WEBVTT

- NOTE duration:"00:14:22"
- NOTE recognizability:0.835
- NOTE language:en-us
- NOTE Confidence: 0.98674935
- $00:00:00.000 \rightarrow 00:00:00.470$  It's.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- 00:00:05.670 --> 00:00:11.580 Yes, OK, perfect. Alright, uh.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:00:11.580 \longrightarrow 00:00:14.210$  So I'm just gonna come.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:00:14.210 \rightarrow 00:00:17.546$  Present some investigator initiated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00{:}00{:}17.546 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}21.130$  studies here were myself and some
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:00:21.130 \longrightarrow 00:00:24.214$  of my colleagues are doing so.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:00:24.214 \longrightarrow 00:00:26.218$  The first one I'm going to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:00:26.220 \rightarrow 00:00:28.660$  present this perfuse icast,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00{:}00{:}28.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}31.418$  which was submitted last year
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00{:}00{:}31{.}418 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}34{.}896$  and we got some comments and we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- 00:00:34.896 > 00:00:36.664 are resubmitting in November.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00{:}00{:}36.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}38.970$  So some background about entrepreneurial
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- 00:00:38.970 --> 00:00:41.740 after Austero Sis as everyone knows,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

- 00:00:41.740 --> 00:00:42.790 intracranial symptomatic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00{:}00{:}42.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}44.890$  large vessel after all.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- 00:00:44.890 --> 00:00:47.638 As a strong predictor of earlier
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00{:}00{:}47.638$  -->  $00{:}00{:}49.470$  occurrence and current treatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:00:49.546 \rightarrow 00:00:52.236$  consists of aggressive medical treatment
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:00:52.236 \rightarrow 00:00:54.492$  with anti thrombotic treatment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- 00:00:54.492 --> 00:00:56.418 mainly dual antiplatelets
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- 00:00:56.418 --> 00:00:58.344 high intensity statin,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00{:}00{:}58.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}02.030$ risk factor modification and lifestyle
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:01:02.030 \dashrightarrow 00:01:05.806$  coaching and this was based on the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:01:05.810 \dashrightarrow 00:01:09.770$  sample's trial that samples and visit.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00{:}01{:}09{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}12.662$  They both tested standing and showed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:01:12.662 \dashrightarrow 00:01:14.590$  superiority of medical treatment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:01:14.590 \longrightarrow 00:01:15.583$  But you know.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:01:15.583 \rightarrow 00:01:17.900$  The question that comes is the best
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:01:17.968 \rightarrow 00:01:20.398$  medical treatment work for everyone,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:01:20.400 \rightarrow 00:01:24.636$  and this is a nice study or figure here.

 $00{:}01{:}24.636 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}28.140$  Comparing samples to we sted and you can see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:01:28.140 \longrightarrow 00:01:31.228$  So this is the medical arm of samples

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:01:31.228 \rightarrow 00:01:34.787$  and this is what patients and you can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:01:34.787 \longrightarrow 00:01:37.959$  that the risk is significantly lower.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

00:01:37.960 --> 00:01:39.313 Occurrence and Sampras,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00{:}01{:}39{.}313 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}42{.}470$  versus what sets or medical treatment over

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:01:42.540 \rightarrow 00:01:45.480$  the past decade has significantly improved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

00:01:45.480 --> 00:01:49.464 But unfortunately the recurrence risk using NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:01:49.464 \rightarrow 00:01:52.945$  real-world data is still relatively high,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:01:52.945 \longrightarrow 00:01:56.877$  and this is a study from Northwestern

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

00:01:56.877 --> 00:02:00.866 University from Chicago showing that

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:02:00.866 \dashrightarrow 00:02:04.214$  even in patients who were treated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00{:}02{:}04{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}08{.}948$  Using the sample as a treatment regimen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:02:08.948 \dashrightarrow 00:02:10.970$  aggressive medical treatment.

