall order

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00{:}18{:}55.703 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}57.829$ because you can't ask them about

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:18:57.829 --> 00:18:59.337 their thoughts of suicide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:18:59.340 --> 00:19:00.324 what you can,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:00.324 \longrightarrow 00:19:02.922$ but they don't tell you anything but most

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:02.922 \longrightarrow 00:19:05.410$ of the animal models that are out there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00{:}19{:}05.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}07.430$ Will perturbed either stress

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:07.430 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.450$ hormones or sex hormones.

 $00:19:09.450 \longrightarrow 00:19:11.144$ Now you can't ask them about their

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:11.144 \longrightarrow 00:19:13.147$ symptoms that you can look at some

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:13.147 \longrightarrow 00:19:14.065$ endophenotypes of depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:19:14.070 --> 00:19:16.910 including those biomarkers, very easily,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:16.910 \longrightarrow 00:19:18.962$ obviously in animal models.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:19:18.962 --> 00:19:21.014 And in our studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:21.020 \longrightarrow 00:19:22.376$ I know there's a busy slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:22.380 \longrightarrow 00:19:23.700$ but I put this up there to say,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00{:}19{:}23.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}25.380$ look, it's a heterogeneous disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:25.380 \longrightarrow 00:19:26.976$ It's difficult to model in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:26.980 \longrightarrow 00:19:29.300$ It's difficult to model in animals as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:29.300 \longrightarrow 00:19:31.316$ But I do think it's really important

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:19:31.316 --> 00:19:33.619 to look at a variety of endophenotypes

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:19:33.619 --> 00:19:36.115 of depression in any kind of study

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:36.115 \longrightarrow 00:19:37.219$ that you're doing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:37.220 \longrightarrow 00:19:38.716$ So we try to look at a number

00:19:38.716 --> 00:19:39.938 of different kinds of behavior,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:19:39.940 --> 00:19:41.480 maternal behavior for looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:19:41.480 --> 00:19:42.635 at postpartum depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:42.640 \longrightarrow 00:19:45.058$ look at endocrine factors as well

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:45.058 \longrightarrow 00:19:47.320$ as some neural factors as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00{:}19{:}47.320 \longrightarrow 00{:}19{:}50.256$ I am a bit fix ated on the hippocampus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:50.260 \longrightarrow 00:19:52.199$ Why am I so interested in it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:19:52.200 --> 00:19:54.102 We know it's important for memory

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:54.102 \longrightarrow 00:19:54.736$ and emotion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

00:19:54.740 --> 00:19:56.550 We see integrity loss with

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:56.550 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.636$ major depressive disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:19:57.640 \longrightarrow 00:19:59.516$ This the early work came from Shailene

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00{:}19{:}59.516 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}01.420$ who showed with untreated depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848241996666667

 $00:20:01.420 \longrightarrow 00:20:05.040$ small hippocampus that negative correlation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:05.040 \longrightarrow 00:20:06.740$ I'm interested in sex differences,

 $00:20:06.740 \longrightarrow 00:20:08.450$ so of course they have to have it has

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}20{:}08.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}10.595$ a lot of these estrogen receptors and

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:10.595 \longrightarrow 00:20:12.600$ and rogen receptors within the campus itself.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}20{:}12.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}14.640$ And the late great Bruce McEwen

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:14.640 \longrightarrow 00:20:16.860$ showed that that the hippocampus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:16.860 \longrightarrow 00:20:19.164$ Had very high levels of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}20{:}19.164 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}20{:}700$ glucocorticoids in the hippocampus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:20.700 \longrightarrow 00:20:22.044$ So if stress is playing a role,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}20{:}22.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}23.800$ it's kind of an important to show

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:23.800 \longrightarrow 00:20:25.069$ that those receptors are there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:20:25.070 --> 00:20:27.614 And it's attractive to study to me because

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:20:27.614 --> 00:20:29.761 it's very plastic in adulthood and

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:29.761 \longrightarrow 00:20:32.337$ there are many forms of plasticity that

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:32.337 \longrightarrow 00:20:34.745$ show both the sex and stress difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:34.750 \longrightarrow 00:20:37.430$ And here's the late great Bruce McEwen there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:37.430 \longrightarrow 00:20:40.054$ This is a coronal section of a rodent

00:20:40.054 --> 00:20:41.919 hippocampus in every single area.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:20:41.920 --> 00:20:43.030 I can give you examples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:20:43.030 --> 00:20:46.310 I'm going to give you one because in his lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768 00:20:46.310 --> 00:20:46.714 his. NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:46.714 \longrightarrow 00:20:48.734$ They showed that chronic restraint

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:48.734 \longrightarrow 00:20:51.424$ stress caused atrophy in the April good

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:20:51.424 --> 00:20:53.769 dendrites in the CA 3 pyramidal cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:20:53.770 --> 00:20:55.546 And when I did a postdoc with him,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:55.550 \longrightarrow 00:20:56.950$ he said what about females?

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}20{:}56.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}58.550$ And he allowed me to do that study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:20:58.550 \longrightarrow 00:21:00.515$ Is a great postdoc supervisor

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:00.515 \longrightarrow 00:21:02.087$ allows you to do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:21:02.090 --> 00:21:03.861 And I did it and we saw

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:03.861 \longrightarrow 00:21:05.260$ that the atrophy happened,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:05.260 \longrightarrow 00:21:07.206$ but it happened in the basal dendrites.

 $00:21:07.210 \longrightarrow 00:21:09.051$ And I'm sure many of you are

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:09.051 \longrightarrow 00:21:10.856$ thinking this is the most boring

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:21:10.856 --> 00:21:12.764 study you could possibly show us,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:12.770 \longrightarrow 00:21:15.038$ but I'm putting it up there because

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:15.038 \longrightarrow 00:21:17.318$ this is one of those examples.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}21{:}17.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}20.470$ Where you can see at a different

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:20.470 \longrightarrow 00:21:21.820$ out functional outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:21:21.820 --> 00:21:23.344 So even though you have atrophy

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}21{:}23.344 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}24.759$ and that should say to you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768 00:21:24.760 --> 00:21:24.994 oh, NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:24.994 \longrightarrow 00:21:26.398$ they're going to be worse at

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:26.398 \longrightarrow 00:21:28.018$ something and this is absolutely true.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}21{:}28.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}30.120$ Vicki Lowe's group has shown that in

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:30.120 \longrightarrow 00:21:32.249$ males this causes a functional impairment

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:32.249 \longrightarrow 00:21:34.194$ for spatial learning and memory.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}21{:}34.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}36.990$ In females it does the opposite.

00:21:36.990 --> 00:21:39.360 So it actually improves learning and

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}21{:}39.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}41.600$ memory and females this paradigm.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:41.600 \longrightarrow 00:21:44.828$ So watch those notions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:21:44.830 --> 00:21:46.750 The dental gyrus is my very favorite area,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:46.750 \longrightarrow 00:21:47.414$ the hippocampus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:47.414 \longrightarrow 00:21:49.406$ because it retains the ability to

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:21:49.406 --> 00:21:51.690 produce new neurons throughout adulthood,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:21:51.690 --> 00:21:53.986 and that's shown in all mammalian species,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:21:53.990 \longrightarrow 00:21:57.000$ which I'm happy to talk about afterwards.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}21{:}57.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}58.675$ There are many different ways

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}21{:}58.675 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}00.015$ you can measure neurogenesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:22:00.020 --> 00:22:02.396 I'm not going to go through all of them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}22{:}02.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}04.815$ but you can look at self proliferation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:04.820 \longrightarrow 00:22:07.214$ which is the production of new neurons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:07.220 \longrightarrow 00:22:09.248$ and you can use an endogenous

 $00:22:09.248 \longrightarrow 00:22:10.600$ marker like case 57.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}22{:}10.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}13.008$ You'll also see some data looking another

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:22:13.008 --> 00:22:14.780 endogenous marker called DOUBLECORTIN,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:14.780 \longrightarrow 00:22:16.740$ which is expressed in

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:22:16.740 --> 00:22:18.700 all amateur new neurons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:18.700 \longrightarrow 00:22:21.139$ Or if you're looking at a longer time point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:21.140 \longrightarrow 00:22:23.324$ you'd use a DNA synthesis marker

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:22:23.324 --> 00:22:24.780 like from a deoxyuridine,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:24.780 \longrightarrow 00:22:26.874$ and then determine whether that new

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:26.874 \longrightarrow 00:22:29.401$ cell is Co labeled with a mature

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}22{:}29.401 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}31.176$ neuronal protein like new one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:31.180 \longrightarrow 00:22:32.956$ And it might not even be the number

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:32.956 \longrightarrow 00:22:34.805$ of these new cells or new neurons

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00{:}22{:}34.805 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}35.618$ that are produced,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:35.620 \longrightarrow 00:22:37.713$ but how are they active and are

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:37.713 \longrightarrow 00:22:39.918$ they active in an appropriate way?

 $00:22:39.920 \longrightarrow 00:22:41.776$ And one of the ways that people do

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:41.776 \longrightarrow 00:22:43.607$ this is by using immediate early

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:43.607 \longrightarrow 00:22:45.237$ genes which are expressed after

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:45.237 \longrightarrow 00:22:46.570$ an action potential,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:22:46.570 --> 00:22:48.926 and some common ones are ZIF 268.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768 00:22:48.926 --> 00:22:49.232 Cfas.

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

00:22:49.232 --> 00:22:49.538 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.773109768

 $00:22:49.538 \longrightarrow 00:22:51.680$ the I don't neurogenesis in the campus

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:22:51.739 \longrightarrow 00:22:53.401$ was sort of rediscovered in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}22{:}53.401 \longrightarrow 00{:}22{:}55.424$ early 90s and and since then there

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}22{:}55.424 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}57.772$ have been a lot of studies trying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:22:57.772 \longrightarrow 00:23:00.306$ figure out what these new neurons do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:00.310 \longrightarrow 00:23:02.298$ And I would say there's no real

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}23{:}02.298 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}03.690$ argument that they're involved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:23:03.690 --> 00:23:05.646 A little bit of stress resilience,

00:23:05.650 --> 00:23:06.496 antidepressant efficacy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}23{:}06.496 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}09.457$ efficacy for some behaviors as well as

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:09.457 \longrightarrow 00:23:11.448$ something called pattern separation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:11.450 \longrightarrow 00:23:13.205$ which I'm going to talk about in a bit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:23:13.210 --> 00:23:17.445 And of course we see sex differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:23:17.450 --> 00:23:19.704 The other thing that people found is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:23:19.710 --> 00:23:21.750 and this is from Boldrini's work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:21.750 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.670$ that major depressive disorder

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}23{:}23.670 \longrightarrow 00{:}23{:}26.070$ is associated with reduction in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:26.070 \longrightarrow 00:23:27.810$ in this case self proliferation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:27.810 \longrightarrow 00:23:30.950$ So that's that endogenous marker

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:30.950 \longrightarrow 00:23:33.012$ of K67 of self liberation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:33.012 \longrightarrow 00:23:35.160$ And with major depressive disorder you

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}23{:}35.220 \to 00{:}23{:}38.006$ see reduction in supply operation with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:38.006 \longrightarrow 00:23:39.900$ selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:23:39.900 --> 00:23:42.204 you see a normalization and in this data

 $00:23:42.204 \longrightarrow 00:23:44.230$ a tricyclic antidepressants overshot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:44.230 \longrightarrow 00:23:45.334$ But she didn't see that every

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:45.334 \longrightarrow 00:23:46.330$ time she's done this study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:46.330 \longrightarrow 00:23:48.166$ So this just happened to be one of those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:48.170 \longrightarrow 00:23:48.942$ Prosperous things.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:48.942 \longrightarrow 00:23:51.258$ We were really interested when this

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:23:51.258 --> 00:23:53.700 first came out because loan of course,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:53.700 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.388$ postmortem tissue.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:54.388 \longrightarrow 00:23:55.420$ That's what happens.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:55.420 \longrightarrow 00:23:56.716$ What we were what about sex?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:23:56.720 \longrightarrow 00:23:58.588$ Are there sex differences?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:23:58.588 --> 00:23:59.989 So John EPP,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}23{:}59.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}01.325$ who's now an assistant professor

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:24:01.325 --> 00:24:02.393 at University of Calgary,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:02.400 \longrightarrow 00:24:04.308$ he was doing PhD with me at the time

 $00:24:04.308 \longrightarrow 00:24:06.607$ and I got her hands and some tissue from

