WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:14:03"

NOTE recognizability:0.860

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

00:00:00.000 --> 00:00:03.000 Thanks daddy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:00:03.000 \dashrightarrow 00:00:05.169$  I'll try to keep it short and sweet now.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}00{:}05{.}170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}08{.}040$  Hang on, I'm the last one I.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

00:00:08.040 --> 00:00:11.508 Uhm, wanna just talk quickly about

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:00:11.508 \longrightarrow 00:00:15.840$  a study that I'm proposing to stroke

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:00:15.840 \rightarrow 00:00:18.090$  net with several collaborators,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

00:00:18.090 --> 00:00:22.277 which I'm sure many of you know, sappy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

00:00:22.277 --> 00:00:27.576 And David Ron, who is a neuroradiologist

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:00:27.580 \rightarrow 00:00:31.300$  at wash U that many of you may not know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}00{:}31{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}32{.}671$  And and Jordan,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

00:00:32.671 -> 00:00:35.870 of course familiar to many of you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}00{:}35.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}39.685$  Essentially it is an ancillary

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}00{:}39.685 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}43.336$  study proposal to Captiva Captiva,

 $00{:}00{:}43.336 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}46.800$  which has been funded and doctor

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

00:00:46.800 --> 00:00:49.500 Broderick described it earlier today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

00:00:49.500 --> 00:00:52.475 But I do wanna touch on just

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

00:00:52.475 --> 00:00:54.630 a couple points quickly.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}00{:}54.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}55.974$  Come and chat.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}00{:}55{.}974 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}59{.}110$  He's talked a little bit about intracranial

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:00:59.196 \longrightarrow 00:01:01.746$  athero which I'll call eye casts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:01:01.750 \dashrightarrow 00:01:05.958$  But one thing that I think we don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

00:01:05.958 --> 00:01:09.750 discuss enough is that overall worldwide

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:01:09.750 \dashrightarrow 00:01:12.870$  it is the most common cause of stroke.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}01{:}12.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}16.614$  So taking into account its prevalence

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}01{:}16.614 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}21.550$  and the mechanism being more common.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

00:01:21.550 --> 00:01:26.638 In Asian and patients of other

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:01:26.638 \rightarrow 00:01:29.182$  other underrepresented groups,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:01:29.190 \longrightarrow 00:01:33.558$  it gets you to the most common cause

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:01:33.560 \rightarrow 00:01:37.148$  and chatty showed you great data

- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00:01:37.150 \rightarrow 00:01:41.756$  from Chicago that really we expect a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- 00:01:41.756 --> 00:01:46.860 recurrence rate of about 20% per year.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00:01:46.860 \dashrightarrow 00:01:52.004$  If you take carotid stenosis as a comparator.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00{:}01{:}52{.}010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}53{.}995$  We have excellent medical and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00:01:53.995 \longrightarrow 00:01:54.789$  surgical treatment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00{:}01{:}54.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}59.137$  so with some treatment I can expect
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00{:}01{:}59{.}137 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}02{.}710$  a recurrence rate of around 2 to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00:02:02.710 \longrightarrow 00:02:05.450 4\%$  per year for carotid disease.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00:02:05.450 \dashrightarrow 00:02:07.970$  So why did the treatments that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- 00:02:07.970 00:02:11.080 work so well for carotid disease
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00:02:11.080 \rightarrow 00:02:13.888$  not work as well for eikaas,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00{:}02{:}13.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}16.123$  and why do we still have such
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00:02:16.123 \rightarrow 00:02:18.250$  a high rate of recurrence?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00{:}02{:}18.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}22.372$  Well, one thing to take into account is that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312
- $00:02:22.380 \longrightarrow 00:02:23.191$  When?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:02:23.191 \longrightarrow 00:02:26.435$  Mens was funding multiple