- $00:02:10.970 \longrightarrow 00:02:11.796$  48 patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:02:11.796 \longrightarrow 00:02:15.520$  The risk of recurrence at 30 days was 20%,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:02:15.520 \rightarrow 00:02:19.652$  so that's still significantly high and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00{:}02{:}19.652 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}21.828$  there's a lot of work that still needs
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:02:21.828 \longrightarrow 00:02:24.070$  to be done, and reducing the risks.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:02:24.070 \longrightarrow 00:02:26.200$  So why those medical treatments fail?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- 00:02:26.200 --> 00:02:27.720 Of course you know medication,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:02:27.720 \longrightarrow 00:02:30.100$  non compliance or risk factor
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00{:}02{:}30{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}32{.}480$  control is a contributing factor.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- 00:02:32.480 --> 00:02:34.175 Plavix resistance as.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00{:}02{:}34.175 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}37.565$  Mentioned, uh earlier today by uh,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:02:37.570 \rightarrow 00:02:40.790$  you know, Doctor Rodrick had mentioned that,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- 00:02:40.790 --> 00:02:43.275 you know, traffics resistance may
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:02:43.275 \longrightarrow 00:02:45.760$  be a component and diagonal,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:02:45.760 \longrightarrow 00:02:47.710$  or maybe a better option.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- 00:02:47.710 --> 00:02:48.439 But you know,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:02:48.439 \rightarrow 00:02:50.490$  there's not a lot of data on that,

 $00:02:50.490 \longrightarrow 00:02:52.132$  but definitely,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:02:52.132 \rightarrow 00:02:56.237$  that's one potential contributing factor,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:02:56.240 \rightarrow 00:03:00.125$  and another one is impaired distal perfusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:00.130 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.745$  So if the perfusion across

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:02.745 \longrightarrow 00:03:04.314$  stenosis is impaired,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:04.320 \rightarrow 00:03:06.416$  medic optimal medical treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:06.416 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.560$  Is less likely than the improve

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00{:}03{:}09{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}11{.}900$  acutely the perfusion across stenosis

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00{:}03{:}11{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}14{.}896$  and reduce the risk of deterioration

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:14.896 \longrightarrow 00:03:17.756$  or recurrence and the setting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00{:}03{:}17.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}21.022$  So what are mechanisms of stroke in

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:21.022 \rightarrow 00:03:23.860$  patients with intracranial Atheros sclerosis?

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00{:}03{:}23.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}26.788$  This is from a study that we published

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:26.788 \longrightarrow 00:03:30.376$  a couple years ago looking at.

 $00:03:30.380 \dashrightarrow 00:03:33.649$  The MRI and the perfusion study on

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:33.649 \dashrightarrow 00:03:36.218$  on patients who have symptomatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

00:03:36.218 --> 00:03:39.010 70 to 99% stenosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:39.010 \longrightarrow 00:03:40.618$  so this is a patient here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:40.620 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.804$  As you can see they have borderzone

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:42.804 \rightarrow 00:03:45.220$  infarction and they have a perfusion deficit.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:45.220 \rightarrow 00:03:48.412$  So these fires are likely related

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:48.412 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.961$  to low blood flow.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00{:}03{:}49{.}961 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}52{.}320$  This one is a core infarct with

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

00:03:52.393 --> 00:03:53.899 no perfusion deficit,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00{:}03{:}53{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}57{.}938$  likely related artery and Bill Isation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:03:57.940 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.388$  This one is another patient who has a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00{:}04{:}00{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}03{.}594$  Borderzone infarct so this is an

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:04:03.594 \longrightarrow 00:04:05.730$  internal borderzone cortical borderzone

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:04:05.805 \rightarrow 00:04:08.550$  infarction with some perfusion delay,

NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594

 $00:04:08.550 \rightarrow 00:04:11.438$  and this one is deep and far likely

- NOTE Confidence: 0.761502594
- $00:04:11.438 \longrightarrow 00:04:14.187$  related to perforated perforated disease