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}24{:}06.607 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}08.660$ the Stanley Medical Research Foundation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:08.660 \longrightarrow 00:24:10.040$ So there are three groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:24:10.040 --> 00:24:11.522 non depressed individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:24:11.522 --> 00:24:13.498 depressed individuals that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:24:13.498 --> 00:24:14.980 prescribed antidepressants and

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:14.980 \longrightarrow 00:24:16.770$ depressed individuals that had psychotic

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:16.770 \longrightarrow 00:24:19.174$ symptoms as well and were prescribed

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:19.174 \longrightarrow 00:24:21.390$ both antidepressants and antipsychotics.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:21.390 \longrightarrow 00:24:23.806$ And he looked at these immature new neurons,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}24{:}23.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}25.150$ these double court and expressing

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:25.150 \longrightarrow 00:24:26.810$ cells that are right down there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:26.810 \longrightarrow 00:24:29.090$ and we didn't see any large

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:29.090 \longrightarrow 00:24:30.230$ differences in males.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:30.230 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.334$ Actually a little decrease

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:32.334 \longrightarrow 00:24:33.386$ with antipsychotics,

 $00:24:33.390 \longrightarrow 00:24:35.581$ but we did see that up regulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}24{:}35.581 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}37.510$ in females that were prescribed

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:24:37.510 --> 00:24:40.288 antidepressants and this actually kind of,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:40.290 \longrightarrow 00:24:41.320$ even though they're not that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:24:41.320 --> 00:24:42.144 many studies out there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:42.150 \longrightarrow 00:24:44.660$ but matches what people found

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:24:44.660 --> 00:24:47.170 in terms of hippocampal volume.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:24:47.170 --> 00:24:49.246 There's an increase in female responders,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:49.250 \longrightarrow 00:24:52.075$ not so much male responders

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:52.075 \longrightarrow 00:24:53.205$ to antidepressants.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:53.210 \longrightarrow 00:24:55.212$ And the neurogenesis effect that we saw

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:24:55.212 \longrightarrow 00:24:57.590$ here was only in the younger populations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}24{:}57.590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}59.132$ We didn't have enough power to

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}24{:}59.132 \longrightarrow 00{:}25{:}01.200$ look at age by sex interactions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:01.200 \longrightarrow 00:25:03.036$ But we saw that this aggregation

 $00:25:03.036 \longrightarrow 00:25:04.960$ was only in people that were

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:04.960 \longrightarrow 00:25:06.545$ younger than 50 or younger,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:06.550 \longrightarrow 00:25:08.080$ not in the older population,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:08.080 \longrightarrow 00:25:09.970$ which is the same thing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:09.970 \longrightarrow 00:25:11.710$ Paul Lucas and had found.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:25:11.710 --> 00:25:13.420 So hopefully what I've told you

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:13.420 \longrightarrow 00:25:16.070$ for this part of the talk is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:16.070 \longrightarrow 00:25:17.880$ sex differences in major depressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}25{:}17.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}20.298$ disorder go beyond prevalence of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:25:20.298 --> 00:25:22.288 disease to symptomology and biomarkers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}25{:}22.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}24.824$ and that it really needs to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:25:24.824 --> 00:25:27.362 considered and along with age,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}25{:}27.362 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}29.719$ treatment response, but also whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:29.719 \longrightarrow 00:25:32.257$ or not there are treatment naive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:32.260 \longrightarrow 00:25:34.690$ I want to pivot to talk about a new

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00{:}25{:}34.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}36.739$ model that we're thinking about.

 $00:25:36.740 \longrightarrow 00:25:38.917$ And this is negative kind of bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:38.920 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.951$ It's a kind of symptom of major

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:41.951 \longrightarrow 00:25:42.817$ depressive disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:25:42.820 --> 00:25:44.228 And what is it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:44.228 \longrightarrow 00:25:45.988$ It's an interpretation of ambiguous

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:45.988 \longrightarrow 00:25:47.479$ stimuli as being negative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

00:25:47.480 --> 00:25:48.756 So Doctor Travis Hodges,

NOTE Confidence: 0.7814706789

 $00:25:48.756 \longrightarrow 00:25:50.670$ who did a postdoc in my

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:25:50.744 --> 00:25:53.257 lab and is now an assistant professor

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}25{:}53.257 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}55.140$ at Mount Holyoke University,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:25:55.140 \longrightarrow 00:25:56.560$ he always uses this example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}25{:}56.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}59.536$ So some body could say to him that's an

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}25{:}59.536 \to 00{:}26{:}01.880$ interesting shirt you have on and if you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:01.880 \longrightarrow 00:26:03.696$ That you can interpret that in a negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:26:03.696 --> 00:26:05.765 way or if you're very a positive person,

00:26:05.770 --> 00:26:07.786 like you can see Travis's, you'd be like,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:07.786 \longrightarrow 00:26:08.746$ well, thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:26:08.750 --> 00:26:10.772 It is a very interesting shirt, isn't it?

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:26:10.772 --> 00:26:12.677 So people with major depressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:26:12.677 --> 00:26:14.675 disorder will have a negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:14.675 \longrightarrow 00:26:16.630$ bias to these ambiguous stimuli.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:16.630 \longrightarrow 00:26:18.522$ It's resistant to treatment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:26:18.522 --> 00:26:20.887 it predicts future depressive episodes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:20.890 \longrightarrow 00:26:23.590$ and it requires pattern separation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:23.590 \longrightarrow 00:26:25.024$ which I'm going to tell you

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}26{:}25.024 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}26.230$ about what that means now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:26.230 \longrightarrow 00:26:28.102$ So pattern separation or

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:28.102 \longrightarrow 00:26:29.974$ pattern discrimination is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}26{:}29.974 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}31.990$ ability to form distinct.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:31.990 \longrightarrow 00:26:34.562$ Representations of similar inputs

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:34.562 \longrightarrow 00:26:37.777$ during memory encoding and storage.

00:26:37.780 --> 00:26:41.660 So it's like trying to find the jar of peanut

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:41.749 \longrightarrow 00:26:45.197$ butter in a sea of similar looking jars.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:45.200 \longrightarrow 00:26:47.237$ And this is a scene that plays

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:26:47.237 --> 00:26:49.857 out in my household all the time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:26:49.860 --> 00:26:51.975 which is why we now have two peanut butters,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:51.980 \longrightarrow 00:26:53.037$ I think, he said the other day.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:53.040 \longrightarrow 00:26:54.900$ We don't have any prunes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:54.900 \longrightarrow 00:26:55.636$ And we had to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:26:55.636 --> 00:26:57.063 We actually had two and I bought

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}26{:}57.063 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}58.719$ another one because I believed him.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:26:58.720 \longrightarrow 00:27:01.220$ I should know better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:01.220 \longrightarrow 00:27:02.564$ It turns out that females and males

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}27{:}02.564 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}03.740$ pay attention to different cues.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:03.740 \longrightarrow 00:27:05.100$ And so sometimes you'll see

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:05.100 \longrightarrow 00:27:05.916$ females perform better,

 $00:27:05.920 \longrightarrow 00:27:07.467$ sometimes you'll see males or perform better.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:27:07.470 --> 00:27:09.780 And I'm happy to talk about that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:09.780 \longrightarrow 00:27:10.575$ that particular work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:27:10.575 --> 00:27:11.370 But right now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:11.370 \longrightarrow 00:27:12.914$ I'm going to talk to you about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:12.914 \longrightarrow 00:27:14.508$ kind of biased task we developed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:14.510 \longrightarrow 00:27:17.390$ So with similar ish inputs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:17.390 \longrightarrow 00:27:17.658$ one,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}27{:}17.658 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}20.070$ they had a context where they got shocked in,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:20.070 \longrightarrow 00:27:21.450$ another they didn't have a shock,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}27{:}21.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}24.708$ got shocked in and this was across 16 days.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:27:24.710 --> 00:27:27.212 And then on the 18th day Travis gave them

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:27.212 \longrightarrow 00:27:29.668$ what we're calling an ambiguous context.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:29.670 \longrightarrow 00:27:31.693$ So it had half the features of

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:31.693 \longrightarrow 00:27:33.563$ the shot context and half the

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:27:33.563 --> 00:27:35.447 features of the non shot context.

 $00:27:35.450 \longrightarrow 00:27:37.606$ And rats and mice will tell you

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:37.606 \longrightarrow 00:27:39.683$ if they remember fear the fearful

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:39.683 \longrightarrow 00:27:41.483$ context by freezing or that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:41.483 \longrightarrow 00:27:43.428$ one thing they can show you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:43.430 \longrightarrow 00:27:44.970$ And so we are interpreting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:44.970 \longrightarrow 00:27:47.265$ High freezing as a negative

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:47.265 \longrightarrow 00:27:49.560$ bias to this ambiguous context.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:49.560 \longrightarrow 00:27:50.580$ If they didn't have this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:50.580 \longrightarrow 00:27:52.176$ higher freezing levels would say they

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:52.176 \longrightarrow 00:27:54.597$ have a neutral or maybe even a positive bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:27:54.600 --> 00:27:56.133 And then Travis went on to look

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:27:56.133 \longrightarrow 00:27:57.540$ at a variety of biomarkers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:27:57.540 --> 00:27:59.604 including activity using the

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}27{:}59.604 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}02.184$ immediate early Gene C Fox.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:28:02.190 \longrightarrow 00:28:06.006$ And so first he looked across the lifespan,

 $00:28:06.010 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.175$ adolescence and adulthood at middle

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}28{:}08.175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}10.732$ age and we actually, to our surprise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:28:10.732 --> 00:28:12.650 didn't see any sex or age difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:28:12.703 --> 00:28:13.528 in that pattern.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:28:13.530 \longrightarrow 00:28:16.188$ Discrimination in terms of their ability

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}28{:}16.188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}18.849$ to discriminate between those two contexts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:28:18.850 \longrightarrow 00:28:21.238$ Where we started to see some

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:28:21.238 \longrightarrow 00:28:23.250$ differences was with negative bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}28{:}23.250 \longrightarrow 00{:}28{:}25.818$ So this is the freezing basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:28:25.818 --> 00:28:27.530 to the ambiguous context.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}28{:}27.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}31.044$ And in males we saw as lifetime

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:28:31.044 \longrightarrow 00:28:32.550$ as life progressed.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:28:32.550 \longrightarrow 00:28:32.954$ Age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:28:32.954 \longrightarrow 00:28:34.166$ As they aged,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

00:28:34.166 --> 00:28:36.186 I showed more negative bias,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}28{:}36.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}38.020$ and I really wanted to subtitle

 $00:28:38.020 \longrightarrow 00:28:39.550$ this as grumpy old men,

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00{:}28{:}39.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}41.560$ but the reviewers and Travis

NOTE Confidence: 0.856535137142857

 $00:28:41.560 \longrightarrow 00:28:43.570$ wouldn't let me do it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:28:43.570 \longrightarrow 00:28:45.200$ Females you see this upregulation

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:28:45.200 \longrightarrow 00:28:47.529$ when it starts to come down again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:28:47.530 --> 00:28:50.008 and the only time you see significant

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:28:50.008 --> 00:28:51.830 sex differences in middle age.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}28{:}51.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}54.889$ But that's in under normal basal situations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:28:54.890 \longrightarrow 00:28:59.058$ What happens in an animal model of stress?

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:28:59.060 \longrightarrow 00:29:00.840$ So using chronic unpredictable stress

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}29{:}00.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}03.130$ paradigm in both males and females,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:03.130 \longrightarrow 00:29:05.188$ we found an increase in negative bias

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}29{:}05.188 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}06.880$ which may be you'd expect to see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:06.880 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.752$ Now a lot of labs I know would stop.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:08.760 \longrightarrow 00:29:09.790$ It's there's no sex difference.