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:02:26.435 \longrightarrow 00:02:29.679$  trials and six trials.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:02:29.680 \longrightarrow 00:02:32.656$  Looking at carotid disease.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:02:32.656 \rightarrow 00:02:36.634$  Come and you could expand this further out,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

00:02:36.640 --> 00:02:39.377 but I think a lot of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}02{:}39{.}377 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}42{.}039$  advances in terms of medications.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:02:42.040 \longrightarrow 00:02:47.010$  Were already apparent by 2005.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

00:02:47.010 --> 00:02:49.890 They had only funded one study

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}02{:}49{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}51{.}810$  for intracranial a thero an

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:02:51.901 \longrightarrow 00:02:53.837$  and subsequent to that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:02:53.840 \longrightarrow 00:02:55.600$  Of course we had Sampras

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:02:55.600 \rightarrow 00:02:57.360$  and Captiva has been funded,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}02{:}57{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}00{.}636$  but I would argue that a

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}03{:}00{.}640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}03{.}320$  disproportionate amount of funding

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}03{:}03{.}320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}07{.}340$  has gone to study carotid disease,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:03:07.340 \longrightarrow 00:03:12.416$  and I think that in part is why?

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:03:12.416 \longrightarrow 00:03:14.368$  Intracranial Athero has such

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}03{:}14.368 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}17.470$  a high rate of recurrence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:03:17.470 \longrightarrow 00:03:20.892$  The other thing that is of course

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}03{:}20{.}892 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}23{.}666$  important is that intracranial arteries

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:03:23.666 \rightarrow 00:03:26.984$  are not the same as extracranial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:03:26.990 \rightarrow 00:03:31.247$  so you can see here in broad terms that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}03{:}31{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}34{.}596$  The structure in cross section of an

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:03:34.596 \rightarrow 00:03:37.139$  intracranial artery is very different

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:03:37.139 \longrightarrow 00:03:39.689$  than that of an extracranial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:03:39.690 \rightarrow 00:03:44.532$  such as the carotid artery and for one thing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:03:44.532 \rightarrow 00:03:46.628$  intracranial arteries are thinner.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}03{:}46.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}52.189$  They sit in spinal fluid, they don't have.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:03:52.189 \rightarrow 00:03:55.577$  By and large vasa vasorum it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:03:55.577 \dashrightarrow 00:03:59.546$  It effectively is a different blood vessel,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:03:59.550 \longrightarrow 00:04:01.870$  so that too I think.

00:04:01.870 --> 00:04:04.766 Is why many of the treatments that work

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}04{:}04{.}766 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}07{.}879$  in carotid disease don't work intracranial,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}04{:}07{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}12{.}098$  so the broad hypothesis of captive

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}04{:}12.098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}15.905$  MRI is that with MRI biomarkers

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:04:15.905 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.295$  and I'll go into them briefly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}04{:}19{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}21{.}452$  but with this additional

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:04:21.452 \longrightarrow 00:04:24.142$  information we get on MRI,

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00:04:24.150 \longrightarrow 00:04:27.293$  we will be able to better risk

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}04{:}27{.}293 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}31{.}210$  stratify patients with DIECASTS and.

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}04{:}31{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}33{.}520$  That that is very similar

NOTE Confidence: 0.87287312

 $00{:}04{:}33{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}35{.}830$  to what perfuse diecasts UM

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:04:35.919 \longrightarrow 00:04:38.760$  is looking at, and I think

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00{:}04{:}38.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}42.000$  both Shadi and I recognize that