 $00{:}04{:}14.187 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}17.427$  with no significant perfusion delay.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00{:}04{:}17{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}19{.}910$  So these are all different

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:04:19.910 \longrightarrow 00:04:21.124$  mechanisms of stroke.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00{:}04{:}21{.}124 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}22{.}909$  In patients with intracranial athero.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00{:}04{:}22{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}25{.}592$  So Arthur to artery embolization perforate

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:04:25.592 \rightarrow 00:04:28.649$  are disease and impaired distal blood flow.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:04:28.650 \rightarrow 00:04:31.326$  So what are we looking at?

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00{:}04{:}31{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}34{.}018$  Perfusion and perfused icast

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:04:34.018 \dashrightarrow 00:04:37.600$  where our aims are two main aims.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

00:04:37.600 --> 00:04:40.085 One to validate perfusion delay

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00{:}04{:}40.085 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}43.298$  volume and border zone and function

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00{:}04{:}43.298 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}46.508$  as biomarkers of increased recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00{:}04{:}46.508 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}49.076$  in patients with symptomatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00{:}04{:}49{.}169 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}51{.}739$ 70 to 99 anterior circulation.

 $00{:}04{:}51.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}55.610$  I cast and the second one is to determine

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00{:}04{:}55{.}610$  -->  $00{:}04{:}59{.}959$  the 90 day recurrence rate in patients with.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:04:59.960 \dashrightarrow 00:05:02.132$  You know each of the biomarkers

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:05:02.132 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.218$  borderzone and fart,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

00:05:03.220 --> 00:05:04.708 optimal perfusion, delay,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

00:05:04.708 - > 00:05:06.196 threshold and volume,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00{:}05{:}06{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}09{.}546$  and the third one is when both

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:05:09.546 \longrightarrow 00:05:10.980$  are combined together.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00{:}05{:}10{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}12{.}810$  The outcomes so the primary

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

00:05:12.810 --> 00:05:14.274 outcome is recurrent stroke,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:05:14.280 \longrightarrow 00:05:16.470$  or that at 90 days we

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:05:16.470 \longrightarrow 00:05:17.565$  have secondary outcomes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:05:17.570 \longrightarrow 00:05:19.070$  These patients are going to

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:05:19.070 \rightarrow 00:05:20.570$  be followed for one year,

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:05:20.570 \rightarrow 00:05:22.820$  so the secondary outcome is looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00{:}05{:}22.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}25.179$  at the 12 month recurrent stroke

- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:05:25.179 \longrightarrow 00:05:27.909$  or that and we're looking at also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- 00:05:27.909 --> 00:05:30.287 90 day modified Rankin scale.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00{:}05{:}30{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}32{.}526$  There's an outcome adjudication
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:05:32.526 \rightarrow 00:05:35.880$  committee that will be adjudicating all
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:05:35.962 \rightarrow 00:05:39.268$  outcomes in our study inclusion exclusion,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:05:39.270 \dashrightarrow 00:05:41.937$  so ischemic stroke in the setting of.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:05:41.940 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.478$  70% or more stenosis of UM,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00{:}05{:}44{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}47{.}240$  the M1 segment or the intracranial
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00{:}05{:}47.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}49.980$  ICA less than three days from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:05:49.980 \longrightarrow 00:05:52.829$  last known normal NIH zero to 10.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:05:52.830 \longrightarrow 00:05:54.298$  Three more with MRSA.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00{:}05{:}54.298 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}55.898$  Zero to three exclusion.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:05:55.898 \rightarrow 00:05:58.388$  Other competing mechanisms or unable
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:05:58.388 \dashrightarrow 00:06:01.859$  to obtain MRI or perfusion imaging.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:06:01.860 \rightarrow 00:06:04.810$  Patients will be managed medically.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