00:29:09.790 --> 00:29:11.473 I'm just going to use males from now on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:29:11.480 --> 00:29:14.060 but we're not that lap.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:14.060 \longrightarrow 00:29:16.859$ And and look at what you can see when

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:16.859 \longrightarrow 00:29:19.680$ you don't assume that it's the same.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:19.680 \longrightarrow 00:29:21.600$ So this is what we're calling

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:29:21.600 --> 00:29:22.240 functional connectivity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:22.240 \longrightarrow 00:29:23.026$ There's like CFOs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:29:23.026 --> 00:29:25.186 I know this is really confusing, but I

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}29{:}25.186 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}27.237$ think you'll see some patterns right away.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:27.240 \longrightarrow 00:29:28.956$ There are 15 different brain regions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:28.960 \longrightarrow 00:29:30.658$ This activity in each brain region

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:30.658 \longrightarrow 00:29:32.370$ and then correlated with each other.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:32.370 \longrightarrow 00:29:35.789$ These are only correlations of .5 or above.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}29{:}35.789 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}38.387$ Absolute value of .5 or five.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667 00:29:38.390 --> 00:29:39.400 Red lines, NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:39.400 \longrightarrow 00:29:40.410$ positive correlations,

 $00:29:40.410 \longrightarrow 00:29:42.430$ blue lines negative correlations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:42.430 \longrightarrow 00:29:44.008$ And hopefully what you can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:29:44.008 --> 00:29:45.443 right away is sometimes you'll

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:45.443 \longrightarrow 00:29:46.767$ see a negative correlation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:29:46.770 --> 00:29:48.942 Females very strong as so the

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:48.942 \longrightarrow 00:29:51.357$ thickness will say how large they are

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:51.357 \longrightarrow 00:29:54.009$ and a positive in males or a very -,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}29{:}54.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}57.070$ 1 in males and non existent one in females.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:57.070 \longrightarrow 00:29:59.240$ So what this suggests to us is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:29:59.240 \longrightarrow 00:30:00.760$ The neural representation of

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:30:00.760 --> 00:30:02.660 negative cognitive biases is very

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:30:02.660 --> 00:30:04.357 different in males versus females,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}30{:}04.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}06.376$ so if you're trying to treat this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}30{:}06.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}08.744$ you can imagine you're going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:08.744 \longrightarrow 00:30:10.320$ get some different responses.

00:30:10.320 --> 00:30:13.140 He also looked at inflammatory signaling,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:30:13.140 --> 00:30:14.940 and in the basolateral amygdala,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:14.940 \longrightarrow 00:30:17.334$ he found that for a variety of

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:30:17.334 --> 00:30:18.360 prone flammatory cytokines,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:18.360 \longrightarrow 00:30:22.206$ females had an upregulation, males didn't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667 00:30:22.210 --> 00:30:23.466 At all. NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667 00:30:23.466 --> 00:30:24.722 So again, NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:24.722 \longrightarrow 00:30:26.606$ completely different representation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:30:26.610 --> 00:30:28.368 Of course, we looked at neurogenesis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:28.370 \longrightarrow 00:30:29.298$ our bread and butter,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}30{:}29.298 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}31.017$ and what we found for both males

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:31.017 \longrightarrow 00:30:32.387$ and females is with chronic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:30:32.390 --> 00:30:33.260 unpredictable stress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:33.260 \longrightarrow 00:30:35.870$ there was a decrease in neurogenesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:30:35.870 --> 00:30:38.126 But when we did correlations with

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}30{:}38.126 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}40.210$ freezing to the ambiguous context,

 $00:30:40.210 \longrightarrow 00:30:42.712$ we actually only saw a correlation

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667 00:30:42.712 --> 00:30:43.963 in the males,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:30:43.970 --> 00:30:45.270 a significant correlation in males,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:45.270 \longrightarrow 00:30:46.722$ but not in females.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:46.722 \longrightarrow 00:30:49.773$ So what this suggests to us is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:49.773 \longrightarrow 00:30:52.149$ using this negative kind of bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:30:52.150 --> 00:30:53.575 Has different representation

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:53.575 \longrightarrow 00:30:55.475$ and females versus males.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:55.480 \longrightarrow 00:30:57.524$ We see more of a tie to

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:30:57.524 \longrightarrow 00:30:58.400$ neuroinflammation and females,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}30{:}58.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}00.208$ perhaps neuroplasticity in males

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}31{:}00.208 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}02.468$ and for sure different neuronal

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}31{:}02.468 \mathrel{--}{>} 00{:}31{:}04.159$ networks that are activated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:31:04.160 --> 00:31:08.108 And actually in the human data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:31:08.108 --> 00:31:09.593 and this is Marianne Stanley's

00:31:09.593 --> 00:31:10.678 working at Chen Sibil,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}31{:}10.680 \to 00{:}31{:}12.374$ they've shown some of the same kinds

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00{:}31{:}12.374 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}13.942$ of things in their transcriptomic

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:31:13.942 \longrightarrow 00:31:15.127$ signatures as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:31:15.130 \longrightarrow 00:31:19.150$ that there seems to be maybe not like

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:31:19.150 \longrightarrow 00:31:20.860$ completely separate neuroinflammation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:31:20.860 --> 00:31:21.227 neuroplasticity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:31:21.227 --> 00:31:23.429 but that goes in opposite directions

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:31:23.429 \longrightarrow 00:31:25.000$ between males and females.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:31:25.000 --> 00:31:27.534 So that's why I think it's so

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:31:27.534 \longrightarrow 00:31:29.688$ important to continue to study this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667 00:31:29.690 --> 00:31:30.095 Now,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:31:30.095 \longrightarrow 00:31:32.930$ I want to totally not totally switch

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:31:32.930 \longrightarrow 00:31:35.926$ gears like so we know that depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:31:35.926 \longrightarrow 00:31:38.810$ is seen in females compared to males,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

 $00:31:38.810 \longrightarrow 00:31:40.138$ more females and males.

00:31:40.138 --> 00:31:42.890 That should really give us to think that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.75482837416666700:31:42.890 --> 00:31:43.252 sorry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:31:43.252 --> 00:31:45.786 that we should look at some female

NOTE Confidence: 0.754828374166667

00:31:45.786 --> 00:31:46.510 specific factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:31:46.510 \longrightarrow 00:31:49.456$ And I put some common ones up there and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:31:49.456 \longrightarrow 00:31:51.458$ we know there's good evidence to show

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:31:51.458 \longrightarrow 00:31:53.815$ that all of these factors can influence

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}31{:}53.815 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}56.110$ the risk for major depressive disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}31{:}56.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}58.399$ But I'm going to talk about pregnancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}31{:}58.399 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}00.149$ and postpartum and before I do.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}32{:}00.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}02.200$ Let's talk about estrogens again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:02.200 \longrightarrow 00:32:05.050$ one of my favorite hormones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:05.050 \dashrightarrow 00:32:06.866$ So I showed you the first graph already,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:06.870 \longrightarrow 00:32:09.215$ right this I said ohl reproductive hormones.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:09.220 \longrightarrow 00:32:11.140$ So that suggests the estrogens and

 $00:32:11.140 \longrightarrow 00:32:12.745$ ovarian hormones are associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:32:12.745 --> 00:32:14.320 a risk to develop depression, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}32{:}14.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}15.720$ You look at that graph and that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:15.720 \longrightarrow 00:32:16.410$ what you think.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:16.410 \longrightarrow 00:32:19.354$ But actually when you think about once a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:19.354 \dashrightarrow 00:32:22.205$ greatest time of rest to develop denovo

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:22.205 \longrightarrow 00:32:24.250$ depression and a female's lifetime

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:32:24.319 --> 00:32:26.531 and that's during postmenopausal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}32{:}26.531 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}28.743$ period and during perimenopause.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:28.750 \longrightarrow 00:32:30.952$ And in fact these periods are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}32{:}30.952 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}32.868$ actually associated with a fluctuation

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:32.868 \longrightarrow 00:32:34.778$ or a decrease in these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:34.780 \longrightarrow 00:32:35.530$ Variant hormones,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}32{:}35.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}37.780$ so I'm going to use postpartum.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:37.780 \longrightarrow 00:32:39.044$ I'm going to talk about a style because,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:39.050 \longrightarrow 00:32:39.738$ again, it's my favorite.

00:32:39.738 --> 00:32:41.310 I know I'm not supposed to have favorites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:32:41.310 --> 00:32:44.249 but it's not my children, so it's fine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:32:44.250 --> 00:32:45.864 At Week 20,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:45.864 \longrightarrow 00:32:49.630$ Australia levels are 200 times normal levels.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:49.630 \longrightarrow 00:32:50.671$ At week 30,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:32:50.671 --> 00:32:53.100 they're 300 times normal levels and they

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:53.175 \longrightarrow 00:32:55.845$ climb even more dramatically after that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:55.850 \longrightarrow 00:32:57.420$ And then what happens with

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:32:57.420 \longrightarrow 00:32:58.990$ the expulsion of the placenta?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:32:58.990 --> 00:33:00.474 People are hypogonadal during

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:00.474 \longrightarrow 00:33:01.587$ this time period,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:01.590 \longrightarrow 00:33:04.985$ so that's been thought of as a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}33{:}04.985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}07.970$ possible risk factor for depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:33:07.970 --> 00:33:10.130 I'm sure many of you are thinking on

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:33:10.130 --> 00:33:11.990 that's weird because I see all these

00:33:11.990 --> 00:33:13.683 images in the media of pregnancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}33{:}13.683 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}15.518$ and how glamorous and a mazing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:15.520 \longrightarrow 00:33:17.840$ It is, and it's just wonderful, amazing time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:17.840 \longrightarrow 00:33:20.760$ And I'm going to blame Demi Moore because

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:20.830 \longrightarrow 00:33:22.979$ most of you were not born in 1991.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:22.979 \longrightarrow 00:33:25.002$ But she posed on the cover of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:33:25.002 --> 00:33:26.200 Vanity Fair magazine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:33:26.200 --> 00:33:27.285 And I don't know if the older

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:27.285 \longrightarrow 00:33:28.440$ people in the audience remember,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:28.440 \longrightarrow 00:33:29.950$ but this was like a huge, big deal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}33{:}29.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}31.720$ This was like, so like, Oh my God,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:31.720 \longrightarrow 00:33:33.184$ she said it's outrageous.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:33.184 \longrightarrow 00:33:34.648$ She's pregnant and naked.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:33:34.650 --> 00:33:36.708 But now look, like at the Grammys,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:33:36.710 --> 00:33:39.130 you see the amazing Beyoncé,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:39.130 \longrightarrow 00:33:40.057$ pregnant and naked.

 $00{:}33{:}40.057 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}42.563$ But I thought I'd share with you the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:42.563 \longrightarrow 00:33:45.029$ worst picture of me ever taken in my life.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:45.030 \longrightarrow 00:33:49.350$ And this is to prove a point that it is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725 00:33:49.350 --> 00:33:49.793 yeah, NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:33:49.793 --> 00:33:51.122 it's a point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:51.122 \longrightarrow 00:33:52.008$ all right,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:33:52.010 \longrightarrow 00:33:54.668$ that it takes a tremendous toll

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:33:54.668 --> 00:33:58.051 on a person's body to just state

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}33{:}58.051 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}00.075$ that parasite penny fetus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:00.080 \longrightarrow 00:34:03.100$ Pulmonary output decreases by 50%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}34{:}03.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}05.164$ Cardiac output increases by

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:05.164 \longrightarrow 00:34:06.649$ 50% for extra fluid.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}34{:}06.649 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}08.910$ Liters of fluid are pumped through a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:08.980 \longrightarrow 00:34:11.180$ person's body when they're pregnant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:11.180 \longrightarrow 00:34:13.742$ and so it's not super surprising

 $00:34:13.742 \longrightarrow 00:34:16.848$ that there might be some health

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}34{:}16.848 {\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}}{\:\raisebox{--}{\text{--}}} 00{:}34{:}18.819$ repercussions for pregnancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}34{:}18.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}21.058$ And in fact we boy cotters coined

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:21.058 \longrightarrow 00:34:23.600$ this as a perfect storm for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:23.600 \longrightarrow 00:34:26.510$ depression because a number of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:26.510 \longrightarrow 00:34:28.576$ so-called biological outcomes or

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00{:}34{:}28.576 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}34{:}31.116$ biomarkers with pregnancy and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:31.116 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.630$ postpartum mirror that of what you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:33.630 \longrightarrow 00:34:35.280$ see in major depressive disorder.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:35.280 \longrightarrow 00:34:38.206$ So volume decreases in the hippocampus and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

00:34:38.206 --> 00:34:43.430 this is some work by the not by maxima.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:43.430 \longrightarrow 00:34:46.010$ The stress system is also perturbed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:46.010 \longrightarrow 00:34:47.950$ increased levels of cortisol impairments

NOTE Confidence: 0.8261995725

 $00:34:47.950 \longrightarrow 00:34:49.890$ and negative feedback as pro

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:34:49.947 --> 00:34:51.522 inflammatory towards the end of

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:34:51.522 \longrightarrow 00:34:53.687$ pregnancy and you see up regulations

00:34:53.687 --> 00:34:55.289 and tryptophan metabolism,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}34{:}55.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}57.985$ all of these same kind of biological

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:34:57.985 \longrightarrow 00:35:01.940$ outcomes you see with depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:01.940 \longrightarrow 00:35:05.398$ The DSM 5 does not recognize perinatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:05.398 \dashrightarrow 00:35:07.760$ depression as something different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:07.760 \longrightarrow 00:35:08.876$ It's a specifier,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:08.876 \longrightarrow 00:35:11.480$ but it describes it as depression during