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00{:}04{:}42.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}45.037$  stenosis is an important metric.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:04:45.040 \longrightarrow 00:04:46.625$  We're not saying that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:04:46.625 \longrightarrow 00:04:47.893$  want to supplant stenosis,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:04:47.900 \rightarrow 00:04:52.948$  but that we can add information to stenosis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:04:52.950 \rightarrow 00:04:56.408$  And that may well help us identify
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:04:56.408 \rightarrow 00:04:59.789$  patients who fail medical management.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:04:59.790 \longrightarrow 00:05:02.884$  So in Captiva we may find that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:05:02.884 \rightarrow 00:05:05.344$  low dose rivaroxaban and aspirin
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:05:05.344 \rightarrow 00:05:08.464$  lowers the rate of recurrent stroke,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:05:08.470 \longrightarrow 00:05:10.354$  perhaps to 10%.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:05:10.354 \longrightarrow 00:05:14.302$  But why did those 10% still
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:05:14.302 \rightarrow 00:05:17.510$  fail medical management and?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- 00:05:17.510 --> 00:05:20.390 The multimodal MRI markers
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:05:20.390 \rightarrow 00:05:23.990$  that were interested in UM,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:05:23.990 \longrightarrow 00:05:27.302$  we anticipate patients will spend about
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00{:}05{:}27{.}302 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}32{.}315$  50 minutes in the scanner in addition to.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:05:32.315 \longrightarrow 00:05:35.690$  Sort of conventional diffusion imaging
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00{:}05{:}35{.}690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}39{.}084$  volumetric imaging will get standard
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:05:39.084 \rightarrow 00:05:42.429$  perfusion imaging the main exposures,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

00:05:42.429 --> 00:05:43.112 though,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:05:43.112 \rightarrow 00:05:46.984$  will be quantitative MRA which you

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:05:46.984 \longrightarrow 00:05:49.708$  might be familiar with from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

00:05:49.708 --> 00:05:53.050 Vera TOS study wall shear stress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

00:05:53.050 - 00:05:56.350 which is an emerging technique

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00{:}05{:}56{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}59{.}664$  that looks at the disruption

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:05:59.664 \rightarrow 00:06:02.176$  of flow around plaque.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00{:}06{:}02{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}05{.}195$  And then inflammation of plaque

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00{:}06{:}05{.}195 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}09{.}309$  on vessel wall or black blood Mr.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

00:06:09.310 --> 00:06:09.990 Uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:06:09.990 \longrightarrow 00:06:14.846$  I won't show up numerous a data

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:06:14.846 \longrightarrow 00:06:17.694$  fields in this presentation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:06:17.700 \longrightarrow 00:06:21.102$  but these all have been shown

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:06:21.102 \longrightarrow 00:06:24.219$  in prospective studies to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:06:24.219 \dashrightarrow 00:06:27.187$  associated with recurrent stroke.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00{:}06{:}27.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}31.642$  All smaller studies and and a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:06:31.642 \rightarrow 00:06:35.440$  suboptimal in in various ways,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:06:35.440 \longrightarrow 00:06:37.320$  which I won't go into.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:06:37.320 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.560$  But certainly they have.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:06:39.560 \rightarrow 00:06:42.360$  Preliminary data suggesting that they
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:06:42.360 \longrightarrow 00:06:45.807$  could be predictive of recurrent stroke.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:06:45.810 \dashrightarrow 00:06:49.386$  And I think when looking at the rationale
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- 00:06:49.386 --> 00:06:53.269 for an ancillary MRI study to Captiva,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- 00:06:53.270 --> 00:06:53.880 UM,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:06:53.880 \rightarrow 00:06:59.276$  it is an opportunity that if we miss it,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:06:59.276 \longrightarrow 00:07:02.888$  it really would be a major loss.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00{:}07{:}02.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}04.160$  I think for the field,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- 00:07:04.160 --> 00:07:08.170 because regardless of if Captiva
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00{:}07{:}08.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}10.090$  ends up being a positive trial,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:07:10.090 \dashrightarrow 00:07:13.594$  and I think there's ample reason
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:07:13.594 \rightarrow 00:07:16.390$  to believe it will be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:07:16.390 \rightarrow 00:07:19.715$  There will be trials subsequent to Captiva,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:07:19.720 \longrightarrow 00:07:23.283$  and if we can identify the patient

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:07:23.283 \rightarrow 00:07:26.863$  population who's going to fail the new

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:07:26.863 \rightarrow 00:07:29.809$  standard of care of medical management,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00{:}07{:}29{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}33{.}200$  that is an important piece

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:07:33.200 \longrightarrow 00:07:36.720$  for trials moving forward.