 $00:06:04.810 \rightarrow 00:06:07.888$  Dual antiplatelets for 90 days, then single. NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495 00:06:07.888 --> 00:06:10.258 Agent high intensity statin therapy NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495  $00:06:10.258 \rightarrow 00:06:12.670$  were also planning each patient. NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495  $00:06:12.670 \rightarrow 00:06:16.240$  With a lifestyle coach using the same NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495  $00:06:16.240 \rightarrow 00:06:19.744$  company that was used in the sample's trial, NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495 00:06:19.744 --> 00:06:22.216 it's also being used in Captiva NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495  $00{:}06{:}22.216 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}25.346$  and an increased intervent so you NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495  $00:06:25.346 \longrightarrow 00:06:28.450$  know the study is going to pay for NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495  $00{:}06{:}28.549 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}31.769$  a lifestyle coach to try to ensure NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495  $00:06:31.770 \rightarrow 00:06:34.155$  that lifestyle modifications are done NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495  $00{:}06{:}34.155 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}37.566$ risk factor control as well as an NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495 00:06:37.566 --> 00:06:39.926 important aspect of medical management. NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495  $00:06:39.930 \rightarrow 00:06:43.129$  So this is a biomarker validation study. NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495  $00:06:43.130 \longrightarrow 00:06:45.054$  That has a go. NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495  $00:06:45.054 \rightarrow 00:06:49.110$  No go criteria to move forward for NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495  $00:06:49.110 \rightarrow 00:06:51.755$  potential interventional study testing,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:06:51.755 \longrightarrow 00:06:53.325$  potentially angioplasty,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- 00:06:53.325 --> 00:06:57.955 plus or minus standing in the high
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00{:}06{:}57{.}955 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}00{.}925$ risk patients who have impaired distal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:00.925 \rightarrow 00:07:03.488$  perfusion based on the biomarkers.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- 00:07:03.490 --> 00:07:06.479 So this study would move forward an
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:06.479 \longrightarrow 00:07:09.115$  interventional study if the 90 day
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00{:}07{:}09{.}115 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}11.250$  recurrence risk and the validated
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:11.250 \longrightarrow 00:07:13.118$  biomarkers was more than 15.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- 00:07:13.120 --> 00:07:13.652 Percent,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- 00:07:13.652 --> 00:07:17.020 that is the the 95% confidence
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:17.020 \longrightarrow 00:07:19.706$  interval lies above 15%.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00{:}07{:}19.706 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}24.368$  The sample size calculation was 250
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:24.368 \longrightarrow 00:07:26.854$  patients that accounted for 15%
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00{:}07{:}26.854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}29.472$  loss to follow up and that gives
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:29.472 \dashrightarrow 00:07:31.688$  super adequate power for all aims.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495

- $00:07:31.690 \rightarrow 00:07:35.827$  The projected study is over  $4 \ 1/2$
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:35.827 \rightarrow 00:07:39.288$  years with recruitment over 33 months.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:39.290 \longrightarrow 00:07:41.354$  So that's the first study we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:41.354 \rightarrow 00:07:42.730$  re submitting in November,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:42.730 \longrightarrow 00:07:45.649$  so fingers crossed.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:45.650 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.416$  The second study that was proposed Genentech.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:49.420 \longrightarrow 00:07:52.036$  It's looking at the safety of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- 00:07:52.036 --> 00:07:54.339 alteplase and patients on direct
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00{:}07{:}54.339 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}56.719$  or al anticoagulants and this is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:07:56.719 \dashrightarrow 00:07:59.761$  called that by myself and Kristaps
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00{:}07{:}59.761 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}03.090$  threats from here from Brown so
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00{:}08{:}03{.}090 \longrightarrow 00{:}08{:}05{.}778$  we know that patients with a third
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00{:}08{:}05{.}778 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}07{.}614$  face heightened risk of ischemic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:08:07.614 \rightarrow 00:08:10.932$  stroke and this risk is reduced by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:08:10.932 \rightarrow 00:08:12.564$  oral anticoagulation and recent
- NOTE Confidence: 0.925504495
- $00:08:12.564 \rightarrow 00:08:14.616$  studies have shown that in patients