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:35:11.548 --> 00:35:14.180 gestation or up to four weeks postpartum.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}35{:}14.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}16.420$ But if you look a little bit carefully

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:16.420 \longrightarrow 00:35:18.865$ at what who's getting depression during

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:35:18.865 --> 00:35:21.135 pregnancy versus in the postpartum,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:21.140 \longrightarrow 00:35:23.420$ it's actually could be quite different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}35{:}23.420 --> 00{:}35{:}24.659$ So Munk, Olsen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:24.659 \longrightarrow 00:35:27.137$ Showed that for first time admission

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:27.137 \longrightarrow 00:35:30.176$ to hospital with any mental disorder,

00:35:30.180 --> 00:35:32.160 not just major depressive disorder,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}35{:}32.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}35.044$ it's actually a lower risk during pregnancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:35.050 \longrightarrow 00:35:36.514$ First time admission, OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:35:36.514 --> 00:35:39.164 But in the postpartum you see much

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:39.164 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.450$ higher levels or much greater risk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:41.450 \longrightarrow 00:35:43.304$ And it turns out that depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:43.304 \longrightarrow 00:35:44.952$ onset during pregnancy is associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:44.952 \longrightarrow 00:35:46.727$ with a history of depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:35:46.730 --> 00:35:48.514 Depression onset postpartum is

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:48.514 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.744$ associated with the Novo Depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}35{:}50.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}53.048$ So we were really interested in

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:35:53.048 --> 00:35:55.450 modeling that de Novo depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:35:55.450 --> 00:35:56.896 And we have two different models,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:56.900 \longrightarrow 00:35:59.428$ one of them that we work on more now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:35:59.428 \longrightarrow 00:36:01.192$ But I'll tell you a little

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:01.192 \longrightarrow 00:36:02.679$ bit about both of them.

 $00:36:02.680 \longrightarrow 00:36:04.540$ So hormonal withdrawal after pregnancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:04.540 \longrightarrow 00:36:06.478$ So we just wanted to model

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:36:06.480 --> 00:36:07.496 pregnant a rodent pregnancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667 00:36:07.496 --> 00:36:08.258 in this case, NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:36:08.260 --> 00:36:09.885 very high levels of estrogens

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:09.885 \longrightarrow 00:36:10.535$ and progesterone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:36:10.540 --> 00:36:12.437 And then we withdrew them very quickly

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:12.437 \longrightarrow 00:36:14.138$ from these hormones and what happened?

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:14.140 \dashrightarrow 00:36:15.556$ And we published this a long time ago,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:36:15.560 --> 00:36:16.436 although Laura Bean,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}36{:}16.436 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}17.896$ this group's been showing some,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:17.900 \longrightarrow 00:36:20.068$ I think she's got actually two papers out

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}36{:}20.068 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}22.047$ now showing some very similar findings.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:22.050 \longrightarrow 00:36:25.362$ What we found is that this this increased the

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:25.362 \longrightarrow 00:36:28.028$ expression of depressive like endophenotypes,

 $00:36:28.030 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.985$ so increased passive coping and

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}36{:}29.985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}31.940$ the forced swim test decreases.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:31.940 \longrightarrow 00:36:35.738$ Sucrose preference is akin to anodontia

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:35.738 \longrightarrow 00:36:37.637$ and decreased neuroplasticity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:37.640 \longrightarrow 00:36:40.142$ This is very similar to what's

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:40.142 \longrightarrow 00:36:41.393$ seen in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:36:41.400 --> 00:36:43.990 So Rubino's Group has looked at a

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:43.990 \longrightarrow 00:36:45.515$ hormone simulated pregnancy and

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:36:45.515 --> 00:36:47.591 people with a history of postpartum

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:36:47.591 --> 00:36:50.235 depression or not and seeing an up

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}36{:}50.235 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}52.160$ regulation in these depressive symptoms.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:52.160 \longrightarrow 00:36:54.134$ And the individuals that had postpartum

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:54.134 \dashrightarrow 00:36:56.206$ depression and VBA for Garger didn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:36:56.206 --> 00:36:58.306 give a hormone stimulated pregnancy or

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:36:58.306 \longrightarrow 00:37:00.340$ withdraw from home simulate pregnancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:00.340 \longrightarrow 00:37:02.416$ She just withdrew them from ovarian

 $00:37:02.416 \longrightarrow 00:37:05.457$ hormones using a GNRH agonist and you can

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:05.457 \dashrightarrow 00:37:07.447$ see a slight statistically significant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:07.450 \longrightarrow 00:37:11.300$ Increase in Hamilton depression scores.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:11.300 \longrightarrow 00:37:13.379$ Viper's gone on to show that this

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}37{:}13.379 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}14.969$ increase in Hamilton Depression scores

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:14.969 \longrightarrow 00:37:17.202$ was related to the amount of decrease

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:17.202 \longrightarrow 00:37:19.761$ in estradiol and related to an increase

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:37:19.761 --> 00:37:21.673 in functional connectivity to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:21.673 \longrightarrow 00:37:24.391$ amygdala and a decrease in functional

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:24.391 \longrightarrow 00:37:26.720$ connectivity to the hippocampus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:26.720 \longrightarrow 00:37:28.240$ So hopefully what this clearly

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:28.240 \longrightarrow 00:37:30.543$ shows you from this work is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}37{:}30.543 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}32.363$ with drawal from a variant hormones

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:32.363 \longrightarrow 00:37:34.152$ can increase depressive symptoms in

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:37:34.152 --> 00:37:36.054 both younger women and in rodents,

 $00:37:36.060 \longrightarrow 00:37:37.360$ which suggests that ovarian

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}37{:}37.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}38.660$ hormones are providing some.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667 00:37:38.660 --> 00:37:40.740 Resilience. NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:37:40.740 --> 00:37:41.538 Now Rand Eade,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:41.538 \longrightarrow 00:37:44.170$ who did her PhD in my lab and is

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:44.170 \longrightarrow 00:37:46.252$ now doing a postdoc with Kieran

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

00:37:46.252 --> 00:37:47.879 O'Donnell and Rose Baggott,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:47.880 \longrightarrow 00:37:49.655$ really was interested in this

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}37{:}49.655 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}51.075$ sort of perimenopausal period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:51.080 \longrightarrow 00:37:54.000$ And So what she did here was overact,

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00{:}37{:}54.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}56.785$ demonized or did not recognize

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:37:56.785 \longrightarrow 00:38:00.453$ sham surgery to these sort of

NOTE Confidence: 0.802580971666667

 $00:38:00.453 \longrightarrow 00:38:02.799$ quasi perimenopausal females.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00{:}38{:}02.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}05.320$ And then she gave six weeks of chronic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:05.320 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.018$ unpredictable stress.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:06.018 \longrightarrow 00:38:08.112$ Now she did that because three

 $00:38:08.112 \longrightarrow 00:38:09.889$ weeks will increase these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:38:09.889 --> 00:38:11.419 depressive like endophenotypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:11.420 \longrightarrow 00:38:13.135$ We wanted to mirror what

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:13.135 \longrightarrow 00:38:14.507$ might happen in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:14.510 \longrightarrow 00:38:16.662$ You present with depressive

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:38:16.662 --> 00:38:17.738 like endophenotypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:17.740 \longrightarrow 00:38:21.310$ You're given an antidepressant like an SSRI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:21.310 \longrightarrow 00:38:23.648$ Fluoxetine is the one that we chose,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:23.650 \longrightarrow 00:38:24.866$ better known as Prozac.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:24.866 \longrightarrow 00:38:27.185$ And then she looked at a variety

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:27.185 \longrightarrow 00:38:29.345$ of behaviors and neural outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00{:}38{:}29.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}30.854$ And I'm going to show you a graph

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00{:}38{:}30.854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}32.088$ that's going to look really busy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00{:}38{:}32.090 \to 00{:}38{:}33.746$ but it's like the clearest data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:33.750 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.868$ I think, that we've ever had.

 $00:38:35.870 \longrightarrow 00:38:37.420$ The pale green bars are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:38:37.420 --> 00:38:38.350 their overactive mized,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:38.350 \longrightarrow 00:38:40.950$ so removal of ovarian hormones

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:40.950 \longrightarrow 00:38:42.322$ and it didn't matter.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:42.322 \longrightarrow 00:38:44.380$ That behavior we looked at passive

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:44.448 \longrightarrow 00:38:46.779$ coping and the four swim test sucrose,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:46.780 \longrightarrow 00:38:47.263$ anhedonia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:47.263 \longrightarrow 00:38:49.195$ sucrose preference over atomized

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00{:}38{:}49.195 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}51.127$ group showed this greater

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:38:51.127 --> 00:38:52.820 depressive like endophenotype,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:52.820 \longrightarrow 00:38:54.398$ so more anxiety.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:38:54.398 --> 00:38:58.460 And we also looked at negative feedback HP,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:38:58.460 --> 00:38:59.228 a negative feedback.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:38:59.228 \longrightarrow 00:39:01.759$ And the way we did this is by using

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:01.759 \longrightarrow 00:39:03.449$ a dexamethasone suppression test you

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:03.449 \longrightarrow 00:39:05.387$ have a synthetic glucocorticoid that

 $00:39:05.387 \longrightarrow 00:39:07.967$ should shut down release of corticosterone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:07.970 \dashrightarrow 00:39:09.690$ the main glucocorticoid and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:09.690 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.840$ rodents and it's sort of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:11.840 \longrightarrow 00:39:13.264$ That was in the Shams you can see,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:39:13.270 --> 00:39:14.495 but in the over recognized

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:14.495 \longrightarrow 00:39:15.230$ group that overshoots.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:15.230 \longrightarrow 00:39:16.895$ So we see an impairment

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:16.895 \longrightarrow 00:39:17.894$ and negative feedback.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:39:17.900 --> 00:39:20.581 Now we have this idea that fluoxetine

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:20.581 \longrightarrow 00:39:23.259$ would have different outcomes depending on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:39:23.260 --> 00:39:24.298 I have a really nice coat,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:24.300 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.820$ but I took it out because it takes too long.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:39:25.820 --> 00:39:27.450 But anyway I didn't work.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:27.450 \longrightarrow 00:39:30.636$ So we didn't see any difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:30.636 \longrightarrow 00:39:33.485$ in the efficacy of fluoxetine

 $00:39:33.485 \longrightarrow 00:39:36.880$ based on the based on the hormonal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:36.880 \longrightarrow 00:39:38.440$ background of the females.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:39:38.440 --> 00:39:40.800 But we actually didn't see efficacy at all,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:40.800 \longrightarrow 00:39:42.816$ at least in terms of the behavior.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:42.820 \longrightarrow 00:39:45.340$ The only time we saw efficacy was in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:39:45.340 --> 00:39:47.209 this endocrine and neurochemistry,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:47.210 \longrightarrow 00:39:47.890$ not just show you that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:47.890 \longrightarrow 00:39:48.784$ Looking out here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:48.784 \longrightarrow 00:39:50.572$ you see that flat response here

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:50.572 \longrightarrow 00:39:52.140$ in the sham individuals?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:52.140 \longrightarrow 00:39:53.036$ In the obex individuals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:53.036 \longrightarrow 00:39:54.380$ it does come down a bit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:54.380 \longrightarrow 00:39:55.792$ but it's still overshooting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:55.792 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.910$ So even with the longer term

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:57.977 \longrightarrow 00:39:59.589$ withdrawal from a variant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:39:59.590 \longrightarrow 00:40:01.615$ home owners in combination with

00:40:01.615 --> 00:40:03.235 stress increases the expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:40:03.235 --> 00:40:05.610 of depressive like anathema types.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:05.610 \longrightarrow 00:40:07.612$ And we found that the efficacy of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:07.612 \longrightarrow 00:40:09.451$ fluoxetine was limited to neural and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:09.451 \longrightarrow 00:40:10.679$ endocrine outcomes very different

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:10.679 \longrightarrow 00:40:12.781$ than what we see in terms of male

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:12.781 \longrightarrow 00:40:14.282$ outcome even in our own lab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:14.282 \longrightarrow 00:40:16.886$ But I would say that this also

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:16.886 \longrightarrow 00:40:19.018$ suggested a variant hormones

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:40:19.018 --> 00:40:20.968 provide some resilience.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:20.970 \longrightarrow 00:40:23.283$ So I want to talk in the last few

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00{:}40{:}23.283 \rightarrow 00{:}40{:}25.549$ minutes about the second model we have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00{:}40{:}25.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}27.130$ So hormone with drawal after birth