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00{:}07{:}36{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}39{.}744$  And Captiva does not have standardized

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:07:39.744 \rightarrow 00:07:43.353$  imaging and and as somebody who does

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

00:07:43.353 - > 00:07:46.359 a lot of secondary data analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:07:46.360 \longrightarrow 00:07:49.852$  I think it's it's a responsibility

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:07:49.852 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.078$  of mine to try to give back to

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:07:54.080 \dashrightarrow 00:07:58.635$  the community by hopefully giving

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:07:58.635 \rightarrow 00:08:01.830$  some standardized imaging and

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:08:01.830 \longrightarrow 00:08:04.590$  other imaging in addition to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615

 $00:08:04.590 \dashrightarrow 00:08:07.030$  three exposures that I mentioned.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:08:07.030 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.114$  To accompany the outcome
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- 00:08:09.114 --> 00:08:10.156 adjudication Captiva,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:08:10.160 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.122$  which will be excellent and the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00{:}08{:}15{.}122 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}19{.}708$  final reason is that I think there
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:08:19.708 \longrightarrow 00:08:23.720$  are other hypotheses related to that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00{:}08{:}23.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}28.054$  additional Mr Data such as you know,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:08:28.054 \rightarrow 00:08:32.548$  do we see signal for cognitive outcomes?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:08:32.550 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.814$  There are some cognitive
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:08:34.814 \rightarrow 00:08:37.078$  outcomes collected in Captiva.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- 00:08:37.080 --> 00:08:39.780 But getting a standardized MRI will
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:08:39.780 \longrightarrow 00:08:43.243$  allow us to circle back and say why.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:08:43.243 \rightarrow 00:08:47.827$  Why do we see decline in cognitive function?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:08:47.830 \rightarrow 00:08:50.938$  Is it because there's cortical atrophy?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00{:}08{:}50{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}53{.}472$  Is it because the white matter
- NOTE Confidence: 0.815809795384615
- $00:08:53.472 \rightarrow 00:08:55.160$  hyper intensity volume increased?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

00:08:57.190 --> 00:09:00.246 And I think I'll skip this because, uhm?

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

00:09:00.246 --> 00:09:02.950 It, uh, our inclusion

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:09:02.950 \longrightarrow 00:09:04.978$  exclusion mimics Captiva.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

00:09:04.980 - > 00:09:08.032 We would want to obtain the MRI

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:09:08.032 \rightarrow 00:09:11.530$  within 14 days of captive enrollment.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}09{:}11.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}14.494$  And our primary outcome would be

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}09{:}14.494 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}17.132$  recurrent stroke in the vascular

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:09:17.132 \longrightarrow 00:09:19.997$  territory of the index stroke.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}09{:}20{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}23{.}384$  We will have a 12 month follow up

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

00:09:23.384 --> 00:09:26.927 MRI so the study includes a baseline

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}09{:}26{.}927 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}31{.}026$  and follow up Mr UM and that would

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

00:09:31.026 --> 00:09:34.540 allow us as a secondary outcome to

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}09{:}34.647 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}38.658$  have asymptomatic silent infarcts in

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:09:38.658 \rightarrow 00:09:41.798$  addition to the symptomatic infarcts.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}09{:}41.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}43.198$  As I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:09:43.198 \longrightarrow 00:09:45.994$  will also is a tertiary outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}09{:}46{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}49{.}110$  Look at cortical thickness and

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:09:49.110 \longrightarrow 00:09:50.976$  white matter hyperintensities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