 $00:08:14.616 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.300$  with history

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}08{:}15{.}362 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}15{.}998$  of a field.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:08:16.000 \rightarrow 00:08:18.760$  Or hospitalized for ischemic stroke.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:08:18.760 \longrightarrow 00:08:21.298$  Nearly 40% of them were using

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:08:21.298 \rightarrow 00:08:24.039$  anticoagulation at the time of the event,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:08:24.040 \longrightarrow 00:08:26.273$  and 50% of which war were on

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:08:26.273 \rightarrow 00:08:28.370$  a direct oral anticoagulant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:08:28.370 \longrightarrow 00:08:30.820$  So these patients are typically

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:08:30.820 \longrightarrow 00:08:32.780$  excluded from from alteplase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}08{:}32.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}36.964$  And actually we looked at data from two

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:08:36.964 \rightarrow 00:08:39.440$  large comprehensive stroke centers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:08:39.440 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.496$  where in 130% of the exclusion

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:08:43.496 \dashrightarrow 00:08:46.810$  of patients excluded from TPA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}08{:}46.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}49.570$  Who would be otherwise eligible were

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}08{:}49{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}52{.}782$  excluded only because they were on a

 $00:08:52.782 \rightarrow 00:08:55.362$  direct oral anticoagulants within 48 hours,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}08{:}55{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}58{.}640$  and another study 194 patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

00:08:58.640 - 00:09:00.665 were excluded only because they

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:09:00.665 \rightarrow 00:09:03.235$  were on a direct oral anticoagulant

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:09:03.235 \longrightarrow 00:09:05.785$  over a 2 1/2 year period.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:09:05.790 \dashrightarrow 00:09:08.590$  So that's like 7 patients per month

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:09:08.590 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.684$  excluded only because they were

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:09:10.684 \dashrightarrow 00:09:12.739$  on a direct oral anticoagulant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

00:09:12.740 --> 00:09:13.631 So you know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:09:13.631 \rightarrow 00:09:16.390$  it's all to play safe and these patients.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:09:16.390 \dashrightarrow 00:09:18.390$  Why should we? I think that it's safe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

00:09:18.390 --> 00:09:21.118 UM, one, you know. There are many reasons.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}09{:}21{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}23{.}814$  One doax have improved safety profile

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:09:23.814 \longrightarrow 00:09:26.478$  and lower risk of intracranial

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:09:26.478 \longrightarrow 00:09:28.809$  hemorrhage than warfarin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}09{:}28.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}31.170$  And another important reason is

- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00{:}09{:}31{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}34{.}587$  that dogs have a short half life
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- 00:09:34.587 --> 00:09:37.954 and as you see here from some
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00:09:37.954 \rightarrow 00:09:42.150$  pharmacokinetic data and this is on 10A.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00:09:42.150 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.078$  Anti 10A treatments and you can
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00:09:45.078 \longrightarrow 00:09:47.909$  see that apixaban within 12 hours.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00:09:47.910 \longrightarrow 00:09:50.878$  The level is pretty low rivaroxaban
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00:09:50.878 \longrightarrow 00:09:54.084$  at 24 hours the level is lower
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00{:}09{:}54.084 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}57.263$  edoxaban at 12 hours and there's
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00:09:57.263 \longrightarrow 00:09:59.978$  similar pharmacokinetic data for the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00:09:59.978 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.638$  bigger Tran showing that you know
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00:10:02.638 \rightarrow 00:10:05.790$  the drug level at about 12 hours.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00{:}10{:}05{.}790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}06{.}930$  Is this law as well?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- 00:10:06.930 --> 00:10:10.010 So alteplase may be safe if you're
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00:10:10.010 \longrightarrow 00:10:12.562$  giving it beyond 12 hours from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- $00:10:12.562 \longrightarrow 00:10:14.090$  the last dose of.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}10{:}14.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}16.845$  Doac and also several studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}10{:}16.845 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}19.049$  including recent meta analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:10:19.050 \longrightarrow 00:10:22.340$  shows that treatment alterplase treatment