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00{:}40{:}27.130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}29.686$ is to mimic that de Novo depression

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:40:29.686 --> 00:40:31.395 right after pregnancy, right,

 $00:40:31.395 \longrightarrow 00:40:33.465$ because we're withdrawing right away looking.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00{:}40{:}33.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}35.325$ But we were also interested in later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:35.330 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.810$ like maybe three months later,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:36.810 \longrightarrow 00:40:38.990$ that kind of time period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:38.990 \longrightarrow 00:40:41.354$ And also this is really the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:41.354 \longrightarrow 00:40:42.930$ brainchild of Suzanne Vermette.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:42.930 \longrightarrow 00:40:44.746$ I would keep forgetting which mouse to use.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:40:44.750 --> 00:40:45.083 Remote,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00{:}40{:}45.083 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}46.415$ who's an associate professor

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:40:46.415 --> 00:40:47.747 at Wayne State University,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:47.750 \longrightarrow 00:40:48.430$ she came to the lab.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:40:48.430 --> 00:40:50.870 She's like, I don't like your model because.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

00:40:50.870 --> 00:40:52.120 They're not actually giving birth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:52.120 \longrightarrow 00:40:53.455$ and that's Fairpoint.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8741944125

 $00:40:53.455 \longrightarrow 00:40:56.570$ So we came up with this model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:40:56.570 \longrightarrow 00:40:58.110$ which I'll tell you in a second

00:40:58.110 --> 00:40:59.697 because I forgot this was coming up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00{:}40{:}59.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}01.815$ But I'm glad we came up with the model

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:41:01.815 --> 00:41:03.836 because 15 years later somebody showed us,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:03.840 \longrightarrow 00:41:05.700$ hey, this is a good model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:05.700 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.544$ So this is looking at cortisol

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:08.544 \longrightarrow 00:41:12.264$ levels on postpartum week 6IN humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:41:12.264 --> 00:41:16.314 And this is people that had

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:41:16.314 --> 00:41:17.628 depressive symptoms postpartum

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00{:}41{:}17.628 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}19.380$ versus depressive symptoms that

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:19.438 \longrightarrow 00:41:21.458$ occurred before or during pregnancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:21.460 \longrightarrow 00:41:22.753$ Versus healthy controls.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:22.753 \longrightarrow 00:41:25.339$ And it's only those individuals that

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00{:}41{:}25.339 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}27.928$ showed postpartum depression postpartum,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:27.930 \longrightarrow 00:41:29.530$ sort of postpartum depression postpartum,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857 00:41:29.530 --> 00:41:29.960 yeah, you, NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857 00:41:29.960 --> 00:41:31.465 I think you understand what I'm saying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:41:31.470 --> 00:41:33.810 Only those with postpartum symptoms

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:33.810 \longrightarrow 00:41:36.150$ that started onset postpartum that

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:36.216 \longrightarrow 00:41:38.688$ show these higher levels of cortisol.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:38.690 \longrightarrow 00:41:40.740$ That's good because our model

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:41:40.740 --> 00:41:42.790 involves having a normal pregnancy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:41:42.790 --> 00:41:43.518 normal birth,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:43.518 \longrightarrow 00:41:44.974$ and getting really high

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:41:44.974 --> 00:41:46.066 levels of corticosterone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:46.070 \longrightarrow 00:41:49.180$ which again is the main

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00{:}41{:}49.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}51.046$ glucocorticoid for rodents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:51.050 \longrightarrow 00:41:53.770$ And we looked at eternal care and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:53.770 \longrightarrow 00:41:56.813$ force from test and N plasticity and we

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:56.813 \longrightarrow 00:41:59.480$ see these depressive like endophenotypes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:41:59.480 \longrightarrow 00:42:01.344$ So we see a reduction in maternal care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:01.350 \longrightarrow 00:42:02.638$ And I'm going to show you the

 $00:42:02.638 \longrightarrow 00:42:03.470$ rest of the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00{:}42{:}03.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}05.761$ So you'll see it in just a second and

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:05.761 \longrightarrow 00:42:09.067$ then we will give concurrent fluoxetine

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:09.070 \longrightarrow 00:42:10.650$ and it restores maternal care.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:10.650 \longrightarrow 00:42:12.694$ But what does it do to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:12.694 \longrightarrow 00:42:14.800$ rest of the endophenotypes?

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:14.800 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.900$ So you can see the answer right there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:42:17.900 --> 00:42:19.140 It doesn't rescue it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00{:}42{:}19.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}20.690$ so here's a postpartum court.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:20.690 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.462$ These are really high levels of

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:23.462 \longrightarrow 00:42:25.310$ corticosterone and increases passive

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:25.386 \longrightarrow 00:42:27.360$ coping in the four swim test.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:27.360 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.356$ The Hatch bars here are given fluoxetine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:30.360 \longrightarrow 00:42:31.512$ It doesn't help.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:42:31.512 --> 00:42:33.708 In fact, it makes things worse.

 $00:42:33.708 \longrightarrow 00:42:35.850$ It was a significant effect to

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:35.924 \longrightarrow 00:42:37.844$ worsen symptoms with fluoxetine

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:37.844 \longrightarrow 00:42:39.764$ in the postpartum period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:42:39.770 --> 00:42:41.202 In terms of neurogenesis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:41.202 \longrightarrow 00:42:43.350$ again the dark Gray bars here

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:43.420 \longrightarrow 00:42:45.308$ are the corticosterone group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:45.310 \longrightarrow 00:42:47.530$ reduction in neurogenesis and both

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:47.530 \longrightarrow 00:42:49.306$ dorsal and ventral hippocampus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:49.310 \longrightarrow 00:42:51.560$ and these hash bars are the

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:51.560 \longrightarrow 00:42:52.685$ fluoxetine treated group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:52.690 \longrightarrow 00:42:54.146$ And you can see it's not restoring it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:54.150 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.670$ It should increase neuroplasticity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:42:55.670 --> 00:42:57.950 It does outside of the postpartum,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:42:57.950 \longrightarrow 00:42:58.628$ does in males,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:42:58.628 --> 00:43:00.610 it does outside of the postpartum in females,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00{:}43{:}00.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}02.354$ but during the postpartum

 $00:43:02.354 \longrightarrow 00:43:04.970$ period it doesn't do its job.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:04.970 \longrightarrow 00:43:07.628$ So we've tried citrulline as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:07.630 \longrightarrow 00:43:08.992$ Neither one of them are efficacious

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:08.992 \longrightarrow 00:43:10.740$ in the long term, so we wondered,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:43:10.740 --> 00:43:11.860 why might this be?

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:11.860 \longrightarrow 00:43:13.981$ And I want to chew who's who

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:43:13.981 --> 00:43:15.770 did a PhD in my lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:43:15.770 --> 00:43:16.940 looked at a variety of things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00{:}43{:}16.940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}18.476$ and I just want you to pay attention

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00{:}43{:}18.476 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}19.741$ to the information because that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:19.741 \longrightarrow 00:43:21.409$ what I'm going to talk about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00{:}43{:}21.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}22.706$ But we can talk about the other part.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:43:22.710 --> 00:43:24.636 Just looked at some serotonin markers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00{:}43{:}24.640 \to 00{:}43{:}26.075$ Those seem to be perturbed as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:26.080 \longrightarrow 00:43:28.950$ That might be another Ave to go.

00:43:28.950 --> 00:43:31.660 In terms of hippocampal inflammation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00{:}43{:}31.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}34.236$ the pink bars or the court treated animals,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:34.240 \longrightarrow 00:43:36.075$ hatched bars are also those

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:36.075 \longrightarrow 00:43:37.176$ fluoxetine treated animals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:37.180 \longrightarrow 00:43:39.340$ It didn't matter when we gave

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:39.340 \longrightarrow 00:43:40.780$ them fluoxetine that upregulated

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:40.845 \longrightarrow 00:43:42.585$ IL 1 beta and the hippocampus.

NOTE Confidence: 0.84254672714285700:43:42.590 --> 00:43:46.319 So that that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:43:46.320 --> 00:43:47.400 To this route,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:47.400 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.680$ because Siad at all in 2018

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

00:43:49.680 --> 00:43:52.560 had shown that for a variety

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:52.560 \longrightarrow 00:43:54.000$ of inflammatory markers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:54.000 \longrightarrow 00:43:56.604$ there was an increase in non

NOTE Confidence: 0.842546727142857

 $00:43:56.604 \longrightarrow 00:43:59.256$ responders and so and also in IL 1 beta.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:43:59.260 \longrightarrow 00:44:01.192$ So we thought if we could

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:01.192 \longrightarrow 00:44:03.260$ block the actions of IL 1 beta,

 $00:44:03.260 \longrightarrow 00:44:05.060$ could we improve antidepressant

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:05.060 \longrightarrow 00:44:06.860$ efficacy in the postpartum.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:06.860 \longrightarrow 00:44:10.596$ And we did this using Anakinra and Romina.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:44:10.600 --> 00:44:13.360 Garcia de Leon is doing a PhD in my lab

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:13.430 \longrightarrow 00:44:16.190$ and she's looking at perineuronal Nets.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:44:16.190 --> 00:44:18.724 Now playing around on Nets are an

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:18.724 \longrightarrow 00:44:20.393$ extracellular structure that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:20.393 \longrightarrow 00:44:21.968$ associated with neuroplasticity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:21.970 \longrightarrow 00:44:24.620$ More of these perineuronal Nets

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:44:24.620 --> 00:44:26.210 reductions in neuroplasticity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:26.210 \longrightarrow 00:44:28.600$ and this is early days,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:28.600 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.678$ you're going to see a low end.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00{:}44{:}29.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}31.215$ There's actually more than two

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:44:31.215 --> 00:44:32.443 in that pink group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:32.450 \longrightarrow 00:44:33.548$ It just looks like there's two.

 $00:44:33.550 \longrightarrow 00:44:34.534$ But the Anna,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:34.534 \longrightarrow 00:44:37.250$ we're going to have more data very soon.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:37.250 \longrightarrow 00:44:38.348$ So I'm not going to say

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:44:38.348 --> 00:44:38.897 anything about Corpus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:44:38.900 --> 00:44:40.588 who knows which way it's going to go.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:40.590 \longrightarrow 00:44:42.605$ But with fluoxetine again and

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:44:42.605 --> 00:44:45.130 those hash bars only under court,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:45.130 \longrightarrow 00:44:46.114$ you see an increase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00{:}44{:}46.114 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}47.915$ Increase in prayer in our own on

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:44:47.915 --> 00:44:49.270 that's decrease the plasticity that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00{:}44{:}49.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}51.488$ what we see in terms of neurogenesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:51.490 \longrightarrow 00:44:54.178$ So it kind of makes sense and with

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00{:}44{:}54.178 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}56.688$ anakinra we actually see a decrease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:44:56.690 \longrightarrow 00:44:57.491$ So we don't,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:44:57.491 --> 00:44:59.360 I don't know about behavior yet those

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:44:59.419 --> 00:45:00.914 animal that's all getting crunched

 $00:45:00.914 \longrightarrow 00:45:02.950$ right now in terms of the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:02.950 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.800$ But we're we're kind of excited

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:05.800 \longrightarrow 00:45:08.625$ that this might show what we

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:08.625 \longrightarrow 00:45:11.537$ thought I think it might show so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:11.540 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.652$ Just to to finish off the

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:13.652 \longrightarrow 00:45:14.356$ postpartum depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:14.360 \longrightarrow 00:45:17.740$ I want to say that our data mirrors

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:17.740 \longrightarrow 00:45:19.440$ what's seen in the literature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:19.440 \longrightarrow 00:45:22.150$ There is limited evidence for

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:22.150 \longrightarrow 00:45:24.318$ efficacy in the postpartum.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:24.320 \longrightarrow 00:45:25.724$ Specifically those dashed lines

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:25.724 \longrightarrow 00:45:28.200$ are to say there's not any data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00{:}45{:}28.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}30.018$ This came out just last year.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:30.020 \longrightarrow 00:45:32.680$ The eye is to show insufficient data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:32.680 \longrightarrow 00:45:35.288$ And so you can see low efficacy for

00:45:35.288 --> 00:45:37.180 citrulline and moderate efficacy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00{:}45{:}37.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}38.700$ efficacy for because I'm alone.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:38.700 \longrightarrow 00:45:42.250$ So I have to talk about brexanolone for two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:42.250 \longrightarrow 00:45:44.470$ Reasons one is fantastic

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:44.470 \longrightarrow 00:45:47.340$ translation from animal to human.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:47.340 \longrightarrow 00:45:48.672$ I think partially because

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:45:48.672 --> 00:45:50.337 a Jimmy Grier is amazing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:50.340 \longrightarrow 00:45:52.040$ but be because she,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615 00:45:52.040 --> 00:45:52.890 you know, NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:52.890 \longrightarrow 00:45:54.936$ we're paying attention to sex and

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00{:}45{:}54.936 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}56.820$ gender and female specific factors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:56.820 \longrightarrow 00:45:58.420$ So she has another model

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:58.420 \longrightarrow 00:45:59.380$ of postpartum depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:45:59.380 \longrightarrow 00:46:00.844$ showing that allopregnanolone and

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:46:00.844 --> 00:46:03.040 that it's very high during pregnancy

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00{:}46{:}03.095 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}04.559$ decreases in the postpartum.