00:09:50.980 --> 00:09:53.980 Uh, it's a pretty simple ancillary.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:09:53.980 \rightarrow 00:09:57.557$  We're only collecting data from the imaging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}09{:}57{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}01{.}484$  so there's an MRI within 14 days and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}10{:}01{.}484 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}06{.}460$  one at completion of Captiva, 12 months.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:10:06.460 \longrightarrow 00:10:10.217$  Uhm, we think will need about 300

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:10:10.217 \rightarrow 00:10:14.639$  patients to reliably show and outcome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:10:14.640 \longrightarrow 00:10:17.538$  Uhm. We mainly powered it on Q.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}10{:}17.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}18.101$  Murray.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}10{:}18{.}101 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}21{.}467$  Although actually many of the assumptions

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}10{:}21.467 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}26.080$  hold for the other exposures as well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:10:26.080 \rightarrow 00:10:30.310$  And when getting those 300 patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}10{:}30{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}32{.}635$  multimodal MRI is not something

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}10{:}32.635 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}34.960$  that every site can do,

 $00:10:34.960 \longrightarrow 00:10:37.150$  and stroke net.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

00:10:37.150 --> 00:10:40.140 Certainly elements of the MRI

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:10:40.140 \longrightarrow 00:10:43.130$  are going to be challenging,

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:10:43.130 \longrightarrow 00:10:46.100$  although we think within the

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:10:46.100 \longrightarrow 00:10:48.476$  the realm of feasibility.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}10{:}48{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}53{.}639$  But we are proposing picking 30 high

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:10:53.639 \rightarrow 00:10:56.744$  enrolling sites and we think those.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

00:10:56.744 --> 00:10:59.180 30 sites will actually account for

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:10:59.262 \rightarrow 00:11:02.044$  about 50% of captive a sample,

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:11:02.044 \longrightarrow 00:11:05.480$  so if you look at the enrollment

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}11{:}05{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}08{.}326$  in Arcadian most up to date,

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:11:08.326 \longrightarrow 00:11:11.044$  well it's a couple weeks ago.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:11:11.050 \rightarrow 00:11:14.290$  But what you'll see is that if you

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00{:}11{:}14.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}17.666$  take all of the sites and then sort

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:11:17.666 \rightarrow 00:11:21.740$  of focus on the top third there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:11:21.740 \longrightarrow 00:11:24.806$  you get at least half of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

00:11:24.806 - 00:11:27.519 enrollments in the overall trial.

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

00:11:27.520 --> 00:11:28.173 Uhm?

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

00:11:28.173 --> 00:11:31.438 The sample size of Captiva

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:11:31.438 \longrightarrow 00:11:33.544$  is about 1600 patients,

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:11:33.544 \longrightarrow 00:11:36.323$  so we think we'd have over 800

NOTE Confidence: 0.923471812857143

 $00:11:36.323 \rightarrow 00:11:38.639$  eligible patients at the 30 sites.

NOTE Confidence: 0.668453095

00:11:40.720 --> 00:11:46.108 Arcadia CSI is enrolling quite well.

NOTE Confidence: 0.668453095

 $00:11:46.110 \longrightarrow 00:11:47.835$  We think we didn't roll

NOTE Confidence: 0.668453095

 $00:11:47.835 \longrightarrow 00:11:49.215$  even better than that,

NOTE Confidence: 0.668453095

 $00:11:49.220 \longrightarrow 00:11:52.844$  and we don't have any additional

NOTE Confidence: 0.668453095

 $00:11:52.844 \rightarrow 00:11:56.190$  data collection apart from the MRI.

