

WEBVTT

NOTE duration:"00:05:10"

NOTE recognizability:0.742

NOTE language:en-us

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:02.080 --> 00:00:03.224 This is like syndrome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:03.224 --> 00:00:04.654 often referred to as RLS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:04.660 --> 00:00:06.290 is a neurological sensory motor

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:06.290 --> 00:00:08.252 disorder that is characterized by an

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:08.252 --> 00:00:09.926 uncomfortable urge to move the legs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:09.930 --> 00:00:11.376 Women are twice as likely to

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:11.376 --> 00:00:12.580 be affected compared to men.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:12.580 --> 00:00:14.185 Did Colonel Literature has suggested

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:14.185 --> 00:00:15.469 that pregnancy may explain

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:15.469 --> 00:00:17.019 some of the gender difference.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:17.020 --> 00:00:18.960 So far multiple observational studies

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:18.960 --> 00:00:20.512 have found positive association

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:20.512 --> 00:00:21.960 between parity and wireless,

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:21.960 --> 00:00:23.360 but presently there is limited  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:23.360 --> 00:00:24.480 understanding about those response.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:24.480 --> 00:00:27.574 Interaction to the best of our knowledge,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:27.580 --> 00:00:29.533 there has only been one population based  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:29.533 --> 00:00:31.229 cross sectional study that has analyzed.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:31.230 --> 00:00:32.830 It's just association by limitation  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:32.830 --> 00:00:34.870 of that study was their method,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:34.870 --> 00:00:36.530 which failed to all other  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:36.530 --> 00:00:38.190 conditions that may mimic RLS.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:38.190 --> 00:00:39.189 Since that study,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:39.189 --> 00:00:40.854 the Cambridge Hopkins are less  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:40.854 --> 00:00:42.463 questionnaire was created for use  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:42.463 --> 00:00:43.948 in RLS research methodology and  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:43.948 --> 00:00:45.510 is designed to exclude mimics.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:45.510 --> 00:00:47.310 The primary objective of our study  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:00:47.310 --> 00:00:48.897 is to determine whether there

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:48.897 --> 00:00:50.552 is a dose response relationship

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:50.552 --> 00:00:52.140 between greater parity and RLS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:52.140 --> 00:00:52.515 Furthermore,

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:52.515 --> 00:00:54.390 our secondary objectives are to

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:54.390 --> 00:00:55.890 assess the association between

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:55.940 --> 00:00:57.650 biological sex and rolls without the

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:00:57.650 --> 00:01:00.064 effect of parity and to identify any

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:00.064 --> 00:01:01.288 potential independent predictors.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:01.290 --> 00:01:04.110 Associated with RLS in our model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:04.110 --> 00:01:05.790 our study is a cross sectional

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:05.790 --> 00:01:07.861 design on data collected in a prior

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:07.861 --> 00:01:09.356 study that looked at hypothyroidism.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:09.360 --> 00:01:11.435 Prevalence in the large population

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:11.435 --> 00:01:13.830 of individuals with or without this

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:13.830 --> 00:01:15.750 data set was appropriate for current

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:15.750 --> 00:01:18.051 study because it also contains helpful  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:18.051 --> 00:01:19.755 information on past pregnancies.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:19.760 --> 00:01:21.215 The female participants were asked  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:21.215 --> 00:01:23.039 to report their total number of  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:23.039 --> 00:01:24.654 pregnancy events in the accompanying  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:24.654 --> 00:01:25.946 gestational weeks and outcome,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:25.950 --> 00:01:27.486 whether that is live birth still,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:27.490 --> 00:01:29.910 birth, miscarriage, or planned abortion.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:29.910 --> 00:01:30.855 To define priority,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:30.855 --> 00:01:32.745 we use American College of Obstetricians.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:32.750 --> 00:01:33.560 Gynecologist definition,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:33.560 --> 00:01:35.990 which is any like pregnancy or  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:35.990 --> 00:01:38.004 still birth greater than or equal  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:38.004 --> 00:01:40.336 to 20 weeks to ascertain RL status,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:40.336 --> 00:01:42.181 we asked participants who completed  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:01:42.181 --> 00:01:44.159 Cambridge Hopkins or less questionnaire