 $00:46:04.560 \longrightarrow 00:46:07.269$ And when you give an analog allopregnanolone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:07.270 \longrightarrow 00:46:09.190$ this can reverse some of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:09.190 \longrightarrow 00:46:10.470$ depressive like behaviors that

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:10.524 \longrightarrow 00:46:12.260$ she saw in her animals and this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:12.260 \longrightarrow 00:46:13.646$ That led to some clinical trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:13.650 \longrightarrow 00:46:15.858$ And for the first time ever,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:46:15.860 --> 00:46:18.398 the FDA approved a drug specifically

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00{:}46{:}18.398 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}19.667$ for postpartum depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:19.670 \longrightarrow 00:46:21.128$ So it's a good news story.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:46:21.130 --> 00:46:22.662 That's brexanolone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:22.662 \longrightarrow 00:46:24.960$ analog of allopregnanolone

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:24.960 \longrightarrow 00:46:27.468$ that shows some efficacy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615 00:46:27.470 --> 00:46:28.286 So I do. NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615 00:46:28.286 --> 00:46:28.830 I mean, NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:28.830 \longrightarrow 00:46:31.110 \text{ I I started I think by saying that}$

00:46:31.110 --> 00:46:32.869 depression is very heterogeneous,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00{:}46{:}32.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}33.755$ so perinatal depression.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:33.755 \longrightarrow 00:46:35.820$ So I think we do ourselves a

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:35.878 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.328$ disservice when we don't look at that

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:46:38.328 --> 00:46:39.920 heterogeneity and embrace it, right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:46:39.920 --> 00:46:42.090 It'll give us some maybe some clarity,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:42.090 \longrightarrow 00:46:42.786$ maybe not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:46:42.786 --> 00:46:45.660 but maybe it'll give us some clarity and

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:46:45.660 --> 00:46:49.214 I won't belabor the point, but it isn't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615 00:46:49.214 --> 00:46:50.150 It isn't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.81826655538461500:46:50.150 --> 00:46:50.794 It doesn't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00{:}46{:}50.794 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}53.850$ I know that this is the child center group,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:53.850 \longrightarrow 00:46:54.935$ and I haven't shown you

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

 $00:46:54.935 \longrightarrow 00:46:55.586$ anything on offspring,

NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615 00:46:55.590 --> 00:46:56.187 so I just, NOTE Confidence: 0.818266555384615

00:46:56.187 --> 00:46:57.580 I give you a couple of slides

 $00:46:57.634 \longrightarrow 00:46:58.930$ on offspring just because,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:46:58.930 --> 00:47:00.450 of course, like Susie said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:47:00.450 --> 00:47:02.090 you know, there's no offspring.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:02.090 \longrightarrow 00:47:03.146$ So now we have some offspring.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:03.150 \longrightarrow 00:47:05.208$ I should show you what happens.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:05.210 \longrightarrow 00:47:06.158$ I'm not going to show it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:06.160 \longrightarrow 00:47:06.592$ Don't worry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00{:}47{:}06.592 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}08.320$ I'm going to show you too much data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:08.320 \longrightarrow 00:47:09.305$ This paper came out just

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:09.305 \longrightarrow 00:47:10.290$ a couple of weeks ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:10.290 \longrightarrow 00:47:11.568$ I forgot to put the exact

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:47:11.568 --> 00:47:12.207 volume and everything,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:47:12.210 --> 00:47:13.463 but it was just like a couple

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:13.463 \longrightarrow 00:47:14.738$ of weeks ago showing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:14.738 \longrightarrow 00:47:16.130$ antidepressant use during gestation.

00:47:16.130 --> 00:47:16.418 Remember,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:47:16.418 --> 00:47:18.146 we're not giving it during gestation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:47:18.150 --> 00:47:19.836 we're giving it in the postpartum.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:19.840 \longrightarrow 00:47:22.255$ It is quite different in our lab

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:22.260 \longrightarrow 00:47:23.997$ but we can talk about that but it it

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:23.997 \longrightarrow 00:47:25.194$ wasn't associated after adjustments

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:25.194 \longrightarrow 00:47:27.108$ wasn't associated with any higher risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:27.108 \longrightarrow 00:47:28.819$ for nerve developmental disorders.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:28.820 \longrightarrow 00:47:30.654$ But what about in our own data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:30.660 \longrightarrow 00:47:32.190$ So we've seen this part of the graph already.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:32.190 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.059$ This is a moms this is hippocampus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:34.060 \longrightarrow 00:47:36.322$ Iowa beta SSRI,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:36.322 \longrightarrow 00:47:39.338$ fluoxetine increase inflammatory markers

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:39.340 \longrightarrow 00:47:41.080$ and the offspring male and female.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00{:}47{:}41.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}43.096$ No sex difference here but I don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00{:}47{:}43.096 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}45.060$ want I'll tend I13 and interferon

00:47:45.060 --> 00:47:47.136 gamma and always all were reduced.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:47:47.140 --> 00:47:48.640 This is an adult offspring

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:48.640 \longrightarrow 00:47:49.840$ the offspring don't get.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:47:49.840 --> 00:47:51.790 Accessorize, it's all through the mom.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:47:51.790 --> 00:47:52.990 It's not during gestation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:52.990 \longrightarrow 00:47:55.129$ it's all through either a change in

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:47:55.129 --> 00:47:56.943 behavior or through breast milk that

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00{:}47{:}56.943 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}59.554$ we see these this outcome is there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:47:59.560 \longrightarrow 00:48:00.439$ That's our thought.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:00.439 \longrightarrow 00:48:02.490$ I put this one up here because

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:02.553 \longrightarrow 00:48:03.609$ it's kind of cute.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00{:}48{:}03.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}05.645$ We've also given non pharmacological

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00{:}48{:}05.645 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}06.866$ treatments like exercise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:06.870 \longrightarrow 00:48:08.238$ so course increase in their genesis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:08.240 \longrightarrow 00:48:09.536$ that's what it should do and it does.

 $00:48:09.540 \longrightarrow 00:48:10.970$ And females thank thank you,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00{:}48{:}10.970 --> 00{:}48{:}12.374$ thank you, thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:12.374 \longrightarrow 00:48:14.950$ And in the adult offspring they don't,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:48:14.950 --> 00:48:16.798 they weren't exposed to a running wheel,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:16.800 \longrightarrow 00:48:17.754$ they didn't run.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:48:17.754 --> 00:48:19.980 But in the adult offspring that increased.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:19.980 \longrightarrow 00:48:20.150$ Regenesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:48:20.150 --> 00:48:21.860 So I think that's kind of cute if your mom,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:48:21.860 --> 00:48:23.318 my mom was on an exerciser.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:23.320 \longrightarrow 00:48:24.916$ So I know what that means.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00{:}48{:}24.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}28.360$ And I'm not a rat though, so I think I'm OK.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:48:28.360 --> 00:48:31.699 And last little bit of the state

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00{:}48{:}31.699 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}34.200$ is Tim Oberlander is a pediatrician

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:34.200 \longrightarrow 00:48:36.615$ at BC Children's Hospital and he

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:48:36.615 --> 00:48:38.571 has a group of individuals that

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00{:}48{:}38.571 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}40.894$ were exposed to SSRI's in utero.

 $00:48:40.894 \longrightarrow 00:48:43.582$ And Susie looked at the neuroplastic

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:43.582 \longrightarrow 00:48:45.942$ protein reelin and found that

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:45.942 \longrightarrow 00:48:47.778$ an SSRI exposed individuals.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:47.780 \longrightarrow 00:48:49.550$ It was a girls that showed

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:49.550 \longrightarrow 00:48:50.730$ a reduction in Wheeling.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:48:50.730 --> 00:48:53.058 And in our rat and our rat model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:53.060 \longrightarrow 00:48:55.195$ we also see an early time point

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:55.195 \longrightarrow 00:48:57.435$ only that the walk maternal

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:48:57.435 --> 00:48:59.310 fluoxetine reduced neurogenesis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:48:59.310 \longrightarrow 00:49:00.290$ So if you're thinking

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:49:00.290 --> 00:49:01.025 about neoplastic proteins,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:49:01.030 \longrightarrow 00:49:04.214$ it's kind of a mirroring of the two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:49:04.220 \longrightarrow 00:49:05.688$ So my last point,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:49:05.688 \longrightarrow 00:49:08.650$ which you already know what the point is.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:49:08.650 \longrightarrow 00:49:10.106$ So at the beginning of the pandemic,

00:49:10.110 --> 00:49:11.798 I had some undergrads and they're like, ohh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:49:11.798 \longrightarrow 00:49:14.030$ can't work in your lab because you can't go.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:49:14.030 --> 00:49:14.870 And yeah, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:49:14.870 \longrightarrow 00:49:15.710$ play with the rats.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:49:15.710 --> 00:49:16.566 And I said no,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:49:16.566 --> 00:49:18.225 but you can do this study that

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:49:18.225 --> 00:49:19.509 I've been thinking about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:49:19.510 \longrightarrow 00:49:23.320$ And so I made them look at 3191

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:49:23.320 \longrightarrow 00:49:26.794$ articles published in 2009 and 2019.

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:49:26.794 \longrightarrow 00:49:29.062$ And they just look to see are

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:49:29.062 \longrightarrow 00:49:30.900$ they set in the article,

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

 $00:49:30.900 \longrightarrow 00:49:32.988$ do they say it's across 6

NOTE Confidence: 0.834178215

00:49:32.988 --> 00:49:34.032 journals in neuroscience,

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

00:49:34.040 --> 00:49:36.350 3IN neuroscience, 3IN psychiatry, do they

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:49:36.350 \longrightarrow 00:49:39.619$ say did they use males and females or not?

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:49:39.620 \longrightarrow 00:49:41.756$ So many more of these studies are using

 $00:49:41.756 \longrightarrow 00:49:43.908$ males and females and many fewer are

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00{:}49{:}43.908 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}46.069$ omitting whether they what sex they used,

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00{:}49{:}46.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}48.954$ which is that's the good news story.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:49:48.960 \longrightarrow 00:49:51.832$ But then very few of these papers are

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:49:51.832 \longrightarrow 00:49:54.577$ using what we call an optimal design.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:49:54.580 \longrightarrow 00:49:56.632$ And So what I mean by that is just

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:49:56.632 \longrightarrow 00:49:58.480$ did they disclose sample size?

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:49:58.480 \longrightarrow 00:49:59.626$ That was one of our criteria.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00{:}49{:}59.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}02.836$ Sample size. It's a pretty low bar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:50:02.840 \longrightarrow 00:50:06.062$ And then did they use it in the analysis?

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

00:50:06.070 --> 00:50:08.350 5% if you aren't looking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

00:50:08.350 --> 00:50:10.686 you're never going to see a sex difference,

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

00:50:10.690 --> 00:50:11.590 right, if you don't look.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

00:50:11.590 --> 00:50:14.068 And then to my other horror,

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:50:14.070 \longrightarrow 00:50:17.110$ 9 times more male only studies and female

 $00:50:17.110 \longrightarrow 00:50:20.096$ studies and we know those female specific.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:50:20.100 \dashrightarrow 00:50:24.280$ Experiences matter half the population.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00{:}50{:}24.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}27.059$ It would be great to increase that

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

00:50:27.059 --> 00:50:28.634 percentage and Neil Epperson's

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

00:50:28.634 --> 00:50:30.938 group has found his last slide,

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:50:30.940 \longrightarrow 00:50:33.208$ found as this was published just

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

00:50:33.208 --> 00:50:35.608 very recently that of the 20% of

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:50:35.608 \longrightarrow 00:50:37.834$ studies that they looked at that it

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:50:37.834 \longrightarrow 00:50:40.114$ properly about properly evaluating sex

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:50:40.114 \longrightarrow 00:50:41.736$ differences 72% found a difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

 $00:50:41.736 \longrightarrow 00:50:43.989$ So that's why like if you look you

NOTE Confidence: 0.800606148

00:50:43.989 --> 00:50:45.627 will find you will likely find

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

 $00:50:47.650 \longrightarrow 00:50:51.194$ 100%. So I tried to acknowledge all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.7881313511111111

00:50:51.194 --> 00:50:53.984 people that have done the work in my lab,

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

 $00:50:53.990 \longrightarrow 00:50:55.134$ also the funding agencies

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

00:50:55.134 --> 00:50:56.278 I haven't talked about.