NOTE Confidence: 0.668453095

 $00:11:56.190 \longrightarrow 00:11:59.242$  Uhm, and, uh, I think I'll close

NOTE Confidence: 0.668453095

 $00:11:59.242 \rightarrow 00:12:01.669$  there 'cause we're out of time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.668453095

 $00{:}12{:}01.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}05.009$  but thank you so much honey for

NOTE Confidence: 0.668453095

 $00{:}12{:}05{.}010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}08{.}080$  letting me briefly present that. Thank

00:12:08.090 --> 00:12:11.667 you so much Adam. This was certific.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00:12:11.670 \longrightarrow 00:12:14.230$  We definitely need better treatments

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00:12:14.230 \rightarrow 00:12:16.790$  for patients with symptomatic icad.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00:12:16.790 \rightarrow 00:12:19.268$  As you mentioned, the risk of recurrence

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00:12:19.268 \longrightarrow 00:12:22.054$  is high and you know there are

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00:12:22.054 \rightarrow 00:12:24.209$  multiple reasons why patients recur,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00:12:24.210 \longrightarrow 00:12:26.338$  so it's a comprehensive.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00:12:26.338 \rightarrow 00:12:29.530$  Understanding of these reasons is very

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00{:}12{:}29.618 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}32.658$  important than secondary prevention.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

00:12:32.660 --> 00:12:35.008 I don't see any.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00{:}12{:}35{.}008 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}38{.}530$  I I see question from Kevin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00{:}12{:}38{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}41{.}250$  And I'm just gonna read the the question,

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00:12:41.250 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.039$  uh, so for each of your approaches is

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00:12:45.039 \rightarrow 00:12:49.092$  the idea to one identify patients at

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00:12:49.092 \rightarrow 00:12:51.900$  higher risk or patients that may be

NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571

 $00:12:51.900 \rightarrow 00:12:53.850$  more likely to benefit from mechanical

- NOTE Confidence: 0.848039561428571
- $00:12:53.906 \rightarrow 00:12:55.998$  intervention versus medical treatment.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.824975114285714
- $00{:}12{:}57{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}01{.}782$  I think Kevin's question is for me, although
- NOTE Confidence: 0.824975114285714
- $00{:}13{:}01{.}782 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}04{.}960$  it could apply to profuse eyeglasses.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728
- $00:13:07.630 \rightarrow 00:13:09.905$  I think the idea is to identify
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728
- $00:13:09.905 \longrightarrow 00:13:11.280$  patients at higher risk.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728
- $00:13:11.280 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.822$  Come with the idea of both
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728
- 00:13:15.822 --> 00:13:18.093 understanding plaque biology.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728
- 00:13:18.100 --> 00:13:19.796 I didn't talk about it in my slides,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728
- $00:13:19.800 \longrightarrow 00:13:22.089$  but one of the things we really
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728
- $00{:}13{:}22.089 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}25.053$  want to do is look at the evolution
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728
- $00:13:25.053 \rightarrow 00:13:28.027$  of of these plaques with sort of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728
- $00{:}13{:}28.027 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}29.999$  multimodal high resolution Mr.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728
- 00:13:30.000 --> 00:13:33.230 Over a year. But uhm,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728
- 00:13:33.230 --> 00:13:36.655 that's that's secondary to being
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728
- $00:13:36.655 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.342$  able to identify inclusion.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.902554167272728

 $00:13:39.342 \longrightarrow 00:13:41.966$  Exclusion for future studies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8941694

00:13:44.320 --> 00:13:46.046 Great, thank you so much

NOTE Confidence: 0.8941694

 $00{:}13{:}46.046 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}47.990$  for this and thank you so

NOTE Confidence: 0.936955975

 $00{:}13{:}48.068 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}50.180$  much everyone for attending.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936955975

 $00:13:50.180 \longrightarrow 00:13:52.670$  We had great sessions today.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936955975

00:13:52.670 --> 00:13:55.904 I personally have learned so much from

NOTE Confidence: 0.936955975

 $00{:}13{:}55{.}904 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}58{.}267$  each presentation and I'm sure most

NOTE Confidence: 0.936955975

 $00:13:58.267 \rightarrow 00:14:01.139$  of us if not all feel the same way.

NOTE Confidence: 0.936955975

 $00:14:01.140 \longrightarrow 00:14:02.995$  Now I'll turn it over the Kevin.