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:10:22.340 \longrightarrow 00:10:26.520$  and patients on doac is likely safe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}10{:}26.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}28.745$  But these are observation ull

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

00:10:28.745 - 00:10:31.269 studies with some selection bias,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}10{:}31.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}33.614$  so it's hard to make a firm conclusion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:10:33.620 \longrightarrow 00:10:36.068$  So the aim of the study is to

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:10:36.068 \rightarrow 00:10:38.355$  determine the risk of symptomatic

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:10:38.355 \rightarrow 00:10:39.957$  intracranial hemorrhage with

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:10:39.957 \rightarrow 00:10:42.615$  alteplase in patients with acute

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

00:10:42.615 --> 00:10:44.870 ischemic stroke on doac therapy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:10:44.870 \longrightarrow 00:10:48.086$  With the last doors of 12 to 48

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}10{:}48.086 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}50.516$  hours or apixaban and Dabigatran

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:10:50.516 \rightarrow 00:10:54.797$  and 24 to 48 hours for over oxygen,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:10:54.800 \rightarrow 00:10:58.232$  and the hypothesis is that the risk of

- NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769
- 00:10:58.232 --> 00:10:59.535 symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage

 $00:10:59.535 \longrightarrow 00:11:02.090$  is less than 10% in these patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:11:02.090 \rightarrow 00:11:04.610$  we have some secondary aims as well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

00:11:04.610 --> 00:11:06.633 which you know I can skip for

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

00:11:06.633 --> 00:11:07.900 the purpose of time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:11:07.900 \rightarrow 00:11:10.800$  so the inclusion exclusion criteria,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:11:10.800 \rightarrow 00:11:13.352$  any ischemic stroke eligible

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:11:13.352 \longrightarrow 00:11:15.266$  patient for alterplase.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:11:15.270 \rightarrow 00:11:17.307$  With the exception of being on Doac,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

00:11:17.310 --> 00:11:18.562 and as I said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:11:18.562 \longrightarrow 00:11:21.388$  the last dose should be 12 to 48

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}11{:}21{.}388 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}23{.}568$  hours for a pixaban and dabigatran,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}11{:}23{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}25{.}747$ 24 to 48 for the proxy ban.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}11{:}25{.}750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}28{.}179$  There are some exclusion criteria as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}11{:}28{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}31{.}276$  We did some power calculation and

00:11:31.276 --> 00:11:34.180 sample size of 144 patients would

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}11{:}34{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}37{.}330$  be needed to achieve our goal and

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:11:37.422 \rightarrow 00:11:39.810$  this would be using six centers

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:11:39.810 \longrightarrow 00:11:42.494$  and a 33 month enrollment period

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:11:42.494 \longrightarrow 00:11:45.994$  with three months of follow up so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

00:11:46.000 --> 00:11:48.424 I think this will be a very good

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

00:11:48.424 --> 00:11:49.980 study for our network,

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:11:49.980 \longrightarrow 00:11:52.392$  so hoping that after this conference

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00{:}11{:}52{.}392 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}55{.}323$  we can touch base and see if any

NOTE Confidence: 0.816155769230769

 $00:11:55.323 \longrightarrow 00:11:57.195$  of the sites are not within

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

00:11:57.277 --> 00:11:59.811 our network, is is interested.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

00:11:59.811 --> 00:12:03.672 Finally, just like 2 minutes on this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00{:}12{:}03.672 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}06.477$  So this is another investigator

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:12:06.477 \rightarrow 00:12:09.401$  initiated study that you know we're