 $00:50:56.280 \longrightarrow 00:50:57.340$ These are past and present.

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

00:50:57.340 --> 00:50:59.594 I don't get money from all of

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

 $00:50:59.594 \longrightarrow 00:51:02.050$ them right now and I just wanted

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

 $00:51:02.050 \longrightarrow 00:51:04.162$ to end off on the organization

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

 $00:51:04.238 \longrightarrow 00:51:06.656$ for the study of sex differences.

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

00:51:06.660 --> 00:51:08.935 Please do I think about this group?

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

00:51:08.940 --> 00:51:10.802 It's not just for neuroscience, it's it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

 $00:51:10.802 \longrightarrow 00:51:12.699$ It is a focus more on sex.

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

 $00{:}51{:}12.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}13.892$ But there is a little bit of gender

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

 $00{:}51{:}13.892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}15.155$ in the conference as well and it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.7881313511111111

00:51:15.155 --> 00:51:16.698 going to be in beautiful Calgary, AB.

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

 $00:51:16.698 \longrightarrow 00:51:19.082$ So if you feel like learning about more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.788131351111111

 $00{:}51{:}19.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}22.537$ These do join us, so thank you very much.

NOTE Confidence: 0.912127525

 $00:51:30.470 \longrightarrow 00:51:30.930$ All right.

NOTE Confidence: 0.699165225

 $00:51:32.390 \longrightarrow 00:51:33.734$ Some lovely comments coming through on

 $00:51:33.734 \longrightarrow 00:51:35.259$ the chapter saying and wonderful talks.

NOTE Confidence: 0.699165225

 $00:51:35.260 \longrightarrow 00:51:36.680$ Thank you so much for that

NOTE Confidence: 0.699165225

 $00:51:36.680 \longrightarrow 00:51:37.868$ questions for Doctor Glia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:51:45.360 \longrightarrow 00:51:47.440$ Hi. Thank you so much for your talk.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:51:47.440 \longrightarrow 00:51:49.609$ I was wondering.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:51:49.610 --> 00:51:52.589 If you did any work and or have any

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:51:52.589 \longrightarrow 00:51:55.821$ sort of inklings about what chemically

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:51:55.821 \longrightarrow 00:51:59.261$ would make like brexanolone or I

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:51:59.261 \longrightarrow 00:52:02.015$ think it was Anna Keenora effective

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:52:02.015 --> 00:52:04.740 in these like postpartum symptoms

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:52:04.740 --> 00:52:06.894 that fluoxetine you know doesn't have

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00{:}52{:}06.894 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}07.814$ that characteristic or something

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:07.814 \longrightarrow 00:52:09.158$ like that like what is it chemically

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:09.158 \longrightarrow 00:52:11.210$ that like might make those effective.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:11.210 \longrightarrow 00:52:14.546$ I think I think that's a great question

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:14.550 \longrightarrow 00:52:16.517$ and I'd say that for brexanolone it's

00:52:16.517 --> 00:52:18.353 easy because it's kind of replenishing

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:18.353 \longrightarrow 00:52:19.918$ those hormones that we know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:19.920 \longrightarrow 00:52:20.606$ Have diminished.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:52:20.606 --> 00:52:23.066 So I do think, remember I said oh you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00{:}52{:}23.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}24.630$ part you may or may not remember I

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:24.630 \longrightarrow 00:52:26.717$ said that part of our question has been

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:52:26.717 --> 00:52:28.130 hey does antidepressant efficacy is it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:28.130 \longrightarrow 00:52:30.930$ is it, does it change based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:52:30.930 --> 00:52:33.020 hormonal status and something.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:33.020 \longrightarrow 00:52:34.832$ There's there's many things that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:52:34.832 --> 00:52:37.111 going on in the postpartum that I

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:37.111 \longrightarrow 00:52:38.796$ just don't think allows fluoxetine

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00{:}52{:}38.796 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}41.237$ to do its work long term like in in

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:41.237 \longrightarrow 00:52:43.416$ our model it actually reverses the

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:43.416 \longrightarrow 00:52:46.308$ maternal care deficits really early on

 $00:52:46.308 \longrightarrow 00:52:49.577$ but for some reason it stops working so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00{:}52{:}49.580 --> 00{:}52{:}50.018$ You know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:52:50.018 --> 00:52:51.332 I think that has something

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:51.332 \longrightarrow 00:52:52.798$ to do with the information.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:52.800 \longrightarrow 00:52:54.893$ I probably don't know that's what Anakinra

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:52:54.893 --> 00:52:56.905 is doing is you know blocking those

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:52:56.905 --> 00:52:59.500 effects of IL 1 beta but allopregnanolone,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:52:59.500 \longrightarrow 00:53:02.484$ I think that part of that is by

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:02.484 \longrightarrow 00:53:04.985$ that mechanism of action is by

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:53:04.985 --> 00:53:07.206 replacing those that metabolite of

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00{:}53{:}07.206 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}09.138$ progester one that's that's missing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:53:09.140 --> 00:53:11.336 So just my system that you know the other

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:11.336 \longrightarrow 00:53:13.398$ thing I think about a lot is plasticity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:13.400 \longrightarrow 00:53:15.857$ So that of course I think about the campus

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:15.857 \longrightarrow 00:53:18.159$ and we see those reductions in plasticity

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:53:18.159 --> 00:53:20.778 and it's not just us in the postpartum,

 $00:53:20.780 \longrightarrow 00:53:22.958$ it's pretty long term and things

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:22.958 \longrightarrow 00:53:24.410$ that normally would upregulate

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:24.469 \longrightarrow 00:53:25.678$ it don't necessarily.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00{:}53{:}25.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}27.090$ So maybe it's that maybe it's

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00{:}53{:}27.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}28.396$ like a clamping of homeostasis

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:28.396 \longrightarrow 00:53:30.244$ really like it's just we're not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:30.250 \longrightarrow 00:53:32.202$ that system is not allowed to be as

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:32.202 \longrightarrow 00:53:34.374$ liable as it should be and we need that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:34.380 \longrightarrow 00:53:37.922$ There are many reasons to think that that's

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:37.922 \longrightarrow 00:53:40.328$ important for the efficacy of fluoxetine.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:40.330 \longrightarrow 00:53:42.620$ Because that guy named uh.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:42.620 \longrightarrow 00:53:43.478$ That's wrong.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00{:}53{:}43.478 --> 00{:}53{:}44.336 \ \mathrm{And} \ \mathrm{Herbert},$

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:44.336 \longrightarrow 00:53:46.481$ Joe Herbert at Cambridge University

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:46.481 \longrightarrow 00:53:49.803$ has also shown that you don't get that

 $00:53:49.803 \longrightarrow 00:53:51.864$ obligation and neurogenesis unless you

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:51.864 \longrightarrow 00:53:54.594$ give corticosterone in like a daily dosage.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:54.600 \longrightarrow 00:53:56.175$ If you give a pellets or you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:56.175 \longrightarrow 00:53:57.600$ clamping at a certain level,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

00:53:57.600 --> 00:53:58.700 you don't get an increase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:53:58.700 \longrightarrow 00:54:00.434$ That's in males.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:54:00.434 \longrightarrow 00:54:03.902$ So something about that ability to.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:54:03.910 \longrightarrow 00:54:04.606$ Move, be liable.

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00{:}54{:}04.606 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}06.550$ I don't know how else to say that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:54:06.550 \longrightarrow 00:54:07.618$ but I think it has something

NOTE Confidence: 0.92675772375

 $00:54:07.618 \longrightarrow 00:54:08.330$ to do with homeostasis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.594240793333333

 $00:54:11.300 \longrightarrow 00:54:14.340$ To change this. Something.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

00:54:18.400 --> 00:54:19.936 The person who I always think is Allison,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:54:19.940 \longrightarrow 00:54:23.916$ who's not Allison. April, I'm so sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:54:23.920 \longrightarrow 00:54:25.156$ That's from now on you're out.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00{:}54{:}25.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}27.267$ But could you please change your name

 $00:54:27.267 \longrightarrow 00:54:29.378$ because I clearly haven't encoded that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:54:29.380 \longrightarrow 00:54:30.560$ I need some better pattern

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:54:30.560 \longrightarrow 00:54:31.268$ separation or something.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:54:31.270 \longrightarrow 00:54:32.734$ Yes, go ahead. Sorry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

00:54:32.734 --> 00:54:35.530 April, April, April.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:54:35.530 \longrightarrow 00:54:40.000$ So you talked about like different?

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

00:54:40.000 --> 00:54:41.392 Aspects, so like hippocampus,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:54:41.392 \longrightarrow 00:54:43.480$ the stresses in the immune system.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:54:43.480 \longrightarrow 00:54:48.359$ I'm curious if you have looked at

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:54:48.360 \longrightarrow 00:54:50.625$ microglial phenotypes in the influence

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00{:}54{:}50.625 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}53.484$ like in the inflammation and immune

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:54:53.484 \longrightarrow 00:54:56.079$ system route and postpartum depression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00{:}54{:}56.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}58.200$ if you could speak on that at all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:54:58.200 \longrightarrow 00:55:02.022$ Yes, we have and we're and you're

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:02.022 \longrightarrow 00:55:04.969$ going to ask me what we found?

 $00:55:04.970 \longrightarrow 00:55:07.308$ Uh, So what happened was that particular

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00{:}55{:}07.308 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}09.769$ study is the one that was an akinra.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:09.770 \longrightarrow 00:55:10.890$ So we have some of the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:10.890 \longrightarrow 00:55:12.370$ We don't have all of the data yet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

00:55:12.370 --> 00:55:14.246 And that was one of those pandemic,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

00:55:14.250 --> 00:55:14.768 you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:14.768 \longrightarrow 00:55:16.581$ a woman named Emily Clark started that

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00.55:16.581 \longrightarrow 00.55:18.639$ and then the pandemic hit and she decided

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00{:}55{:}18.639 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}20.636$ I'm going to go and do an MD instead,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:20.640 \longrightarrow 00:55:23.000$ which I don't blame her.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

00:55:23.000 --> 00:55:25.960 And uh, I don't remember,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:25.960 \longrightarrow 00:55:27.346$ but it was a low end because

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:27.346 \longrightarrow 00:55:28.780$ we had to stop the study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:28.780 \longrightarrow 00:55:29.392$ So we'll,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:29.392 \longrightarrow 00:55:31.534$ we'll have that information for you soon,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:31.540 \longrightarrow 00:55:32.580$ I think.

 $00:55:32.580 \longrightarrow 00:55:36.740$ I mean microglia in general anyway are there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00.55:36.740 \longrightarrow 00.55:37.667$ Then there's a,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:37.667 \longrightarrow 00:55:39.212$ there's a change that happens

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

00:55:39.212 --> 00:55:40.833 at postpartum day early like by

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:40.833 \longrightarrow 00:55:42.460$ 8:00 and then it comes back up.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00{:}55{:}42.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}43.452$ It's restored really quickly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:43.452 \longrightarrow 00:55:44.692$ They do seem more angry.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:44.700 \longrightarrow 00:55:47.500$ So they have that and me void shape,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00{:}55{:}47.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}49.190$ not reactive, but a meboid shape.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:49.190 \longrightarrow 00:55:50.900$ So there are some changes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:50.900 \longrightarrow 00:55:51.844$ but they're pretty early.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:51.844 \longrightarrow 00:55:53.260$ They don't last a long time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

00:55:53.260 --> 00:55:54.790 But I don't know how to

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

00:55:54.790 --> 00:55:55.555 fluoxetine what's happening,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:55:55.560 \longrightarrow 00:55:59.326$ and that is something we'll look at.