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:44.160 --> 00:01:46.085 and for analysis we share for women

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:46.085 --> 00:01:48.112 based on the total number of Paris

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:48.112 --> 00:01:50.262 events and no data that were excluded

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:50.262 --> 00:01:52.280 from the analysis will get a table one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:52.280 --> 00:01:53.995 We found that having no pair servant

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:53.995 --> 00:01:55.624 and having one Paris with it or

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:55.624 --> 00:01:57.134 more common in the negative women

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:57.134 --> 00:01:59.126 whereas having two pairs events in

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:01:59.126 --> 00:02:00.913 having through more Paris events were

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:02:00.913 --> 00:02:02.680 more common in the positive woman.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:02:02.680 --> 00:02:04.780 In our most like their model,

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:02:04.780 --> 00:02:06.887 we found that women with one person

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:02:06.887 --> 00:02:09.115 had 1.44 times the odds of having our

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:02:09.115 --> 00:02:11.039 list compared to normal Paris woman.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:02:11.040 --> 00:02:13.116 But this difference was not significant.

NOTE Confidence: 0.707506492222222

00:02:13.120 --> 00:02:13.461 However,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:13.461 --> 00:02:16.212 women with two pairs event at 3.3 times,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:16.212 --> 00:02:18.318 often women with three or more  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:18.318 --> 00:02:20.220 Paris events had 3.31 times odds  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:20.220 --> 00:02:21.460 of having our allies,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:21.460 --> 00:02:23.910 and these differences were significant.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:23.910 --> 00:02:25.270 When assessing her dose  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:25.270 --> 00:02:25.950 response relationship,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:25.950 --> 00:02:27.834 we also noted a positive trend  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:27.834 --> 00:02:29.386 between the purity groups and  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:29.386 --> 00:02:31.162 all the findings I just mentioned  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:31.162 --> 00:02:32.709 are reflected in figure one,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:32.710 --> 00:02:34.830 former vault type variant model.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:34.830 --> 00:02:36.770 We identify Agent depression  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:36.770 --> 00:02:38.225 as independent predictors.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:38.230 --> 00:02:39.873 We found that there is a 10% increase

NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:39.873 --> 00:02:42.344 odds of having RLS with each year

NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:42.344 --> 00:02:44.482 increasing age and women who reported

NOTE Confidence: 0.7075064922222222

00:02:44.482 --> 00:02:46.528 depression had 2.5 times odds of

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:02:46.592 --> 00:02:49.105 having RLS compared to women who did

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:02:49.105 --> 00:02:51.138 not report depression to assess the

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:02:51.138 --> 00:02:52.402 association between biological sex

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:02:52.402 --> 00:02:54.569 and or less without the effect of.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:02:54.570 --> 00:02:56.964 Apparently we applied a separate regression

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:02:56.964 --> 00:02:59.356 analysis that look that compare mental

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:02:59.356 --> 00:03:01.904 Nola Paris woman looking at table three.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:01.910 --> 00:03:03.912 We found there is no association between

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:03.912 --> 00:03:06.486 sex and or less after adjusting for age

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:06.486 --> 00:03:08.650 in conjunction with their main finding,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:08.650 --> 00:03:10.442 we can infer that it is not