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:12:09.401 \rightarrow 00:12:12.689$  very fortunate to have a lot of sites,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:12:12.690 \rightarrow 00:12:16.925$  including sites from our own RCC contribute.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00:12:16.930 \longrightarrow 00:12:20.188$  So this is a large retrospective,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- 00:12:20.190 --> 00:12:23.376 multicenter study comparing doax warfarin for
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00{:}12{:}23.376 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}26.889$  the treatment of venous sinus thrombosis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00{:}12{:}26.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}30.537$  So we know that the recent randomized
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00:12:30.537 \rightarrow 00:12:32.650$  trial suggested that the bigger trend
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00:12:32.650 \rightarrow 00:12:34.830$  may be as effective as warfarin,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00:12:34.830 \longrightarrow 00:12:37.310$  and the treatment of CVD.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- 00:12:37.310 --> 00:12:39.740 Our aim was to compare direct
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00:12:39.740 \longrightarrow 00:12:40.550$  oral anticoagulants.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00{:}12{:}40.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}43.190$  Warfarin and a real world
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00:12:43.190 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.351$  international cohort. So we had.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00{:}12{:}45{.}351 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}46{.}819$  This is a retrospective.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00:12:46.820 \longrightarrow 00:12:49.118$  Study that had sites from EU.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- 00:12:49.120 --> 00:12:51.478 S. Europe New Zealand over six
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00:12:51.478 \rightarrow 00:12:54.399$  years and all of these patients.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:12:54.400 \rightarrow 00:12:56.974$  We included them if they received

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:12:56.974 \rightarrow 00:12:58.690$  oral anticoagulation and had

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:12:58.760 \longrightarrow 00:13:01.320$  confirmed cerebral venous thrombosis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:13:01.320 \rightarrow 00:13:03.756$  We used inverse probability of treatment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

00:13:03.760 --> 00:13:07.460 Weighted Cox regression models.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00{:}13{:}07{.}460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}09{.}452$  Outcomes were recurrence cerebral

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

00:13:09.452 --> 00:13:11.288 or systemic, venous thrombosis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:13:11.288 \rightarrow 00:13:13.802$  death and we looked at recanalization

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:13:13.802 \rightarrow 00:13:16.555$  rates and major hemorrhage and patients

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00{:}13{:}16.555 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}20.050$  treated with warfarin versus doac's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:13:20.050 \longrightarrow 00:13:24.816$  So the results we had 1029 CVD

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:13:24.816 \longrightarrow 00:13:27.848$  patients across 27 centers.

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

00:13:27.850 --> 00:13:30.280 847 met our inclusion criteria and

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

00:13:30.280 - 00:13:33.026 these are the study sites and EU,

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:13:33.026 \longrightarrow 00:13:36.034$  S and Europe and we had a site

NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364

 $00:13:36.034 \rightarrow 00:13:38.548$  in New Zealand as well,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00{:}13{:}38{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}41{.}655$  so the paper is now under review and stroke
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00{:}13{:}41.655 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}44.727$  and to be presented at the upcoming ISC.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00{:}13{:}44.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}47.862$  So stay tuned and I will stop here and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00{:}13{:}47.862 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}50.815$  thank you for your attention and I'll.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.861982623636364
- $00:13:50.820 \longrightarrow 00:13:52.008$  Take any questions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.70443533
- $00{:}13{:}59{.}780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}03{.}808$  Charlie, this is the great presentation
- NOTE Confidence: 0.70443533
- $00{:}14{:}03{.}808 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}06{.}556$  for the DOAX study with Alteplase,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.70443533
- $00:14:06.556 \rightarrow 00:14:09.733$  there's going to be an exclusion if they're
- NOTE Confidence: 0.70443533
- $00:14:09.733 \longrightarrow 00:14:12.055$  also on antiplatelet therapy or not,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.70443533
- 00:14:12.060 --> 00:14:16.029 I don't think so, but you know
- NOTE Confidence: 0.70443533
- $00:14:16.029 \rightarrow 00:14:18.829$  something to consider for sure.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.70443533
- 00:14:18.830 --> 00:14:22.000 Thank you, thank you. OK, so.