 $00:55:59.330 \longrightarrow 00:55:59.595$ Yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

00:55:59.595 --> 00:56:01.185 we also want to do some

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

00:56:01.185 --> 00:56:02.270 RAC and microglia too.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:56:02.270 \longrightarrow 00:56:03.518$ So that's on the,

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:56:03.518 \longrightarrow 00:56:06.454$ that's in the on the books, super exciting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.76798717

 $00:56:06.454 \longrightarrow 00:56:07.518$ Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.6595031875

 $00:56:08.050 \longrightarrow 00:56:09.940$ And of course thinking about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.6595031875

 $00:56:09.940 \longrightarrow 00:56:10.995$ intergenerational transmission of

NOTE Confidence: 0.6595031875

 $00{:}56{:}10.995 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}12.920$ mental health, Stacy Bilbo has some

NOTE Confidence: 0.6595031875

 $00:56:12.920 \longrightarrow 00:56:16.990$ wonderful micro gear data. Tracy Bale.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754163781111111

 $00{:}56{:}18.440 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}56{:}19.875$ At the intersection of prenatal

NOTE Confidence: 0.754163781111111

 $00:56:19.875 \longrightarrow 00:56:21.023$ stress and environmental pollution.

NOTE Confidence: 0.611038075714286

 $00:56:22.560 \longrightarrow 00:56:23.564$ Yeah, she's got some.

NOTE Confidence: 0.611038075714286

00:56:23.564 --> 00:56:25.286 I love state, Stacy Bubble and

NOTE Confidence: 0.611038075714286

 $00:56:25.286 \longrightarrow 00:56:26.678$ Tracy Bale. I love them both.

NOTE Confidence: 0.769211664

 $00:56:27.230 \longrightarrow 00:56:29.050$ Thank you for your talk.

 $00:56:29.050 \longrightarrow 00:56:31.450$ I have just a curiosity about

NOTE Confidence: 0.769211664

 $00{:}56{:}31.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}32.796$ other medications that we know

NOTE Confidence: 0.769211664

 $00:56:32.796 \longrightarrow 00:56:34.126$ have an effect on inflammation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.769211664

 $00:56:34.130 \longrightarrow 00:56:36.811$ like statins or metformin, for example.

NOTE Confidence: 0.769211664

00:56:36.811 --> 00:56:40.160 Like, is there any research to show you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.769211664

 $00:56:40.160 \longrightarrow 00:56:42.020$ their benefit because it seems like

NOTE Confidence: 0.769211664

 $00:56:42.020 \longrightarrow 00:56:43.968$ it's the same kind of mechanism

NOTE Confidence: 0.769211664

 $00:56:43.970 \longrightarrow 00:56:45.580$ increasing inflammatory markers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:56:45.630 \longrightarrow 00:56:49.172$ Yeah. You know, that is really an

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:56:49.172 \longrightarrow 00:56:51.389$ interesting question and I know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

00:56:51.390 --> 00:56:52.820 I, I, I don't know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:56:52.820 \longrightarrow 00:56:54.476$ The answer like off the top of my head.

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00{:}56{:}54.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}57.056$ But I know there's a researcher called

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00{:}56{:}57.056 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}59.012$ Hillary Brown who's in University

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:56:59.012 \longrightarrow 00:57:01.370$ of Toronto who looks at autoimmune

 $00{:}57{:}01.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}03.177$ disorders and Perry Natal mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:57:03.177 \longrightarrow 00:57:06.310$ illness and it it's not a clear story.

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:57:06.310 \longrightarrow 00:57:11.206$ I think there I think it's something oh oh.

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:57:11.210 \longrightarrow 00:57:15.158$ So interferon therapy I do believe

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:57:15.160 \longrightarrow 00:57:17.392$ causes more depressive symptoms and in

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:57:17.392 \longrightarrow 00:57:19.820$ females than in males and in humans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:57:19.820 \longrightarrow 00:57:21.353$ So I think that there is more

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:57:21.353 \longrightarrow 00:57:23.229$ of a tie to inflammation and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:57:23.230 \longrightarrow 00:57:24.676$ And females, but it's, you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:57:24.680 \longrightarrow 00:57:27.040$ that's not depression either.

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:57:27.040 \longrightarrow 00:57:28.260$ So I don't know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333

 $00:57:28.260 \longrightarrow 00:57:29.520$ That's a really good question though.

NOTE Confidence: 0.777320125833333 00:57:29.710 --> 00:57:30.300 Thank you. NOTE Confidence: 0.776884551176471

00:57:33.050 --> 00:57:34.305 Just quickly check the chat

NOTE Confidence: 0.776884551176471

 $00:57:34.305 \longrightarrow 00:57:36.121$ and just maybe in terms of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.776884551176471

00:57:36.121 --> 00:57:37.386 CFOs data that you presented,

 $00:57:37.390 \longrightarrow 00:57:39.246$ just looks really fascinating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.776884551176471

 $00{:}57{:}39.246 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}43.338$ So are you aware of any data on say

NOTE Confidence: 0.776884551176471

 $00:57:43.338 \longrightarrow 00:57:45.518$ transcranial stimulation studies or you

NOTE Confidence: 0.776884551176471

 $00:57:45.518 \longrightarrow 00:57:47.849$ know insects differences in terms of

NOTE Confidence: 0.776884551176471

 $00:57:47.849 \longrightarrow 00:57:50.620$ the regions that need to be targeted?

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

00:57:51.250 --> 00:57:52.650 Non of course not enough,

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

00:57:52.650 --> 00:57:54.882 but the studies that are out there show

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:57:54.882 \longrightarrow 00:57:57.017$ that it's actually better for females than

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:57:57.017 \longrightarrow 00:57:59.617$ it is for women than it is for for men,

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:57:59.620 \longrightarrow 00:58:03.540$ which is fascinating and I'll just give you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:03.540 \longrightarrow 00:58:06.220$ A so I I tried to look at that because

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:06.299 \longrightarrow 00:58:08.579$ we've actually done some dread work

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00{:}58{:}08.579 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}10.198$ in that negative cognitive bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:10.198 \longrightarrow 00:58:12.440$ And this is what I'm really pushing for.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

00:58:12.440 --> 00:58:13.616 It was just some pilot work,

 $00:58:13.620 \longrightarrow 00:58:15.181$ but it I'm not going to tell

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

00:58:15.181 --> 00:58:16.400 you where or anything,

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:16.400 \longrightarrow 00:58:17.835$ but it went in the opposite direction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:17.840 \longrightarrow 00:58:21.580$ So when we shut down.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

00:58:21.580 --> 00:58:23.918 Glutamate receptors and then a certain area,

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:23.920 \longrightarrow 00:58:26.038$ it actually increased negative bias in

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:26.038 \longrightarrow 00:58:28.339$ the females and decreased it in the male.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00{:}58{:}28.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}29.360$ So we're really excited about.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:29.360 \dashrightarrow 00:58:30.482$ So that's why exactly why I

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00{:}58{:}30.482 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}31.808$ looked at that because I wanted to

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:31.808 \longrightarrow 00:58:32.698$ see is there any evidence,

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

00:58:32.700 --> 00:58:33.699 but you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

00:58:33.699 --> 00:58:36.153 like that paper like 5% of people are

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

00:58:36.153 --> 00:58:38.580 looking at like using sex as a variable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:38.580 \longrightarrow 00:58:40.029$ like they use it as a covariate

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:40.029 \longrightarrow 00:58:41.638$ of let's say we accounted for it,

 $00:58:41.640 \longrightarrow 00:58:44.376$ accounted for it by having an equal number.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:44.380 \longrightarrow 00:58:45.826$ But that's not showing me the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

00:58:45.830 --> 00:58:47.798 So if you're doing that work,

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

00:58:47.800 --> 00:58:49.851 even if you're not just give like

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:49.851 \longrightarrow 00:58:51.180$ make them different colors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:51.180 \longrightarrow 00:58:54.090$ On the graph so I can look at it and see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:54.090 \longrightarrow 00:58:54.970$ And the second thing is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:54.970 \longrightarrow 00:58:56.951$ don't tell me you don't have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

00:58:56.951 --> 00:58:58.349 power without doing it right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:58:58.350 \longrightarrow 00:59:01.045$ So actually it can increase your power.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:59:01.050 \longrightarrow 00:59:02.863$ If you have a sex difference it

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

00:59:02.863 --> 00:59:04.010 will increase your power.

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:59:04.010 \longrightarrow 00:59:06.082$ And Murshed AL 2015 they did a

NOTE Confidence: 0.654342954

 $00:59:06.082 \longrightarrow 00:59:08.268$ really good job of explaining that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.633283416666667

 $00:59:09.600 \longrightarrow 00:59:11.838$ Kyle Pruitt does have a question.

 $00:59:11.840 \longrightarrow 00:59:13.256$ Kyle, would you like to unmute

NOTE Confidence: 0.633283416666667

 $00{:}59{:}13.256 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}14.680$ and ask doctor glia question?

NOTE Confidence: 0.84143864375

 $00:59{:}17.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}18.954$ I was told to look at the camera.

NOTE Confidence: 0.927008025

00:59:22.180 --> 00:59:24.730 Quick question, I'm sorry I missed the

NOTE Confidence: 0.927008025

00:59:24.730 --> 00:59:26.820 1st 3 minutes of your presentation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.927008025

00:59:26.820 --> 00:59:30.061 but I wondered if you if you included

NOTE Confidence: 0.927008025

 $00:59:30.061 \longrightarrow 00:59:33.470$ a trigger warning to the vast numbers

NOTE Confidence: 0.927008025

 $00:59:33.565 \longrightarrow 00:59:36.635$ of upper academics who are now pretty

NOTE Confidence: 0.927008025

 $00:59:36.635 \longrightarrow 00:59:39.480$ convinced that sex differences don't exist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.873922721428572

00:59:41.030 --> 00:59:43.059 I said I don't know if you. I did talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.873922721428572

00:59:43.059 --> 00:59:44.830 about how I don't think it's sexist.

NOTE Confidence: 0.651143117142857

00:59:45.000 --> 00:59:47.807 OK, good. That's good to be warned.

NOTE Confidence: 0.624510106

00:59:50.220 --> 00:59:52.930 I also yeah, I really,

NOTE Confidence: 0.81088518625

 $00:59:53.210 \longrightarrow 00:59:54.332$ I could give a whole talk

NOTE Confidence: 0.81088518625

 $00:59:54.332 \longrightarrow 00:59:55.410$ about that. But yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754490446666667

 $00:59:56.120 \longrightarrow 00:59:58.820$ I also appreciated your mantra about

 $00:59:58.820 \longrightarrow 01:00:02.404$ if you don't look you'll see the same

NOTE Confidence: 0.754490446666667

 $01:00:02.404 \longrightarrow 01:00:04.812$ thing contaminates 87% of all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.754490446666667

 $01{:}00{:}04.812 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}07.080$ parent child research on on variables

NOTE Confidence: 0.754490446666667

 $01:00:07.153 \longrightarrow 01:00:09.069$ and resilience because variables

NOTE Confidence: 0.754490446666667

01:00:09.069 --> 01:00:11.943 don't exist in all those studies,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754490446666667

01:00:11.950 --> 01:00:13.700 no matter what they title the paper,

NOTE Confidence: 0.754490446666667

01:00:13.700 --> 01:00:16.864 it's extremely important that it

NOTE Confidence: 0.754490446666667

 $01{:}00{:}16.864 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}19.804$ ruins so much wonderful research.

NOTE Confidence: 0.754490446666667

 $01:00:19.810 \longrightarrow 01:00:22.006$ And I couldn't agree more with

NOTE Confidence: 0.754490446666667

 $01:00:22.006 \longrightarrow 01:00:23.914$ your your your incredible passion

NOTE Confidence: 0.754490446666667

01:00:23.914 --> 01:00:26.690 for including it now. Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68702568375

01:00:27.410 --> 01:00:28.706 About to say, but you have fetal sex.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68702568375

01:00:28.710 --> 01:00:30.019 A lot of people don't include it,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68702568375

 $01:00:30.020 \longrightarrow 01:00:31.609$ and I do think it's really important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68702568375

 $01:00:31.610 \longrightarrow 01:00:32.525$ especially when they're

01:00:32.525 --> 01:00:33.440 at inflammatory markers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68702568375

 $01:00:33.440 \longrightarrow 01:00:34.840$ And then don't tell me

NOTE Confidence: 0.68702568375

 $01:00:34.840 \longrightarrow 01:00:36.840$ is it a male or female.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68702568375

01:00:36.840 --> 01:00:38.205 We know that's going to change things,

NOTE Confidence: 0.68702568375

 $01{:}00{:}38.210 \dashrightarrow 01{:}00{:}41.416$ so I'm sure it muddies the waters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.68702568375

 $01:00:41.420 \longrightarrow 01:00:42.910$ Thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.796145329

01:00:42.910 --> 01:00:44.955 Please join me in thanking

NOTE Confidence: 0.796145329

 $01:00:44.955 \longrightarrow 01:00:47.000$ Dr Galea one more time.