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:10.442 --> 00:03:11.450 necessarily the biological sex,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:11.450 --> 00:03:12.935 but rather the effect of  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:12.935 --> 00:03:13.826 the childbearing potential.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:13.830 --> 00:03:15.672 There may be counted for the  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:15.672 --> 00:03:17.323 gender difference that is noted  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:17.323 --> 00:03:18.779 in the current literature.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:18.780 --> 00:03:20.045 Some notable strength over study  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:20.045 --> 00:03:21.714 include the use of the Cambridge  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:21.714 --> 00:03:23.146 Hopkins on RLS Questionnaire,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:23.150 --> 00:03:24.915 which is a validated questionnaire  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:24.915 --> 00:03:25.974 with high sensitivity.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:25.980 --> 00:03:26.826 And specificity,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:26.826 --> 00:03:30.210 and that is designed to exclude RLS mimics  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:30.210 --> 00:03:32.009 to define our main variable of interest,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:32.010 --> 00:03:33.420 we utilize a professional body.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:33.420 --> 00:03:36.060 The ACOG to provide a standard  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:36.060 --> 00:03:38.659 consensus on the definition of parity.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:38.660 --> 00:03:38.990 Lastly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:38.990 --> 00:03:40.970 this study attempts to provide better

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:40.970 --> 00:03:42.640 understanding about possible dose response,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:42.640 --> 00:03:44.680 interaction between parity and RLS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:44.680 --> 00:03:47.064 which is an area of limited research and

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:47.064 --> 00:03:48.699 understanding the current literature.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:48.700 --> 00:03:50.608 There are also some several notable

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:50.608 --> 00:03:51.880 limitations with their study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:51.880 --> 00:03:53.386 First is with a cross sectional

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:53.386 --> 00:03:55.100 analysis on data from a prior study.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:55.100 --> 00:03:57.548 They use a case control design

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:57.548 --> 00:03:59.590 which may introduce selection bias.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:59.590 --> 00:03:59.875 Second,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:03:59.875 --> 00:04:01.585 a large proportion of the symbols

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:01.585 --> 00:04:02.440 of Caucasian race.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:02.440 --> 00:04:02.842 Therefore,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:02.842 --> 00:04:04.852 this may not be generalizable  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:04.852 --> 00:04:06.058 to other ethnicities.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:06.060 --> 00:04:06.388 Third,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:06.388 --> 00:04:08.356 the participants were asked to provide  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:08.356 --> 00:04:10.518 retrospective data on their past pregnancies,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:10.520 --> 00:04:12.308 which may have introduced recall bias  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:12.308 --> 00:04:14.142 as these events were several decades  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:14.142 --> 00:04:16.486 in the past for some of our participants,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:16.490 --> 00:04:18.104 4th depression was self reported and  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:18.104 --> 00:04:19.959 this was not confirmed with objectives.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:19.960 --> 00:04:22.170 Sources such as medical records.  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:22.170 --> 00:04:23.031 So in conclusion,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:23.031 --> 00:04:25.456 in line with Bergeron on their 2004 study,  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:25.456 --> 00:04:27.892 we also observed a dose response relationship  
NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:27.892 --> 00:04:29.738 between greater purity and analyst.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:29.740 --> 00:04:31.635 We identify Asian depression as

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:31.635 --> 00:04:33.530 independent predictors in our group.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:33.530 --> 00:04:33.898 However,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:33.898 --> 00:04:36.106 the data around this is conflicting.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:36.110 --> 00:04:37.780 Lastly, we found no association

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:37.780 --> 00:04:39.450 between biological sex and RLS,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:39.450 --> 00:04:41.795 suggesting that parity in pregnancy or likely

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:41.795 --> 00:04:43.959 factors in explaining the gender difference,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:43.960 --> 00:04:45.004 and so far,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:45.004 --> 00:04:46.396 both iron deficiency anemia.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:46.400 --> 00:04:48.305 Hormonal changes during pregnancy have

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:48.305 --> 00:04:50.210 been implicated as likely explanations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:50.210 --> 00:04:51.338 Are less pathophysiology,

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:51.338 --> 00:04:53.970 but more research is still needed to

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:54.035 --> 00:04:55.707 better understand these interactions

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:55.707 --> 00:04:58.215 in order to provide more optimal

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:04:58.284 --> 00:05:00.468 therapy for pregnant women with RLS.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:05:00.470 --> 00:05:02.400 Given that most pharmacologic used

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:05:02.400 --> 00:05:05.279 to treat RLS or unsafe in pregnancy.

NOTE Confidence: 0.785275316

00:05:05.280 --> 00:05:06.280 Thank you for listening.